

## COLLEGE ATHLETICS.

### TRAINING.



WELL, I've sent him, George; but I don't believe they will have him six months before he gets into some scrape," remarked General Bradhurst to one of his old friends, whose advice he had taken in sending a rather self-willed boy to college. His friend dined with the general recently, and afterward related the conversation to me as follows :

"I asked him," he chuckled, "if his boy had come home in disgrace yet. 'To tell the truth,' he replied, 'I begin to think you hit the mark in telling me to send him. He *has* been home,—home only last week,—but not in disgrace, and he went back Monday morning bright and early. At dinner Sunday night I noticed he did n't take any of the *entrée*, and would n't have any dessert, and turned down his wine-glass when the claret was passed, and I thought something must be wrong with the boy's appetite, so I said: 'What ails you, Jim? Digestion out of order?' "Oh, no," he said; and that was all I got out of him. When Mary brought in the coffee, he would n't have any, and I said: "Look here, young man; I don't understand this. Let's go into the library, and you shall tell me all about it while we have a cigar." I pushed the cigars over to him, but he said he guessed he would n't smoke. "Now, what is the matter with you, Jim? Let's have it out," said I. "Nothing," replied the young rascal; "but I'm on the foot-ball team, and we are in training"; and before ten o'clock he ended our confab with the words: "Well, I'm going to turn in. Good night." And to bed he went. Now, George, I begin to believe there must be something in your new-fangled athletic fads, when they're strong enough to make a boy like Jim give up his sweets, turn down his glass, shake his head to a cigar, and go to bed before ten o'clock. They are going to make a man of him there, after all."

Yes, my dear sir, and yes, my dear madam, when your boy at college says he is "in training," it means that he is following, with the closest observation, the laws of health. He is free from the taint of dissipation, and is making of himself a clean, strong young man. This training has been made a study, and the results have been handed down through college and school until every boy now enjoys

the advantages. The enforcement, too, of these laws of training is stricter than that of any rules of teacher or faculty, for, instead of surveillance, the boy is bound by his honor to his captain and his fellows.

When the collegian first took up training he had as a guide only the conceited follies of broken-down prize-fighters to guide him. The "pug" was the only man who trained in those days, and he was put through a course of purging to take away the effects of months of debauch. It is no wonder, then, that the early training laws in our universities were worse than crude. The governing principle was to feed a man as much nearly raw beef as he could be induced to take, and to give him as little liquid in any form as possible. The exercise, like the diet, was an exaggerated copy of the follies of men who knew next to nothing about the human animal. In 1859 the Yale crew was wont to run four miles before breakfast; then, in the forenoon, to pull weights and wrestle for an hour; and finally, in the afternoon, to do their rowing, which always included one pull over the entire course. By 1864 this had grown to a run before breakfast of from three to five miles, sometimes with weights in the hands, and that before a mouthful was eaten. Then, in addition to general work about the quarters, they rowed the full course—four miles—at speed twice a day.

As late as 1876 the foot-ball men were made to practise general work in the morning, then to play an hour and a half in the afternoon, and at nine o'clock at night to run three miles at speed on a dusty gymnasium track. Baseball men and track athletes escaped more easily, for their training had hardly become very strict until the days of a more rational system. Training for the 'varsity teams of to-day means keeping early hours, a generous diet of the very best that the markets afford in the way of beef, mutton, and occasionally turkey and chicken; fruit; a limited supply of vegetables, toast, sometimes very plain puddings, oatmeal water, and milk. In the way of exercise, there is a very gradual increase from the beginning of the season up to within a week of the actual contests, and then light work until the event itself. As for the time all this takes from a man's studies, that depends chiefly upon the individual. Probably more than half the athletes average less than three hours a day of actual work in their sport. The length of time consumed in going to the field or boat-



house in some universities would add half an hour more. A week before the important contest, it must be confessed, the great interest in the event, the enthusiasm of the non-contestants, and the general public heralding and predicting, lead the competitors to forget everything else, and studies suffer accordingly. After the contest nine tenths of the men engaged make equally determined application to their studies in order to make up for that week of excitement and neglect. The total result is that the average rank of the athlete is rather above than below the average rank of any other body of men selected without reference to scholarship.

