**Elect King to unify city**

Boston voters will choose a new mayor for the city next Tuesday, either Melvin King, a former state legislator, or John F. Collins. Students and city residents are highly qualified for the position, but only King is able to effectively unite the city.

King has demonstrated his sensitivity to the neighborhoods through his role in developing a job program for Boston residents, his support of neighborhood-based advisory committees, and his attention to the problems of minorities in the city. His "Rainbow Coalition" includes residents of every neighborhood in the city.

Flynn's positions on issues have often been contradictory. Although he opposed compulsory education when some parents sought to remove their children from school during the busing crisis of the early 1970s, he now supports education as a key to the city's success. He supported cutting the budget of the Economic Development Industrial Commission, but he later said that commission is a key to economic development for Boston.

Flynn has long served on the city council and knows much about the city budget; he claims, "I know where the cuts can be made." But King also has such experience, as director of the MIT Community Fellows Program, and as a former state legislator. He has promised "an audit and analysis, program by program" of the city's expenditures, and is capable of making reductions where necessary.

It seems unlikely, however, that King will win the election. Flynn's lead, according to polls conducted by The Boston Globe, has increased in recent weeks, illustrating the King's difficulty in garnering the support he needs in many primarily white neighborhoods of the city. It is a shame that discrimination still appears to play a large role in the election of government officials.

For the first time in recent years, the choice for mayor of the city, either man could serve the interests of the city, and bring the neighborhoods of Boston relief from debilitating years of neglect. In this respect, the race for mayor has already produced a victory for Boston.

**Students must speak on enrollment pains**

The Office of the President and the Office of the Dean for Student Affairs will hold a forum this evening to solicit opinions from the community on developing ways to alleviate overcrowding in the Department of Electrical Engineering and Computer Science.

Each of the solutions now being seriously considered threatens some freedom crucial to MIT students. The proposal that students apply as freshmen to specific departments rather than apply to MIT implies the freedom to choose any major offered by the Institute.

The notion of reviewing grades and limiting admission to certain departments on that basis will only increase academic pressure and reinforce students' and prospective students' image of MIT as a sweatshop. Institution of freshman grade review again means the freshmen pass/fail system, a favorite target for emasculation by the administration in the past year. The absence of recorded grades from the freshman year is often a primary reason behind a student's decision to attend or remain at the Institute.

A policy of reviewing sophomore grades would force students to gamble with their futures: should one play it safe by taking a broad range of classes to prepare for one major, or should one risk it all by loading up on Course 16 subjects? By postponing major until the junior year entails extra time and expense, no small concern for an MIT student.

Some departments would attract students lured only by the challenge of gaining a "good grade" in them, while others would be perceived as "dumping grounds" for those unable to survive the more competitive courses. This situation would create an unhealthy elitism at MIT, further detracting from the quality of life here. This school must now become the Massachusetts Institute of Electrical Engineering and Computer Science. The administration must develop the latent diversity present at this university.

The best solution is to change publicitv techniques and recruiting policies to focus on less well-known, though similarly excellent departments. The change will harm no one while increasing the enrollment in and upgrading the quality of non-engineering departments.

There is still time to influence the composition of the Class of 1988 if the decision is made now. Smaller departments, the Dean's Office, and the MIT News Office should assist the Admissions Office in recruiting and admitting a more broadly based group of freshmen next year.

The forum will take place between 4 p.m. and 6 p.m. tonight in room 26-100.

The administration will make a unilateral decision if there is no student input. Go to the forum and make yourself heard on this issue.

**MIT must not censor**

The Undergraduate Association General Assembly will hold a special meeting today at 5 p.m., at which it will consider proposing a referendum concerning community standards debate on pornography.

Discussion since the beginning of this year of the subject of pornography and community standards has been beneficial. It has encouraged members of the community to voice their opinions and understand those of others. Censorship, whether dictated or voted, is anathema to the right of individual choice, to the United States Constitution, and to the spirit of MIT. As an institution predicated on the free exchange of ideas, MIT must not be pressured to turn its lights out because the ideas presented are unpleasant to some or even most members of the community.

A democratic government's greatest challenge is to avoid employing majority rule to the detriment of minorities. This "fractional" majority, as James Madison defined it, abuses its power by exploitation or repression of a minority. The right to freedom of expression and choice is one which the majority must not abridge, especially if the ideas presented or chosen run counter to prevailing tastes and mores.

A decision to hold a referendum, even a non-binding one, on pornography at MIT would create a dangerous precedent. A future referendum might seek to censor "radicals" opposed to an action by or against the government, or to prevent the dissemination of information on dissent. Approval of a referendum on pornography and community standards would represent a blow against free intellectual exchange. The General Assembly must reject the notion of a referendum on what information may be permitted on campus.

**Statement of Tech policy**

To the MIT Community:

The Managing Board of the Tech believes MIT's decision to enforce the requirement that student activities pay an amount equal to 3.9 percent of its payroll to fund the MIT employee benefit program is a poor one. Lacking in foresight, understanding, and compassion for student activities, the requirement places an unnecessary and onerous burden on student activities. It is unfair because the activities—and ultimately the students—who pay the tax will never reap any of the benefits.

The Tech therefore rejects the Institute's fee requirement and will not transmit any portion of its payroll to the benefit program.

The Managing Board
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