The Responsibility of a College President in a Changing Physical Education Program

By Henry M. Wriston
President, Lawrence College

I am an amateur among professionals, and I enter this game with all the moral handicaps involved in so unequal a contest. I am reminded of an incident which occurred in a like circumstance. A learned assembly, similar to this, met at a great university. The governor of the state and the president of the university were both invited to make addresses. Each, mindful of his deficiencies in the subject matter, asked a certain professor to prepare a memorandum as the basis for his discussion. The professor, innocent of the ways of the great world, sent them identical manuscripts. Each, ignorant of the request made by the other, found it so good that it needed no emendation and took it to the function as the manuscript of an utterance calculated to dazzle the audience. The governor spoke first—so the president of the university got himself out of the hole by telling where the governor got his speech.

I wrote one of your learned brethren and asked what I should do upon this occasion. His reply, voluminous but pointed, was embroidery upon this passage, which he took for a text: “What we want, and what you do not dare to give us, is an honest-to-goodness statement of a system which you would like to see inaugurated in your college or any other college, with nothing held back. I know it is a tough place, and probably you are not to be blamed for holding back some things, but the intercollegiate problem is not going to be settled unless the college presidents have the courage of their convictions.” If he had added the words “if any” to that final sentence the expression of his thought would have been complete.

In order to point the moral he enclosed a section of a letter from another of your distinguished members built about the theme that this would be a good discussion “if you can get the people present to tell the truth, an impossibility, I am discouraged.”

Amazing as it may seem to these gentlemen, even the astounding phenomenon of a college president telling the truth will not bring a solution to all the ills of the physical and athletic program. And to prove that point, I will now proceed to accept the challenge of
one friend, restore the courage of another, and perform this modern miracle of truthfulness.

THE topic assigned is "The Responsibility of a College President in a Changing Physical Education Program." I begin by saying that his responsibility in this field is precisely the same as his responsibility in the changing program of education in the social or the physical sciences. He should get the best expert advice he can find; on the basis of that he should frame a program with the department, assist the department in interpreting it to the faculty, and then take the responsibility for the result before his regents or trustees and the public. The initiative ought to rest with the department. If its members are alive to changing emphases they should seek to keep the president in touch with them and make him conscious of their significance. There are many departments, and each has its own pressing problems. Only by a process of continuous education of the president can any one department expect him to take a progressive position.

Only in minor matters may the president develop general policies without faculty support, manifested either by legislative activity or a clear consensus of opinion. The program having been formulated, the president becomes the spokesman of the department and of the faculty before the governing body and the public. President Neilson of Smith spoke of the president of a college as a lightning rod. If I may expand his metaphor, the president must keep his head in the air, his feet firmly on the ground, and resist the tendency to melt under intense heat. If he melts he does not perform his function, which is to carry destructive criticism safely around the academic structure and into the ground.

If many presidents have melted in the storms about athletics, it is because the lightning is very intense. We are dealing with matter of enormous public interest. When the "world's greatest newspaper" regards the defeat of Notre Dame as worth a two-inch banner lead over its first page of a Sunday edition, it is because the editors believe that is the news the public wants first.

If interest in great questions of public policy were as keen as popular interest in sports, if the public would inform itself through the press as assiduously upon governmental issues as it does about sports, the world would have no gloomy prophets as to the future of democracy. Moreover, the writers about sports are less jaded and more militant in their convictions than any other group of news writers. The commentators upon politics have become almost philosophical in their outlook. The writings in the newspapers upon religion and education are usually quite formal and are assignments dreaded by "live wires." The sports reporter, on the other hand,
writes with zest and enthusiasm, and lays out policies for the Big Ten, or the North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools, or for a university, or for a college, with a good deal of assurance. He not merely prints the news, he comments upon it with great freedom. He exercises, in short, an editorial function. His editorials, moreover, are signed, and do not suffer from the usual editorial anonymity. It is really amazing that in connection with sports there has come into the lives of the writers such a militant zeal for their subject that the expression of an opinion at variance with the accepted formula becomes a subject of active and sometimes acrid discussion.

