

CHAPTER IX

EXTRAMURAL RELATIONSHIPS

- I. EXTRAMURAL RELATIONSHIPS AND THE ALUMNI
 - A. The Relation of the Alumnus to Alma Mater
 - B. His Relation to Athletics
- II. INTER-COLLEGE RIVALRY IN ATHLETICS
 - A. Wholesome Aspects of Intercollegiate Rivalry
 - B. Harmful Aspects of Intercollegiate Rivalry
 - 1. Unsatisfactory Relations without Abandonment of Competition
 - 2. The Severance of Athletic Relationships
- III. ATHLETIC CONFERENCES
 - A. Origins and Development of Athletic Conferences
 - B. Representative Regulations
 - C. Notes on the Execution of Conference Rules
- IV. CERTAIN NATIONAL RELATIONSHIPS OF AMERICAN COLLEGE ATHLETICS
 - A. National Bodies
 - 1. The National Collegiate Athletic Association
 - 2. The Intercollegiate Association of Amateur Athletes of America
 - 3. The National Amateur Athletic Federation
 - B. Individual Relationships to National Bodies and Competitions
- V. THE INTERNATIONAL BEARINGS OF AMERICAN COLLEGE ATHLETICS
 - A. International Competition and International Amity
 - B. College and School Contests
 - C. Organizations Possessing International Affiliations
 - 1. The International Amateur Athletic Federation
 - 2. The Amateur Athletic Union of the United States
 - 3. The American Olympic Association

JUST as the ripples from a stone cast into a pool widen till they reach its shores, so the relationships of college athletics broaden as they spread beyond the institution. Of these relationships, the most intimate concern the graduates and former students of the college. Rooted in a sentiment sown and fostered during undergraduate days, persisting among the most cherished memories of later life, they are for many graduates of American universities the most sacred of ties and obligations. Rather more primitive are the relationships between institutions, which affect all members of the college families. The widening circle of athletic relationships encounters next the conferences and associations that bind together the common interests of neighboring institutions, then the representative national bodies, and finally the organizations that provide channels for the contacts of American college athletes with the athletes of other nations. With these relationships and with a few of their implications the present discussion is concerned.

I. EXTRAMURAL RELATIONSHIPS AND THE ALUMNI

Although the alumnus is a member of the college family, yet in the great majority of cases his life and interests lie beyond college walls. Graduates of the older English universities maintain their connection with those institutions through "keeping their names on the books," that is, by the payment of certain fees under certain conditions which entitle them to voting membership in the university organization. Something of the same procedure obtains in Canada. At some of the Scottish universities alumni

are being organized into associations. The direct connection of the American alumnus with his university is formally through the alumni association.

For many years American universities and colleges have expended much effort to interest their alumni. It will be convenient to consider first the more general aspects of the alumnus's relation to his college and then his influence and relation in college athletics.

A. THE RELATION OF THE ALUMNUS TO ALMA MATER

The tender and peculiar place which the university or the college should occupy in the affections of its alumni is not to be denied or impugned. It is compounded of gratitude which prompts to service, a love that springs from impressionable years passed as an undergraduate under the protection of the Fostering Mother, and the tendency common to many men and women to look into the past for the Golden Age. These considerations form the ideal basis for the relation of the alumnus to his college.

This ideal is rarely fulfilled. The failure is as much the fault of those who direct the college as it is of the graduates. Whether from shortcomings of modern civilization or from specific weaknesses in our educational processes, the attitude of the college toward its alumni and of the alumni toward their college is at the root materialistic. Between the graduate and the university there has for years existed a tacit bargain: for money and for activity of interest the college in effect offers certain rewards. The alumnus of to-day is thought of principally as a source of funds for endowment drives, operating expenses, and the maintenance of undergraduate activities. Seldom does he evince interest, without being solicited in support of a financial campaign. In return he receives prominence, the promise of power, and the self-satisfaction that these and his activities bring. With repetition of these conditions the attitude of the alumnus may end by becoming proprietary. The power which he has received takes the form of governance and trusteeship, whether of the university or of athletics.¹

Four considerations must be kept in mind. In the first place, only a small proportion of the alumni of any university or college are active in the administration of the institution, whether in affairs of the alumni association or in athletics. Secondly, the aspects of American college life that have contributed to make graduates "self-starting and self-propelling" — to borrow the phrase of President Lowell — have been principally extra-curricular as distinguished from academic. Thirdly, in soliciting alumni support, the college has emphasized and received it in tangible matters; the interest of the alumni in the intangibles of American college or university life has been recognized only recently and its growth thus far has been limited. Fourthly, whether or not participation in athletics as an undergraduate prompts to graduate interest in the institution as a whole, it can at least be said of the graduates who manifest interest on behalf of the university that former athletes are likely to be interested in athletics, and especially in the branch in which they as students took part.

¹ Eighteenth Annual Report of the Carnegie Foundation, 1925, pages 38-39.

B. HIS RELATION TO ATHLETICS

Just as an ideal relation occasionally exists between the alumnus and the general affairs of the university, so a corresponding ideal relationship may sometimes be found with respect to athletics. It is manifested by that rare alumnus who sees individual boys as the educational units in college life, who expends his best effort in developing not alone their physical prowess but also their contacts with their fellow students and especially their relationship to the things of the mind and of the spirit. To such an alumnus intellectual endeavor, a knowledge of the past, honesty, right living, industry, and love of athletic games all have their appropriate places in the life of the undergraduate. Such an alumnus is of wholesome influence, even though he can afford to give little in time or money.

On the other hand, the usual current relationship of alumni to athletics manifests itself in two ways: the control of policies, and the recruiting and financing of athletes. Probably not a fifth of all alumni are active in either direction.

1. Alumni Influence upon Details of Coaching

At a number of institutions (Brown, Rutgers, and other universities) not the least of the coach's difficulties has been the interference of alumni with the practical details of instruction, chiefly in football. The members of alumni advisory committees are nearly always prominent former players or erstwhile coaches. Naturally they have favorite theories and notions which they wish to see used. A coach who is passive by nature or who for reasons of harmony fears that he must give ear to the suggestions of advisory committees discovers too late that some of the best features of his own teaching have been modified.

2. Alumni and Athletic Policies

The influence and activity of alumni in formulating the policies of universities and colleges as regards athletics have already been discussed at length in Chapter V. Only a few brief observations need be added.

In the modern American university, the graduate manager or treasurer and his functions bear witness to the importance of the alumni and the esteem in which they are held. Their influence is felt in the appointment of coaches, the shaping and administering of coaching policies, the erection and size of stadiums, building programs, the provision and distribution of tickets, the making of schedules, and, indeed, in practically all of the extramural relationships of college athletics. Seldom do alumni manifest strong interest in intramural programs or competition. Although many play golf, tennis, squash, and handball, relatively few appear to realize the importance of cultivating in all undergraduates the experience of games that are suitable to his enjoyment and recreation in later life. The present-day attitude of alumni toward athletics

is essentially the product of our long-standing emphasis upon extramural competition. It is likely that the growth of intramural games will give future graduates a different point of view.

Football attracts most of the alumni attention. During undergraduate days it draws and keeps the interest of men and women students to an extraordinary degree. After graduation the interest persists but does not manifest itself in active participation. Very few players take part in football games for more than five or six years after graduation. In the United States, contests at football between alumni and undergraduates have little to commend them; the graduates, "fat and scant of breath," endure, with little credit to their zeal, the falls, knocks, and runs of American football, while the student players receive small benefit from meeting a team possessing only antiquated strategy and tactics. That this should be so is one of the principal limitations of American football. True, a few alumni who have formerly played on college teams join local or amateur organizations after graduation. In California, for football, and in New York City, for basketball, athletic clubs provide opportunity and training accommodations for graduate athletes; teams representing these clubs are almost invariably more skilful than undergraduate college organizations. Some college graduates, especially from the Middle West, enter professional football for a few years, and a larger number take up coaching or physical education. But by their thirtieth birthdays the great majority of graduates feel more at home in their seats at a football spectacle than they would in suits upon any field. In Great Britain this is not the case. English Rugby, soccer, and the special football games of certain public schools, once mastered, are not infrequently played almost until middle age. The interest of the American changes early from the active to the passive. Usually it expresses itself in attending games, listening to broadcasts play-by-play, participating in the shaping of college athletic policies, subscribing money for equipment and increased facilities, and in other similar works. Much the same is true of other forms of athletics in American colleges and universities.

3. The Procurement and Support of Athletes

Although methods and procedure in recruiting and subsidizing college athletes are discussed at length in Chapter X, a word may be said here concerning the motives which lead alumni to these practices. 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.

The guidance of alumni interest and activity in athletics presents one of the crucial problems of college administration. What is needed is not more interest on the part of graduates, but the direction of this interest to ends that will truly benefit undergraduates. At present, too few alumni look upon athletics as a factor of higher education which prepares for afterlife, where games and outdoor contests ought to play their part. The most active of the alumni in a number of institutions, consciously or unconsciously, tend to make college athletics a preparation for professional athletics.

II. INTER-COLLEGE RIVALRY IN ATHLETICS

Rivalry between institutions springs spontaneously from college pride. It is not confined to athletics. Annual competitions in glee and chorus singing, in debates, and, indeed, in any form of activity in which two institutions desire to test their skill, bear witness to the fact that rivalry exists in many phases of college life. But in no other form of competition is public interest so keen as in athletics. This was not always the case either in England or in the United States. Intercollegiate athletic rivalry in its early days was informal and important principally to undergraduates. The influence of alumni and the acceptance of the principle that their desires must be served grew later out of the sentiment engendered and cumulated in succeeding generations of undergraduates.

