

EVERY
MONDAY

SPECTATOR

Issue No. 3

31 January 1982.

TO WHOMSOEVER IT MAY CONCERN

The Right Honourable Speaker Rev. John Gonsalves has requested us to bring out our "editorial policy" in detail in this issue. "Avoid blanket statements and explain your policy explicitly," he cautioned.

What can be the editorial policy of a mag like ours? Our aim has always been to publicise news on the extra-curricular front. "News," says Saeed Naqvi, Editor, INDIAN EXPRESS, "is something that someone, somewhere wants to conceal." CAMPUS NEWS is certainly not concealed. Our mag is intended to give IITians a perspective of the happenings in lit, cultural and sports fields. We hope to cover these happenings as candidly as possible, omitting no details. This has very much been our tradition right from September 5, when the first copy of SPECTATOR rolled off the cyclostyling machine.

We have no objection whatsoever to overlapping of matters covered in the three campus magazines. Our policy in this matter is - the more the merrier.

You must have seen our new colours. "Keep it simple and neat and get it out in a colour no one else has," said our Art Editor, Raf(r)eeq; and he provided us with the neat and simple part of it. We turned to those veterans at the Reprographic Section for the rest of it.

**

We congratulate Prof. R. Srinivasan, our unofficial publisher, on his elevation to the post of Deputy Director.

ON INTER-IIT

Prof. Surjit Singh

Advisor, Sports,
I.I.T., Madras

The Editor
SPECTATOR
IIT Madras.

Sir,

I congratulate the editorial board of SPECTATOR for bringing out a special issue (17 January 1982) on a complete analysis of the results of the Inter-IIT Meet held at Kharagpur. Even during the meet at Kharagpur a regular issue of SPECTATOR was awaited every morning and I must say that if the General Championship included points for the sports magazines, we would certainly have come back with the trophy. Amongst all the sports magazines brought out by the various IITs, SPECTATOR was the best presented and most crisp in its comments.

Enough has been written both in SPECTATOR and in FOCUS about our loss. In the spirit of the circular I sent after the meet, I still maintain that everyone connected with the meet did his/her best and I don't see any point in blaming someone or something for our defeat. On the other hand, we should now look ahead and prepare to wrest the GC next time. In terms of points won at the meet, our volleyball, men's TT, athletics and gymnastics teams were exceptional. To do better we should concentrate on the games in which we failed. We won the gymnastics gold solely because of Mani, and that too because of a technical snag in interpretation of rules by Kanpur last year, and my own insistence that the same rule be applied this year. But for these 10 bonus points we would never even have dreamt of the GC from the fourth day onwards, no matter what was to happen in the relays and other events.

The gymnastics gold, in future, will be decided on team performance, and we should leave no stone unturned to see that our team is good. We should take greater care in the preparation of the various girls' teams as they carry equal points.

Bala's (Bucket's) rejoinder to Billy's analysis in FOCUS is pretty extensive and explains most of the points raised by Mr. Ahobala Rao. I would only like to add that just because we lost this time, it does not mean that the Sports Advisor and the Sports Secretary did not do their jobs well; and that just because we've been winning for the past 10 years, the previous sports advisors (including the present Sports Advisor, who was President, Institute

Gymkhana, 1974-75) and the Sports Secretaries have been doing their jobs too well. This, I am afraid, is not right analysis. - It is too superfluous!

Every year you have a new combination of sports advisor and sports secretary - they coordinate to the best of their abilities to ensure that the various sports activities are run smoothly, within the limits of the time they can spare out of their main academic responsibilities; and a particular pair may do a few things which others may not have found very important.

In any case, whatever Billy might have meant by his statements, to my mind, none of the points mentioned in his article have directly or indirectly contributed to our defeat this year. Opinions may differ, however, as much as individuals do!

Just a word about the need for the GC itself. The inter-IIT meet is organised with an aim to cultivate intimate relations and social contacts amongst the students of the IITs; but if the GC gives rise to manipulations and spreads ill feeling amongst sister IITs by not having fair play, we should accordingly change the system for the GC so as to fulfil the aims of the meet. If this is not possible, we may as well do away with the GC.

After the happenings in the past few years, it looks as if the subject of the GC needs rethinking.

Sd/-

Prof. Surjit Singh

Madras
28-1-1982.

BERTRAM TOURNAMENTS

Loyola College, Madras organises these tournaments every year without fail. These tournaments are generally held in August; but this year they're being held in Jan-Feb because of the PTIs' boycott last year. The Bertram Tournaments are in their 49th year. The various games held are volleyball, basketball, table tennis, chess and tennis, all in the men's category. Tennis this year will be played from February 5.

BASKETBALL

Our team, handicapped by the absence of Ramanujam, Chandu,

Suthakar and Raja could make no further progress than the last four stage. They had a cakewalk over SIVET in the first round.

Down by five points at the breather in the second round, we fought spiritedly, took the lead and held on to it to put it past Sri Pusham College, Poondi in the quarters.

IIT 68 (Ranga 22, Billa 0 (R.I.P.), Venu 15, Murali 16)
Pushpam 61 (Deendayal 38, Arivalagan 15)

In the semi-finals, it was sweet revenge for St. Joseph's Trichy (whom we beat 57-56 in GF). The absence of our stalwarts was really felt as the Josephites went on a basketing spree.

St. Joseph's 83 (James Vasanthakumar 20, Vincent 18, Kadiresab 18, Kalifulla 12)

IIT 54 (Murali 12, Ranga 18, Venu 12, Ashok Natesan 12)

VOLLEYBALL

Our volleyballers went down in the first round to little-known Guru Nanak 11-15, 15-11, 16-14. The absence of Moses (who is ineligible according to the rules of the tournament), had telling effects. The team did not combine well. The only silver lining for us was some superb spiking by Venu.

TABLE TENNIS

Vatsa, A. B. Srinivasan and Vaidyanathan encountered no difficulty in reaching the third round of the men's singles event, helped by a large number of walkovers. In fact, only Vaidy and ABS had to play one match each (against Assis of Loyola and R. Sanesh of Loyola respectively) which they won comfortably. In the pre-quarter finals, Vaidy lost to fourth seed and TN state player H. P. Joshi of Loyola 13-21, 14-21 while ABS lost to G. Kumar of Thyagaraya 10-21, 14-21. Vatsa, however, entered the quarter-finals, winning a closely contested match against Ajit Philips of MIT 23-21, 18-21, 21-18. In the quarters, he met P. Sudhir of M.C., Trivandrum, the third seed and Kerala state No. 1. Sudhir gave Vatsa no chance and beat him 21-6, 21-8, 21-13.

Vaidy and Vatsa paired up for the doubles event. Having got a first round bye and then a walkover, they entered the quarters where they shocked top seeds Chandramouli and Suresh Kumar of PAUT 21-11, 21-12. In the semi-finals, they started off well by leading 19-16 but finally lost 21-23, 17-21 to fourth seeds Bharat and Sekhar of Vivek 21-23, 17-21.

Wishing all
readers of
spectators happy
listening yours

B. Prasad
25/1/1982

Wishing all readers
of Spectators
happy listening
Yendur

With love

SPECTATOR:
January 31, 1982

Suyatha
25/1/82