Compromises are responses to pressure. The chemistry department may rewrite its theories indefinitely; the public knows little about it, cares less, and the president suffers no damage. But the athletic program being a matter of great public interest, the president may feel that the losses in public approval of the college or of his administration are greater than the gains to be achieved by some specific alteration of policy. It is for this reason that presidents are prone to compromise on athletic matters. I make no apology for this, however much I regret it. Presidents are not omnipotent, and when they lose the support of the trustees they are impotent. I think it could be demonstrated statistically that among the causes of the high official mortality of college presidents, finances and athletics lead the list. Greater devotion hath no officer than that he lose his office! Many have done so, only to be succeeded by others who will follow the popular will. Reform was set back thereby more than it would have been set back by some compromise. Moreover, it must be borne in mind that reform in this field is particularly difficult because a vicious relationship between sports and profits has developed through the years. If a stadium has been built (in a previous administration, let us say) and the service of the bonds is predicated upon the profits of football, it is easier for the camel to go through the eye of the needle than for that institution to take a balanced and judicious educational view of the situation. Or if, for the building of university buildings or running expenses, an institution has counted on football profits to the extent of a third of a million annually, it is very difficult to reform. To replace the profits with endowment would require an increase in endowment of $6,000,000. While this case is an extreme one, the cold fact is that many, if not most, colleges now find themselves in a financial position where the sudden exclusion of all considerations not strictly educational would put a strain on the budget which it is not able to bear.

These are practical considerations of great importance, but I shall not dwell further upon them. Instead I will now make what
my friend called for—an "honest-to-goodness" statement of the situation as I should like to see it, and in doing so will only make suggestions which I am seeking actively to develop into college policies, if they are not already accepted practice. There is no occasion to hold anything back, but I shall refer to Lawrence College only when it is necessary to illustrate a specific point.

In this utopian outline, the staff will have first consideration. I would have for this department men as well trained, as broadly cultured and as professionally competent, as are demanded in physics or economics or literature. Indeed, they should be more broadly and more thoroughly equipped. For they must deal with the whole man, and not with one field of learning. In this department, if anywhere, should be found the educational philosopher. Here should be that group of persons who see the ultimate objectives, whose emphasis is upon rounded development of the whole personality—mind and body—emotions and will and reflexes—all in harmony. Here will be that fine sensitiveness that is willing to lose public prestige with fortitude if a game is lost by withdrawing a player in danger of suffering injury by further exertion. Coaching members of departments of physical education have not always been famous for this quality. Of course the defense is offered that the coach's job depends upon victory. But one can offer much the same defense of the president. It is no defense at all. No man has a right to hold his job by the abuse of another. When it is done, as it often is, the hollow pretense about "character building" is revealed in all its tragic insincerity.

This should be the first department to urge high standards of scholastic attainment for intercollegiate representation. Here will be found professional insistence that no 145-pound hero can play in three sports for three years and come out with his intelligence developed to its maximum power, and his body keyed to its maximum pitch for sane living. In this department the coach simply does not exist as an independent unit. The teaching function with reference to any sport is simply a departmental assignment, precisely as in the history department one man handles ancient and medieval history, a second modern European and English history, and a third American history. This organization leaves no room for the part-time coach. No one who spends part of his time in professional football, no one who is judge, contractor, dentist, or whatever other vocation one may imagine, will be in charge. This is not intended to assault either the competence or the morals of seasonal coaches. It is based upon the conviction that only by using persons whose time and responsibility are undivided can we realize a program the whole implication of which is educational.
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All this competence is to be bought for a price no greater than that of the historian, the sociologist, or the botanist. His salary is not only comparable in size, it is drawn from the same source—endowment incomes and fees. It is not derived directly or indirectly from the gate receipts of athletic events. Having secured him for the staff, I will give the man in physical education, though he coaches, the tenure of his professional fellows, and judge his work on the basis of its educational results, not upon victory or defeat, not upon advertising value or the prestige it brings to the college.

I notice by your program that there are discussions of professional training. More power to you. Speed the day when the departments themselves will revolt against paying more to a young man without graduate training who can throw a flat pass than to a doctor of philosophy or a doctor of medicine. And may I inject a remark, not strictly within my province? An embattled department and an aroused faculty, with the courageous backing of the American Association of University Professors can bring reforms even against the protests of presidents!