#### RULES.

IN the warm summer of 1844, at Yale, the crew manning a dugout canoe having challenged the crew of a lapstreak gig to a race, and that challenge having been eagerly accepted, it became necessary to adopt a code of rules to govern the contest. The rules then made were as follows: The race to be a four-mile race from the boat-house to the light-house; the start to be made by both crews standing on the pier, who should then proceed to enter their respective boats and to row to the finish; and finally, neither to do anything in the mean time in the way of cleaning the boat or in any way preparing the bottom for the race.

Upon the appointed day the two crews lined up on the float, the word was given, and both crews sprang into the boats, shipped the oars, and started. While in the swift current they kept nearly even, but as soon as they were out of it, although her crew struggled manfully, the gig seemed to be lagging. At last, realizing that something must be radically wrong with their boat, they pulled to the shore, and discovered that a ring had been secured to the keel of the gig and a heavy stone attached. As expressed by a writer, "It was the universal belief that neither crew had violated any of the articles of agreement in doing anything to the bottom of their own boat." This was the first recognized set of rules governing a college boat-race, and showed conclusively that apparently fair rules do not always insure a fair contest.

From that time the rules of college boating went through many changes. With the introduction of intercollegiate contests in 1852 came greater legislative necessities. For a few years opinions differed as to the size and manning of the boats, and a rule was made allowing any boat to be entered, manned by any number of men, and one race (in 1855) saw three boats entered, equipped as follows: *Iris* of Harvard, eight-oared barge, with coxswain;

*Y. Y.* of Harvard, four-oared lapstreak, without coxswain; and the Yale boats *Nereid* and *Nautilus*, six-oared barges, with coxswains. To accommodate such a variety, the rule was made that small boats should be allowed eleven seconds for each extra oar in the larger boats. The necessity of such a rule was, however, rather doubted when the result of the race proved to be as follows: First boat in, the eight-oared barge, three seconds ahead of the four-oared lapstreak, and the two six-oared boats over a minute and a half behind.

Perhaps no race ever showed the error of rowing under the wrong set of rules more glaringly than the contest which Yale turned into a bumping race at Lake Quinsigamond in 1870. Harvard led, and, in attempting to round the turning-stake, caught the buoy, and came to a sudden stop. Yale rowed directly into her stern, and gave a most glorious English bump, carrying away Harvard's steering-gear. Finally the boats were separated, and Yale rowed home in good order, Harvard creeping in, in damaged condition, nearly two minutes later. The race was naturally awarded, under American rules, to the bumped boat. Certain hot-headed persons found fault with the Yale management for not having foreseen this result, and for not allowing bumping rules to govern. This was not the only bumping race between Yale and Harvard, as several oarsmen who sat in the Yale and Harvard boats at Saratoga in 1874 might be willing to testify.

But we learn from experience, and the college boat-racing rules of to-day are not made for a dozen crews rowing in indiscriminate fashion, nor for two crews turning the same stake-float; but the boats are few, and each has its own lane marked out, and the course is straight away. The development of what seem now thoroughly satisfactory racing rules has been the work of years. But that work has had a strangely circular course. The first intercollegiate race was a straightaway eight-oared race, with coxswain, and with only two crews on the water. The next race was for a mile and a half and return, and it took seventeen years to get back to straightaway races.

The race of 1855 had four boats entered, and it took until 1864 to get back to two competitors, which number continued until the reform of straightaway courses came in 1872, when the number of competitors was increased to six. The next year there were eleven, and in 1875 thirteen, boats. This last crowd killed the National Rowing Association of American Colleges, and since that time the great college boat-race has had only two crews.

