

CHAPTER X

THE RECRUITING AND SUBSIDIZING OF ATHLETES

- | | |
|--|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none">I. THE BASIS OF RECRUITING AND SUBSIDIZING<ul style="list-style-type: none">A. Changes in ProcedureB. Methods of Attacking Recruiting and SubsidizingC. The Impecunious AthleteII. THE RECRUITING OF ATHLETES<ul style="list-style-type: none">A. Kinds of RecruitingB. Distribution of RecruitingC. Lack of Evidence of RecruitingD. Recruiting by CorrespondenceE. Circulars and Advertisements in RecruitingF. Recruiting through Solicitation in PersonG. Summary | <ul style="list-style-type: none">III. SUBSIDIES IN AMERICAN COLLEGE ATHLETICS<ul style="list-style-type: none">A. Responsibility for SubsidizingB. Unsubsidized College AthleticsC. The Practice of Subsidizing<ul style="list-style-type: none">1. Jobs and Employment2. Loans as Subsidies3. Scholarships as Subsidies4. Subsidies in Money5. Subsidies in Kind, Favor, or Service6. Athletic Subsidies at Catholic Colleges and Universities7. Summary |
|--|--|

IN the pages that follow, the term "recruiting" denotes the solicitation of school athletes with a view to inducing them to attend a college or university. "Subsidizing" refers to the provision of financial or other assistance to athletes in consideration of their services on school or college teams or squads, whether in the year during which these services are rendered or in some other year. It should be noted parenthetically that in the past the term "proselyting," which, strictly speaking, is the solicitation of athletes who have already established academic affiliations, has been extended to cover the combined process of recruiting and subsidizing. Difficult though it may be to disassociate recruiting from subsidizing in the mass of practices that confront the enquirer, the distinction is essential if either subsidizing or recruiting is to be understood.

Considered liberally, certain forms of the soliciting of students to attend a college or university, without reference to the assistance that they may expect after matriculation, may be regarded as a part of the duty of the college toward the public. Moreover, soliciting may include offers of financial or personal assistance that are entirely consonant with the intellectual aims of the institution, and are not restricted to classes or groups, other than those formed on the basis of scholastic achievement or promise. It may even be conducted, more or less innocently, for institutions where men students are declining in numbers, or are outnumbered by women, or are sought, along with women students, to increase the total enrollment. In all such soliciting, which is motivated by general considerations, recruiting in the technical sense of the present discussion is not involved. Our concern is with the procurement of matriculates with the purpose of increasing an institution's prestige in athletics. Invariably, no exceptional or mitigating circumstances having been discovered, recruiting on this basis acquires a sinister aspect, since it involves a subsidy — an advantage for an individual or a

group which is not available to others and which presupposes the possession and use of skill in sport.

Before setting forth the details of the recruiting and subsidizing of American college athletes, a brief general estimate of certain current tendencies is in order.

I. THE BASIS OF RECRUITING AND SUBSIDIZING

With all due allowance for the tendency to magnify the past in comparison with the present, there can be little doubt that the evils of soliciting and subsidizing athletes have diminished over the last twenty-five, twenty, or even fifteen years. A study of facts and opinions set forth from time to time since 1896 in the publications of various bodies, like the National Collegiate Athletic Association and the National Education Association, by men possessing much knowledge of the conditions involved, makes clear that matters have improved. On the other hand, letters, accounts, and other records indicate that this improvement has been one of degree but not of kind; some of these letters, a sampling of which is printed in the Appendix, might easily, if their dates were altered, do duty under present conditions.

A. CHANGES IN PROCEDURE

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

Nor is the abuse by any means confined to any particular sections of the country. In the Mid-West, the Intercollegiate Conference, regarded by many as the most thoroughly controlled of all conference bodies, has repeatedly called recruiting and subsidizing its most serious problem, and events in the spring of 1929 clearly demonstrated this fact. On the Pacific Coast, the larger institutions, having expended much ineffectual effort to control the abuse, are even now attempting to arrive at an equitable solution through common understanding. From similar cares the Southern Conference is by no means free. In the words of one of its coaches, there is "cut-throat competition" for prospective athletes. The president of another Southern university, newly founded, complained of the competition for a prominent athlete whom he himself

had tried to secure. In the Rocky Mountain Conference, sentiment in favor of recruiting recurrently strikes certain institutions with full force. Parts of Pennsylvania and the adjacent territory have long accepted and openly practiced it as indispensable to victory in football. Organizations varying in type from the loosely informal group in the East to the oldest and strongest of conferences, although they have succeeded in influencing the evil, redirecting it, curtailing it, partly controlling it, or changing its form, have not permanently affected its existence or its results.

B. METHODS OF ATTACKING RECRUITING AND SUBSIDIZING

For the most part, the attack upon subsidizing and recruiting has been conducted through the medium of conferences and associations. Thus far, little serious effort has been expended upon the problem. The principal means adopted to meet the situation has been the formulation of rules designed to curtail or eliminate specific practices, but such sentiment as has been roused has mainly resulted in slow or temporary or indecisive action.

This fact finds illustration in two conferences: Members of the Eastern Intercollegiate Conference adopted a regulation limiting the number of athletic scholarships and reducing their amounts as a preliminary step toward their abolition. Naturally, the next step would have been a further curtailment of subsidies, which, however, the conference failed to enact. In the Southern Intercollegiate Conference, a rule which required that, for intercollegiate participation, the names of persons who had held for more than one year scholarships or other financial aids should be published officially by their institutions, was abrogated because of the objection of influential conference members.

Certain measures, although containing at least the promise of better success, have not been entirely successful in application. In the Mid-West, Major John L. Griffith, commissioner of athletics for the Intercollegiate Conference, has attempted to inform high school principals concerning the methods and results of recruiting. The Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools of the Southern States and the North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools have adopted educational standards concerning athletic policy to be required of member institutions. In two instances where such rules have been enforced against applicants for admission to associations, the institutions, although conscious that they have not been innocent of offense in the practices alleged, have known themselves to be no guiltier than many who had not been called in question, and not so guilty as certain others. Organizations with wider membership, like, for instance, the National Collegiate Athletic Association, have adopted amateur definitions which have proved ineffectual to curtail or check serious abuses. If the individual colleges and universities that hold membership in the N.C.A.A. had sincerely accepted its definition of an amateur, as quoted on previous pages, and had conscientiously — or even to a reasonable extent — followed it, the abuses of recruiting, proselyting, and subsidizing would have disappeared overnight. That they have not abated more, casts less discredit upon the N.C.A.A. than upon the individual institutions that are its members. Changing public opinion is a tedious task when the process runs counter to the material interests of some preparatory school

principals and coaches, and of college coaches, directors, and alumni. Rules in this case, prepared usually by academic men, are somewhat readily evaded and, if too much particularized, even invite evasion. The efforts of conferences and other organized groups have produced in this direction little lasting good.

When, however, an occasional individual college, a change of policy having been determined upon, has courageously as a unit endeavored to reform its practices, has not been concerned with excusing its own abuses, and has acted in accordance with wholesome institutional dignity and a reasonable amateur standard, good results have followed. The excuse most frequently heard for recruiting and subsidizing is that "all the others are doing it." The statement is often followed by the assurance that "we are doing very little compared with our competitors." Such temporizing weakness is almost fatal. Attempts to extenuate offenses lead readily to even more persistent efforts to justify them. Far more self-respecting has been the policy pursued by those institutions that, disregarding what their competitors and others were reputed to be doing, have concerned themselves honestly with their own practices.

C. THE IMPECUNIOUS ATHLETE

In the United States the saying is common that "every athlete is a needy athlete." That football players, and, to some extent, other athletes, come from families whose means do not permit them to pay all of the expenses of a college course is generally accepted as fact and, indeed, is broadly true. To the general rule that many college athletes are either wholly or partially self-supporting, there are, of course, exceptions. But when such instances are distributed among the 800-odd colleges and universities reporting to the United States Bureau of Education, almost all of which maintain football teams, the well-to-do athlete becomes something of a rarity. Assistance extended to athletes who otherwise would not have thought of going to college, although it increases the disproportion, only accentuates a condition that is grounded in much deeper causes.

In Canada a far larger proportion of university athletes come from the more prosperous classes and are maintained entirely by their families. The needy athlete is comparatively rare, and even where he exists, he does not expect special consideration.

The presence of the impecunious athlete in American schools, his desire to secure the advantages of a college education, and his inability or unwillingness to distinguish between proper and improper assistance have combined to produce a fertile field in which to sow the tares of commercialized exploitation and subsidies.

II. THE RECRUITING OF ATHLETES

The present analysis of recruiting, as well as the subsequent discussion of subsidizing, is based upon a first-hand personal examination of correspondence, accounts, and

other documents made available, at practically all of the institutions visited, through the ready coöperation of college officers, athletic officials, alumni, and others involved. Although it will be useful to consider these practices separately, they usually go hand in hand. Whenever competition or the athlete's own financial circumstances inject into his choice of a college the question of expense, the recruiter must perforce decide whether to offer subsidies or not. In most instances this initial decision is the turning-point for the recruiter, his college, and the schoolboy.

The varieties of recruiting are almost infinite. They range from rare and casual contacts made or directed by an individual in the athletic organization of the institution (Chicago, University of Colorado, Cornell, Washington State College), in which the motive may be the general welfare of the institution or personal favor, to an intensively organized, sometimes subtle, system that may utilize or coöordinate numbers of agents on or off the campus (Michigan, Northwestern, Oglethorpe, Southern California, Wisconsin¹). Casual or incidental solicitation involves the minimum of recruiting. The use of a prearranged and usually secret plan gives to recruiting its most insidious form.

A. KINDS OF RECRUITING

From a slightly different point of view, recruiting may be distinguished as either professional or non-professional. In any one institution both sorts of activity may exist. When athletes are solicited by one or more individuals in the employ of the institution or its athletic department, the practice is certainly professional in method and often in spirit. Professional recruiting usually involves head coaches, members of the athletic staff, the alumni secretary, or even academic appointees who devote any part of their regular time to forming contacts with prospective athletes as a separate group. Professional also is the similar work, performed whether on a full-time or a part-time basis, by alumni or local organizations. What we here term non-professional recruiting is undertaken by members of the college family, usually alumni or students, who may wish an especially promising athlete to attend their particular institution. Into non-professional recruiting, subsidies may not enter at all, but even the most innocuous solicitation is transformed immediately into the most insidiously dangerous recruiting when financial assistance enters the negotiations, or when it is conducted by one who receives a salary or compensation from alumni or some other non-professional group.

Frequently it is difficult to determine the exact moment at which innocent enquiries end and recruiting begins. The schoolboy notion that athletic ability can be turned to advantage is so widespread that the mercenary athlete seldom waits for solicitation.

¹ *Northwestern*, President Walter Dill Scott, April 25, 1929: "I am not aware of such solicitation being 'officially' done." *Wisconsin*, statement of Professor J. F. A. Pyre, forwarded by Miss Julia M. Wilkinson, Executive Secretary, at the behest of President Glenn Frank, July 30, 1929: A statement that subsidizing is "in full force" is "in my opinion not justified by the facts. I find no evidence of overt [sic] violations of the Conference agreements in regard to recruiting or subsidizing." The statement in the text is based upon careful examination of much correspondence and many other documents.

In common parlance, he starts "shopping." Thus many of the contacts that eventuate in subsidies are initiated by the athletes themselves quite aside from the recruiting activities of institutional and other representatives. Some colleges limit solicitation almost exclusively to athletes who themselves initiate enquiries. Others profess this policy, but do not practice it. The line between active and passive recruiting is therefore tenuous.

B. DISTRIBUTION OF RECRUITING

Although the extent and intensity of recruiting elude geographical classification, it may be observed that soliciting, apart from subsidies, appears to be less strenuous in the Southwest and, with one or two exceptions, in New England than it is in the other Eastern and the Middle Atlantic States. In the Rocky Mountain Conference, the practice, although not yet general, is spreading. In the Mid-West and South, and on the Pacific Coast, soliciting and bidding for athletes are keen. Membership in a particular conference or group does not assure the presence or absence of recruiting. In some conferences, universities that solicit most actively stand side by side with others which do least in this respect. Quite aside from the question whose is the responsibility for honest athletic competition at any institution, the presence or absence of recruiting and subsidizing appears to rest immediately upon the character of the athletic staff and the duties entrusted openly or tacitly to them, particularly the director and head coaches.

C. LACK OF EVIDENCE OF RECRUITING

At a number of institutions evidence was lacking that recruiting existed. Absence or the curtailment of intercollegiate athletics is certainly not the reason, for most of these colleges and universities are keen athletic competitors in the principal branches of athletics, including football. Although the financial need of athletes, the availability of loan funds and general scholarships, and the activity of alumni interest all vary among these institutions, nevertheless, in every instance the absence of recruiting can be ascribed wholly or partly to the attitude and efforts of athletic officials and college officers in the face of as great temptations to recruit as exist in many other American colleges and universities (Bowdoin, Lehigh,² Massachusetts Agricultural, Middlebury, Trinity, Tufts, Tulane, College of Wooster; Emory, Reed, Massachusetts Institute of Technology). In addition, Canadian university sportsmanship is sufficiently strong to prevent recruiting. Occasional acts of single individuals with athletic or administrative connections (Amherst, Chicago, University of Colorado, Cornell, Oberlin,

² Lehigh University has recently made a significant and courageous change of policy respecting recruiting and subsidizing. The process entailed the exercise of much tact and patience on the part of athletic officials and university officers, and an admirable cooperation on the part of alumni. Although officials at Lehigh are too experienced in such matters to be overconfident, nevertheless the results obtained encourage them.