NOW turn from the teacher to the teaching. Shall there be three programs—one of health from the medical standpoint, another of physical education, so called, and a third of athletics? In Utopia college there will be but one. One part of the department will not educate the boy into a sanitarium prescribed by another part of it, even if we fail to be Myopia University. Medical examination, diagnosis, and treatment are all part of physical education, and physical activity in athletics is either education, recreation, or exploitation. The first two are legitimate; the last should be utterly barred. Athletics should not exist apart from education or recreation.

To this department belongs the total control of schedules, and of eligibility. Schedule making and eligibility rules present two of our most absurd modern situations. Manifestly, games should be played with neighboring colleges of like size and character, where the benefits of intercollegiate contact and sportsmanlike rivalry may be obtained. Nothing else is pertinent; the question of gate receipts is distinctly impertinent.

No other phase of college education is so bedeviled with rationalizations that manifest insincerity or feebleness. One of these is to the effect that football must be exploited in order to raise money enough to support the physical education program and the minor sports. The simple fact is that either the physical education program and these other sports are intrinsically valuable for the educational objective—or they are not. If they are not, they do not need the support, and if they are, the college is under as much obligation to
one friend, restore the courage of another, and perform this modern
miracle of truthfulness.

THE topic assigned is "The Responsibility of a College President in a Changing Physical Education Program." I begin by saying that his responsibility in this field is precisely the same as his responsibility in the changing program of education in the social or the physical sciences. He should get the best expert advice he can find; on the basis of that he should frame a program with the department, assist the department in interpreting it to the faculty, and then take the responsibility for the result before his regents or trustees and the public. The initiative ought to rest with the department. If its members are alive to changing emphases they should seek to keep the president in touch with them and make him conscious of their significance. There are many departments, and each has its own pressing problems. Only by a process of continuous education of the president can any one department expect him to take a progressive position.

Only in minor matters may the president develop general policies without faculty support, manifested either by legislative activity or a clear consensus of opinion. The program having been formulated, the president becomes the spokesman of the department and of the faculty before the governing body and the public. President Neilson of Smith spoke of the president of a college as a lightning rod. If I may expand his metaphor, the president must keep his head in the air, his feet firmly on the ground, and resist the tendency to melt under intense heat. If he melts he does not perform his function, which is to carry destructive criticism safely around the academic structure and into the ground.

If many presidents have melted in the storms about athletics, it is because the lightning is very intense. We are dealing with matter of enormous public interest. When the "world's greatest newspaper" regards the defeat of Notre Dame as worth a two-inch banner lead over its first page of a Sunday edition, it is because the editors believe that is the news the public wants first.

If interest in great questions of public policy were as keen as popular interest in sports, if the public would inform itself through the press as assiduously upon governmental issues as it does about sports, the world would have no gloomy prophets as to the future of democracy. Moreover, the writers about sports are less jaded and more militant in their convictions than any other group of news writers. The commentators upon politics have become almost philosophical in their outlook. The writings in the newspapers upon religion and education are usually quite formal and are assignments dreaded by "live wires." The sports reporter, on the other hand,
support them as it is to finance any other branch of the educational program. What would we think of a college which commercialized its chemistry department, for example? It would be entirely possible to run a commercial testing laboratory with the advanced students in chemistry and physics. The routine determinations made in that sort of laboratory could readily be done by them, and at a profit to the institution. The students would not learn as much chemistry in that way, but the profits would pay for instruction in Greek, one of the expensive minor sports of the modern curriculum.

To distort and throw the whole football program out of perspective is to offset legitimate recreation with the kind of educational charlataney which ought not to be possible in any American institution. False reasoning frequently manifests itself in schedules, particularly when small colleges play outside their own class. Sometimes it is done in the name of advertising and prestige; but it is highly doubtful if a score of sixty, or seventy, or one hundred to nothing adds to the prestige of any institution. When it is done because the institution frankly wants income for other purposes, it is heartless exploitation of exceedingly innocent young men who ought, if they are to earn money for the school, to get a share of the proceeds. Is it any wonder that they think the college owes them something, and that they have done something for the institution?

As for eligibility, why should not the department handle it? Can anything be more absurd than our conferences with their elaborate rules for eligibility, with official interpretations, and with an official, sometimes paid, to interpret the interpretations. Lawrence College is a member of two such conferences. In both the eligibility requirement is so low that it would require a student who met only the minimum regulation seven and a half years to graduate—certainly an inspiring educational thought! And why do we have them? There can be only one answer—because we do not trust the educational integrity of our alleged friends, and they do not trust ours. The rules are designed to put the rivals in leading strings so that there may be some chance of beating them.

