Editorial

**CJAC should hold an open forum**

Last semester, tensions between members of the Coalition Against Racism and the MIT administration came to a head with the arrest of eight students on Kresge Oval. One of the major causes was the lack of communication between the MIT administration, the faculty, and the student body. To improve these relations, MIT reorganized the Corporation Joint Advisory Committee (CJAC). CJAC’s objectives included organizing a public colloquium on MIT’s anti-divestment policy.

That forum has not yet been scheduled; CJAC failed to make the necessary preparations in time for a fall colloquium. It is unclear that this failure should be blamed upon any one person—several committee members were unaware of the progress, or the lack thereof, towards the colloquium. Our stumbling block cited has been the failure to enlist a “drawing card” speaker, such as Rev. Leon Sullivan. Although many members of the MIT community would be interested in what Sullivan has to say, the purpose of the colloquium should be to have the MIT administration explain their investment policy to the students and the faculty, both of whom have approved resolutions calling for divestment. The presence of a drawing card speaker should not have resulted in the postponement of the forum.

The colloquium should instead feature members of the MIT Corporation who have repeatedly failed to clearly explain the recently put forward arguments. That forum has not yet been scheduled. CJAC should begin immediately to facilitate discussion between the corporation and students, not to provide one more diversionary outlet for silent stalling.

---

**Anti-abortion arguments fail**

With an abortion question on the November ballot which could make reinstatement in the Commonwealth what is now a legal right in the country, we have been subjected to even more discussion than usual on reproductive freedom. Several people have recently put forward arguments which are, pragmatically, intended to change people’s minds.

They are not likely to do so. In fact, all of the anti-abortion letters which I have read in recent weeks have suffered from major rational flaws and lapses of logic, as well as an obvious lack of concern for the future of the pro-choice movement. President’s letter (“Pro-Life against improper choices,” Oct. 7) which began from the untenable premise that some choices should be protected by law, while others should not. He then observes that people who are pro-choice on abortion “are also quite sensitive about the choices they champion.” Of course they are! Groups fighting to maintain abortion rights are single-issue groups which are not expected to give an opinion on other matters.

President says that supporters of abortion rights have a “selective regard for choice [which] breaks down only when the issue is abortion.” This is patent nonsense. Everyone feels that people should be required to do some things, forbidden to do others and given a choice whether or not to do the rest.

Pro-life’s misconception stems from (Please turn to page 9)