To the Editor:

Mr. Peter Peckarsky's letter published in "Opinion" (The Tech, Sept. 26) titled "Support for Israel Can't Mean Nukes" is based on error, common implied errors, two of which have nothing to do with the Middle East, and the third could be easily rejected by anyone with a scant knowledge of this subject.

These erroneous assumptions are:

A) Nuclear weapons require very special means of delivery.

Actually, the early A-bombs were very heavy and bulky, and only the heaviest bombers of that time. Hence the term "nuclear bomber" etc. This is no longer the case. In the US arsenal one can find nuclear shells for 4" guns, weighing about 100 lb, as well as lighter devices. This kind of weight can be carried by a truck, a ground vehicle or even carried manually.

B) Nuclear weapons are beyond the technological/financial capabilities of most of the countries.

Actually, some 30 countries are believed to have that capability. This number is probably higher than the number of countries capable of turning out good machine-guns or artillery pieces.

C) No missile of range comparable to that of the Pershing are in the Middle Eastern nations' arsenals.

Actually, Soviet missiles having about 250 mile range have been supplied to Syria and deployed in Egypt since 1973. The American Pershing missile is the only non-Soviet missile of comparable range, all others having much shorter or far longer ranges. Their supply will, therefore, restore balance by removing a destabilizing factor and the availability of such weapons to one side only (the Soviet-supplied ones). D) Israel asked for the nuclear version of the Pershing.

According to Time (Sept. 29) Israel asked for another version - to be developed - intended primarily for conventional warheads. I do not know the difference between the two versions, which can't be very significant. Many short and medium range missiles have both kinds of warheads, including the Soviet ones. There is, however, a difference between a vehicle made to carry either warhead and one designed specifically for one kind only, making modifications difficult. I hope that other future scholars, studying in leading universities, will be more careful about their assumptions and conclusions.

Ardon Gador

Sep. 8, 1975

(Edi tor's Note: Peckarsky's column pointed out that Israel is already widely believed to have nuclear capabilities, and that the danger of introducing Pershing missiles is that the Arab nations will be provoked into developing nuclear weapons in response. He did not say not, apparently, assume that "Nuclear weapons are beyond the technological/financial capabilities of most of the countries"; the capability to develop weapons is what he feared - not that the 30 nations Gador cites are "most" of the world's 150-plus countries. In addition, Peckarsky pointed out the Pershing's range is approximately 410 miles - at twice the 250-mile range of the Soviet missiles Gador refers to.

(Finally, Peckarsky does not state "Israel asked for the nuclear version of the Pershing." He does say, however, "the Pershing can always modify the warhead section to carry a nuclear package," and goes on to point out the "reports indicate that the Pershing's guidance section is too inaccurate to be used effectively with anything but a nuclear tip" - a difference between the conventional warhead missile and a nuclear warhead which is, contrary to Gador's argument, "very significant.""

The Tech welcomes Letters to the Editor. Typewritten letters are preferred. Letters in excess of one column will be withhold upon request. Send letters to The Tech, V20-483.

Defining the black perspective

Much of the lack of understanding and inaccuracy can be summed up in one question: Why do blacks have non-economic objectives different from the avowed wishes of Israel? Those three reasons come immediately. First blacks as a group have been oppressed by almost every institution in America, not excluding MIT. From 1860 to 1875, there were no blacks, not even one graduate, from MIT. / though progress is now being made, less than 4 percent of blacks degrees given in 1972 went to blacks. American comprise 11 percent of the population of the United States. Why is there a discrepancy?

A second reason is that minority students come from vastly different educational and socio-economic environments than your typical Tech student. Tech is a group of students who are affluent, coup of a rural and a social fraternity. MIT is comparable to a high school for just coming or who stole a art. This early the sub- year to keep at home, so I believe I can speak for all MIT students they are used to dealing with black people, and I don't think they are afraid to venture into a situation like that. Blacks are average in both the by-law states, a Phil Hampson. I am a fourth-year student in Chemical Engineering. I was co-chairman of the Black Students' Union in 1974, and currently am chairman of our Political Action Committee. Currently I am vice-chairman of the Undergraduate Finance Board and a member of the Equal Opportunities Committee. Last year I served on the Office of Minority Education Search Committee, was elected to Who's Who Among Students in American Colleges and Universities, and co-founded the MIT chapter of Kappa Alpha Psi fraternity, a national predominately Black social fraternity.

The above data is not given in order to be pompous or to heap, but to give you a feel as to why I believe I can speak about black students and minority students. And although I am intimately involved in several organizations, The Black Side will not be a mouthpiece for any particular organization or group at MIT. All comments made in this column are my own. If all black folks agree with my columns, fine; if they all don't, that's also fine. I'm not my brother's keeper, and he is not mine.

Back to the fundamental purpose of this column, "the concerns and aspirations of black MIT students." At the mention of the above phrase, many white faculty and students appear perplexed. A lot of this perplexity is due to a lack of understanding, and some of it, unfortunately, is due to a lack of desire to understand. Although this column will never be able to aid the latter situation, the former one is rectifiable.