this is far from being coeducation. What is Harvard Annex but a second Wellesley. Where, indeed, is its social connection with the University? The Tech does not believe in coeducation, but does not intend by any means to argue against it. We do not believe in even discussing it to any extent. If established, it must remain so; if not, this should only be done by the vote of the student body. For the Tech believes that in matters of such general bearing and prime importance, student opinion should be largely considered and respected. It is the students, equally with the Faculty, that make the college, and equally in some affairs should they have a voice in its governance,—a German student principle, perhaps, but none the less a sound one. Under this, following Professor Levermore's assumption, coeducation would cease its growth once for all, it is true; but this does not hurt the principle at all, and it is principles which we have been discussing.

The report of the treasurer of the Football Association, published in our last issue, and the lack of success of those trying to collect money to pay off the debt therein shown, offers an excellent object lesson. Occurring at some other time, it would probably cause many of us to think over the situation. At present, when the "annuals" are the all-absorbing topic, few of us have time to consider the state of things shown by the above facts; however, they afford food for reflection during the vacation, and between this time and next fall it must be decided whether or no a football team goes in the field. Let each man decide the matter for himself; and if he decide that we should have a team in the field, then let him also decide to support it well, and make the execution of his decision a possibility. It takes pluck enough to play a losing game of football with good financial backing; but it takes a great deal more to play a losing game when every time a game is played and lost the team goes so much more in debt.

The Senior Dinner this year is a lamentable example of the way a majority of Institute men shun the only social event of the school year. The attendance of the Senior Class was unusually large this year, and that of the three lower classes was proportionately smaller. Men stayed away from no other cause than that they were perfectly indifferent to the whole affair, and thus what might have been a great success financially, proved in this respect a decided failure, although a great social success. The members of the committee are certainly not to blame; they worked honestly and earnestly, and deserve much credit for the interest they took in the dinner.

Every one who was absent claimed a motive for his nonappearance; the majority of them pleaded lack of time, although a half holiday was granted, which should have had the effect of at least removing this excuse; and it seems as though to have remained away on this plea was but taking an unfair advantage of the very generous action of the Faculty. It is of little consequence what the excuses were, as excuses didn't assist the managing committee in squaring their accounts, which showed a large excess on the debit side,—much larger than many imagine or believe it to be; and it may be clearly seen that either the Senior Dinner must receive better support, or else it, which has been the most pleasant, brilliant affair of the Institute year, must be dropped from the list of social events. We cannot believe that the latter resource will be resorted to in an Institution where the attendance is 1,000 strong, so it only remains to adopt the first plan.

In conclusion, we hope that the weak support given '93 in her laudable undertaking will furnish an example for future years; and that this year's financial failure will mark the end of small attendance and poor support, rather than a beginning of poorer support and greater failures of an event which, as it is has