After the eight-oared race of 1852 all sorts of boats and rigging came in—four-oared, six-oared, with and without coxswains; shells,



barges, and lapstreaks. It took, again, over twenty years to get back to eight oars and coxswains, but the shell replaced the 1852 barge. The principal points of the boating rules of 1852, then, are the chief points in the boating rules of 1892; namely, two crews, a straightaway course, eight oars, and a coxswain. Only the distance is four miles instead of two, though had Mr. Sargent's proposed regulations of a few years ago gone into effect, we should have had the two-mile race of forty years ago as well as all the other conditions.

But in other sports there has been a more appreciable distance traversed by the rule-makers. The foot-ball game of the forties was an annual rush between the freshmen and sophomores with a foot-ball as an excuse. The answer of the sophomores to the freshmen's challenge a few years later, in a slight paraphrase of Hotspur's words, characterizes the game and its rules sufficiently:

Come! like sacrifices in their trim,  
And to the fire-eyed maid of smoky war,  
All hot, and bleeding will we offer you!

In 1872 there had come to be something in the nature of a game, with rules to govern. The important rule bearing upon the history of the sport was, "No player shall pick up, throw, or carry the ball in any part of the field." Today the chief employment is to pick up, throw, and carry the ball. Then, when there was a violation of a rule: "The player so offending shall throw the ball perpendicularly into the air from the spot where the foul occurred." To-day, when a violation of a rule occurs, "a player of the opposite side puts the ball down on the ground upon the spot where the foul occurred."

Until the fall of 1875 American college foot-ball was a sport *sui generis*, rebelling against any other known code of foot-ball rules. Then, Harvard, having become enamoured of the English Rugby through some matches with Canadian teams, made the first step toward its introduction among American colleges by effecting a compromise with Yale, and playing a game under four fifths Rugby Union and one fifth American nondescript laws. The following year Rugby Union rules were adopted. Since that time rapid changes have been made, but instead of the game having gone to pieces under the alterations, a new game has been evolved which now in point of interest challenges the foot-ball game of any other country. The American scrimmage, though developed from the Rugby scrimmage, has a more clean-cut and satisfactory termination, is faster and more accurate in changing the play, and admits of a wider field for the development of tac-

tics. The American system of interference is a most direct breaking away from the Rugby law of "off side," but possesses many advantages in the way of increased opportunity for team work; and finally, the scoring by points, and the ruling by two men, insure more certainty of determining the issue, no matter how closely the teams be matched.

In base-ball the progress of the rules has been chiefly along the pitcher's crease. The straight-arm pitch, no balls, and no strikes, but the batsman hitting when he chose—these were the characteristics of the early days. Home runs without number, scores of fifty and over, time of games from three to four hours—to these were the patrons of the sport treated in the fifties and sixties. Then came the underhand throw, the hand passing below the hip, and every third ball called; next followed the underhand throw, the hand swinging on a line below the shoulder, nine balls to take the base; then quickly followed seven balls, and the putting back of the pitcher farther from the batsman; then five balls, and the throw instead of the pitch, and the abolition of restriction as to the pitcher's swing; and now we have four balls, and the determination to place the pitcher still farther from the batsman. Such has been the record of our base-ball rules.

In track athletics the seven-mile walk, the three-mile walk and the three-mile run, and the graduates' seven-mile walk have all disappeared, but an effort is being made to revive the three-mile run. The tug of war came in, dug holes in the ground, attained the dignity of a wooden platform, cleats, and harness, and then had its head lopped off. The standing jump had a short life, but the sprints and hurdles have held their own and increased. Throwing the base-ball and graduate events were swept away before having a chance to demonstrate their value. Bicycles whirled into the procession: first the high machines, which nearly murdered the riders when the almost inevitable collision occurred; now the low safety, with its huge bulging tire, which, like the fabled hoop-snake of our youthful fancy, rolls faster than man or horse can flee. Stricter rules, closer matches, longer and more systematic training, have all combined to stimulate interest and endeavor to a higher pitch, and records have fallen until one is almost ready to fancy that the limit has been reached. But as we approach that time there again enters the unceasing restlessness of the American collegian as an element in all rules governing athletics in our universities, and changes in events and rules will probably usher in the unforeseen development to satisfy this craving. The first signs come in the proposal to reinstate the three-mile run. Who knows but that, like the boating legislation, the



track-athletic lawmakers are about to move in a circle, approaching again the old-fashioned distance events and separate graduate contests, especially should the new advocacy of confining the general events to undergraduates strictly meet with general favor?

