

YALE AND ATHLETICS

A. Bartlett Giamatti

APRIL 10, 1980

AYA Assembly XVI
April 10, 1980
A. Bartlett Giamatti

YALE AND ATHLETICS

As is customary, we can discover how we think about ourselves by looking at how we speak about ourselves. Our subject tonight begins in two words of ancient Greek, athlōn and athlōs, which shape a third, athletēs. Athlōs meant a contest; athlōn, a prize won in a contest, and they provide us athletēs, an individual competing for a prize in the public games. Here in small compass is much of the ancient Greek world. Life and all that is valuable is seen as a contest. Struggle and contention lie at the core of everything, and one must devote all one's being to winning. If one wins, there is a prize, a tangible mark of triumph in the endless competition. Merit, skill, capacity -- call it what you will -- must be tested, and if victorious, rewarded.

No part of Greek life was immune to this view of competition or to the possibility of triumph. If you won a footrace or a chariot race, you could ask Pindar to immortalize your achievement in an ode; if you were Aeschylus or Sophocles or Euripides, and you won the annual three-day contest for dramatists in Athens, you gained a prize. By the fifth century B. C., what we would call the realms of the athletic and the artistic were not separate in the intensity of competition or in the assumption that reward would follow victory or in the importance placed on the activities by the culture. The athlete and the artist lived in the same world and did the same thing: they both asserted the spirit in order to thrust the individual beyond time and achieve something permanent.

A sense of proportion between the exertions of body and mind was essential to the shaping of a triumph or a life, and this perspective is concisely expressed in the dialogue between Socrates and Glaucon in the Third Book of Plato's Republic.

Socrates sums it up:

. . . it seems there are two arts which I would say some god gave to mankind, music and gymnastics, for the service of the high-spirited principle and the love of knowledge in them -- not for the soul and body incidentally, but for the harmonious adjustment of these two principles by the proper degree of tension and relaxation of each. (412)

An earlier, Homeric ethos of winning at any cost was transmuted by Plato's time into a strict observance of the rules and a deep sense that the law was essential to survival. The toughness, however, of their ancestors remained part of the Greek soul that Plato was so concerned to reform; for while Plato asserted physical training and games as explorations of knowledge of the spirit on behalf of a healthy citizen and healthy state, he never considers athletics as pleasurable in itself. Nor did he have any idea of sportsmanship. Or what we call character building. In Plato, physical training and games are part of the necessary regimen that will make a soul shapely and balanced and thus defend it against impurities, defend a city against its enemies. The concept of athletics as important for creating other values, of teamwork, moral character, social equality, comes as a legacy from nineteenth-century England.

English life before the nineteenth century enjoyed sport -- some bloody, some not, but in most cases unorganized. Only over a century ago, in the 1850s and 1860s, were the rules of many games codified, with the rules of Rugby football being set in 1846. That game carries the name of a great English public school and indeed the reform of that school, under Dr. Thomas Arnold, and of the other old public schools, is central to the history of the rise of organized games in England. In those schools, and the ones founded at mid-century on their model, games began to assume overwhelming importance. The sage and serious Dr. Arnold, and his epigones, were intent, through their sermons and their schools, on training Christian gentlemen for service to Church and State and sport was not, at least to Arnold, an important ingredient in the moral recipe for a responsible Christian servant of society. But Arnold's notion of his school was not the notion the world enjoyed. In 1858, a former student of Arnold's, Thomas Hughes, wrote an immensely successful and influential novel about a boy at Rugby. The novel was called Tom Brown's School Days and it presented another Rugby, the Rugby where games were the heart of school life and of the making of a brother in what came to be called the fellowship of muscular Christians.

