

best and took their defeats like thoroughbreds, all are overlooked.

Let us readjust our perspective a bit and get our sense of proportion back.

Football Simply an Incident of College Life.

It is not whether you win or lose, but it is how you played the game. Football is a sport, not a business. It is an incident of college life, not one of the purposes of the college. It is a character builder, not an advertising medium. Its value to the student body is neither measured by or recorded in the scores. Its real values are too far-reaching and too intangible to be stated in figures. If, while attending a game, we kept our eyes glued to the scoreboard, we would miss all the sport. It is equally true that if we measure the season solely by adding up the total scores we are missing the whole point.

Football a Sport not a Business.

Speaking of football as not a business brings me to the last of the four tendencies, which is that we are "businessizing" football to its great detriment as a game.

This is really simply the natural result of this idea that every team must have a "winning season."

Therefore we must organize for it.

No precaution to prevent defeat must be overlooked.

Nothing left undone that might help pile up the score.

Let me cite a few illustrations—some of them are isolated cases. I do not claim that they all represent any general practice. I cite them simply as illustrations of tendency.

Are the Coaching Staffs Too Large?

In a few institutions which I have in mind, the amount of money spent on the coaching staff is out of all proportion to the amount of training and teaching which the squad needs if the team is to know enough about the game to play it intelligently. It is not necessary that every player on the team should know

the last detail in the development of the art of playing football. This is not a business, it's a game—a schoolboy game.

The size of some of the paid coaching staffs can be justified in my opinion only on the theory that nothing must be left undone that will tend to produce a winning team.

Scouting.

I will take scouting as my next illustration. Why not teach the boys the fundamentals of the game, train them in some of the technique, give them plenty of illustrations of its broad opportunity for strategy and let it go at that?

Why do we deem it necessary to scout out the opponents' plays, plot them out in detail and have the second team play them versus the varsity the entire week before the match?

The answer is easy. It is because we do not want our team to be taken by surprise. Why not? Our opponents might produce some new strategy, the team might not fathom it and the opponents might win. All right. Why not? Strategy is one of the finest elements of the game, and it ought to win unless counterbalanced by some equally fine unscouted strategy of our own.

Scouting is a good illustration of the tendency to make winning a business. It is efficiency engineering applied to a game for schoolboys by their elders.

Coaching From the Side Lines.

Coaching from the side lines is another illustration. Many coaches rigidly refuse to interfere, either directly or indirectly, with the conduct of the game or in the development of its strategy.

Others, and for the good of the game it seems to me too many others, use every opportunity to direct and dominate the strategy of the play during the progress of the match.

Why? I suppose it is because such a coach does not consider he has fulfilled his responsibilities when he has taught the players the fundamentals, the technique and the code of the game which they themselves are supposed to play. Perhaps he assumes that his job is to win