#### ELIGIBILITY.

THERE is a story of a famous physician who was asked to write a prescription for a patient afflicted with rheumatism. With it he sent a note which read as follows, "If this does you any good, I wish you would let me know, as I have been troubled with rheumatism myself for the last few years."

A similar desire to try experiments outside of their own person has always afflicted the colleges when dealing with the disease of professionalism, or with any question of eligibility of players. Before college sports became of sufficient importance to provoke symptoms of professionalism, there were differences of opinion as to whether graduates should be permitted to take part. In 1874, at the meeting of the Rowing Association, Harvard proposed that "professional school students should be eligible for crews." The question was put to a vote, but the motion was lost, Yale and eight other colleges voting against it. Later, in 1876, Yale and Harvard passed a rule to the effect that "all undergraduates of either college, and all of its graduates who were studying for a second degree, should be eligible for the crews." These two points in the history of the legislation bear very directly upon the questions now being so fiercely agitated.

In base-ball, when the Intercollegiate Association was formed at Springfield in 1880, the Yale delegates refused to join in the formation because the association was unwilling to bar out professionals, and did not apply for membership until, in the following year, a rule was adopted rendering professionals ineligible. The particular individuals at that time against whom the rule was directed were Richmond and Winslow, the battery of the Brown nine. Both these men went into the professional ranks, and the former played for some years in professional teams. Since then there have been several poorly disguised instances of professionalism among college ball-players, but the point most in question has come to be how far a college player may go in the way of taking expenses—sometimes rather lavish ones, too—for summer ball-playing in local nines. Action restricting this practice is likely to come before long.

But in foot-ball have been seen the most bitter quarrels upon this issue. Professional base-ball and professional boating rather prepared the way for a laxity of opinion in these

sports, while in foot-ball, up to a few years ago, there had been no question or supposition of professionalism. It was purely a gentleman's game. When, therefore, a man who had played base-ball avowedly for money, and who was commonly considered a member of one of the professional league nines for the coming season, undertook to play upon one of the teams in the Intercollegiate Association, it gave rise to a storm of protest and not only the passage of a rule forbidding professionalism among college players, but also a bitterly fought quarrel, the after effects of which still keep two of our leading college foot-ball teams apart. The rule passed at that time provided that no professional should be eligible, nor any man who had received any pecuniary inducement, directly or indirectly, nor any man not pursuing a course of study requiring a certain number of hours' attendance each week. That same year, and under this rule, Harvard questioned a majority of Princeton's players, and Princeton questioned a majority of Harvard's men. Feeling ran so high that not one of the colleges represented has since brought a single challenge under this rule. Nor has it been because of lack of cases coming under it, but because of the vivid memory of that most acrimonious set of meetings, and the recrimination indulged in for months thereafter.

This brings us to the vital point: College men as a class are bitterly opposed to professionalism, but college representatives in any law-making meeting are able to see clearly only the professionalism in the rival teams, and the rules proposed by each college are prepared to fit the case abroad rather than the case at home. Then, when the trouble begins, the college likely to get the worst of the arrangement in the matter of players threatens to resign; and what is even worse, if these representatives do not legislate to "save their own bacon" at home, their college is likely to make it unpleasant for them.

Fortunately, the unusual publicity given this year to the fact that men are hired in one way or another on account of their athletic ability, has resulted in stirring up the better element among college men to the necessity of action, and all the colleges are at last vying with one another to discover and adopt the best measure to attain the result. Yale has passed a rule confining membership in her nines, teams, and crews to undergraduates, and strictly to undergraduates of her own college, barring out any man who comes from another college. Princeton has adopted a similar rule. Harvard will undoubtedly adopt some equally stringent measure, but not until a year from now. The other colleges are equally active, and presumably are determined to stamp out the evil, so



that there is little doubt of the final extinction of the most apparent part of it. But there is still an evil existing against which no very satisfactory rules have yet been directed, and that is, the inducements offered young boys to determine their choice of a college.

