DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 175 823 SP 014 471

AUTHOR Freeman, William H.
TITLE College Athletics in the Twenties: The Golden Age or Fool's Gold?
PUB DATE Mar 77
NOTE 26p.; Paper presented at the Pre-Convention Symposium on the History of Sport and Physical Education, American Alliance for Health, Physical Education and Recreation (Seattle, Washington, March 1977)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Administrator Responsibility; *Athletic Programs; *Athletics; *College Programs; Educational History; Educational Quality; Football; Fund Raising; Physical Education; *Program Development; Social Indicators; Social Values; Sportsmanship; *Trend Analysis; Womens Athletics

ABSTRACT

A study of the problems ensuing from the growth of intercollegiate athletics during the 1920's into monumental fund-raising events reveals striking social parallels between that time and the present day. This paper examines the social and economic conditions that contributed to the "sports boom" of the Twenties and comments on the similarities found in the attitudes and approaches of modern-day varsity athletics personnel. The impact of disproportionate emphasis on competition on the development of physical education is discussed. Negative results of the changed attitude towards amateur sports with regard to educational quality, admissions standards, and national philosophy are also considered. The appropriate place of athletic programs in the college curriculum is debated, and the history of women's sports in the 1920's is briefly mentioned. (LH)

Presented at Pre-Convention Symposium on the History of Sport and Physical Education, American Alliance for Health, Physical Education and Recreation, Seattle, WA, March 1977.

# College Athletics in the Twenties: The Golden Age or Fool's Gold

by William H. Freeman

State University College at Brockport, N.Y.

When Americans think of the period of the 1920s, the first reaction is usually the "Roaring Twenties," economic boom, high living, the Chicago mob, a time of carefree life. The second thought is often parallel, the "Golden Age of Sports" in the United States. Until the real rise to prominence of professional sports in the late 1950s and the glut of televised sports coverage in the 1960s and '70s, the Golden Age of Sport really was the 1920s. We see in the sport of the Twenties many facets of today's sporting scene: strengths, weaknesses, areas for hope and matters of concern. Sport in the 1920s still provides us with a vast area to explore as historians, yet we have scarcely approached the true significance of sport in the Twenties, a vast social phenomenon strongly reflected in the uneasy relationship between athletics and the schools during that time.

My area of concern here is that moment of history so often called "The Golden Age of College Athletics." One problem of prospectors for gold is, of course, the discovery of iron pyrites instead, "fool's gold." As we look more closely at college sport during the Twenties we may be tempted to conclude that rather than an Age of Gold, college

athletics really went through an Age of Fool's Gold. But I am getting ahead of myself; I need to be more specific in defining my problem and what I propose to do with it.

This Symposium has suggested as a general purpose the identification of historical relationships between sport and American education. My specific area of concern is intercollegiate athletics during the 1920s. I am studying the area as only one facet of a massive boom in the popularity of sports across the United States, for both participant and spectator.

I will try to respond to several areas of questions. First, what caused this vast outpouring of sporting fervor? What factors contributed to this unprecedented groundswell of sport in a nation that had shown considerable sporting interests for several centuries before this time? Second, what were the symptoms of this sporting boom, both positive and negative aspects? Third, what influence did those aspects have on the place of sport in American education, with a side view at the relationship created with physical education in the schools? Fourth, what lessons might we find in this period of sporting history? And finally, what are our research opportunities in the sport of the 1920s?

First, a look at the contributory causes of the First Golden Age of College Sports. A number of factors apparently coalesced during the late 'Teens and early 'Twenties to give impetus to the rise of

sport across the nation. Factors which preceded the First World War included a growing interest in athletics which was strongly reflected on the collegiate s cene. College sports had become big enough operation that a national organization began organizing in 1906 to try to bring about some control over the direction and emphasis of intercollegiate athletics. The National Collegiate Athletic Association was formed originally in response to problems in college football, but its interests were far broader than that. Intercollegiate sports had already been growing well before the war. After the interruption caused by the war, the interest in college athletics abounded.

