

*U.S. Election*

The election was particularly difficult to discuss in a group context. I think that was because we have so many different perspectives to apply to the candidates and unlike the other discussions it is not a simple debate over the issues but over the individual/party holistically. Especially in a group of disconnected MIT students where so many students are unaware of the latest issues I think it is particularly difficult. So it is not a surprise we waded into dangerous waters with our discussion, something that is frequently done during political campaigns. I thought it was unfortunate the bold implications that were made about Romney and his untrustworthiness due to him being a Mormon.

Like many in the class hearing this put me on edge, because in the words are implicit discriminatory tones which I agree with some others that shouldn't be tolerated. I think it becomes obvious the dubiousness of such an assertion when you try replacing Mormon with black or women. Someone's religion, though not 100% exclusive from their political life should play the central role. I think it's awfully one dimensional to take one characteristic of an individual and construct an entire narrative for them including motives, beliefs, and actions. Even in the category of murderer, we exist in context and as whole individuals; a murderer may be a soldier or someone who preemptively kills another in defense.

So, while I agree we should vet Romney more thoroughly on issues that we may feel could be unfavorably influenced by his religion we should not just assume, because as they say

it makes an ass out of you and me. Regardless, Romney has enough issues himself to make him untrustworthy.

MIT OpenCourseWare  
<http://ocw.mit.edu>

17.S914 Conversations You Can't Have on Campus: Race, Ethnicity, Gender and Identity  
Spring 2012

For information about citing these materials or our Terms of Use, visit: <http://ocw.mit.edu/terms>.