1905 Class, when in its Freshmen year it voted dis-
approval of the yell, and the fact that the “We are
happy” is used five times to every once of the M.
I. T., show plainly enough the trend of popular
sentiment. These strong facts were the main ar-
gent of the negative.

The affirmative stated that the yell lessens the
dignity of the college. While it is true that the
dignity of a crowd of men, jubilant over some victory
or returning from Field Day, is not very evident,
there is a dignity belonging to the Institute which
it is the duty and should be the pleasure of every
undergraduate to preserve, even though he dis-
penses with his own on occasion. To give any yell
may be considered an undignified action, but that
one yell may be more impressive than another is
obvious, and as we surely desire a yell which cor-
rectly expresses our spirit, something more mature
than the “We are happy” yell should be adopted.

Other strong points for the affirmative not easily
refuted and well worth consideration, are, that only
third rate colleges indulge in similar yells, even the
smaller New England colleges avoiding them; that
the yell exemplifies the ideas of college life of the
cheap non-collegiate sport; and that numbers of
loyal Tech men are heartily ashamed of the yell and
this last not because of the word “hell.” If one
considers for a moment it is evident that the yell can
signify to an outsider nothing else than that Tech
men consider themselves very wicked college boys,
or that they sincerely hate Technology, either of
which suppositions is equally erroneous and stupid.

By far the most vivid objection and one which
from its unpleasant truth should cause every Tech
man to blush with shame was embodied in a simple
remark: “Put this ‘We are happy’ yell in the
mouths of three thousand Harvard men at the Yale
game. Is it possible to imagine Harvard men
giving this yell?” If a Harvard man’s estimation
of his university is too high for him to deliver a
similar yell in public, how much less should we
lower the dignity of the good old Institute by caus-
ing the abominable impression which “We are
happy” produces. If comparisons are odious, they
are too often indispensable in opening people’s
eyes. Are we willing to support longer a type of
yell which men whom we believe ourselves to equal,
would disdain to use? How much longer shall we
insult our college by yelling that “Tech is hell?”

Calendar.

THURSDAY, DEC. 31.
7:15 P.M. SENIOR CLASS WATCH. Seniors meet at
Rogers to go to Keith’s, and to watch the Old Year out on Rogers steps.
3:00 P.M. SOCIETY OF ARTS MEETING in Walker
Building. Mr. Charles Garrison, of the
De Laval Steam Turbine Company, will
address the Society on “Steam Tur-
bines.” Students invited.

FRIDAY, JAN. 1.
4:00 P.M. MANDOLIN CLUB REHEARSAL in Rogers, 33-

SATURDAY, JAN. 2.
6:00 P.M. REGULAR INFORMAL DINNER at the
Union. Tickets twenty-five cents, from
Mr. Powers. Be sure to get a ticket be-
forehand.

MONDAY, JAN. 4.
4:15 P.M. MEETING CIVIL ENGINEERING SOCIETY
in Room II, Engineering B. Mr. F. H.
Snow will speak on “Sewage Dispos-
al.”

TUESDAY, JAN. 5.
4:00 P.M. MANDOLIN CLUB REHEARSAL in Rogers, 33-

WEDNESDAY, JAN. 6.
2:00 P.M. COURSE IN ARGUMENTATION. Debate
in 6 Lowell on the question: “Resolved,
that the removal of the Institute to a
site in the suburbs will be of advantage
to the students.”

4:15 P.M. TRIALS FOR INDOOR MEET at Gymna-
sium in High Jump, Shot-put and Pole-
vault. Six men qualify.

THURSDAY, JAN. 7.
7:30 P.M. ANNUAL INDOOR ATHLETIC MEET at Gymna-
sium. Six events and Class re-
lay races. Admission, twenty-five cents.

FRIDAY, JAN. 8.
8:00 P.M. CHESS TEAM VS. BOSTON CHESS CLUB,
Metropolitan League Match at rooms of
the Boston Chess Club.