Along with the already strong interest in intercollegiate athletics on the campus was the development of intramural athletics, seen partly as a way to train people for intercollegiate athletics and also as a sports outlet to involve more people in athletics than could be accomodated by the college teams. Led by the example of the University of Michigan, departments of intramurals began to appear shortly before World War I. The philosophy which was beginning to develop was one of "sports for all," the idea that sports had benefits which could be realized regardless of the level of one's skill in any particular sport. The result was a strong student interest in competitive sports, for some schools reported that as many as eighty per cent of their students took part in sports at some level.

Women's sports were also developing during this time, moving from

the lower intramural level toward intercollegiate programs. Interest increased in the women's areas during the 1920s, perhaps partly as a result of the Nineteenth Amendment, giving women voting rights and putting them a bit more into the mainstream of civic life. The women were in a time of expanded rights, coupled with a time of prosperity, so they experimented to determine the limits imposed by the new times. At the same time, there was a reaction during the 'Twenties against women's athletics, so while men's sports were expanding rapidly, the women's programs were often disappearing with equal rapidity, largely under the leadership of women physical educators who feared the physical and psychological stresses which they believed might result from programs as highly competitive as those of the men. While the men's programs were moving toward more national and international competition, the women's programs in the United States were often moving backward past the intramural level to a playday concept which was even less competitive than intramurals, even as women elsewhere were moving on to international competition.

Physical education also influenced the expansion of sporting competition, for during this time the older, more formal massed gymnastics programs of physical training, with their rigidity and lack of individuality, were beginning to be replaced by the "New Physical Education" preached by Thomas Denison Wood and Rosalind Cassidy in their 1927 text, the inclusion of sports and games in the

physical education program, also sometimes considered the American plan of physical education. This development came on gradually. Its seeds were sown before 1900, but just barely, for remember that games and sports were not even discussed as a possible part of the physical education curriculum during the Boston Conference of 1889. The major steps were taken in the 1920s. Sports and games were becoming accepted by physical educators as a legitimate part of the educational curriculum, which made it easier to justify the inclusion of intercollegiate athletics as a part of the educational activities of the nation's colleges and universities.

However, despite these contributory factors, the greatest impetus came from World War I, not from the war itself, but several developments which were either a part of or a result of the war. First and most notable was the astonishingly high rate at which American men failed to pass the physical requirements for entry into the armed forces. For a nation which had always prided itself on its national strength, this was a cruel blow. Its impact was similar to the impact of the Franco-Prussian War in 1870 on the French, for France's humiliating defeat by the Germans convinced Baron Pierre de Coubertin that France was suffering from the weakness of its youths. He looked outward at a British model, then worked for decades to develop the Olympic movement as a challenge to French youth.

The Americans saw that programs of physical education were needed.

America's young were weak, and the weakness was physical. This visible problem was combined with an approach used by the armed forces to help in combatting it: competitive athletics. The armed forces had used athletics extensively as a builder of physical strength and morale, and they considered it very successful. However, they had not anticipated the postwar effect of their heavy use of athletics among the troops. Many young men were for the first time exposed to a large variety of sporting activities of which they had previously been unaware. When they returned home, they continued their interest in many of the new sports, resulting in a great increase in sports competition across the country, much of it in sports not previously widely contested. Some of the sporting enthusiasts returned to carry the new sports to the colleges, while others competed at the non-school level.

After the war the Olympic Games began to expand considerably. Women's events were added during the 1920s, over the objections of Coubertin, and soon thereafter the Winter Olympics were begun. Some of the women's problems came from this expansion, for many people considered their competition at this level indecorous. The AAU attempted to take charge of women's athletics at this time, and the opposition of women physical educators to competitive athletics for the women was to a considerable degree a defensive response to this attempt to gain more power for the AAU.