When, a few years ago, it was discovered that a large proportion of the Tulane football team had been recruited and was subsidized, seventeen members of the squad were immediately dismissed from the University. Doubtless this decisive action explains the absence of recruiting now at Tulane.

Vanderbilt³) are not regarded as of sufficient significance to justify grouping these institutions with those discussed on subsequent pages,— especially since it is possible that at other colleges and universities casual or occasional recruiting has occurred without its evidences coming to the attention of this enquiry.

D. RECRUITING BY CORRESPONDENCE

The first contacts with many promising athletes are made through correspondence. When correspondence is started by schoolboys, it may be merely an innocent part of the process of choosing a college, but often it represents one phase of "shopping-round." When it is begun on behalf of a college or university, it may be entered upon directly or procured indirectly through some intermediary, such as a high school coach who is friendly with the college coach, an alumnus, or a friend of the institution or the schoolboy. Conference rules prohibiting the initiation of correspondence by coaches and directors are sometimes ignored and often evaded, with a naïveté that is astonishing in mature men. By whomever the interchange of letters is begun, — schoolboy, coach, director, alumnus, or friend, — it is likely to end in putting the athlete and the dispenser of subsidies in direct communication.

1. Letters from Schoolboy Athletes

Again it must be pointed out that numbers of enquiries come to all institutions from athletes who are genuinely interested in a particular college or university, and who quite naturally write for information concerning matriculation. In other cases, enquiries are not so innocent. Very large numbers of high school athletes in the United States have the notion that universities and colleges are bidding for their services. How this conception has arisen will be easily understood from typical letters assembled in the Appendix. The boy whose parent does not understand the essential nature of subsidizing, or whose school coach or friend has held out to him alluring promises of what can be gained by a little "shopping-round," is readily led to auction his athletic services to the highest bidder.

Long ago, college publicity taught the venal school athlete the use of newspaper clippings, a collection of which in praise of the athlete's exploits often accompanies his tenders of athletic skill to one or more colleges. Or the letter may state that his clippings will be forwarded as soon as they have been returned by another institution. For purposes of "shopping-round" one schoolboy (Evanston, Illinois), with an enterprise worthy of a more honorable cause, had an especially favorable press notice

³ As regards the University of Chicago, among hundreds of letters examined, only one, which recommended candidates for rushing by fraternities, remotely suggested recruiting. At Cornell, of scores examined, only one savored at all of the recruiting motive, and only the strictest interpretation of this single letter leads to the inclusion of the University in the list. Chicago and Cornell may therefore be regarded as reflecting the absolute minimum of such activity. At the University of Colorado, in granting a personal favor, an athletic official temporarily passed over his responsibility to his institution. As abuses of standards accepted and usually adhered to at these universities, the instances cited are utterly insignificant. A minor official in the Oberlin administrative office appeared to be carrying on a recruiting correspondence with or concerning high school athletes without the knowledge or sanction of the athletic staff or the college authorities.

mimeographed from a local paper with some of its comments underscored. Almost identical letters of another high school athlete (New York City), who was hawking his services, were encountered at no fewer than five institutions. A third football "prospect," much solicited, furnished our enquiry with fifty-eight answers to his own tenders, with the comment that he had "been shopping, and this is the result." Indeed, so common has "shopping-round" become that many colleges of small athletic prominence and even others that have no intercollegiate athletics at all sometimes receive letters asking openly or between their lines, "What can you do to attract a promising but needy athlete?" Action upon such a letter reflects the policy of the institution respecting solicitation and, generally, subsidies.

The usual clearing-house for letters of this sort is the athletic department, and the individual, whether present on the campus or remote from it, who looks after enquiries of this nature, is generally the person who initiates correspondence with prospective athletes, in case this practice is countenanced by the particular institution.

2. Under the Auspices of the Department of Athletics

Recruiting correspondence, varying from the most innocuous and casual to the most purposive and systematized, was examined at a comparatively large number of the colleges and universities visited (Alabama, California, Columbia, Denver, Drake, Michigan, Montana State College, New York University, Ohio Wesleyan, Oregon Agricultural, Pennsylvania, Rutgers, Southern California, Vermont, Washington, Washington and Jefferson, Washington State College, Wisconsin⁴). At some of these institutions the amount and nature of correspondence demand that a member of the athletic staff or a coach out of season shall attend to the letters of prospective athletes, and in some cases the files contain literally hundreds of letters to or about promising schoolboy athletes scattered over a very wide area (Brown,⁵ Dartmouth, Montana State College, New York University, Pennsylvania, Wisconsin).

Usually in a case of recruiting the head football coach has the opportunity to set a policy respecting the treatment of correspondence. At small institutions where the football coach acts also as director of athletics, and at a few of the larger institutions (California, New York University, Pennsylvania), he is likely to care for such correspondence himself. On the other hand, the majority of head football coaches at larger universities do not regard such tasks as a part of their duties (Cornell, Harvard, Missouri, Princeton, Southern California, Washington, Wisconsin, Yale, for example). Where the responsibility for establishing recruiting contacts rests upon a designated

⁴Respecting the University of Alabama, although correspondence seemed to be unnecessarily voluminous, it was written with a care for standards and addressed only to high school boys within the state. At Washington State College, the enthusiasm of a member of the athletic staff for a particular athlete carried him beyond what the member regards as his normal and conservative policy. At the University of Washington, a subordinate appeared to have forgotten momentarily the instruction of conscientious superiors.

⁵Brown, letter forwarded by President Faunce, and dated April 29, 1929: "No influence has been brought to bear to violate college regulations."

member of the athletic staff, letters from prospective athletes may be passed to him (Brown, Columbia, Purdue, Wisconsin), or they may be transmitted to the alumni secretary, if they contain matter within his province. In some instances, a coöperative effort may develop; the football coach, the director of athletics, a designated member of the athletic staff, and an alumni officer or an alumnus may unite to form and extend connections (Michigan, Oregon Agricultural, Pennsylvania). Occasionally some member of the business or administrative staff of the institution (Drake, Gettysburg, Oberlin) conducts the correspondence.

It is gratifying to note that at a considerable number of the colleges and universities visited examination of the files showed that letters from prospective athletes receive polite but reserved acknowledgment, with an indication of willingness to be of such assistance as circumstances allow and the reputation of the institution permits. But in view of the strong, universal expressions of disapproval by both athletic and academic officers concerning the commercializing attitude of the "shopping" athlete, it is astonishing not to find in replies to enquiries a similarly universal effort to correct this attitude. No less astonishing is the tendency of many coaches, directors, and other persons, who in theory deplore professional-minded approaches, to reply to thinly-veiled hints with encouragements of a purely financial or commercial nature, such as references to the low cost of living, the availability of jobs or scholarships, and the advertisement that may accrue from being in a particular conference or section of the country. Whatever the resources at the disposal of the writer of such a reply, the great majority of athletes value these answers in dollars and cents. Even in cases where money is not mentioned, replies are sometimes so laudatory or solicitous that the schoolboy thinks not at all of his own offense against amateurism in offering his athletic skill at a price, and swells with the self-importance that calls forth such acknowledgments from (to him) mighty athletic organizations. It is only later, in college, that he learns the true worth of such flattery.

If all who receive and answer athletes' letters showed in their replies the high-minded disapproval of these tenders that they exhibit in conversation and in speeches, before long the tone of such "feelers" from high school athletes would change. Evidence to this effect is found at those institutions (Bates, Bowdoin, Brigham Young, Chicago, Cornell, Lehigh, Stanford, Tulane, Virginia) where such phrases as follow set the tone of replies:

The only inducement we offer to any student is that of a good education. This is all the right kind of athlete expects of us.

Although, upon receiving such a reply, many an enquiring athlete will merely look to other pastures for his grazing, nevertheless he has at least learned that the practice of soliciting athletes by correspondence is not universal.

Up to this point consideration has been directed principally to correspondence that, presumably, has not been initiated on behalf of the college. Those institutions whose files evidence mere casual or incidental recruiting very seldom make overtures. For the college or university that, on the contrary, solicits athletes, or countenances recruiting on its behalf by members or friends, there are many sources of information from which lists of prospects may be compiled; newspaper clippings, graduation lists, personal recommendations, — even those written by school officers who stress athletic prominence, — lists of “all-state” players, and other compilations. A conference rule against soliciting does not stop it, for a trail, more or less devious, can be laid around it. Methods used in evading such prohibitory regulations are illustrated in the following quotations:

As you know, it is contrary to Conference rules for us to initiate correspondence with any high school athletes. However, were these boys to write us first, we could, of course, reply and then do our best to get them to come to —. Perhaps you might wish to suggest this to them. Once I have had a letter from a prospective student, I always follow up the case vigorously.

It might be well for you to secure the name and address of the boy and have him write me a letter of inquiry covering such things as he wants to know about. The athletic directors cannot initiate correspondence with any prospective athlete, but they do have the right to answer any enquiries made of them by prospective students.

I will appreciate it if you will suggest to these two kids that they write me a letter so that I can communicate with them. One of the rules of the Conference prohibits any member of the staff of the University from writing directly to prospective students, but the lid is off if any one makes an inquiry.

Sometimes alumni are judged to need instruction in the fine art of recruiting. The following letter was written by a coach to an enthusiastic alumnus:

Dear —, Just thought I would drop you a line to remind you that this is a good time to start our work on preps who look good in athletics and try to interest them in —. Between now and the time school is out and then in August is a good time to start our activities and pepper them up.

Another director-coach has written of “fat jobs saved” for promising athletes. He has stated also that “we can do something fancy in the way of a job,” and that “I am willing to go to some extremes in jobs to get them.” The impecunious athlete who receives such golden assurances is naturally drawn strongly toward the institution from which they emanate, and away from one where, he is told, “many of the students succeed in working their way,” and where his name will be given to the university official “who has charge of employing students,” but nothing can be guaranteed.

Frequently correspondence may preface the more intimate recruiting for an institu-

tion from which an agent goes out to establish contacts in person (Brown, Columbia, Oglethorpe, Wisconsin), or to which athletes can be brought for the purpose of establishing pleasant personal relationships (Oregon Agricultural, Pennsylvania, Southern California). The wary athletic official may so phrase his letters to prospective athletes that his institution cannot be accused of making offers. More naïve is the letter-writer who warns the prospect that "there are some things that cannot be written about," but that So-and-So will call upon him in the near future, or — what appears to be more effective — it will be made possible for the athlete to visit the campus and then "everything" can be gone over in detail.

In short, it is just to say that when letters from prospective matriculates are received or answered by members of the athletic department or the coaching staff of any university or college, the tempting way is open to recruiting by correspondence with athletic officials or others or to the activities of personal solicitors, whose functions are discussed on subsequent pages.

3. By Alumni Secretaries or Officers

The alumni secretary who has connections of varying intensity with the alumni on the one hand and with the athletic organization on the other (Amherst, Arizona, Drake, Michigan, Northwestern, Oregon Agricultural, Purdue, Southern California) may readily become a useful intermediary in recruiting. Such a situation is the natural result of the many-sided functions, both specific and general, that have gradually accrued to the office of the alumni secretary. In keeping his fellow-alumni informed and interested, he finds it convenient to be prepared with accurate and, as far as possible, encouraging reports of teams and contests. When he visits widely separated alumni groups, information concerning prospective athletes in whom alumni are interested almost forces itself upon him. Even if he does not travel about, letters from fellow-alumni often mention schoolboys of athletic promise. These phases of activity are almost inescapable duties of the alumni secretary. But at some colleges either he is called upon to take, or else he voluntarily assumes, an advisory capacity respecting athletics; and he may even be a member of the board that controls them. In these circumstances it is not astonishing to find that alumni secretaries or their assistants (Drake, Georgia School of Technology, Michigan, Northwestern, Oregon Agricultural, Southern California, Vermont, Washington and Jefferson) have become involved in recruiting, whether by correspondence or in person.

4. In Administrative Offices of Colleges and Universities

Occasionally a college administrative officer is encountered whose interest in athletics leads him to correspond with promising athletes. He may be the assistant secretary of the institution (Oberlin), or the assistant to the president (Gettysburg), or the

business manager (Drake). The athletic department may or may not be cognizant of his activities; in the first instance cited, these were certainly inconsistent with the ideals expressed by the department and the institution.

