

Schwegler You raise a very difficult and tricky question. Perhaps angels should fear to tread on this ground but since you ask me, I will undertake to tell you what is in my mind. Formal athletics, as presented by the spectacular performance of carefully selected and trained teams, answer a deep psychological hunger for mastery on the part of those of us who do not play. The mediaeval knight, jousting with his opponents in the presence of the assembled populace, is merely another answer to this same eternal hunger of the human individual for mastery. The gladiatorial combats in the Roman arena are another. There has always been the desire on the part of the commonplace individual to have the psychic thrill of superiority and mastery. Unable conveniently to devise ways and means of achieving this feeling of mastery in connection with the humdrum routine of ordinary life, we set up occasional situations in connection with which we secure by a species of identification with our team the thrill of contest and the ecstasy of victory. Looked at from this angle, athletics, whether intercollegiate or otherwise, possess a very definite psychic and social value. They bind otherwise loosely organized groups into coherent bodies. They offer escape mechanisms for persons about to be overwhelmed by the monotonous routine of daily serving.

Their value is undeniably great enough to outweigh the dangers and disadvantages. If such were not the case they would have been abandoned ages ago. However, they do not constitute physical education. They are something wholly apart. It just happens that in order to be an efficient publicly acceptable professional athlete one has to be efficient in physical skills and physical prowess. One's health has to be topnotch, one has to practice in daily life the things that physical education teaches. It is unfortunate, however, to confuse physical education with athletics. Physical excellence happens to be involved, but athletics are not physical education. They merely utilize its products.

Allen Dean Schwegler, that is an interesting analysis. But would you not say that the series of inhibitive activities that the athlete indulges in are educational? Is there, or is there not, a transference of training from the field of athletic strife, where the boy learns to say "no" a thousand times to temptation in order that he may say "yes" once to victory, to other fields of endeavor?

Schwegler Every study of the transfer of learning that has come to my attention points in the direction of a negative answer to your question. The facts of human experience as illustrated by the extra-scholastic life of athletes seems to coincide fairly well with the theoretical discoveries of the laboratory. It is almost a commonplace to learn that the athlete off the job is not characterized by any outstanding degree of temperance or continence; and there is in many, many cases a painful record of physical and mental disaster resulting from the obliteration of inhibitions, either during or shortly after the period of athletic pre-eminence. There is little reason to believe that, except under somewhat special conditions, the habits of continence and temperance which function almost automatically when