All the fuss and bother about these meticulous eligibility rules is nonsensical. Twelve hours and twelve points in one institution do not represent the same values as twelve hours and twelve points in another. The Carnegie study of colleges in Pennsylvania demonstrated the enormous disparity among colleges with regard to internal standards. There is no gold standard of scholastic credits; to assert a parity does not create one. Therefore, the college which for one reason or another is in favor of a money-making athletic racket has only to adjust its internal standards to meet the "needs" of the team. Personally, I am perfectly ready to trust the standards of most of our natural rivals and let them frame their own eligibility rules.
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regulations. Where there is distrust there are no dividends in sportsmanship in playing the game at all. About this much abused word sportsmanship so many barnacles have clustered that the idea is all but lost. Sportsmanship involves playing hard, playing fair, and appreciating the opponent without reference to victory or defeat. Sport has been moving in precisely the opposite direction, doing everything possible to exalt victory, and stimulating fears and suspicions and bitter rivalries. One of the evidences is the elaborate system of spies and scouts. The logical result is the sort of hysteria which culminated so disgracefully this fall in the sequestration of a suspected player. I would abolish all scouting. Indeed, Lawrence College, like many another, has dropped the whole absurd and expensive performance.

Even if mechanical standards were really uniform, conference eligibility requirements are shockingly low. In any institution with educational self-respect the actual standard is higher than the requirement. One member of our faculty recently checked upon this matter and gave me the results while I was in the midst of preparing this paper. He discovered that of thirty-two men allowed to play football or basketball only one had any failures and only four had less than a point-per-hour record. In other words, we will not let a boy play unless he is headed for graduation at a normal pace.

In Utopia college we shall go further. The department will have full power in the matter of eligibility, without the intervention of policing deans, statistical registrars, or supervisory faculty committees. The department will give the boy what he needs. If intercollegiate athletics have significant physical and moral values for him, he may participate. If they have none, he will not. It seems reasonable to suppose that the boy who has played two or three years in high school, and then after the sacred freshman year (another monument to intercollegiate distrust!) plays in intercollegiate athletics another year or two may reach the point of diminishing returns, both physical and moral. This is particularly true if we may take at its face value the statement of one of the most notable among the coaches resigning this year. He is reported to have said, "I am sick and tired of driving boys, whipping them into frenzies with everything but lashes, seeing them crack from nothing but exhaustion. That's not football, the game. I'll never be a party to that again." This singularly frank testimony accords with facts familiar to everyone in this room. Every one of us knows that there is absolutely no educational excuse for it. All the wretched rationalization which excuses that sort of thing by appeals to the need for body-contact games in a soft age break down in the face of this testimony. There is no doubt that there should be strenuous body-contact games, but between that statement and the
realities of big-time, high pressure football there is certainly a world of difference.

This brings us to the heart of the program. The only excuse for any educational institution is the development of the individual. Education in America has the appearance of mass production. We deal with human beings in statistical terms as though our calibrations measured something significant. This is all justified on the ground that it is designed to achieve a social result. But the total social result depends upon the result with each individual. Physical education, as I see it, has a threefold objective. It aims at physical well being through the cultivation of habits of constructive recreative activity, at moral well being through providing an outlet for excess youthful vitality and cultivating functionally the virtues of sportsmanship, and at intellectual well being by furnishing a sound constitution sanely to bear the stresses of modern life. No other considerations are pertinent. We have built up a whole new system of child discipline and a whole new educational ideal about the conception of the sacredness of the individual personality. Then in the name of physical education we have witnessed the most ruthless exploitation of students—for the sake of the prestige, the advertising, the profits of the college.

Physical education must not seek its objectives with a mass of men and women. It must attend to the interest of the individual—not of the few more capable, nor even the greatest number, but of every individual. In physical education, as in all other education, the most significant thing about individuals is individual difference. If, therefore, we are to deal intelligently with the subject of physical education and athletics we must make the individual and his personal needs the subject of study. It is manifest beyond any argument that as a rule this has not been done. Few subjects have been standardized as fully as gymnastics, where every movement is in unison; and gymnastics still survive in many institutions. Even sports and games have sometimes been formalized to a demoralizing degree. The amount of successful correctional work done in colleges is entirely negligible, and the amount of attention given to the especially gifted is much greater than the attention given to those in need of correctional activity.

