Revised policy equally flawed

The Faculty Policy Committee last week proposed revisions to the MIT Policy Statement on Sexually Explicit Films. These revisions rejected the dormitory's current view of the original policy and fail to address any of the concerns that the MIT Committee on Discipline had last November.

While the revised policy would allow the presentation in Kreeger auditorium of films not approved by a Dean's Office screening committee, it retains the major provisions of the original policy—including restrictions when certain materials containing violent imagery are shown. The revised policy also does not address the concerns that led to the formulation of the original policy, yet the COD asked that the MIT community renew debate on the issues that brought the COD to question the policy in the first place:

- Freedom of speech should never be the method used to change attitudes.
- The proposed restrictions on the dormitory system are unnecessary. Certainly, no one should be forced to view something he or she deems objectionable. But as with numerous other difficulties that frequently emerge in a living group environment (such as noise complaints or open use of illegal drugs), the issue should be resolved among members of the group. If an impasse is reached, and a student feels that he or she is being forced to watch objectionable material in a common area of the living group, the student can bring harassment charges against the people who are causing the problem.
- Other difficulties that frequently emerge in a living group environment (such as noise complaints or open use of illegal drugs), the issue should be resolved among members of the group. If an impasse is reached, and a student feels that he or she is being forced to watch objectionable material in a common area of the living group, the student can bring harassment charges against the people who are causing the problem.

The guidelines are based on the assumption that a screening committee can enumerate and evaluate these points. This oversight may prove valuable in the future. This previously politically quiet group was simply taken for granted by the board, even worse, was ignored.

In making its revisions, the FPC has neglected the claims that brought the COD to question the policy in the first place: that the policy constituted an "excessive restraint on freedom of expression" and that it was "inap-propriate." The COD asked that the MIT community renew debate on the concerns that led to the formulation of the original policy. The FPC has declared that it does not intend to organize hearings or special meetings.