New Safety Awareness Needed on Campus

The unsuspected and unprovoked murder of Yvonne K. Raustein ’94 on Friday evening in a tragic act and a pathetic statement on the deterioration of our urban environment. We extend to the Raustein family our deepest sympathies and can only hope that the misfortune that befell him while visiting our campus.

But to call this vicious robbery and murder a mistake would be wrong. The very fact that two male students walking through campus at 9:45 p.m. could be set upon by a gang of four under the delusion of security afforded to members of the MIT community. Safe Ride has done little to improve safety, despite the good intentions of those involved. Unfortunately, Safe Ride has continued to be plagued by incompetent organization and insufficient funding. Instead of stopping at predetermined times at various spots on campus, it arrives randomly, forcing students to continue walking in the darkening streets for the van to arrive. A van which would arrive more frequently and at set times for each stop would be more readily used by students. Raustein’s murder might well have taken such a regular and safe vehicle.

We can only commend the Campus Police for their quick and responsive action at the scene of the murder, and congratulate Boston University’s police for their diligent investigation of the three suspects. But that Raustein was assaulted at all is an admission of failure. The MIT administration must take a reassessment of its policies, if it hopes to remain a respected institution of learning.

I have never seen the poster in question, so perhaps I am not the best judge of its acceptability. But to assert, as Rebecca Widom ’94 does in her letter (“GAMIT Poster Destabilized”), Sept. 7, that the poster is acceptable because a风景区 draw is greatly needed is false. No one has the right to portray other members of his or her group in a potentially offensive manner. When a question of poster space is "fair" or "unfair" applies, the standards are the same regardless of the publishing medium.

I sound Robert F. J. Mesler’s letter (“Poster Does Not Objectify Women," Sept. 15), that the poster is a draw is greatly needed is false. No one has the right to portray other members of his or her group in a potentially offensive manner. When a question of poster space is "fair" or "unfair" applies, the standards are the same regardless of the publishing medium.

The question must be asked whether the use of possible pornographic material is justified. Since at least one person, and since there is no reason to believe that his objections are unfounded, the poster should not be published for an abhorrence for the public display of pornography, and others like it, should not be put up in the future.

Jonathan Katz ’96
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