

Communications.

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

To the Editor of THE TECH:

May I, through your columns, make a suggestion or two of interest, perhaps, to Tech men in general — at least to those who took part in, or were present at the debate between the C. E. Society and the Walker Club?

I suppose that few fellows doubt that debating, on subjects of concern to every citizen, is worth while to men whose education is likely to bring them into prominence in their community. It seems to me personally a sort of training more effective than is ordinary class work toward alert, straight-thinking, and prompt, practical expression. It was surely a pity that, through insufficient advertising or because of an unfortunate hour, the audience for so jolly a fight was — though fit — so few.

If other debates should take place, there are two matters that, for the hearers' satisfaction, certainly should, I think, be considered.

(1) In reaching a decision how much importance are the judges to attach to the *substance* of the speeches, gathering and logical marshaling of facts; and how much to the *form*, clearness, force, and case of English, and composure and persuasiveness of delivery? Intercollegiate debates usually, I believe, allow definite percentages to each group of qualities. An audience certainly wants to know the relative importance of these elements in determining the award.

(2) A matter of interest more immediately to debaters is that of the burden of proof, which, in this particular debate, was too much ignored — unfortunately so by the negative, and, as it seemed to me, disastrously so by the affirmative. The C. E. Society was supporting a policy that to some extent represented innovation; therefore, they had positively to prove the advantage of their scheme. The Walker Club was opposing innovation; they had, therefore, merely to discredit the arguments of their opponents. It seemed to me fundamentally to weaken the position of the affirmative, that they were too often on the defensive; and triumphantly to the credit of the Walker Club, that they, though legitimately the defenders, were constantly forcing the fight.

H. L. SEAVER.

The Technology Club of New York.

A meeting of the Technology Club of New York was called on the 10th of this month to consider the rumored affiliation of Tech with Harvard. The question was very thoroughly investigated and discussed.

Mr. Eben S. Draper of the Corporation was present, and gave a clear and concise statement of the true condition, as it now exists. After his interesting talk, the discussion was taken up by the members, and the following resolutions were passed unanimously, with instructions to the secretary to send the Corporation, the president of the Institute and the secretaries of the alumni associations each a copy.

TO THE PRESIDENT AND CORPORATION OF THE MASSACHUSETTS INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY:

We, graduates and former students of the Institute, and members of the Technology Club of New York, learning of the action of the Corporation of the Institute on May 5, 1904, wish to express our interest in and our desire to extend our approval of their action and our confidence in the president and Corporation of the Institute.

ALEX. RICE MCKIM, *President.*
CLYDE R. PLACE, *Secretary.*

Gifts to the Institute.

Three gifts have recently been made to the Institute. They are as follows: Another gift of \$5,000 for work at the Sewerage Experiment Station, by the anonymous donor who gave a like sum a short time ago. A legacy of \$2,000 left by Mrs. Theodore F. Russel, to be known as the Richard Lee Russel Fellowship, provides that the income shall go to the student in Civil Engineering who shall make the best record for scholarship each year.

Six high power bacteriological microscopes have been presented to the Biological department. The addition considerably increases the working strength of this department.