The difficulty here arising is similar in one sense to that which existed in the first rule, as above described, adopted in foot-ball. Where the proof required is of a nature involving more or less detective work, the obtaining of it is obnoxious to gentlemen. To ferret out the inducement, to play the detective, and to trace back the benefit, whether in the form of dollars and cents, or the remission of usual dues, room rent, board, or tuition, from its recipient to the instigators, and to show that the suggestion of that benefit came in some way from the fact that the man was likely to be serviceable in some athletic branch, is not only an extremely difficult undertaking, but an essentially repugnant one. On this account, any rule that involves detective work will never be practically operative. It will sound well, but the procuring will never be affected by it, because the better class of college men — and they are the ones upon whom, from the nature of things, the ferreting out of infractions of the rule must devolve — will revolt from the only methods which could end in successful search. The summer ball-playing, which is productive of pecuniary gain, and the inducement by similar means which leads a school-boy athlete to be influenced in his choice of a college, are the next two evils to be faced and overcome by some legislation requiring no detective work.

#### ATTITUDE OF FACULTIES.

THAT professor who rushed into the faculty meeting one day, and, after stating that he had just learned that in base-ball the pitcher was wont to deceive the batsman by curving the ball, proposed that the faculty should at once do away with a sport which placed a premium upon deception, had the right idea in his honest old head, although in the particular instance his lack of technical knowledge led him to pose as something very near a fool. He abhorred cheats and shams, and he did not want his boys taught trickery. Faculties have always been upon the side of honesty of purpose, but where they have undertaken to interfere in points requiring technical knowledge, the results have, in many instances, been disastrous both to their *amour propre* and to the sports themselves. The student, graduate and undergraduate, has built up his own sports. He began with them when none but he took any interest in them. He sat up nights and worked days to make them better, and, as they

grew, he puzzled out for himself all the problems involved. Neither the public nor the faculty took any particular interest. That is one of the reasons why the student body has of late years often resented interference with what was regarded as the internal management of the sports. So long as the sports did not interfere with studies, they asked to be allowed to enjoy immunity from interference. Such intolerance of meddling can hardly be regarded as peculiar. But, unfortunately, the line was not always clearly drawn either by the student body or by the faculty, and cases are on record of overstepping the line on the part of both bodies. Moreover, both sides have occasionally changed their minds, and hence their policies have been woefully inconsistent.

In 1883 the Harvard faculty astonished the college world, just previous to the Yale-Harvard foot-ball match, by forbidding Harvard to play the game in New York. But they were over-persuaded, and the game was played. In 1885 Harvard was forbidden to play foot-ball at all, and in 1890 a rule was passed forbidding any athletic contests of any kind by Harvard students outside of New England. A certain exception to this rule has been made in favor of the men engaged in track athletics. These rules, and those of recent date, have been made by a committee composed at first of three members of the faculty. This committee was appointed by the faculty, and was known as the Standing Committee upon the Regulation of Athletic Sports. This was the committee which forbade foot-ball at Harvard. Questions of importance were referred to the faculty for discussion.

After some three years of control, this faculty committee recommended the appointment of a new committee with student representation. The faculty agreed to the composition of the committee, but restricted its powers, requiring it to consult with the faculty on all questions involving general principles. This committee consisted of five, two being undergraduates, but all being appointed by the president of the university, and making reports to the faculty. After three years of experience with this committee, it was recommended that the control of athletics be removed from the hands of the college faculty by the appointment of a committee existing by the authority of the corporation, and responsible to that body alone. This the faculty refused, giving the committee power subject to such general regulations as the college faculty should from time to time adopt. Then by a later rule they appointed a committee consisting of three undergraduates to be elected by the management of the Athletic Association, and six graduates, three to be members of the faculty, and all six to be appointed by



the corporation with the consent of the Board of Overseers.

