

**AMERICAN COLLEGE
ATHLETICS**

BY

HOWARD J. SAVAGE

STAFF MEMBER, CARNEGIE FOUNDATION FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF TEACHING

AND

HAROLD W. BENTLEY, JOHN T. MCGOVERN, DEAN F. SMILEY, M.D.

WITH A PREFACE BY

HENRY S. PRITCHETT

PRESIDENT OF THE FOUNDATION

BULLELTIN NUMBER TWENTY-THREE

NEW YORK
THE CARNEGIE FOUNDATION
FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF TEACHING
522 FIFTH AVENUE

1929

CONTENTS

PREFACE

I. The Study of Athletics in American Universities and Colleges

II. The Growth of College Athletics

III. The Development of the Modern Amateur Status

IV. Athletics in American Schools

V. The Administrative Control of American College Athletics

VI. Athletic Participation and Its Results

VII. The Hygiene of Athletic Training

VIII. The Coach in College Athletics

IX. Extramural Relationships

X. The Recruiting and Subsidizing of Athletes

XI. The Press and College Athletics

XII. Values in American College Athletics

APPENDIX

INDEX

PREFACE

ATHLETICS, AN ELEMENT IN THE EVOLUTION OF THE AMERICAN UNIVERSITY

*Instead of holding the universities in contempt, we ought
rather to endeavor to recall them to more sober studies
Erasmus to Luther, May, 1519*

THE university grew in Europe. It was transplanted to the Americas. It is an association of scholars and students whose primary aim is the development of the intellectual life. The name *universitas* given to this association was not intended to indicate the effort to teach universal knowledge. The term connotes simply the whole body of teachers and students associated together. The quality of a university will therefore depend upon the scholarship of its teachers and the intellectual quality of the students it gathers unto itself and by their attitude toward the things of the mind. While the university in every civilized country will reflect, to a greater or less extent, national ideals and habits of mind, its primary function in every country is to serve as an exponent of its highest intellectual life. This is the reason and the justification for its existence and the basis of its appeal for support.

II

Nothing in the educational regime of our higher institutions perplexes the European visitor so much as the role that organized athletics play. On a crisp November afternoon he finds many thousands of men and women, gathered in a great amphitheater, wildly cheering a group of athletes who are described to him as playing a game of football, but who seem to the visitor to be engaged in a battle. He is the more mystified when he discovers that of the thousands of onlookers, not one in a hundred understands the game or can follow the strategy of the two teams. At the end, the vast majority of the onlookers only know, like old Kaspar of Blenheim, that "t was a famous victory" for one university or the other.

When the visitor from the European university has pondered the matter, he comes to his American university colleagues with two questions:

"What relation has this astonishing athletic display to the work of an intellectual agency like a university?"

"How do students, devoted to study, find either the time or the money to stage so costly a performance?"

III

This study undertakes to answer these questions, not for the foreigner as much as for thoughtful Americans both in and out of the university. In undertaking this study the Foundation has sought sincerely after the facts. It has got information at firsthand and has aimed to marshal it, in this report, in such form as will enable the student of education to apprehend the process through which the present athletic situation has come about, and the reaction of this development upon

the scholarly and social life of the universities, colleges and schools.

The study has been carried out, and its results are here set forth, in no captious or faultfinding spirit. It has been assumed that there is a legitimate place in the secondary school and in the college for organized sports, that such sports contribute, when employed in a rational way, to the development both of character and of health. The report is a friendly effort to help toward a wise solution as to the place of such sports in our educational system. It has been necessary, in order to render this service, to set forth the abuses and excesses that have grown up. This has been done with the most painstaking effort to be fair, as well as just. . . .

...

VI

...

The great expansion of college sports is not an isolated fact in our educational development. It is characteristic of the transformation through which the college has gone in the last five decades.

To make clear to the reader what has happened, one can scarcely do better than to answer the questions of the European visitor just quoted. What has organized sport to do with the work of an intellectual agency which the university and the college are conceived to be? And how can college boys find the time or the money to maintain so costly a display of popular entertainment?

VII

In brief these questions can be answered in the following terms:

In the United States the composite institution called a university is doubtless still an intellectual agency. But it is also a social, a commercial, and an athletic agency, and these activities have in recent years appreciably overshadowed the intellectual life for which the university is assumed to exist.

In the second place, the football contest that so astonishes the foreign visitor is not a student's game, as it once was. It is a highly organized commercial enterprise. The athletes who take part in it have come up through years of training; they are commanded by professional coaches; little if any personal initiative of ordinary play is left to the player. The great matches are highly profitable enterprises. Sometimes the profits go to finance college sports, sometimes to pay the cost of the sports amphitheater, in some cases the college authorities take a slice of the profits for college buildings.

VIII

The process by which football has been transformed from a game played by boys into a profitable professional enterprise can only be understood by a review of the transformation of the American college of fifty years ago into the present-day American university.

Fifty years ago our highest institutions of learning called themselves colleges. Their courses of study were not so widespread as they are today, but the college conceived of itself as an intellectual agency. . . .

In their haste to become universities, our colleges adopted the name and then proceeded as rapidly as possible to grow up to it. This effected by superposing a graduate school on the old

college. Two disparate educational agencies were merged into one. It was the first great merger.

IX

...

The university, so constituted, soon began to conceive of itself not merely as an agency for training students to think hard and clearly, but as a place where, without fundamental education, young people can acquire the elementary technique of business, banking, accounting, transportation, salesmanship, journalism, and, in effect, all the vocations practiced in a modern industrial state. From the exposition of exoteric Buddhism to the management of chain grocery stores, it offers its services to the enquiring young American.

It is under this regime that college sports have been developed from games played by boys for pleasure into systematic professionalized athletic contests for the glory and, too often, for the financial profit of the college. It is important to trace out the process by which this has come about.

...

XI

The question is whether an institution in the social order whose primary purpose is the development of the intellectual life can at the same time serve as an agency to promote business, industry, journalism, salesmanship, and organized athletics on an extensive commercial basis. The question is not so much whether athletics in their present form should be fostered by the university, but how fully can a university that fosters professional athletics discharge its primary function. It is true the athletes belong (in recent years) to the college half of the university. Now and again one hears from the graduate school side of the university a protest against the all-absorbing glamour of the athlete, and from the college side a complaint that the graduate students lack college "patriotism." But the fact remains that the same administration that is seeking to promote scholarship and research in the graduate school is responsible for the stadiums, the paid coach, and the gate receipts in the college.

How far can an agency, whose function is intellectual, go in the development of other causes without danger to its primary purpose? Can a university teach equally well philosophy and salesmanship? Can it both sponsor genuine education and at the same time train raw recruits for minor vocations? Can it concentrate its attention on securing teams that win, without impairing the sincerity and vigor of its intellectual purpose? It is to these questions that the thoughtful man is finally led if he seeks to reconcile the divergent activities of the present-day American university. The matter of athletics is only one feature in the picture, but a significant one.

...

XIV

The preceding pages have dealt with a complicated situation of which organized athletics are but one factor. It remains to summarize the particular defects and excesses of present-day athletic contests as set forth in detail in the chapters of this report. The game of football looms large in

any account of the growth of professionalism in college games. This does not mean that other sports are untouched by the influences that have converted football into a professional vocation.

The unfavorable results upon students through the athletic development may be briefly stated in the following terms:

1. The extreme development of competitive games in the colleges has reacted upon the secondary schools. The college athlete begins his athletic career before he gets to college.

2. Once in college the student who goes in for competitive sports, and in particular for football, finds himself under a pressure hard to resist to give his whole time and thought to his athletic career. No college boy training for a major team can have much time for thought or study.

3. The college athlete, often a boy from a modest home, finds himself suddenly a most important man in the college life. He begins to live on a scale never before imagined. A special table is provided. Sport clothes and expensive trips are furnished him out of the athletic chest. He jumps at one bound to a plane of living of which he never before knew, all at the expense of some fund of which he knows little. When he drops back to a scale of living such as his own means can afford, the result is sometimes disastrous.

4. He works (for it is work, not play) under paid professional coaches whose business it is to develop the boy to be an effective unit in a team. The coach of to-day is no doubt a more cultivated man than the coach of twenty years ago. But any father who has listened to the professional coaching a college team will have some misgivings as to the cultural value of the process.

5. Inter-college athletics are highly competitive. Every college or university longs for a winning team in its group. The coach is on the alert to bring the most promising athletes in the secondary schools to his college team. A system of recruiting and subsidizing has grown up, under which boys are offered pecuniary and other inducements to enter a particular college. The system is demoralizing and corrupt, alike for the boy who takes the money and for the agent who arranges it, and for the whole group of college and secondary school boys who know about it.

6. Much discussion has been had as to the part the college graduate should have in the government of his college. In the matter of competitive athletics the college alumnus has, in the main, played a sorry role. It is one thing for an "old grad" to go back and coach the boys of his college as at Oxford or Cambridge, where there are no professional coaches and no gate receipts. It is quite another thing for an American college graduate to pay money to high school boys, either directly or indirectly, in order to enlist their services for a college team. The process is not only unsportsmanlike, it is immoral to the last degree. The great body of college graduates are wholly innocent in this matter. Most college men wish their college to win. Those who seek to compass that end by recruiting and subsidizing constitute a small, but active, minority, working oftentimes without the knowledge of the college authorities. This constitutes the most disgraceful phase of recent intercollege athletics.

7. The relation of organized sports to the health of college students is not a simple question. The information to deal with it completely is not yet at hand. A chapter of the report is devoted to this subject. In general it may be said that the relation of college organized sports to the health of the individual student is one dependent on the good sense exhibited by the college boy in participating in such sports, and to the quality of the advice he receives from the college medical officer.

8. For many games the strict organization and the tendency to commercialize the sport has taken the joy out of the game. In football, for example, great numbers of boys do not play

football, as in English schools and colleges, for the fun of it. A few play intensely. The great body of students are onlookers.

9. Finally, it is to be said that the blaze of publicity in which the college athlete lives is a demoralizing influence for the boy himself and no less so for his college.

XV

It goes without saying that fifty thousand people (not an unusual attendance) could not be gathered to witness a football game, through the mere pull of college loyalty or interest in the sport. The bulk of the spectators do not understand the game. They are drawn to this spectacle through widespread and continuous publicity. The relation of the press to the inter-college sports is described in detail in a chapter devoted to that subject. It is sufficient here to add a brief statement.

The American daily, or weekly, paper lives on its advertising, not on the subscriptions paid by its readers. The news policy of the paper is determined by this fundamental fact. It desires to print the things that will be eagerly read by the great body of everyday men and women who shop in the stores. The working woman likes to read of the fine clothes of the society belle, her husband delights in the startling accounts of fights or the details of the professional baseball games. The paper, being human, supplies the kind of news the advertisers like. It prints much for those of wider interests, but it follows the desires of its great advertising constituency all the time.

This has led to a form of personal news-telling unknown in any other country. In no other nation of the world will a college boy find his photograph in the metropolitan paper because he plays on a college team. All this is part of the newspaper effort to reach the advertiser. The situation is regrettable alike for journalism and for the public good. But it exists.

Into this game of publicity the university of the present day enters eagerly. It desires for itself the publicity that the newspapers can supply. It wants students, it wants popularity, but above all it wants money and always more money.

The athlete is the most available publicity material the college has. A great scientific discovery will make good press material for a few days, but nothing to compare to that of the performance of a first-class athlete. Thousands are interested in the athlete all the time, while the scientist is at best only a passing show.

And so it happens that the athlete lives in the white light of publicity and his photograph adorns the front pages of metropolitan (which means New York, Boston, Chicago, San Francisco, Los Angeles, New Orleans, and a hundred other) dailies. It must be an unusual boy who can keep his perspective under such circumstances. Why should the college boy be subjected to this regime merely to enable some thousands of attractive young reporters to make a living?

...

XVII

...