A Master in Tom Brown's School Days says of cricket that the "discipline and reliance on one another, which it teaches, are so valuable." In an educational philosophy where character is more important than intellect and teamwork more valued than individuality, games are the teachers; the school is simply the place where the games happen. By mid-century, as Asa Briggs has said, games are

"institutions" and on the fields of those institutions develop ideals of sportsmanship, and fair play, and team spirit, and the development of character for later life, which are still with us. How different are those from the Greek ideals. The Greeks saw physical training and games as a form of knowledge, meant to toughen the body in order to temper the soul, activities pure in themselves, immediate, obedient to the rules so that winning would be sweeter still. The English ideals, on the other hand, aim beyond the field to the battleground of life, and they emphasize fellowship, sacrifice, a sense that how one plays is an emblem of how one will later behave; they teach that victory is ultimately less important than the common experience of struggling in common. Discipline and a view of life as a contest are part of both attitudes, but the two concepts of the value and purpose of athletics are as different as they can be, as different as exalting a shining, individual winner, and cherishing a character that effaces itself in the team.

We inherit these distinct views of athletics, each with its own aspects of cult, each placing athletics within an educational framework, each devoted to an amateur ideal. Both views are held in common by individuals and by institutions to this day, but they coexist uneasily. That ambivalence exists within our own Ivy Group -- those institutions most closely modeled on the English public schools and universities, where organized collegiate competition grew up in America in the nineteenth century -- and that ambivalence is easily stated: does one place the highest value on winning or does one subordinate victory to the larger values of an educational institution? We think we have chosen the latter idea, but we are nervous, nervous because we

do not want to lose at anything, any more than Tom Brown, or Frank Merriwell, did. The ambivalence about how to merge winning and education is writ large in the country's ambivalence about big-time collegiate athletics; it is obvious in the national debate about the 1980 Summer Olympics -- the Greeks among us, believing in their individual destinies, want to go to Moscow and win; the Celts among us, team members all, will play along with President Carter.

Where does Yale stand in 1980? Do organized games and physical training have any role in our modern University, and if they do, what are their purposes? If my sketch of how athletics has come to us is valid, it is clear that we behave like the English and think like the Greeks. But to create a contest between the ancients and the moderns and then to stand as spectators at the match trying to decide which side to root for is not enough. We must know if athletics figure in our educational scheme, and if so, how. I believe that athletics is part of an education of a young person, as the Greeks and the English schoolmasters believed; and I believe athletics is part of an education because athletics teaches lessons valuable to the individual by stretching the human spirit in ways that nothing else can. Is there a view of education that will contain this conviction concerning athletics?

There is, and I can offer it in no better way than by citing one of the subtlest and most powerful minds of the nineteenth century, another Englishman who thought profoundly about the nature of education. I refer to John Henry Newman and his The Idea of a University. In the fifth discourse of that work, Cardinal Newman distinguishes "liberal" education from "servile" or useful education. "There are

bodily exercises," he says, "which are liberal and mental exercises which are not." Those pursuits that are intellectual and not liberal are those of a professional or commercial education; he then turns to exercises of the body which are, in his sense, liberal.

Such, for instance, was the palaestra, in ancient times; such the Olympic games, in which strength and dexterity of body as well as of mind gained the prize. In Xenophon, we read of the young Persian nobility being taught to ride on horseback and to tell the truth; both being among the accomplishments of a gentleman.

And what is the conceptual grounding that allows for this view of physical training as "liberal"? ". . . that alone is liberal knowledge," says Newman, "which stands on its own pretensions, which is independent of sequel, expects no complement, refuses to be informed (as it is called) by any end, or absorbed into any art, in order duly to present itself to our contemplation. The most ordinary pursuits have this specific character, if they are self-sufficient and complete; the highest lose it, when they minister to something beyond them."

Newman drew upon Aristotle and other Greek thinkers to go beyond them, and to develop a view of a liberal education that also had his own culture's stamp upon it. We recognize that stamp when he says that education is higher than instruction because education "implies an action upon our mental nature, and the formation of a character" Various philosophies of education, therefore, come together

in Newman's idea of a liberal education, and various notions of athletics cluster too, in the larger vision here projected so powerfully. It is a vision to inspire us still, where the discrete character of the pursuit, physical or mental, is the essence; where the lack of expectation of sequel, the absence of an end except the enactment of the pursuit itself, makes the pursuit a liberal one. Thus, an athletic contest construed as enjoyable in itself, with no expectation of a consequence beyond the playing of it, as hard and as fully as possible, is a natural and inevitable part of a program of education called, in Newman's (and my) terms, "liberal."

