



## Should College Athletes Be Paid?

## PS!

## - Says Forrest C. Allen

Director of Physical Education, Basketball Coach, University of Kansas

UBSIDIZE college athletes? That's what we're doing now-furtively. There is not a college in the United States, excepting Johns Hopkins University and one or two others, that does not subsidize athletes.

Take the university with the 40 thoughtful alumni, for a sample. Every year each of these "well-heeled" gentlemen endows four scholarships each of which pays \$125 monthly. This has a way of bringing 160 hand-picked athletes to the campus every Fall. But the scholarships aren't exactly gifts. The boys have to earn them—by visiting their mothers at Christmas and Easter, absolutely! Beyond that there are no strings.

Or turn to that State university which a year or two ago diverted \$10,000 from its athletic association for advertising. The sum bought football and basketball players . . . at \$90 a month.

The same salary scale holds in a certain other school, but there the selection of the athletes who shall benefit is a matter of pure science—of trial and error. Each

August the football department holds a training camp where the varsity men start conditioning themselves for the Fall schedule. To the camp come also the freshmen prospects whom the athletic director and his aides have corralled during the Summer. Double workouts are held daily, and the new lads who survive the grind are selected to attend the institution—at \$90 a month, plus board, room, tuition, and all theater and baseball tickets. Freshmen who make poor showings in the gridiron drills are released—just as are the hopeless rookies in the Spring training camps of baseball's major leagues. Which is all very convenient. The coach knows what he's to work with before the boys matriculate—not after.

Football is no longer a sport! It's a business! A surreptitious business, a clandestine business—but a business nevertheless! I could offer further proof. I could cite as an added instance the school whose assistant athletic director is a sort of glorified paymaster. He handles all the monetary arrangements for the school's athletes whether they live on or off the campus. He "cracks down" on them if they violate training rules or let their scholastic averages slip. The football coach and the athletic director, of course, know nothing about it-but you and I both know that they know.

Someone has said that our American life divides itself into three epochs: the passing of the Indian, the passing of the buffalo, and the "passing of the buck." We are

still in the last epoch—in the administra-

Continuing the Debate-of-the-Month Series tion of college athletics. Everyone with