

dollars "in the hole." The only change from one season to the next has been that the debt has been slightly decreased or considerably increased. The cause of this condition is one worthy of investigation. In the early history of State's athletic relations with other institutions, when, on account of her meagre reputation, our teams could command but very small guarantees, and when, on account of the small number of students, the attendance at home events was correspondingly small, there was indeed some excuse for the existing financial conditions, but these arguments are no longer adequate to explain present conditions. With teams commanding guarantees which even a few years ago seemed unheard of amounts, and with twice the number of students of a few years back, the financial status of the Association has, if anything, assumed a lower plane.

The principal cause has for some time been only too obvious, yet the very persons who are loudest in the expression of dissatisfaction at the outcome each year, are the ones who are individually responsible for it. In just as great a measure as an employer is responsible for the acts of an employee, are the individual members of the Athletic Association responsible for the acts of the managers whom they elect? Unquestionably the root of the trouble lies in the selection of managers.

Before discussing the method of selection, let us glance for a moment at the results. During the four years spent by the writer at State, twelve managers were elected by the Athletic Association, one each year in each of the three departments—foot ball, base ball and general athletics. Now of these twelve managers, nine increased the indebtedness of the Association by sums reaching as high as \$300, while only three held their own. The foot ball department came out ahead once, the general athletic department twice, and the base ball department not even once in the four years in question. The results are simple, undeniable facts which an examination of the Association records will corroborate, and they can, almost without exception, be traced back to one fundamental cause, namely, the election of incompetent men to an office which requires persons of the keenest business as well as general athletic instincts. That the success of the team itself has but little to do with the financial outcome of the season as compared with the abilities of the manager, was more than conclusively proved when the manager of the poorest foot