The inevitable future(s) of Cambridge

By Michael McNamee

The ultimate vision of O'Connor in 2000 is an increasingly familiar one: a town whose high technology and financial services industries have split into two opposing poles, the rich, the young and the old, the professional and the immigrant. As it was a century-and-a-half ago, a place inhabited primarily by professors, and the small number of blue-collar employees, all living next door to each other encircled by fancy apartment complexes and city sidewalks.

The Real Paper presented a stark picture last week when it asked "Will There Be a Cambridge in the Year 2000?" Staffer Rory O'Connor traced the history of MIT and Harvard and university expansion back to the 18th century, and then offered his own prediction for the future: division of the city between the "University behemoths" which will primarily "by students," and the small number of workers, as it was a century-and-a-half ago, a place inhabited primarily by professors, and the small number of blue-collar employees, all living next door to each other encircled by fancy apartment complexes and city sidewalks.

"The question the book, 'Notes on the Future of the University,' explores is, therefore, no more than a matter of perspective than it is a matter of opinion," C. Wesley Stone contends in his essay, "An Interlude." The question, he says, is, "Is it possible that someone may have more vision and perspective than he does, that something good might rise in a New Cambridge great enough to justify the loss of Old Cambridge?" Cambridge must be developed. Incredibly, it will be developed. Whether it will be developed as O'Connor sees it - ugly, drab, new, sterile, or - creatively - efficient but open, businesslike but human, modest but with room for the past - depends upon everyone involved understanding the inevitability of development, and efforts by all to turn that trend to the best possible advantage of the city.

To the Editor:

The subject of this letter is Louise Nevelson's "Transparent Horizon," quoted from Webster's New Collegiate Dictionary: "art - the conscious use of creative imagination. (See Tech Talk, Dec. 10, 1975, article entitled "Notes on the Sculpture"). It is also not an aesthetic object.

I therefore submit that "Transparent Horizon" is not art.

Keith Kasunic '79
Dec. 13, 1976