

of spirit of the men confided to them. The system as a whole not only tends to stress the hardier and more physical qualities—this no one could object to—but in the very nature of its methods it ordinarily discourages any others.

Furthermore, the system stresses money, and that can be instantly translated into gate receipts in a way which is inevitably somewhat demoralizing and debasing to college ideals and relations. You cannot have a professionally coached team with all the paraphernalia of attendants, uniforms, accoutrements, and what not, without involving heavy expense. This expense can only be met, so experience has demonstrated, by well-patronized games, bringing large gate receipts. Gate receipts come steadily only from winning teams, or "near winners." Hence, we must have winning teams and do whatever is necessary to secure them. The vicious circle is thus complete, as many a college knows to its humiliation. The disintegration of conscience which good men exhibit when tempted in the manner suggested has been one of the least edifying chapters in the history of American college life, and not the most encouraging feature has been the frequent disposition of college authorities to acknowledge that X, Y, and Z colleges have been very culpable in the matter, "but, thank heaven, our record is perfectly clear."

Again, the old system involved, in the case of urban institutions at least, furnishing, in the case of football anyhow, weekly or biweekly gladiatorial shows at which the attendance was often in large degree comparable with that at prize fights. The only justification for a college team to furnish entertainment to this stratum in the community is the need for gate money. In the older organizations, good officials have largely robbed the crowd of its former hoodlumizing influence on the play. But it is by no means a sportsman's crowd. It can rather be designated as a crowd of sports, and as such a dubious type of spectator for young college boys to amuse.

Although matters were perhaps generally getting better as time went on, the system as such, being administered too often on "win at any price" principles, had repeatedly led to the silliest and most atrocious estrangements of relations between institutions. Charges of bad faith, of cheating, of foul play have been bandied back and forth as though the controversy were between two sets of guttersnipes instead of between representatives of institutions of learning. Whatever may be said of their honesty of purpose, many institutions have been so misrepresented by their agents that they must be adjudged guilty of hopelessly bad manners, and all for the maintenance of a system which has often been intrinsically vicious in spirit.

There are abundant other shortcomings which might be mentioned, but these will suffice for the refreshment of memory which is the immediate object of this rehearsal.