It is a useless enquiry at this day to ask who were responsible for the development in the colleges of commercialized sports. The tendencies of the time, the growing luxury, the keen

inter-college competition, the influence of well-meaning, but unwise, alumni, the acquiescence in newspaper publicity, the reluctance of the authorities of the university or the college to take an unpopular stand,-- all these have played their part.

But there can be no doubt as to where lies the responsibility to correct this situation. The defense of the intellectual integrity of the college and of the university lies with the president and faculty. With them lies also the authority. The educational governance of the university has always been in their hands. There have been cases in the past quarter century when a politically minded governing board, or an excited group of alumni, has sought to override the decision of the faculty in such matters. Such incidents to-day are rare though not entirely unknown. The president and faculty have in their power the decision touching matters affecting the educational policy and the intellectual interests of their institution. If commercialized athletics do not affect the educational quality of an institution, nothing does. The responsibility to bring athletics into a sincere relation to the intellectual life of the college rests squarely on the shoulders of the president and faculty.

What ought to be done?

The paid coach, the gate receipts, the special training tables, the costly sweaters and extensive journeys in special Pullman cars, the recruiting from the high school, the demoralizing publicity showered on the players, the devotion of an undue proportion of time to training, the devices for putting a desirable athlete, but a weak scholar, across the hurdles of the examinations -- these ought to stop and the inter-college and intramural sports be brought back to a stage in which they can be enjoyed by large numbers of students and where they do not involve an expenditure of time and money wholly at variance with any ideal of honest study. Extensive statistics have been gathered as to the comparison between the college performance of those taking part in inter-college contests with that of students who take no part in athletics. Some of these tabulations are given in this report. They mean little. When the intellectual life of a body of college students is on a low plane, the difference between the formal credits of men in training for inter-college contests and those of the ordinary student who is not in training, may be inappreciable. But it requires no tabulation of statistics to prove that the young athlete who gives himself for months, body and soul, to training under a professional coach for a gruelling contest, staged to focus the attention of thousands of people, and upon which many thousands of dollars will be staked, will find no time or energy for any serious intellectual effort. The compromises that have to be made to keep such students in the college and to pass them through to a degree give an air of insincerity to the whole university-college regime. We cannot serve every cause -- scholarship, science, business, salesmanship, organized athletics -- through the university. The need to-day is to re-examine our educational regime with the determination to attain in greater measure the simplicity, sincerity, and thoroughness that is the life blood of a true university in any country at any age.

* * *

CHAPTER I

THE STUDY OF ATHLETICS IN AMERICAN COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES

...
[F]ive members of the enquiry's staff visited a total of 130 schools, colleges, and universities. . . .

C. RULES AND THEIR OBSERVANCE

Only the slightest consideration is necessary to validate the proposition that "rules do not enforce themselves, and the athletic standing of a college is in no way determined by its rules." Whatever college athletic regulations respecting recruiting and subsidizing of players may be in vogue, they must be regarded as ideals to which a very large number of institutions have not yet attained. It is safe to say that if as much ingenuity were expended upon discovering and eliminating those cases in which young athletes accepted secret assistance for unworthy motives, as now is devoted to infringing rules and corrupting youthful sportsmen, our college athletics would soon take on an entirely different complexion. It is one thing for older and presumably wiser persons to entertain lofty ideals for the general run of undergraduates. It is quite another matter to cause individual young men and young women, as well as persons of maturer years, to feel the force of such ideals, to make them their own, and finally so to shape their conduct as to approximate them or at least not deliberately to contravene them. The value of any rule of conduct lies in its observance. . . .

CONCLUSION

The present situation in American college athletics could be described and efficacious remedies proposed merely by setting forth a series of quotations from materials published before 1900. The complaints that have been voiced since 1900 have been in the main echoes or amplifications of the adverse criticisms of previous years. Some of the reasons these cries have gone unheeded are to be found in their general nature and lack of specific modern instances, but especially in the fact that the interests of individuals and the special pleadings which have been used to buttress and justify their complaints have obscured the truth of their utterances. The present study is not the final word on American college athletics. Although very possibly it contains more generalizations than will please numerous readers, a formula for remedying the defects of college and, school athletics is not proposed. So complex and so overlaid with the interests of individuals are our athletics that, with their bearing upon self-pride and the maintenance of reputation and esteem, they yield few approaches for amendment by any means other than a long continued amelioration of habits in youth.

* * *

CHAPTER II

THE GROWTH OF COLLEGE ATHLETICS

- I. The Beginnings of American College Athletics (to 1852)
- II. The Intensification of American College Athletics (1853-1885)
- III. The Expansion of College Athletics and Its Results (1886-1906)
- IV. The Faculties Take a Stronger Hand (1907-1928)

...

II. The Intensification of American College Athletics (1853-1885)

...

D. THE FACULTIES; THE PRESS

The year 1880 has been set as a dividing line between the old regime and the new. After this date the attention devoted to sports increased rapidly and coincidentally with the rise of their popularity in the universities of England. For a time American faculties tolerated with a few rather ineffectual protests the development of pursuits which many of their members already regarded as inimical to the best scholarly interests of the colleges. In 1871 both the Harvard and the Yale faculties prohibited intercollegiate soccer contests, and it has been suggested that the agreement of 1878, between twelve colleges for contests in public speaking, essay writing, and exercises in Greek, Latin, mathematics, and mental science marked an attempt on the part of their faculties to abate some of the enthusiasm that athletics aroused. There may also have been some resentment of the intrusion of newspapers into the field of college sports. For instance, in 1874, the New York Herald Olympian Games were inaugurated. These constituted an intercollegiate championship meeting in which athletes from Columbia, Cornell, Dartmouth, Harvard, Princeton, and Yale competed, and they continued for several years. Be these suppositions as they may, there is little doubt that the football of the 1880's amply justified President Eliot's epithet "brutal." In 1884, after repeated protests against the roughness of the game, the Harvard faculty by formal vote abolished football at Cambridge. The prohibition lasted for two years. Similar but less drastic attempts to control football were made at other colleges. The attitude of most faculties toward athletics appears to have been not opposition but tolerance or *laissez-faire*. There was a general lack of comprehension respecting the implications of college sport and a complete failure to foresee the development that it was destined to undergo. . . .

III. The Expansion of College Athletics and Its Results (1886-1906)

...

A. CONTROL, 1887-1906

During most of what we have called the second period of American college athletics, the direction and management of sports and games rested, in general, with the undergraduates. About 1880, expansion began. More branches of athletics were introduced. Training was intensified and elaborated, and trainers were employed. Coaching began to be a progressively technical task, and paid coaches grew to be rather the rule than the exception. Not a few of the leaders of the present who demand that athletics be administered by faculty members alone, began their careers as hired coaches of teams before 1906. Equipment ashore and afloat grew in amount, in complexity, and, above all, in cost. All of these factors were reflected in a rapidly rising expenditure for athletics, which called for increased funds for their support, whether from subscriptions or from gate receipts or from both. Charges for admission to football contests, the origin of which is obscure, advanced in some instances to \$1.50. Special financial support began to be solicited from alumni. One result was that alumni who made generous contributions to college athletics received, openly or covertly, in return, a generous share in their control; and alumni who became active in that control gained or retained their power and prestige by their own contributions of money and

by subscriptions which they solicited from other alumni and from friends of the college. The reciprocity that underlay this situation was generally regarded as a fair exchange.

The motives among alumni that led to their acquisition of influence and, in many instances, their domination of college athletics, have been unjustly impugned. There was betting on college contests in the 1880's and '90's, and there is betting to-day; but it is doubtful if the amounts of money that the rank and file of graduates wager on college games have ever bulked very large in the personal economics of most individuals. Although a winning team at football or baseball always will be pleasing to a graduate, only a very small proportion of men wager such large sums that a bet makes any real difference to them, whatever its issue. Motives, in the struggle for athletic control must be sought in other aspects of personality. For the most part they are to be found, on the one hand, in college loyalty, which is akin emotionally to patriotism, and on the other in that flattering sense of power, of consequence, and even of social prominence in certain circles, which comes from a connection with large affairs, or affairs that are much in the public eye,-- an enjoyment which may lead either to a comparatively innocent feeling of self-gratification, or to an insatiable and offensive lust for power: Nor must the motive of service to youth be overlooked. As yet comparatively rare, it is of the highest value.

Meanwhile, most members of faculties appear to have played the role of the traditional pedant in holding aloof from athletics and their administration, in maintaining their attitude of *laissez-faire*, and in concerning themselves with the study and the lamp, rather than with all the affairs of college life. Attempts were made to "control" athletics, but at most institutions their results were negligible. Dr. Hartwell was moved to write in the Report of the United States Commissioner of Education for 1897-98, "The powerlessness of our educational leaders to originate, and their failure to adopt, effectual measures for evolving order' out of the athletic and gymnastic chaos over which they nominally preside, constitutes one of the marvels of our time." In consequence, there was scarcely a struggle for the control of college athletics; the alumni, or such of them as concerned themselves actively with the matter, achieved dominion almost by default. The importance of undergraduates to college athletics began to diminish. From the point of view of the extravagances into which their administration had fallen, their loss of power is not to be regretted. On the other hand, new abuses sprang up to crowd the old. The reputation of a college came to be regarded as uncomfortably low unless its teams won more than a fair share of victories. . . .

B. THE OPPOSITION DURING THE 1890'S

As early as five years after the inauguration of the committee plan at Harvard, President Eliot, in his annual report for 1892-98, first set forth both the benefits and the disadvantages of college athletics. The fact is usually lost sight of that he referred these disadvantages not necessarily to the sports themselves, but to their "wanton exaggeration." A flock of do-or-die defenders of college athletics rose up, but there were also those who, like Walter Camp, pleaded for moderation and reprobated extravagance in training, playing, and press reporting. It was not long before the controversy became general. The attackers were led by E. L. Godkin and other editors, especially of church and religious periodicals. The defenders found that without serious danger to their cause they could divide their efforts between repelling the charges of their opponents and consolidating their own positions. Recruited principally from the ranks of college graduates and former players, the champions of athletics found their materials of war ready to their hands in the convictions which had grown from their own experience. In general, the bitterness of the attack and the vigor of the defense have not been surpassed in even the most heated of subsequent athletic controversies.

The accusations against athletics current in the last decade of the century might easily have served as a source-book for their later opponents. They included charges of "over-exaggeration," demoralization of the college and of academic work, dishonesty, betting and gambling, professionalism, recruiting and subsidizing, the employment and payment of the wrong kind of men as coaches, the evil effects of college athletics upon school athletics, the roughness and brutality of football, extravagant expenditures of money, and the general corruption of youth by the monster of athleticism. The defense denied the accusations, one

and all, pointed to the bodily vigor and mental alertness of athletes, their manly character, their loyalty, and the qualities of leadership that their own participation in athletics had engendered; scoffed at the notion that any college athlete could be recruited or paid; and generally sought by assertion to deny all appearance of evil.

In the midst of the tumult stood the college teacher. The year 1905 found him exerting his disciplinary power to abolish American football at Columbia, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, the University of California, Nevada, Stanford, and a few other institutions. Apparently only at the Institute did intramural contests gain permanently by this measure. At the three Western institutions Rugby football was substituted for the American game. To judge from what the college teacher published over his own signature, his perception of the province and uses of athletics, their merits and their defects, was keener than that of any detractor or enthusiast. Second to him stand a few alumni, whose reasoning leads one to believe that they had profited as much from their studies as from their games. However keenly the college teacher analyzed the athletic problems of that day, he seems to have done comparatively little about them, except to abolish football at the institutions just indicated. Upon many regulatory committees he stood among the minority, and not infrequently his faculty colleagues who were members of college athletic committees and alumni as well, sided in close votes with the groups of their older allegiance. Only in the West and South did the faculty member tend to claim on nominally equal terms with undergraduates his share of the control of athletics. . . .

C. CENTRALIZING ORGANIZATIONS

. . .