5. Beyond the Immediate Jurisdiction of the Institution

Whether the reply to the "shopping" letter comes from an officer of the college, from a member of its athletic staff, or from some person less immediately connected with the institution, its effect upon the athlete is the same: the institution is credited with the recruiting activities of its partisans. In this there is a certain crude justice; for in almost every instance an open connection or a secret channel of information exists or has existed between the athletic or administrative staff and the more remote and active individual or organization. Enquiries received at the athletic office may pass to an unpaid alumnus (Dartmouth), who because of loyalty and personal pleasure in such contacts devotes much energy to them, or the alumnus agent may receive from a local organization (Brown, Purdue) a salary that lends a professional shade to his proceedings. When a club of local citizens sets out to secure through correspondence "a good live football team," all considerations of amateurism vanish under the pressure of commercial or business methods. The farther removed is the correspondent from the academic interests of the university, the less amenable is he to control by officers of the institution, and the less likely he is to feel any responsibility for honesty in college sport.

E. CIRCULARS AND ADVERTISEMENTS IN RECRUITING

Of all the uses of the mails for recruiting college athletes, the distribution of printed matter tends to be the least prejudicial to the amateur status. Sometimes, however, such material goes only to athletes in the senior classes of high and preparatory schools. When it emphasizes the athletic activities of the college, its relation to recruiting becomes closer. When, finally, this type of advertising is so elaborate and so concentrated upon athletics and courses in coaching as it was for a time at the University of Illinois, it lays the institution open to well-founded charges of professionalism, even though subsidies, except in the form of scholarships, be not a consideration.

F. RECRUITING THROUGH SOLICITATION IN PERSON

The recruiting of college athletes reaches most intense development at those institutions where it is professional in nature, that is, where it engages the paid services of one or more persons whose responsibility includes the making of personal contacts with promising athletes in order to influence their choice of a college. When the agent devotes full time to this work and is allowed by the institution or its athletic association transportation and liberal incidental expenses, his activities can readily include,

in addition to voluminous correspondence, the interviewing and entertaining of prospects (Brown, Northwestern, Purdue, Wisconsin⁶).

1. Athletic Coaches as Recruiting Agents

Only a little less concentrated than the foregoing activities is the similar work of a coach who is expected or permitted to devote all or a necessary amount of his time to recruiting (Bucknell, Colgate, Columbia, University of Georgia, Georgia Institute of Technology, New York University, Oglethorpe, Tennessee, Washington and Jefferson, Western Maryland). If engaged partly for such work, a freshman coach of two or more branches of athletics may have to "scout" his athletes in off seasons or in the summer. On the other hand, the head coach of a single sport, who recruits, is fairly free, aside from his regular and off-season coaching, to divide his time between bolstering up the academic standing of his squads and establishing contacts that ultimately draw recruits.

At most institutions that make the establishing of contacts a part of the program of the athletic department, the responsibility is usually assigned to a single individual, such as the head coach, the freshman coach, a special employee engaged for the work, or the alumni secretary, a part of whose salary may be paid from athletic funds. On the other hand, the charge has been made, and evidence adduced to support it, that at a few institutions in the Mid-West and on the Pacific Coast, coaches, managers, athletes, and even university officers combine in a broad but intensive and systematic approach to prominent schoolboy athletes (Michigan, Ohio State, Purdue, Southern California, Wisconsin⁷). In defense of the practice it has been urged that athletes are not more sought than other promising high school students, but the fact that members of the athletic staff are assigned to the work casts doubt upon the validity of the contention. Such soliciting, whether general or specialized, breeds suspicion and distrust among colleges. Certainly it offers tempting opportunities for recruiting if agents are so minded. Furthermore, although it is maintained that speaking engagements of coaches and others are not utilized for interviewing and entertaining athletes, nevertheless careful examination of resulting correspondence and conversation with athletes themselves lead to a contrary conclusion. A comparison of speaking itineraries with a list of the home towns of promising athletes strengthens the argument against such methods of "putting the university before the people."

⁶ Brown, letter forwarded by President Faunce, and dated April 29, 1929: "The Brown Club representative has no official or semi-official connection." *Northwestern*, President Walter Dill Scott: "I am not aware of such solicitation being 'officially' done. . . . The Assistant Alumni Secretary is not authorized to subsidize athletes. He may inform prospective students that there are a certain number of scholarships."

⁷ *Wisconsin*, statement of Professor J. F. A. Pyre, forwarded by Miss Julia M. Wilkinson, Executive Secretary, at the behest of President Glenn Frank, July 30, 1929: "I find no evidence of any financial promises beyond the promise to provide jobs." That the Assistant to the Director, Department of Physical Education, "goes 'as far as the law allows' is evident from his correspondence. I find no evidence that he has overstepped that boundary." The statement in the text, however, is based upon a thorough examination of the correspondence files of this officer at the time of the field visit.

2. Alumni Soliciting and Recruiting

A common misconception touching the personal recruiting of athletes for inter-collegiate competition is that most of the work is done by alumni. The facts of our enquiry prove conclusively that this is not the case. Of one hundred and twelve colleges and universities visited, at only a little over thirty per cent was recruiting conducted by alumni. In slightly over half of the cases it was an affair of the athletic departments, and in eight per cent it rested upon administrative, executive, or academic officers. This apportionment of the responsibility for recruiting takes into account all activities of organizations, groups, or individuals concerning whom information has been sufficient to justify conclusions. In this particular, then, alumni are scarcely so black as they have been painted.

In a majority of the cases in which alumni recruit, the consent of the athletic department or the institution may amount to coöperation. The part played by correspondents and alumni secretaries has been indicated. The usual form of coöperation is that in which the athletic department directs the alumni in establishing contacts with prospective athletes. Alumni may be urged to coöperate with recruiting agents in the field by facilitating personal introductions and interviews.

Their aid is often enlisted in offering hospitality of various sorts to high school athletes. Alumni dinners, whether held at the university or at a distance, annually or as special gatherings in honor of victorious teams, are a fruitful source of contacts (Brown, Dartmouth, Rutgers). The announcement of such a dinner, held in New York City, reminded loyal sons that the occasion would be convenient and timely for work with sub-freshmen. At dinners held for the special purpose of entertaining prospective members of college athletic squads, members of the coaching staff and prominent athletes are often present; excellent opportunity is afforded for them to "talk things over" with schoolboys who may be interested. Although contacts of this nature are not necessarily utilized for recruiting, nevertheless they obviously and readily provide excellent openings. When, for the purpose of fostering alumni loyalty, college presidents or prominent administrative officers likewise attend, their presence is a handy screen behind which to begin the most subtle forms of recruiting.

The distribution of complimentary tickets to home athletic contests, although much curtailed by conference rules and in some cases completely stamped out, may be another factor in alumni recruiting. At one university (Southern California) alumni supply fraternities with tickets to football or other contests on the understanding that the fraternities will entertain prospective athletes whom alumni have invited to visit the campus. Again, an individual alumnus himself may buy the ticket for the athlete or provide him with transportation, in order that the schoolboy may enjoy the hospitality of the campus and "meet the fellows," among them the coaches. An Indiana

high school boy, distinguished in several branches of athletics, was thus entertained from one to three times on the campus of every university in a large conference. In several such cases it was clear that alumni had practically forced fraternities to entertain prospective athletes. If fraternities feel it necessary to limit this form of free entertainment, the schoolboy may be provided with meal tickets for use at a local restaurant at the expense of the athletic organization.

Although only an alumnus of means is able to entertain school athletes upon such visits at his own expense, the burden of cost may be lightened by coöperation. One alumni athletic committee invited from all alumni of the university (Purdue) contributions of twenty-five dollars for each local group, and ten dollars a year from individuals for the dispensing of this hospitality and the employment of a field secretary. Another athletic department (Oregon Agricultural⁸) arranged to reimburse the alumnus host who has sponsored an athlete on a trip to see the campus. The reimbursement is more direct when the athlete is invited by the department of athletics (Pennsylvania) and draws his expense money upon presentation of his traveling account. Special funds are sometimes maintained by alumni clubs for such reimbursements. Incidentally, it was once the custom of an individual alumnus to operate a kind of recruiting excursion — several special Pullman cars hired at his own expense to take athletes from the city of his residence to the campus of his university (Indiana). Nor is the hospitality of an alumnus withheld in his own home. Week-end invitations from wealthy alumni readily serve the purposes of ingratiation and friendly relationships. Apparently in some instances a genuine personal interest is taken in the athletes aside from their athletic ability (Princeton, Stanford).

Although alumni who thus trade in hospitality display at times an enthusiastic loyalty to Alma Mater and great generosity toward worthy boys, one fact should not be overlooked. Their hospitality is sometimes prompted by those who have a more professional interest than they in successful teams. Practically never are their activities discouraged by athletic officials. For example, even at a university of high ideals (Michigan) the alumni treasurer writes to a fellow-alumnus who was willing to pay a school athlete's expenses in traveling about four hundred miles to visit the campus, that he is "spoken of most highly down at the Athletic Association offices and they certainly appreciate what you have done."

Three instances were encountered in which recruiting activities were being conducted by alumni apparently in opposition to the wishes of the responsible athletic authorities (Amherst, Princeton, Tennessee), and even in these cases a connection existed between other officers of the institution and the alumni engaged in this work.

⁸ Statement forwarded by President W. J. Kerr, signed by Dean A. B. Cordley, Chairman, Board of Control, drafted by P. J. Schissler, Director of Athletics, C. A. Lodell, Graduate Manager, and Dean Cordley, and dated July 22, 1929: "Entertainment for prospective athletes has never been made by athletic association funds." The statement in the text is made after a careful examination of accounts.

Indeed, at no institution visited did organized or semi-organized alumni recruiting exist without the knowledge of some official of the institution or the athletic staff, who received a salary for duties performed in athletic or administrative connections.

3. By Fraternities

One manifestation of the desire for publicity that afflicts fraternity chapters is the competition for athletic stars whose lustre presumably will shed glory on "the house" and distinction upon its members, present or prospective. Unfortunately, the fraternity chapter has proved itself to be as convenient a unit in a program of recruiting as it is in other more praiseworthy activities. Coöperation between fraternities, on the one hand, and individuals, whether alumni or members of the athletic staff, who solicit athletes, on the other, has been developed at a number of universities (California, Columbia, New York University, Ohio Wesleyan, Oregon Agricultural, Purdue, Southern California, Wisconsin, and other institutions⁹). School athletes, invited at their own expense or that of the athletic association or alumni, have been brought to the campus for a week-end or a game and lodged and entertained at fraternity houses.

High school athletic tournaments held on university grounds afford a convenient occasion for aggressive "rushing," whether at the behest of the athletic staff or on the initiative of the fraternities themselves. At one Western university (Southern California) a fraternity had listed for "rushing" the outstanding athletes of the region, giving for each the sport and position that he played; later, opportunity offered to entertain these athletes at the fraternity house. Variations of such activities, motivated always by institutional and fraternity loyalty, are found at other institutions. At parties or dinners prospective athletes are fed, among other good things, much propaganda concerning the university, and they are also enabled to see, meet, or hear the leading members of the coaching staff.

Many reputable national fraternities maintain a policy under which athletes are not unduly sought or favored over candidates possessing an interest in other extracurricular activities. Conservative fraternity chapters have refused to put facilities at the disposal of the recruiting agent, and others who have acceded to his importunities have done so with varying degrees of reluctance. An opinion is growing to the effect that an athlete who possesses scholastic ability and who does not expect special considerations or concessions because he is an athlete stands among the most desirable of fraternity members.

⁹*Oregon State Agricultural College*, statement forwarded by President W. J. Kerr, prepared as indicated in Note 8, above, and dated July 22, 1929: "Entertainment for prospective athletes has never been made by athletic association funds. Fraternity groups sometimes entertain visiting prospective athletes." *Wisconsin*, statement of Professor J. F. A. Pyre, forwarded by Miss Julia M. Wilkinson, Executive Secretary, at the behest of President Glenn Frank, July 30, 1929: "Athletic officials make trips only on invitation of out-of-town organizations and their expenses are defrayed by the hosts, usually on the occasion of athletic 'banquets' and the like." A statement made after careful examination of the accounts of the Inter-Class Fund at Wisconsin that free transportation to the campus is provided for prospective athletes is, in Professor Pyre's words, "categorically false, if it is meant that such provision is made by an athletic officer or from any fund over which the athletic department exercises any form of supervision. There may have been a few cases in which such visits have been subsidized unofficially by alumni or friends of the University." Apparently, then, the Athletic Department exercises no supervision over the Inter-Class Fund.

4. Recruiting at Athletic Tournaments

Whatever other purposes high school tournaments may serve, they enable coaches and others similarly interested to see schoolboy athletes at their sports and to establish personal contacts with the more promising. Some coaches contend that they do not attend high school tournaments for purposes of recruiting. Testimony from high school athletes, however, indicates that coaches who attend tournaments do not neglect their opportunities in this direction. Clearly, the cure for the situation is not more stringent rules, which might tend to lessen the activity temporarily, but could do little toward permanent improvement. As long as high school tournaments are held, the only remedy for the abuse is that coaches shall voluntarily refrain from practices that are hostile to the best interests of college sport.