Such an ideal of education, and of the proper place of athletics within it, should be with us to this day, in this place, and must shape our thinking. Such a liberal education, properly understood, supports athletics as an essential part of the educational process. It is equally consistent with this view, however, that athletics not outstrip that larger process, or deviate from it. Such an ideal means that we no more encourage a professionalism of spirit in athletics in our undergraduates than we encourage a professional view of the purpose of an undergraduate education. It means we believe in an education that is a process of exploration and fulfillment, not a process of pursuing a career.

Consistent with this perspective is Plato's idea of the necessity for proportion in things of the spirit. And thus we must remember that it is our obligation to consider our students as students above all else, and to treat them in an evenhanded fashion, and to construct their athletic programs so that their time to develop as thinking and feeling human beings is not deformed by the demands of athletic

pursuits. The time and effort given to athletics by a student must be proportioned in such a way that the student has more time and energy for studies than for sports. Yale is not the place for Tom Brown; his Rugby and Oxford had their still air broken often by the cries of players but never by the rustling of a page. There must be at Yale, in philosophy and in actuality, proportion in how the institution shapes itself and in how it encourages and sanctions a student's behaviour. Athletics is essential but not primary. It contributes to the point, but it is not the point itself.

By "athletics" in what follows, I mean formal sports systematically pursued, physical training and physical recreation. In thinking about athletics this way, one realizes immediately that many more people than students are involved. And therefore while it is appropriate to have a view of athletics within education for undergraduates, and we do, we must also remember that there are an equal number of graduate and professional students at Yale. For many of them, various forms of athletics are important. Within the University community, there are also postdoctoral students, staff, faculty, alumni, and the spouses of all these people, for whom access to and use of activities and facilities are important. Athletics generously conceived, therefore, touches thousands throughout the Yale community. When we construct principles according to which the University will allocate its resources for athletics, we must place an educational vision at the core, but we must also remember that it is a community of people larger than any student body. In constructing principles, we must remember also that Yale's physical facilities for athletics

need their share of resources, else a distinguished physical asset will continue to deteriorate and a whole community will be impoverished. Finally, we need always to recall that the production of revenue is as much a part of the picture of Yale athletics as the provision of services and opportunities. Yet as we seek actively to increase revenue so that growing expenses can be borne, we must be extraordinarily careful. We cannot increase revenues by exploiting students simply as athletes, or by allowing others to displace the Yale community for whom the physical resources are first intended. Most important, we cannot do anything to increase revenue that would in any way impair the general educational mission of the University. The management of all these ideas, and of the people, places and human efforts they involve, is a complex and fascinating task, and Yale is extremely fortunate to have a Director of Athletics, Physical Education and Recreation, Frank Ryan, who has brought energy and imagination to the post. Dr. Ryan is also a member of the faculty, a lecturer in the Department of Mathematics, and he embodies an understanding of the University's teaching and scholarly mission. In the Director, the University's commitment to athletics as part of the larger nature and purpose of the University is made manifest.

That commitment also informs the following principles that guide and will guide the University as it thinks of athletics and as it allocates scarce resources to athletics.

The first principle, already implicitly set forth, is that there must be a broadly-based program of athletic opportunities, of a competitive and non-competitive

sort, on a variety of levels.

The key phrase is broadly-based, because this is a total community. To indicate the extent to which some form of athletic activity is important to Yale, let me offer some statistics. Despite the fact that Yale does not offer courses for credit in physical education, and no longer has a physical education requirement for graduation, this year some 9,000 individuals have used the Payne Whitney Gymnasium on some basis. Not quite half were undergraduates, including 77% of the men and 80% of the women enrolled in Yale College; the others were about 3,000 graduate and professional students and some 2,000 faculty, staff and others and their families. Not all the users paid a fee because not all asked for a direct service, but that many people, and probably more, used Payne Whitney at some point. When one thinks of how many used the gymnasium often, it is an extraordinary amount of activity.