2. Athletic Conference and Organizations

The last decade of the century was marked by the founding of three organizations among colleges and universities that furthered mutual interest and facilitated intercollegiate competition. The first of these bodies were regional in membership and extent; and of the first three, two were deliberative assemblies rather than organizations to promote competition. These differed materially from the Intercollegiate Association of Amateur Athletes of America, which had been founded by undergraduates in 1875. The Southern Intercollegiate Athletic Conference was formed in 1894, in the Mid-West the Intercollegiate Conference, colloquially known as the "Western Conference" or "Big Ten," in the following year, and the Maine Intercollegiate Track and Field Association in 1896. The advantages of such organizations, which are discussed more fully in subsequent pages, were soon felt. After the turn of the century, came the Northwest Conference (1904), and in 1905 the first nation-wide attempt to unite in one body all of the reputable colleges and universities supporting intercollegiate competition, resulted in the formation of the Intercollegiate Athletic Association, with thirty-nine member colleges, which in 1910 became the National Collegiate Athletic Association. Almost at once the good results of informal, open discussion of problems were so apparent that to many it seemed as if the athletic millennium had come.

D. PROBLEMS OF ELIGIBILITY

About the matter of eligibility for intercollegiate competition during the 1890's clustered many of the abuses which have persisted even to the present day. Then, as now, they bulked largest in connection with football. The origins of recruiting and subsidizing, the bestowal of nominal jobs, the relaxation of standards, and the granting of favors of all sorts to athletes are referable in part to the laxity of college standards for entrance, attendance, and graduation. For such requirements during the 1890's as well as at the present time, college and university faculties under the leadership of presidents and deans have been responsible. Between 1890 and 1929 the requirements appertaining to these matters have been materially

strengthened. Even as early as 1898 the eligibility codes for athletics at Columbia, Harvard, and Pennsylvania included requirements respecting academic status and an intention to remain in college throughout the year, minimum programs' of work, a one-year residence transfer rule, and a four-year eligibility rule. At Harvard many of these features were adopted through the influence of faculty members serving on the Committee for the Regulation of Athletic Sports. At Columbia, undergraduate dissatisfaction with conditions had had much to do with recent changes. At both Columbia and Pennsylvania the influence of faculty members was considerable, and apparently it was felt at a number of other Eastern institutions. Yet a great portion of the current improvement is to be ascribed to the work of the college associations and athletic organizations and conferences which had their inceptions before 1906.

In this respect, then, the influence of college teachers has been productive of good. The reasons it has not more generally eliminated the abuses in question are to be referred to at least three general causes: first, a certain softening and sentimentalization of college education in the United States, which happily, as these words are written, appears to be abating; secondly, the usurpation of athletic control by alumni, whose studied intent too often has been to depreciate the scholastic values of our college education and disproportionately to exalt the benefits to be gained by undergraduates through participation in "outside activities," whatever their nature; and thirdly, on the part of college teachers themselves, a lack of concern with the true value and functions of study and scholarship, and a lack of ability to make clear and binding upon others their own convictions through action. In short, the control of college athletics would probably have followed naturally a suitable directing of college life and standards of value on the part of faculties. This matter is now past history, and it is comparatively easy to say what might have been.

College athletics assumed Gargantuan proportions before faculty members in general understood, much less considered, the implications of their exaggerated growth. Apparently the first causes contained less of educational insincerity than of general inattention, preoccupation with other matters, and administrative unsteadiness.

IV. THE FACULTIES TAKE A STRONGER HAND (1907-1928)

...

C. THE FACULTIES ASSERT THEMSELVES

The somewhat scattered but constantly growing attempts on the part of faculties to secure over college athletics a control which in some sections of the country they had apparently never exercised have grown out of a number of causes, of which probably the most commendable is the conviction that a college or university should be an institution of learning. Into the matter enter other considerations, the relative importance of which will vary according to the individual judgment.

In the first place, the advancement of coaches or teachers of physical training to faculty appointment or directorships of physical education at a number of institutions led to a natural feeling on the part of less favored colleagues at other colleges that their work should be similarly dignified. To this conviction the interchange of sentiments at meetings of conferences and other bodies and the strength manifested by various groups and associations lent force. In the West, especially, the number of conferences and associations increased rapidly after 1906, owing to emulation of the Intercollegiate Conference [Big Ten] and its success, and the power of the National Collegiate Athletic Association grew steadily because of the injection of a kind of crusading spirit directed to the spreading of the gospel of "faculty control." Some of the origins of this spirit are to be traced in the professional training which certain schools of physical education dispense; others, in the intrinsic attractiveness of the new conception of the purposes of college athletics and the honor and power which it promised to men who hitherto had enjoyed less than what they and many others considered their fair share of both.

In the second place, the widening conception of education as a process having at least two-fold bearings, on mind and on body, gave currency to a definition of physical education that includes all bodily

activity, -- even sport itself. From these premises, nothing was more logical than that those charged with the oversight of the mental phases of education should be charged also with the oversight of its physical phases. The importance of this concept in its most extreme aspects is its implied exaltation of things physical to a theoretical parity with the things of the mind and of the spirit.

These and other factors operating in varying force at large numbers of colleges and universities have had their effects upon every aspect of college athletics. Above all, they have lent force to the rallying-cry that athletics are "educational."

D. ATHLETICS CONTINUE TO EXPAND

With the control of athletics nominally in the hands of faculty members at numbers of universities and colleges, it might be expected that by some means their expansion would be diminished or at least regulated with a degree of strictness. Such has not proved to be the case. Since 1906 their intensity has not abated, intercollegiate rivalry has not grown appreciably kinder, and specialization has much increased; costs have mounted amazingly. A part of the growing expenditure has been due to improvements in buildings, playing-fields, and equipment of all kind, and a portion of the money, thus paid out has benefited the building investments of universities. Popular interest has been deliberately stimulated by many types of newspapers and periodicals, including the college press. At the same time, at some institutions problems of student discipline have apparently become less acute, and at many others they have become different in character. More young men and women are being led to health-giving diversions. There can be little doubt that since 1924 a number of changes for the better have come into college athletics.

E. ABUSES AND SECRECY

Whatever the reason, it is certain that the seriousness with which college athletics are nowadays taken has driven certain well-recognized abuses under cover, but at the same time has propagated and intensified them. As a consequence, the observer is confronted, on the one hand, with the most lofty ideals and, on the other, by rumors and even well-authenticated statements of questionable practices, deception, and hypocrisy which constitute the very antithesis of the exalted sentiments in whose light they multiply. This paradox is less puzzling if examined in the perspective of years. The abuses which reached open crises about 1890, 1900, and 1905 have not by any means been eliminated even by the guarded publicity that they have recently received; they are probably more deliberately practiced but more carefully covered than they have been at any previous period.

CONCLUSION

The competitions and contests, the delight in bodily activity, the loyalties, and the honor that form a part of that vast organism called college athletics are the reflections in our college life of characteristics that are common to the youth of the world. In the pages that follow, these and other less pleasing phenomena of college athletics will be examined in the hope that those aspects which are good may in course of time achieve an unassailable predominance over those which are less worthy to survive. There can be no question of abolishing college athletics, nor should there be. What can be looked for is a gradual establishment through concrete action of a few general principles, to which all men would agree in the abstract. Even this slow change will be impossible without the sanction of an enlightened college and public opinion.

* * *

CHAPTER V

THE ADMINISTRATIVE CONTROL OF AMERICAN COLLEGE ATHLETICS

HOWEVER the academic aspects of the American college may have changed during the past thirty-five years, the changes in college athletics have been far greater. A growing recognition of the educational bearings of athletics, a flood of new students, the enormously rapid increase of material facilities, and the increasing influence of conferences and associations have united with a quickened public interest in college games to force a revision of athletic administration, while the theory of "faculty control" has been extended by the development of departments of physical education. For the most part, the general movement of change has been imitative in character; rarely have the results of the innovations been foreseen from their inception. Apparently, the conviction has been that one best method of controlling college athletics must exist, if only the formula could be discovered. The quest has proved, and is likely to prove, as elusive as the search for the philosopher's stone. No such formula has been found.

I. THEORETICAL AND ACTUAL CONTROL

Between the control that any system is supposed to exert over athletics in a college and the control which it actually exerts, a wide divergence may, and indeed often does, exist. If it is one thing to announce a program of athletic administration and another to effectuate it, it is a third and entirely different matter to maintain in its practical application the balance of powers which any such system is designed to guarantee. A writer who recently studied control in some one hundred and fifty-one universities and colleges concluded that in all but one, control was exercised through committees, that in 56 per cent of the cases these committees included faculty representatives, students, and alumni, and that 16 per cent of the institutions studied have their intercollegiate athletics directed by a faculty committee, and "it is likely their athletics are directed from the faculty view-point." It is perhaps pardonable to suggest that in the last clause the wish is father to the thought. Certainly our enquiry has convinced us that in a large number of institutions the actual weight of authority and control rests upon quite other shoulders than those intended by the framers of the systems.

Such a result should cause no astonishment. The administration of American college athletics is in reality a problem in the adjustment of human relationships, and its solution depends upon a compromise and cooperation which some of those concerned appear unable or unwilling to accord. Yet few college administrative officers appear to have attended sufficiently to the fact that the devising of a logically complete system for the control of athletics has little relation to the way in which that system may operate over a period of years.

II. THE IMPLICATIONS OF CONTROL

Before going further into the practical aspects of control and the interests that it serves, we shall do well to examine some of the functions which the administration of college athletics discharges.

A. CONNOTATIONS OF THE TERM, "CONTROL"

It is a commentary upon the nature and the functions of most of the bodies charged with the administration of athletics that the term most used in referring to it is "control." This term connotes the curbing of a force which is or may be dangerous, or which may get out of hand if not treated firmly. No one talks of controlling the academic aspects of college life; most men speak of controlling athletics. If the least controversial aspects of the control of athletics be regarded, the term implies the conduct of games and contests through the definite delegation of authority and responsibility touching a vast number of

phases of college life, including a clear assessment of purposes both actual and theoretical, the framing and execution of a policy that takes account of the interests, whether practical or sentimental, of various groups, the provision and care of suitable accommodations, medical attention, finance, including auditing and bookkeeping, the preparation and the holding of contests, their schedules, and external relationships in competition. At some institutions separate regulation may be exerted over intercollegiate athletics and intramural athletics, for men and for women. All of these functions have come to be theoretically included in the whole duty of an institution of higher learning.

B. ADMINISTRATIVE CONTROVERSIES

Most Americans who are concerned with the educational process agree that the unit which it must serve is the individual boy or girl, young man or young woman. With athletics, however, the case is different. Their financial and public aspects, the reputation which they confer upon the institution, and a thousand other forces have united to make them not so much activities of undergraduate life as joint cooperative enterprises involving presidents, trustees, faculties, alumni, and townsmen, and the vast publics of the radio and the press; they are undertaken less for the diversion of the schoolboy or the undergraduate than for the amusement of others. Thus, their "educational values" have frequently to be rediscovered and proclaimed in order that the hospitality of the college toward commercialized athletics may be justified. Naturally, then, the desire for power and influence is the source of most controversies over athletic administration and control.

III. ATHLETIC POLICIES AND PRACTICAL AIMS

No one who is familiar with the history and aspirations of higher education expects that the administration of college athletics should be entirely logical, or that it should wholly serve the ideals to which so much lip service is rendered. We talk much of sportsmanship, fair play, and the moral values inherent in games, but we act as if we believed that an ornamental gateway to these ends must be provided before the ends themselves can be served. Much of the work of administering our college games, therefore, rests upon expediency. The notion is that the first essential to the execution of any athletic policy is money, and plenty of it. This attitude is accounted to be hardheaded and practical, and such it is, but it is also short-sighted in that it leaves out of consideration the fact that athletics are grounded in human relationships that are at least as much spiritual as physical or financial.

