Dorms: rent up, rush barred

**Rent up $136 next year**

Rush rules proposed:
- due to heat, electricity

**DormCom votes May 8**

By Bill Conklin

Dorm rates for next year will be up an average of 18% for housing and 15% for food services.

The announcement came at the May 3 meeting of the Dormitory Council.

"I think rates have gone up more than any of you would have liked," commented H. Ewing Clift, Director of Housing.

The rates, drawn up by the rate review committee for the increases were the large increase in the cost of utilities and the rise of food prices.

According to the committee's report, the price of heat went up 121%, electricity 64%, and food 20% with a projected increase of 15% for next year.

Of the $13.6 average rent increase over last year, 64% was said to be due to utilities' increase.

The committee, made up of representatives from the Dean's Office, Housing and Food Services, and each of the undergraduate dorms, met next year's housing rates by establishing a "quality differential" for each dorm based on a quality analysis completed last year. Using Senior House as a base, East Campus and Baker were given a $50 differential, Burton and McCormick $200, and MacGregor $270, (see table below).

Byle, which is outside the regular dormitory system, was set equal to Senior House. In addition, each house will be charged individually for desk service.

Summary rates were set at an average of $10.

Overduing

The probability of overcrowding in certain dorms was one factor figured into the differentials, since some dorms are more likely to be overcrowded than others.

"We tried to set a fair rent for the rooms," said Ken Browning, Assistant Dean for Student Affairs, "but also take into account the price other places charge for similar accommodations.

**SUMMARY OF ROOM AND BOARD (1973-74 and 1974-75)**

ANNUAL RENT (Including Dining Fee)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>73-74</th>
<th>74-75</th>
<th>Dollars</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baker House</td>
<td>$734*</td>
<td>$852</td>
<td>$119</td>
<td>16.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burton House</td>
<td>824</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Campus</td>
<td>726</td>
<td>852</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>17.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior House</td>
<td>690</td>
<td>792</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>14.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McCormick Hall</td>
<td>856</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>17.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MacGregor House</td>
<td>857*</td>
<td>1,018</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>16.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*These figures assume an effective dining fee of $688 from those off campus (who pay $75) and those on commons (who pay $60).

For collection purposes, this was reflected in a reduced price for common in 1973-74.

**COMMONS CONTRACTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Fall 73-74</th>
<th>Spring 74-75</th>
<th>IAP 74-75</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Change</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 meal plan</td>
<td>$262</td>
<td>$370</td>
<td>44.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 meal plan</td>
<td>490</td>
<td>520</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 day plan</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

By Bert Halstead

**(Second in a series of two)**

The Technology and Culture, founded for the first time in 1971, has been in a constant state of self-examination and change since that time.

During its first year of operation, in addition to its public lecture series, the Seminar sponsored a series of special meetings in which a group of about two dozen faculty and students took part. The purpose of these meetings was to determine what the "Seminar phenomenon" was according to the Reverend John Crocker, Episcopal chaplain at MIT and the Seminar's de facto administrator. Typically, the first quarter of a meeting was taken up by an address, relating a particular point of view, and the remainder was devoted to a discussion of it.

After this review, it became clear that Technology and Culture Seminar had succeeded in attracting two kinds of people with basically different goals.

One group was dubbed the "instrumentalists." Their primary interest lies in facing up to the many difficult conceptual and interpersonal problems facing our society and world. The industrialization process has rapidly developing technological power in a variety of areas, and a political economy dependent on "unending growth" are among their concerns. This group organizes itself into logical committees and initiates programs. The other group are the "philosophers." They are concerned about the status of science as a way of understanding and dealing with the instrumentalists as part of the problem rather than as part of the solution.... These issues were the focus of another seminar that began in the fall of 1972: Images of the Human.

By Bill Conklin

A new set of rush rules for dormitories has been proposed to eliminate conflicts between fraternity and dormitories.

The Dormitory Council (DormCom) will vote Wednesday on the new regulations, which restrict dormitory members from participating in a dormitory rush in the fall.

The DormCom is scheduled to meet Tuesday evening to review applications from the Interfraternity Conference, (IFC) are:

1) Anyone from any living group may contact any freshman in any dormitory during rush week, but the fraternity members cannot rush within the dorm.

2) Any dorm social events planned for Friday or Saturday night of rush week will be for dorm residents, rather than to attract freshmen from elsewhere, and no advertisement of these activities is allowed until after the Freshman Picnic.

3) A mediation board shall be established consisting of the IFC Chairman, Rush Chairman, and IFC Judicial Committee Chairman representing the fraternities and the DormCom Chairman, R/O Coordinator, and DormCom Judicial Committee Chairman representing the dormitories. The board will hear complaints between dormitories and fraternities.

The rules will somewhat parallel the IFC's rush rules, according to Matin.

"It has brought to the MIT community a way of looking at the fraternities. They don't usually pay attention to the student government's proposals. They are expected to eliminate the bad practices, and those that have been proposed; the rest are up to the students to consider.

The principal problem described as "university" by the students is we feel we have less control over our dorms than those that they claim to be "de facto" - "What do you think of these ideas?"

How do groups of people come together to discuss effectively - to frame and implement these ideas - to confront and fuel our society?"

"It has brought to the MIT campus outstanding sequepcial which are university-wide implications (Please turn to page 2).
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