Column/Andy Fish

Affirmative action is essential

The fight against affirmative action programs has been on the rise in the last few years. For this reason, it is crucial to examine the movement. The arguments against affirmative action, on the one hand, and the support for it, on the other hand, are narrow and shortsighted.

Diversity is one of the major benefits of affirmative action. Most of the minority students I have encountered, would have a student body almost exclusively white-sauced. Such an MIT would be a very boring place to live. Most of the students would come from similar backgrounds with very little to learn from each other.

This lack of diversity would reinforce prejudices. Such a student would not live with Hispanic, black, Asian, and women students. He would not be able to learn about different cultures or environments. Even if students were placed in the same environment, one is likely to realize that all groups are worthy.

It is also important that the admissions officers take different backgrounds into account when reviewing applicants. Because more blacks than whites live below the poverty line, their environment is less conducive to academic achievement. A student with poor, uneducated parents who manages good grades and decent SAT scores deserves admission as much as a child of rich, educated parents who has better credentials. Affirmative action considers these variables. Minority students are often disadvantaged. Minority students have lower SAT scores, a smaller number taking the SAT, and greater poverty. How is this problem to be changed? Do the opponents of affirmative action expect blacks to suddenly start taking the SAT and suddenly become interested in science and engineering? Such claims are ridiculous.

Column/Simson L. Garfinkel

US retains genocide option

After 37 years of deadlock, the United States Senate voted last Wednesday to ratify an international treaty outlawing genocide.

It took the US Senate 37 years to ratify the treaty banning genocide after it was signed in 1948. During that time, 96 other nations approved the treaty.

Remember World War II? Remember the Holocaust? Remember Hitler, who killed over 11 million civilians in death camps, over six million of whom were European Jews? The anti-genocide treaty was written by a guilty, war-time world in hopes of preventing future holocausts.

Why did the senators add this reservation? Do they intend to support the Senate needed reasons more important than decency to ratify a treaty with such noble purpose.

Many people fought long and hard to convince the Senate to ratify this treaty. Why? Was it so hard to get 100 people to agree that the United States will never commit genocide?

In the end, the Senate passed the treaty with a number of reservations. In one of these amendments, the United States exempts itself from the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice (World Court) for violations of the treaty.

Why did the senators add this reservation? Do they intend to embark on a campaign of genocide in the future?

The treaty "defines" genocide as killing, inflicting serious bodily or mental harm, imposing conditions deemed to deprive, preventing births and forcibly transferring of children of any race, ethnic, religious group, "according to The Washington Post. By this standard, the United States has committed genocide many times. Our wars with the American Indians and the internment of Japanese Americans during World War II are two examples of US genocide which readily come to mind. We've done it before, and we will probably do it again.

Perhaps one day we will thank the Senate for ratifying this treaty with the World Court reservation. The next time the United States commits genocide, we will not be held liable for it in the World Court.

For 37 years this treaty had been waiting in the Senate for ratification. Every US president except for Eisenhower endorsed it. Last Wednesday, the Senate passed the treaty 43 to 11. Eleven US senators still voted against the treaty. I think you should be embarrassed.

US senators who voted against the treaty are: Steven D. Symms (R-ID), Jesse Helms (R-NC), Jeremiah Denten (R-AL), John P. Pastore (R-R), E. J. "Jake" Garn (R-UT), Barry Goldwater (R-AZ), Charles Mathias (R-MD), Franklin J. Garrett (R-WA), James A. McClure (R-ID), William V. Roth (R-DE), Strom Thurmond (R-SC) and Malcolm Wallop (R-WY).

Voters from these states, please see that these men are never elected to office in this country again.

To the Editor:

How gratifying to have seen the support for Frank Morgan '74 in recent issues of The Tech! Since he has given so much support to me and all of his IG, I feel compelled to add my voice to those who have spoken of his abilities both in teaching and research while at MIT. Much has been said to commend his excellent efforts in these areas, which is generally attributed to his high degree of intelligence. I would agree, but only if intelligence alone means lovingkindness, humanity, consideration for others, patience and humility; a friend is dead.

Are these not the qualities our society speaks of? Do they not fulfill the statements of integrity and high principles published on the walls and montments of the schools and universities throughout the land? How can we instruct our youth to discover the truth when such great preachers are not held liable for it in the World Court?

This letter was written in behalf of all young people seeking instruction and enlightenment, and not only for my son, in whom I am well pleased.

Frank E. Morgan, Sr.