A. THE SHAPING OF ATHLETIC POLICIES

Of the institutions visited, very few appear to operate upon a consistent or complete educational policy that includes athletics. The attitude of administrative officers, like presidents, assistants, and deans, ranges from attempts to justify, upon various grounds, an apparently deliberate unconcern with athletics (Dickinson formerly, Wisconsin), to active participation in even their most minute phases (Allegheny, Oglethorpe, Wesleyan). As regards the weight of control exercised by administrative officers, most institutions occupy a mid-ground. The result is a delegation of authority and function, usually tacit, that may be characterized as pragmatic. Although the "control of athletics in most institutions probably derives from the charter or act of incorporation, nowadays custom at the great majority vests it in committees" whose membership represents a variety of interests, professional and sentimental.

In the resulting confusion of functional powers it is not astonishing to find that many institutions have no settled athletic policy. . . . It is, however, our intention to suggest that many university or college presidents have left the shaping of athletic policies to conferences, committees, or specialists in physical education, who represent not so much the welfare of the institution and its undergraduates as special interests of one sort or another, all of which apparently feel that material prosperity, their own prestige, or professional standing must be served before other ends can be considered.

B. THE INTERESTS THAT ATHLETIC ADMINISTRATION MUST SERVE

It would not be difficult to defend the theory that the only persons who ought to be intimately concerned with college athletics are the undergraduates, but the theory would not represent the facts of academic life, past or present. Even at those institutions at which undergraduates have achieved most nearly complete direction of their own athletic affairs (Amherst, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Reed, Wyoming) their policies and decisions, in the making or in final form, are subject to the of older persons. In reality, athletics involve several groups, many of which to feel in them an interest which savors of the proprietary.

An enumeration of these special interests will illustrate the resulting confusion of which athletics at present are subject. First, then, university presidents must be considered by virtue of their responsibilities and functions as coordinators of general policy. **Faculties must be considered for disciplinary and educational reasons, although few persons have taken the trouble to analyze precisely what those educational reasons are or may be.** Moreover, the profits from athletics, and especially from may be put to academic uses in the form of new buildings and increased equipment. It is held by many that this use of such profits removes from athletics of the opprobrium that is felt to attach to them. Directors and departments of physical education must be considered because of their convictions concerning the values inherent in athletics as well as because of more personal ambitions and reasons. Alumni must be considered ostensibly on account of their loyalty to Alma Mater, less often or less admittedly because, now that their financial support to the institution is an established fact of university policy, they are held to have in justice a right to a voice in the conduct of those of its activities which afford the most spectacular and concentrated diversion. . . . **Trustees in some institutions must be considered, because, as in the case of faculties, the profits from intercollegiate contests represent increases in college or university wealth; it is comforting to find one source of funds that gushes without the use of a rod.** Townspeople must be considered because of the financial returns from the crowds of people who attend games, not to mention the active civic pride of trade and welfare organizations. Undergraduates must be considered, not because athletics necessarily fire them with a spontaneous loyal enthusiasm but because it is nowadays assumed that athletics benefit the institution; because athletic contests sometimes resuscitate a waning interest in calisthenics or gymnastic drills which long ago came to be regarded as "good for" undergraduates and required for their degrees; and, finally, because teams that "represent" a university are traditionally composed of student members of the university.

Many of the motives actuating the groups that embody these special interests are unselfish. Because those motives spring from the idealism and the loyalties which characterize men, and especially youths, the world over and which smolder but are not quenched under the advance of years, we should be the poorer without them. . . . With Americans a passive college loyalty is not enough. True loyalty to a university must actuate to pride, and pride to activity. Nor must that activity be merely nominal. It must not stop with polite unessentials; it must dominate and control. Once the seeming necessity to control emerges, the conflict of the interests begins. Trustees, faculties, directors, alumni, townspeople, all, indeed, except the undergraduates, who might profit most by athletics, have expected, and in some instances demanded, that the shaping of athletic policies be entrusted at least in part to them.

These facts are reflected in the various forms of athletic control which exist in the colleges and universities of the study. . . . In a word, the athletic situation in most American colleges and universities has been met by a compromise that involves the yielding of the less vocal interests. Often, however, the shaping of policy has depended upon satisfying as many special claims as possible without due regard to the best interests of the undergraduates, and especially to the diversification of those interests. The serving of the special groups that have been particularized has led to a confusion of the aims and purposes of athletics which has obscured not only the benefits to be derived from them and the values they contain, but even the means; financial and otherwise, by which they may be honestly fostered. One key to the legitimate aims of athletics may be derived from a frank consideration of the purposes of intercollegiate contests and intramural contests, both of which, needless to say, are included in a reasoned athletic policy.

1. Fundamental Considerations in Intercollegiate Contests

When two institutions compete in athletics the ends involved belong less to the fields usually labeled "educational" than to what one university president has called "the pageantry of college life." There probably are moral values to be developed from a game well played or a race well run, but they accrue less from the final contest than from the period of preparation and training. Partly for this reason, the fundamental purpose of intercollegiate contests ought to be the diversion or development of undergraduates, alumni, other members of the college family and their guests. As matters now stand, their fundamental purpose is financial and commercial. The monetary and material returns from intercollegiate athletics are valued far more highly than their returns in play, sport, and bodily and moral well-being.

The observation is especially true of football, but it holds good for other branches of athletics as well. . . . Football carries the bulk of the monetary burden. . . . This commercial aspect is illustrated in the making of football schedules, especially when they include games to be played on "neutral" grounds. It is almost universal. In New England, traditional rivalry may outweigh it (Amherst, Bowdoin, Wesleyan, Williams), and in some other parts of the East as well. But in Pennsylvania two universities (Pennsylvania, Pittsburgh) reshaped their athletic policies with a view to higher profits from contests. Even in instances where football receipts have reached hundreds of thousands of dollars, games with well-established rivals have been abandoned if they have involved financial loss (New York University and Syracuse; Ohio State and University of Iowa). The Missouri Valley Conference was reorganized to eliminate four financially unprofitable institutions. In the Intercollegiate Conference, the cry is "We've got to have money. . . ." In short, the commercialization of intercollegiate athletic policy in the United States is undeniable. . . . Other powerful materialistic considerations enter into the shaping of athletic policy. The supposed advertising values of success at football and a few other branches has led some institutions to charge certain athletic expenses to advertising, and others to render a naive and undue regard to the notice which a victorious team or an athletic event attracts. . . . Even in cases where the formalities of bookkeeping do not involve charging expenses of a team to college advertising, the motive of advertising and publicity is often discernible. On the other hand, a college may become self-conscious with respect to losing teams and a defeat at football is regarded as a major tragedy. Alumni testify to great embarrassment because their football team does not win from their dearest rival or is not numbered by sports writers and enthusiasts among the outstanding teams of the section. . . . The inroads of money have been gradual and they have increased with the rise of costs in general, on the one hand, and with the seeming necessity of augmenting facilities and the luxuries of athletics, on the other, until they have dominated intercollegiate competition, especially, and unfortunately, in football.

IV. THE ADMINISTRATION OF ATHLETIC POLICIES

...

A. FINANCE AND ACCOUNTING

...

It may appear unjust to criticize adversely the mere size of the amounts of money involved in a year's athletics at any institution, but it is unfortunate that modern college athletics cannot be more simply and modestly conducted. High gate receipts inevitably reflect commercialism and all the evils that follow in its train. The availability of such resources stimulates from year to year the desire for steadily mounting sums that athletics, and especially athletic success, will bring.

Moreover, from the hugeness of athletic receipts, there flow certain results which have not yet received the scrutiny that is their due. Of these results, first stand the luxuries which nowadays are lavished upon players in the continuous supply of new personal equipment and in traveling accommodations. Secondly, a great extravagance is apparent in the special personnel, including advertising agents and publicity men, employed by athletic associations or paid for by them. Annual expenditures in this direction may run as high as \$10,000 or \$15,000, sums which contrast discredibly

with the miserable \$300 or \$400 paid out for medical advice and care. Some institutions are prodigal with free passes to games (California, Southern California, Wisconsin); one (Alabama) paid the expenses of newspaper men who accompanied its football team across the continent; and others have gone to comparable extremes on a smaller scale. . . . Fourthly, and generally, from the size of athletic accounts there grows a fictitious exaggeration of the importance of athletics and especially of football in American college life. . . . When, however, football supports not alone itself but all or nearly all other forms of athletics as well, and when it is so managed as to provide college buildings and equipment, and to pay inflated salaries, its rational functions in athletics and in college life are grievously distorted, first, in the minds of those actively concerned with its direction and management, and secondly, throughout the clientele of the institution. The result is a general increase in the material emphasis of university life and consequent neglect of teaching and research, especially as regards salaries and grants of money. A genuine interest in academic pursuits and the things of the mind and of the spirit becomes secondary to material development. In the circumstances, it is small wonder that occasionally the college teacher of academic subjects exhibits envy of the material successes of the athletic director, the graduate manager, or the football coach. . . .

The increasing amounts of money that flow through the athletic treasury have led as a natural consequence to the transfer of the financial aspects of college athletics from the hands of the undergraduates to those of older and, presumably, wiser men. . . .

B. GYMNASIUMS, PLAYING FIELDS, AND EQUIPMENT

. . .

2. Fields, Football Stadiums

Two forces, namely, the insistence of alumni and townspeople upon accommodations at intercollegiate contests and the profits to be reaped from vast crowds in attendance at football games, have pressed to increase the size of stadiums. It is true that some institutions appear to have over-built, although as yet it is too early for judgment upon this matter. The general practice has been to erect stadiums from bond issues, and many also have thus been materially enlarged after building. Strength of construction, visibility from all seats, the economical use of terrain, and other considerations have contributed to set aside stadium building as almost a special branch of the architectural profession. Unfortunate accidents, like the falling of a stand at Washington and Jefferson, have served only to emphasize the importance of sound construction and to increase the amounts of money expended upon the security of spectators.

Although a single structure may accommodate as many as 74,000 (Yale) or even 88,000 (Stanford) spectators, or cost as much as \$1,700,000 (Illinois), it is not our purpose to lament the size or the cost of stadiums. Here again doubtless a more modest intercollegiate athletic program would render unnecessary the building of such structures, however beautiful or impressive their architecture may be. But it is unfortunate that it should appear necessary to increase so much the accommodations for intercollegiate competition before facilities for intramural athletics are provided. The reason, of course, lies in the opinion that much money must be found before intramural athletics can be developed. Moreover, the seeming importance of intercollegiate competition has led to reserving for it the best and largest athletic facilities of universities, with the consequent impoverishment and, in many cases, a consequent inadequacy in the facilities provided for intramural athletics. . . .

8. Personal Equipment and Its Uses

It has long been observed that the American college athletic association lavishes upon participants in 'varsity athletics a wealth of personal equipment which finds no counterpart in other American college activities or in the university athletics of other countries. Only within comparatively recent days have economies been effectuated in the issuing of athletic uniforms and in the salvaging of athletic equipment. This liberality in providing equipment for 'varsity players has had its roots in the notion that an attempt to get full value from the personal equipment issued reflects niggardliness. Among players there has grown

up an attitude which at one Western institution was interpreted in the sentence, "Get all you can; Dad's rich." The result has been a lack of appreciation on the part of undergraduates and a growing notion that a boy who represents a college in athletics thereby confers a favor upon the institution.

Another phase of this general matter bears very directly upon commercialism and its results. With the intensity of modern competition in football, personal equipment has taken on an importance that far transcends its true value. An institution (for example, Notre Dame) that can pay from seventeen to twenty-five dollars a pair for the lightest weight, best-made football shoes and purchase for its squad pants made of aeroplane silk has an obvious advantage over the college that cannot or does not spend its money upon such luxuries. . . .

It is safe to say that in no country of the world are the buildings and stationary equipment devoted to the athletic activities of the college or university student so costly or so extensive as in the United States.

. . .

D. SCHEDULES

It has already been pointed out that monetary profits from intercollegiate contests are the prime consideration in the making of athletic schedules. Second to this aspect, and closely allied with it, stands the desirability of pleasing alumni, often in distant regions. Occasionally, as in Pennsylvania, the possibility of securing legislative appropriations has influenced schedules. A fourth strong consideration in schedule-making is in many instances the conference, which may dominate the selection of opponents, restrict a university's contests to its own fellow members, endanger its athletic autonomy, and greatly increase the commercializing tendency. Justly or unjustly, it has been urged that the principal motive that leads directors to favor simultaneous dual football contests between universities is a desire to double football receipts. With the making of intercollegiate schedules, academic engagements are seldom permitted to interfere. . . .

