Souter needs more scrutiny

From the accounts I’ve been reading of the David Souter hearings thus far, I’m almost tempted to like the guy. Almost … and probably would, if I did not have an abiding and profound question concerning Souter that’s been haunting me for some time now.

I’m concerned with private sexual acts and was relieved to hear that Souter believes that the Constitution implicitly maintains a right to privacy and that he supports Roe v. Wade and the constitutionality of legal abortion. Although I’m not sure how this states the views of Souter on this question of a woman’s right to choose, I’m willing to wait for this. I find it much more urgent that Souter share his opinion on another fundamental right of women: a woman’s right to refuse intercourse.

In an Aug. 17 article entitled “Rape: She Asked for It,” the author revealed that in 1988 Souter overrode a rape conviction because the woman “openly provocative behavior” was a bar with several men indicated her “probable” willingness to have sex with one of them. In New Hampshire, where the alleged rape took place, there is a rape shield law which prevents a testimony of a victim’s prior conduct in dealing with others. Thus, in the original trial of State v. Colehath, the judge prohibited the defense from putting on the stand any witnesses who would describe the woman’s sexual behavior with men other than her husband.

Judge Souter disagreed with this original decision. He overturned the case, and the court excluded information “crucial.” He wrote, according to The Voice, that “[j]udicial ‘public display’ of provocative behavior so close to the alleged rape could have been viewed as indicating the complainant’s likely willingness at the time of the incident. It would, in fact, underline the importance of the complainant’s case to see if it were merely ‘as relevant.’ The woman could have claimed rape as a ‘self- defense and to avoid an unignorably profiteered.’

Perhaps the most alarming part of Souter’s decision is to consider if we can call it a decision at all of an unignorably profiteered is based entirely on the fact that the woman’s “provocative behavior” was not related to the complaint’s plausible testimony of how the rap occurred. Which is, that she’d gone home with Coleblath and that the two engaged in interact. on her “openly provocative behavior.”

In another case, according to The Voice: Coleblath’s girlfriend, suspi. cious aroused, returned home, kicked open the door, and overheard her boyfriend talking to the woman who adopted his name for her injury. It was then, according to The Voice: Coleblath’s girlfriend, a girl friend — to pull the two women apart.

This scenario of the girlfriend assaulting the victim seems highly implausible, especially when one considers that the girlfriend is scarcely five feet tall, while the victim is a shapely young woman who could not possibly fight back — who supposedly needed help pulling the two women apart — is a hefty five feet, 10 inches.

(Planned to page 12)

AEPi must not be recognized

Column by Ron Scharf

On Sunday morning, the last Sunday of the year in the Jewish calendar, Jews around the world and at MIT began an intense period of repentance by reading the Slichot, the prayers of forgiveness. It provided a reminder that the worst moments of the previous year. At this time we recognize that as human beings, we act thoughtlessly, aggressively, treacherously, and disdainfully about other things. It is important for us to contemplate the ways in which we personally have committed these transgressions so that we can work for forgiveness from God and from others, and so that we can strive to improve ourselves in the coming year. It is ironic, then, that, at approximately the same time that Jews were asking for Slichot, the newly reorganized chapter of the AEPi house and organization. This action was a slap in the face to the MIT community and for many reasons. It was outrageous that an outside organization would act against MIT students in a manner that would so drastically affect them. Even more outrageous was that this action was so easily acceptable by the national organization. The AEPi chapter was organized a year ago.

Unless they were living in a paper bag last year, returning students will remember how the national inflicted the previous members of the Mit AEPi chapter from its house and organization. This action was a slap in the face to the MIT community for a number of reasons. It was outrageous that an outside organization would act against MIT students in a manner that would so drastically affect them. Even more outrageous was that this action was so easily acceptable by the national organization. The AEPi chapter was organized a year ago.

As a direct result of these meetings, AEPi was not allowed to include their literature in the ASA package. As a direct result of this action, the AEPi chapter was allowed to include their literature in the ASA package. The final result of this, and other considerations, AEPi agreed to try not to step on any more toes. Among other things, they promised not to begin retrofitting the chapter until the activities resume.

When only a few members failed to keep its word. Freshmen were indeed rushed and given bids before their activities had even begun. Now, they had employed unscrupulous and disingenuous tactics. First, the brothers of AEPi went through the Freshman Pledgebook and specifically pointed out any male name that sounded Jewish and any face that looked Jewish. They approached these unsuspecting freshmen under the guise of friendship, taking them one at a time on tours of the city, buying them meals and trying to imprint in them a sense of obligation. At first they declined to discuss the fraternity at all, saying, ”Let’s just become friends.” Later however, they switched to high pressure tactics — and freshmen who did not jump on the AEPi bandwagon were made to feel increasingly uncomfortable. If nothing else, the actions of the new chapter should show us how the AEPi house is perceived by the Jewish community with nothing but contempt. The brothers of AEPi have gone back to their old ways of being remembered as the worst moments of the previous year. The new chapter has no members of the community and is not recognized by the MIT community with nothing but contempt. The brothers of AEPi have gone back to their old ways of being remembered as the worst moments of the previous year. The new chapter has no members of the community and is not recognized by the MIT community with nothing but contempt.