G. SUMMARY

The recruiting of American college athletes, be it active or passive, professional or non-professional, has reached the proportions of nationwide commerce. In spite of the efforts of not a few teachers and principals who have comprehended its dangers, its effect upon the character of the schoolboy has been profoundly deleterious. Its influence upon the nature and quality of American higher education has been no less noxious. The element that demoralizes is the subsidy, the monetary or material advantage that is used to attract the schoolboy athlete. It is seldom lacking in the general process of gathering "a winning team."

III. SUBSIDIES IN AMERICAN COLLEGE ATHLETICS

In amplification of the definition of subsidies set forth at the opening of the present chapter, a subsidy denotes any assistance, favor, gift, award, scholarship, or concession, direct or indirect, which advantages an athlete because of his athletic ability or reputation, and which sets him apart from his fellows in the undergraduate body. For both schoolboys and undergraduates the subsidy entails, first, an offer or a promise sufficiently definite to attract and hold the "prospect." The making of an offer implies, secondly, the procuring of subsidy funds, the preëempting and listing of jobs, arranging for concessions, and similar preliminaries. The third factor in the process of subsidizing is the actual receipt of the subsidy, usually in a series of transactions. Any effort to reach a conclusion respecting the control of subsidizing involves appraisal of the responsibility for each of these three factors. If the athletic association or department is in any measure responsible for one or all of them, official action can be taken by the college or university. If all of them fall under the administrative authority of the institution, all can be controlled. If, however, there are rare cases where any of the three elements in the process is not susceptible to university or college regulation, then some or all of them will be difficult to curb.

A. RESPONSIBILITY FOR SUBSIDIZING

Subsidizing in some form or degree was found to exist at eighty-one of the one hundred and twelve institutions studied. At only twenty of these eighty-one universities and colleges was a single agency responsible for the practice: the institution was the sole dispenser of subsidies in eight instances, the alumni alone in eleven, and the athletic association alone in one.

With respect to the remaining sixty-one instances of subsidizing, various agencies combined in the work. For example, at fifty institutions, or 62 per cent of the whole number at which subsidizing was in force, the athletic department, the athletic association, or some member of the athletic staff was a party to the arrangements, including those institutions where subsidies take the form of jobs. Thus, the athletic department or association or a member of the athletic staff shared in all but eleven cases of combined effort.

At twenty-eight institutions, besides the eleven previously mentioned, alumni participated in the practice. Thus, the alumni were concerned in subsidizing at a total of slightly less than half of all the institutions at which subsidizing was found.

The institution itself participated in the process in nineteen instances, in addition to those in which it was the sole dispenser of subsidies, and townspeople in eleven instances.

Various forms of coöperation in subsidizing were encountered. In ten cases the athletic department or association and the alumni worked together; in six the association or department and the college administration; in three the alumni and the administration; in two the alumni and the fraternities; in seven the alumni and townspeople; in four the athletic department or association, the alumni, and the townspeople; and in two the athletic association, the alumni, and the institution.

The relation between subsidizing and recruiting has been discussed in previous pages, where it was pointed out that one seldom if ever exists without the other. Because of the origins of a large proportion of the most skilful college athletes, the recruiter, even if he wished, could not ignore the financial problems that a college education forces upon the schoolboy and his family. From the recruiter's point of view, it would be absurd not to be ready with a solution; hence, the vast number and variety of subsidizing expedients that competition has brought forth, ranging from a helpful interest and an offer to be of service, through an endless diversity of ways and means, open or secret, large or small, official or unofficial, to the frank and businesslike payments of expenses and even of compensation.

B. UNSUBSIDIZED COLLEGE ATHLETICS

The notion that intercollegiate competition is impossible, or at least impracticable, without subsidies is disproved by the fact that at twenty-eight of the one hundred and

twelve colleges and universities visited for the enquiry no evidence was found that athletes were subsidized by any group or individual :

Bates	Queen's
Bowdoin	Reed
Carleton	Rochester
Chicago	University of Saskatchewan
Cornell University	Toronto
Dalhousie	Trinity
Emory	Tufts
Illinois	Tulane
Laval	United States Military Academy
McGill	University of Virginia
Marquette	Wesleyan
Massachusetts Agricultural College	Williams
Massachusetts Institute of Technology	College of Wooster
Ottawa	Yale

In this list stand colleges and universities of all sizes, sections of the continent, conferences, and unions. At some, the temptations to subsidize are less strong than at others. At some, there has been subsidizing in the past. Of any one it is impossible to say that there will not be subsidizing in the future. Possibly, also, at the time of the field visit subsidizing existed without being discovered, but in our enquiry an apparent absence of subsidizing inevitably occasioned the closest scrutiny.¹⁰ Whatever may be the rights and wrongs of athletic subsidies, the conditions encountered at this group of institutions, especially at those enjoying keen intercollegiate competition, should encourage anyone who feels that subsidies ought to be eliminated from American college athletics.

C. THE PRACTICE OF SUBSIDIZING

The subsidizing of college athletes involves only four main instrumentalities: jobs and work of various kinds; loans; scholarships; and miscellaneous assistance.

1. Jobs and Employment

Athletic authorities commonly interpret conference and institutional rules against providing "financial assistance" to college athletes as not including the help afforded by employment and jobs that stand at the disposal of the department of athletics. It is obvious, however, that if on the initiative of the athletic authorities an athlete is given term-time employment that nets him \$125 or \$150 a month, he is receiving financial assistance that quite overshadows that involved in a job at trench-digging or

¹⁰ One exception to the statement concerning coöperation was due to lack of understanding of such enquiries as ours and a resulting oversensitiveness, together with disharmony in the directing of athletics at the particular university.

dishwashing at forty cents an hour. Between these two extremes it would be possible, from the cases included in our enquiry, to construct a scale of subsidizing that would start at one extreme with the least remunerative tasks, involving hard and honestly performed manual labor, and end at the other with the few sinecures that have enabled their recipients to attend college, play on teams, and contribute to family support or put aside a capital sum with which to embark upon a business venture after graduation. Many a candid athlete acknowledges that his athletic ability has proved a "meal ticket" throughout his college course because of the readiness with which jobs were provided.

a. *The Offer to Assist in Securing Part-time Employment*

"I would like to attend your institution in the fall and if you can help a poor but honest schoolboy, with little money but a lot of ambition, I'd like to hear from you." Such an appeal can scarcely fail to arouse in any American coach, director of athletics, or teacher the liveliest impulses to help its author. But the athletic official who himself attempts to provide the assistance involved fails to recognize three facts: First, his apparently harmless favor is likely to lead to subsidizing. Secondly, it may lead to evils that profoundly affect the athlete, the institution, and college sport itself. Thirdly, dealing with such requests is the affair not of the athletic office but of the college employment bureau, committee, or officer. The coach who assumes no responsibility in job-hunting not only saves himself much unnecessary trouble, but gains a respect that is not accorded to the coach who scours the campus and the community for jobs wherewith to subsidize his players.

Although many schoolboys who request the opportunity to "work their way through college" while participating in athletics, are, of course, innocent of any desire to capitalize their athletic ability, a great many others are bent upon it. The motive that prompted the boy to write as follows to a prominent Southern college coach is unmistakable: "What chance has a fellow to work his way through your school . . . who has played regularly on the line of the most outstanding high school teams in the state?" and who, if the answer is "right," will bring with him three other equally valuable players? The boy believes this to be an adroit way of asking, "How much is my athletic ability worth to you?" or "Is it worth subsidizing?" The fact that so often the most desirable jobs in the athletic department and sometimes even on the campus are held by skilled athletes testifies to the same attitude of barter on the side of the institution. In not a few instances, such requests as have just been quoted are honored in accordance with the probable athletic gains that the young men may bring to the college, sometimes in comparison with the disadvantages that may arise from their playing on rival teams. The fact that in most cases campus jobs performed by athletes justify the compensation paid must be weighed with the fact that scores of other under-

graduates who also need employment would do the work as well if not better than the athletes selected.

Further evidence concerning the job as subsidy is available in the following documentary citations :

An alumnus who has enquired concerning help for two promising athletes is answered thus by the university business manager : "If you say these two boys can make the team then we sure want to take care of them."

And again : "If he is an honest-to-goodness athlete, that is, one who can make our teams, we will, of course, do our best to help him with a job."

A director-coach, in writing to a recruiting agent that he can provide a fifty-dollar job for an athlete who is good enough, and referring to a particular young man asks, "Is he worth it?" Regarding other athletes, he asks in the same letter, "How much are they worth?"

At an Eastern preparatory school a highly remunerative campus job is available. The school coach writes to a college coach concerning a high school athlete whom the college coach has been considering. After a trial of the boy the college coach writes to the school coach : "He don't amount to much and I would not recommend him."

Instructions from the chairman of a recruiting committee read : "If they [the prospective athletes] need financial assistance, find out how much. Understand, however, that our primary interest is in the football or other athletic ability of the candidate . . . a merely good man is not good enough. He must be *superlatively* good or you can't afford to waste any time with him."

A university officer writes : "Under the circumstances, it seems we had better tell the boy we will be unable to help him in any special way since you say he is only a fair athlete in any sport and since we have many calls from big stars."

The foregoing quotations from the correspondence of athletic officials in various parts of the country represent no isolated or sporadic manifestation of the mercenary attitude. Indeed, in almost every instance of assistance provided for athletes as a special class, the motive can be called in question. In every instance, the unwisdom of such a policy is clear. However natural or philanthropic the desires of members of the athletic staff to assist their charges, the course under present conditions is neither necessary nor desirable. When an athletic department or association undertakes to provide employment for prospective athletes, it, to all intents, employs its time and funds for the purpose of subsidizing.

b. *The Athlete and the College Appointments Office*

Apparently a well-conducted college appointments office may care for athletes and non-athletes with equally good results, whether it be in charge of a Y.M.C.A. secretary, an administrative officer of the institution, or a manager specially employed for

the work. Yet very commonly such an office is relieved of the responsibility of finding employment for athletes, although its results respecting other undergraduates are apparently satisfactory. The reason given by both athletes and athletic officials is that athletes who apply for positions receive insufficient attention. This, being interpreted, means that they must take their chances along with other undergraduates, without special privileges, — naturally an irksome process after the favors that have been lavished upon them by way of inducements. Such “unfairness” is not at all consonant with the privileged treatment that the recruited athlete has been led to expect. If, in response to his complaints, the coach or director, independently of the duly constituted agency, endeavors to provide a job in keeping with the young man’s promise or reputation as an athlete, the beginnings of a separate and illegitimate employment service have been made.

That such special privilege is entirely unnecessary is demonstrated at those institutions where the athletic department or association maintains no separate employment agency for the athletes and refers applicants to the university appointments office (Beloit, Bowdoin, Cornell, Stanford, Tulane; Brigham Young, Columbia, Yale, and other institutions in great measure).

c. Employment Agencies in the Athletic Department

Midway between the more regular methods of providing employment for athletes through the college appointments office and the irregular practice involving special services rendered under the auspices of the athletic department, stands the scheme by which a member of the athletic staff, under the instructions of the director, lists all applicants for work in order of application regardless of athletic prominence, to be cared for in turn as long as positions remain (Illinois). At a large number of colleges and universities, however, the responsibility of finding employment for athletes devolves upon those who correspond with athletic prospects (Alabama, Amherst, Arizona, Brown, Chicago, Colgate, Columbia, Dartmouth, Denver, Drake, Georgia School of Technology, Idaho, Michigan, Missouri in part, Montana State College, Northwestern in part, Oglethorpe, Oklahoma, Oregon Agricultural, Purdue, Queen’s, Rutgers, South Dakota, Southern Methodist, Tennessee, Utah, Vermont, Washington State College, University of Washington, Wisconsin¹¹). The degree of specialization in the placement task varies widely. Sometimes the director, coach, or other athletic assistant attempts merely to apportion the jobs available in the department among the candidates (Arizona, Chicago, Missouri, Utah), no great effort is made to list other openings on or off the campus, and all applicants for whom jobs cannot be thus provided are referred to the regular university appointment officer. Sometimes the athletic employment agent

¹¹ *Wisconsin*, statement by Professor J. F. A. Pyre, forwarded by Miss Julia M. Wilkinson, Executive Secretary, at the behest of President Glenn Frank, July 30, 1929: That the Assistant to the Director, Department of Physical Education, “goes ‘as far as the law allows’ is evident from his correspondence.”

makes with university authorities arrangements whereby a certain number of campus jobs in addition to those in the immediate disposal of the athletic department are pre-empted for athletes (Idaho, Oklahoma, Oregon Agricultural, South Dakota), an arrangement that may result in a practically complete monopoly (Idaho) or in a more or less fair allotment between athletes and non-athletes. Or concessions for the sale of refreshments at athletic contests may be allotted exclusively to athletes (Harvard¹²). A resourceful athletic employment agent may employ athletes to work for the department without additional cost or even at a slight saving over other students (Montana State College, Washington State College). A more specialized development is found at institutions where a member of the athletic staff or some other individual has had little to do but recruit and subsidize athletes and find them employment (Brown, Denver, Northwestern, Purdue, Wisconsin¹³). These agents, tireless in their efforts, come to look upon their protégés with an almost paternal interest, so strong as to overlook mediocre playing and even failure as an athlete. They discover every available job on the campus or in the community, win over the campus employer of labor, and convert townsmen to the duty of thus loyally supporting the college teams. If an employer becomes dissatisfied, they do their best to adjust difficulties. Under a system that permits them to exist at all, they are extremely useful.

