Bakerites vs. Commons

The common's issue elicited many conflicting viewpoints and impassioned debate. While no one questioned the desirability of a voluntary commons system, the economic feasibility of setting one up has, in the past, been doubted. (Continued from page 1) The Baker House Meeting and the Housing Office would ensure the closing of one or more dining halls. Some students questioned whether Baker could handle the side effects of non-compulsory commons-cooking as a room and possible overloads of extrasaturating by hotplates.

Many students expressed mistrust of the Housing Office management of the dining system and the figures quoted when discussing commons. UAP Wells, candidate 71, 71 complained about the difficulty of getting the administration to open its books. The meeting ultimately decided it need not recommend a plan, that it should apply pressure to the Housing Office to get it to offer a voluntary commons plan that students can help design and exploit and which would not be paid for by increasing rents.

The meeting also petted a discussion of dorm autonomy. Opinion was divided over whether to demand the right to keep pets or the right to decide on the matter as a prerogative of house government. Keeneur argued that the direct route was preferable since "you'll never get them to give the house a standing statement of autonomy." Several students countered that this was precisely what they should go after, and though no resolution to demand dorm autonomy was passed, most residents at the meeting seemed in favor of the idea, as indicated by a generally rebellious mood.

At present a few residents keep pets in violation of MIT rules, and the porters have complained of urine and feces on the floors. No one wants the house to become overrun with animals, but the meeting was in agreement that a popular dog named Free should be allowed to stay. Pressure tactics were considered.

Among these were petitions, a commons boycott, demonstrations, and sit-ins, as well as more conventional methods—personal appeals by House executives. (Some students have refused to pay for commons since the year began.) A resolution to filebomb the Housing Office was voted for by voice, though only in jest.

Indeed, the meeting was punctuated with levity and took itself half-seriously. Revolutionary rhetoric was self-sincerely handed about even while serious discussion took place, the assumption being everyone would know the difference. For example, the Baker House Liberation Front, a group of radical freaks who live in the house, offered a hack manifesto, demanding among other things that the "Imperialist Housing Office and its necrocapitalist occupation of Baker House" and that they "stop poisoning us with commons." The proposals were greeted with enthusiastic laughter. But the Bakerites are serious about their cause as a BSHL subcommittee called "Students Having Intestinal Troubles" clarified the house. Wednesday called for the mass trashing of the house.

At the invitation of the House Committee, Ken Browning will appear with his assistants at a meeting next Tuesday to discuss the issues.

NMC to campaign for Drinan, Studds in Mass. fall contest

War in Vietnam, and the League of Women Voters (who are serving in an advisory capacity only) runs organization called Peace Cooperative '70.

In addition to the election of peace candidates, the Movement for a New Congress has been active in local voter registration campaigns.

Inflation and unemployment are also of interest to NMC, and those issues have been helpful in obtaining much "grass roots" sympathy.

Campus-oriented

Although the Movement is primarily oriented towards collective enterprises, it is prevented from direct use of campus facilities by laws that prohibit the use of university facilities on other than a rental basis for partisan political activities.

NMC's Eastern Massachusetts Regional Headquarters is located at 68 Roger St. in Cambridge near MIT. Many students interested in voting for local peace candidates is invited to call Bob Schaffer at x2044.