If the twenty intellectually best students in the school were sorted out from their fellows and given the same disproportionate attention that the twenty best athletes are given by the coach and the department of physical education, there would be a shout of protest over the dangers of building an intellectual aristocracy, and over the pampering of the especially gifted. Indeed, it is one of the notable educational facts that, in general, America supplies more
energy, time, thought, attention, and money to the mediocre student
than to the especially gifted student. But in the field of physical
education and athletics it has been the practice to reverse that policy
and spend a disproportionately large part of our time upon the
physically gifted. There are many colleges so small and so poor
that they cannot afford a full-time director of physical education,
but there are very few who do not have a coach, even if he be
part-time, and many have a part-time coach who has no other work
in physical education. In other words, in many schools only the
physically gifted get any attention at all!

The curriculum of the modern college is built upon the basis of
individual tastes and aptitudes. A very few basic tool subjects are
required. For the rest, an effort is made to see that the student
learns something about several things in the first two years and
much about some specific field in the last two. We offer a wide
variety of electives. The purpose is to accommodate the special
interests, needs, and capacities of the student body. But in the field
of physical education and athletics there has been a strong tendency
to restrict the choice of activities very narrowly, and to have the
choice based, not so much upon the interests, tastes, capacities, and
needs of the students, as upon public excitement and other factors
of that character. Thus the motivating force that comes from variety
is lost. Thus we tend to restrict the number of students who par-
ticipate, and lay the emphasis upon a small group with a specific
skill rather than upon the very much larger group with varied skills.
It is perfectly obvious that many a boy who ought not to play
football ought to play tennis. No one will contend that the values
of tennis can be adequately exploited without some training in the
execution of its plays. There is as much “form” in a drive or a
lob as there is in blocking or tackling. There is, I suppose, as
much value in swimming as in basketball—and again it is necessary
to have instruction and training in order to get the maximum benefit.
If there are benefits in competition, are we not obligated to extend
those benefits to as many students as possible, and should we not
multiply the forms of competition so that students with varied physi-
cal talents may participate?

MANIFESTLY, we should take into account the significance
of habit and utility in after life. There has been an enormous
drive away from subjects whose utility in adult life is not obvious.
Emphasis has been put upon teaching the students things which they
can actually use. I noticed in a New York newspaper that in one
institution with a strong football team, many of the members came
from a school of commerce. That school was organized specifically
to provide the largest possible “carry-over” of educational material
in after life. From the standpoint of "carry-over," from the stand-
point of building habits of exercise which will be continued, the
more highly publicized sports are the least useful. If it is complained
that the boy or girl who studies Latin never reads a Latin book after
graduation, it is equally true that the boy who plays football almost
never again plays football after leaving school.

On the other hand, the "minor" sports are precisely the ones
wherein recreative habits are established which may be maintained
in after years. If this argument were carried to its logical extreme
we should lay our principal emphasis upon golf. But I am not
advocating going to logical extremes. I am suggesting that we have
gone to illogical extremes from an educational point of view, and
that we should redress the balance. We should bring to bear on this
problem of building adequate habits of recreation all that we bring
to bear in trying to build intellectual habits by way of variety of
appeal, by recognition of special aptitudes and skills, and by laying
our emphasis upon training in those things which will have a direct
carry-over into after life.

At Lawrence College, we have three hundred and ninety boys in
the four classes. For those boys, in addition to football, basketball,
and track, we maintain teams, when they can find competition, in
swimming, cross-country, wrestling, tennis, and golf; and to those
intercollegiate sports we have added intramural fencing, hockey,
volleyball, baseball, handball, boxing, and squash. It is altogether
likely that the development of a program as varied and diverse as
that, and the maintenance of so many intercollegiate branches with
relatively so small a number of boys, has lowered our percentage
of victories in football and basketball. If, however, we look at the
matter from the point of view of the benefit to the individual student,
and from the point of view of individual differences, and from the
point of view of the enthusiasms that come from variety, and the
values which come from habit formation, the gains are infinitely
greater than the losses.