The foregoing observations apply with varying force to those freshmen coaches, assistant coaches, or alumni who undertake the same sort of work (Alabama, Colgate, Columbia in part, Dartmouth).

Thus far our discussion of the employment of athletes has dealt with the procurement and apportionment of positions. We turn now to some of the many kinds of work for which athletes are engaged; we may classify them according to three types of employer.

d. The Athletic Department or Association as Employer

The operation of an extended program of intercollegiate and intramural athletics necessitates, in addition to the regular athletic staff, the employment of assistants in a number closely proportional to the number of participants. Certain tasks of undergraduate managers, assistants, and others were formerly performed on a voluntary basis. These positions, however, are increasingly coming to be regarded as work for which wages should be paid. In this development of paid assistance, the desire to provide jobs for needy athletes has been a factor. The expansion of athletic facilities offers additional opportunity to employ numerous undergraduates as laborers. A natural consequence has been that members of the athletic staff tend to regard certain kinds

¹² William J. Bingham, Director of Athletics, August 21, 1929: "Plans are at present under way for placing [certain concessions referred to in the text] beyond the control or direct interest of athletes," but this action is deferred by certain conditions which, it is hoped, are temporary.

¹³ Statement of Professor J. F. A. Pyre, forwarded by Miss Julia M. Wilkinson, Executive Secretary, at the behest of President Glenn Frank, July 30, 1929: "I find no evidence of any financial promises beyond the promise to provide jobs."

of employment that lie at their disposal as legitimate subsidies to be allotted to promising or outstanding athletes (Allegheny, Colgate, Harvard, Idaho, Lebanon Valley, Missouri, Montana State College, New York University, Northwestern, Ohio State, Oklahoma, Southern Methodist, Syracuse, Texas, Utah, Wisconsin). Needless to say, the athletes have not been slow to reach a similar point of view, especially with regard to such relatively regular tasks as those of clerical assistants, caretakers, attendants for locker and equipment rooms, towel-dispensers, gymnasium janitors, gymnasium assistants, concessionaires, and field laborers. Other regular employment frequently is available as swimming pool guards, advertising solicitors, towel launderers, rubbers and assistant trainers, and waiters at training tables.

For such jobs compensation ranges from as low as thirty cents an hour to as high as seventy-five cents an hour, seldom higher. Or a weekly or monthly wage or allowance may be provided (Oklahoma, Oregon Agricultural, New York University, Wisconsin). The compensation depends upon several considerations, such as the athlete's need, the amount of the budget, academic standing, and athletic performance. Where he is paid an hourly wage he may, in case of absence even on an athletic trip, lose his time unless permitted to make it up upon his return. Generally athletic officials exhibit toward athletes thus employed a patience that amounts to leniency. During absence with teams, substitutes are provided, usually by the athletic organization. From a weekly or monthly wage, as a rule, no deduction is made to pay a substitute; the athletic department or organization pays not only the incumbent but his substitute as well. The conscientious athlete, who is not pressed with other duties, appears to render fair service at these tasks.

Unfortunately, at some jobs the athlete does not render satisfactory service. A number of superintendents of grounds and buildings, by no means unsympathetic with athletes, none the less prefer non-athletes as student workers. As janitor or monitor, especially when responsible to a member of the athletic staff, the athlete is not a success. A director-coach may find it necessary to sweep the gymnasium himself (Beloit). Sometimes athlete janitors are credited with hours of work out of all proportion to the amount actually performed; for example, twenty athletes are regularly employed for the tasks that some of them estimate would engage half that number of non-athletes (Oklahoma¹⁴). One superintendent of buildings (Oregon Agricultural¹⁵) holds athletic workers strictly to the hours of employment, six to eight a.m., but employs a regular force of janitors in addition. The payroll for these athletes is labeled "football help."

¹⁴ President W. B. Bizzell, April 24, 1929: "I do not believe it quite accurate to say that the jobs assigned to athletes are regarded somewhat as sinecures. There may be some perhaps who think this is true." At the time of the field visit, a coach concerned with these jobs, as well as two athletes who had held them, apparently regarded them not only as sinecures, but as inducements.

¹⁵ Statement forwarded by President W. J. Kerr, prepared as indicated in Note 8, above, and dated July 22, 1929: "All janitor jobs on campus changed from former sliding scale of forty to sixty cents an hour to forty cents an hour throughout. Recording of men engaged in athletics as football help in office of superintendent of buildings was made to assure exact supervision of time these men worked, thus assuring that they received no wages for time not put in on the job."

The rate of pay for non-athletes at such tasks is thirty cents an hour, and for athletes sixty cents, while the coach reports forty cents an hour on eligibility blanks in order to conform to conference regulations. At the time of one field visit (New York University) the condition of the squad quarters cared for by athletes was certainly unsatisfactory. Where such employment is not a disguised subsidy, similar results are not tolerated; with janitors' jobs placed on a competitive basis, open to all, and assigned fairly without prejudice, the work is better done (Brigham Young, Cornell, Massachusetts Agricultural, Middlebury).

As clerical assistants, locker room attendants, and towel dispensers, athletes are more proficient, but substitutes are leniently permitted or furnished. Sometimes towels are left to dispense themselves, while the athlete paid for this work spends his time in study or otherwise.

Working as gymnasium assistants and swimming pool guards, 'varsity athletes give at least as much satisfaction as non-athletes. Working as tutors in physical education courses, as long as the question of amateur standing is not raised (Y.M.C.A. College), they may be more desirable because of greater skill. To use athletes as towel launderers requires constant vigilance and close supervision (Montana State College, Oregon Agricultural, Washington State College). When not responsible to the athletic staff, athletes appear to give satisfactory service as field laborers. If, however, a regular weekly or monthly wage is paid, the force may be unnecessarily large (New York University, Oklahoma). In an extreme case thirty-two athletes and prospective athletes were employed to maintain a small playing field and do odd jobs (New York University). These men, whose work is assigned by the head football coach and who are responsible to an assistant coach or an ex-athlete, keep their own time, amounting to ten hours a week, besides week-end extra service, paid for at the rate of fifty cents an hour.¹⁶

At institutions where concessions within the control of the athletic department or association are allotted to athletes (Harvard,¹⁷ Lehigh, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Northwestern, Oklahoma, Syracuse, and other universities) profits are usually so restricted that, while not excessive, they afford what is considered to be just compensation. Commonly a member of the athletic staff or an outside agent supervises the concessions and the athletes act as salesmen at the contests. Advertising in football and other athletic programs may involve considerable sums, and frequently athletes prove to be successful solicitors, although the services performed are rarely commensurate with the compensation. To a select list of "loyal supporters," an athlete can sell enough

¹⁶ Inspection of these labor accounts for one week during the football season showed a total of 320 hours of work and tended to support the opinion of one of the coaches that "the athletes are not overworked."

¹⁷ Harvard, William J. Bingham, Director of Athletics, states in a letter of August 21, 1929, that "Plans are at present under way for placing [certain concessions referred to in the text] beyond the control or direct interest of athletes," but this action is deferred by certain conditions, which, it is hoped, are temporary.

advertising to make his allotted commission in a very short time, particularly when the athletic department (Missouri) coöperates with a group of townsmen. Indeed, coöperation reduces to a minimum the efforts required of a solicitor. When members of the athletic council pave the way by telephone calls or personal conversation with business associates (Pennsylvania), or when advertising space in the alumni directory of a large city is sold by prominent athletes (Michigan), the task may be not only easy but pleasant. Indeed, whenever university athletes are employed in selling advertising space in athletic or other publications, the solicitor's athletic reputation and the loyalty of the solicited are exploited unduly.

Of all jobs, legitimate or illegitimate, that are filled by athletes, waiting on table has proved to be the most convenient and satisfactory to the athletes employed. At training tables (Colorado, Columbia, Dartmouth, Harvard, Haskell, Pennsylvania, Yale) numbers of waiterships are usually available for 'varsity athletes or promising freshmen. In some instances these are so administered as to provide legitimate employment for athletes; in others they are clearly subsidies. For example, when they are divided without prejudice between athletes and non-athletes, or awarded to any needy student regardless of his athletic prominence, they can scarcely be regarded as subsidies. The situation is far different when several athletes are provided with living quarters at a "Freshman House" and wait at training table for their meals (Pennsylvania).

At universities where rubbing forms an important part of football training, athletes may be employed as rubbers (Minnesota, Missouri, Southern California, Wisconsin¹⁸), and freshmen are more conveniently used for the work than members of university squads. Some seventeen athletes at the University of Wisconsin, where athletes are most extensively employed in this capacity, appeared on the regular payrolls of the athletic department as "trainers and rubbers," with an average monthly wage of \$33.67. With all due allowance for large squads and an intensive rubbing system, the number is generous.

Those who maintain that all jobs at the disposal of the athletic department should be given to prominent athletes often cite the practice of such other departments as chemistry, languages, or mathematics, that employ their better students as assistants. The analogy is pressed to the point where superior athletic skill is regarded as entitling its possessor to the more lucrative or influential posts. The resulting impairment of amateur standing in college sport is sometimes recognized by the advocates of the system, but seldom to the point of producing a reversal of policy.

e. *The University or College as an Employer of Athletes*

As an employer of athletes in various capacities on the campus, the college administration is generally more stringent than the athletic department or association. Excep-

¹⁸ Wisconsin, statement of Professor J. F. A. Pyre, forwarded by Miss Julia M. Wilkinson, Executive Secretary, at the behest of President Glenn Frank, July 30, 1929: "This kind of employment is all *rigidly audited*." The italic is Professor Pyre's.

tions to this general rule arise from an excess of local interest in intercollegiate competition. At the institutions visited, about one-third of the campus jobs administered outside the athletic department and held by athletes, are janitorships which, for football players, at least, are less desirable than lighter work, such as waiting at table in common dining halls. Exceptionally, at the University of Texas, a specified number of athletes had been provided with employment in the Package Loan Library, a bureau of the Extension Division, at compensation ranging from ten to thirty dollars a month.¹⁹ From the point of view of the university as employer, the chief deficiencies of the athlete are his proneness to discontent and his absences on trips. At Saturday and other part-time employments, if he is free to devote his attention to them, he has been found to give entire satisfaction.

f. Off-Campus Employers

The extent to which employment away from the college campus should be regarded as a subsidy depends partly upon the way in which such positions are secured and partly upon the industry that employers require of the athletes whom they hire. If an athlete secures his job without making his athletic connections his means of approach, and if he is required, like any other employee, to give service commensurate with his wages, jobs seldom are subsidies. Moreover, athletes who exhibit in their work those qualities of persistence, resourcefulness, and conscientiousness which athletics are supposed to develop, generally adopt a quite independent procedure in securing and filling positions. But an organized attempt, directed perhaps by a paid official, to provide and assign work away from the campus, approaches more nearly the nature of subsidizing (Denver, Drake, Southern California). Moreover, when employers, because of sympathy with the hard-worked athlete, permit him to draw his pay for purely nominal services, the situation is aggravated (Denver, Oregon Agricultural College, Wisconsin²⁰). Business men, when questioned concerning their employment of athletes, have maintained that their chief motive is institutional loyalty, sympathy for the athlete, or general interest in athletics; nevertheless, they have not ignored the value of athletic reputation in pursuits that call for personal contact. Hence, athletes at a number of universities have been subsidized under the guise of salesmen of insurance or bonds (Columbia, Wisconsin), clothing store clerks (California, Drake, Ohio State), agents for business firms (Chicago, Colgate, University of Iowa, Southern Methodist, Wyo-

¹⁹ The time sheets were turned in by a university officer, but the athletes were paid from funds in the custody of the Director of Athletics.

²⁰ *Oregon State Agricultural College*, statement forwarded by President W. J. Kerr, prepared as indicated in Note 8, above, and dated July 22, 1929: "Investigation of help given athletes by local business men shows that no subsidizing has existed during the past two years. One man was employed by a group of business men as janitor in doctors' offices at fifty dollars per month. This is the only evidence that can be found to show subsidizing of athletes by local business men during the past five years." *Wisconsin*, statement of Professor J. F. A. Pyre, forwarded by Miss Julia M. Wilkinson, Executive Secretary, at the behest of President Glenn Frank, July 30, 1929: "I fail to find any cases at the present time answering to these descriptions. . . . There are some athletes who have fairly remunerative jobs away from the campus during the summer vacation."

ming²¹), sporting goods salesmen (Dartmouth, Drake, Texas, University of Washington, Wyoming²¹), advertising solicitors (Michigan, Missouri, Northwestern, Pennsylvania), motion picture employees (Southern California), companions to children (Denver, Harvard), writers (Michigan), and otherwise. In view of everyone's natural impulse to accept all that his employer feels inclined to pay, it is doubtful whether, in the majority of cases, the notion ever enters the athlete's mind that he is professionalizing himself by trading in his athletic skill or reputation. Only a college athlete who is conscientiously devoted to the amateur ideal can be expected to avoid exploitation of any sort. Yet it requires no unusual code of honor to refuse to be paid an amount out of all proportion to service rendered.

