THE RELAY RACE FOUL.

We sincerely regret the attitude taken by the Bowdoin Orient of Feb. 19, 1902, in regard to the relay race at the B. A. A. Meet. The article in question is not only rancorous, but careful and extended inquiry failed to substantiate the claims that, before the fatal collision, Emerson fouled Bates twice, while the latter was trying to pass the Tech runner, and that Emerson fell untouched by the Bowdoin man. Furthermore, the lead at the finish claimed by the Orient is grossly exaggerated. The decision of the foul, however, rested with the inspector at that corner, Dr. W. R. Mansfield, a man who has had wide experience in track work, and was fully competent to judge whether the foul was due to "jockeying" on Emerson's part or to interference on Bates' part as he tried to take the lead on the pole side when there was insufficient space to pass. His decision was that Bowdoin fouled. As we said last week, we believe the foul was unintentional, and was due to misjudgment. The manner in which our team in succeeding laps cut down the lead, plainly indicated what the result of the race would have been had the accident not occurred.

However, it is gratifying to note that the bitterness evinced against Tech in the Orient is not shared by their track team. Though not satisfied with the decision, their relations with the B. A. A. officials and our team are most gentlemanly and sportsmanlike, and we hope the Orient will follow their lead. College athletics should be clean, generous rivalry, and anything which tends to produce an intercollege hatred should be treated as carefully as possible.

N. E. I. ATHLETIC ASSOCIATION.

The M. I. T. Athletic Association proposed two changes before the N. E. I. A. A. Convention (the account of which may be found on another page) in regard to the Annual Meet at Worcester: The first change, providing for the discontinuance of the bicycle race, was defeated by one vote, four of the ten colleges opposing