Editorial

List grandfathered distribution subjects

When the current list of 158 Humanities Distribution subjects is reduced to 107 in the fall, current students will be "grandfathered"—they will be allowed to draw their distribution classes from all current HUM-D offerings. But next course selections.

Students should not be required to "seek out" the classes they can use to fulfill the requirement. Dear of the School of Humanities and Social Science Ann. F. Friedlander Ph.D. '64 said, "I suspect that most students don't know they're grandfathered. However, those who care will seek it out and take advantage of it."

First, the alternative plan does not place an arbitrary cap on the number of distribution courses as the current proposal does. This cap is unnecessary and will severely restrict student choices.

Furthermore, the three categories of the alternative plan (humanities, social sciences and arts) would be easier to implement since they reflect existing sections, but they would not require assignments to be redistributed in order to fit into new categories, as the current CUP version does. Rather, classes would be left in their existing sections, and the sections would be grouped together.

The faculty should approve a distribution plan with these features.

---

Opinion

Faculty should adopt amended HASS-D plan

The faculty should adopt a Humanities Distribution system that includes the changes proposed in the alternative to the Committee on the Undergraduate Program's (HASS) "Humanities Distribution reform proposed by group of nine faculty," May 1. The alternative plan remedys several flaws in the official proposal.

First, the alternative plan does not place an arbitrary cap on the number of distribution courses as the current proposal does. This cap is unnecessary and will severely restrict student choices.

Furthermore, the three categories of the alternative plan (humanities, social sciences and arts) would be easier to implement since they reflect existing sections, but they would not require assignments to be redistributed in order to fit into new categories, as the current CUP version does. Rather, classes would be left in their existing sections, and the sections would be grouped together.

The faculty should approve a distribution plan with these features.

---

On Friday, the Lecture Series Committee will show "Body Talk," a film which is em-

phatically described as "sexually explicit" but is in fact pornographic.

LSC evidently expects to make money: they have booked a Krage Auditorium for three showings. It follows that, in someone's judgment, a large number of students are interested in pornography. "Body Talk" was approved in 1985 by the MIT and Ace Pornography Screening Committee.

These two facts do not excuse the showing of a movie with no redeeming qualities, but a questionable moral one. LSC recognizes that it is on a firm legal footing, but it is unfair to exploit the fact that they have taken the cowardly step of making "Body Talk" one of their end-of-term "To-Be-Anounced" movies, in effect serving notice three weeks before the showing of the movie.

That decision has provided a measure of defense against the fire LSC expected to draw from both right and left. Given little time to organize, and little hope of being able to cancel the showing, concerned groups have had little time to react.

Perhaps this is just as well. "Body Talk," a relatively harmless flick, will not revitalize another. Those who see it will get what they paid for: two hours of indelible punctuated by laughable scenes of sexual explicitness.

The characters are not objectified either, if that simply means that lovers should look at each other from time to time. There is little of face-to-face stuff and desiring. The most disturbing scene shows Cassie with one John who is unconsensually dominant and tells her "your obligation is to please me."

So, that follows the guidelines to the letter. It does not follow the spirit of fairness. Cassie has no objection to being a kept woman, but Mark finds being a kept man distasteful.

There is.some tension between two best friends who look like a lovely ex-

perience for the characters, but really pales to the boys in the crowd who like to believe that this is what their women friends get up to. There is no true hetero-

sexuality.

When Adam L. Dershowitz '89 showed "Deep Throat" in February, at least he be-

lieved he was making a point. LSC intends only to make money, and for this reason alone are prepared to reopen the old por-

nography debate, a wound which has not yet healed. Because they are not financially strapped and have plenty of other money

makers to choose from, this is an ignoble reason to show a film which they know will offend a substantial portion of the community.

People go to see "Body Talk" purely for the

sex. (Unfortunatly, if they go to see good acting they will be terribly disappointed.) In fact, most audience members are presum-

ably going to watch the film for the sex. This is not a healthy attitude either to sex or to pornography.

The characters in "Body Talk" do not indulge in objectified sex, if they are per-

spectively horny, at least sex is not the only thing in their lives. But the film itself obj-

ectifies sex because it is the only point of interest in the film. It is the audience, not the characters, who are immobilized by the

experience.
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