Three factors—a deeper concern for the lot of freshmen at MIT, a greater sense of responsibility within the Interfraternity Conference, and a greater effectiveness of dormitory leadership—have contributed to a marked increase in discussion of close-knit living groups, both in the Institute Houses and the fraternities. Thus, this matter remains more a matter for intellectual rather than practical debate. However, first term rush raises another quite significant question.

Are freshmen adequately informed to make responsible residence decisions? Under the present system, contact with MIT students over the summer, rush books, and other housing information is considered adequate. A few freshmen either decide not to consider fraternities and therefore not attend Rush Week, or consider choosing fraternities a four-day open rush period and pledging if they wish. It was surprising to find a large number of freshmen at MIT, a larger amount of discussion about rushing activities, polices, and problems. Most of the dialogue has centered around several important issues.

First, when should Rush Week be held? So far, delayed rushing at MIT is generally considered better for both the fraternities and MIT. This overshadows other considerations such as the value of intense upperclassman guidance first years each fall to the decision of close-knit living groups, both in the Institute Houses and the fraternities. Thus, this matter remains more a matter for intellectual rather than practical debate. However, first term rush raises another quite significant question.

The IFC has in the past and should continue in the future to accept responsibility for the fraternities and all that is happening in the rush week. They are responsible for the whole system, and cannot continue to allow us to solve problems in an ad hoc fashion and accept responsibility for the outcome of single decisions. The IFC has the potential to provide a forum for the discussion of the entire residence system. This year, as a radical innovation, all three speakers at the pre-Rush Week Meeting (Dean Gray, the IFC Chairman, and the Rush Chairman) each covered the entire gamut of the residence system, and this year over 60% of those who attend open rushing period and pledging if they wish, including a large number of freshman who have rejected fraternities by attending a four day open rush period and pledging if they wish. Thus, the IFC is in a position to discuss any questions presented by the residence system. In part, this is because the IFC is composed of all who pledged last year.

Two rash week meetings, overwhelmingly endorsed by the freshmen for its helpfulness, directly introduces fraternities, Rush Week, and the residence system. Even though some people doubt whether all this is sufficient preparation, the freshmen report that they consider themselves confident and able to make the residence decision.

Further very significant question that has provoked considerable debate is rush. Should the IFC continue in this rush week? This query becomes increasingly pertinent as the nature of rush week changes to encompass activity in all part of the residence system. Thus, two-thirds of the freshmen attend a voluntary rush week at the invitation of the IFC and encouraged by the MIT administration.

Thus, the IFC has in the past and should continue in the future to accept sole responsibility for the fraternities during this time. During Rush Week, the IFC has demonstrated a willingness to help the freshmen with an unblurred view of the residence system. This year, as a radical innovation, all three speakers at the pre-Rush Week Meeting (Dean Gray, the IFC Chairman, and the Rush Chairman) each covered the entire gamut of the residence system, and this year over 60% of those who attended open rushing period and pledging if they wish.

I was surprised to find a large number of freshmen at MIT, a larger amount of discussion about rushing activities, polices, and problems. Most of the dialogue has centered around several important issues.

First, when should Rush Week be held? So far, delayed rushing at MIT is generally considered better for both the fraternities and MIT. This overshadows other considerations such as the value of intense upperclassman guidance first years each fall to the decision of close-knit living groups, both in the Institute Houses and the fraternities. Thus, this matter remains more a matter for intellectual rather than practical debate. However, first term rush raises another quite significant question.

The IFC has in the past and should continue in the future to accept responsibility for the fraternities and all that is happening in the rush week. They are responsible for the whole system, and cannot continue to allow us to solve problems in an ad hoc fashion and accept responsibility for the outcome of single decisions. The IFC has the potential to provide a forum for the discussion of the entire residence system. This year, as a radical innovation, all three speakers at the pre-Rush Week Meeting (Dean Gray, the IFC Chairman, and the Rush Chairman) each covered the entire gamut of the residence system, and this year over 60% of those who attended open rushing period and pledging if they wish. Thus, the IFC is in a position to discuss any questions presented by the residence system. In part, this is because the IFC is composed of all who pledged last year.

Second-class postage paid at Boston, Massachusetts. The Tech's office of the 10th of freshmen at MIT, a stronger amount of discussion about rushing activities, polices, and problems. Most of the dialogue has centered around several important issues.

First, when should Rush Week be held? So far, delayed rushing at MIT is generally considered better for both the fraternities and MIT. This overshadows other considerations such as the value of intense upperclassman guidance first years each fall to the decision of close-knit living groups, both in the Institute Houses and the fraternities. Thus, this matter remains more a matter for intellectual rather than practical debate. However, first term rush raises another quite significant question.

The IFC has in the past and should continue in the future to accept responsibility for the fraternities and all that is happening in the rush week. They are responsible for the whole system, and cannot continue to allow us to solve problems in an ad hoc fashion and accept responsibility for the outcome of single decisions. The IFC has the potential to provide a forum for the discussion of the entire residence system. This year, as a radical innovation, all three speakers at the pre-Rush Week Meeting (Dean Gray, the IFC Chairman, and the Rush Chairman) each covered the entire gamut of the residence system, and this year over 60% of those who attended open rushing period and pledging if they wish. Thus, the IFC is in a position to discuss any questions presented by the residence system. In part, this is because the IFC is composed of all who pledged last year.