A. WHOLESOME ASPECTS OF INTERCOLLEGIATE RIVALRY

It is not to be doubted that a wholesome and magnanimous rivalry in athletic competition between two or more institutions represents a salutary condition in undergraduate life, especially as between two or more institutions of approximately the same size, with comparable ideals and traditions. Among the best examples of such rivalry in the East stands the relation between Amherst College, Wesleyan University, and Williams College, which for a number of years have competed keenly in both athletics and in other fields of endeavor, and, more recently, the relation of St. John's College, Annapolis, to some of its opponents. Not the least good resulting from such pleasant relationships is to be traced in the mutual respect, magnanimity, and hospitality between institutions and the inter-college friendships which individual undergraduates cherish. So long as relations such as these remain normal, there is little trace of the institutional jealousy and distrust which quickly become the sources of many evils. Under guidance,

athletics can be made to contribute to pleasant inter-college or inter-university relationships. It is not a question of checking such rivalry, but of tempering and directing it to salutary ends.

B. HARMFUL ASPECTS OF INTERCOLLEGIATE RIVALRY

The discussion which follows is based upon a study of the intercollegiate relations of some forty colleges and universities in the United States and Canada.² Some of these relations are cordial, others are bitter, many have been severed. It is matter of history that many colleges and universities have been engaged in disputes with other institutions with which their relations should have been friendly and tolerant. The fact that in a great number of such instances the causes in dispute have been forgotten gives ground for the hope that much of the bad feeling which to-day exists in inter-university dealings may in time be replaced by a sportsmanlike magnanimity.

Unpleasant intercollegiate relationships have in some cases given rise to distrust, without leading to the abandonment of athletic competition. In other cases they have progressed so far that athletic contests have been abandoned.

1. Unsatisfactory Relations without Abandonment of Competition

To the attention of this study have come at least three instances in which the relations existing between colleges or universities have been for a number of years far from satisfactory but not so acute as to lead to the severance of athletic competition. During the past few years, contests between two Eastern institutions and between three universities in the Far West have been held not for reasons of friendship — which have long since disappeared — but for the sake of the financial return from gate receipts and guarantees. At a dinner tendered to two football squads representing Mid-Western universities, much of the evening was passed in charges and countercharges of recruiting and subsidizing of players at the respective institutions. It is doubtful if under such circumstances a continuance of athletic competition is desirable or beneficial. The attitude of distrust and suspicion invalidates whatever good might flow from a continuation of relationships.

² In collecting information concerning intercollegiate rivalry the following groups of relationships were considered: University of Alabama with Auburn Polytechnic Institute, Amherst College with Massachusetts Agricultural College, Baylor University with Texas Agricultural and Mechanical College, Brown University with Dartmouth College, University of California with University of Southern California, University of California with Stanford University, University of Chicago with Northwestern University, Columbia University with New York University, University of Georgia with the Georgia School of Technology, Harvard University with Princeton University, Harvard University with Yale University, Haskell Institute with several institutions that competed in the Drake University Relay Races, Holy Cross College with Harvard University, University of Iowa with Iowa State, University of Michigan with University of Minnesota, University of Michigan with Notre Dame University, Notre Dame University with University of Southern California, University of Oklahoma with University of Nebraska, University of Oklahoma with Oklahoma Agricultural College, University of Oregon with Oregon Agricultural College, University of Pittsburgh with University of Pennsylvania, Princeton University with University of Pennsylvania, Princeton University with Rutgers University, Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute with Union University, University of Toronto with McGill University and other Canadian institutions, U. S. Military Academy with Syracuse University, U. S. Military Academy with U. S. Naval Academy, Washington State College with University of Washington. In each instance an unprejudiced attempt was made to ascertain the views of all parties regarding relations or their severance. It is not intended in the present study to pass judgment upon the merits of any claim or dispute that may be involved in the relationships which are discussed.

2. The Severance of Athletic Relationships

The reasons which lead to the severance of athletic relations between institutions, in so far as they are ascertainable, are usually of the utmost complexity. Sometimes breaks have been of such long standing that it is impossible to discover what conditions occasioned them or whether the existing ill feeling arose after the break or before it. Usually many acts or conditions were involved, no one of which upon examination was apparently of sufficient strength alone to have caused the break. Frequently the reason which has been alleged for a discontinuance of athletic competition was merely an excuse. In every instance, however, the immediate cause was bad feeling between the partisans of the institutions. In almost every instance, its origin appears to have been an overweening desire for victory and the reputation that victory is supposed to bring.

Of the matters involved in these breaks the most direct and acutely contributing factor was disorder at or during football games. Certain other cases of ill feeling are ascribable to close scores and possibly to the lost wagers which they involved. In three instances a financial loss on gate receipts which made contests not sufficiently profitable is the reason alleged for the failure of natural rivals to compete. Questionable alumni activities at one institution and the desire on the part of a director to give his fellow-director at the rival university a means of combating the recruitment and subsidizing of athletes led to the abandonment of football games between two universities in the Mid-West. Jealousy of the apportionment of state aid to sister institutions and personal animosities of directors, coaches, and other officers have contributed to similar results. Personal animosities on the part of directors, managers, and alumni have been handed down from generation to generation for no justifiable cause; even when changes have supervened in the personnel at rival institutions (Brown, Dartmouth; Princeton, Pennsylvania), ill feeling may persist. Finally, in at least eight cases, a variety of reasons are put forth for abandoning competition. In a few instances an ill-disguised feeling of superiority on the part of one or both of the universities involved made contests impossible. Undergraduate pranks not connected with athletics and disputes over eligibility have played their part. Upon three occasions low scholastic standards have been advanced as the cause of the abandonment of competition. This excuse is frequently put forward by many private institutions to justify their refusal to compete with Catholic colleges and universities. It was also invoked recently in the disputes resulting from success of the team representing the Haskell Institute at the Drake University Relay Races. The counter-statement has been made that, during those races, when the Haskell team gave evidence of superlative excellence, the treatment accorded to its members by representatives of other institutions became markedly discourteous. Incidentally, the excuse of low standards has more than once been used to cloak real reasons for severance of relationships.

A study of these cases prompts the following observations: First, the source of the ill feeling that has resulted in a majority of these breaks has been intercollegiate football. Moreover, in many instances in which football relations have been severed, com-

petition in other branches of athletics, including soccer, has survived the breaking off of relations in football. Such facts reflect the overvaluation of football, and its attendant importance in rousing bad feeling among colleges and universities in the United States. Far from invariably leading to friendly rivalry, clean and manly contests, and pleasant regard, as its proponents never tire of insisting, American football, whether from its intrinsic nature as a body-contact game or from the abuses that have grown up to choke it, has bred distrust, suspicion, jealousy, and physical violence.

Theoretically, any college, however small, should be able to compete with any institution, however large. Practically, competition between small and large universities has given rise to dissatisfaction and dishonesty. As one well-informed critic has written, "I am firmly convinced that no institution of less than one thousand male students can compete on an equal basis with an institution of two thousand or more students honestly." Although these criteria appear to be somewhat crude, the principle that underlies them is valid. It is impaired in its operation by the financial returns to be gained by competition with much larger institutions in the same conference (in the Intercollegiate Conference, Chicago, Northwestern, and Purdue, with eligibles ranging in number from five hundred to a thousand, compete with Michigan, Minnesota, and Wisconsin, whose eligibles number from four to six thousand; Idaho and Washington State in the Pacific Coast Conference). In some conferences small colleges suffer many inconveniences and even indignities rather than withdraw. The ambition to compete outside of a class has given rise to many deleterious influences and temptations.

Secondly, the regrettable fact appears that very few colleges and universities of the country make any genuine effort to understand life and conditions at other institutions, whether those institutions be athletic rivals or not. Such a state of affairs is doubly unfortunate in view of the value of a sincere college loyalty that grows from the understanding of even a few other universities, the mutual respect prompted thereby, and, no matter what superficial appearance may seem to indicate, a disposition to forbearance. Generally, the cultivation of a beneficent college loyalty in extramural relationships is a task of years that demands the sympathetic guidance and work of older men and women, — presidents, alumni, frequently members of faculties, who, understanding the implications of even latent hostilities, labor unobtrusively to change conditions that do no credit to any university or college. The resumption of athletic relationships between Amherst College and the Massachusetts Agricultural College, the long traditional rivalry between Harvard and Yale, Amherst and Williams, Purdue and Indiana in spite of divided appropriations from the state, may be cited as proof. In the majority of these instances the attitude of certain individuals, translated into action, has done much to bring about and maintain cordiality. The change of the word "Opponents" to "Visitors" on the score board of the Harvard stadium is a case in

point. The hospitality of the University of Toronto to visiting teams, of Cornell University on the occasion of the annual indoor intercollegiate tennis tournament for the Larned cup, and of many other universities during May regattas, contrasts sharply with the fact that usually, when accommodations for two teams at one institution differ, the guests are assigned to the inferior quarters. Managers and directors have more or less apologetically attempted to justify the condition by explaining that, first, it would be unfair to the home team if visitors were better accommodated, since better accommodations might contribute to better physical condition and an advantage in the contest, and secondly, that since the home team is regularly established in the best available quarters, it is far simpler if they occupy them rather than yield them to their guests. The difference implied between athletic hospitality and other forms need not be elaborated. Bad feeling between institutions is often roused deliberately by coaches and by newspaper writers who report practice or contests. The undergraduate rally preceding a football game which does not emphasize the hospitality that should be shown visiting teams and spectators had best be abolished. Furthermore, instances have been rehearsed in which a partisan spirit among an undergraduate body has led even to the rebuke of men who have cheered opponents or recognized their excellence or skill. Comparatively few universities or colleges attempt to instill into their undergraduate bodies the notion that, on the occasion of the annual football game or other contest with the natural rival on home grounds, undergraduates are really hosts. Much the same is true of preparations for students to accompany teams to games played away from home. Too often visiting partisans not only exhibit the worst of manners, but indulge in recalcitrant disorders which disgrace both the institutions and the games. A private individual whose guests smash furniture, drink to excess, and generally make themselves obnoxious, is amply justified in no longer offering them hospitality.