This committee was allowed control of athletics, "subject to the authority of the faculty of the college," and it is this committee, under such authority, that has supervision and control of all athletics at Harvard.

Almost the exact opposite of all these conditions has prevailed at Yale. There, in the early days, the faculty did not even recognize the existence of athletic sports, and their only recognition of them (with the single exception mentioned later) has come from them rather as individuals than in their official capacity. The exception mentioned is in recognizing the peculiarly powerful means of discipline which lies ready to their hand in the existence of these sports. An act of disorder by any body of men of any class is likely to be punished, whether these men be athletes or not, by the deprivation of that class of their class games either at home or with other colleges, and there is no doubt that any unusual outbreak of the college at large would result to the disadvantage of the university contests of the following season. This tacit understanding has done much to prevent disorder of all kinds, because the captains and general management of the athletic teams make a point of using their influence and authority toward the suppression of all kinds of disorder. The measure of popularity enjoyed by the 'varsity captains insures their wishes being heeded and their suggestions being, in the main, carried out.

One of the striking features of this system lies in the fact that the Yale boat-house, the Yale field, and the Yale gymnasium are the results of unaided subscriptions, mostly in small sums, from undergraduates and graduates, together with the earnings of the athletic teams; and with the exception of the gymnasium, the property is owned not by the college authorities or corporation, but by the boat club and field corporation. The gymnasium was given over by the gymnasium committee to the college a few months ago, but the college authorities paid nothing for it. Not even have the graduates been given a voice in the management of athletics at New Haven, though of course they are at liberty to offer advice.

Some twelve years ago an advisory committee was appointed, but it had no executive powers; and upon the occasion of an attempt to invest it with such powers, several of the members prepared their resignations, declining to serve except in an advisory capacity. This advisory committee has not held a meeting for years, and of the present members of the college few are even aware of its former existence. The faculty had one member upon this committee, but only as a grad-

uate of Yale who was interested in athletics, and not as a representative of the faculty. There is, however, one point of similarity not only between Harvard and Yale, but also between them and almost all the other colleges. Whenever there has been any favor shown in the way of appropriation or salary to a man to direct athletics, it has always been with a leaning toward the indoor rather than the outdoor side—a gymnasium director. That is one feature of the faculty relations which is even now changing, and which the next decade of athletics must see radically changed if the best results are to be obtained. It is the outdoor sport which should have the major part of the attention and encouragement; the indoor apparatus should be only supplemental, to be regarded as a substitute when weather or time prevents the more natural exercise. Without in any way detracting from the excellent results of our gymnasium work, we must not make them so attractive as to draw any man or body of men under a roof that might otherwise be in the fresh air and sunshine.

#### BRAWN AND BRAINS.

THERE is a story of a party containing two ministers crossing a lake in a storm. When matters became most critical, some one cried out, "The two ministers must pray!" "Na, na," said the boatman; "the little ane can pray if he like, but the big ane maun tak an oar."

Outside of emergencies there is much to be said in favor of brawn, and fortunately it is no longer necessary to argue that brains are better when there is brawn behind them, while, on the other hand, the time has already come when those who select athletes have little use for brawn without brains. So they supplement each other more and more. The college man, caricatured for years as a consumptive, then as a big brute, is to-day neither. The type is approaching more nearly to that of soundness of body and mind. Twenty years ago a father exhorted his son to study hard and stand high; now the anxiety is that the student should not fail to take plenty of exercise.

The strongest argument in favor of school and college sports is the one advanced by Nature herself. She develops the body before the mind. A man reaches the prime of physical power years before the maximum of his mental strength is attained. The best systems, backed by the best exponents of the times, have failed to make physical development popular among men whose college days and days of youth were over, who were in the struggle of their life's work. It then takes too much out of the man to build up his physique. He has not the time. If he has done the



building years before, exercise will prevent retrogression. Youth is the time for physical development, the time to expand the chest and increase the biceps, to take the larger proportion of bodily exercise; then in maturity the proportion should change to a mental exercise with the other for relaxation.

