

To the Misinformed.

For the benefit of those who may have been misled by the article "No Politics Needed" in the last issue of this paper, let it be stated that the person who wrote the said article knew very little about the actual facts concerning the new method of electing the 1906 *Technique* Electoral Committee and was therefore dealing with a subject beyond him. Strong words become nonsense in such a case.

It is entirely unnecessary to enlighten such a man through these columns. For those interested let it be said that the class raised no positive objection to the adopted system. But one man expressed his feelings against it. Is this not proof of its acceptance by the class? Surely the members of 1906 are mature enough to use their brains to advantage and, if they considered the adopted method as being correct should they allow tradition or precedence to influence them? Decidedly not.

Who should form the Electoral Committee? Those members of the class who heretofore have been nonparticipants in the affairs of the class, who do not know the capabilities of its members and are therefore unable to judge, or those who have always shown an active interest, who have worked for the class and have given their time, their thought and their strength to advance its interests? These men are certainly the more fit judges — they know the capacity of the class.

By a general ballot many votes are lost. One man or other, just realizing that something is going on by the receipt of his ballot may find himself elected to perform a duty for which he is entirely unfitted. For this reason let the election wax hot between the best men, of whom there are many more than are needed to work on the committee and let the best men win out.

As to politics influencing these elections it is to be hoped that the class possesses characters strong enough to subdue any such improper practise. It fully realizes the position that *Technique* should and does hold among other

college annuals and any influence acting detrimentally toward the success of the book will be well taken care of.

Communications.

The Editors do not hold themselves responsible for opinions expressed by Correspondents.

The Chairman of the Advisory Council says in your last issue:

"As it has become a principle that the Track Team is the one to which all other athletics at the Institute should be subservient, it is a fact that every year at least one and sometimes more men have played baseball who would have very likely made the Track Team if they had tried for it."

If it has "become a principle" that from twenty to thirty students should be deprived of exercise in order to draw "at least one" man to the Track Team it is high time that the principle becomes obsolete. Of course we want a good Track Team. Possibly the abolition of baseball would make it a little better, but at what expense? Is the general physical development among the students to be made subservient to the comparatively few men on the Track Team?

Moreover what has been the effect of the disfavor of the Advisory Councils with respect to baseball. They have opposed it as Mr. Briggs says for three years. Yet baseball has been so popular that class teams have continued in spite of this opposition. That baseball has cost the classes money is equally true of the Field Day Teams.

Mr. Briggs says that there is not time to develop a good baseball team in April and early May. It would be well to remember that the class football season last Fall lasted just five weeks. It seems that the only way in which the Advisory Council can avoid being "inconsistent" is to abolish our most flourishing athletic event of the year, Technology Field Day, or else support baseball if they intend to use the argument of lack of time in developing teams. If the Advisory Council supports baseball and makes it one of the Spring events there is no reason why it cannot be put on a good