NEW YORK — by the waters of the Hudson I laid down and wept. I remembered Cambridge.

For the past four months, I have been living in a small apartment in the Big Apple. I didn't choose to live in New York; I chose to go to graduate school at Columbia University. I knew the city would be a hell of a lot better than Cambridge.

I didn't get university housing. Priority in the Columbia graduate housing system is based on how far you live from New York; I chose to go to the University of the Hudson I laid down and wept. I remembered Cambridge.

New York has always been a city of excess. New York has never been a city of economy. New York has always been a city of exorbitant rents. New York is like that. I'm told that such exorbitant- rent-rents are typical in the city.

On my way home each night, three or four people would ask me for money. New York has nearly 100,000 homeless people and nearly an equal number of vacant apartments owned by the city. New York has always been a city of excess.

When a slum lord fails to pay taxes and the city takes possession of an apartment building, it breaks up the windows, turns off the water and the electric current, and does its best to make the building uninhabitable. Obviously, the technique keeps drug addicts from using the building. It also keeps the homeless from occupying the building.

Can't have the homeless living in abandoned apartments when the city is spending millions of dollars for tax credits to builders of office building and luxury condominiums.

A friend was looking for a two-bedroom apartment in Brooklyn, so I moved in with her. The apartment is in Prospect Heights, a community in the process of gentrification — that the poor people are getting pushed out for the rich professionals, of which I am considered one.

A block east, the rent on my apartment would be $1500 a month. A two-bedroom, pre-war children smoke crack in abandoned lots and on the steps of broken windows.

Take police powers away from MIT

to the Editor: Jeff Meredith G should be applauded for his effort to bring "balance" to The Tech's coverage of Nicaraguan issues [*News* section's "reporter's notebook" series].

However, I must take issue with Meredith concerning his suggestion that the Gimenez family's ten armed guerrilla units have benefited crucially from significant external support, and that the contras are in no way exceptional. He specifically cites the Vietnamese, Cubans, and Afghan guerrillas.

A little history is in order here. The Cuban revolution of 1959 was won not with a guerrilla war, but with conventional tactics, and with very little outside support. In particular, it has been demonstrated that the Vietnamese and Afghans have been as much a victim of US support as a beneficiary of it.

I think it's high time that the scope of that edict be reconsidered. In particular, it has become clear that MIT does not know how to deal with nonviolent political protests (much less armed ones) and that the Cambridge police force is not an entity that can be casually dragged into MIT's happenings. MIT derives its police powers from a special legislative edict and I think it's high time that the scope of that edict be reconsidered. In particular, it has become clear that MIT does not know how to deal with nonviolent political protests (much less armed ones) and that the Cambridge police force is not an entity that can be casually dragged into MIT's happenings. MIT derives its police powers from a special legislative edict.