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Divestment supporters demand public hearing

(Editors' note: the following is an open letter addressed to President Paul E. Gray '54.)

To the Editor:

Recent events at this Institute have forced us to reconsider MIT's role in the struggle against Apartheid, a conflict which is currently characterized by violence and political repression.

Furthermore, members of your administration have claimed that the Institute Colloquium on Apartheid last fall failed to elicit the right opinion. In fact the Colloquium organizers did all they could to avoid any discussion on MIT's investments of students in South Africa operations.

We believe the MIT community is entitled to a public discussion by the Executive Committee on the following:

- MIT refusal to totally divest from South Africa.
- MIT refusal to form a broader, more inclusive discussion in the form of Alasdair Thomson Shiawasan and MIT's arrest of eight anti-Apartheid demonstrators.
- The 50 percent drop in black freshmen enrollment since 1979, and the need to increase financial aid so that all students of all races can attend MIT.
- Job security for the food service workers.

We are aware that if the administration continues its present policy, then MIT's community's majority support for divestment, yet we continue to not hold the Executive Committee regardless of the black student movement.

Arnold Contreras '86

To the Editor:

I would like to make the following points concerning the letter of Karen Spencer '86 "Not everyone is created equal," April 1:

- One should consider the following: affirmative action programs the injustices of the past have developed into the injustices of today.
- Affirmative action programs are not more arbitrary than any of the other methods used to help admit students to MIT or any other institution. As Spencer pointed out, SAT scores are not invariably a good indicator of academic performance.
- The development of a good policy or device depends on two factors: talent and opportunity. Without opportunity, talent is wasted, an unacceptable outcome. Talent is obviously independent of ethnic background, but unfortunately, opportunity is still not.

To develop better scientific and technical talent, as well as those of other professions, the talent pool from which these professions are drawn will be large as possible; this means making opportunities for advancement available to people of all races, including those whose first underprivileged ones.

The point is that MIT is here to provide opportunity not to judge talent, because judging is not being that MIT or any other institution can do precisely well.

Toussaint W. G.

Tou Epsilon Phi's party was a night for intellectual discussion and sexual equality. April 3

To the Editor:

My letter "Tou Frequenty's party theme is guys only," March 21, in which I gave full victory to us in our quest to bait militant feminists. We deeply regret and condemn the malicious misunderstanding of Ouwarter and all others who support her cause.

Had Ouwarter chosen to come to our gathering of March 15, she would have witnessed not only a group of people collectively enjoying the wonderful benefits of life. She would have observed and probably partaken in a fascinating discussion on the continuing intelligence of intelligent, ambitious and well-to-do women in the MIT community.

Ouwarter would have enjoyed a series of lively debates on cat slavery in Northwestern Bell, the difficulties arising from excessive divorce, and the bombings in Central Kuwait, wherein it was established of 22 old imbelodges, and every other social, moral and political issue known to woman/man. She would have visually inhabited in a pleasant glimpse of delightful humanity. It was an evening of relaxation, harmonious intellectual discussion and sexual equality.

But Ouwarter did not attend, and it was probably for the best. It is precisely to avoid the arrival of those whose lives center around rivetology that we invite our friends.

Michael Suga '88

Social Co-Chair

Tou Epsilon Phi

Freedom of speech should be available for non-leftists too

To the Editor:

I applaud the letter by Kevin Christopher B. "Accusation reflects paranoia," April 4) for showing the true hypocrisy of The Student and other left-wing groups. The "hoax of free speech" only applies to non-left- ist groups; in other words, the left has its right of free speech to all who disagree with their views. The actions of the left at the tail of the National Review's actual actions of the conservative groups and their letter will bear the point out.

On April 2, Jorge Rosales, the student who was chased by a group who helped depend Osmena, spoke at a rally as a representative of the Student International Committee. Before his it the other guest speakers, he invited the audience to say "We aren't here to talk, we are here to denounce" and "Fascists don't belong on campus!" This was a speech, amongst others, soundly of "We aren't here to talk, we are here to denounce" and "Fascists don't belong on campus!"

Those two slogans spoke well of the "free exchange" of ideas that the left wanted to take place. The students chanted, yelled, screamed, denounced and made irrelevant remarks like "- and what about Israeli criminals" and "Khomeini is there too in order to interpret the speakers. This is a "free exchange" of ideas for the speakers. They could often not be heard due to this excessive noise.

This is in line with the standard leftist ideas. They want to say something, they yell and scream at the administration. When given a chance to aall freedom of speech that they demand for themselves to others, rather than listen to them.

Many people, including several prominent liberal students in attendance, were appalled by the behavior of these students. The behavior of these students, was not the behavior of the MIT community. At the University of Massachusetts and at Wellesley, when the contra representatives spoke earlier, there were not only verbal disturbances, but also the throwing of paint at speakers, and the talk had to be shut down. At Boston College, however, even there was a restriction of attendance to students only, and the violence was not repeated.

We decided to follow this successful example. Our action was based on the fact that a group of individual agitators had been following the speakers and were the cause of this violence. Violence would not allow a free exchange of ideas, as we decided to ban the outside group to attend the speakers.

The agitators, with their rage built up, were not being able to join the MIT talk, went to the late talk at Harvard by the political representatives. Harvard did not check student IDs, and the worst case of violence occurred. Two Harvard campus police officers had red paint thrown on them. Rosales was struck in the face with a bottle of red dye and the talk had to be helped out of the room, and the talk had to be cancelled.

Those agitators were supported by a group of MIT students, who often demanded their admission during the talk at MIT. This kind of brutal assault is their idea of "peaceful protest."

With the banning of posters and placards, this was the only way to get students to see the speakers in an indoor situation. Hecklers had the right to carry them before and after the talk, outside, and were allowed a provision and another period to air their views.

The practice was advocated by the militant minority that was named in Ouwarter's letter. This is a false statement of The Student. The student has not been able to join the talk on Nicaragua was getting even more juvenile.

Some people on campus better not get too much for this straight, but better also think about their hypocrisy. Free speech must be allowed, but it can't just be allowed to the leftist leftists. Freedom of speech must be allowed for all students, including non-leftists. MIT, let's stop listen to the leftists who have abandoned American rights, duties and privileges.

John P. Berlin '88

President, MIT Republican Club