Erratum
To set the record straight, Bexley Hall has 3 crowded rooms, according to Ann Braden, staff assistant in the Dean's Office. Bexley had no crowds in the original housing lottery; those crowds were created afterwards. One crowd involved a resindent who was told a freshman must be permanently dispensed to Bexley, so the vacancy was filled from the waiting list.

The second involved a transfer student who pledged a fraternity and then depledged. The third involved a group of freshmen who did not want to uncrew even though there was a vacancy, so the vacancy was filled from the waiting list.

feedback
Freshman likes Bexley despite others' tales
To the Editor:
Yes another viewpoint concerning the Bexley controversy: that of a "double involuntary limbo" freshman forced into becoming a resident of Bexley.
During the course of Rush Week '85, I, like numerous other freshmen, heard horror stories about the anti-rush, lifestyle, and residents of Bexley. I now realize that they were propagated by upperclassmen who, for the most part, have little to no knowledge of Bexley and based their tales on rumors and lies.

Naturally, I had no desire to visit (much less consider residing in) such a place. Imagine my disay when Dean Sherwood finally handed me my room assignment and informed me that I had been permanently dispersed to Bexley! This Hoosier was ready to catch the next plane back to Indiana. Indeed it may be as some students believe, since I have been at Bexley, I have been harangued in no way, shape, or form (other than the threats from the OGA to take away the security of a permanent fraternity - but that's another letter...). No unwelcome guests (cockroaches) have invaded my room or bed in the middle of the night (or any other time, for that matter). In fact, I observed more cockroaches during rush stay at Next House.

Furthermore, everyone I have come in contact with has been friendly, helpful, and interested in talking to. About house government (or lack thereof):民生 concerning the dormitory as a whole are democratically handled by house meetings where each resident is welcome and has an equal vote.

In conclusion, I thank Dean Sherwood for forcing me to open my closed mind and view Bexley as I REALLY is: one of the best places I have ever lived on or off-campus.

Robin Hunter '86

Your work is for your own benefit; decide your obligations for yourself
To the Editor:
I would like to ask if in the fur- ther part of this argument, per- sons for at least some of what they write in The Tech. I ask this because if what they believe is right, then I prefer to be con- sidered, rather than to make a point with the proof left to the reader. If that was the case, I would like to know which of my premises I disagree with (so I can check my own) or where their logic went wrong.

For example, Mark Kantrowitz "[Obligation to help society."
Sept. 27) claims, "It is not suffi- cient to merely avoid harming the rest of the world with the by- products of one's work, rather, one has an obligation as a mem- ber of society to contribute posi- tively to the advancement of soci- ety. In fact, the motivation behind one's work should be the ultimate benefit of human kind." How, where does that obligation come from? No answer. Why should altruism be one's motiva- tion?

I beg the reader to engage his or her frontal lobes and ponder this question, as Kantrowitz has neglected to.

Why are you a slave to the ad- vantages of "society," which is only a collection of individuals, and that has no more rights than each constituent member? Are not "your" life and its rewards yours because of rights that exist without law and agreements in society? Does it not then follow that protection take protecting these rights as its sole function? These rights included most importantly your ability to live as you choose unin- 

Anti-pornography law is censorship
To the Editor:
As the readers of your newspap- er may already know, a propo- sed referendum to win ap- proval of a law defining pornography as a violation of women's civil rights will appear on voters' ballots this November in Cambridge. And on October 4 and 5, a symposium on women's pornography will be spon- sored by MIT and Harvard.

The Feminist Anti-Censorship Taskforce members do not know if these events were deliberately scheduled to follow sequentially if their closeness is a co- incidence. In other case, the situ- ation is this: a program on por- nography planned and sponsored by MIT and Harvard will include a slide show presentation by Bar- bara Findlen of the Cambridge Women's Alliance Against Porn- ography, the law's principle lo- cal supporters, and the symme- rium will conclude with an un- tied address by Catherine MacKinnon, co-author of the law

When we contacted Cindy Brown at MIT Women's Studies who is the coordinator of the symposium to ask that a local PACT member be included in the Saturday program, she refused our request on the grounds that the symposium is not be used as a forum to debate the Cambridge proposal. Brown's intransigence aside, we do not believe that a chief supporter of the local pro- posal and its co-author will re- 

David Hoag '86