**Tom Curtis**

**How far should MIT exert its power?**

An important philosophical question has been raised by the Dining Committee. Should MIT have standards for its students or is it better to give them as much freedom as possible? That question is "How extensively should MIT exercise its power over its students?"

In some situations, MIT is clearly justified in exercising its power over its students. In academic matters, MIT must set down certain standards in order to maintain its integrity and is obviously justified in asking students to meet certain requirements before they graduate.

However, in some other situations, MIT would clearly be exercising its power beyond reasonable bounds. An example would be requiring students to wear uniforms to class.

The question is: Which group in the middle is MIT trying to improve social interaction? Isn't it better to simply provide students with as many opportunities as possible?

In some situations, however, it is necessary for MIT to act. For example, one standard that could force MIT to act is that MIT is legally responsible for the actions of most MIT-sponsored groups. MIT is therefore justified in setting down some standards for these groups in order to avoid a lawsuit.

MIT is also justified in exercising its power when economics require it. For example, MIT is "forcing" students to pay tuition in order to study here.

Some people would say that MIT is also justified in exercising its power to instill values in its students. Thus, various rules have been established which are designed to make students "complete human beings." The fact that MIT is allowed to live in an MIT living group is "an environment conducive to personal development." In order to maintain its integrity, MIT is therefore justified in asking its students to avoid many activities.

However, when MIT tries to instill values in its students by making them do something, it runs into problems. First of all, how do you determine which values to instill? This could be done by majority rule, but it may not be fair for the majority to force its opinions on everyone else.

Even if there is an unanimous agreement that a value is important, how do you go about cultivating this value in students? Anyone who agrees that social interaction is good, but there are millions of ways to interact. Should MIT single out one or two methods as better than all others?

Finally, is forcing students to do something really the best way to improve social interaction? Isn't it better to simply provide students with as many opportunities as possible?

**Gordon Hunter**

**Professors, students, and love**

A survey conducted for the American Psychological Association recently reported that one in five couples have a psychology doctorate in the last six years. "More and more people are entering relationships thinking they will be happy," report in my opinion.

This formality of set rules for these groups in order to maintain its integrity and is clearly justified in asking the students to tell where to eat! What guidelines can be used to resolve the two points of view?

A major guideline should be that MIT should exercise no more power than is necessary. This is the only way to be consistent with the ideals of academic freedom.

In some situations, however, it is necessary for MIT to act. For example, some standards that could force MIT to act is that MIT is legally responsible for the actions of most MIT-sponsored groups. MIT is therefore justified in setting down some standards for these groups in order to avoid a lawsuit.

MIT is also justified in exercising its power when economics require it. For example, MIT is "forcing" students to pay tuition in order to study here.

Some people would say that MIT is also justified in exercising its power to instill values in its students. Thus, various rules have been established which are designed to make students "complete human beings." The fact that MIT is allowed to live in an MIT living group is "an environment conducive to personal development." In order to maintain its integrity, MIT is therefore justified in asking its students to avoid many activities.

However, when MIT tries to instill values in its students by making them do something, it runs into problems. First of all, how do you determine which values to instill? This could be done by majority rule, but it may not be fair for the majority to force its opinions on everyone else.

Even if there is an unanimous agreement that a value is important, how do you go about cultivating this value in students? Anyone who agrees that social interaction is good, but there are millions of ways to interact. Should MIT single out one or two methods as better than all others?

Finally, is forcing students to do something really the best way to improve social interaction? Isn't it better to simply provide students with as many opportunities as possible?