For a fee, there was this year even more activity. In the fall term, people took classes in aquatics, martial arts, exercise, dance and a wide variety of sports, taught by instructors in physical education and by varsity coaches. The total number here was over 2,000; most were students at all levels in the University. Thus, thousands used Yale facilities, indoor and outdoor, with and without the benefit of coaching or instruction. I believe we must sustain this broad program that allows for formal and informal physical activity, by individuals and by groups, at all seasons, for all purposes. America needs citizens who know how to cherish fitness of the body with fitness of the mind.

The second principle, focused on Yale College, follows from the first and it

is that the intramural program for athletics within the residential college system must be nourished and sustained. I need not tell this audience of how essential to an education in Yale College the residential colleges are; of how they are far more than simply residences because of the energy of the academic, literary, musical, theatrical, social and athletic life contained within them; of how they provide intelligible, manageable communities for advising, teaching, learning, and life. The intramural competition among the colleges is a critical element in the system's success. Again, statistics reveal part of the story. Of the roughly 10,500 applicants to the class of 1983 last year, 6,900, or 66%, noted on their applications participation at the varsity level in secondary school. Such a figure indicates an extraordinarily high degree of interest and involvement in athletics on the part of many young people, and it accounts for the high levels of participation in intramural sports. Last year, some 4,800 engaged in inter-college athletics during the fall, winter and spring seasons; this year, some 3,600 played during the fall and winter. Even assuming that some students participate in more than one season, the numbers engaged in this form of residential college life are impressive and confirm my conviction that the intramural program is essential to the health of the colleges and, therefore, to the vitality of the undergraduate educational experience.

My third principle speaks to a specific type of athletic activity: we must encourage a group of varsity sports that aspire to high intercollegiate achievement within the context of the Ivy Group. Yale currently has 37 varsity sports squads, the largest number offered by an institution in the Ivy Group. In this area,

we must strive to do what we do well, by providing coaching, which is to say, teaching, of the highest quality, facilities and equipment adequate to the needs and talents of the students involved, and an atmosphere of aspiration to excellence within the spirit of a liberal education and the context of the Ivy Agreement of 1954.

Varsity sports are important, though not more important than intramural athletics or the broad program of opportunities offered the whole community. We must recognize that varsity athletics is the most expensive part of the total athletic program and we must find appropriate ways to increase the revenue flowing from varsity sports. We must also recognize that it will doubtless be necessary to do fewer things, in this area of Yale as in others, in order to do what we do as well as possible.

In thinking about varsity athletics, we must understand that coaching is crucial and that the highest standard of coaching must be sought here as it must be sought in all other programs of a teaching nature in the University. Budgetary realities will mean that coaches will have to teach in the future in more than one area, whether those areas are two varsity sports, as happens now in soccer and tennis, or are in the areas of a varsity sport and physical education. I believe it must be widely acknowledged as well that recruiting is not coaching, and that the present practice of the recruitment of students who are athletes cannot encroach upon the time and effort that must be devoted to working with the students who are here, working with them and teaching them in one form or the other. I will return to this point later.

We all know that varsity athletics is the most visible part of the athletics program. It is the one some alumni, and others, find most immediately available as a form of connection with Yale. When a program in History or Physics or Divinity or Nursing is lessened or dropped, the people who think most fondly of Yale in terms of the Departments of History or Physics, or the Schools of Divinity or Nursing, do not feel as immediately betrayed as alumni and others seem to when the same process of necessary, and carefully considered, reduction goes on among varsity sports. In short, pressure groups flare up quickest in this area. And yet, if we insist, as I do, that athletics is essential to the larger educational program and purposes of Yale, then athletics at all levels cannot expect to be immune to the pressures afflicting all the other parts of the University. With regard to varsity athletics, some changes will continue to be made so that we can afford to do what we will do at the level of excellence Yale must expect.

