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The place of THE TECH to publish a regular issue yesterday was frustrated by the refusal of the engravers and printers to work on Thanksgiving Day. Accordingly, the Friday issue of THE TECH has been omitted.

MAIN REQUISITE IS EFFICIENCY.

"Not considered a fit man to represent the Institute" is becoming a popular reason for opposing the election of a candidate to an athletic managerial position.

"He is not fit to represent Technology" has come to be the only reason advanced to uphold the candidacy of certain men. The candidate's real ability and knowledge of the sport is what he is to conduct concerns not to be considered.

The arguments for and against have been advanced again and again. A striking case was brought up in the election of the track manager last year.

In the spring of '06, very quietly these arguments were advanced in the election of the track manager this year. But more vigorous cases were brought up in the election of the fencing manager last fall and in the election of the fencing manager in the meeting of the Athletic Association last Monday.

The assistant track manager in '06 proved an extremely efficient man when he became manager. He was probably selected by the good men of the Institute because of his active energy and was forced to do justice to the work. Yet the latter worked as assistant manager throughout the season, did an immense amount of work on the track, and it was said that the less efficient man who was here to be efficient, but designated as "not so good a manager" as the former, "certainly turned out well, it was a strange experiment, one that has proved disastrous in the case of the fencing manager.

"Too much energy" also seems to be an argument against candidate's election to a managerial position. For a manager, for this reason, advanced against the candidate for track manager this fall. The men competing against him for the position were more aggressive. This one man had his ability, efficiency, and energy; why was there any question about his election when he did so well?

When the opposition to him was nul- lified, it was found that he was too energetic, too efficient, and popular, and "he is not fit to represent Technology," not a Junior, but this is a manager. A large number of men, the chief management of a man absolutely without training or knowledge in track work turned up, and it was a dangerous experiment, one that has proved disastrous in the case of the fencing manager.

"Too much energy" also seems to be an argument against candidate's election to a managerial position. For a manager, for this reason, advanced against the candidate for track manager this fall. The men competing against him for the position were more aggressive. This one man had his ability, efficiency, and energy; why was there any question about his election when he did so well?

When the opposition to him was nullified, it was found that he was too energetic, too efficient, and popular, and "he is not fit to represent Technology," not a Junior, but this is a manager. A large number of men, the chief management of a man absolutely without training or knowledge in track work turned up, and it was a dangerous experiment, one that has proved disastrous in the case of the fencing manager.

"Very much energy" also seems to be an argument against candidate's election to a managerial position. For a manager, for this reason, advanced against the candidate for track manager this fall. The men competing against him for the position were more aggressive. This one man had his ability, efficiency, and energy; why was there any question about his election when he did so well?

When the opposition to him was nullified, it was found that he was too energetic, too efficient, and popular, and "he is not fit to represent Technology," not a Junior, but this is a manager. A large number of men, the chief management of a man absolutely without training or knowledge in track work turned up, and it was a dangerous experiment, one that has proved disastrous in the case of the fencing manager.

"Main requisite is efficiency."