

M4
N144i
c.1

INTERCLASS CONTESTS.*

JAMES NAISMITH, M. D., UNIVERSITY OF KANSAS.

We may lay it down as a fundamental principle that no game or event can survive unless it is capable of progress, as the requirements of life change; for games are played to satisfy that instinct which is the hereditary habit of the race, and as the race advances the race instinct must also advance. Thus most of our games have changed materially in the last few years, and have changed in such a way as to bring into play the powers that are used in everyday life. Thus football is changing from a game in which brawn is the chief requisite to one where skill, finesse and concentration are the chief factors, as these are of greater value to the business and professional man of to-day than weight of body or strength of muscle.

So, too, baseball has changed from the game where individual skill was the main requisite to one where the whole team works together as a unit. The game is becoming more complicated and difficult to acquire.

The business world and each social unit is becoming more complex and dependent on the other units to make up the whole, as we find in the units taking their part in the work of the whole. So our games must partake of this same element, and the factor which is made prominent is that of coöperation.

Track athletics are lacking in this element of coöperation. In the events there is very little of the social or coöperative. It is the individual alone who is responsible for the event.

It is this element of individuality that makes track athletics lag in popularity among the college games. The event becomes one of individual merit and the single strong competitor may far outweigh a combination of good men. This is against the spirit of the age where the majority of the units determine the result of the contest.

The line of evolution now for track events must lie in the effort to make them partake more of the coöperative and less of the individualistic spirit.

Intercollegiate athletics are for the few rather than for the many, and the number of participants is necessarily limited, but there is no reason why this should be true of class athletics. The

* Read before the Society of College Gymnasium Directors, New York, December 31, 1908. Reprinted from the AMERICAN PHYSICAL EDUCATION REVIEW, March, 1909.