Considerable numbers of students are involved in varsity sports -- by no means as many as the people who use Payne Whitney Gymnasium and its resources or as many as the students who exploit the athletic possibilities in the residential colleges, but a good number nevertheless. Last year, 1,264 students, or 20% of the undergraduate body, participated at the varsity level in three seasons. In some important ways, those varsity programs are in very good condition. We have done more, for instance, as a University than almost any institution in America on behalf of women's sports at the varsity level, and the record of Yale women in all-Ivy competition is good. As a percentage of wins to contests, the record of our women

varsity athletes has declined from a high of .808 in 1976-77 to an all-Ivy percentage of wins through the fall and winter seasons of this year of .571. That decline indicates an increase in competitiveness in the Ivy Group, not a diminishment of commitment to excellence at Yale. The others are catching up. The situation with regard to winning percentages in the area of men's varsity athletics is improving. In 1976-77, the men's percentage of wins to contests in the Ivy Group was .378; through the fall and winter seasons of this year it is .525. Why do I cite these percentages? Why do I bring up the won-lost records in assessing the health of varsity athletics? Because I want there to be no doubt about what I believe. I think winning is important. Winning has a joy and discrete purity to it that cannot be replaced by anything else. Winning is important to any man's or woman's sense of satisfaction and well-being. Winning is not everything but it is something powerful, indeed beautiful, in itself, something as necessary to the strong spirit as striving is necessary to the healthy character. Let all of us without bashfulness assert what the Greeks would find it absurd to suppress. Having said that, and meaning it, I repeat what I said above: our commitment to excellence, of aspiration and achievement, is based on the basic presupposition that athletics play a properly proportioned role within our educational philosophy and program.

There are ways, however, in which our varsity, and other, sports activities are not well off. Our facilities are not in good shape; some of them are in very poor shape. Within the context of the total University need to do maintenance, renovation and refurbishment, we must improve these athletic facilities. They are at the dis-

posal of thousands of people and are an integral part of the quality of the University. We must be first-rate in all things, and if we will not tolerate second-rate laboratories or libraries or faculty or students, we cannot tolerate mediocrity here. Next fall we will announce an effort to raise money for athletic facilities, and for other parts of the University's total program as well, and we will need your help.

Our fourth principle in making athletic decisions is that there must be opportunities for instruction and competition in a wide variety of physical skills. I have referred already to our programs and resources in physical education and to our commitment to individual recreation. There are others. We may well find that some varsity sports can only be sustained at a sub-Ivy level of competition, with part-time coaching or schedules that do not involve great amounts of travel. We ought also to remember that Yale fields 18 Club sports, ranging from badminton through Frisbee to women's rugby. Club sports are the result of student initiative; the Department of Athletics, Physical Education and Recreation provides no administrative or technical support -- that is, it does not schedule contests or provide coaches -- but it does offer modest funding for equipment and travel. This year, 360 people participated in Club sports, and now that the applications for Club status from Women's Rugby and Men's and Women's Polo are approved, the number will be larger. The Club program is inexpensive; it is important as a way of providing an outlet for genuine interest without an elaborate administrative superstructure. Newman's ideal of the self-contained liberal pursuit fits the Club activities elegantly. In the same vein, and for similar purposes, one ought to note the

Outdoor Recreation program .

All the activities cited in these four principles are important to someone , and , in some sense , to all of us; all in varying ways are expensive to the University . The principles stated here are meant to provide a spectrum of activities and a set of priorities in how the University views these activities . Expenses must be reduced and just as clearly revenue must be raised . I know AYA Convocations are not comfortable when their bracing ether is sullied by references to Fund Raising but I trust you will let me note two areas of revenue that are important . The first is sources of revenue the Department must pursue and it is money from (1) the traditional use of athletic facilities at Yale by the whole Yale and Greater New Haven community in activities such as tennis , golf , sailing , horseback riding , ice skating and through memberships in Payne Whitney Gymnasium and through ticket revenue; and (2) the non-traditional uses of Yale athletic facilities , such as concerts in the Bowl, the acquisition of a paying tenant for the Yale baseball field, and entertainment events in the amphitheater of the Payne Whitney Gymnasium and on the baseball field .

