The Pornography committee examines three policy changes

(Continued from page 10)

The report, compiled by Hildebrand, question whether the consequences of unapproved films should be strengthened. Hildebrand argued that the screening of all explicit and unrated sexually-explicit films is not allowed on campus. If the committee finds that a film is pornographic according to a set of guidelines, the film is subject to sanctions. However, if the film is not shown on campus. If the committee finds that a film is pornographic according to a set of guidelines, the film is subject to sanctions.

Another member proposed that "an effort . . . be made to involve members of the community who have special interests in the questions: LSC, Profeminia, Women's Studies, Women's Advisory Group, etc.," the report stated.

Caroline Hozan G of Profemina asserted, "The make-up of the committee is blatantly unfair. LSC should not be given special administrative privileges." In contrast, the screening committee's membership guidelines make no mention of women's groups. Hozan noted.

The administration tried to respond to the demands of the MIT community in creating the pornography policy and the screening committee, the committee said. "There may be a way of working within the system," Hozan said. "At least, it's worth considering. But the committee must represent everyone who has an interest in this."

Kenneth Weems G, LSC representative on the screening committee, did not believe LSC was overrepresented at all.

Bryan R. Muoz '87, president of the Undergraduate Association (UA), said, "Because the porn policy was geared toward film showing, it is appropriate that LSC has representation on this committee."

"The people running LSC last year felt that running the pornographic movies under the guidelines was too much of an encroachment," said Weems, chairman-elect of LSC. "Whether this situation stays the same remains to be seen."

LSC has not finalized its spring schedule, Cothren added, so LSC does not yet know whether it will show a pornographic movie next term.

Irene Baker G of Profemina indicated that Profemina will continue to protest the showing of pornographic films at MIT. "A protest is a very democratic way of expressing your views," she commented. "You circulate your ideas."

She also stressed the importance of keeping the dialogue open on this issue. "I don't think people's minds will change overnight," she admitted. "But we must continue getting people to think about the issue and debate it."

Dean McBey is also waiting for recommendations from the UA and the Graduate Student Council. Is pornography harmful?

The present policy concedes that "pornography is a necessary evil," according to Baker. Pornography is a form of harassment, she explained, because it leads to false and harmful stereotypes of women. "It's an issue of discrimination, not free-speech," Baker said.

Perry compared pornography-caused stereotypes of women to racial stereotypes. "It would be much preferable if the community decided to forego its exploitative attitudes. Just as it recognizes that racism is a barbaric attitude, so should pornography."

"There's not a single feminist position on how to deal with pornography, but most of the women are terrified that especially the most violent forms of entertainment can be considered entertainment for anybody," Perry claimed. "It is important to realize that this campus is equally shared by men and women."
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