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EC to secede from DomCon

By Jerri-Lynn Scofield

Dorm Con President David K. Eisen '82 has informed the Dormitory Council (DormCon) of his dormitory's intention to secede from that organization, according to DormCon President David J. Scrimshaw '83.

"Well, basically we felt that there was no benefit to be gained from staying as a member," said Eisen. He noted that several people, including himself, had concluded "that DormCon was not responsive to the east side of campus."

Scrimshaw confirmed this feeling, commenting, "East Campus felt that they were getting nothing from DormCon." He added, "I'm not satisfied that the issue of East Campus leaving DormCon is dead."

Scrimshaw indicated that he had asked Eisen for permission to address an East Campus House Council meeting on Thursday to discuss the benefits of the proposed dormitory, and Eisen had granted this permission. Eisen confirmed Scrimshaw's statement, adding, "It's possible that we could reconcile our issues."

One reason for the secession, according to Eisen, was DomCon's denial of a request by Senior House and East Campus for funds to have a party. He claimed that this request was similar to a proposal Burton House and Baker House had made last spring, which he said was funded.

According to Scrimshaw, DormCon receives one dollar per term for each member of each council currently enrolled in DormCon. Eisen noted that it is "unclear where the money comes from. It comes from some fund somewhere." Commenting on the possibility that house residents would see the money that was contributed for East Campus this term, Eisen said, "I doubt it very highly."

Addressing the issue of what would happen next term, he said, "I really don't know."

Scrimshaw observed, "DormCon will be weaker because of it [the East Campus withdrawal]." He noted that East Campus, if it abides by its decision, will not be involved in any decisions governing dormitory housing for the next Residence/Orientation Week, but he expressed optimism that the Office of the Dean for Student Affairs would ensure that East Campus abides by general rules.

The decision also means that DormCon will not hold any social activities at East Campus, according to Scrimshaw. "I have no idea really," commented Scrimshaw, "I really don't know when they made the decision [to secede]."

Eisen noted that the house had made this decision on October 8.

MIT to change payment plan

By Kenneth Snow and Howard Trachtman

MIT will soon change its deferred payment plan, senators' bills and abolish the deferred payment plan, according to Jack Frailey '44, Director of Student Financial Services.

The new policy will probably take effect next term and will change the penalty from a flat fee of $50 to an undetermined monthly percentage. Currently, MIT levies a $50 surcharge on the account of any registered student who chooses not to pay his tuition bill. A student also has the option of using the deferred payment plan, under which, for a $50 surcharge, he may pay his tuition in three equal installments over the course of the semester.

One reason that the deferred payment option will be terminated is to encourage students to pay their bills in full, according to Frailey. According to Frailey, a significant percentage of the approximately 800 students on the deferred payment plan, about 30 percent of all MIT undergraduates, are getting financial aid and compared to all MIT undergraduates. Frailey commented that these statistics indicate that most persons who are utilizing the deferred payment plan are probably taking advantage of the system. He noted, however, that he was very concerned about the student who chose to use the deferred payment plan because of financial aid benefits.

Frailey commented, "The present plan is very unfair." Those students who do not pay a small amount of their bills are penalized with a large fine.

The plan for the change originated in the Office for Student Affairs, at the request of the student government. Originally, the new plan was to be presented to the Academic Council by the end of the year, but Frailey foresees no obstacles in the implementation of the plan for next term.

Life inside...

Simplex property talks suspended

By Michael Shimazu

In one sense the negotiations have stopped but in another sense, they will go on for quite a period of time," said Walter L. Murray '62, Assistant to the President for Urban Relations, commenting on the suspension of negotiations to reach a compromise on the development plan for the so-called Simplex property, behind MIT.

"I expect there will be ongoing discussion for 20 years," commented Milne, who said he anticipates continuing negotiations on a formal and informal, during the remainder of the planning stage and during the development of the property.

The 14 acres of land in Cambridgeport, formerly owned by Simplex Wire and Cable Company, are now owned in part by MIT, and were discussed in negotiations which ended without resolution in October.

Community groups, including the Simplex Steering Committee (SSC) and MIT were to formulate a compromise plan for the development of the area that also meets city approval.

During the negotiations, the SSC advocated zoning the area to a largely industrial classification and wanted "a defined zone, exclusively for housing" to be part of the Simplex property.

The SSC, in a letter to the Cambridge Chronicle, blamed MIT for the breakdown in the talks. "All parties should have come to the negotiations willing to compromise, but clearly MIT did not," the letter charged.

Asked to comment on this, Milne said, "Well, they've been doing that for years and I seldom answer their letters anymore." He added that despite the breakdown, "I think we'll be moving ahead toward something.

The SSC letter noted that the Committee conveyed to MIT a number of procedural points during the talks and added that MIT's insistence on these points "created an atmosphere of confrontation that really brought the negotiations to a halt."

The question of the disposition of the land will probably be raised before the Cambridge City Council at a few weeks. The Council had considered a proposal by the Cambridge Development Department (CDD) which would have allowed MIT to fund a lower density of development on the land than that advocated by the SSC last spring.

Four council members support the CDD proposal. Six votes would be needed for adoption of a zoning ordinance; however, acceptance...