V. FACULTY CONTROL OF ATHLETICS AND ITS RESULTS

Among recent measures of athletic administration, none has received more favorable notice or spread more widely than the system that goes by the name of "faculty control." The term itself is not clear in many minds, nor has it been considered with a care sufficient to bring out its full implications.

A. PSEUDO-FACULTY CONTROL

On earlier pages it was indicated that the mere setting up of a method of administering college athletics provides no inherent guarantee that the principles of the system will be carded out in practice. Certainly no more illuminating illustration of this statement could be found than exists in those institutions where "faculty control," although assumed to be absolute, is restricted to the responsibility of passing upon the scholastic eligibility of participants. Actual practices in faculty control range from this condition on the one hand, to a situation on the other in which a single member of the faculty participates and even dominates in the financial management, the provision of facilities, the making of schedules, and the hiring and the discharge of coaches. . . .

Not infrequently "faculty control" exists in name but scarcely in fact. Although the regulations of the Intercollegiate Conference [Big Ten] stipulate for complete faculty control and provide for an operating body of faculty representatives, the actual control often appears to rest with the directors or the coaches. Presumably the fact that such officers hold their appointments from University trustees is felt to make them thoroughgoing faculty members. One or two universities (Iowa, Minnesota) fix such authority in their presidents; in final decisions and in the execution of policies little regard appears to be paid to representatives of the faculty. This condition prevails to an even greater extent in the Missouri Valley

Conference. Apparently, the ethical bearing of intercollegiate football contests and their scholastic aspects are of secondary importance to the winning of victories and financial success.

The compensation paid to certain faculty representatives increases the weakness of this situation. The receipt of an honorarium of, say, \$600 from athletic funds and various favors and honors may easily tend to obligate certain of these faculty representatives to defend not alone athletes and athletics but also existing conditions. It is, therefore, not necessary that the actual control shall lie with others than academic teachers if deficiencies in faculty dominance are to be sought.

...

C. TRUE FACULTY CONTROL

It must not be inferred that genuine faculty control, that is, the actual regulation of college athletics by the academic members of faculties, does not at present exist. On the contrary, it is found at a number of institutions where its operations appear to be salutary. At least five members of the Southern Conference (Georgia, Georgia School of Technology, North Carolina, Tennessee, Tulane) have established a practice which, less in its formal aspects than in its results, resembles the methods of control in English universities. . . . The application of true faculty control not only makes heavy demands upon the time and energy of the responsible individual, but also requires a point of view sympathetic with the interests of young men. . . .

D. THE TESTS AND THE APPLICATION OF FACULTY CONTROL

The final tests for the presence or absence of true faculty control would seem to be these: First, is the guiding influence of a man whose chief activities and interests lie in academic fields, or of one to whose income athletics contribute directly or indirectly? Secondly, are the coaches immediately responsible to a faculty representative whose principal concerns are academic, or are they subordinate to another or former coach now elevated to faculty status, or of a former business manager or an alumni secretary who is under academic appointment for the sake of the good that may accrue to athletics from his connection to them? Certainly, in the institutions where faculty control exists at its best there appears to be little truckling to special interests or privileged groups, because the director is not in any way dependent on athletics for success in his professional career.

The present tendency is to look upon "faculty control," whether genuine or not, as the panacea of all the ills of athletics. When the criteria which have just been set down lend reality to what is so often a mere subterfuge, certainly true faculty control at its best is to be preferred to control by graduates or coaches.

* * *

CHAPTER VI

ATHLETIC PARTICIPATION AND ITS RESULTS

...

I. WHAT LEADS UNDERGRADUATES TO PARTICIPATE IN ATHLETICS?

...

C. ENJOYMENT OF ATHLETICS

By and large, undergraduates enjoy participating in athletics. But one whose principal interest is his academic work tends to be irked by the intensity of modern training, especially at football. When in such circumstances a choice must be made between academic work and intercollegiate athletics, the decision is doubly irksome and may lead to protests against the stringency of training. A majority of the intercollegiate football players questioned appear to enjoy playing football, but not to regard it as fun or recreation; their enjoyment seems to arise from more intangible rewards, -- the atmosphere surrounding competition, the notoriety that success brings, and the like. A great many football players volunteered the information that for actual fun, they prefer the less formal intramural games to intercollegiate. The indulgence of the "play instinct" is rarely possible in modern intercollegiate athletics, especially football.

...

IV. A FEW OF THE CONDITIONS OF PARTICIPATION

...

B. CONDITIONS OF PARTICIPATION IN INTERCOLLEGIATE ATHLETICS

...

2. Scholastic Requirements and their Administration

In the course of the study much attention has been paid to scholastic requirements for participation in intercollegiate athletics and the strictness or laxity with which they are administered. . . .

All such matters are in the hands of faculties. They are not the concern of alumni or of friends of a college. When, therefore, standards are relaxed to permit skilled athletes either to enter a college without due qualifications or to compete in intercollegiate athletics without satisfying academic requirements, these matters also are the affair of faculties. But when the faculty officers concerned with eligibility happen to be athletic enthusiasts as well, the resulting division of responsibility has worked, in an appreciable number of cases, to the impairment of the standards and standing of the institutions.

A collection of examples (Alabama, Boston College, Fordham, Grinnell, Iowa, New York University, Northwestern, Notre Dame, Southern California, Stanford, Wisconsin) drawn from many parts of the United States will illustrate some of the results of conflicts between athletic ambitions and academic standards. The decision of one university faculty in a matter of participation and eligibility was overruled by the president. A trustee of another institution endeavored to persuade a college president to admit a young athlete whose credentials were not sufficient to justify this course. Prominent alumni of a third were embarrassingly insistent in their demand that a scholastically unqualified athlete should be admitted. The double standard that results from different university and conference requirements, non-athletes meeting the higher university requirements and athletes being held to meeting the lower conference requirements, not to mention a tradition of laissez-faire respecting a dean's office, results in immediate injustice to non-athletes and lasting injustice to athletes. At certain Southern institutions the practice of checking of players' scholastic records in mid-season has not been followed by the strictest adherence to requirements. At another university an athlete attained scholastic eligibility through the passing of an examination under circumstances that were, to say the least, unusual. The registrar of this same university has in at least three instances received instructions to admit candidates whose records were defective because of "the unusual conditions surrounding the case." The rulings concerning scholastic eligibility at certain Catholic institutions have been widely questioned. It is a pleasure to note that at another Catholic university (Georgetown) a strengthening of eligibility requirements is said to be in process. In two carefully studied cases, one of which is typical of a very large majority of institutions that are members of highly respected conference, the functions of the university registrar are debased to those of a clerk, with the result that questionable rulings are reflected in questionable practices.

In short, high though the academic standards of participation maintained at certain institutions may be, they represent no universal condition. Faculties, trustees, and even college or university presidents are not as yet united as respects the maintenance of strict requirements in the face of the supposed benefits that can be wrung from winning teams. The fact that all of these supposed advantages are tinged at one point or another with the color of money casts over every relaxation of standards a mercenary shadow. The good repute which a university attains through high academic standards and their honest enforcement is priceless, and it is not to be compared with the cheap and ephemeral notoriety that winning teams may bring.

...

V. THE IMMEDIATE RESULTS OF PARTICIPATION IN COLLEGE ATHLETICS

...

D. THE MORAL QUALITIES

The moral qualities that participation in college athletics is widely supposed to engender -- courage, obedience, unselfishness, persistence, and the rest -- have formed the theme of countless eulogies of athletes and athletics. No attempt to measure them has yielded unmistakable results. . . .

On the other hand, our study of the recruiting and subsidizing of college athletes affords much direct evidence that college athletics can breed, and, in fact, have bred, among athletes, coaches, directors, and even in some instances among college administrative officers, equivocation and dishonesty, which actual participation has not removed or prevented. The impairment of moral stamina that such practices imply is the darkest blot upon American college athletics.

...

* * *

CHAPTER VIII

THE COACH IN COLLEGE ATHLETICS

...

II. THE STATUS AND TENURE OF COACHES

...

B. THE TENURE OF COACHES

...

2. Causes Assigned for Termination of Service

...

Comparing the foregoing evidence with what could be learned of conditions in the past, we believe that the tenure of the football coach is coming less and less to depend upon victory. The standard desired at present appears to be a "fair winning average" over a period of from five to ten years. Such an aggregate is being achieved through the operation of forces working from two directions: coaches, on their side, are demanding longer contracts, and institutions, on the other, are becoming less and less subject to the pressure for victory from a few rabid enthusiasts. And yet one striking injustice to the coach remains: Even though victory be not so essential to tenure as it was in the past, nevertheless if a coach believes it to be thus essential, the result of defeat upon his peace of mind is equally detrimental.

In any case, from the point of view of the coach, academic status and appointment, to membership in a faculty, -- not to mention even a professorship of physical education, -- do not protect a coach's tenure when teams' cease to win and the college administrator charged with the shaping of the institution's athletic policy wavers in his support. Nor, from the point of view of the institution, is "a seat on the faculty" a guarantee of the good character of the coach, his contentment with his post and its duties, or satisfactory teaching. Some time ago it was suggested that an endowment from the income of which a football or other coach might be paid would offer the best solution of all questions touching tenure and salary of coaches.

III. THE COACH'S SALARY

During the enquiry many requests were received for information concerning the salaries paid to coaches. Doubtless these questions reflected not alone a common curiosity and a desire on the part, of college administrators to conform to general practice, but also the notion that no coach ought to receive a higher salary than a full professor at the same institution. Accordingly, data were collected from about one hundred universities and colleges' concerning the salaries paid to deans, the maximum salaries paid to full professors, the compensation of the head football coach, and the pay of the next highest paid coach. A few inferences concerning the maximum salaries of professors have appeared in the Twenty-third Annual Report of this Foundation (1928). All of the figures represent maximum salaries being paid at the time of the field visits to the respective institutions.

A. THE SALARY OF THE HEAD FOOTBALL COACH IN RELATION TO OTHER SALARIES

...

At fifty-eight large colleges, the head football coach was still more highly paid. His highest maximum salary was \$14,000, or \$2,000 more than the maximum paid to a full professor, but his lowest minimum salary, -- at a Southern institution where the head football coach engages in business and regards coaching as an avocation, -- was only \$2,000, or \$1,000 less than the minimum salary of the full professors in the highest paid group. The median and average salaries presented even more significant contrasts. For the professors the median maximum salary was \$6,000; for the coaches, \$6,500. The average maximum salary of the highest-paid full professors at these large colleges was \$6,315; of the head football coaches, \$6,926, -- a difference in favor of the coaches averaging \$611.

It is possible that, in general, the smaller colleges have been more successful than the larger in limiting the salaries of their head football coaches. Certainly, on the whole, the head football coach at a small college appears to be paid on a scale more nearly comparable to that of a professor than he is at a large college. Again it should be emphasized that the salaries of professors here dealt with are maxima. Consequently the average salary for all full professors at all of the institutions from which data were obtained would be much lower than figures herein set forth. Possibly also college administrators at smaller institutions are able to keep a steadier hand upon athletic expenditures, while larger institutions have a greater income from which to pay larger salaries to the men who create it. Elsewhere in the study it is indicated that the larger the

sums that are available for athletics, the more will be spent upon athletics. Thus extravagance has grown by what it fed on.

...

VI. ATTITUDE AND INFLUENCE

Athletic coaches, in spite of the notoriety that newspaper writers have bestowed upon them, differ not a whit from the generality of mankind. As with other men, the deepest tragedy among coaches is found where exigencies of the calling or of a situation have given rise to an increasing series of compromises with ideals which, starting in a cooperative yielding to comparatively innocuous practical considerations, increases with repetition until the life and influence of the man have come to be an almost perpetual negation of the verities. Happy is the coach to whom years and experience bring knowledge of the true relation of sport to education. Thrice happy is the college with which such a man is connected.