The attitude of mind which many intercollegiate athletic contests reflect presents a problem that is really social. Hospitality on the part of a group can be cultivated, and the reason it is not more evidenced is a lack of initiative, or even an adverse sentiment on the part of older persons. If it were necessary to fix the responsibility for mutual understanding between colleges and universities, it would be salutary if the initiative in courtesy were taken by the larger institution.

Thirdly, undergraduate opinion upon the merits of institutional rivalry has demonstrated itself to be illogical, emotional, easily provoked by rumors emanating from players, coaches, alumni, and other partisans, false or one-sided newspaper accounts of games, all of which readily flame into hostility and contribute after graduation to an inimical sentiment among alumni.

Finally, it is a commentary upon American sportsmanship that when athletic relations are severed, the initiative is generally taken by the institution that has been losing games over a series of years.

III. ATHLETIC CONFERENCES

A third phase of extramural relations is represented by athletic conferences. Although these bodies differ widely in composition, nevertheless their organization, purposes, and methods exhibit many resemblances one to another.

The athletic conference of to-day may be described as a voluntary regional association of colleges and universities through elected or appointed representatives for discussion of problems concerning intercollegiate athletics, formulation of regulations to govern athletic contests between member institutions, and usually the conduct of competitions in various branches of inter-college and inter-school athletics. Thus its functions are deliberative, regulatory, and executive. Although the powers of conferences vary, most of the forty-two associations that have come to the attention of this study possess police functions respecting violation of their rules. One or two, notably the Intercollegiate Conference, have gone further than others in engaging a commissioner and a paid executive staff. Other bodies appropriate sums of money for secretarial allowances, clerical assistance, and various services. In certain instances the conference is based upon special mutual interests or affiliations; witness, the Colored Intercollegiate Athletic Conference and the so-called Eastern Jesuit Conference, which is less a formal conference than a mutual informal agreement. The athletic conference, as the term is used in the present discussion, being essentially regional, is to be distinguished from a national association in size, membership, and geographical extent. Thus, although the National Collegiate Athletic Association possesses many of the characteristics of an athletic conference, it is a national representative body.

A. ORIGINS AND DEVELOPMENT OF ATHLETIC CONFERENCES

The predecessors of the athletic conference, as we know it to-day, are to be traced in three organizations of the 1870's.

Of these, the first in respect of time was the Rowing Association of American Colleges which, formed in 1870, included most of the New England colleges and universities and three or four in New Jersey and New York State.³ For six years the Association conducted intercollegiate regattas with varying success. The Rowing Association was apparently dominated by Harvard and Yale, "the minor colleges taking sides with either one or the other. This rivalry, together with the difficulty of managing and judging so many crews on the same course, led to much doubtful diplomacy and frequent controversies."⁴ In 1876, the intense rivalry between Harvard and Yale led to their withdrawal and the wreck of the Association. A second tributary to the stream of college conferences was the Intercollegiate Association of Amateur Athletes of America, founded in 1875, while a third is to be traced in the convention of American colleges that met in New York City in 1876 to establish rules for intercollegiate football competition, — a predecessor of the Football Rules Committee of the present day.

³ Sheldon, *Student Life and Customs*, New York, 1901, pages 250-255.

⁴ *Ibid.*, page 251.

A fourth intercollegiate agreement, formulated in 1878, bound together twelve colleges for competition not in athletics but in public speaking, essay writing, and exercises in Greek, Latin, mathematics, and mental science.⁵ Doubtless the convenience, utility, and practicability of intercollegiate associations such as these led to the formation of intercollegiate conferences dealing exclusively with athletic competition. The Southern Intercollegiate Conference was founded in 1894, followed by the (Mid-Western) Intercollegiate Conference one year later. The dates of the founding of other conferences were as follows: Maine Intercollegiate Track and Field Association 1896, North-west Conference 1904, Canadian Intercollegiate Athletic Union 1906, Missouri Valley Conference 1907, Rocky Mountain Faculty Athletic Conference 1909, Southwest Athletic Conference 1914, the original Harvard-Yale-Princeton agreement 1916, Pacific Northwest Intercollegiate Conference 1923, California Coast Conference 1926, Eastern Intercollegiate Athletic Conference 1928.

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

It will suffice to consider a few of the important provisions laid down by some of the more influential conferences touching faculty control, eligibility, the general subject of compensation of players, including recruiting, proselyting, subsidies, and scholarships; training seasons, tables, and quarters; summer baseball, coaches, and sportsmanship. The great majority of conference regulations are designed to apply especially to football. Indeed, the framers of conference rules apparently place other forms of athletic competition, like baseball, basketball, and track and field events, in a decidedly subordinate position.

1. Faculty Control

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

⁵ Harold De Wolf Fuller, *New York University Alumnus*, Vol. VII, No. 9, 1926, page 9. The institutions subscribing to the agreement were Colgate (then Madison College), College of the City of New York, Cornell, Lafayette, New York University, Northwestern, Princeton, Rutgers, St. Johns, Syracuse, Wesleyan, and Williams.

For example, the (Mid-Western) Intercollegiate Conference, which has no written constitution, restricts its membership to "institutions having full 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. The Rocky Mountain Conference goes so far as to stipulate for institutional representation in the Conference only on a basis of professorial rank and to bar from such functions any person "whose duties include those of a coach or manager." Here, although faculty representatives have no very large authority, the matter rests with the presidents who, however, act with little semblance of unanimity. The Southern Conference "requires faculty responsibility and control in intercollegiate athletics" and insists that the "faculty members of the athletic committees in the different institutions of the Conference must constitute a majority and must assume the full responsibility for carrying out the eligibility rules of the Conference." Perhaps the Southern Conference more than any other exemplifies actual control by academic teachers.

In some conferences that stipulate for "faculty control," rules are so vigorously interpreted that they lose their value. For example, in the (Mid-Western) Intercollegiate Conference restriction upon compensation to players is regarded at some institutions as forbidding only payment for summer baseball. At least one faculty chairman in the Southwest Conference, differing with the action of the local scholarship committee in awarding semi-athletic scholarships, signs eligibility blanks almost as a matter of form. Here and there in the United States there is too much rationalizing and dictating of interpretations of rules by coaches, managers, and directors to undergraduates who should be led rather to follow the dictates of their own consciences as regards eligibility than to accept the interpretation of older persons who in one sense are certainly "wiser than they."

2. Eligibility

The endeavor to place intercollegiate competition upon a fair and equitable basis leads to regulations concerning the eligibility of players.

The (Mid-Western) Intercollegiate and Rocky Mountain Conferences make detailed provision for due attendance of players upon university exercises. Certification of eligibility is required by the (Mid-Western) Intercollegiate Conference, the Missouri Valley, the Pacific Coast, the Rocky Mountain, the Southern, and the Southwest. Most of the requirements concerning eligibility are very specific and detailed. Among the most stringent stands Rule 10 of the (Mid-Western) Intercollegiate Conference, which requires certification of athletes at the beginning of the season in each intercollegiate branch by each institution to every other, and a statement from each registrar concerning residence, attendance, and scholarship. "As to the remaining rules, the certification shall be by the chairman of the athletic board or committee." However excellent the intention of this regulation, it has led to a divided responsi-

bility. The business of the registrar is not the business of the chairman, and *vice versa*. On the contrary, eligibility certification in the Southern Conference, although it includes the registrar's statement, places the full responsibility for a player's status upon faculty chairmen of athletic committees. The Southwest Conference requires the approval of the chairman of the faculty committee of athletics upon each eligibility card of each player, which is mailed to the president of the Conference within one week after the opening of the session at every institution. Moreover, at the beginning and end of each playing season, lists are interchanged by the colleges of the Conference. A pre-season eligibility list must be in the hands of managers of opposing teams in the Rocky Mountain Conference five days before any game.

The (Mid-Western) Intercollegiate and Rocky Mountain Conferences are not alone in requiring from each athlete a statement over his own signature that he is eligible to compete in intercollegiate contests under the "letter and spirit" of the rules. The version of the Harvard-Yale-Princeton agreement, as revised in May, 1926, appears not to demand from the individual athlete a signed statement concerning his eligibility, but all three of the universities do in fact require it. In these three pacts and a number of others, the intention is to place the ultimate responsibility for the eligibility of any athlete upon his own honesty.