Other positions off the campus filled by athletes include those of playground supervisors, life guards at summer resorts, letter-carriers, newspaper deliverers, theatre ushers, firemen, night watchmen, milk deliverymen, waiters, and filling-station clerks. No such position can be accounted a subsidy when the employer requires of his employee the same services as he would demand of other undergraduates not engaged in athletics. The self-respecting American undergraduate does not solicit charity, and little good flows from accustoming any young man to slack at his work.

2. Loans as Subsidies

Although successful general student loan funds are available to great numbers of American college students, the practice of lending money to young men because of athletic prominence or ability persists. Usually, such loans to athletes reflect a conscientious attempt to compromise between athletic scholarships or cash payments on the one hand, and the withholding of all financial assistance to athletes on the other. A loan to an athlete, even when its repayment is dubious, tends to ease the conscience of both lender and recipient. The sponsors of loans may be either individuals or organizations.

a. *By Individuals*

Even if it were possible to estimate the extent of loans to athletes by individual alumni, coaches, and friends, the information would be nearly valueless without trustworthy knowledge of the motives behind each transaction. A fair proportion — perhaps a seventh — of the athletes interviewed during our study were borrowing funds from individual friends to assist them through college. Of these young men, fully half believed that the loans had been made out of friendship or courtesy without reference to athletics at a particular institution, and expressed an evidently sincere intention to repay them in full.

The greater number of these loans by individuals are made by alumni of the athlete's

²¹ President A. C. Crane, written statement, May 13, 1929: "From 1924 to 1927 local alumni and business men subsidized athletes with jobs and loans; . . . this activity was discontinued in 1927."

own college. Occasionally a local business man (Southern Methodist) or a member of a board of trustees (Texas) thus helps athletes. Few coaches or directors of athletics now lend money to their athletes or endorse their notes (Drake, Georgia School of Technology, Texas); in one instance, losses on such transactions have fallen upon the sponsor. To a prudent director or coach, financial self-protection, his own reputation, and the good name of the institution are far more important than the temporary relief of a needy athlete. Moreover, a disgruntled or disloyal player who has borrowed from his coach or director may easily create a most embarrassing situation for the considerate lender and the institution with which he is affiliated.

b. *By Organizations*

Although it is not nowadays customary for an institution or an athletic organization to loan money officially to athletes as such, vestiges of such practices in past years have been found (Southern California). Loan funds sponsored or provided by alumni are usually dispensed at the direction of the athletic organization (Drake, Georgia School of Technology, Ohio Wesleyan, Vermont; Baylor, in process of formation at time of field visit²²). One such special athletic loan fund that grew out of the vote of an athletic council was distributed to some forty nominees of the director of athletics and the coaches in return for notes; another, provided by alumni and friends of the institution, was managed by the athletic organization; a third, maintained by alumni, was in charge of a member of the athletic council; a fourth loan fund has superseded the practice, which formerly had the sanction of the university trustees, of stamping the registration card of athletes "paid" without any payment of institutional obligations being in fact made. This fund, for which an alumni secretary is now responsible, assists about a hundred athletes. None of its notes, which appear to be scarcely legal in form, has as yet fallen due, but efforts are made to impress the borrowers with their obligations.

Unfortunately, it appears that the notes of athletes are collectible in comparatively few instances, even when the loan fund is administered through a local bank in order to create a sense of responsibility on the part of the athlete-borrowers. The fact is that loans from funds provided by groups of persons and controlled or administered by athletic organizations or departments are practically the equivalent of gifts, and borrowers tend to regard them as subsidies, feel little responsibility for repayment, and

²² Drake, President D. W. Morehouse, letter of April 24, 1929: "We are enforcing these collections wherever it is possible. Within the year a number of collections have been made from those who had ignored our statements before. We can cite name and date." In response to a later request, President Morehouse furnished information concerning payments from five individual borrowers as follows: (1) on September 13, 1928, \$51.75; (2) on September 17, 1928, \$18.50; (3) on January 24, 1929, \$26.90; (4) on February 15, 1929, \$59.74; (5) on May 4, 1929, a pledge of \$20 a year for five years to the Drake Endowment and Dormitory Campaign, with the statement that "The Alumni Association holds my tuition notes for eight hundred dollars which I hope to pay, and this will take all I can spare for the next five years."

Ohio Wesleyan, President E. D. Soper, April 20, 1929: "They [the athletes] are put on exactly the same basis with other students in their relationships to the scholarship loan fund. . . . [The local alumni loan fund] has been done away with entirely and there is no such fund maintained at the present time whatsoever."

appear not to fear prosecution for default. In contrast, when bona-fide loans from officially constituted funds are wisely made and regularly collected, both athletes and non-athletes being included among the beneficiaries on equal terms (Columbia), no disproportionate losses are incurred through loaning to athletes and the essential nature of subsidies is lacking.

A few alumni loan funds have been administered independently of the athletic organization (Arizona, Brown,²³ Georgia School of Technology, Detroit Club of the University of Michigan, University of Washington). Apparently in no instance have large sums been involved.

Often citizens luncheon clubs of benevolent intent provide general loan funds for students. Where, however, interest in local college athletics runs high or athletic enthusiasts influence awards, such funds may be loaned only to athletes (Arizona, University of Colorado, Ohio State, Wyoming²⁴). In one instance the fund developed out of impatience on the part of business men with the meagre encouragement given to athletes at the local institution. Although funds such as these are generally inaugurated with much enthusiasm, they tend to peter out.

3. Scholarships as Subsidies

If, in the assignment of a scholarship, whatever its designation, source, or form, the element of athletic ability or reputation is a determining factor, the award is, to all intents and purposes, an athletic scholarship. The term, however, has suffered more official disfavor than the practice.

Under present conditions, the notion is general, especially among high school athletes, that athletic scholarships are plentiful at American universities. Even at certain institutions that upon close examination are apparently innocent of the practice (Brown, Coe, officially awarded scholarships in Columbia College, Ohio Wesleyan), undergraduates as well as prospective students believe that scholarships are awarded on a basis of athletic prominence. No doubt this state of affairs is partly ascribable to misrepresentations or misunderstandings on the part of schoolboy athletes, inducements set forth in the name of other institutions, and an occasional offer from a solicitor couched in language that leaves the athlete under the impression that the assistance he may receive is in reality a subsidizing scholarship.

a. *Athletic Ability as a Scholarship Qualification*

No single factor has contributed more directly to the use of athletic scholarships in American colleges and universities than the second qualification set by the will of Cecil

²³ Emery M. Porter, M.D., president of the Brown Club, Providence, to President W. H. P. Fannce, of Brown University, letter of April 29, 1929: Only one loan has been made from the club's funds to an athlete since January, 1927.

²⁴ Wyoming, President A. C. Crane, written statement of May 13, 1929: "From 1924 to 1927 local alumni and business men subsidized athletes with . . . loans; approximately 10 athletes assisted; they were required to sign a note covering loan bearing 8% interest after graduation; this activity was discontinued in 1927."

Rhodes for recipients of the Oxford scholarships that bear his name.²⁵ Certain American institutions (for example, Dartmouth, Rutgers, Swarthmore) award scholarships upon what is termed an "all-round" basis, including, besides scholastic excellence, qualities of "leadership," interest in undergraduate activities, usually physical vigor, and, perhaps, value to the student body. Obviously, all of these qualifications except the first may be interpreted as athletic ability. When, in awards, intellectual achievement is underrated and qualities of character and "leadership" thereby are given undue emphasis, an "all-round" scholarship is in reality granted on the basis of athletic skill and attainment. Examination of academic records among such scholarship-holders usually bears out this view. It is true that some instances in which a disproportionate award of aid appears to have been made to athletes from general scholarship funds may arise more or less naturally from the fact that official effort is made to provide tuition or part-tuition scholarships for all deserving undergraduates (Dartmouth, University of Iowa, Ohio Wesleyan), and that many athletes need assistance. Alert recruiters may be trusted to bring to the attention of the committee awarding such aid every impecunious athlete. In such circumstances the right use or the abuse of awards depends entirely upon the wisdom and fairness of those who make them. When examination of a list of scholarship-holders reveals that practically every important athlete at the institution enjoys a scholarship, the fact points to the use of general scholarship aid as an athletic subsidy.

b. Special Scholarships

The result of awards from certain funds that are provided by special regulations and that go principally to athletes is the same as in bestowing athletic scholarships (Columbia University Club scholarships at Columbia, Hobart, Undergraduate Division of New York University School of Commerce,²⁶ Southern California, Southern Methodist, Stanford, Ursinus). Although formal application may be required of a candidate, the enquiries preliminary to award rarely include the usual questions con-

²⁵ Founded in 1902, these awards are authorized by the will of the late Cecil J. Rhodes, in which he stipulated that "in the election of a student to a scholarship, regard shall be had to (1) his literary and scholastic attainments; (2) his fondness for and success in manly outdoor sports, such as cricket, football, and the like; (3) his qualities of manhood, truth, courage, devotion to duty, sympathy for and protection of the weak, kindliness, unselfishness, and fellowship; and (4) his exhibition during school days of moral force of character and of instincts to lead and to take an interest in his schoolmates."

A Memorandum on the Rhodes scholarships for the United States of America, 1928 (Department of the Interior, Bureau of Education, Washington, Higher Education Circular No. 34, February, 1928), restates the basis of selection: "In that section of the will in which he defined the general type of scholar he desired, Mr. Rhodes mentioned four groups of qualities, the first two of which he considered most important: (1) Literary and scholastic ability and attainments. (2) Qualities of manhood, truth, courage, devotion to duty, sympathy, kindliness, unselfishness, and fellowship. (3) Exhibition of moral force of character and of instincts to lead and to take an interest in his schoolmates. (4) Physical vigor, as shown by interest in outdoor sports or in other ways. . . . Participation and interest in open-air and athletic pursuits form an essential qualification for a Rhodes scholar, but exceptional athletic distinction is not to be treated as of equal importance with the other requirements."

It should be noted, however, that it is the earlier and not the later version of these qualifications which has influenced materially American theory and practice respecting the relation of athletic skill to the award of scholarships, etc.

²⁶ *New York University*, Chancellor Elmer Ellsworth Brown, letter of May 16, 1929: "Such tuition scholarships as are available to worthy applicants are available not alone in the School of Commerce, Accounts, and Finance, but in all other departments of the University."

cerning his origins, references, evidences of promise, and other qualifications upon which candidates for regular scholarships available to all students are examined. Most of the personal recommendations appear to come from alumni, coaches, and recruiting agents, who are interested in the athletic success of the institution. Indeed, for the actual appointments, or the nominations that are their practical equivalents, made by alumni or coaches, the officers of a university may merely act as recording agents (New York University,²⁷ Southern California, Stanford, Catholic institutions). Even when the actual appointments are made by the duly constituted scholarship agencies, the recommendations of recruiters may be influential (Columbia).

Only one step removed from this practice is the procedure by which a regular committee on scholarships appoints incumbents after the receipt of recommendations from persons intimately acquainted with candidates (Southern Methodist; proposed method at Stanford; Ursinus). A dean may permit a coach to dispose of a number of scholarships upon official approval of the dean (New York University²⁸), or the alumni who provide the necessary funds may merely inform university officers that certain candidates are to receive credit for specified sums of money (Stanford). Even though appointments be nominally annual, it is usually understood that, once made, they will continue while the holder remains in residence.

The sources and value and the numbers of such special scholarships vary greatly among the institutions that make use of them. The principal sources are two: university funds allocated by presidents or trustees to provide a certain number of scholarships or amount of assistance (Drake, neither specified — converted into loans; New York University, seventy-five scholarships; Southern Methodist, twenty scholarships; Southern California, \$40,000; Ursinus, twenty scholarships; certain Catholic institutions); or alumni contributions (Stanford, approximately fifty scholarships). If funds or numbers of scholarships available are limited, most of the awards usually go to football players (New York University,²⁹ Southern Methodist, Ursinus), but keenness of interest in other sports may bring a wider distribution (Columbia, Stanford). In no instance are awards of special scholarships confined exclusively to athletes. The popularity of this method of assistance probably flows from the convictions, first, that it is fairer than other methods to both athletes and non-athletes; secondly, that under it the athletic situation is more nearly controlled and the interests involved are better subserved, possibly on a basis of compromise; and, thirdly, that, if athletes are to be subsidized at all, the institution itself should dispense the subsidies.

²⁷ *New York University*, Chancellor Elmer Ellsworth Brown, letter of May 16, 1929: "The award of such scholarships is never delegated to a coach, nor are coaches permitted to make commitments as to such awards." The statement in the text is based upon a newspaper interview with the head coach in November, 1926, upon letters written by him, copies of which were kindly supplied to our enquiry, and upon his oral statement to the same effect.

²⁸ See Notes 26 and 27, above.

