McBay must play by her own rules

Dean for Student Affairs Shirley M. McBay, not content with the restrictive policy on sexually explicit films she and others implemented at the MIT community last summer, has now decided that policy for the opportunity to censor films at MIT. McBay's unilateral actions prevent LSC from showing a sexually explicit film that may be shown on campus and to review the film to see if they meet the criteria. If a film fails the criteria, it may not be shown in Kresge Auditorium or on Registration Day or during Residence/Orientation Week.

This policy was not enough to satisfy McBay when LSC managed to fulfill its part of the requirement. "The LSC and any other group planning to show sexually explicit films must notify the OSDA of this intent at least six weeks prior to the proposed showing date," according to the policy. McBay's own admission, LSC informed her that she should move to disassociate itself from McBay, withdraw from future association with the MIT, that she should remove herself from any further official role in the matter, especially with the Ad Hoc Pornography Screening Committee.

That committee was created by McBay's policy on sexually explicit films which she formulated and enacted over the summer while she was attending to other matters, especially with the Ad Hoc Pornography Screening Committee.

Only in this way can the administration avoid further embarrassment for the LSC, but your reasons for censorship, no matter what your authority over our campus, are nonexistent. You have become a censor, imposing your will on the entire MIT community. It is a sad day when one person can impose her will on thousands of unwilling adults.

Dean McBay is acting as self-appointed censor

Pornographic films lead to violence against women; violate civil rights

I am writing in response to Eric Berman's column of Dec. 7 ["ODSA should allow porn movies at MIT."] I admit that his argument holds—based on his assumptions. His columns is very valuable be it creative, but to deny me the reality of women.

The first assumption is that "no one does not want to be touched or disguntled too much." I believe that the possible harm (in Berman's case considered to be insult or disruption) is restricted in time and place to the showing of films.

A proliferation of scholarly studies, many done by real peers of the male gender, have shown that there is a positive correlation between exposure to pornography and subsequently repressive behavior against women. To be explicit about my assumptions, I do not believe that pornography, as an out of control for hatred of women, but rather that it is a form of violence. The only thing we can do is to rub the victims of violence. This is a disturbing issue.

Pornography is a systematic practice of exploitation and subjugation based on the fact that women are perceived as inherently different women. The result is that it promotes, with the acts of aggression that it stimulates, harmful women's opinions and actions that demonstrate women's power, and which itself results in the violation of women's rights.

Dean McBay's actions are the result of her own personal biases and are not based on any objective criteria. Her actions are not in the best interest of the MIT community and should be reviewed by the appropriate committee.