To the Editor:

M. K. Homer's article of last Friday (May 2) brings to light one of the major reasons why Cambridge politics are handled the way they are.

As a resident of Cambridge for eight years, and a member of the Democratic City Committee for the past three, I have at least a slight acquaintance with some of the "people of Cambridge," and I can assure Mr. McNamara that they respect Harvard and MIT. This resentment existed long before any "community organizer" came along, when City Council and Mayor were already making a political career out of threats to pave over Harvard (and the present parking lot).

None of the points Mr. McNamara's specific points. About getting industries for Kendall Square: Yes, there are blue-collar workers living in Cambridge, and yes, a lot of them are unemployed. (Do you think they're going to climb out of their basements?) Rising rents are making it difficult for blue-collar workers to stay in Cambridge, which is where they grew up and where they would like to stay. Too much loss of blue-collar jobs in Kendall Square (which used to be factory jobs) and at Simples isn't making it any easier.

Also, how do these lower-income residents of Cambridge be helped by the building offices and luxury apartments in Kendall Square, as MIT wants? Even if the office space could be rented, these people could get only low-paying secretarial and janitorial positions. It is a nightmare for these factory work heads of families to see how toll roads could be driven up, because the extra city services necessary to support the roads will be as considerable as the buildings would bring in in taxes. And the influx of highly paid professionals into the neighborhood would drive up rents so that low-income families (not so much MIT graduates) would find it hard to afford to stay.

Finally, if this land is as valuable as many Harvardians maintain, why does the City of Cambridge have to offer subsidies to get anyone to stay in the municipal lot?

None of Mr. McNamara's points make sense because the "people of Cambridge" are not as sophisticated and intelligent as Mr. McNamara needs to believe. His views are no different from the point of view of the 1960's any more than are those of the 1920's. Cambridge would be helped by a municipal lot, not by a private one.

Benjamin Ross G
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