The final factor in the sports boom of the 1920s, perhaps the

greatest factor, was economic: the United States went through a sustained economic boom which lasted for fully a decade, with little indication to the public that it would ever reverse. The American people had become more conscious of themselves as a part of the outside world at a time when much of the rest of the world was going through very difficult economic times. The contrast tended to build national complacency. The mark of the 1920s was adventure and escapism. People wanted to try new things, to have adventures, to be entertained. Sports helped in meeting many of those needs.

We might also note two developments which were growing in the colleges during the 1920s. First was the development of news bureaus to get publicity for the colleges. Sports was a good medium for this task, and they were not hesitant in using it. Sports was not the only area of the college which they publicized, but it was the most widely accepted by the media. At the same time college alumni groups were beginning to organize to boost their schools. The Twenties was the Age of Babbitt, the Chamber of Commerce boosterism applied to everything. The alumni retained few tangible school interests, except perhaps for the success of school teams. The colleges used sports to get to the alumni who might otherwise be difficult to approach financially. The colleges were quick to use sports for its fund-raising side effects and its reputation-building possibilities.

Sports more than ever became popular entertainment. First as

journalistic endeavors, then as radio and motion picture characters, athletes came more than ever into the public eye. The media clasped sport to its bosom, making reputations coast to coast in syndicated newspaper coverage. The Twenties also became a radio age, for the first commercial station opened in Pittsburgh in 1920, broadcast its first sporting event in 1921, and by 1924 the World Series could be heard from coast to coast and football games were weekly media events. By 1927 there were six and a half million radio sets in the nation, and the number increased by one half, to ten million, by the following year.

The Twenties had everything ready to provoke a massive boom in sports at all levels: public interest, financial opportunity, exposure of large masses to new sports, expanded opportunities for media coverage, and a time of public interest in new things. All that remained was to take advantage of the situation, which the colleges did. Intercollegiate sport suddenly became one of the hottest sporting scenes in the world.

So much for the factors contributing to the sports boom. What of our second question: what were the symptoms of the sporting craze of the 1920s? How do we know that the changes were really so massive?

Guy Lewis[1] has detailed a rather clear idea of the basic progress of intercollegiate athletics, showing us many of these symptoms, which we need first to look at dispassionately, with no regard to whether they

were necessarily good or bad directions for sport to take. Perhaps the most noticeable changes were in what John Rickards Betts[2] called "King Football," for football was the king of sports in the 1920s, at least in the colleges. The Twenties was a time of massive building programs in athletic facilities, with enough large football stadiums built for critics of athletics to complain that the United States had become an imperial Rome, with its coliseums and gladiators fighting to entertain the decadent masses, who were attired in skin of raccoon rather than togas and drank from the monogrammed hip flask rather than common cup of wine. The age of the concrete stadium had come to college athletics, as had the "Big Game," which might mean attendances of well over seventy or eighty thousand people at a football game. In ten years the stadium capacity for 135 of the more prominent colleges and universities in the United States had increased from a combined figure of under one million seats to over two and one half million seats. Futhermore, the annual football attendance doubled, reaching twenty million spectators a year by 1929.

The percentage of students participating in intercollegiate and intramural athletics was increasing dramatically, according to school reports, so the interest among the students was apparently at least as great as among the non-students. The attendance at contests was increasing rapidly despite much higher prices charged for tickets to games.

New sports were appearing and beginning to hold national collegiate championships. The colleges had provided championship meets for the high schools before the war, but the state high school federations were becoming more omnipresent, and the National Federation was formed in the 1920s to try to prevent the high schools from showing signs of the problems and abuses which were increasingly apparent in intercollegiate sports.

Media coverage was becoming a vastly expanded characteristic of Twenties sport, with colorful sports reporters vying to outdo each others' descriptions of events of the day. It was at this time that some leading public figures claimed that the best writing to be found in the newspapers was on the spor ts pages. (not necessarily the most accurate prose, but certainly the most interesting.

