The philosophy behind John DeRubes' motion before the Graduate Student Assembly (GSA) is that the academic community cannot condone, and in fact should censure, the reprehensible actions of its less tolerant members. Written in that spirit, amidst the adverse reactions from the focus of a few, are the words of the motion, which suggest that "anyone who is found guilty of malicious actions against a member or group of members of this community on the bases of race, religion, sex, ethnic origin, sexual orientation or political beliefs be dismissed from the Institute." The question arises as to just what a "malicious action" is. Is it, as an GA floor leader Arthur Conterdom has said, something which it "threatening to someone's life?" If that is what the GA means, that is what the GA should say. The motion, as written, is unclear. So, the motion stands, and I pray that it does not precipitate any more equivocal and ambiguous action. This raises the possibility that someone could be dismissed from MIT for an action which, while it reflects insensitivity, was not motivated by any sympathy or dislike of the victim.

Once malicious action is defined, there is another potential problem with the motion: it may infringe on the First Amendment of the United States Constitution. While MIT may certainly punish anyone it finds guilty of threatening violent actions or destroying physical property, it cannot punish someone for being a bigot. Espousing prejudicial beliefs, no matter how offensive they may be, is a civil right with which no one can legally tamper.

The last problem with the motion is the severity of the recommendation. Without the existence of a conflict of interest, there is no basis to dismiss someone. If someone claims, "expulsion is never going to happen — it's more like a threat," this provision seems worse off than before. There is a danger that MIT could simply use these statutes on the books, statutes which may be invoked at a later time for purposes for which they were clearly not intended. The motion before the GA is designed to alert the MIT community to the intolerant acts being committed. Once aware of it, they hope that students will condemn them. Yet, the GA motion cannot be supported in its present form. Even though the perpetrators of such insults have little respect for the rights of others, the GA and the Institute community have a responsibility to ensure that substantive and procedural freedoms are protected for all, including bigots.

Conflicting interests

Although an Institute lawyer has confidently proclaimed that there are no conflicts of interest involved in the formation of a biotechnological research firm by three prominent MIT professors, there is cause for concern.

At least two potential sources of conflict of interest have plagued genetic engineering's recent sprint toward commercialization. There is an inherent difference in the treatment of information about the events at issue by the two groups. In the former, claims of "expulsion is never going to happen" — it's more like a threat. This provision seems worse off than before. There is a danger that MIT could simply use these statutes on the books, statutes which may be invoked at a later time for purposes for which they were clearly not intended. The motion before the GA is designed to alert the MIT community to the intolerant acts being committed. Once aware of it, they hope that students will condemn them. Yet, the GA motion cannot be supported in its present form. Even though the perpetrators of such insults have little respect for the rights of others, the GA and the Institute community have a responsibility to ensure that substantive and procedural freedoms are protected for all, including bigots.

Motivation must change before activism returns

To the Editor:
I feel compelled to write in response to clarify certain misconceptions expressed by Sheryl Strothers in her letter which appeared in the April 7, 1981 — Debra Smith, 27 year old nurse is brutally raped and murdered by two nigger ass-whoopers.

We do not intend to provoke publicity to anyone that would do these asinine things. We do want to inform the community of the situation.

We call on the people responsible for these actions to show some courage to attach their names to their statements.

The Black Students Union is
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Past not a justification for affirmative action

To the Editor:
As an attempt to clarify the principle arguments against so-called "affirmative action" programs, this letter is a response to the letter appearing in the April 7 issue of The Tech headlined "Racist hiring won't disappear.

The editor of the letter, senior Sheryl Strothers claims that these programs are necessary to eliminate discrimination in faculty hiring. Ms. Strothers cites as evidence for her position and as justification for these programs the many injustices suffered by blacks in America's early history, such as being "denied under pain of death even such simple skills as reading and writing," "lynchings, burnings, and murders," and a host of other evils spanning American history. Even such simple skills as reading and writing, the editor of the letter asserts, were "cruelly and arbitrarily denied to blacks by the laws of the land.

The past is a terrible thing to dishonor. In the case of the treatment of blacks by the laws of the land, it is even more tragic. The laws of the land were cruel and vicious, and they were wrong. But they were not arbitrary. The laws of the land were not cruel and vicious because of prejudice, but because of prejudice.
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