

Another element that must not be neglected in our appraisal of the future of intercollegiate athletics is that of student activity. Like the general public, and the alumni, the students are not now satisfied to be in the role of spectators. They desire participation in games. This attitude explains the lack of so-called College Sprit which so depresses certain alumni. Said one such to me, "Something is wrong. When I was in college every man marched down to the field on Thursday before the big game to give the team a great sendoff. Now it is impossible to get a quarter of them out." He had not observed that on that afternoon there were several intramural football games on the practice fields; crowded tennis courts; soccer practice; cross country and a dozen other forms of organized games claiming the attention of that other three-fourths who, without being disloyal, wished to devote their time to the enjoyment of their own competition, and recreation.

In modern education we set great store by systems of achievement grading, and of tests to determine positive rating. Why not evolve a system by which the relative athletic rating of colleges and universities will not depend upon games won and lost so much as upon the total number of participants in those games? If Intercollegiate competition is of educational value, as I believe it is, then the more participants a college has, the more successful is its athletic policy. To explain what I mean - during the present academic year at Lafayette College, our athletic teams have participated in 123 dual games and have won 55 of them. This is by no means a brilliant record. The fact, however, that 288 students or 29 per cent of our student body has represented the college in these contests, is I believe, a cause of some satisfaction. And if by means of a system of special weights meeting similar teams from other colleges, the number of participants would be considerably increased, the results would be correspondingly more gratifying. Again it means more to have had 300 men playing football last fall as we did than to have won all our intercollegiate games - and to have 22 baseball teams playing full schedules this spring than to have several varsity men batting 400. I can get up little enthusiasm over the so-called three-letter man. Unless his is particularly brilliant, the question naturally arises as to how much else he is getting out of college. To encourage three one-letter men is far better policy than to glorify ~~the~~ one three-letter man.

Another matter that needs definition in the light of future needs is that of major and minor sports. As a spectator, and a frequent one, at football and baseball games, I am willing to admit they are major sports; but as a duffer on the golf course, I wish that golf had been a major sport at my college and that I had been compelled to major in it. After all if College is an institution worthy to survive, it cannot be an end in itself but a means to an end, and the subjects in its curriculum must be simply a means to an end - the end being an abundant life. Football is largely an end in itself. In other words, not one out of 1000 men play it after leaving college. It teaches participants fine lessons in self-control, team work and sportsmanship, but in continuing active effect its influence is limited. On the other hand, tennis, golf, swimming, fencing, if properly mastered in college, will be sources of enjoyment for many years after undergraduate days are over. It would appear to be the part of educational efficiency then for a college to elevate some of these minor sports to a place of major importance; and to give every student an opportunity to go out and become expert in some game that he will continue to play for many years.