CONCLUSION

...

Obviously, the position of a coach whose tenure depends on victory is both unfortunate and unfair. The situation is deleterious to sport but especially to education, however it be defined. A coach who trusts to faculty status and fair words for safety in the hour of disapproval leans upon a broken reed. When the new ideals now stirring public and private school athletics reach their inevitable fruition in college and university sport, a change will come over the attitude of the coach toward his own calling. It remains to be seen whether coaches, through conviction, sound business judgment, or mere prudential shrewdness, will anticipate and hasten that change through their own efforts.

* * *

CHAPTER IX

EXTRAMURAL RELATIONSHIPS

...

I. EXTRAMURAL RELATIONSHIPS AND THE ALUMNI

...

The number of cases in which the entire support of athletes is furnished by alumni are far fewer than those in which a part is given and the athletes are provided with actual or nominal jobs through alumni efforts. Doubtless some alumni have a philanthropic and worthy desire to enable a deserving youth to obtain a college education, but comparatively seldom is this the genuine motive for subsidizing and recruiting. In the course of this study we have never heard it advanced except in defense of dishonest practices, in extenuation of the course of an institution, a group, or an individual, or in a theoretical and academic discussion. The pretended fear of doing injustice to some deserving boy is a bogeyman kept close at hand to justify all such doings. In view of the kindly solicitude that is lavished upon the athlete, the only injustice that he is likely to experience is the injustice that falls to any youth who is overcoddled and whose money comes too easily.

...

III. ATHLETIC CONFERENCES

...

A. ORIGINS AND DEVELOPMENT OF ATHLETIC CONFERENCES

...

The methods and procedure of the earlier athletic conferences justified the designation. Representatives of colleges and universities met, discussed the governance of athletic competition, and bound their institutions to abide by the rules passed by the assembly for the common good. With the increase of available funds, the associations established central offices to act as clearing houses of athletic information, centres of mutual interests, and executors of the policies of the group as expressed in votes and regulations. Gradually the central offices acquired powers to enforce regulations by the imposition of penalties and assumed certain of the functions of investigating agencies. Some of the studies carried out under such auspices have exerted the utmost influence upon the conduct of competition and the formulation of organization policies. It may be noted, however, that the days of disinterested discussion in conference meetings appear to be long past.

B. REPRESENTATIVE REGULATIONS

...

A number of conferences emphasize control of athletics by faculties as a qualification for membership.

For example, the (Mid-Western) Intercollegiate Conference, which, has no written constitution, restricts its membership to "institutions having fun and complete faculty control of athletics." Representatives must not be those who receive "pay primarily for services connected with athletics or the Department of Physical Education." But in this Conference, academic teachers, although vouchsafed theoretical control, do not actually control the athletics of their institutions. With the organization of the Directors Conference in 1922, directors and coaches have taken upon themselves some of the duties and prerogatives of the academic members. Being aggressive, they have taken the lead in nearly all official actions of the Conference since that date.

...

C. NOTES ON THE EXECUTION OF CONFERENCE RULES

Between the minutely detailed provisions of the constitutions and rules governing the Rocky Mountain Faculty Athletic Conference of 19~3 and the general and elastic principles laid down in the Harvard-Yale-Princeton agreement as revised in the same year, most of the sets of conference rules occupy a mid-ground. Sometimes, as in, the case of the Southern Conference, all of the regulations are to be classified in this middle position as regards detail. Sometimes certain rules are general, while others are much particularized, like, for example, the requirements of the (Mid-Western) Intercollegiate Conference [Big Ten] respecting eligibility. It does not appear that any relationship exists between minuteness of provisions and the degree of thoroughness with which they are carried out. . . .

It would be idle to complain that conference rules are not enforced. Considering their complexity, the overweening desire for victory, and the reprehensible tendency to win games by means of "jokers," exceptions, and far-fetched interpretations of rules or resolutions, the regulations of conferences are

generally well administered. But he who believes that clean and sportsmanlike games, chivalrous rivalry, and magnanimous competition are to be attained through mere administrative provisions and procedure is indeed naive. The tendency to assume that any abuses inherent in intercollegiate athletics will automatically disappear if a conference is formed and passes rules of a nature sufficiently lofty and stringent is absurd, no matter how much administrative machinery is provided or how many teeth may be placed in regulations. The fundamental problem concerns, not the enforcement of rules by conference administrators, but conscientious adherence to them and their honorable observance on the part of all whom they affect, -- alumni, graduate managers, coaches, faculty members, college presidents, and undergraduates. In the course of the present study it has been proved again and again that no rule, however well intended, can be made binding without the consent and the active cooperation of those to whom it applies. Too often multiplicity of detail in regulations tends only to drive dishonest practices out of sight and to make them secret, not to eliminate them. . . .

* * *

CHAPTER X

THE RECRUITING AND SUBSIDIZING OF ATHLETES

. . .

I. THE BASIS OF RECRUITING AND SUBSIDIZING

. . .

A. CHANGES IN PROCEDURE

Before, say, 1917, recruiting appears to have been conducted by enthusiastic undergraduates and by athletes themselves more generally than it is to-day, except at a few institutions where fraternities have not yet outgrown such practices. The subsidizing that accompanied recruiting under these auspices was comparatively ineffectual and certainly crude. Since those days, a more businesslike procedure has been developed by older persons on the basis of experience in previous years and in the field of commerce. About 1919, there began to spread through the East and South and along the Pacific Coast a contagion of ready assistance to promising athletes, which was initiated and coordinated mainly by older hands. The result is that to-day, notwithstanding many statements to the contrary, the colleges and universities of the United States are confronted with acute problems of recruiting and subsidizing, especially with respect to intercollegiate football.

Nor is the abuse by any means confined to any particular sections of the country. In the Mid-West, the Intercollegiate Conference [Big Ten], regarded by many as the most thoroughly controlled of all conference bodies, has repeatedly called recruiting and subsidizing its most serious problem, and events in the spring of 1929 clearly demonstrated this fact. On the Pacific Coast, the larger institutions, having expended much ineffectual effort to control the abuse, are even now attempting to arrive at an equitable solution through common understanding. From similar cares the Southern Conference is by no means free. In the words of one of its coaches, there is "cut-throat competition" for prospective athletes. The president of another Southern university, newly founded, complained of the competition for a prominent athlete whom he himself had tried to secure. In the Rocky Mountain Conference, sentiment in favor of recruiting recurrently strikes certain institutions with full force. Parts of Pennsylvania and the adjacent territory have long accepted and openly practiced it as indispensable to victory in football. Organizations varying in type from the loosely informal group in the East to the oldest and strongest of conferences,

although they have succeeded in influencing the evil, redirecting it, curtailing it, partly controlling it, or changing its form, have not permanently affected its existence or its results. . . .

* * *

CHAPTER XI

THE PRESS AND COLLEGE ATHLETICS

Many college administrators hold that during the past twenty years the relations of the college to the public have been seriously impaired by the way in which American newspapers treat college athletics, but not all of those who hold this opinion have taken the trouble to enquire into the matter from other than their own point of view. The difficulties are not all on the side of the college administrator. Newspaper men themselves have noted that the growth of public interest in athletics is in large part the result of an attempt of the newspaper publisher and editor to satisfy a stimulated appetite of their readers. Professor James Melvin Lee has pointed out that "the newspapers in the United States tend with the passing years to become more and more economic products." By the very nature of the present situation, the publisher or editor must regard college athletics as a single phase of sport, which in turn is only one phase of news, and hews shares with editorials and "other interesting reading matter" that portion of the pages which is not offered to advertisers "at so much an inch."

Admitting, then, for the sake of argument, that the view of the college presented in the newspapers is distorted through overstressing of athletics, nevertheless college athletics are news, and news that appeals to many readers as the most consistently interesting and important aspect of college life.

...

II. THE COMPLAINT AGAINST THE PRESENT TREATMENT OF SCHOOL AND COLLEGE ATHLETICS IN AMERICAN NEWSPAPERS

...

A. THE SENSATIONAL IN SPORTS WRITING

...

4. The Effect of Sensationalism upon the College Athlete

The effect of newspaper notoriety upon secondary school athletes was well set forth by a writer in the Harvard Graduate Magazine, 1895 (Volume III, page 318): "A schoolboy finds his photograph and a sketch of his life put before the public, and he is described as a future star. The consequence is that the first few weeks, which ought to be spent developing him into a player, are spent in reducing, what is the natural result of his publicity, a 'swelled head.'" In, 1901, Professor Sheldon concluded that "the results of the notoriety and fever of expectation are seen in (1) the recruiting of men, (2) the extravagant outlays of money, (3) the overtraining of teams, and (4) the fierceness and intensity of the contests." At the annual meeting of the National Collegiate Athletic Association, 1925, Professor J. F. A. Pyre, of the University of Wisconsin, noted that the publicity accorded college athletes in newspapers results in (1) the excessive pursuit of high school and migrant athletes by colleges and the offering of inducements, and (2) the development of a "pre-professional" type of college athlete. These are only a few of the critics who have

pointed out the harm that sensationalism in newspapers has wrought, not only to college athletics but to the individual participant.

An indeterminate number of athletes deliberately set about capitalizing newspaper reports and stories of prowess. The usual means is the clipping or scrapbook, in which is pasted every available printed reference. Doubtless many such, collections start as college memorabilia, but many more appear soon to reach the position of a stock in trade, to be treasured and used, as a means of commercializing athletic ability. A football captain at a Mid-Western university, on the other hand, being determined to avoid some of the ill effects of publicity, scrupulously refrained from reading any newspaper stories in which his name appeared during the season. . . .

* * *

CHAPTER XII

VALUES IN AMERICAN COLLEGE ATHLETICS

As for American college athletics, their improvement during the past thirty years has been marked. Let that improvement continue -- let their physical, moral, and spiritual potentialities in the education of youth be clearly understood and sincerely acted upon, and their value in our national life will be immeasurably enhanced. If the reader ask, What is delaying this consummation? the answer, as we conceive it, is set forth toward the end of the present chapter.

In the meantime, certain features of college and university athletics must be weighed: their educational bearings, the amateur status, and the interest of the public.

I. THE EDUCATIONAL BEARINGS OF COLLEGE ATHLETICS

That college athletics bear upon the educational process few will deny. The notion that they possess inherent "educational values" and the question whether they are to-day so administered as to exert such values may be discussed quite independently of whatever conception of education may be favored. In general, modern American theory respecting the purposes of education exhibits two fairly well distinguished trends: On the one hand, there are those who believe the university, the college, and the school, to be essentially intellectual institutions that should train the habits and powers of the mind. On the other hand, the school and the college, and, indeed, parts of the university are regarded by many as socializing agencies that prepare for various aspects of life. The question whether the tendency to regard the college as a socializing agency has grown from an attempt to justify uncontrolled conditions in our higher education on the basis of existing phenomena need not detain us. Either of these fundamental conceptions recognizes the importance of athletics. If training the habits and powers of the mind is to be the function of education, athletics may provide recreation and contrast and may tend to develop moral qualities of perseverance, honesty, courage, and the desirable ethical characteristics that comprise sportsmanship. If, again, education is regarded as the greatest of the socializing forces, then athletics may directly prepare for life through their physical and their moral and ethical aspects. Thus, in whatever philosophical background education be viewed, both intercollegiate and intramural athletics may contribute, either indirectly in the case of the first view or directly in the case Of the second, their share to the process. The channel through which athletics make their contribution is habits, physical and psychological, moral, or social. Any commendation or condemnation of college athletics may therefore be tested by the habits that they mold in youth.

A. THE TANGIBLE ASPECTS

...

