**R/O week called a success**

By David C. Langbein  

The 1979 edition of the MIT Residence/Orientation Week is finished, and, with a few exceptions, appears to have gone well, according to Bath Hill '80, FIC chairman, and Philip '80 Dormorman chairman. Hill stated, as of Friday, September 7th, 397 freshmen had pledged a fraternity. Although the fraternities were originally aiming for 416 pledges, Hill stated that "everyone is happy with the quality of the people" that were pledged, as well as with the class as a whole.

Many of the anticipated problems, such as disorderly behavior, neighborhood disturbances and violation of drinking laws, also failed to materialize, despite "one or two complaints" according to Hill. The drinking problem "came off all right," and no real alcohol-related incidents occurred. Problems with neighbors also failed to occur. Phillips painted a similarly rosy picture for the dorm portion of the week. The only problem that has surfaced is the "fair amount" of dorm overcrowding, due in part to unsubscripted fraternity pledging and in part to a larger than usual freshman class. Baker, Burton, McCormick, MacGregor, and East Campus were all instituting room crowding as of Tuesday night.

With reference to any possible political ramifications associated with dorm activities, Phillips said that there were "no major problems." The image that Boston has attained was seen as a possible friction area, but the only problem that arose was during Parents' Weekend, when parents of Boston freshmen became anxiously involved with the Boston runners circulating about campus.

As far as any changes being made in the dorm program, Phillips indicated that the women's orientation, Hall, be well. Phillips has been downplayed or even eliminated in future years. Phillips said that he had received numerous complaints, many from women in the Class of '83, about the overwhelming place on women's participation.

**SCC claims not to be GA committee**

By Erik Sherman

"I don't consider the UA to have any authority over any organization on campus," said Hill. This statement by Chris Wheeler, '81, chairman of the Student Center Committee, indicates that fundamental differences in philosophy exist between the SCC and the office of the Undergraduate Association President, Jonathan Hakala, '81.

Wheeler continued, "I consider the SCC very expensive but not responsible to the UA and more specifically, the GA. I don't consider them to have authority over the Student Center Committee, I feel that the UA should have at least limited authority over such groups as the Football Board and the Nominations Committee, but group that are not predominantly fraternities and whose programs are directed to unfraternized students."  

The point of contention between the two organizations is the fact that under the present SCC constitution, the SCC is considered to be a standing committee under the General Assembly. However, approximately six years ago, the SCC approved a set of bylaws in which they declared that they were no longer a standing committee.
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Hakala views the situation differently. "The SCC has always been controverisal under the control of a viable GA," he said. He continued, "What they consider them to have nothing to do with what the constitution says to the contrary. If there is not a viable GA, then people will act independently. When there is a viable GA, I would expect and appreciate them for cooperating with the UA."  

When questioned about the constitutionality of the SCC as a standing committee, Wheeler replied, "That's nice. It's not clear that this is a standing committee."  

Except for a "very substantive" reason, Hakala said he sees no reason to force this difference of opinion out into the open. He defined, such a reason to be a lack of adequate fulfillment of the needs of the student body. When pressed for an example of such a situation, he explained that one such situation would be that of the SCC permanently closing the 24-hour Coffeehouse. Associate Dean for Student Activities Robert Holden expressed his views on the subject. "I think that the SCC is a standing committee. Whether it has become de facto more than that or less than that, I don't know."  

Undergraduate Association Vice-president Chuck Mathhisons, '81, echoed Hakala's sentiments. "Just because they're under the GA, we won't go around changing things; they're doing a good job." Both Hakala and Wheeler agree that the two groups have a good working relationship at the present.

When asked why the UA might be interested in transforming the SCC as a standing committee if Hakala should develop a viable GA, Wheeler replied, "The UA is only interested in the SCC for the money, manpower, and organization (it would provide)." Hakala said he disagrees. "The constitution states very clearly that the GA has specific authority over the SCC. I intend to enforce that. If there is a viable GA and it acts, I expect to SCC to abide by the GA's action. The SCC has specific legal authority over the entire affairs of the SCC. We will not quarrel unless they are not responsive. Then, I will act very quickly and very decisively," he said. Hakala refused to comment on the actions that he would take.

(See page 3)