A reflection of the extent of the sports interest can be seen simply by wandering through the pages of the Readers Guide to Periodical Literature for the years of the decade. Around 1920 the number of articles on sport cited in the popular magazines is small, but by 1925 that is no longer the case. With football as an example, we gradually go from a year with perhaps half a dozen articles to a time when the articles are counted by the page, double-columned, numbering in the scores and appearing even in such magazines as the Literary Digest. To be sure, they were by no means all in favor of sports; many were critical of the overemphasis on athletics. Nonetheless, athletics was

coming in for a hugh share of the popular spotlight. The peak perhaps was reached with an article which the Saturday Evening Post considered unusual enough to publish on November 1st, 1930: "I Have Never Seen a Football Game."

The controversies were many. Are the athletes meeting the proper standards of scholarship, does athletics belong in the college program, is competition out of hand, is athletics corrupt, has college athletics become Big Business, and so forth. The controversy seems continual, until it was capped by the release of the Carnegie Report in 1929, of which more later.

We had, then, an intense interest in intercollegiate athletics, and one which was not without its problems. So, we need to look at our third problem or question, that of the influence of these symptoms of boom on the place of athletics in American education, coupled with their influence on physical education.

One clear aspect of the boom was that sports was increasingly absorbed as a legitimate part of the educational experience to be provided by the schools, not just at the college level, but at the high school level and even lower. This is not to say that it was a good or bad trend; it simply was a trend. Clearly it was a controversial trend, for the periodicals of the day spent much time arguing whether such an absorbtion of sports programs into the schools was proper or beneficial. However, while they argued, they continued to

absorb and expand. Apparently the only contrary argument which carried enough weight to slow the development was one of cost, but until the end of the Twenties money was rarely considered that great a problem. Many individuals of high academic regard defended athletics, pointing out that many successful teachers and scholars had been athletes and that the academic record of athletes was at least as good as that of the non-athletes. By this time sport was becoming accepted as a major factor in education even by many people of purely academic interests.

Another aspect was the expansion of physical education programs in the schools, coupled with a move to absorb athletic departments into the school (often combined with physical education). Teachers of physical education and athletic coaches, at this time still not so frequently the same people, were beginning to win acceptance as faculty members, rather than staff members on the periphery of the institution but not really fully a part of the school.

Perhaps one development which we often overlook was the change which many academicians and physical educators found most threatening: the gradual replacement of the "value of the struggle" emphasis with the "what was the result" emphasis, a slow loss of sport as valuable because of the means by which it is conducted, replaced by the more controversial interest primarily in the outcome. The point of the program was becoming victory, rather than competition.

Many issues sprang up during the 1920s, but perhaps they can be

seen more clearly as we consider them in the context of the fourth question, which was: What lessons do we see in this period of sporting history?

I think we are now at the point when it is time to look at some ideas expressed by the most important publication on intercollegiate athletics during the 1920s. I refer, of course, to the Twenty-Third Bulletin of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, titled American College Athletics.[3] Written by a staff member of the foundation, Dr. Howard J. Savage, with the assistance of Harold W. Bentley, John T. McGovern, and Dean F. Smiley, this careful study appeared almost perfectly in conjunction with the collapse of the American stock market in 1929. In many respects, it enjoyed a similar degree of popularity among the people to whom it was addressed.

The Carnegie Foundation had studied sports in the schools twice before: in 1925, a study based only on written materials from twenty American colleges; then in 1927, studying the sports program in the British schools and universities by visiting the institutions. The foundation then began a three and one half year study of American intercollegiate athletics which included considerable research and visitation. Their written comments were not popular.