And as for the actual conflict of study and sport, the writer can speak with assurance of his own time in the university, from a comparison of the records for six years. In '76 among the appointments at graduation were one base-ball man, four foot-ball men, one of the crew, and the winners of four out of the five events at the spring athletic meeting. Among the composition prizes were two foot-ball men and one of the crew, and the Townsend prize was taken by a crew man. In '77 the valedictorian was a shining light in the line of the 'varsity foot-ball team, and the short-stop of the ball nine was on the appointment list. In '78 on the appointment list were two foot-ball men, the recipient of the Scott prize was the right fielder on the ball nine, and the first French prize was taken by a foot-ball man. In '79 the appointment list contained four foot-ball men, one base-ball man, two of the crew and the coxswain, while in the same class the mathematical prize was taken by a foot-ball man. In '80 on the appointment list were three foot-ball men, one base-ball man, and one of the crew. In '81 the appointments fell upon five foot-ball men, one base-ball man, and two of the crew, while the salutatorian was the 'varsity quarter-back, and one of the Townsend men was on the team. In '82 the appointment list contained four foot-ball men, three base-ball men, and two crew men; the winner of the Junior Exhibition prize was a foot-ball man who was also one of the crew, and the Scott prize winner was a foot-ball man. I have no doubt that even a better showing could be made by one familiar with the names and records of classes since that day.

But the showing which one cannot follow because the lists are so far separated,—the showing after graduation, the good constitution built up in college days to be drawn upon in the worry and care of later years,—that is the showing which would tell even more strongly how the generally increasing love of athletics is benefiting our young men, and making their lives better and more worth the living.

#### THE SPIRIT OF FAIR PLAY.

It would be a serious error to infer from the earnestness with which partizans of different plans for the welfare of college athletics hold to their own ideas, that agreement and eventual progress are out of reach. It is not a bad show-

ing that has been already made in our scant thirty years of just such argument. In the heat of controversy, one who looks back over the past may see how easily things adjust themselves, even after the most bitter differences of opinion.

In 1858 Harvard proposed the formation of an intercollegiate regatta association, and delegates met, including Yale. In 1864 Harvard and Yale met, and agreed to row by themselves. In 1871 Harvard again requested Yale to send delegates to establish a union regatta. Yale refused, but in 1872 entered the association. In 1876 Yale withdrew. In 1877 Harvard withdrew. A change of policy was thus adopted for almost every college every four years.

In 1876 Yale wanted Harvard to come to New London, but Harvard would have nothing but Springfield. Two years later it was Yale that preferred Springfield, but Harvard chose New London; and I remember that each thought the other in the wrong both times.

In 1873 Princeton, Columbia, Rutgers, and Yale held a convention to frame a code of football rules, and Harvard refused to attend. In 1876 Princeton, Columbia, and Harvard held a convention and formed an association, Yale being the one this time to refuse to join. More recent differences of opinion between the large universities are too fresh in the minds of those interested in such matters to need repetition, but the differences are short-lived. Affairs adjust themselves very quickly when the breaches are not widened by a desire to live apart. College managements enjoy the inestimable privilege of rapid changes of men in authority. A new set of men come into power annually, and once in four years their entire constituency has altered, so that they can forgive, forget, and again clasp hands.

After all the proper spirit of fair play underlies college athletics. While each institution may be earnest in supporting its own method, all are united in their final purposes. There may be a bit of rivalry even among the college faculties in posing for public effect; there may be too great a tendency among the managers of the athletic sports to submit their actions to the tribunal of public opinion; there may be even more interest to the athletes themselves in a game played before thirty thousand enthusiastic spectators than would attach to the same contest with no spectators save the umpire and referee; but these are none of them grave faults. They are manifestations of human nature. So long as college athletics build up the physique of our youth, so long as they teach self-control, temperance, and courage, so long as money considerations and dishonesty do not enter into them, they will form a valuable feature of college life.

*Walter Camp.*