Protest, housing future confront CJC

By Robert Fourer

Residents of large radical groups against MIT Northgate housing policy, and prediction of growing housing crisis in three or four years, marked the opening of the Corporation Joint Advisory Committee (CJAC) Thrusday.

Vice-President Kenneth Wadleigh opened the meeting with a presentation of Institute activities in undergraduate, graduate, staff and community housing projects, and a series of questions from CJAC members and the public.

The "SDS-UAG Housing Committee" had advertised the meeting as "the last chance to talk Wadleigh on Housing" posters in the hallways, and there was a somewhat larger than-usual crowd on hand to hear the same talk.

They greeted Wadleigh's presentation on Northgate with hisses and catcalls, and subjected him to an angry grilling during the question-and-answer period. Neither side gave ground.

Wadleigh was noticeably an-gry at the tone of the question- ing, and continued his insistence that Peter Quinn, a managing agent at a Northgate apartment house, had told one tenant she was being evicted because she had "too many s搅拌ers and Purification visiting." The protesters refused several times to reveal their source for this information, and countered that MIT would not reveal its sources of complaints against government-subsidized tenants who were removed by the Cambridge Housing Authority.

Wadleigh's presentation began with a controversial survey of on-campus graduate housing plans are now very vague, he said. Plans for "MacGregor II," another under-grad dormitory west of MacGregor, were shelved three years ago, because of the recession and doubt as to the viability of the house concept. The dormitory system is now filled slightly over capacity, because the return rate of upperclassmen has been lower than expected. The decline in new graduate students is creating vacancies in on-campus housing, according to Wadleigh.

In the return rate continues to the present, it is probable that campus housing crisis is likely in 1974 or 1975, by which time $12,000 million in repairs pending on older build-ings. In addition to the costly possibility of building a new form on campus, Wadleigh sug-gested the Institute might aban-don the goal of housing for all undergraduates, build apartments cheaply and lease them at market rates, buy older buildings, and convert them to dorms, convert graduate housing to undergrads, or let freshmen live off-campus.

In the same period, fractures in the body of people, the majority of them seedling, will start to become a central low-interest loans to keep their houses from falling apart. The money can be raised by the tax laws which do not provide for deductible gifts to fraternity houses.

Wadleigh offered several conser-vative solutions: MIT owner-ship of fraternity houses, movement to less expensive suburbs, or doing building in the hope that money will come from somewhere.

Graduate students are presently housed on campus only in Ashdown House, which has a waiting list deserving of poor to the extent that graduate and undergraduate dormitories are in much worse shape, housing is the crisis which starts Wadleigh noted had reached a stage where MIT is now spending more than $7,700,000 annually on the five year project a sum that is rising each year, and it is expected to reach the president's desk by the end of the year.

The details will be filtered through both the Institute's past chairmen of the President's Domestic Council, before finalization.

Usually informed sources indicate that MIT's share of any public funding of research is expectedly the Institute's current budget, which one-half million dollars, and the AMT administration succinctly described as "in the doghouse."

There is a variety of causes, including the Institute's past policy, and the Republican nature of the Nixon administration.

Dean Robert Albert, head of the School of Science noted that, "it's too early to tell what this means to the country or to MIT." He said, "to get that attention is being given to the development of a national health care, education, natural resources, transportation, pollution, and space."
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The areas in which work will be concentrated are described by Dr. Lawrence Goldenhar, who is doing a survey for David's laboratory. The main areas are being spaced into nine broad areas at this time: communications, transportation, protection from natural disasters, health care, justice, environmental quality, law enforcement, urban development, and pollution.
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