2. Athletic Success and College Enrollment

The usual approach to discussion of the relation between athletic success and college enrollment has been somewhat like this: On the assumption that the one promotes the other, enthusiastic alumni have argued that athletic success must be secured at all costs for the sake of the college, while their critics have maintained that such a course implies a prostitution of educational ideals. This controversy is all more or less beside the point. As a matter of fact, the athletic reputation of a college or university, and especially its success at football, have little if anything to do with college registration. A successful college football or other athletic season comes too late in the school course to influence materially the choice of college by the great majority of boys, because that choice will have been made perhaps as long as four years previously. Even a succession of three or four victorious football teams appears not to be sufficient, of itself, to affect registration appreciably. The factor of material prosperity among parents exerts a far more important effect upon college enrollment, and a conviction that college or university training makes for success in life, however the term be defined, also contributes its share. There may be a trivial increase in attendance when these matters are used as "talking points" by recruiters or "boosters" in "selling" the college to expert athletes. **An influx of such matriculates, eager for concessions at every turn, exerts upon the quality of intellectual work in any college a markedly deleterious effect.**

...

B. THE INTANGIBLES

...

2. Anti-Social Influences

We turn now to those influences in college athletics, which, if the theory of the spread of training is accepted, work to impair the relationship of men and women to their fellows.

Both in management and conduct and in the technique of play college athletics of the present day exhibit phases of dishonesty, deceit, chicanery, and other undesirable qualities. Perhaps this is to be expected in view of long-standing abuses in which some present-day alumni participated as undergraduates. But a contention that most of these qualities are the results of the machinations of older persons and that they are not now initiated by undergraduates fails to take into account numerous representative cases cited in Chapter X. The fact is that the subsidized college athlete of to-day connives at disreputable and shameful practices for the sake of material returns and for honors falsely achieved. Arguments in support of such practices are specious, calculated to mislead, and fundamentally insincere. Viewed in the light of common honesty, this fabric of organized deceit constitutes the darkest single blot upon American college sport.

If it be argued that the desirable social effects of participation in college athletics persist into afterlife, it is just as probable that their evil effects also persist. The matter does not lend itself to statistical proof, but on the basis of moral analogy, a knowledge of the charms of material comforts easily won, and even a rudimentary appreciation of human fallibility under temptation, it is more than probable. Under just what conditions of life a businessman will be dishonest who in undergraduate day was subsidized to play football and yet passed himself off as an amateur, it is impossible to state; but the fact that his earlier deceit was successful over a period of years is to be reckoned with in accounting for his adult character and acts. Such a man, of course, may not go to prison. But we are concerned with those undiscovered acts which may not reach the stage of criminality, yet nevertheless bulk large in the welfare of society and the relations of a man to his fellows. If, then, we deplore the actions of those young men who under the guise of sportsmen profit by the dishonesty that recruiting and subsidizing involve, we must condemn utterly the activities of those older persons, be they alumni, townsmen, or college officers, who recruit and subsidize

athletes, corrupt young habits under the guise of charity, and imperil private morals to the detriment of society. They stand among the secret enemies of the social order.

3. Preparation for Success in Life

The notion that athletics "prepare for life" is, of course, based upon the theory of the spread of training and the persistence of habits. As we have noted, this theory depends for its validity upon an assumed similarity between athletic competition and modern life. Even when this notion is accepted, together with the concomitant notion that life is very like a team game, present-day college athletics may exert both advantageous and deleterious effects upon individuals, and through them upon the groups of individuals that we call society. We lack objective evidence to show that success in athletics is an index to success in life after graduation. On the other hand, recent studies tend to demonstrate that a high quality of intellectual accomplishment in college has relationship to later success, however that term be defined. Accordingly, it is probable that the qualities of character that give rise to what we understand as success in life have developed less from the pursuit of college athletics than from the best academic achievement. From such a working hypothesis it follows directly that college athletics should be so conducted as to exercise as many as possible of the desirable social qualities, -- honesty, sincerity, persistence, thoughtfulness of others, cooperation, initiative, modesty, self-control, and the rest -- that may contribute to the welfare of society; that they should assist and by no means interfere with intellectual pursuits, success in which gives earnest of later achievement; and that they should be shorn of anti-socializing tendencies. Although this ideal may never be completely fulfilled, it can be served far more sincerely than it has been up to the present time by the American college.

C. SUMMARY: ATHLETICS IN EDUCATION

The boasted "educational values" of athletics as they exist to-day in the American college leave much to be desired. The educational advantages that flow from intercollege contests are principally by-products. Those which result from intramural athletics are neither so strong nor so widespread as they could and should be made. It is true that, in spite of comparatively high incidence of fatalities and injuries, athletics tend to confer much physical benefit upon participants. On the other hand, however strong may be the conviction that they inculcate or increase in young men courage, initiative, and other moral qualities, this remains to be scientifically established. More than a decade ago it was pointed out that excessive desire for victory has deprived us of one of the most important educational advantages of athletics, since coaching from the side-lines removes from the players the essential quality of initiative. The precision of play engendered by modern American coaching methods in practically all branches of athletics becomes a habit which exerts itself to shape conduct when conditions arise in games or in life similar to those that have been experienced in preparation. The amount of independent or individual thinking on the part of college athlete which modern methods of athletic coaching, and in many instances supervision in management, induce is minimal. If the theory be adopted that education consists in the pupil's experiencing a series of situations as similar as possible to those he will encounter in after-school life, the notion that our college athletics are "educational" falls miserably to pieces. Tested by this standard, physical education, to the extent that it includes many branches of intercollegiate athletics, has little value. Much the same is true with reference to those intramural sports in which interest and participation are grounded in compulsion to obtain credits for the degree.

II. THE AMATEUR STATUS IN COLLEGE ATHLETICS

At no other point in the whole field of college athletics is honesty so severely tested as it is in connection with the convention of amateurism. The reason can be readily comprehended. Those who have sought to uphold the status of the amateur in the United States have proceeded, consciously or unconsciously, upon the notion that the man who plays a game for fun, or for the love of it, or for sport's sake, is in some way advantaged over the man who makes a living at it. Certainly the advantage cannot

pertain to skill, for the general run of professional athletes tend to be far more expert at their sports than the general run of amateurs. Nor has either group a proprietary claim upon the exemplification of sportsmanship. The root of all difficulties with the amateur status touches the desires of certain athletes to retain the prestige that amateurism confers and at the same time to reap the monetary or material rewards of professionalism. The results in college athletics and probably in other forms of competition have included equivocation, false statements concerning eligibility, and other forms of dishonesty, which are to be numbered among the fruits of commercialism.

The values that argue for the preservation of the amateur status in American college athletics bear, first, upon the educational process, whatever its fundamental purpose, and secondly, upon the individual undergraduate. It must be kept in mind that amateurism is a convention. Furthermore, it is a social convention, in that it affects not alone the individual but also his relationships to his fellows, both participants and non-participants.

A. AMATEURISM AND THE EDUCATIONAL PROCESS

It is important that the doctrine of amateurism in college athletics be preserved, whether the college is regarded as an intellectual agency or as a socializing agency.

1. In an Intellectual Agency

The direct bearing of amateurism and of its antithesis, professionalism, upon American higher education was set forth a few years ago by a committee of the faculty of Purdue University:

The average individual does not appreciate the real evil of professionalism in college athletics. He sees nothing inherently wrong in the acceptance of money for playing, any more than in accepting compensation for any other kind of legitimate performance. Why, then, should faculties make so much noise about it? The fact is, that mere playing for compensation is not, in itself, wrong, but the admission to the university of students who are financed because of their athletic prowess and because of their ability to round out winning athletic teams, cannot do otherwise than result in disaster to our educational program and to its standards of scholarship.

Particular instances in which athletes have been subsidized or otherwise professionalized to the detriment of the intellectual aims of a college or university will recur to many readers. The presence of a man whose prime interest in college is dependent upon payment for his athletic services delays and reduces academic instruction to his intellectual level and speed, both in the classroom and in every other phase of college work. It invokes concessions at entrance and at every point at which an academic requirement is set. It leads in the direction of special privilege in tests and examinations, the relaxation of standards of grading in class and in written work, the granting of special opportunities to repair academic standing when it is injured by the close attention to athletic practice that subsidies entail, and much excusing from the obligation to meet academic appointments promptly and sincerely. It disunifies the student body and soon brings other undergraduates to feel that efforts to fulfil the intellectual purposes of the institution avail nothing if men are to be supported merely for the sake of winning games. No other force so completely vitiates the intellectual aims of an institution and each of its members.

All this would be true if professionalism were practiced frankly and openly. Where, however, its practice is concealed, an even deadlier blow is struck at spiritual values.

2. In a Socializing Agency

If the American college be regarded as a socializing agency, the effects of professionalism, open or covert, in its sports are even more deleterious. Contravention of the amateur status in college sport strikes at the root of educational democracy.

The term "educational democracy" stands in need of definition. For present purposes, it denotes that characteristic of our educational process which vouchsafes to each and sundry equal opportunity to develop his habits and powers, of the mind, the body, or the spirit, in accordance with his capacities. The

effect of importing subsidized or professionalized athletes into any institution seriously impairs not alone the incentive but also the privilege of every other student to develop to the full his interests and powers, intellectual, spiritual, or physical. If college athletics have the socializing values that are attributed to them, then the infraction of the amateur convention usually gives to the man who possesses athletic talent that he develops with a view to financial return, an advantage over his less skilful fellows which, because of the desirability of victory, destroys at one blow that democracy of the playing field and the river which is rightly numbered among the most precious merits of college sport.

From the point of view of American ideals in physical education, professionalism is an even more serious evil. Now, amateurism, as Professor Hetherington pointed out twenty years ago, "aims to conserve the natural rights of the many as against the privileges of the few." Thus, the convention of amateurism represents a guarantee on the part of the American college that every undergraduate shall have his fair and equal chance to develop his physical powers for the honor of his fellows, his own self-satisfaction, and the good of the nation. This guarantee any form of professionalism in a college or a school tends to destroy."

The stock arguments of those who would countenance defiance of the amateur convention in college athletics are as follows: A man with musical talent is permitted without comment to represent his college on a glee club and at the same time to sing for pay in a church; or another person may edit a college "periodical" and sell as many stories as he can to magazines. Why, then, should not an athlete represent his college and simultaneously be compensated' for this or any other athletic success if his skill be sufficient? Is he not suffering from unfavorable discrimination if he is not permitted thus to capitalize his talent?

The answer, for present purposes, is soon made. In college life such pursuits as singing, acting, public speaking, debating, and writing make up a general group of undergraduate activities "that are directly related to the arts. The "skills" upon which expertness in them depends are primarily mental or emotional; physical skill enters only as a part of the mechanics of expression. These pursuits, in their more competitive development, afford tests of even temper and self-control, but such tests are in general not sudden or violent; in other words, they offer opportunity for a degree of reflection which may considerably delay and modify the reaction to any stimulus.

On the other hand, such pursuits as football, baseball, tennis, golf, and rifle-shooting belong to a special group of undergraduate activities that collectively are termed sport. Sport involves the larger muscles of the human body and their coordination, almost always in violent exertion. Its "skills" are primarily physical; mental and emotional "skills" are present, but they vary between sports. Sport in general implies the overcoming of opposition or an obstacle -- physical, mental, moral -- which is immediate. The resulting contest is carried on under certain conventions. Through the relation of these convention to the desire to excel, sport tests the good temper and chivalry of its participants. These tests, which involve the control of reactions, and our primal inheritance of admiration for physical prowess, give rise to much' of the aura with which sport is surrounded.

The conventions of sport are of two kinds: One sort -- rules, written or otherwise established -- pertains to the conditions under which contests take place. Appropriate rules are as essential to a general activity as to a sport, if competition is present. The second set of conventions, some of which are expressed in rules, penetrate deeper into the essential nature of sport; they are extended to the general activities only by a process of analogy. These conventions reflect the conflict between certain primal, inherited characteristics on the one hand, and certain traditions of social behavior on the other, -- the moral struggle between force and the uses to which, with the sanction of our civilization, it may and should be put.