It is a fair question, of course, whether such a program is ruin-
ously expensive. The answer is that it depends upon whether one
is ready to sacrifice something of the perfection of the finish upon
the teams which attract public attention in order that the staff may
have time to devote to the other activities. Of course, if there is no
limit to the amount of money one can spend, one can put a high
polish upon all the activities. But so far as educational benefits are
concerned there is no reason for spending more upon one type of
activity than upon another, proportional to the number who partici-
pate in that activity.
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THE physical education program in a college ought to be subordinated to the principal purpose of the institution. That principal purpose is to develop intellectual skills. If the purpose were to develop physical skills the institution would be of an entirely different sort. That is not to detract from physical education. The same is true of social education; there is no sneer more damning than to call a college a country club.

It is manifest that the refinements of physical skill, achieved by some of our over-coached athletes, do not compensate for the deficiencies in intellectual skill involved in the engrossment of time and attention by athletics. If his subsequent livelihood is to come from physical skills, rather than intellectual, he should not have come to college.

Is there evidence that athletics do detract from intellectual skills? In Wisconsin data are available upon the basis of which one can form some estimate of the intellectual costs of refined physical skills. When a student graduates from high school we have two measures of his achievement and his capacity, his high school record, and his intelligence rating by a state wide test. If one will develop the matter statistically, he can determine whether the athletes as a group win high school grades which their intelligence indicates they should win. Just for experimental purposes we worked that out so far as the persons who entered Lawrence College during the last three years were concerned. We took the intelligence scores of the class and the high school averages and compared the athletes with the entire class. This was a legitimate procedure, inasmuch as the boy who was ineligible for high school athletics was also below the standard for college admission. The results showed that so far as intelligence was concerned the athletes were somewhat better than the average of the class; fifty-six per cent of all athletes were in the upper half. This is effective demonstration that their skills were not peculiarly physical, that their intellectual capacities were more than equal to the intellectual capacities of the other students. On the other hand, when their high school grades were studied it was found that their averages were below the averages of the entire class, there being a considerable margin in some cases. Thus we were led to the inescapable conclusion that concentration upon athletic activities had in a large number of cases (enough to affect the total result markedly) led the athlete to do poorer scholastic work than his intelligence warranted.

Then we applied the same test to students in college. In this case the term "athlete" had a broader meaning, because we maintain several sports, so that a large percentage of the men academically eligible for intercollegiate competition actually participate. We made a further departure from the earlier study by comparing the athletes
not with the whole class but with the non-athletes. On these bases it developed that the intelligence ratings of the "athletes" were slightly lower than those of the non-athletes. During the freshman year of ineligibility, and during the sophomore year when relatively few "make" the teams as regulars, the average grade of the athletes was equal to the average grade of the non-athletes. But during the junior year, and more markedly during the senior year the grades of the athletes fell below the grades of the non-athletes. This was true even in a college where there is none of the high-pressure variety of athletics. I think no one would contend that the values an undergraduate receives from participation in sports to such an extent that it adversely affects his scholastic work are comparable to the values he would receive if he participated only to an extent which would maintain his physical vigor for his intellectual work.

The customary program of physical education and athletics is often defended upon the ground that it is valuable in the work of promotion, in the maintenance of community interest, or in the development of the loyalty of the constituency. This is more false rationalization. In reality it should have no more to do with any of these worthy objects than any other part of the educational program. For more than a decade it has been asserted that students were thronging to college in such insistent numbers that highly selective methods of admission were necessary. Yet during that period the most ingenious schemes for colonizing athletes have been developed, and football has been openly used, even by some of the very largest schools, as an advertising medium. Despite popular opinion to the contrary, every careful study of the matter has demonstrated that victory or defeat does not significantly affect attendance; and it certainly does not affect income other than gate receipts. Even if it were otherwise, it is manifest that college publicity ought to center about major intellectual objectives. Social life and sports should occupy distinctly secondary positions. It is a slander upon community intelligence to intimate that only by an appeal to its love of victory may the constituency be brought to understand the value of the college.