The general decrease in the number and complexity of the problems arising from the migration of athletes is probably ascribable in great measure to the very stringent regulation of almost all conferences concerning transfers. There is, however, no uniformity of detail. For example, the Pacific Coast Intercollegiate Conference lays down the rule that "a student who has established a residence in one institution loses the same when, upon entering a second institution, his fees shall become due; and he shall not represent the second institution until he has passed one season of each sport thereafter. He shall also lose one season's participation in each sport. However, registration for the summer session or quarter in a second institution shall not be considered as nullifying residence already established in the first." The supplementary agreement adopted by Harvard, Yale, and Princeton, and made effective January 1, 1923, provides that "any student who has, while enrolled in another university or college, taken part in competitive athletics as a member of his university, or college, or class team or crew while playing against opponents not members of that institution, shall be ineligible to represent Harvard, Yale, or Princeton in any sport in which he so represented his former college or university." This regulation as regards transferred students is probably the most stringent of any athletic pact.

Most of the American colleges restrict intercollegiate competition to undergraduates; Canadian institutions do not. Furthermore, all appear to require one year's residence before membership upon any 'varsity team, and the Intercollegiate Conference, under certain conditions, prohibits its teams from engaging "in athletic competition with institutions that do not require one year of residence before participation."⁶ The restriction of intercollegiate play to three years of undergraduate connection with

⁶ The Minutes of the Eighteenth Annual Meeting of the Association of New England Colleges for Conference on Athletics, held in May, 1925, reveal that in reply to a questionnaire sent out during that year by the Association, 3 colleges of the 21 members stated that they permitted freshmen to compete on university teams throughout the entire first year; 9, however, had a one-year rule, and 8 a partial-year rule. There is discernible among Eastern institutions a tendency to increase rather than to diminish the number of games on freshman schedules, although general opinion seems to be to the effect that a reduction of such schedules, besides preventing freshmen from participating on university teams, benefits the first-year men scholastically.

an institution is almost unanimous. To some of these requirements the United States Military Academy at West Point has felt that because of its peculiar constitution and position it could not subscribe. Finally, late registration by athletes is discouraged.

The subject of eligibility is much involved with certain other topics that are treated separately in these pages, for example, summer baseball and compensation to players. The great bulk of all intercollegiate rules, as set down by athletic conferences, represents an attempt to particularize eligibility as that status upon which any undergraduate in good academic standing, who is a genuine amateur athlete, may compete in intercollegiate contests as a member of an athletic organization representing his university or college.

3. Compensation to Players

Just as in the case of eligibility, so in the case of compensation to players in its broadest sense, the intention of the colleges and universities of the country is clear. Except in the matter of summer baseball, conferences and individual institutions agree that intercollegiate athletics are for the amateur and the amateur alone. The intent of all rules concerning recruiting, proselyting, and subsidizing of athletes is unmistakable.

The complexity and detail of conference rules governing these matters is the result of an attempt to specify and define *in extenso* as many as practicable of the acts or conditions which result in the giving and receiving of assistance in kind or in money, which impairs the amateur status of athletes. The intention may be commendable, but the attempt to cover every individual case by a regulation is futile. Of necessity it must result in the omission of certain instances or conditions in which no rule has been devised or, indeed, can be devised. Such omissions make possible covert agreements between individuals which, because they controvert both the regulations and their intent, can be regarded only as equivocal, detrimental, and dishonest. In conference regulations concerning recruiting and subsidizing, as in all other laws involving ethical values, "the letter killeth, but the spirit giveth life."

Although it is idle to quote examples in detail, it may be noted that the Harvard-Yale-Princeton agreement, now in force between Harvard and Yale and Princeton and Yale, appears to be unique in requiring that when assistance is given to an athlete, "the motives of those who extend the aid and the motives of those who receive it" shall be considered. The requirement in the supplementary agreement is that "no man who has ever received any pecuniary reward or its equivalent by reason of his connection with athletics — whether for playing, coaching, or acting as teacher in any branch of sport or engaging therein in any capacity — shall represent his university in any athletic team or crew except that the . . . [Two] Chairmen may permit such participation in intercollegiate athletics by men who might technically be debarred under

the letter of the rule, but who in the judgment of the Committee have not commercialized their athletic ability nor offended against the spirit of the foregoing provision." In spite of the fact that the listing of "playing, coaching, or acting as teacher in any branch of sport or engaging therein in any capacity" has led to some equivocation and evasion, nevertheless, no other agreement appears to rest so precisely upon the honor of the institutions involved.

4. Training Regulations

Conference rules concerning the training of athletes deal principally with the maintenance of training tables, camps, and quarters. As regards training tables, there are two attitudes, the one permissive, the other prohibitive. For example, the Pacific Coast Intercollegiate Conference and the Southwest Conference countenance training tables, the former limiting the table to the evening meal for football and basketball and imposing special restrictions upon crews, the latter providing that the entire cost of training tables is to be paid by the students who participate in their privileges. The (Mid-Western) Intercollegiate Conference, the Missouri Valley Conference, and the Southern Intercollegiate Conference permit no training tables whatsoever. Apparently the great majority of conferences have now taken legislative action in this matter in one way or the other.

Camps for the preparation of teams, especially in football, are prohibited by the (Mid-Western) Intercollegiate, Southern, and, except upon home grounds or campus, the Southwest Conferences. The Pacific Coast Intercollegiate Conference provides that "in crew the participants, because of the remoteness of practice waters and other considerations, shall be allowed to associate themselves together for the purpose of better preparing themselves for the contest, this at an expense to them not less than the expense at their regular eating places." This regulation appears to permit the use of training quarters by crews. Certainly it would be difficult for any university eight representing an inland institution to be deprived of the privilege of training quarters.

5. Summer Baseball

Conference regulations respecting summer baseball are more elastic than those bearing upon any other single topic.

They range from absolute prohibition (Intercollegiate Conference, Rules 6 and 7) through restricted participation (Harvard-Yale-Princeton agreement, Pacific Coast Intercollegiate Conference), to practically complete permission (Rocky Mountain Conference). In the middle group the favorite restriction embodies the requirement that permission to play summer baseball must be secured from the student's university athletic authorities. The Harvard-Yale-Princeton agreement appears to recognize, although somewhat timidly, the principle that a professional in one branch of athletics is a professional in all: "A student who takes part in summer baseball or in the work of a summer camp, without first securing the approval of the University Committee

on Eligibility jeopardizes his right thereafter to represent his university in any team or crew, and may in the discretion of the University Committee on Eligibility forfeit temporarily, or permanently, his right to do so." Two conferences, the Rocky Mountain and the Southern, restrict players to teams recognized by the National Baseball Commission. Although the Missouri Valley Conference "believes in the necessity of the amateur rule" it permits students to play summer baseball, presumably for pay, on home teams and agrees "to reinstate men who are technically ineligible through ignorance or through the acts of others." At the Nineteenth Annual Meeting of the Association of New England Colleges for Conference on Athletics it was stated by representatives present that Brown University allows its men to play baseball for money during the summer, as well as after-season football, and that four Maine colleges, namely Bates, Bowdoin, Colby, and the University of Maine, permit summer baseball except on professional teams operating under the national agreement. More than one college representative expressed the opinion that at present summer baseball playing cannot be controlled. In the words of Mr. C. A. O'Donnell, of Holy Cross College, "The attempt to cut out summer baseball is idealism. Only colleges where they have wealthy men can do it. The Western Conference claims to control it but it does not. Any boy who has a talent for baseball should be allowed to use it."

Few conferences or individual colleges have set their faces determinedly against summer baseball. Of the conferences, the (Mid-Western) Intercollegiate Conference has dealt commendably with the problem in its obvious phases as well as those most obscure. As a result, it probably suffers less from this form of commercialism than any other group of institutions in the country. The principle that the college should determine the eligibility of its players respecting summer baseball is, of course, no more efficacious than the practices that the colleges themselves permit under it. A very few institutions have taken a decided stand against summer baseball; for example, Cornell has strict regulations against it and enforces them conscientiously. The number of colleges that have followed the principle that an athlete who receives money for playing baseball at any time under any condition shall not represent them in intercollegiate contests would be negligible were it not for the honesty and the courage that such a course displays.

6. Coaching

With respect to the employment and status of coaches, only one tendency is common to all athletic conferences. Such associations as have legislated concerning the appointment of coaches agree upon the principle that members of the coaching staff shall be regularly employed by their institutions. Apparently none of the larger conferences recognize any distinction, whether in fact or in desirability, between (1) entrusting the coaching of teams or crews to men appointed primarily for work in academic subjects, (2) employing specialists in physical education, which is an essentially non-academic subject, as faculty members to coach, and (3) engaging as a coach with faculty status a former player whose occupation since graduation has been far from

academic. The Southern Conference prohibits employing as a coach any football player "who plays as a member of a professional football team." The (Mid-Western) Intercollegiate Conference stipulates that "no coach shall be appointed except by university governing bodies on the recommendation of the faculty or president in the regular way." Harvard, Yale, and Princeton once agreed that "it should be the aim of each university, as far as practicable, to have the coaching of all teams done by members of its regular staff." Both provisions amount in the end to the same thing. It is, however, true that the second of the two affords an honest latitude in the selection of football coaches and permits the employment of men with due qualifications of skill and of character without "a seat on the faculty" to disguise their status as professional athletes. Most of the conferences that have legislated in the matter prohibit the coach's receiving from other than duly regularized sources any bonuses or extra compensation for his work.

