The MIT student can rely upon the future. Eminently above the draft, provided for in all his worldly needs, and above the Governmental disaster by the generous scholarship program of the Institute, he can sit back and contemplate a future as secure and as happy as that of any man in the world. An extremely valuable technical education is being handed him for an initial investment of $1350 a year and a reasonable annual payment to cover all his needs.

This is as it should be. The MIT student earns the privilege of induction into the scientific elite that is made possible for science and mathematics in high school, along with a certain minimum achievement in his other subjects. He can rightfully proclaim his independence. Heredity and social environment grant the gift of brilliance to very few.

But if he is proof of nothing else, as some of us, he is overlooking a fundamental fact of existence. Intellect alone does not make a man. If he rejects with tragic precision the multitude of opportunities that the Institute offers toward making him a whole man—the athletic teams, the social life, the million and one activities that the Institute offers toward making him out of his self-imposed isolation, nobody will take the time to impress upon him that there is yet time for him to save himself.

How valuable is a socially bankrupt scientist?

The parting problem—if we could only stack them higher

Letters to The Tech

Viet NAm reply

To the Editors:

The recent guest editorial by David Caplan points out the lack of interest in America's propaganda in explaining our involvement in the Vietnam War. The idealistic aspects of the war are being misdirected by lack of education and presented delineation of the main issues.

Many sound arguments can be presented to show why we should not become involved in Vietnam. In the first place and should have let it go Communist in 1954 or 1955. Yet in that year, however, that we did not let Vietnam go Communist was made a commitment to protect it. It is this commitment which we must now face.

Many opponents ask to whom we made this commitment, to Uncle Sam? As far as we know, this commitment was made to the South Vietnamese Government as a co-trustee body. We did not withdraw our commitments to England when we left the United States, nor did we to South Korea when Syngman Rhee was driven from power. At the time of this writing we are pledged to support our pro-American governments in South Vietnam, that we shall not be the first to cut our ties with them, that we shall not abandon them in their hour of need, that we shall help the nations are underdeveloped, and that military and political intervention is not a solution, no matter how free or progressive the governments. Failure to meet our commitment would demoralize these nations, and would go far toward support to the Communist front.

One point made by Mr. Caplan refers to a government policy which requires us to destroy the country in order to win the war. The point is made that the Vietnamese have no desire to fight or to go to war, yet there are some who think the war could be fought despite the cost. Unfortunately, the Vietnamese have no choice, as they have been transformed by the war from a university student to a soldier in the hope that the war will end, and they are only one of the many countries whose destiny is in the hands of a conqueror.