The difference between representing a college in athletic competition and representing it on a glee club is the difference between sport and some other form of diversion.

The amateur convention is thus a social convention, -- that is, a convention that the present order of society maintains for its own good. Against the maintenance of the amateur convention in college sport, the most powerful argument is that it does not work. But no human convention operates to perfection. The reason amateurism does not work perfectly inheres, not in its essential qualities or disadvantages, but in the very human weakness of those who would justify through victory the means whereby victory is

sometimes achieved. An athlete has every personal right to professionalize himself so long as he deceives no one concerning his status.

The proposal that the amateur convention in college sport be abolished, is a counsel of defeat. Such a step is far from justified by present conditions. The abolition of the amateur code,-- assuming for the moment that it could be abolished,-- not only would destroy the best that is now gained from college sport, but would bring with it a new set of evils that would be infinitely worse than any that now obtain. The solution of the problem is a wider and more conscientious adherence to the convention. It has already been noted that if all who iniquitously recruit, subsidize, and otherwise debauch college athletes would expend a fraction of such efforts upon honestly and conscientiously upholding the amateur status, the ethical aspects of our college athletics that are summarized in the term "sportsmanship" would largely care for themselves. So long as there is personal honor among undergraduates, alumni, and all others who are interested in college sport, the honest preservation of the amateur status will be respected and its impairment will be deprecated. . . .

III. THE PUBLIC AND COLLEGE ATHLETICS

That portion of the American public which is without college interests or affiliations naturally regards college athletics solely from the point of view of popular amusement. The diverting and spectacular elements are paramount.

Surely an interest in clean, hard-played games conducted in the open air is to be preferred above addiction to any of the thousand and one forms of indoor entertainment that compete for popular favor. On the other hand, there is much to be regretted in the proprietary influence over college athletics that the general public of to-day is permitted to exert. In sacrificing many phases of the guidance of college athletics to popular whim, those charged with their conduct are subserving two forces that are unjustifiable from any point of view in education: commercialism, and the special privileges of small groups of alumni. Much of the distortion of the popular attitude toward the college has flowed from the fact that intercollegiate contests appear to be almost the only phase of college life that is regarded as news. . . .

IV. THE CAUSES OF THE PRESENT DEFECTS IN AMERICAN COLLEGE ATHLETICS

The fundamental causes of the defects of American college athletics are two: commercialism, and a negligent attitude toward the educational opportunity for which the college exists. To one, and generally to both, of these inter-acting causes, every shortcoming of college sport can be traced. Both may be abated, even if neither, in view of the imperfectability of human nature, can ever be absolutely eliminated.

A. COMMERCIALISM

We have defined commercialism as that condition which exists when the monetary and material returns from sport are more highly valued than the returns in play, recreation, and bodily and moral well-being. Through the medium of self-interest it affects every person whom it touches: college officers, teachers, undergraduates, and alumni, the press, and the public: Because some of its results are desirable, as many other material things are desirable, it is frequently argued that commercialism can be beneficent as well as harmful. This argument neglects the influence of time, which in its passage withers the beneficent aspects of commercialism into evils that are the more difficult to eradicate because of the depth of their roots.

Commercialism has made possible the erection of fine academic buildings and the increase of equipment from the profits of college athletics, but those profits have been gained because colleges have permitted the youths entrusted to their care to be openly exploited. At such colleges and universities the primary emphasis has been transferred from the things of the spirit or the mind to the material.

In general, university trustees are relatively innocent of commercialism by formal or tacit delegation of their responsibilities. Yet they have profited by it; the task of finding money for new

equipment and buildings has been lightened. As for members of faculties, commercialism has added to their numbers through providing from athletic profits a part of the salaries of certain teachers. Rising gate receipts have brought them enlarged facilities. But the college teacher finds also that commercialism has complicated the instructional task through the admission of the unfit, the lowering of academic standards for the sake of gain, and the pressure exerted from various sources at a great number of points not to be "unfair" to athletes. Through commercialism the coach or director of physical education has received very great increases in salary, luxurious trappings, and sometimes the means and the opportunity to attract' and subsidize athletes of unusual skill.

Commercialism has added to the amusement of alumni, but it has corrupted the moral fibre of not a few of them through its temptations to recruit and subsidize. It has deprived the college of the loyalties of some of her sons, whose encouragement and devotion she most needs. Although it has given to graduates stadiums of which to be proud and to boast, these gains would appear less gratifying in a less distorted scheme of values. It has given the general public more seats at football games, but it has impaired their attitude toward sports at some points, even while improving it at others. For newspaper men its results have provided inexhaustible "copy" and augmented profits and salaries.

It is the undergraduates who have suffered most and will continue most to suffer from commercialism and its results. True, the commercial policy has provided medical attention and hospitalization for injured athletes, but far fewer injuries would have resulted from uncommercialized games. It has rendered attendance at contests held on alien fields for the sake of profits, expensive and sometimes impossible. It has provided increased seating space for home games, and in some instances has added to the playing space available to all undergraduates, although usually increases of playing space are used for the benefit of participants in intercollegiate athletics. At some colleges, it has alienated the sympathies of considerable numbers of undergraduates, not alone from intercollegiate athletics but -- what is more important -- from intramural athletics; and it has impaired loyalties that would have been most precious to any institution. Commercialism motivates the recruiting and subsidizing of players, and the commercial attitude has enabled many young men to acquire college educations at the cost of honesty and sincerity. More than any other force, it has tended to distort the values of college life and to increase its emphasis upon the material and the monetary; indeed, at no point in the educational process has commercialism in college athletics wrought more mischief than in its effect upon the American undergraduate. And the distressing fact is that the college, the Fostering Mother, has permitted and even encouraged it to do these things in the name of education.

The argument that commercialism in college athletics is merely a reflection of the commercialism of modern life is specious. It is not the affair of the college or the university to reflect modern life. If the university is to be a socializing agency worthy of the name, it must endeavor to ameliorate the conditions of existence, spiritual as well as physical, and to train the men and women who shall lead the nations out of the bondage of those conditions. To neither of these missions does commercialism in college athletics soundly contribute.

B. NEGLIGENCE RESPECTING EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITY

At a time when higher education in the United States is being much scrutinized, it is fitting that enquiry should be directed as well at its informal as at its formal aspects. In an agency primarily intellectual, athletics may take their place among the devices of informal education and recreation. In a socializing agency, the functions of athletics become more formal and more closely associated with the activities of the curriculum. But if at their best they are to be made to contribute indirectly or directly to the education of youth, their essential nature as sport must be preserved.

Occasionally a college president has attempted to improve athletics at his own institution. In certain cases failure has resulted because fellow presidents, for various reasons, have refused cooperation or have cooperated only in limited measure, or because pressure from alumni, townsmen, or friends of the college has grown too great to be resisted. Such presidents have been beaten at the game largely because they have tried, or have had, to play it single-handed.

The country over, college athletics present few isolated conditions or temptations. They are grounded in fundamental characteristics of young men and women, which, once recognized with clear vision, afford a basis for determining the place of athletics in the educational procedure. What that place may be depends upon the educational aims that the college sets for itself under the guidance of its officers.

We turn now to three respects in which the college has been negligent in its relating of athletics to college education. To characterize them thus implies no lack of discussion or theory; it does imply a certain poverty of lasting good results from action, ascribable principally to the workings of commercialism.

1. The Lack of Intellectual Challenge

It has been recently pointed out that a fundamental defect in the American college is its lack of intellectual challenge to the young and alert mind. If this is true respecting its academic aspects, it is doubly true of college athletics as they are at present conducted. Their governance has been delivered utterly into the hands of older persons, whose decisions are made with little reference to the benefits that the reasoning processes involved might confer upon younger minds. Most intercollegiate contests entail little independence of judgment on the part of players, whether in preparation or in actual participation. At every turn, our college athletics are mechanized into automatism, and our athletes and managers are puppets pulled by older hands. What intellectual challenge intercollegiate sport might afford has given way before the forces of commercialism. Fortunately for the future, intramural athletics have not succumbed to the deadening touch; but they are even now dependent for their existence upon the profits from intercollegiate football. If the spiritual and intellectual challenge of intramural sport can in time rejuvenate intercollegiate athletics, no man should withhold his hand from the task.

2. Control through Formula; Imitation

The problems of college athletics, like other problems in human relationships, are not to be completely solved by formula, however much they may be temporarily changed. As in the case of single branches of competitive athletics, standards and rules form the conventions of sport, and so long as sport exists, it will have its conventions. But conventions are not formulas. It is often assumed that if college athletics, as distinct from school athletics, are to contribute to education, they must be controlled (that is, restricted and curbed) through the direct action of faculties. This formula has failed at two points: If, on the one hand, it means delivering college athletics into the hands of men whose chief professional interest and means of livelihood they are, the result is not to check but to propagate commercialism. If, on the other hand, academic teachers on college faculties are placed in control, such men, being specialists, only in comparatively rare instances can and do give to the governance of college athletics that concentrated attention and devotion which they bestow upon their chosen fields of teaching and scholarship. Probably more than any other single factor, the operation of faculty control, even at its best, has tended to deprive the undergraduate of that opportunity of maturing under progressively increasing responsibility which an enlightened policy of guidance affords.

Imitation in the control of college athletics has wrought an equal havoc. To assume that the athletic policies and regulations that appear to work well at one university or in one section of the land can without modification be taken over successfully into another is fallacious. A clear understanding of the functions of athletics in their relation to the educational process, however that process be conceived, a sincere and uniform recognition of the principles of human conduct that athletics involve, and an honorable adherence to the spirit as well as the letter of the conventions of sport, have wrought vastly beneficial changes in college athletics wherever they have been effectuated with due reference to specific phases of local sentiment. The solution of the problem of control is not imitation but adaption, not repression but guidance by college presidents, deans, teachers, directors of physical education, or alumni who understand the implications of the term "sport," whose generosity prompts the gift of many hours without compensation, and whose honesty is beyond self-interest or commercialism.

3. Morals and Conduct

In the field of conduct and morals, vociferous proponents of college athletics have claimed for participants far greater benefits than athletics can probably ever yield, and, in attempting to evaluate these supposed benefits, have hailed the shadow as the substance. The workings of commercialism have almost obliterated the non-material aspects of athletics. And yet such qualities as loyalty, self-reliance, modesty, cooperation, self-sacrifice, courage, and, above all, honesty, can be more readily and directly cultivated through the activities and habits of the playing field than in almost any other phase of college life. What, therefore, is needed is not one set of moral and ethical standards for sports and games, and another for all other phases of college life, but a single set of standards so sincerely valued that by taking thought they can be made operative in life's every aspect. The transfer or spread of training implied is as much the affair of the academic teacher as of the coach or the director of physical education. It must begin with a diminished emphasis upon the material benefits of college athletics and a sincere resolution to substitute other and more lasting values for those that now are prized.

CONCLUSION

The prime needs of our college athletics are two, -- one particular and one general. The first is a change of values in a field that is sodden with the commercial and the material and the vested interests that these forces have created. Commercialism in college athletics must be diminished and college sport must rise to a point where it is esteemed primarily and sincerely for the opportunities it affords to mature youth under responsibility, to exercise at once the body and the mind, and to foster habits both of bodily health and of those high qualities of character which, until they are revealed in action, we accept on faith.

The second need is more fundamental. The American college must renew within itself the force that will challenge the best intellectual capabilities of the undergraduate. Happily, this task is now engaging the attention of numerous college officers and teachers. Better still, the fact is becoming recognized that the granting of opportunity for the fulfillment of intellectual promise need not impair the socializing qualities of college sport. It is not necessary to "include athletics in the curriculum" of the undergraduate or to legislate out of them their life and spirit in order to extract what educational values they promise in terms of courage, independent thinking, cooperation, initiative, habits of bodily activity, and, above all, honesty in dealings between man and man. Whichever conception of the function of the American college, intellectual or socializing agency, be adopted, let only the chosen ideal be followed with sincerity and clear vision, and in the course of years our college sport will largely take care of itself.