Letters To The Editor

Safe Walk Would Be More Effective If Route Were Expanded

In theory Safe Walk is a good idea (“Safe Walk Suffering from Lack of Use,” Sept. 27). While not obvious for street combat effectiveness, the members of Safe Walk can provide safety in numbers and constant radio contact to a central dispatcher (whom, in turn, can contact the Campus Police and Safe Ride). In practice, however, Safe Walk is useless for the majority of students who would benefit from this service because they do not patrol the places students are expected to go which are deemed “unsafe.” These unsafe areas include Random Hall (an official Safe Walk area), the architecture studios (ask any Course IV major about the hours they keep there), the Bates Street dormitory (where several students I know have been mugged and the means of avoiding dangerous confrontations are limited). While it is arguable for the purposes of liability that students who live across the bridge can be compared to students renting apartments and are therefore on their own, it does not seem acceptable to deny accountability for what happens to students that are assigned to go to designated Institute buildings. Because Safe Walk patrols Institute building areas that are generally considered safe places to walk and dormitory resident halls that are monitored closely by students, it ignites the need of dormitory residents and other students, the institute does not contribute too much to student security.”

The solution presented is to take Safe Walk and the protection of the campus or for the protection of students? Compared to students walking around dormitory area, there are relatively few students going in three other direction to pair up with, although many would prefer the safety of a group. Student do not take advantage of this service because they can’t, its “value” is limited to the “safe” area of campus.

The solution presented was to take Safe Walk escort services to the area in which student can alone take up two minutes. Instead, many students choose the five or ten minutes walk thereby reducing the time they are exposed to criminal and natural (i.e., snow, rain) elements. My vested interest is Random Hall.

Our first house meeting, I informed the residents that Safe Walk was available for campus travel, but it was off-limits for our needs. We are expected to commute to and from Random Hall, yet it is too unsafe to allow Safe Walk to escort me or my fellow dormitory mates back from campus proper. If a person from Random Hall was to join Safe Walk, they would not be allowed to walk home on duty.

Why is it too much to ask to allow Safe Walk to walk the three blocks from Vassar Street to Random Hall or across the Harvard Bridge to Beacon Street? Even if the Campus Police do not have an official capacity to assist students in these areas, don’t they have better access to local authorities than a student? If the Institute would allow Safe Walk to escort students to places that we can assign to go, what right does it have to expect us to even go to these places on our own, especially without assistance when the means of reasonable protection are available?

We would like to use Safe Walk. Members of Safe Walk would like to offer an escort service and assistance to the students who need it the most.

Erika K. Schutte ’95
President of Random Hall

AEPi Claims Innocence

We, the brothers and pledges of the Alpha Epsilon Pi Fraternity, would like to respond to Friday’s article, “IFC Rush Fines Led by LCA, AEPi” [Sept. 23]. We are currently appealing the current Local Court of Appeals (LCA) decision, and we are confident that they will be overturned. However, even if we are cleared, we worry that our reputation will remain damaged unless we respond to the MIT community immediately.

All of the convictions stem from our current events On Saturday, Aug. 27, a comedian performed at our house, beginning at 10:15 PM to end at midnight. A few freshmen, “if someone wants to talk to you during the show, would you like to be interrupted?” We recorded the responses on a list that we kept at the front desk.

When a “camper” (a representative of one fraternity wanting to speak to a freshman who is at a different fraternity) arrived, we checked the list to see if he or she was to be allowed. If they were, we met with them at the front desk and offered them a free beverage. If the camper was not on our list, we politely apologized and told the camper to return at a later time.

We, the brothers and pledges of the Alpha Epsilon Pi Fraternity, would like to respond to Friday’s article, “IFC Rush Fines Led by LCA, AEPi” [Sept. 23]. We are currently appealing the current Local Court of Appeals (LCA) decision, and we are confident that they will be overturned. However, even if we are cleared, we worry that our reputation will remain damaged unless we respond to the MIT community immediately.

All of the convocations stem from our current events On Saturday, Aug. 27, a comedian performed at our house, beginning at 10:15 PM to end at midnight. A few freshmen, “if someone wants to talk to you during the show, would you like to be interrupted?” We recorded the responses on a list that we kept at the front desk.

When a “camper” (a representative of one fraternity wanting to speak to a freshman who is at a different fraternity) arrived, we checked the list to see if he or she was to be allowed. If they were, we met with them at the front desk and offered them a free beverage. If the camper was not on our list, we politely apologized and told the camper to return at a later time.

Unfortunately, the comedian performed 15 minutes longer than we had anticipated. At around midnight, the campers became restless and some asked if they could see the freshmen. We explained that Safe Walk was available for on campus travel, but it was off-limits for our needs. We are expected to commute to and from Random Hall, yet it is too unsafe to allow Safe Walk to escort me or my fellow dormitory mates back from campus proper. If a person from Random Hall was to join Safe Walk, they would not be allowed to walk home on duty.

Why is it too much to ask to allow Safe Walk to walk the three blocks from Vassar Street to Random Hall or across the Harvard Bridge to Beacon Street? Even if the Campus Police do not have an official capacity to assist students in these areas, don’t they have better access to local authorities than a student? If the Institute would allow Safe Walk to escort students to places that we can assign to go, what right does it have to expect us to even go to these places on our own, especially without assistance when the means of reasonable protection are available?

We would like to use Safe Walk. Members of Safe Walk would like to help on. Current policy does not allow Safe Walk to be effective for the students who need it the most.

Erika K. Schutte ’95
President of Random Hall
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