Editorial.

**Breakdown delays security measures**

The rape of a female Bexley Hall resident in August revealed the sad state of dormitory security at MIT. Two months have passed, and nothing much has changed — some new locks have been installed. It is an outrageous that such a tragedy seems not to have been enough to stir the MIT community to action.

It is now clear that a breakdown in communication between several groups — the MIT Campus Police, the Housing Office, the dormitory governments, and students — is delaying long-range measures that could make dormitories safer.

What measures would help? The Campus Police must release a physical description of the rapist. The Housing Office must implement a security plan developed last December which would include desk-controlled entrances. This office must also consult with students on the plans changed. Finally, students must make use of such security measures.

The Campus Police refused to release a description of the rapist, claiming that it was against policy to do so. A similar statement was made to students at East Campus when the students had requested a photograph of a man arrested for theft there. This has now been linked to other thefts in the dormitory system.

Such a policy is perplexing. The Campus Police force has non-Profit Org. Permit No. 1987

CMANAGEMENT STAFF FOR THIS ISSUE

**Staff:** Peter D. Glenn, Michael J. Garrison '89, Halvard K. Merchant '90, Kate G. Pettersen '89, David B. Press '89.

**Editorial position:**

To the Editor:

In view of the imminent INF treaty, it would be instructive to examine some of the history that made the global elimination of LRINF (Longer Range Intermediate Nuclear Forces) missiles possible. Although President Reagan proposed the global double zero option, the NATO policy that brought this view about was conceived during the Carter administration. In addition, had the European nuclear forces movement been successful, it is unlikely that an agreement of this type would have been feasible.

Bacteriological warfare weapons have been placed in Western Europe by the United States primarily as a symbol of US commitment to the security of NATO. Their secondary purpose is to make the nuclear deterrent and the NATO doctrine of nuclear retaliation a credible response to the threat of the use of nuclear weapons to stop a conventional attack, credible.

These weapons include, bombs, artillery shells, and short-range missiles. From 1960-1962, there were also LRINF missiles deployed in Turkey which had the capability to threaten targets in the Soviet Union from Western European soil.

The Soviet Union also deployed similar types of nuclear weapons in the Western USSR and in Eastern Europe. In 1977, the Soviet Union began to deploy the 55-20 SRAB LRINF missile. Since the SS-20 would put nearly all high value NATO interests at risk, and NATO had no equivalent system, NATO embarked on a two track policy in 1974. The United States would develop and deploy the Pershing II and GLCM (Ground Launched Cruise Missile), and at the same time, would begin negotiations to remove LRINF missiles from Western Europe.

In the early 1980's, the Soviet

**PORN SHOWS VALUE OF NUCLEAR POLICY**

To the Editor:

I don't intend to express any particular opinion for or against the absolutely discussed problem of "sexually explicit films" on the MIT campus. My concern is that this be a valid argument. Let us examine if there is not a natural classification for films on the arguments of the supporters when they pose the issue under the heading of the "freedom of speech," which, as an undiscriminable right, is considered to be the essential foundation of showing the films on the campus.

The Tech wrote, "The right to express ideas, contrary, unpleasant, or repellent, is a natural right of the American people and should be respected. However, a person's right to express an opinion does not mean that he is entitled to do so at the expense of other people."

The Tech also wrote, "The right to screen films is a natural right of the American people and should be respected. However, a person's right to screen films does not mean that he is entitled to do so at the expense of other people."