To the Editor:

I would like to respond to the article of Manuel Rodriguez '89 which occurred in the Spring Weekend Amberly party ["MIT police arrest Rodriguez," May 3]. As one of the party organizers, I had met with the Campus Police prior to the event and was aware of the police detail for that evening. At that point we discussed the closing time of the party (12 midnight), and I was also on the scene during the entire night and witnessed the Rodriguez incident—if I may call it that.

The Campus Police worked very hard to gather extra manpower for all the Spring Weekend events that were happening Saturday night. They also worked hard the entire night, responding very hard to all the fights that occurred. It was at this point that a student, Philippe Lefebvre '89, had a whiskey bottle confis- cated as he was told to clear the area. Instead of an arrest, an example for the rest of the students by obeying the Campus Police and helping clear the area. Under- graduate Association President Rodriguez chose to agitate the officers by pushing them repeatedly, effectively interfering with their ability to do their job.

After Rodriguez had already crossed as officer at least once, the officer told Rodriguez that any further physical contact would result in his arrest. The of- ficer exceeded the bounds set to Rodríguez and back to the situation at hand when an obviously "bored" Rodriguez grabbed him again. The officers proceeded to arrest him.

I applaud the patience of the officers in this matter. Rodriguez was without a doubt a mis- stook and I personally would have docked him as would have most other people had he had not been me in the manner in which he harassed one of the officers at the time.

In the future I hope all student representatives learn to work with authority figures in times of crisis rather than against them, and in such a fashion as an example for other students to fol- low.

Craig D. Cohen '89 Social Chairman Theta Delta Chi

Hart supporters undercut by media

To the Editor:

I called Libby at 3. "Gary's de- cided to close down the offices for a few days," she said, "maybe a few weeks, until things calm down. I don't like this. I'm afraid that once we close, that's it." None of us could understand what was happening to our candi- date. Since the results of primary voting on Sunday, we were surprised, but we didn't think it was the end. How could we? Certainly everyone would see the Miami Herald post as shady journalism. So we thought. But news was after news that the accusations continued.

I had only been working for the campaign for half of a year. Libby, like many others that I knew, had been with Gary since before New Hampshire in '84. When he was seventh of seven. She's seen it all the ups and downs. Would it all come down to this? I remember a friend telling me about Hart in '84. He remem- bered Hart from McGovern's '72 campaign and said he liked him, liked his politics. I followed Hart in '84 all the way through, taking the time to learn about him and his ideas. I was struck by how different Hart's approach to is- sues is, practical and intelligent —not bound by ideology.

Hart lost in '84, I think, be- cause he just wasn't ready. But he was ready this time— prepared with the issues, confident, and a smoother, more experienced ver- sion of himself. I saw him speak in '84 and thought he was bor- ing. When I saw him in '86 there was a big change. He was ready this time.

Libby and my other friends from the Hart campaign weren't working for Hart just to work for a candidate. Other political campaigns might have a genera- tion run the campaign. But not Hart. These folks, in charge of the mud and bolts of the cam- paign, knew what it was about.
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MIT should censor all offensive activities

To the Editor:

On April 30 the MIT Students for Individual Freedom adver- tised and showed a film which made pointed racist remarks. We cannot justify such films to be shown at MIT as campus events in such a casual manner. We call for the following guidelines for dealing with events which are in conflict with MIT's policy of non-discrimination:

— formation of a committee with fair representation (i.e., students from all racial and ethnic groups) to make a policy to deal with events which are intentionally harmful to racial, eth- nic, and women's groups;
— a requirement that anyone sponsoring such events gain the approval of this committee;
— consultation with affected groups weeks prior to the host- ing of such event; and
— disciplinary action against groups violating these require- ments.

The film shown by Students for Individual Freedom made the following racist remarks:
— Black people have no concept of democracy.
— Black people are incapable of responsible government.
— Black people appeal only to machismo in choosing their leaders.
— Black people are no different and need to be treated as equals.

As with the incident of the ZBT flyer ["Mexican students call ZBT poster derogatory," April 28], MIT has not taken ac- tion, as other campuses have, to insure that public activities which are offensive to the MIT commu- nity receive prior scrutiny. It is possible to advertise and show a film at MIT that advances a cause he just wasn't ready. But he was ready this time— prepared with the issues, confident, and a smoother, more experienced ver- sion of himself. I saw him speak in '84 and thought he was bor- ing. When I saw him in '86 there was a big change. He was ready this time.
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