I grasping bootlickers, or call- tary engineering, destroy America. So one gross, bungling inefficiency and problem existences. People only see real in the eyes of others. They live the protest, what someone else is doing; they live the self. They are ever worried about less psychological these people have no particula and favors is no rest, if your ambition lies in problem. If their work; 3) There is much rush. They need open minds to avoid pulling the people out of their life and career follow. David Honig's article deserves another reading. He is not advo- the ignoring of the effects of one's actions. Unfortunately, in today's Welfare State, the ap- of his ideas can be com- 

Mack Hunter

Do not consider punishment of Bexley

To the Editor:

Robert Sherwood's remarks "MIT seeks security housing," Sept. 10, about a Bexley problem are disturbing. He is quoted as saying "I hope that ( edição Bex- ley) would not be necessary. . . If I really envisioned getting Bexley and kicking the people out of there. . ." This implies that the Dean's Office is considering punish- because of an alleged an- ti-rush and suggests that the problem needs a solution "as we did in Senior House."

The Dean's Office has solved no problem at Senior House, be- cause there was none. If they base action against Bexley on a similar dubious basis, they are seri- ously in error. I lived in Senior House from 1980 to 1994, was jacketum there during 1982 and 1983, and so I am aware of the following events.

At Senior House, an anti-rush problem was made out of an inci- dent occurring a week after Rush Week 1982 and several years of poor rush. In 1982, two resident-ent of Senior House tried to scare some freshmen on their floor with a loud party. A house meeting was held within days that the matter condemned by the house and apologised made: three of eight freshmen on the floor moved to a different entry, the rest stayed. Dean Sherwood was present at the meeting, 1982 and 1993 had no particular rush weeks with- less than ten freshmen asking to live there; "bachelor" freshmen protested and wrote letters to the house; rather than live there. Diana Sherwood and McBay cited these as evidence of an anti-

An anti-rush was held. Activities such as the border guard house in the Bexley courtyard or the Race Krohas dinner are not anti-rush, even though they are not the same activities as at the other dorms. They need open minds to avoid this misconception again, this time with harm to a dormitory behavior; possibly considering pun- shment, Dean Sherwood and McBay should first make sure there is a problem. There was no anti-rush at Senior House during the years they tried to address one — they should not try to ad- dress such a non-existent prob- lem at Bexley without better evidence. They certainly should not con- sider punishment on such a flimsy basis at all.

Michael Rohan G