The second area involves funds the Department has begun to receive , and here I wish to announce a major gift . By the magnificent generosity of William Clay Ford, 1948, the University has received a gift that will total \$2,000,000 for athletics at Yale . Mr . Ford has invited me to designate precise areas for its use and I have decided to designate that gift in the following ways: we will use half of it to endow the intramural program of athletics in the residential colleges , to insure the excel-

lence and long-range health of that program; and we will devote half of it to our most pressing need, the renovation of facilities. Specifically, \$1,000,000 will be put toward the renovation of the Coxe Cage in order to begin the long effort to bring the Cage back to good condition, so that it is once again suitable for athletic contests and for the myriad of alumni and other community events that occur near the Bowl. In these decisions, Mr. Ford encouraged me with his warmest support, and for that I am personally grateful. For his splendid faith in Yale and his timely, strong support of Yale athletics, and by that, his support of the whole institution, Mr. Ford has the deep gratitude of all of us.

We now come to the third part of this address, the mode of administration of athletics at Yale. In the largest sense, Yale athletics is governed by the educational principles and mission of the University; specifically, Yale athletics is governed by the agreements set down in the Ivy Agreement of 1954 and its subsequent refinements. The letter and spirit of these agreements are central to Yale's ongoing view of athletics, and I will return to this point later.

Internally, the responsibility for and authority over athletic matters in terms of policy and procedures are delegated to the Director of Athletics, Physical Education and Recreation. The Director is appointed by the Yale Corporation upon the recommendation of the President and the Director shapes matters of policy with the President. At the President's request, the Director also reports to the Corporation on athletic matters. For budgetary matters, the Director is responsible to the Provost and the University Budget Committee. Within this framework, the Director is in

full charge of the Department and its policies and personnel. There are other groups interested in athletics, such as the AYA Committee on Athletics, which comes from this body and reports to the alumni, the University Council Committee on Athletics, which advises the President, and the seventeen Alumni Sports Associations, which assist in raising money for various teams. None of these groups, however, welcome and useful as they are, has any direct role in the management of athletics at Yale.

The Director consults with groups internal to the University. There is a Students' Users Committee, a group that meets upon its own call with the Director and that is composed of five undergraduates, appointed by the Yale College Council, and three graduate or professional students, appointed by the Graduate-Professional Student Senate. There is another student group, one that the Director has taken the initiative to form and which he consults, in this case composed of the captains of the various varsity squads. And there is a third group, perhaps the most involved of all, a body growing out of the old Board of Athletic Control and then revised by the Jones Commission Report of 1976 and called the Athletic Executive Committee. Since its revision in 1976, this committee of faculty and administrators has never in fact functioned in an executive fashion and it could not. It should, however, be an advisory group to the Director, and I propose tonight to clarify that committee's function and to present it a name and a charge appropriate to its character and duties. The purpose of this new committee, whose composition is not significantly different from that suggested by the Jones Commission Report, is to bring the advice of the

faculty into the management structure of athletics at Yale in such a way that the central academic values of the University are present in the formation and review of athletic policy and procedure. Our conviction that athletics has an appropriate and essential role to play in the educational process is best given life by involving knowledgeable, experienced faculty in a collegial relationship with the Director.

The name of the committee will be the Faculty Committee on Athletics. Its membership will consist of six members of the Yale faculty, to include one residential college Master and one member of a professional school faculty. The term of service will be three years, with two members rotating off after each year. In addition, there will be an associate dean of Yale College, ex officio. The members of the Committee will be appointed by the President to advise the Director of Athletics, Physical Education and Recreation. The Director will be chairman of the Committee.