²⁹ See Notes 26 and 27, above.

c. *Honorary Scholarships and the Athlete*

Another type of scholarships is hardly distinguishable from that just described. It includes those honor awards which, named from the donor, source, or purpose of the fund that provides them, almost invariably are bestowed upon athletes and are currently regarded by many as athletic scholarships (Brown, one scholarship; Des Moines, fifteen scholarships; University of Georgia, forty scholarships; Lehigh, one scholarship; Montana, five scholarships; Princeton, eight scholarships;³⁰ Southern California, two scholarships). If a traditional practice of awarding such scholarships to athletes exists, it may be in part due to the influence of alumni in urging the appointment of athletes whom they have encouraged to attend the university (Princeton³⁰). Again, the scholarship funds may have been specially earmarked by their donors for athletes (Brown, Lehigh, Montana, Southern California); or a university may remit all or part of the tuition for an unspecified number of athletes as a tapering-off of a more extensive system (Des Moines); or a special fund may have been created by alumni (Georgia School of Technology, University of Georgia) in the hope of ultimately eliminating subsidies (University of Georgia). Although such controlled and duly recorded awards may represent a step in advance of extensive and indiscriminate subsidizing by outside agencies, the policy is not to be compared for firmness and courage with the action of the University of California in advocating a conference rule to deprive itself of a gift that would have established what would have proved to be an athletic scholarship.

d. *Athletic Scholarships*

Thus far our discussion has dealt with scholarships and awards, which, although their purposes and results may be very similar to those of veritable athletic scholarships, are not officially designated as such. We turn now to those forms of aid which are frankly and unequivocally termed athletic scholarships. The amounts or numbers of such awards available and the bases of award at the time of each field visit varied considerably (Blue Ridge, twelve; Colgate, twenty-five; Geneva, thirty-five; Georgetown, unspecified; Gettysburg, thirty; Fordham, forty; Lebanon Valley, sixteen; Muhlenberg, unspecified; Pennsylvania State College, seventy-five; Syracuse, \$14,000; West Virginia Wesleyan, twenty; Ursinus, sixteen³¹).

The benefit is rarely paid in cash. The partial or complete remission of tuition

³⁰ Since the time of the field visit to Princeton, December 10-13, 1926, the method of awarding scholarships has been completely and soundly revised. For the method now in force see the Princeton University Catalogue for 1929-30.

³¹ *Pennsylvania State College*, President R. D. Hetsel, written statement of May 15, 1929: "There is a general sentiment on the part of the faculty and the students against giving athletic scholarships as inducements. In 1926, there were 75 'Trustee Athletic Scholarships' covering fees and room rent, or fees or room rent or board. The number is reduced to 28 holding a full scholarship which covers room rent, incidental fees, and, in some cases, non-resident tuition; one holding a partial scholarship which covers room rent and non-resident tuition; one which covers room rent only; and three which cover non-resident tuition only — a total of twenty-eight holding full scholarships, and five holding partial scholarships. The Board of Athletic Control passed an action two years ago that no new athletic scholarships should be offered, and none have been offered."

West Virginia Wesleyan College, President Homer E. Wark, letter of June 27, 1929: In December, 1926, "all assistance to players was stopped; no scholarships have been provided by the Athletic Board; no use of the 'gym' as a rooming place, and the training table was discontinued . . . and this year [1929-30] we want to abandon the training camp."

through athletic scholarships generally involves and often takes place in the offices of the institution, which devise methods of award to suit local conditions and the needs of athletes. Values of athletic scholarships range from part or full tuition at the lower end of the scale (Colgate), to allotments graduated in amount according to the number of teams for which the recipient is selected (Blue Ridge). In the first instance, athletic scholarships represent a step away from even graver forms of subsidizing; in the second, a step toward them. Usually the source of the fund in a measure conditions the selection of its beneficiaries, but in some instances coaches (Lebanon Valley) or a graduate manager (Syracuse) have chosen the recipients; or, again, the regularly constituted scholarship committee of the institution may distribute the scholarships.

e. Publication of Lists of Scholarship-Holders

Although it is generally customary in English-speaking countries that a trust or endowment operated for charitable educational purposes should make public the extent and nature of its benefactions, a few universities have felt it unwise to publish full statements of scholarship awards (Southern California, Stanford, certain Catholic institutions), with the result that natural but harmful suspicions have been aroused among athletic opponents. Suspicions such as these apparently do not arise when accurate information concerning all awards may be gathered from official publications of the university (Columbia, New York University, Princeton). In this connection, the suggestion has been made that awarding scholarships to undergraduates of questionable scholastic achievement is embarrassing to an institution that prides itself upon its academic standing. When academic standards rise, the award of a scholarship or other aid is preceded by scrutiny of the candidate's intellectual ability and promise, but where athletes are almost without exception regarded as special cases in such awards, it is difficult to discern in the practical results any very sincere regard for the academic reputation of the institution.

4. Subsidies in Money or Other Tangible Consideration

Campus jobs and scholarships, when used as subsidies, generally entail no payment in cash; they result in bookkeeping transactions, whereby the money credits obtained are applied to college bills. We turn now to various other types of subsidy, which are sometimes conferred in conjunction with athletic scholarships and which, in certain cases, involve the receipt of money or some value that is accepted in its stead.

a. In Conjunction with Athletic Scholarships

The practice of "caring for" a more or less definite number of athletes, ranging from twenty-five to fifty (Bucknell, Gettysburg, Muhlenberg, Oglethorpe, Pennsylvania State, Pittsburgh, West Virginia Wesleyan), is a somewhat less formal matter than the award of athletic scholarships. Its excuse is the competitive bids of rivals, and its

limit is usually "all college expenses." Sometimes (Boston College, Holy Cross, Notre Dame) no definite promises are made; the athlete is merely assured that he will be "cared for." Neither procedure necessarily entails cash payments, although these may be present. The sources of the necessary funds or credits may include, singly or in combination, subscriptions from alumni as individuals or as groups and from local merchants, appropriations from the athletic treasury, and the remitting of tuition by the institution. Although the probable success of a candidate at athletics is usually a prerequisite to such arrangements, a further obligation of some sort is occasionally imposed: the performing of odd tasks about the campus, or recruiting — indeed, an athlete successful at recruiting may even be valued at his full college expenses without any other requirement than attendance at the university (Oglethorpe³²). As is to be expected under a system that links the institution, through the bestowal of athletic scholarships, with other agencies and sources of provision, recommendations and appointments to subsidies are made by persons intimately acquainted with the institution's athletic affairs: coaches, graduate managers, athletic directors, the president's assistant (Gettysburg), or the president himself (Oglethorpe³³).

b. *Subsidies without Athletic Scholarships*

At the time of the field visits to a number of institutions, athletes were subsidized on the basis of their financial needs or demands; that is, although the process closely resembled the awarding of athletic scholarships, the element of barter entered more frequently into the recruiting and maintenance of athletes than it does in the transactions previously discussed. Of course, an athlete is seldom subsidized thus unless he needs assistance. Funds for subsidizing according to need or demand may come, singly or in combination, from alumni or friends of the college, from the athletic association or organization, or from the institution (Allegheny, Carnegie Institute of Technology, Centre, Dickinson, Grove City, Lafayette, Lebanon Valley, Northwestern, University of Pennsylvania, Western Maryland³⁴). At some preparatory schools, these subsidy expenses have been charged to advertising (Bellefonte,³⁵ Kiskiminetas) with a frank

³² President Thornwell Jacobs, letter of April 19, 1929: "There are no students playing on any of the teams of Oglethorpe University who do not pay their entire expenses at the institution, either in cash or services. These services consist of various forms of self help work for which the University would otherwise have to pay cash."

³³ President Thornwell Jacobs, letter of April 19, 1929: "The President does not favor subsidy of athletes. He has never in his life attempted to proselyte an athlete." In a subsequent conversation, President Jacobs stated that he did not like the use of the terms "recruiting" and "subsidizing" to describe the *securing* of students, athletes and non-athletes, at Oglethorpe.

³⁴ Centre, President Charles J. Turck, letter of April 22, 1929, states that the emphasis on football has greatly decreased; only five out of nineteen football games have been won in the last two years. Grove City, President Weir C. Ketter, letter of April 22, 1929: During 1928-29, "only twenty-six boys engaged in athletics" are "receiving any sort of scholarship aid, and fewer will receive it next year." Northwestern, President Walter Dill Scott, letter of April 25, 1929: "There was a sum provided by alumni for scholarships. . . . It is quite possible that the sum of the funds paid for these sixteen scholarships amounted to \$2900. These scholarships were awarded by the regular committee of the faculties and were not more generous in amounts than the scholarships assigned to other students." The statement in the text does not refer to scholarships awarded by the "regular committee of the faculty."

³⁵ Bellefonte, Headmaster J. R. Hughes, letter of May 14, 1929: The Academy has "abolished the practice of giving full scholarships. Very few athletic officials are paying the expenses of needy athletes in schools like Bellefonte."

appreciation of the appropriateness of the procedure. In the case of one college, this type of subsidy was distributed, with the knowledge of the athletic authorities, in addition to unorganized activities by individuals. Alumni subsidies are dispensed, sometimes by a member of the athletic staff or someone intimately connected with athletics, from a "slush fund" or "black box fund," and thus a close supervision of beneficiaries can be maintained. Wherever the head coach is influential in selecting candidates for subsidies in which the element of bargaining is present, players are expected to "make good" or forfeit all or part of their subsidies. The amounts available in slush funds vary (Carnegie Institute of Technology, \$13,000; Centre, \$600; Grove City, \$8,000; Lafayette, \$3,000) with the interest of contributors; but the number of beneficiaries varies less with the size of each fund than with the cost of living at the institutions (Carnegie Institute of Technology, thirty-two; Centre, eleven; Dickinson, twelve; Grove City, thirty-five; Lafayette, twelve; Lebanon Valley, sixteen; Northwestern, sixteen; Western Maryland, six³⁶). The intensity of the practice depends upon conditions in the section or conference in which the college is situated and which may license, retard, or even stop the practice. Ordinarily, an interview between the recruiter — be he coach or agent — and the prospect settles the prospect's approximate need, which in at least one instance was supplemented on instructions from the recruiter's "superiors" to "match anything up to tuition, board, and room." The bargaining that results sometimes taxes the wits of both parties; one subsidizer personally and closely examined every candidate for assistance to ascertain his precise needs. Coöperation from fraternities in providing food and lodging, and from the athletic organization in supplying jobs, is, of course, very helpful. At no institution are all of the athletes thus subsidized, and at none, also, is it customary to grant subsidies in excess of the cost of tuition, food, lodging, books, supplies, and incidental fees.

In an extreme case of subsidizing, alumni and business men made contributions ranging from \$10 to nearly \$1,000 annually to a fund aggregating from \$25,000 to \$50,000 a year. From this the college expenses of all football players were paid and additional sums, termed "pay checks," were disbursed to leading performers (Washington and Jefferson). Later, the practice was modified to provide only tuitions, board, room, and fees, without cash payments.³⁷ The essentials of the practice may be the same, even though the fund be small (Franklin and Marshall).

In at least three instances the practices at the time of the field visits were explained as a tapering-off of more extensive operations (Centre, Lafayette, Northwestern).

c. On a Basis of Guarantees

As a variation of this practice, on a basis of estimated monthly expenses at an insti-

³⁶ Centre, Grove City, Northwestern: see Note 34 above.

³⁷ President S. S. Baker, in a letter of April 22, 1929, states that, instead of a reduction of from 10 per cent to 15 per cent, estimated by this study, "the actual reduction averages almost 40%."

tution, an athlete may be guaranteed \$25 or \$50 a month, to be secured partly through work at off-campus jobs (Tennessee, ten to twenty athletes) or outright, without reference to other than athletic services (University of West Virginia, twenty-five or thirty football players³⁸). Funds for the purpose are raised and allotted by alumni. Under the first of these systems, a man who engages in three branches of athletics and finds his time too much occupied to work at other employment is, nevertheless, assured of a fixed income for the college year; the work performed appears to be of less importance than the guaranteed amount of the subsidy. From the point of view of the custodian of the fund, who equalizes the amounts under each guarantee, the advantage is that a hard-working young man will not need much assistance of this sort. Under the second system, an athlete who lives at home, instead of at the squad house, may be compensated by a similar process of equalization under his guarantee. One distinguishing feature of this method of subsidizing on a basis of guarantees is payment in cash or by check. The monthly basis testifies to the insecurity of employment as an athlete.

5. Subsidies in Kind, Favor, or Service

The types of subsidy about to be considered resemble those already discussed in purpose and sometimes in operation, but, for reasons which will become apparent, they are treated separately.

a. *Alumni Assistance to Athletes*

Some of the many ways in which groups or individuals among alumni assist athletes, especially in conjunction with other agencies, have been set forth. A little apart from these practices stands the over-enthusiastic alumnus, who, aroused by competition for athletes on behalf of rival colleges, is led on his own initiative to match or to exceed these inducements by assisting promising schoolboys, from two or three to ten in number, to attend his own Alma Mater (Dartmouth, University of Iowa, Pennsylvania, Southern California, Stanford). In no case studied were qualities other than athletic prominence apparently so important a consideration in the minds of the men who gave the assistance. Challenged in this traffic, the alumnus usually replies that he has a perfect right thus to help young men if he chooses. The fallacies of this position are outlined in Chapter XII. For the present it should be noted that much has been done (Dartmouth), and much more can be done, by genuine efforts to eliminate this independent type of subsidizing.