7. Sportsmanship

Among the conferences whose rules have been subject to detailed examination, a growing number emphasize the principles of sportsmanship.

The Harvard-Yale-Princeton agreement was prefaced with a statement of the desire to keep the "spirit and uses of professionalism out of college sports and unreasonable hampering of them by the mere letter of rules," and the expression of a desire to maintain mutual confidence concerning eligibility. The Southern Conference enjoins upon each institution the duty of avoiding controversy over athletics and of using "every available means to encourage right feeling and courteous relations between the teams and student bodies of the representative institutions." A resolution passed by the Pacific Northwest Intercollegiate Conference some years after the original agreement in 1910 urges "upon the student body and upon the student newspaper correspondents of each member the necessity of close observance of the ideals of good sportsmanship." Too often where such resolutions exist they yield to expediency when coaches and other athletic officials must choose between theory and practice. On the other hand, as a rule college conferences in the past have laid too little stress upon good sportsmanship as a fundamental instrument in athletic competition. The Illinois Intercollegiate Conference states as its object "to encourage sportsmanlike conduct and fair play in all collegiate contests in which any or all the colleges of this Conference may engage; to promote the spirit of purity in college athletics and keep athletics free from professionalism; to provide for annual intercollegiate contests within the Conference and to formulate and enforce general rules for the government of all athletic contests between colleges of the Conference."

8. Summary

In respect of the seven topics just examined there appears to be general agreement among the conferences concerning at least four: namely, eligibility, compensation to players, training regulations, and coaching. Matters of faculty control and of sports-

manship are, it would appear, taken for granted in a number of sets of rules. Of all of these topics, summer baseball has produced the widest divergence of opinion and the greatest variety of practice. It is difficult to understand the logic of a representative body that in one paragraph of its regulations goes on record as upholding the status of the amateur and in another countenances the payment of its athletes for playing baseball with professionals during the summer months. Perhaps it is too much to expect consistency in such matters.

Whatever reasons are urged for countenancing procedures which contravene and nullify the fine phrases in which conferences indulge concerning the amateur status, the real reason is this: universities and colleges have found that unless they relax their rules regarding professionalism and wink at flagrant abuses they cannot win enough games to satisfy their constituents and continue their large expenditures.

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 1923 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 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.

On the other hand, in not a few sets of rules general principles are so modified by exceptions, both to theory and to operation, that they become nugatory. The Missouri Valley pronouncements on the amateur status and on participation in summer baseball on home teams is a case in point.⁷

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 naïve. 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

⁷Of eligibility rules adopted by athletic associations at various institutions, those concerning summer baseball at Amherst and Cornell appear to stand among the most stringent. The attitude of most conferences is reflected in the eleventh and thirteenth eligibility rules of Lehigh University (1925).

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 coöperation 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.

In this matter the American athlete can profit from the words of the Canadian Rugby Union quoted in Chapter III. If athletics in Canadian institutions offer to us who live south of the international boundary any principle that is worthy of our most active and sincere admiration and imitation, it is that principle which the Canadian Football Code embodies.

IV. CERTAIN NATIONAL RELATIONSHIPS OF AMERICAN COLLEGE ATHLETICS

In the United States, universities and colleges, although influential, have not dominated athletic and sporting tradition as they have in England and Canada. This fact, as regards the United States, is accounted for by three considerations, which have operated to dilute the effect of university life upon the life of the people: democratic conditions, political, and social; both the vast expanse of territory and the distance between institutions of higher education; and, above all, the nature of the interest that the American people have evinced in college games and contests. This interest is largely ascribable to the emphasis laid by our newspapers upon athletics in college life. Under these conditions, the day has not yet arrived when the college or the university may be regarded as furnishing all of the essentials of an American athletic tradition. That day will be delayed until our college men and women over a period of years act as regards athletics with a "leadership," a sincerity, and a courage of principle that shall command the respect and the active emulation of other Americans.

Our present concern is with only two phases in the national relationships of American college athletics: representative legislative and executive bodies and their functions, and national contests as they involve individual college students as participants.

A. NATIONAL BODIES

As far as colleges and universities are directly concerned, their present countrywide affiliations are with the National Collegiate Athletic Association, which is essentially deliberative and legislative in its activities, and with such directive and executive organizations as the Intercollegiate Association of Amateur Athletes of America,

which holds track and field meets and sponsors other activities in which college undergraduates participate. It should be remembered also that the National Collegiate Athletic Association has held some seven annual track and field meetings in which, however, Eastern participation has been much restricted. To certain very influential bodies that govern the various branches of athletics and safeguard the standing of participants in them and include both college and non-college athletes, — such bodies as, for example, the Amateur Fencers League of America, the National Association of Amateur Oarsmen, and the United States Golf Association, — American colleges and universities have a certain relation, but it is less close than their connection with the various intercollegiate associations in boxing, fencing, lawn tennis, rifle shooting, rowing, Rugby and association football, swimming, and wrestling. Moreover, college students, among others, participate in the annual games, some national, some regional in their entries, conducted by such organizations as the Knights of Columbus and the Young Men's Christian Association. The mazes of all these associations are too complicated to be threaded by the present discussion, which is concerned less with the listing of intercollegiate athletic bodies than with the relation of college athletics to education.

1. The National Collegiate Athletic Association

Membership in the National Collegiate Athletic Association, originally organized as the Intercollegiate Athletic Association in 1905, is open to "all colleges, universities, and institutions of learning in the United States."

Three classes of membership are provided: active, which includes some one hundred and fifty universities and colleges; allied, embracing six conferences with about sixty institutional members; and associate, in two classes, the first consisting of schools, the second of "groups of colleges and universities that are organized for the purpose of conducting mutual competition in sports," of which only one, the United States Intercollegiate Lacrosse Association, holds membership. The constituency of the National Collegiate Athletic Association is divided into eight geographical districts, each with its vice-president, who acts as arbitrator of charges concerning amateurism, adviser of the conduct of intercollegiate athletics, and custodian of records, and who reports to the annual convention of the Association concerning the strictness with which the rules have been "enforced" during the year, "modifications or additions to the eligibility code made by institutions individually or concertedly," progress toward uniformity in the activities of intercollegiate athletic associations, of local conferences, of leagues, district competitions if any, and other facts or recommendations which may be of interest to the Association. A council of fifteen members, eight of whom are members of faculties, conducts the affairs of the Association between meetings, and the council elects its own executive committee of five. The Association chooses annually committees to frame the rules in twelve branches of athletics — football, soccer, basketball, swimming, volley ball, boxing, track, wrestling, hockey, fencing, gymnastics, and lacrosse; to preserve college athletic records; to arbitrate; and, under the

approval of the executive committee, to publish the rules of various sports. Many of the items of receipt and expenditure in the accounts of the Association concern the preparation and publication of these rules.

a. *Purposes of the National Collegiate Athletic Association*

The purposes of the Association, which are laid down in its constitution as amended December 30, 1924, are so important and generally so wholesome that they are quoted in their entirety :

The purposes of this Association are :

(1) The upholding of the principle of institutional control of, and responsibility for, all collegiate sports.

(2) The stimulation and improvement of intramural and intercollegiate athletic sports.

(3) The promotion of physical exercise among the students of the educational institutions of the United States.

(4) The establishment of a uniform law of amateurism and of the principles of amateur sports.

(5) The encouragement of the adoption by its constituent members of strict eligibility rules to comply with high standards of scholarship, amateur standing, and good sportsmanship.

(6) The formulation, copyrighting, and publication of rules of play for the government of collegiate sports.

(7) The supervision of the regulation and conduct, by its constituent members, of intercollegiate sports in regional and national collegiate athletic contests, and the preservation of collegiate athletic records.

(8) In general, the study of the various phases of competitive athletics, physical training, and allied problems, the establishment of standards for amateur sports, and the promotion of the adoption of recommended measures, to the end that the colleges and universities of the United States may maintain their athletic activities on a high plane and may make efficient use of sports for character building.

The precise meaning of "amateurism," as the term is used by the Association, is defined in the seventh article of this constitution. The third section specifies six acts on the part of the participants that are considered to violate amateurism.

b. *Meetings and Carnivals*

Mention has been made of the annual track and field meeting held by the Association, usually in Chicago, and of the committees chosen annually by this body to frame rules. In the case of track athletics these functions have a very wide extent. Although only a single meet is conducted by the Association, nevertheless a conception of the extent to which its rules are influential may be gained from an enumeration of track and field meetings in which member institutions compete. National and sectional conference meets of this character number about twenty during each year. Collegiate

state meets are slightly fewer. Over one hundred and twenty-five dual college meets, several triangular meets, and, usually, a meeting between four institutions are held. The popularity of the relay carnivals is shown by the fact that more than ten are held annually in the United States. In addition, about thirty-five scholastic track meets, practically the same number of interscholastic meets sponsored by conferences, associations, or colleges as members of the Association, and four or five high school relay contests take place during each year. Over such competition the National Collegiate Athletic Association appears to exercise no direct control. These responsibilities are undertaken by constituent bodies and universities.

c. Merits and Defects of the Organization

Certainly to the general principles upon which the National Collegiate Athletic Association is based few objections are to be taken. The Association fixes responsibilities in college athletics, favors the extension of athletics to include a widening circle of undergraduates, encourages strictness of regulations touching eligibility, and upholds the status of the amateur. Few universities and colleges would have either the desire or the temerity to attack openly these principles, which, so far as they go, appear to be almost impeccable. A critic may regret that more responsibility for the conduct of college athletics is not given to undergraduates, that students have no part in the affairs of the Association, that in the deliberations of this body the voice of the men to whom athletics are a vocation rather than an avocation tends to be more frequently heard than that of the amateur by the Association's own definition, and that at times the organization has appeared to be more concerned with enforcement of its standards than with persuasion to the end of coöperation.

