Affirmative Action upheld

(continued from page 1) the auspices of the Congregational Commission on Education. It received its impetus from the lead article in The New York Times under the heading "Affirmative Action Lowers Standards." The book itself, according to Tobias, is "predictive, based on conversation, not analysis based on data." "It falls under the classification of an unidentified university administrator at "elite" schools, she said. Indeed, the result that lenient qualified students were being accepted by universities because of AA.

According to Tobias, Lerner has no factual basis for this conclusion, since what makes a person "qualified" is often a matter of opinion. Tobias also questions his statement that if women and minorities were really qualified, they would be offered a position over them, as Tobias raised the question of whether or not the book was a scheme to arouse anti-AA feelings. First, she said, the book received great deal of publicity in the press. Then, the conservative House Select Committee on Education began a series of hearings on Affirmative Action policies which were clearly tinged with anti-AA bias, according to Tobias.

She feels AA may be threatened in the future, and that women and minorities should consider what they might do in its absence. She warned that although women and minorities now have the law on their side with regard to discrimination in hiring, they still have not overcome the current economic and class pressures which society exacts to keep them from "getting onto the ladder to the top."

AWARE members to unionize

(continued from page 1) grant them any voice in determining the wages and working conditions of these workers. And, at the same time, to unionize them by MIT administrators, they feel, can be arbitrarily taken away.

The members point out that if AWARE were to become a union, the MIT administration would be legally compelled to "bargain in good faith" with the union's representatives, District 65. That contract, circular printed by the group: "It seems rather na"ively to believe that MIT will give up significant decision-making power and increased benefits unless they are given a concrete reason for doing so."

AWARE is being motivated to unionize by the practices of the Boston Survey Group, which comprises about 50 large employers in the Boston area, including MIT, who meet regularly to exchange information about the wages and working conditions of Boston clerical workers.

In response to the charges that AWARE is a "shadowy consortium" that controls the wages of these workers, MIT administrators declared that they use the statistics of the Survey Group only to stay competitive in the clerical job market (see This Week, March 12, 1974).

Garber scoffed at such a claim, saying that the Survey Group is "a cozy way to keep wages down."

Sollitto added that according to a "source close to a contract" negotiated by the Boston clerical union, "in Boston, with the nation's highest cost of living, is 13th out of 15 major U.S. cities in terms of clerical wages."

"The Boston Survey Group has to take some amount of responsibility for this," she said.

Garber noted that at other colleges such as Brown and Harvard, clerical unions that have recently been formed have already negotiated contracts that are superior to those at MIT.

According to figures supplied by Sollitto, clerical workers at Barnard now earn an average of $2.50 more than they did before a new contract was negotiated by the clerical union. District 65, the same union that is affiliated with