Cinderella win opener; down weak Colby by 16

By Arno Varettsson

MIT's varsity track squad won their first dual meet of the season last Friday as they defeated a weak Colby team by the score of 110-27.

The meet, which was hampered this time by their lack of distance runners and hurdlers, though that lack is expected to cause problems later in the season.

The meet was run in a very slow 9:17, with Tech's #2 and #3 taking a second place and #1 winning by a wide margin. Steve Sydoriak '68 behind him.

MIT's Larry Siewert won the mile in a time of 4:33.4, while Rob Wesson '66 won the mile with a time of 4:32.9, and Colby lost the meet 39-17.

MIT's #2 and #3 placed in the mile with times of 5:01 and 5:33, respectively, and the #1 won the 880 in a time of 2:02.4.

The #3 in the 1500 placed second by a close margin of 1.5 seconds, while the #2 placed third, almost a minute behind the #1. The #3 in the mile placed second by a margin of 5.5 seconds.

The #1 in the 100 placed second by 2.5 seconds, while the #2 placed third, almost 30 seconds behind the #1. The #3 placed fourth, almost 1 minute behind the #1.

The #4 in the 400 placed second by a margin of 1.5 seconds, while the #3 placed third, almost 28 seconds behind the #1. The #2 placed fourth, almost 30 seconds behind the #1.

The #2 in the 800 placed second by a margin of 1.5 seconds, while the #1 placed third, almost 28 seconds behind the #2. The #4 placed fourth, almost 30 seconds behind the #1.

The #1 in the 1500 placed second by a margin of 1.5 seconds, while the #2 placed third, almost 28 seconds behind the #1. The #3 placed fourth, almost 30 seconds behind the #1.

The #2 in the mile placed second by a margin of 1.5 seconds, while the #3 placed third, almost 28 seconds behind the #2. The #4 placed fourth, almost 30 seconds behind the #2.

The #1 in the 800 placed second by a margin of 1.5 seconds, while the #2 placed third, almost 28 seconds behind the #1. The #4 placed fourth, almost 30 seconds behind the #2.

The #1 in the 400 placed second by a margin of 1.5 seconds, while the #2 placed third, almost 28 seconds behind the #1. The #3 placed fourth, almost 30 seconds behind the #1.

The #1 in the 200 placed second by a margin of 1.5 seconds, while the #2 placed third, almost 28 seconds behind the #1. The #3 placed fourth, almost 30 seconds behind the #1.

The #1 in the 100 placed second by a margin of 1.5 seconds, while the #2 placed third, almost 28 seconds behind the #1. The #3 placed fourth, almost 30 seconds behind the #1.

The #1 in the 800 placed second by a margin of 1.5 seconds, while the #2 placed third, almost 28 seconds behind the #1. The #4 placed fourth, almost 30 seconds behind the #2.

The #1 in the 400 placed second by a margin of 1.5 seconds, while the #2 placed third, almost 28 seconds behind the #1. The #3 placed fourth, almost 30 seconds behind the #1.

The #1 in the 200 placed second by a margin of 1.5 seconds, while the #2 placed third, almost 28 seconds behind the #1. The #3 placed fourth, almost 30 seconds behind the #1.

The #1 in the 100 placed second by a margin of 1.5 seconds, while the #2 placed third, almost 28 seconds behind the #1. The #3 placed fourth, almost 30 seconds behind the #1.

The #1 in the 800 placed second by a margin of 1.5 seconds, while the #2 placed third, almost 28 seconds behind the #1. The #4 placed fourth, almost 30 seconds behind the #2.

The #1 in the 400 placed second by a margin of 1.5 seconds, while the #2 placed third, almost 28 seconds behind the #1. The #3 placed fourth, almost 30 seconds behind the #1.

The #1 in the 200 placed second by a margin of 1.5 seconds, while the #2 placed third, almost 28 seconds behind the #1. The #3 placed fourth, almost 30 seconds behind the #1.

The #1 in the 100 placed second by a margin of 1.5 seconds, while the #2 placed third, almost 28 seconds behind the #1. The #3 placed fourth, almost 30 seconds behind the #1.

The #1 in the 800 placed second by a margin of 1.5 seconds, while the #2 placed third, almost 28 seconds behind the #1. The #4 placed fourth, almost 30 seconds behind the #2.

The #1 in the 400 placed second by a margin of 1.5 seconds, while the #2 placed third, almost 28 seconds behind the #1. The #3 placed fourth, almost 30 seconds behind the #1.

The #1 in the 200 placed second by a margin of 1.5 seconds, while the #2 placed third, almost 28 seconds behind the #1. The #3 placed fourth, almost 30 seconds behind the #1.

The #1 in the 100 placed second by a margin of 1.5 seconds, while the #2 placed third, almost 28 seconds behind the #1. The #3 placed fourth, almost 30 seconds behind the #1.