This was no attempt at a hatchet job. In the preface to the report, Harry S. Pritchett, president of the foundation, tried to explain the view of school athletics held by the foundation:

> It has been assumed that there is a legitimate place in the secondary school and in the college for organized sports, that such sports contribute, when employed in a rational way, to the development both of character and of health. The report is a friendly effort to help toward a wise solution as to the place of such sports in our educational system. It has been necessary, in order to render this service, to set fourth the abuses and excesses that have grown up. This has been done with the most painstaking effort to be fair, as well as just.[4]

The report was critical of the abuses of college sport, the overemphasis upon competition, the financial shenanigans, and the lack of intellectual interests in what was supposedly an educational activity, but interestingly enough, much of the criticism was directed not at the coaches, athletes, alumni, or demanding public, but at the administrators of the nation's intellectual institutions. Some of the committee's comments bear repetition and much careful thought by today's faculty and administrators.

Some comments about the place of athletics in the college, and about the role of the school itself, are the following:

> In the United States the composite institution called a university is doubtless still an intellectual agency. But it is also a social, a commercial, and an athletic agency, and

these activities have in recent years appreciably overshadowed the intellectual life for which the university is assumed to exist.

In the second place, the football contest that so astonishes the foreign visitor is not a student's game, as it once was. It is a highly organized commercial enterprise. The athletes who take part in it have come through years of training; they are commanded by professional coaches; little if any personal initiative of ordinary play is left to the player. The great matches are highly profitable enterprises...in some cases the college authorities take a slice of the profits for college buildings.[5]

Some of these faults of the colleges are explained as the result of trying to progress too rapidly toward the status of "university," as it was understood in Europe.

> In their haste to become universities, our colleges adopted the name and then proceeded as rapidly as possible to grow up to it. This was effected by superposing a graduate school on the old college...The university, as so constituted, soon began to conceive of itself not merely as an agency for training students to think hard and clearly, but as a place where, without fundamental education, young people can acquire the elementary technique of...in effect, all the

vocations practiced in the modern industrial state.

It is under this regime that college sports have been developed from games played by boys for pleasure into systematic professionalized athletic contests for the glory and, too often, for the financial profit of the college....

It may well be that the political service of the present-day system of schools [that is, in providing equal opportunity and ending class distinctions] is its greatest contribution. But is it necessary to sacrifice the intellectual ideal in order to be democratic? There is nothing more democratic than the ability to think. To recognize and act upon that principle is a profound test of durable democracy....

The weakness of the American university as it exists to-day lies in its lack of intellectual sincerity. It stands nominally for high intellectual ideals. Its effort at intellectual leadership is diluted with many other efforts in fields wholly foreign to this primary purpose. Intercollege athletics form only one of these....

It is a useless enquiry at this day to ask who were responsible for the development in the colleges of commercialized sports. The tendencies of the time, the growing luxury, the keen intercollege competition, the influence of well-meaning, but unwise, alumni, the acquiescence in

newspaper publicity, the reluctance of the authorities of the university or the college to take an unpopular stand,--all these have played their part.

But there can be no doubt as to where lies the responsibility to correct this situation. The defense of the intellectual integrity of the college and of the university lies with the president and faculty. With them lies also the authority. The educational governance of the university has always been in their hands...The responsibility to bring athletics into a sincere relation to the intellectual life of the college rests squarely on the shoulders of the president and faculty.[6] With comments such as this, we should not be surprised that the appearance of the report brought forth squeals of pain from the schools whose programs were studied. Not surprisingly, none of the schools felt that the abuses were present in their own programs, though they had been the subjects of the study.

With such criticism as this, we are naturally curious as to the results of the study. Were changes made in college athletics in response to the not-too-surprising revelations? Did the NCAA rise up and demand that the colleges toe the line? Actually, the primary result apparently was nothing. While many people agreed with the information and conclusions of the report, the supporters and detractors did not split along academic-athletic lines. Some notable defenders of the

academic side of college life were strongly critical of the report. It aroused much controversy, but apparently fostered little agreement.

