Foot-Ball.

SATURDAY, Oct. 18, the eleven went to Williamstown, and were defeated by the Williams eleven. The afternoon was rainy, and the grounds were unfit to play upon. In the first inning neither eleven scored. In the second, Williams made two touchdowns, from one of which a goal was kicked.

The score: Williams, 10; Tech, 0.

On the following Saturday, Harvard played a return game on the Union grounds. Harvard won an easy victory, as was expected, but made no larger score than in the game two weeks previous, although the Techs presented a much weaker team than then, five of the men being substitutes. The Techs kicked off, and the ball was soon rushed to their goal, but Harvard failed in repeated attempts for touchdowns. For a while it seemed as though the Techs might keep the Harvard score down to a low figure, but they soon became rattled, and Harvard rapidly made point after point. In the latter part of the inning, the Techs rushed the ball well down to Harvard's end of the field, and Twombly made an attempt for a goal, but failed. The second inning was but a repetition of the first. At the end, the score was, Harvards, 43; Techs, 0. Ladd, Twombly, Pratt, and Fletcher did the best work for the Techs, especially by their good tackling. The team suffers a great loss in its captain, P. Winsor, who is obliged to stop playing on account of ill health.

Communications.

(The editors do not hold themselves responsible for opinions expressed by correspondents.)

To the Editor of The Tech: Four years ago, Prof. Howison severed his connection with the Institute of Technology, and closed a service which had been of value to every student, a credit to himself, and an honor to the school. Had his departure meant merely a change in the personnel of the Faculty, the issue would have long since been dead; but when we consider Prof Howison as a man equal in ability to the greatest of his coadjutors, and of such a character that, while teaching subjects distasteful to a large number of his pupils, he retained not only the respect but the esteem of every student, we recognize in the event the abolition of logic and philosophy from the curriculum of the school.

In the revolt against the system of the classics, the iconoclastic scientist of to-day rejects everything that bears the mark of age.

To say that these studies do not directly produce dollars, is to deride rhetoric, grammar, history, and other necessities of common education, as well as botany, zoology, and higher branches of learning.

To say that the Institute has no time to devote to more work, is to beg the question of a higher grade of entrance.

Repeat the old saw, that logic is intellectual gymnastics, and we will answer that it is only by gymnastics that the body is trained and strengthened systematically and proportionally.

Grant that Aristotle and Plato are dreamers that have long since passed away, that Descartes, Kant, and Hume are theorists who are dead, the fact remains that without their speculations modern thought could not exist. From their pregnant ashes have arisen men like Huxley and Darwin, Thompson and Spencer.

The aim of education is not to make encyclopedists, but thinkers. It is certainly absurd to graduate from a seat of highest learning men who have never thought of the infinite in contradistinction to the limited, save as the impossible numerator or denominator of a ridiculous fraction; who have spent years in the study of the attributes of time and space, but think only of these concepts as a priori self-existent entities.

The Institute may be forgiven for temporizing in past financial straits; but as it never has abandoned its motto of doing well what it does at all, so let it not rest until, in these days of its prosperity, it replaces what must always be the foundation of every perfect scheme of thought.

Sterlton, Oct. 27, 1884.

H. H. C.