The alumni, in particular, have been appealed to by an extravagant athletic emphasis. In point of fact the alumni should not appear in the pattern at all, save as they have their proper representation upon the board of trustees of the college. This is not to be interpreted as an assault upon the alumni, or as an attempt to flout their desires. It is one of my sincere beliefs that the alumni have not been so greatly at fault. With a few honorable exceptions, almost no sustained effort has been made to make the relationship between the college and its alumni primarily intellectual in character. The graduates are usually
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given a gossipy magazine, frequent appeals for money, and news about athletics. When faculties and administrative officers cease talking about the alumni as though they were brainless persons with no other interests a great stride forward will have been taken. Every serious attempt at the establishment of an intellectual contact between the college and its alumni has met with success. As that program becomes general, and develops momentum, the problem of the relationship of the alumni to athletics will sink into insignificance.

The high-pressure program has often been defended upon the ground that it improves the "morale" of the student body. One president expressed it in these terms: football "invigorates the life of the college." I doubt that the hysteria of victory, or the gloom over defeat, incident to undue stress upon football, actually invigorates the life of the college. I deny that the appeal to a man to set aside his own wishes and interests so that he may fight for the fame of good old Myopia is educationally legitimate. If the discipline of the coach were exercised by professors, it would produce a roar of protest. And if the hyper-emotional appeals which characterize a football rally were made in the name of religion the college would be denounced as backward and intolerant. College morale should rest squarely upon fine teaching, an interesting social life, and a sane recreational program. There are problems enough in the attempt to create an atmosphere of intellectual purpose; they are made much more difficult by the false morale incident to athletic over-emphasis.

In point of fact the students themselves, in many institutions, have made it perfectly patent that the whole ballyhoo is stupid and unreal. More than once they have precipitated overdue reforms. So far as the constructive results of football "invigoration" are concerned, no one has ever produced evidence to indicate that intellectual life prospers and thrives in direct proportion to the percentage of victories or the size of gate receipts. In fact if the argument that high pressure football is necessary to student morale had not been current for years one would regard it as too stupid to be invented. Nothing is plainer history than that the more famous football colleges have not led the way to the intellectual renaissance of the American college.

Cultivation of public attention and community interest, alumni loyalty, and student morale are all not only legitimate but important. But it is manifest that it is not desirable, and it is not proper to achieve these ends by any exploitation of students. In so far as these objectives may be achieved by student activity educative in character, and without any deflection from the legitimate goals of the educational process, there can be no criticism.

WE HAVE had a great deal of rationalization of the absurdities of the athletic program under the guise of character building. We have all heard it said that the coach is a more potent influence
in the matter of character than the dean of the chapel. But the hunger for advertising, the victory complex and the "big gate" ambition are associated with a whole host of petty dishonesties. There are very few elements in college life that do more to corrode character than the shady practices associated with the colonization of athletes. When rival institutions bid for a boy on the basis of his physical prowess he is not to be blamed for a distorted sense of values. Whoever pays a boy, by whatever indirect device, when he is not supposed to be paid, is helping him build an expectation and a habit which will prove detrimental to his character. Borrowing money is serious business; whoever makes a "loan" without expectation of repayment, is helping break down a boy's sense of the importance of meeting his obligations. Giving a boy grades he does not earn, or giving him a job with nominal duties or with pay higher than the job deserves, is injurious to character development. To prate about the influence of the coach or about character building in an institution where any of these devices are tolerated is shameful. The coach, under proper conditions, may exercise great influence, as may a teacher in any other field. But the integrity of the institution itself is a necessary precedent.

IN CONCLUSION, speaking as one who has followed this matter for many years, and as one bearing the scars of battle, I am not so pessimistic as my friends in your organization. Do not wait for the president. Frame a sane and balanced program, and fight for it boldly. The newspapers will back it; the sports writers may call you professors, as though that were a term of opprobrium, but the editors will call you educators. The undergraduate is already, for the most part, won over. The alumni have centered their loyalty about the theatrical elements which were played up to them; they have a deeper, a more sincere, and a more significant loyalty to which you can successfully appeal. The trustees and the public have supported the institutions of the country with a generosity which is, soberly speaking, one of the wonders of the world. For every dollar that has been given because of interest in high-pressure athletics, there have been thousands given in the hope that the colleges will do something intellectually significant. There is no room for doubt that they will continue to support a sane and balanced program. Indeed many of the greatest potential benefactors will heave a sigh of relief at the disappearance of the most serious threat to the integrity of the college. I have a profound faith that the distressing era of moral fatigue is drawing to a close, and that all the constituent elements of the American college are ready for your leadership.