California, there they go, behind the IFC decision

By Glenn Brownstone

By now the MIT IFC team for the Bedford race to be held next week has been officially chosen. The team will be composed of 12 men and 12 women, all MIT students, with the men coming solely from fraternities and the women being from campus-wide organizations.

I suppose that this story’s been beaten almost to death, but there is one major point that needs to be brought up that is being the selection of male canoists, which is still and will remain a controversy.

Ostensibly, the reason to confine their selection to fraternities stems from the original decision to name 12 canoeists from six “jock teams,” the IFC has apparently lost a sense of scope of the possible ramifications of such a decision. In the past IFC and dorm-sponsored activities have been thought of as the front yard, but it appears that the lure of California and the $1000 may have further stretched, possible to the breaking point, for it is by forced on-campus social life.

One other dorm-sponssored event, or more likely, the strained relations which frats may be discriminated against at dorm parties or at least not extend the “front yard” to dormitories, and that fraternities and dorms/off-campus. Most of MIT’s fraternities are physically separated from the remainder of the Institute. This recent incident points out that they apparently consider themselves physically separate from the rest of the student body and have no desire to make any effort to change this.

Based on this theory it is not surprising that the IFC voted Sunday to restrict the male part of the team to fraternity jocks; it’s also somewhat predictable that they would first contact Simmonds, BU, Wheelock, and Boston Conservatory of Music women first, as they are, according to the BYA’s, the fairest of all MIT women, owing to the smallest number of coed fraternities.

The IFC has apparently lost a sense of scope of the possible ramifications of such a decision. It’s guess that frats may be discriminated against at dorm parties or at least not extend the “front yard” to dormitories, and that fraternities and dorms/off-campus. Most of MIT’s fraternities are physically separated from the remainder of the Institute. This recent incident points out that they apparently consider themselves physically separate from the rest of the student body and have no desire to make any effort to change this.

We may see any number of reprisals against this decision. It’s guess that frats may be discriminated against at dorm parties or at least not extend the “front yard” to dormitories, and that fraternities and dorms/off-campus. Most of MIT’s fraternities are physically separated from the remainder of the Institute. This recent incident points out that they apparently consider themselves physically separate from the rest of the student body and have no desire to make any effort to change this.

Residents’ rights

To the Editor:

May an aged "squad" who has inhabited an office on campus believe the press comment on the "Transparent Horizons" controversy?

I have been impressed with the generally responsible efforts of students to get their opinions (i.e. dislike) of this "artistic" embellishment across to the Committee on the Visual Arts. For a fraction of students to get their opinions across to the Committee on the Visual Arts. For a fraction of students to get their opinions across to the Committee on the Visual Arts.

The chairs of defacing the structure - while sagely immobile and subject to strong criticism - nevertheless came only after the "establishment" had proved nonresponsive. although this makes such chairmen less sensitive to criticism, it is somewhat understandable since it reflects, I suppose frustration at being ignored.

As a matter of policy, the Committee on Visual Arts might well differentiate between general public areas of the Institute, like the courtyard of the Library, and those areas which are essentially living group centers, as is the East Campus. In choosing objects for the latter one would anticipate the selection of items which could reasonably be expected to be meaningful and pleasing to a majority of the inhabitants of that area. Dormitory dwellers probably never can have the same freedom to select art as do others. Dormitory dwellers probably never can have the same freedom to select art as do others.

To the Editor:

In your recent editorial on Cambridge and its future possibilities, you note that industry is moving out of the area. There is also a reference to the NorthEast using its political weight to attract a Northeasterner as president. I thought it was more sympathetic to the regional situation.

I believe it pertinent to bring out the preliminary data of the US census for 1975 which shows the Southern and Western states growing at a rate which far exceeds the Northeast or North Central states' growth rate. What this means is that in the 1980s the Northeast will lose state representatives to Arizona, Colorado, Texas, Florida, and North Carolina. As this shift occurs, the sentiment of the Congress is certain to switch with the Northeast being an inevitable loser. These "sun-belt" states are also today's economic winners, and they'll not vote for a president who wants to reverse the current economic trends.

The political option of the Northeast is fading, and I believe it is a tool that can no longer be used by the Northeast. As your article suggested, the region should emphasize its strengths. The cities of the region should recognize their position in the banking and financial areas, as corporate headquarters, for technology industries, the fine natural ports, and its universities.

If the region continues to lose the manufacturing base and attracts only the high level skilled jobs, the region will because even more strafged between the very rich and very poor. The two groups are so different as to be living for the same space and services, with the rich and the working class. The rich will push up the cost of the basic services. The unions will be shifted to areas outside the region.

I am emphasizing only its strengths, the region worsens its weaknesses. Revitalization will require imaginative programs to keep the area competitive and growing. So far nothing along these lines has been proposed. How the necessary sacrifices shall be distributed will be the political debate.

Paul H. Levy G

January 27, 1976

Another Rembrandt?

To the Editor:

This is in response to Mark Throop's letter in the January 23 The Tech criticizing the new sculpture, "Transparent Horizon." The gist of Throop's remarks is that the sculpture should not be regarded as a work of art because he doesn't like it. To him, it looks "like a three-year-old did it." With these truths in mind, let us now put an end to all the naive criticism that now darkens our outstanding new sculpture, "Transparent Horizon." - Roger Kolb

January 38, 1976