The report studied the abuses of college athletics, including problems caused by questionable or unclear values and problems which stemmed from the massive publicity of college sports, then it cited two things as fundamental causes of the defects in American college athletics. The first cause was commercialism, suggesting that many schools had become more interested in the monetary and material returns possible in athletics than with the educational values of sport. The committee commented that

> Commercialism has made possible the erection of fine academic buildings and the increase of equipment from the profits of college athletics, but these profits have been gained because colleges have permitted the youths entrusted to their care to be openly exploited...It is the undergraduates who have suffered most and will continue most to suffer from commercialism and its results...
>
> The argument that commercialism in college athletics is merely a reflection of the commercialism of modern life is specious. It is not the affair of the college or the university to reflect modern life.[7]

How many of us noticed that one court has ruled that being a varsity athlete in college has a financial value to the athlete, and that that

value cannot be abridged?

The second cause cited was the schools' negligence toward the educational opportunity for which the college was supposed to exist. The committee called for a change in values, and charged that the college needed to return to a concern with its essentially intellectual function.

College sports began to drop off at this point, the end of the Twenties. Budgets and attendance fell, the number of competitive sports was cut back, and recreational interests began to come more to the fore. Was this a result of the impact of the Carnegie Report, or was it, as may be more likely, simply because the Depression had begun to make its impact in the heartland of 1920s intercollegiate athletics, the pocketbook? We do not really know.

Now, to those lessons I mentioned earlier. The first comes from a bit of philosophy, the idea that while challenge lies at the heart of our culture, we need to be careful to contain its impulses if the challenges are to be a positive, rather than a negative, influence upon us.[8] Competition can get out of bounds, as William A. Sadler, Jr., pointed out. He noted that while our competitive urges grew with the Social Darwinism of the 1870s, we actually have found that in a modern society cooperation is far more important than competition. We discovered the limits to the value of unlimited competition in business in the late nineteenth century with the so-called "Robber Barons." Indeed, they did

compete to cut prices, but only to drive their competitors out of business, so they could then charge as much as they wished. For this reason, we find many controls clamped onto our free enterprise system.

We may discover that the same is true in athletics. We may be making a grievous error if we place such an unlimited emphasis upon competition, pushing it to a high level at ever younger ages. I coach track and field. Those of you in that sport know that you can get a set of so-called "world records" for all ages, giving the world record, for example, for the one mile run for two-year-olds. We can see parents pushing pre-schoolers to break records, when the children have no real idea of what a record is. We are turning out a nation so hooked on competition that according to one book on administrative theory the new dominant character is not the old "Organization Man" but the "Gamesman," involved in everything primarily for the challenge of winning. The ultimate level is reached with the "no-contests" appearing on television, with network-appointed "superstars" competing in non-events accompanied by great publicity, in a sense the ultimate use of sports as a commercial enterprise.

So, what does our lesson show us that we needed in the 1920s, and still, you may have noticed by the familiarity of the problems, need today? For one thing, we need college presidents and faculty who have the integrity to stand up for educational sport. Do we have them?

We need strong national organizations to strictly enforce rules

of ethical conduct in educational sport, such as the NCAA claims to do. Do we have such bodies which will seek out and strongly censure any such misconduct, no matter where it occurs? No. The NCAA is frightened of its own shadow in this area; it has become a dollars and cents organization itself. The women of the AIAW are as suspicious of the NCAA as they are of the unfortunate example of men's college athletics, and well they should be. Unfortunately, the AIAW is already edging in the same directions in its own conventions.

We need a strong public stand by coaches' organizations for ethics in sport, for sport as an educational experience. Do we get it? No, we see a coach hitting a camera man after a losing game, or cursing a reporter who has suggested that some ethical violations might have occured. You will notice that we hear nothing from the president of his institution. Perhaps like many of our schools, it has no president, at least in the sense of educational or ethical leadership where intercollegiate athletics is concerned, for the coach , whatever his failings of educational philosophy, brings home the bacon on Saturday afternoons. And college presidents are not exactly Muslims, in that respect.

