

an education would be less liable to destroy or mar public property than any other class of persons, but such is not always the case as an inspection of many of our college buildings will show. We are comparatively free from this evil here, but there are a few in our midst who belong to the property destroying class. The college has been artistically repaired and the halls are especially inviting; probably no similar institution in the State can boast of such beauty. May we not all of us create a public sentiment in favor of preserving this beauty in our midst, that would defy our thoughtless students to indulge in any actions in the buildings, halls, and class-rooms which would mar them.

* * *

IT is questionable whether the present athletic system at many of our colleges is productive of the greatest good to the greatest number. Our objections to the present system are as follows:

- (1.) More importance is placed upon intercollegiate sports than local athletics.
- (2.) The already developed or natural athlete is still more highly developed, while the undeveloped student is discouraged.
- (3.) The ambition of many of our smaller colleges to win renown in intercollegiate sports, causes a decline in local sports.
- (4.) The money expended in intercollegiate sports would produce a better result if expended on local athletics.

The intercollegiate game depends upon local athletics to a great extent. If the interest in local athletics is small the intercollegiate games are not well sustained. Thus we see that the local athletics of an institution should not be subordinate to intercollegiate sports.

The best athletic material of an institution is selected and put in training to the exclusion of students whom exercise would benefit. This arises from the immediate need of athletes to play intercollegiate games. It is a waste of

time to develop the untrained student, so long as naturally fitted athletes can be secured. Thus the students at large are discouraged. Very often small colleges neglect all home sports in general in their eagerness to get a base-ball or foot-ball team in the intercollegiate field. The standard of athletics of many of our institutions cannot be judged by the intercollegiate game, as all the interest in athletics may be placed in these games. Most colleges spend from three hundred to several thousand dollars on intercollegiate sports, while their athletic grounds, if they have any, are not worth mentioning. If this money were expended in building up home athletics, the students in general would be benefitted instead of but a few. We do not wish to disparage intercollegiate games, but we would rather build up an interest in home athletics than make them subordinate to intercollegiate games. We would build up home sports, so that an intercollegiate game would be of greater importance. We believe every institution should have an athletic ground before venturing out into the intercollegiate field. It is a deplorable fact that we cannot boast of this condition. We are trying to make a showing in intercollegiate games while we are without both an athletic ground and a gymnasium. For this state of affairs both the students and the college authorities are to be blamed. The students do not manifest the desire for an athletic ground, and naturally the conservative college authorities are not going to force the issue. Next spring begins the base-ball season, and we would like to see our team play several games with teams from other institutions, but we would rather first see a good athletic ground and every person encouraged to take part in athletic sports. Until the standard of our home athlete is raised we cannot expect much from intercollegiate games. By a change, as suggested; in our present system of athletics, money expended would make a showing, and the body of students in general would be benefitted.