Decision will harm the public schools

(Continued from page 4)

The fact that the reading series in evaluate the merit of textbooks. The reading series in historically based that I have heard public school officials say that fundamental courses are being taught because is a valid concern. However, I believe that it is a concern that is being exaggerated.

If basic ideas are to be denied, there will be no students who can understand larger concepts. If a child is not to be taught about tidal waves, he will never be able to learn about any physical phenomena. If the dinosaurs or evolution are to be denied, major portions of geology, chemistry, and biology will have to be omitted from the classroom. If the metric system is barred (because it promotes one world government), subjects would be banned from the schools. This danger is a national one. Indeed, in Alabama there is a case attempting to have " secular humanism" declared a religion and barred from the schools. Thus, all the aforementioned subjects would be banned from the classroom. Should that happen, public education would cease to exist.

Institute clocks should display correct time

To the Editor:

May I propose a research project for the Undergraduate Research Opportunities Program? One of the most difficult and baffling problems to solve at MIT is the synchronization of all the clocks. I will give $5 to the first person to show me two clocks at the Institute that have the same time. It would seem that this research would come under the department of electrical engineering and computer science. However, because of that part of the problem which has defied solutions for many years involving two time zones, I believe it might require an interdisciplinary approach.

Georgia M. Nagle
Secretary, Laboratory for Manufacturing and Productivity

Abortion puts a price tag on a human life

(Continued from page 4)

To some extent, in the various cases of "abortion lobbies" of handicapped infants, and to some other cases, the fundamentalists make their points. This utilitarian ethic is very persuasive. Consider the opinions of Nobel prize-winners Francis H. C. Crick and James D. Watson. Crick said, "No newborn infant should be declared human until it has passed certain tests, required of pregnant women, and if it fails these tests it is forfeit to the right to live.

Watson said, "If a child were not declared alive until three days after birth, then all parents could be allowed the choice that only a few are given under the present system. The doctor could allow the child to die if the parents so choose and save a lot of misery and suffering."

We may think these chilling proposals are far from reality today, but wouldn't someone from the Victorian era have found our proposals for the preservation of life just as chilling and distant? Incidentally, I find it amusing that West equates the responsible denial of sex with "savagery." This was, after all, the sex ethic of the 19th century. I have little doubt that someone from that age could only put forward sexual ethics of their own time and morality [or lack thereof] on a par with those of ancient rome. In conclusion, maybe those of us who propose such chilling ideas are quite forgetting the facts straight before us. Nothing can make abortion unconstitutional. Julian West should get the facts straight before accusing others of not being in "compassion of their moral."

(Anti-abortion arguments fail."

States can, and Massachusetts does, go beyond the US Constitution in making abortion acceptable by requiring that state money be available for abortions. The proposed amendment would align the Massachusetts Constitution with the US Constitution, but no state can make abortion unconstitutional. Michael Poz' 90
ever restrict abortion more than the US Constitution allows. If there is confusion regarding the referendum, those who have been exaggerating its consequences are partly to blame. The current slogan, "Keep abortion safe and legal" - Vote NO on question #1 - blatantly misrepresents the facts by linking the amendment with the legality of abortion, which is simply not an issue.

The most conspicuous possible outcome of this amendment would be less state funding of abortions. Even this would be up to the legislators, who can be elected or replaced as voters see fit. Still, nothing would prevent private organizations from re- placing lost state funds, giving abortion advocates the chance to use them as a lever, and not some other's, behind their convic-
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Abortion question is misrepresented

To the Editor:
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