On the whole, the influence of the National Collegiate Athletic Association has been salutary. But the past twenty years have witnessed a change in the tone and temper of its annual meetings. At its inception the Association appears to have been rather an informal coming-together of individuals possessed of mutual interests and aspirations than what it now is — a legislative assembly before which invited speakers set forth their views, coupled with an agency for holding track meets. The resumption by the Association of membership in the American Olympic Association closes happily a brief but unfortunate chapter in the history of both bodies.

2. The Intercollegiate Association of Amateur Athletes of America

The Intercollegiate Association of Amateur Athletes of America, which is allied to the Amateur Athletic Union, was organized in 1875. Its present constitution, framed in 1891, has been amended in every year since its adoption except 1912 and 1918.

The object of the Association is "the protection of the mutual interests of the different universities and colleges which comprise the Association, and the advancement and improvement of amateur athletic sports among universities and colleges." Its membership (1928) numbers forty colleges and universities, of which by far the greater

number are situated in the Eastern States. Beyond the Middle Atlantic States and New England the members are the University of California, University of Cincinnati, University of Michigan, Michigan State College, University of Southern California, Stanford University, and the University of West Virginia. The Association "declares its absolute jurisdiction among its members" over competition in the following events: running (all distances), walking, jumping, pole vaulting, putting the shot, and throwing the hammer, weights, javelin, and discus. It conducts annually an indoor meeting in February under sets of rules which it promulgates and a track and field championship meeting in May. Since 1908, it has sponsored in each November a series of cross-country runs.

Officers of the Association are not permitted to receive remuneration for their services. In cases of infraction of its own amateur rules, the organization possesses a pardoning power. Under these rules, in 1927 some eighty-eight varsity meetings and seventeen freshman meetings were held, and during the preceding year more than seventy cross-country runs. The I.C.A.A.A. is officered entirely by undergraduates; graduate members act as advisers without vote. In this respect the Association is believed to be unique among national bodies.

3. The National Amateur Athletic Federation

The National Amateur Athletic Federation, organized in 1920, comprises two divisions, one for men, the other for women.

In the men's division are included eighteen bodies, among which may be mentioned the United States Army, Navy, and Marine Corps, the American Legion, the National Collegiate Athletic Association, the Young Men's Christian Association, the American Physical Education Association, the Jewish Welfare Board, and the Catholic Boys' Brigade of the United States. The Federation states its "mission" to be "to create and maintain in the United States a permanent organization representative of amateur athletics and of organizations devoted thereto; to establish and maintain the highest ideals of amateur sport in the United States; to promote the development of physical education; to encourage the standardization of the rules of all amateur athletic games and competitions and the participation of this country in the International Olympic Games." Its definition of an amateur and its pronouncement upon the spirit of "Amateurism" are those of the National Collegiate Athletic Association. The constitution provides that "each organization in the Federation shall direct its own activities, conduct its own competitions, and control its own athletes in accordance with the principles set forth by the Federation. Governmental agencies are exempt from all dues. These provisions appear to leave the Military and Naval Academies, as well as the Services, responsible for the formulation and application of their own regulations.

B. INDIVIDUAL RELATIONSHIPS TO NATIONAL BODIES AND COMPETITIONS

Concerning the relationship of institutions and of individual athletes to national bodies and competitions, it will be possible to set down only a few observations.

1. The Athlete and the National Deliberative Body

The American university undergraduate who possesses any specific information con-

cerning the processes and work of the National Collegiate Athletic Association is very rare. The reason, which has been foreshadowed in preceding pages, is reflected even more sharply in the vote of the Association at its twenty-second annual session "that the president of the Association be requested to send a letter before the time of the next convention to the president of the member colleges suggesting the desirability of their sending two delegates to the convention, one from the physical education department, and the other from the academic teaching staff." In short, the Association is not intended for undergraduates; the delegates who attend its meetings should, it is held, be evenly divided between professional physical educators and teachers of academic subjects who are interested in athletics. Such a representation doubtless facilitates procedure, but it none the less certainly provides a powerful professional leaning in the assembly and absolutely eliminates the possibility of student interest in the more general aspects of the Association, together with all the good that might flow from personal contacts between undergraduates of widely differing and separated institutions. The mere presence of a few score students as spectators at the deliberations of the Association would be well worth the cost in money, and might in a decade lend an entirely different cast to certain aspects of college athletics.

2. The Athlete and National Games and Meets

Much more intimate is the undergraduate's relation to the national or even the regional bodies that hold intercollegiate track meets and similar competitions. At the annual games of the Intercollegiate Association of Amateur Athletes of America, his position is similar to that of a guest; similarly, when such bodies as the Knights of Columbus and the Young Men's Christian Association hold invitation or closed meets that college athletes enter. The merging of individual interest in the scoring of points with the interest and success of the college is mainly wholesome, and in most track meets points scored for an institution have more importance than individual triumphs. Exception, of course, is to be found in those cases of very expert athletes, whose concern is almost wholly with their own performance and whose reputations have been established through newspaper publicity, prompted sometimes by the press agents of their universities. Trophies awarded on the basis of institutional rather than individual success serve to diminish the undue renown of these "stars." For such reasons the abandonment of team competition in the annual meets of the National Collegiate Athletic Association is regrettable. No force or incident that operates to merge the esteem in which the individual athlete is held with the honor of his college should be neglected.

Of late years one of the reasons most frequently advanced against national or regional competitions has been the distances that teams and supporters must travel to matches. It is also urged that academic work is seriously impaired by a week's absence from a university, that college discipline is weakened, and that such trips breed "over-

emphasis." On the other hand, it is asserted, usually by coaches, students, or others who have an immediate interest in such trips, that through travel, seeing distant parts of the country, and the amicable contacts that athletes make one with another, much "educational" benefit accrues to the contestants, not to mention the favorable publicity that such contests bring to the institutions involved. With due respect to the arguments advanced by both sides, it must be said that the weight of fact and of policy appears to rest with those who oppose long trips.

The clearest example of what occurs is to be found in the relay carnivals. Beginning with such annual events as those sponsored by the University of Pennsylvania, relay meetings have spread to include those of Drake University and the sections of New England, Illinois, Texas, and the Far West. It is undeniable that the increase of such carnivals has dimmed the lustre of the "Penn Relays." On the other hand, the results of the movement have been in some respects wholesome because of the dilution of interest it has brought about.

These comments concerning intersectional matches, of course, refer only to non-commercial, college competitions. The commercial exploiting of any form of college athletics through intersectional contests and championships is reprehensible, and should not be countenanced by any university. Such interests as are involved in the California Tournaments of Roses can work only injury to college athletics in their relation to the general public, institutions, their teams, and the individual participants. Furthermore, the holding by universities of football, basketball, and track competitions on home grounds for school teams appears to be deleterious to the best interests of all. Certainly the benefits to the contesting schoolboys are negligible; from the point of view of physical welfare, and, indeed, from all other points of view, these boys might far better be competing on their own fields or courts. The supposed advantages to universities that hold such meetings in selecting promising schoolboy athletes to whom inducements, however mild, may be proffered, certainly are unsavory enough. The dangers to individual athletes that national, intersectional, or regional competitions breed arise from the exploiting of teams to increase gate receipts and the undue publicity lavished upon them. The educational advantages, if any, that accrue to the contestants from long trips are more than counteracted by unwholesome notoriety, fatigue, the impairment of studies, and the increase of commercialism in college athletics. The reputation that comes to any university whose teams are permitted to indulge in long trips is largely of commercial rather than of academic importance. In such circumstances it is not astonishing that the name of the modest gentleman who occupies the president's chair should be less widely known than that of the coach whom he hires to develop a team, every member of which is exploited for the commercialized dishonor of the institution and the enhancement of the factitious reputation of its coach.

V. THE INTERNATIONAL BEARINGS OF AMERICAN COLLEGE ATHLETICS

The widest of the extramural relationships in American college athletics is that which extends into other lands. It involves both the competition of American universities and colleges with particular institutions in other countries and the participation of athletes, whether as individuals or as members of teams, in international games. In both of these two types of competition the colleges and universities of the United States have met Canadian, English, and, in baseball, Japanese universities. In the second type, relationships have involved as principals nations rather than particular institutions, because they have been formed mainly through the medium of the Olympic Games.

A. INTERNATIONAL COMPETITION AND INTERNATIONAL AMITY

The conviction is frequently expressed that the surest road to friendship between nations lies through sport. The prospect is alluring: hosts of the youth of all countries coming to exalt by practical example the principles of sportsmanship and fair play, gaining through games the understanding that prompts to national friendships; wholesome rivalries that make impossible the suspicions which breed war between nations; a diplomacy of sport founded and upheld by numberless ambassadors of international amity, to the end that there shall come a parliament of sportsmanship, an athletic federation of the world. The view which these conceptions presents is based upon hope rather than upon past fulfillment. The history of international competition between schools and universities, between sections of countries, and between nations indicates that the good will of peoples is most substantially furthered through games and contests when the units represented are comparatively small and when patriotism is not debased to mere partisan prejudice. In short, it would appear that the road to international peace through sport is long, that the beginnings of the journey have only just been made, and that the surest hope for the consummation so devoutly wished by many rests upon the changing and broadening of their own attitudes.

