

at least one eye half open admits that there is *some* proselytizing in the present picture—but no one does anything about it, anything helpful. But something needs doing because this malignant lesion, this hypocritical parcelling out of sinecure jobs, is devitalizing many of our best athletes. Surreptitiously pay a boy more to play football in college than he can earn on the outside in honest employment and you leave a scar on him which he'll carry far beyond the campus halls. Having grown used to the feel of this so-called "easy money" during his days of eligibility, he often turns to professional football when his college days are over. You have, in fact, only to study the roster of the professional football leagues of the United States and note the players' college affiliations to learn where proselytizing is dominant.

Now you can't get rid of this great straight-faced subterfuge by talking about it. That has been tried. I doubt if you can get rid of it at all. But you can dignify it—by recognition. You can bring it out into the fresh air of public intelligence, agree on principles, establish a few simple, businesslike procedures—and so achieve scrupulous honesty in the athletic department of an institution dedicated to honest thinking, the college.

Talking, I have just said, has been tried. Three years ago the Committee on Student Group Life drew up some *Standards of Athletic Eligibility*. The National Association of State Universities endorsed them. Article III of these *Standards* provides that:

The faculty committee on eligibility shall, in advance of competition, require of each candidate for competition in any sport a detailed statement in writing of the amounts and sources of his financial earnings and income received, or to be received during the college year and the previous Summer, from others than those upon whom he is naturally dependent for support. In case any question arises with regard to the implication of this statement, the matter shall be referred to the executive committee of the conference for decision.

If the above unfair discriminatory regulation does not produce mass perjury, then pass judgment upon the following edict from the same *Standards of Athletic Eligibility*:

Every candidate for an athletic team must, after a careful explanation of all the eligibility regulations and their implications of honor, by the faculty committee on athletics, declare orally to the committee and in writing upon his honor his eligibility or ineligibility under each separate regulation. Each member of the athletic staff, physical-education department, athletic council, and faculty committee on athletics shall upon his honor in writing certify his own adherence to all the athletic regulations and to the best of his knowledge

the eligibility or ineligibility of every member of the team that represents the institution.

There is no admission or confession here stated that the majority of athletes are receiving secret subsidies, but the very tone of this act immediately gives it the spirit of the inquisition, and then the crime results in getting caught. This scheme above mentioned was in operation a decade ago concerning Summer baseball for collegians, and it failed dismally. It is working no better today.

Open, honest subsidy is the only answer. But by subsidizing I do not mean the hiring of athletes merely for playing ability, at a salary based on skill. We have that sort of thing now in the tramp athlete, the youth who seeks to barter his physical prowess *not* in exchange for an earnestly desired education, but only for an attractive monetary consideration. I am vehemently opposed to him and his kind, as I am certain, most college coaches are. I am irrevocably against professionalism of ~~any~~ *any* sort or any other in college athletics!

But if subsidizing means "to furnish aid with a subsidy," or to give the athlete an even break with other students, then my answer is *Yes! And why not?*

Today is the age of subsidizing. James Bryant Conant, president of Harvard, stated recently that Harvard would subsidize the best young brains of the United States at his institution. Students preparing for law, medicine, engineering, the ministry, and all the professions have been and are subsidized through scholarships and fellowships. Why exclude physical education and athletics? "Without discrimination for or against the athlete" has long been the slogan of the present purity collegiate eligibility rules committee. There has been much talk but little action to shift that principle into gear. Byron ("Whizzer") White, superb football player from Colorado, is to be subsidized in England with a Rhodes Scholarship. Yet if the English practice of subsidizing Rhodes Scholars were applied to our American college athletes, all would be declared ineligible by our own eligibility committees.

One of the requirements of the Rhodes Scholarship is, in fact, that the applicant be outstanding in at least one sport. English education, in other words, encourages physical skill, while American education looks upon that kind of skill with suspicion.

The athlete, I repeat, is already and many times discriminated against. Just why should the finger of suspicion be pointed at a healthy, husky American boy because he wants to play a game in which he excels? Why should he be hailed into an academic court, lectured to, and caused to sign papers and also to declare orally that he is without stain of professional guilt any more than the rotund and dappered campus luminary with a Carusoan voice, who sells his talent *by* [Continued on page 59]



Photo: International News