Editorials

Due process vs. intentional bias

Two separate but related issues should be considered in evaluating the dismissal of two dormitory desk workers as a result of their refusal to release the telephone number of a black student.

In its rush to respond to the accusations, the house administration seems to have disregarded a fair hearing process. An appeal by the accused is now necessary in order to address the disparities between the two versions of the story and determine whether any serious action was warranted. While racial bias and intentional discrimination may be difficult to detect, and racial incidents should be handled with sensitivity, any special care must not preclude due process for the accused.

Minority students should discuss their concerns about racial bias, but they should not create racial incidents to promote awareness. After all, there may be legitimate causes for concern, in this case, the acuser's decision to notify the press at the same time as the desk workers' supervisors created a bad impression. This action demonstrates an unspoken mistrust of a system of justice which tries to be color-blind.

Minority students' perceptions of a lack of racial neutrality in the community must be recognized, but cannot interfere with every student's right to due process. If the incident truly involves racial bias, proper due process to first a fair process must be used to resolve the disputed facts and determine whether or not any discriminatory action was intentional.

Putting an end to illegal finals

It may seem too early in the term to discuss final examinations, but, unfortunately, finals week arrives just in short weeks.

The Institute has delineated explicit rules controlling examinations in section 2.51 of their ability to attend finals week without prior approval of the Faculty. These rules were drafted to alleviate some of the pressures students feel during finals week.

Some professors are following illegal finals — tests held during finals week without prior approval of the Registrar's Office, or exams lasting more than one hour during the last week of classes. Many of these professors sincerely believe they are assisting students by violating faculty rules.

They are not. Professors tend to forget that the average MIT student takes more than one course each semester. The rules were adopted to make it easier for students to make their last effort. A common complaint is that the course material, not their ability to perform without sleep or to cram many days of study into a few short hours.

Students feel awkward complaining to professors about illegal finals, feeling that any complaint would hurt their grades. The Institute, if it is serious about this rule, must therefore establish a formal complaint procedure to follow in instances where a violation of rules has occurred.

WORKER DISPUTES BSU VERSION

Worker disputes BSU version

To the Editor:
I would like to comment in the letter from the BSU, that appeared in last Friday's Tech. The first thing that caught my eye was when reading the subtitle, the dis-pute reported by Mr. Contreras involved right there in Lobby 7. His memory truly improves with time. In the first place, I was not the desk worker and I did not answer the telephone. It was what Mr. Contreras reports. Secondly, Mr. Contreras then reports that a worker who looked who Sam Austin was and that a bystander answered by making a comment about Mr. Austin. The fact is that the bystander was already made the comments was also the person who also answered the phone. I suppose he could have asked himself a question only to answer it seconds later but that seems a bit hypocritical if you ask me.

I especially questionMr. Contreras' recollections of the Voting method not explained

To the Editor:
In response to Dennis Gorman et al. (The Tech, 11/3/81), I would like to respond to Mr. Arnold's letter. It appears that Mr. Arnold is apparently bombarding students with improper materials and that he has also not been sanctioned — Walker time, temp, below standard. In the week that was termed slow according to Paul Reins '82, a crew of steam plant workers in the Physical plant and various dishwashing at Walker Memorial kitchen had not been sanitized for five days.

Mr. Reim further stated that "Walker management had called in physical plant, but physical plant just went down stairs and picked their noses. There was also a statement by Mr. Jackson who stated that Walker was not very clean, but that seems a different dialogue from fixing it and working on it. I believe for The Tech should check out their facts before writing a story and the editors of The Tech should check to make sure that the story is written properly.

PHYSICAL PLANT FIXED HEATER WHEN CALLED

Physical plant fixed heater when called

To the Editor:
In the October 27, 1981, edition of The Tech, there was an article by Duane Lerner and Michael Shafer entitled "Doubts May Not Be Sanitized — Walker time, temp, below standard." In the middle of the week that was termed slow, according to Paul Reims '82, a crew of steam plant workers in the Physical plant and various dishwashing at Walker Memorial kitchen had not been sanitized for five days.

Moreover, the Steinman's shops at a certain time was not being served, and the rooms were not being cleaned. The ventilating systems were not being cleaned, and the lights were not being turned on. The glaciers were not being cleared and the snow was not being removed from the walkways. The heating system was not being repaired. The physical plant just went down stairs and picked their noses.

I believe for The Tech should check out their facts before writing a story and the editors of The Tech should check to make sure that the story is written properly.

SERVICE widens options

Service widens options

In The Editor:
We are writing in response to Ken Soum's unfavorable, and, in our opinion, unfair column concerning the Campus Match Service in Tech, Nov. 21. Though an adequate criterion, Mr. Soum produced arguments whose flaws are easily resolved. The services are considered.

Our first argument dealt with the portion of the Service's questionnaire dealing with the purpose of the applicant's desired match. There are four possible responses: 1) friendship and shared activities 2) Sometime romance as well 3) Mostly romance/sex 4) Serious romance/sexual only. He stated that responding "1" or "2" indicates that the applicant is admitting his/her own inability to find a date, and expressed the viewpoint of a friend that "Sending in the form is like admitting you're a complete wimp — a social incompetent." He failed to consider two points. First, sending in an application is to meet another person, or find a partner of sound judgment. It allows one to develop a new option for meeting attractive people. One can obviously still attend parties, study breaks, and other events, and meet people that way. The Campus Match Service offers a new way to improve your chances of meeting someone with common interests and looks.

Please turn to page 71