We need, above all, to clearly define the place of athletics in education, then fight to see that our schools live up to it. The Carnegie Report detailed the values of athletics at length. And accepted th- But even among physical educators we do not agree on the values

of athletics. We do not even agree that they are valuable. I have seen every stage from blind worship of competitive sport, however unethically conducted, to ill-disguised hate of athletics, however well-conducted, all among physical educators. We physical educators are often also the coaches under discussion, so our house should be put in order first.

Finally, we should decide whether we want genuinely amateur sports, or semi-professional, or professional sports. We face an immediate problem with our proposals for developing international competitors by helping them financially. We want to stay in the real world, but in a sense that is not our primary task. Yet, we have taken no stand. Have we even given that much dispassionate thought to the problem?

I realize this list of lessons of the Twenties sounds more like the lessons of the Seventies. The reason is simple: The situation has changed very little. The same problems are still here. We have done little or nothing about them. We have, in fact, an extension of the Golden Age of Sports, for it is really today, not in the 1920s. Today college sports is spelled M-O-N-E-Y and, for we weaker spellers, T-V. For many years schools at one level would not schedule their contests to conflict with schools at another level, drawing away their spectators. Now the colleges play basketball on local television almost every night of the week in some areas, and lower schools and small colleges are hurt in attendance. Once the colleges would not play on Sundays for religious considerations, but say "television contract," and they'll

play in the aisles of your church during the services. And cuss at the ushers for bad calls.

We are not speaking about even vaguely amateur sports or educational sports. We have had many lessons given to us, but whether we have absorbed or accepted them is questionable. What will it take for us to say to the colleges, "Enough!"?

My final area of inquiry concerned our research opportunities in the period of the 1920s. We can find much written of the period, but much of it is "Gee Whiz" history. John Rickards Betts was one of the few to look at the Twenties with much care, but even then we are speaking of 20 or 30 pages for ten years of sports at all levels. We need to look more closely at the factors from which the sports model of the 1920s arose. We need to study the factors causing the problems, and how those problems might have been avoided before they became so great. We need to study the effects of alumni pressure on the development of collegiate sport, the relationship between the American business ethic and the growth of sport. We need to look at the use of sport by college presidents to build school and personal reputations, both for young and small or isolated schools. We need more research on the role of the student in the expansion of sport. Finally, we need research on the actual effect of the Carnegie Report. It detailed abuses still common, perhaps more common today than in the 1920s. Was anything really accomplished by the report? What effect did it have on the colleges?

On educational policy? On athletic departments? Did it have any impact or effect upon physical education programs? Were the short-term areas of decline in college sports from about 1929 to 1931 or 1932 an effect of the impact of the report, or were they simply an outgrowth of the economic collapse of the Great Depression? Did the boom of the 1920s affect the programs in the black colleges, and was there another change after the Carnegie Report?

We need to study the college athletics of the 1920s historically, but with due consideration for sociology, economics, and philosophy, if we are to really understand a complex period. Most of our research has been as superficial as this paper, a skimming of the waters of a very deep pool, and one whose example is clearly similar to today's uneasy alliance between education and athletics. Let us hope that we will continue to study our problems of yesterday in the hope that we can find the hints which might help us to solve our problems of today and tomorrow.

Footnotes

[1] Guy Lewis, "Enterprise on the Campus: Developments in Inter-Collegiate Sport and Higher Education, 1875-1939," in Proceedings of the Big Ten Symposium on the History of Physical Education and Sport, ed. by Bruce L. Bennett, The Athletic Institute, Chicago, 1972, pp. 53-66.

[2] John Rickards Betts, America's Sporting Heritage: 1850-1950, Addison-Wesley, Reading, MA, 1974, pp. 254-258.

[3] Howard J. Savage, ed., American College Athletics, Bulletin No. 23, Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, New York, 1929,

[4] Ibid., p. vi.

[5] Ibid., p. viii.

[6] Ibid., pp. ix-x, xiii, xviii, xx-xxi.

[7] Ibid., pp. 306-308.

[8] William A. Sadler, Jr., "Competition Out of Bounds: Sport in American Life," Quest, XIX, 124-132.