To the Editor:
I was absolutely astonished when I read the recent letter in The Tech preparing to stop showing pornographic movies at MIT [Feedback, March 4].

Mr. Bonugli's arguments were generally invalid, suffering from these problems: not defining concept (except for secular humanism) improperly equating certain words, asserting hypocrisies and not substantiating conclusions. It is existentialist, as Mr. Bonugli would have one believe, tantamount to moral neutrality. One of the basic tenets of existentialism is that one must be responsible for one's actions—this seems to encourage morals. Also, existentialism does not say that "If it feels good, do it!" but rather it states that life is pain, as exemplified by Hemingway's character Santiago.

Until Mr. Bonugli informed me so wisely, I did not know that Social Darwinism implied moral neutrality. I thought it was simply said that the most socially fit are selected for. Do not morals make one socially fit? Social Darwinism is that one must be responsible for one's actions. If Mr. Bonugli has several unsubstantiated conclusions.

As his crowning achievement in obfuscation, Mr. Bonugli commits that he does not care what he uses, maybe pares ethics and economics by coupling ethics with communism. PSK did not lose game.

To the Editor:
When I opened The Tech today (March 8, 1983), I was pleased to see that 11 results were published. However our house (Phi Sigma Kappa) and I were quite surprised to find out that we had been defeated by Sig Ep B when we had won. In fact we played tonight against the Zeta Devils. I realize that these printing errors may not be your fault entirely if at all, but I hope you can correct the mistake and retract the previous result printed.

Philbert Pan '86
Editor's note: The Tech regrets the error.