B. COLLEGE AND SCHOOL CONTESTS

It is not to be denied that friendship between undergraduates of universities in different countries at present rests more firmly upon cordiality in athletic competition than upon the academic amenities.

1. With Canadian Universities

Contests between teams representing American universities and colleges and Canadian institutions, covering a wide field of athletic competition, began to come into public notice with the first football game between Harvard and McGill, in 1874.⁸

⁸ Weyand, *American Football*, 1927, pages 8 ff.

Between Harvard on the one hand, and McGill University and certain Canadian amateur football clubs on the other, contests were continued sporadically until 1884, when football at Harvard was abolished on account of roughness. Meanwhile, Michigan, in 1880, played one match with Toronto, and Dartmouth one match with McGill. Since the divergence of the American rules from the Canadian code, which developed rapidly after the withdrawal of Harvard from the game, relations in football between the two countries have languished. Michigan played Windsor in 1885, Haskell Institute played the University of Toronto in 1912, and in the following year St. Lawrence University played Ottawa. The days when teams from Canadian and American universities could adapt the number of men on either side and the entire style of play to whichever rules were agreed upon have long passed. Happily, however, the playing of Rugby at Stanford and the University of California has provided in more recent years a basis of competition with the universities of British Columbia and Nova Scotia.

Although in track athletics and in soccer relations have not been so intimate as might be expected, they have prospered in other branches of athletics. Thus, teams chosen from various Canadian universities meet American intercollegiate representatives, chiefly of the two Service Academies that have fostered the contact, in annual assaults-at-arms, including fencing, wrestling, and, principally, boxing at Annapolis. The annual carnival of winter sports sponsored by Dartmouth College has brought Canadian undergraduates to Hanover for ski-ing and snow-shoeing, and several New England colleges are combining with McGill University to extend competition in this field. Individual swimmers and tennis players have, of course, entered American matches as representatives of Canadian universities. Ice hockey has become more intimately North American than other branches of athletics through the visits of Canadian teams to colleges in Maine and annual series of contests in Boston, Chicago, and New York City with various neighboring universities. The commercialized management of some of these series, prompted probably by the comparatively high cost of travel, is to be regretted. Here again, the most satisfactory relationships have sprung from visits of teams representing one university or college to the campus of another. It is notable that the trips of Canadian university players to the south of the boundary appear to have been much more numerous than the excursions of American teams to the north. Doubtless considerations of university discipline, the keenness of the rivalries between American colleges, the lack of extensive common ground in football, and the comparatively large number of neighboring institutions with which competition in the United States can be fostered without recourse to extended trips have all contributed to limit international contests between American and Canadian universities.

2. With English Universities

Of the twenty-six fields of sport in which British undergraduates indulge, representa-

tives of universities in Great Britain meet American college competitors in only three: rowing, track and field athletics, and lacrosse. As regards rowing, crews of Columbia, Cornell, Harvard, the University of Pennsylvania, Princeton, Syracuse, and Yale upon a number of occasions have rowed against Oxford or Cambridge crews. The recent visit of the Kent School four to English waters was followed by the trip of the Browne and Nichols School eight to the Henley and other regattas in 1929. The jaunts of American college track athletes to England and of Oxford and Cambridge athletes to the United States have given rise to not a few personal friendships. Indeed, because of good sportsmanship and the pains that have been bestowed upon the entertainment of such visitors in both countries, it is doubtful if any other athletic pilgrimages have left such pleasant memories to both hosts and guests. Sporadically, lacrosse teams of certain of our Eastern universities have played against Oxford and Cambridge teams. The fruitfulness of all these contests is ascribable to their freedom from commercial exploitation, the intimacies arising from the close associations that they bring to pass between the undergraduates of both countries, and the acceptable personal qualities of members of teams or crews.

Thus far, the only universities of Great Britain which have entered into athletic relationships with American institutions have been Oxford and Cambridge. It should be noted that the British universities that compose the Inter-'Varsity Athletic Board offer an opportunity to open wider the field of international relationships in college athletics.

C. ORGANIZATIONS POSSESSING INTERNATIONAL AFFILIATIONS

Before briefly considering certain aspects of the relation of American colleges and universities to the Olympic Games it will be well to glance at some of the complexities which surround international university competition, and which have arisen from the desire of sportsmen in most countries to preserve the amateur status. What that status is and how it came to be defined need not enter into the present discussion. For the moment, our concern is with the relation of universities and colleges of the United States, through the Amateur Athletic Union of the United States and the International Amateur Athletic Federation, to the universities of other countries. Because this complicated matter has given rise to much controversy, some heated, some even bitter, and because it is involved in an understanding of a host of problems that beset American college athletics, it cannot be omitted from this enquiry.

1. The International Amateur Athletic Federation

Several international amateur sports federations antedate the revival of the Olympic Games at Athens in 1896. Before that year, associations or unions in gymnastics, swimming, rifle shooting, revolver shooting, and other branches had been dealing indi-

vidually with problems arising from competition between countries. About the time of the Olympic Games of 1908, Mr. J. S. Edstrom of Sweden led a movement for international solidarity, with the result that by 1912, when the games were held at Stockholm, the International Amateur Athletic Federation had advanced beyond an experimental stage. It was not, however, until the summer of the following year, when the Federation met in Berlin, Mr. Edstrom presiding, that American representatives began to take active part in its affairs. Probably the most important work of the year was the adoption of an amateur rule.

The constitution of the Federation provides that in each country a single organization shall exercise jurisdiction over both international and national aspects of competition. Thus, for example, the Amateur Athletic Association of Great Britain and the Amateur Athletic Union of Canada perform these functions for their respective countries. Naturally, the strength of the International Federation, like the strength of any other alliance of a similar nature, resides in the vigor and the strictness with which each country maintains as a member the letter and the spirit of the pact. In spite of not a few attempts to break the authority of the Federation over international competition, based upon certificates and permits granted by each component national body, its powers have never been seriously threatened. The necessity of the Federation's maintaining an unbroken front, although obvious, has apparently been strengthened by politico-social conditions in Russia. The American body upon which the control, through sanctions and certification of eligibility, devolves is the Amateur Athletic Union of the United States.

2. The Amateur Athletic Union of the United States

The only American body duly recognized by the representative amateur athletic organizations of other countries, through the International Amateur Athletic Federation, as controlling the eligibility of American competitors, always as regards only certain sports enumerated below, is the Amateur Athletic Union.

Although the Union was not organized until 1888, nearly twenty years after American colleges began to compete with English universities in various branches of athletics, nevertheless when active American participation in the International Amateur Athletic Federation began in 1913 the Union was, with the possible exception of the American Olympic Committee, whose functions were highly specialized, the only American organization of sufficiently cosmopolitan composition, long experience, and variety of contacts to be considered capable of performing the important duties of the American member in the Federation. It is not to be expected that a body whose organization is very inclusive and whose officers receive no salaries for their services should exhibit either absolute unity or solidarity. The Union is somewhat loosely composed of twenty-three district associations or "active" regional bodies covering the United States on a geographical basis, each with its own officers and presumably its own constituency. To these regional organizations various colleges and universities are affiliated, as Columbia is connected through membership in the Metropolitan Association, Harvard in the New England Association, Yale in the Connecticut Associa-

tion, and all three through the Intercollegiate Association of Amateur Athletes of America. Colleges west of the Alleghenies have not affiliated with the Union to the same extent as their Eastern neighbors. Moreover, the Army and Navy and their Service schools have not entered the relation.⁹

Now, it is a fact that the International Amateur Athletic Federation has been consistent in its refusal to recognize in any country any organization that does not hold membership in the Federation. It has, therefore, followed that an American athlete who desires to take part, for example, in international track and field competition must obtain permission from the Amateur Athletic Union. Unless this permission is forthcoming, no other country will allow him to enter into competition with its athletes. The policy appears to be sound. Its soundness, however, has not prevented attempts at Paris in 1924, at Prague in 1925, and at the Hague in 1926, on the part of representative Americans, to secure exceptions to this rule as it affects international intercollegiate contests, to the end that, for example, members of Cornell, Harvard, Princeton, and Yale track and field teams might compete in England against athletes from Oxford and Cambridge without the necessity of a sanction from the Amateur Athletic Union of the United States. Upon none of these petitions was favorable action taken by the Federation. Mr. Gustavus T. Kirby explains the grounds for the refusal somewhat as follows: The American type of university, and especially its control of amateur athletics and of its athletes, is practically, if not altogether, unknown on the Continent and quite generally unappreciated in England. In view of these facts, it is not astonishing that Europeans should oppose the American request on the ground that no distinction in principle can be made between athletes representing colleges in the United States and the athletes of Russia, because of the complications that always result from payment for "broken time." To the pleas that the American college athlete is of a very different type from the member of the Russian Soviet, and that the American college maintains athletic control over its students even after the close of the academic year, the reply is, in effect, that under these circumstances American colleges and universities should work in harmony with the American Athletic Union, to which they can and should appeal for permission for their athletes to compete outside of the United States. The provision for direct certification adopted by the A.A.U. in 1928 is a fortunate step. It would therefore appear that the concern of the Federation is solely with international events.

