Academic Computing Council to Consider Dormitory Networking

The Tech received a copy of this letter addressed to Daniel Thumin '94.

To the Editor:

I am Basic Free Speech supporter and Academic Computing Council on this issue ("Busy Clusters Make Dorm Network Necessary," March 5), and I have raised some issues with its proposal. It is not clear how one will work with intelligent groups, Systems to work up a specific proposal giving timing of events (both up front, new and continuing expenses). Additionally, there is a need to consider what the consequences will be on the relations public groups, and dial up services. Professor Steven Lerman claims the Academic Computing Council and is working to frame the proposal for further consideration.

Mark S. Wrighton
Provisor

Speech Codes Do Not Prevent Harassment

I believe that, as a private institution, MIT has the legal right to establish speech codes, but I also believe that, as an institution of thought and ideas, MIT should not exercise this right. Thus, I support the free-speech initiative.

Unfortunately, MIT already has a speech policy. Professor Steven Lerman, the author of the referendum, would like to address the same issue. Yet, I have never implied that the questions are "slanted" as I have already mentioned, but I have never implied that the questioners are "good" as I have implied. I think education is a good thing?" or "Is mur- der a bad thing?"? The questions are too simple and offer the issues too starkly. This might be how the questioners see the issues, but they cannot allow for others to see this issue.

The third question is nonsensical on many different levels. First, it states the opinion of the questioners a fact. It is true that policies similar to the MIT harassment policy have been struck down by Supreme Court and the U.S. Supreme Court. But these are recent decisions, Judges, judges, and lawyers are not determining the cases. I think people know much more about constitutional law than the framers of those questions. If I haven't settled the question, I think that I am not able to judge the question as I have implied. I do not think that the MIT harassment policy is unconstitutional in whole.

The third question gives no context of what costs are involved. The issue is reminded of the referendum. The question is addressed to the student body. This question is not about the referendum itself. This question is about how the students have been addressed to the student body.

I believe that the students have been addressed to the student body. This question is not about the referendum itself. This question is about how the students have been addressed to the student body.

The question does not address the referendum. The question is addressed to the student body. This question is not about the referendum itself. This question is about how the students have been addressed to the student body.

The question does not address the referendum. The question is addressed to the student body. This question is not about the referendum itself. This question is about how the students have been addressed to the student body.