This practice in some particulars associates itself with a rather more farsighted effort on the part of alumni. In the East, relations have been established between

³⁸ President John R. Turner, letter of April 23, 1929: "We . . . have altogether discontinued the practice of subsidizing athletes. . . . I do not say, as in my judgment no college president can say, that no alumnus is making any contribution to the support of a member or members of our athletic teams. I must say, however, that after careful inquiry I have learned of no case where a student is receiving support because he plays on one of our athletic teams."

certain private preparatory schools on the one hand and certain colleges and universities on the other, whereby athletes, varying in number from one to as many as twenty, have been wholly or partly maintained at the schools until they are ready for college (Brown, Carnegie Institute of Technology, Dartmouth, Dickinson, Lafayette, New York University, Pittsburgh, Princeton,³⁹ Syracuse, Washington and Jefferson). Those most frequently responsible for the arrangement, which, whether old or new, is predicated upon mutual good will and a supposed advantage to both college and school, are alumni, headmasters, and coaches. The actual basis of operations may be a number of free places or scholarships in a school to which alumni as individuals or as groups may appoint athletes of promise, or merely a working understanding under which boys are induced to enter the school on such especially favorable financial conditions as the school coach or headmaster is able to arrange. In a few instances, the athlete's school expenses have been paid from a college athletic slush fund. It is only fair to state that rumors of similar subsidizing on behalf of certain other institutions have not been substantiated by the present enquiry.

b. Training Tables and Subsidizing

Experience at a number of universities and colleges tends to demonstrate that training tables provide a ready means of subsidizing that may appear difficult to stop. Rarely are training table board bills settled promptly and regularly. The subsidized athlete, seeing his fellows lax in these payments, quickly concludes that he, too, is entitled to his meals at someone else's expense. An easy-going official in charge of collections readily slips into the way of allowing large indebtednesses for meals to accumulate, while a conscientious steward is torn between his duty as collector and his sympathy for the impecunious athlete. Of course, an athlete who is "taken care of" to the extent of "all college expenses," pays no board bill. Board that is given, or practically given, by the athletic organization (Colgate, Columbia, Pennsylvania) is obviously a subsidy.

The situation is less serious when the athlete himself meets all, or almost all, of the training table expense (Amherst; Colorado, up to January, 1927; McGill). The dangers are minimized when bills are collected through the business office (Brown, Washington State College), or when only the evening meal is served (California, Lafayette, Lehigh, Southern California, Tulane, Vanderbilt).

c. Fraternity Subsistence

Besides the ways already detailed in which fraternities are exploited for subsidizing athletes, local chapters, as their contribution to a subsidizing program, may provide

³⁹ The practices at Princeton to which reference is made in the text have been abolished through the efforts of President John Grier Hibben, Dean L. P. Eisenhart, Professor Charles W. Kennedy, and Dr. Joseph A. Raycroft. This fact again indicates what can be accomplished when administrators, sincerely concerned for institutional honor and college sport, act with the same sincerity upon information, however distasteful, offered to them in a disinterested fashion.

certain athlete members with rooms or board or with both at so low a figure that the arrangement can be regarded only as an athletic subsidy (Franklin and Marshall, New York University, Ohio Wesleyan,⁴⁰ Oregon Agricultural, Pennsylvania State). Usually not all of the fraternities at any one institution are given to this practice. Sometimes a fraternity chapter is used as a kind of agency or clearing house for other subsidizing transactions between an athlete and an alumnus or some other person (University of Iowa, Ohio State, Stanford). Although these are usually termed "loans," it is almost needless to say that, as in the case of other unofficial borrowings, the record of collections is not good.

d. *Maintenance of Academic Standing*

It would be difficult to discover an institution in which the athlete, if hard pressed to maintain his academic standing, is not afforded some gratuitous assistance in study by his fellow undergraduates. If the help is intelligently given and utilized, it may even become an important and valuable element in the intellectual development of all concerned. From this natural condition, it is only a step to the notion that a degree of responsibility devolves upon administrative or athletic officers for the academic standing of undergraduates who assumedly benefit the college through participation in extra-curricular activities, especially intercollegiate athletics. Moreover, with increasing strictness of requirements of eligibility has come an increased concern, sometimes prudential, on the part of coaches over the academic standing of their players. The result has been that a number of institutions or athletic organizations have provided professional tutoring or similar special instruction for athletes (Brown, California, Carnegie Institute of Technology, Colgate, Columbia, Georgia School of Technology, Oklahoma, Pennsylvania, Pennsylvania State, Southern California⁴¹). For practical purposes, there appears to be little difference between this practice and relieving a regular salaried member of the athletic staff from some of his other duties in order that he may supervise the academic standing of athletes.

A further consideration respecting academic standing as a factor in the support of athletes touches upon the average of grades required as a qualification for financial assistance. Of seven institutions (Baylor, Columbia, Des Moines, Rutgers, Southern California, Southern Methodist, Stanford), at which a minimum academic require-

⁴⁰ *Ohio Wesleyan*, President E. D. Soper, letter of April 20, 1929: "If this means that athletes receive board and room free of charge, it is not true. . . . There are athletes, however, who work for their rooms and board in their fraternities in the same way that other students work their way through college." The statement in the text does not refer to athletes "who work for their rooms and board in their fraternities in the same way that other students work their way through college."

⁴¹ *Brown*, President W. H. P. Faunce, forwards a statement, May 9, 1929: "Very rarely has the Brown Club paid for any tutoring and then only in exceptional cases. The last time this was done was over two years ago. When possible [the Club tries] to get some of the upper classmen in the fraternities to keep the men up to scholastic standards, but this work is entirely voluntary and without pay." *Colgate*, Mr. W. A. Reid, Graduate Manager, in a letter of April 23, 1929, states that daily tutoring is conducted as follows: "Various boys on athletic teams who are exceptionally good students in the several given subjects tutor the other boys for a half hour during the afternoon and in the season prior to going on the field for practice in the sport," and that no compensation whatsoever is paid. The statement in the text refers to tutoring, for which canceled vouchers for payments to a woman tutor were examined, with Mr. Reid's cooperation, in his accounts.

ment, usually an average of "C," is prescribed for the award of certain scholarships, it was approached at only two. In a third case, if the holder of a scholarship falls below the required average, the scholarship is withdrawn; but the athlete is provided with a loan on the understanding that it will become a gift if he regains his academic standing.

e. Complimentary Tickets as Subsidies

In the course of our study, conversations with a considerable number of athletes have indicated that it is common practice, particularly among certain football players, to sell the complimentary tickets allotted to them as members of squads, in some instances contrary to the exhortations of their coaches. Of course, the market price of such tickets increases with public demand. The value of complimentary tickets as subsidies in kind is illustrated by the fact that a football player at a university on the Pacific Coast sold his allotment at a profit of about \$100 each for various major games of a single season. If an athlete sells his tickets to personal friends, one or more of whom may be financially interested in him as an athlete, the practice is difficult to check. Extensive abuse of the privilege has been reduced by cutting down the number of tickets allotted to each player, and the measures usually taken against "scalpers" have been found as fruitful here as in other similar violations of good faith respecting football tickets.

6. Athletic Subsidies at Catholic Colleges and Universities

In respect of other matters than subsidizing, athletics at Catholic universities and colleges are discussed in these pages jointly with athletics at the other institutions visited. As regards athletic subsidies, however, it has seemed best to treat of the Catholic institutions as a group because of certain considerations which, being common, if in varying degree, to these particular colleges, will enable the reader the better to understand their problems.

Without exception, the Catholic institutions visited coöperated fully and frankly in our enquiry through interviews and immediate and unrestricted access to files and other data. As a rule, their presiding officers are not so closely in touch with the views and actions of athletic conferences as the heads of many other institutions. The explanation is their more secluded lives and training. Hence, also, their general inclination to rely much upon advice from alumni touching athletic practices and policies. During the past two years a very important change in this respect is discernible. Catholic college presidents have begun to examine at first hand into athletic conditions and to act upon their own belief in the wisdom of certain limitations. Consequently, during this period the Jesuit colleges have adopted the usual rules limiting freshman competition and also a very severe regulation regarding transfers. More important still, most of the Jesuit presidents are now disposed to weigh the advice of alumni,

7. Summary

The bearing of subsidizing upon the amateur status comes down at last to a question of motive. No matter what the source of the subsidy, if the reason behind it can be accurately determined, the status of the athlete becomes at once clear. Given a skilled full-back who is receiving from a head football coach \$100 a month, if it can be proved that the motive for this provision concerns not at all the ability or prominence of the athlete, then the athlete is not thereby professionalized, whatever be the presumptions to the contrary. But in such a case, the mere assertion of innocence is not to be taken as proof. On the other hand, any favor, however small, that tends to assist an athlete financially, if it is done because he is an athlete, marks the beginning of professionalism. There is no valid reason why even the most worthy athlete should receive any consideration, favor, assistance, or attention that is not available, upon the same terms and with the same readiness, to the general body of undergraduates. Nor is it easy to see how the sincere amateur could expect such special consideration or advantage.

CONCLUSION

The foregoing exposition attempts to penetrate the deepest shadow that darkens American college and school athletics. Probably portions of the picture are even blacker than they have been painted. Yet in the murk there are many brighter patches. The absence of recruiting and of subsidizing at many institutions, the integrity of the men who have struggled against these evils with varying degrees of success, the unassailable fact that neither subsidizing nor recruiting is essential to college sport, and the improvement that has been manifest in these particulars during the last quarter-century, should hearten anyone who is battling against the corruptions here shown or deplors these perversions of common honesty. This much is certain: The university or college that, under capable leadership, makes up its collective mind to cast out these practices, can do so. What is needed is constancy of purpose and patience in the face of opposition from those whose self-interest, false pride, and mistaken loyalties make their recession difficult.

Experience has shown that, of all who are involved in these evils — administrative officers, teachers, directors of athletics, coaches, alumni, undergraduates, and townsmen — the man who is the most likely to succeed in uprooting the evils of recruiting and subsidizing is the college president. It is his duty to coordinate opinion and direct the progress of an institution. If neighboring presidents are like-minded, his task is a little lightened, but under no circumstances which we have been able to discover is it impossible even if he stands alone. It cannot be easy. But such are the position and the powers of the American college president that, once having informed himself of the facts, and being possessed of the requisite ability and courage, he will succeed.

instead of accepting it forthwith, and to discard it when it runs counter to what, to them, appears to be sound athletic practice.

It is, therefore, perhaps not astonishing that the subsidizing of athletes at certain Catholic universities and colleges appears to have rested less upon the expediency that generally motivates the practice than upon rationalized principles. These principles begin with a conviction that every young man who desires an education should be assisted in its pursuit. To this end all available resources are utilized. But the recipient of assistance is expected to prove himself worthy by honoring in some way his college or university : if gifted in music, he finds his place ; if gifted as an athlete, he can participate in games ; if industrious, a job of some sort will help him partly to compensate for the time and effort that are expended upon his education. Thus far the reasoning is simple and the conclusion natural. At this point, however, enter other factors which invalidate both. The resulting practices of Catholic institutions have been in general at least as objectionable as those of other colleges and universities.

The athletic teams of Catholic colleges compete with other teams upon supposedly equal terms of sportsmanship. Victory is dear to both sides. Where large profits from athletics are available to provide financial assistance to needy athletes, little is lacking except the athletes themselves. As regards the Catholic colleges, alumni and coaches, students, and sometimes parish priests have been given officially to understand that it is their duty to direct to the institutions young men of desirable character and athletic ability. To the loyal alumnus, the devoted priest, the enthusiastic undergraduate, the professional coach, athletic ability readily becomes the most important of these qualifications, and other qualities of character, if outstanding, tend to be taken for granted. Were this not the case, it is inconceivable that the officers of Catholic universities and the parish priests whom they themselves have trained would countenance what in the past has often occurred : the resulting perversion of a worthy and magnanimous principle.

Assistance to needy athletes at Catholic institutions takes several forms. It may be distributed as scholarships from athletic funds, covering wholly or partly tuition, board, and room, in addition to assistance from individual alumni (Fordham) ; or jobs that provide tuition, board, and room in return for very nominal services (Notre Dame) ; or an outright allocation of funds without return except in athletic participation (Georgetown). Occasionally, the attempt is made to balance awards to athletes with those to non-athletes (Holy Cross), so that no young man will "feel that his muscles alone are sufficient to get him through." Or priests may effect arrangements among their own parishioners, members of the faculty, or friends of their college by which athletes may be maintained (Boston College). From such practices as these, in the light of intercollegiate competition, an offer to assist young men to secure part-time work at the usual student rate of compensation (Marquette) is poles asunder.