The charge to the Committee is simply stated and important:

- (1) to provide advice and consultation on issues brought to its attention by the Director;
- (2) to bring forward for the Director's consideration any area of concern or interest which pertains to athletic policy;
- (3) to review and scrutinize Yale's athletic policy;
- (4) to consult with the Director on matters of appointments and terminations and to confirm that appropriate procedures have been followed in actions resulting in either appointment or termination;

(5) to provide a responsible voice to the Yale community regarding the course of Yale athletics;

(6) to provide annually to the President and the Officers a report on the status of athletics at Yale, with particular regard to the relation of athletics to the academic purposes of the institution.

In a very real sense, this Committee and its charge speak to the heart of the concern expressed by the Jones Commission Report, which was: does Yale really care about athletics? The answer is unequivocally yes, Yale did care and will care; Yale cares enough to assert that athletics plays a vital part in the education of its young people and in the ongoing life of everyone else. As a sign of its commitment to athletics, Yale will treat athletics according to the same central educational values and with the same desire for excellence that it brings to its other essential parts.

After this look at our educational philosophy, at the principles and priorities established for athletics, and at the means by which these convictions will be translated into action within the University, where are we? We are ready for the future. And the future, while it will build on our strengths, also presents us with problems. We know about the problems with our athletic facilities; I will only repeat what I have said, if we are to attract people of the highest quality to Yale, for athletics and for other pursuits, then we must have facilities of the highest quality. That statement is particular to athletics and general to the whole University.

I believe, however, that we have problems of another sort as well, problems

with regard to the Ivy Agreement of 1954. While every Ivy institution observes the financial aid policies set forth in that agreement, there are other areas where we have drifted away, to put it most gently, from the original statement. Because I believe this to be the case, and because I believe Yale should be in the lead in reaffirming the spirit and intent of the basic Ivy Agreement, I brought to my fellow presidents in the Ivy Group in December a set of proposals and positions designed to bring us back to the basic principles. These proposals, now being studied by the Policy Committee of the Ivy Group, represent four areas where I intend to press as hard as I can for revision and reform. In these areas, I believe there is a lack of proportion, an imbalance, in the way the programs in athletics in the Ivy Group have been allowed to grow. The result of this disproportion is, in my opinion, that some students, and not a trivial number, spend far, far too much time, with the encouragement of the institutions, on athletic pursuits; the result is that coaching has gone a long, long way, particularly in some sports, to being a matter of recruiting and not of teaching; the result is that athletics in the Ivy Group now hunger for that next event, that sequel, that bigger-league look and feel, that I think violates the essence of what we believe the role of organized athletics in our institutions ought to be. If the Ivy Group wants to be more than a set of financial aid policies and a concatenation of schedules, then I think it must return to its first principles. Else, as a group and as individual institutions, we will lose precisely what is liberating and fulfilling in our kind of college athletics and we will gain nothing save the scorn of those who wonder why we act in a fashion so inconsistent with

our ideals and principles.

The proposals I made to my colleagues, and which found a cordial reception, are the following:

(1) We must, as a Group, discuss restricting recruiting by coaches to on-campus conversations and visits. It is, in my judgment, wrong to spend more for off-campus recruiting of students who are also athletes than is spent on the recruitment of students in general. Nor is it acceptable to the spirit of my proposal to designate an officer in the central admissions office as having a special, full-time responsibility for the recruitment of athletes. We all must recruit students for our institutions nationally, but I do not believe we should send our coaches to recruit students who are athletes as a special group. The present practices now pursued in varying ways everywhere only tend to create separate groups of students; these practices only escalate the competition for stars; they only force more and more of coaching to become hustling in the hustings. As I have said, coaching is teaching -- valuable, honorable and difficult. I believe it is demeaning to the profession of coaching when one has to spend so much time traveling and wooing off campus.