The actual procedure needed to secure a sanction for a track meeting between American and British universities is relatively simple. The athletic authorities of the American institution merely apply to the Intercollegiate Association of Amateur Athletes of America, a constituent of the Amateur Athletic Union in which forty institutions hold membership (1927), for the necessary sanction, which is always granted as a matter of course. Moreover, it is significant that no case is ascertainable

⁹ John L. Griffith, "Why It Is Necessary to Supervise Athletics," four articles, *Chicago Daily News*, February, 1928.

in which a university or a college that desired to compete against an institution in another country ever failed to apply for a sanction, nor does the Union appear ever to have withheld its permission when request for it has been proffered. Private communications from English university athletes to members of the staff of this study reflect the European reluctance to compete in international university events against Americans who are not duly sanctioned through the processes and channels that now exist. At the present writing there is small likelihood that the International Amateur Athletic Federation will alter this feature of its policy in the immediate future.

Neither the International Amateur Athletic Federation, in its world-wide relation, nor the Amateur Athletic Union in the United States seeks to control all competition in track and field athletics. These bodies confine their mutual efforts only to "open competitions"; their provisions "do not apply to events that are 'closed,' that is, open only to members of a club, organization or group that is a member of any Association of this Union." Furthermore, over matches and games in which American college athletes meet only American college athletes the Union disclaims jurisdiction. When, however, an American college athlete competes against a member of any local amateur athletic association or club, including the Young Men's Christian Association, appeal must be made to the Union under the terms of its constitution and by-laws. In opposition to this arrangement it is frequently urged that it involves government without the consent of the governed, and a usurpation of powers that now reside in the colleges of the United States. This objection is more theoretical than practical.

Outside the constituency of the Union remain such universities and colleges as are not members, whether through the regional associations or the Intercollegiate Association of Amateur Athletes of America, the United States Military and Naval Academies, the Young Men's Christian Association, the National Amateur Athletic Federation, and the National Collegiate Athletic Association. With the Young Men's Christian Association and the accusation that its officers desire to dominate American college athletics the present discussion is not concerned. From the point of view, not of theory, but of existing fact, it would appear that a policy of coöperation as regards sanctions and international contests might well be furthered by those colleges and universities of this country which desire to compete against similar institutions in other lands. Apparently, the Amateur Athletic Union has not been unduly severe in any ascertainable case in which a sanction was requested for an American athlete to enter such competition; indeed, it seems likely that, if anything, it has been generous in issuing permissions to certain American college athletes who have derived something more than "pleasure and physical, mental, or social benefits" from college athletics.

We have now discussed the body whose function it is to govern formal international competition (the International Amateur Athletic Federation) and the constituent organization that represents this body in the United States (the Amateur Athletic Union of the United States). We turn now to the principal avenue of international competition, the Olympic Games. Although in general each country has its own Olympic Committee, whose function it is to select the nation's competitors and to arrange the details of its representation at the Games, we shall treat mainly of the work of the American Olympic Association.

3. The American Olympic Association

The certification of contestants in the Olympic Games is a complicated matter. All entries from any country must be certified by two agencies : (1) that country's member body of the International Amateur Athletic Federation which "governs" the particular sport in which certification is to be made, and (2) the national Olympic Committee. The application of this principle of dual certification in the United States is as follows : For those of the seventeen sports over which the Amateur Athletic Union of the United States claims jurisdiction, including, for example, boxing, running, jumping, pole vaulting, swimming, etc., the Union acts as the first of the two certifying bodies. For those branches over which the Union does not "claim jurisdiction," such, for example, as rowing and tennis, the national sports body governing the particular sport certifies. In these two examples certification would be made by the National Association of Amateur Oarsmen of America and the United States Lawn Tennis Association. In every instance, however, the American Olympic Committee acts as the second of the two certifying bodies.

The combination of selection and certification is even more complicated. If, for example, an undergraduate amateur athlete desired to enter an international competition such as the Olympic Games, he might be certificated directly by his college ; or he might be entered in the selective competitions through a subordinate body of the Union ; or, thirdly, he might enter one of the seven sets of semi-final regional tryouts from which winners may be certificated through the Intercollegiate Association of Amateur Athletes of America, and accredited either as a college representative or as an unattached athlete. It is matter of common knowledge that the Union has been adversely criticized for its alleged favoritism toward college and army athletes in not subjecting them to the same rigid processes as it subjects other competitors. So far as can be ascertained, the Union has striven to keep the avenues of competition open to the most capable amateur athletes in those branches over which it claims jurisdiction. As respects all branches, before any American contestant can engage in the respective Olympic contests against competitors from the other thirty-nine countries holding membership in the International Amateur Athletic Federation, the appropriate American governing sports body and the American Olympic Committee must certify to his status as an amateur.

The American Olympic Association grew out of the need for a central organization charged with the selection and management of American competitors in the Olympic Games, the revival of which is due directly to the energy of Baron Pierre de Coubertin. Having previously become acquainted with Dr. William Milligan Sloane, professor of history at Princeton, M. de Coubertin, upon coming from France to the United States to arouse interest in the revival of the Games, naturally placed himself in Professor Sloane's hands. A meeting attended by a few prominent American sportsmen was held

at the University Club in New York City, and, as a result, an American team was entered in the Games at Athens in 1896. This team, which was practically a track and field group, was selected by the late James E. Sullivan without tryouts. Although an American Olympic Committee appears to have been in existence, its functions and influence were somewhat intangible and Mr. Sullivan alone became the judge of the eligibility of competitors. The games were won for America by a team consisting principally of students or recent graduates of Harvard, Princeton, and Columbia.

A rigid selection of American contestants in the Olympic Games by a continuing American committee was not inaugurated until after the Games at London in 1904. During a number of years in this period, Mr. Sullivan continued to choose members of the American committee, who every four years gathered together the best athletes available in the United States. Realizing in 1911 the impermanency of this arrangement, Mr. Sullivan, after consultation with influential athletic authorities, took steps to reorganize the American Olympic Committee and to secure financial support that would be adequate to permit participation in the Stockholm Games of 1912. From these beginnings grew the American Olympic Association, of which Colonel Robert M. Thompson was the first president. The occasion of the Stockholm Games represented the initial attempt of an American Olympic Committee of this Association to pass upon the eligibility of competitors for the teams. The effort was more theoretical than real, since such governing bodies as the American rifle, pistol, and track athletics associations in effect chose representatives with little if any guidance or advice. For the Olympic Games at Antwerp in 1920 the American Olympic Committee made a genuine effort to pass upon the qualifications of all members of teams rather than upon their technical skill or excellence, and a special committee was appointed. A similar procedure was followed in choosing the American representatives to the meeting at Paris in 1924.

The situation has led to much controversy between the somewhat conservative adherents to the established order and the proponents of international university competition to be conducted without reference to the duly constituted agencies. It would be neither seemly nor desirable to rehearse the charges and counter-charges to which this situation has given rise. For the present, it is sufficient to note that the National Amateur Athletic Federation and the National Collegiate Athletic Association have returned to full membership and participation in the American Olympic Association for the sake of "international amity and international sport."

4. Summary

Officers or representatives of the Amateur Athletic Union, the National Collegiate Athletic Association, and the National Amateur Athletic Federation have gone on record to the effect that athletic competitions of an international character between college athletes, whether as individuals or as representatives, should be regarded as "closed" meetings and therefore should lie wholly beyond the jurisdiction of any other body than the colleges or universities concerned. However desirable this may seem from the American point of view, there appears to be little likelihood that England or

other countries of the world will accede to it. The Oxford or Cambridge athlete who comes to the United States certified by the British Amateur Athletic Union is free to compete in any college meeting without recourse or reference to the Amateur Athletic Union of the United States. Should he, however, wish to enter an "open meet" in which college, club, and unattached athletes participate, he may encounter difficulties. Indeed, as a safeguard to his amateur standing the certificate of the British body permits him only to enter sanctioned meets in which he contends only with amateurs so adjudged by the one American body internationally competent to certify to the eligibility of the individual competitor. A reciprocal relationship exists in cases in which American college athletes contend with undergraduates of British universities.

CONCLUSION

Although it has seemed best to discuss the principal extramural relationships of college athletics in a single chapter, few common inferences can be drawn. On the negative side one or two considerations are noteworthy. The extramural relationships of American college athletics have not always been friendly. Indeed, rivalry, whether or not alumni-bred, has been aggravated to jealousy and wrangling, which surely have no place in the American conception of sportsmanship. Some of the individuals who have been involved in these disputes have apparently been more concerned with justifying the payment of their own salaries and augmenting their own power and that of the body with which they are identified than with the encouragement of friendly feeling among athletes and supporters and their institutions.

Yet, on the other hand, there are men — and for these all sportsmen should be thankful — who concern themselves with the extramural relationships of our college athletics because of their desire to see them well and courteously fostered. With such persons motives of self-gratification and the acquisition of power are secondary to an ideal, seldom formulated mentally and very rarely expressed, — the ideal of service both to public and to university. The esteem in which these men are held and the influence that they wield because of unselfish and disinterested endeavor are their reward. The pity is that American college athletics, with all their glamour and popularity, have not brought forth more men of these capabilities and this character.

