**Dining committee favors forced commons**

By Richard Salt

The Committee on Campus Dining is considering a series of recommendations that would make participation in a meal plan mandatory in a number of dormitories, starting with the entrance of the Class of 1984 in the fall of 1980 and continuing with each successive class. Although the recommendations are intended to provide items for committee discussion, Professor John Kassakian, committee chairman, noted that the proposals have met with general committee support. Dan Perich '81, a committee member, mentioned that only he and one other person, also a student, have said anything against the recommendations.

According to the draft, residents of East Campus, Baker, MacGregor and Next House, the proposed new dormitory, would be on a form of combined meal and commons plan, while Senior House, Burton, New House, Betley, and Random Hall would become primarily "cooking houses.

Although the draft recommends that the West Tower of McCormick become a "commons dorm," the committee has not discussed the issue since none of McCormick's representatives were at the last meeting. "I expect McCormick will be embraced in the program," noted Kassakian. "It's a difficult case. It does have one of the finest dining halls (on campus). We will have to deal with it very carefully." The committee recognized existing facilities strengths, according to Kalaskian. Should the plan not work out as expected, the Institute would not be locked in since no major construction would be needed to force such an occurrence. An example of the "backing in" would be to close off the parallel between the two halves of East Campus and build a dining hall, as someone suggested, observed Kalaskian.

To oppose the move on institutional objectives or philosophies, only one person said so. (Please turn to page 3)

**Shareholding committee holds forum**

By Richard Salt

Last Thursday, the Advisory Committee for Shareholder Responsibility (ACSR) sponsored an open forum to solicit opinions from the MIT community on the issue of divesting. MIT currently has more than $130 million invested in companies with holdings in South Africa. Roughly fifteen of the more than sixty people at the meeting spoke, with one or two of them in favor of MIT taking a more active stand.

One of the speakers was Mundi Vundu, the Boston Area Chairman of the African National Congress. He said that blacks in South Africa are not interested in affirmative action but rather they want real political power. He also said that South Africa "would not" if MIT were to divest. The blacks are "trying to seize power from the white minority settler regime," he said.

Michael Gerardi '81, the only person to speak against further action, compared doing business with companies having holdings in South Africa to the practice of doing business with communist countries. He stated that divestment of only South Africa-related stock would be an immoral thing to do.

The majority of the committee does favor divestment, according to Dan Saltzman G., a member of the committee. In addition, "the Corporation feels they dealt with it last year, and they don't want to do it again," he noted. He sees these as the two major stumbling blocks towards divestment. Saltzman is in favor of divestment.

Lawrence Kauans G., the MIT Coalition against Apartheid, is more hopeful. "I'm very optimistic for the first time. I think we made an impact on the committee.

The next meeting of the ACSR is Thursday at 5pm in room 10-383. The purpose of the meeting will be to follow up on the forum.

"I think divestment is an issue that's not going to go away," said Saltzman. "It can't be dealt with in one meeting."