(2) We must, as a Group, cease to think of post-season competition in any varsity sport as the natural or even necessary consequence of victory. The Ivy Group championship must be the goal of our students, and where the Ivy championship is not the major goal, or is a figment only of the daily press' imagination, then the status of Ivy championships must be elevated and affirmed. What I find so

injurious to our principles and to the education of our students is the pressure to prep for the next step, the amount of time and effort expended to get up for what follows the regular season, the insidious sense that there is nothing valuable in the experience of being first-rate within your own league and that one has to complete some sequence to the national level. I am frankly not impressed with the argument that says: why can't we be excellent (or, you say we should be excellent) and therefore why can't we test ourselves against the best? Yale students are among the best; they are tested, and will be tested, with the best all their lives. It is to misconceive a Yale education, however, to think that education is intended simply to be the setting for a national-level athletic career in anything. If athletic gifts are there, and they blossom after graduation, fine. But Yale is not the place to come if the purpose of coming is to spend disproportionate amounts of time on athletics in order to compete beyond the Ivy Group while in college. I genuinely believe in Newman's ideal of a liberal education, an education designed at its heart not for what comes next but for the fulfillment of the pursuit, and the person, in and of itself. The spirit of post-season competition, in my view, violates that principle, whether that principle is construed as general to education or a specific to athletics.

(3) We must, as a Group, reexamine our schedules of practice and of play, in athletics, in terms of both their length and their scope. In the Ivy Group, I think we have in general regulated football well, and I say that knowing that I think ten games to a season is one too many and that a pre-season scrimmage, adding in effect one more game, should not be allowed. I cannot, however, express the

same confidence at all with regard to others, like hockey and basketball. In those sports, and others, we play at the varsity level seasons that I think are too long and schedules that move way beyond the Ivy Group into a staging area for national competition. Needless to say, I find such situations consistent with neither our educational principles nor our students' educational needs. I believe a number of sports need examination in terms of their schedules of practice and play at the highest level of the Ivy Group.

(4) We must, as individual institutions, if not as a Group, explore seriously the practice of multi-seasonal coaching assignments, that is, of requiring coaches to span more than one athletic season. If I am told that a given season begins too early or ends too late to allow such an arrangement, then my reply is that the season is probably too long; if I am told that a coach may have obligations with his players after the normal end of a season, then my reply is that we should not allow post-season competition; and if I am told that travel occupies, necessarily, a great deal of a coach's time after the season, then my reply is that we should not require, or allow, off-campus recruiting by coaches. My point is that coaches are teachers, and that they must not be made into something else by the multiple pressures brought about by present recruitment practices, post-season opportunities, and swollen schedules. A gifted coach, and there are many, can and ought to work with students in various contexts. Members of the faculty do; it is part of the pleasure, part of the job, part of the profession.

My first three proposals in particular are areas where I believe the Ivy insti-

tutions must act in concert. They need to act together for two reasons: it is impossible for one institution to act unilaterally and still remain in the Group in any realistic or practical sense; and, these institutions, having agreed to place athletics within similar educational programs, governed by a similar philosophy, must act in concert if they wish to affirm the integrity not only of their athletic activities but also of their larger programs and of that liberal philosophy.

Within an overall philosophy of education, the Ivy Group wants to combine, in athletics, training of skills and character with a joy in winning. I believe all the Ivy institutions want this and I believe it is a right and proper thing to want. I am convinced that if we go back to the first principles and to the spirit of our Agreement, we will find again, through common effort, a structure for the educational values, the sense of proportion in athletics and the sheer pleasure in hard competition among ourselves that we all want, and none of us wants to lose.

For my part, I commit Yale toward that end. It is a goal consistent with our belief in athletics as important to the educational program of our students and to the healthy life of our whole community. It is a goal consistent with our deepest conviction concerning a liberal education and a necessary proportion in a civilized, fruitful life. Let it go forth that there is a strong spirit at Yale, a strong spirit compounded of respect for the glories of mind and body striving in harmony; and let there be no doubt about what we have affirmed or any doubt about what we have projected. The educational ideals and principles that I have tonight asserted must be Yale's athletic policy; they must be as a seamless garment,

for it is our students and their education that are finally at issue. It is our students for whom our principles and beliefs are intended; it is our students who deserve a place with purpose and proportion. It is our students in whom the spirit that is Yale will live, and it is they who most deserve to know upon what ground of belief we stand, and why we have chosen to stand there.