



Rugby Football

It may seem presumptuous for an undergraduate to engage in discussion with the distinguished president of a great university, but the impertinence of the act is moderated to a certain degree when the latter's discussion descends to the rudiments of football. Therefore, it is but natural that President Jordan's attack upon American football should receive vociferous rebuttal from players and enthusiasts of the game.

In his article, entitled: "Football: Battle or Sport?" the President of Stanford compares the American game with Rugby; and by systematic processes of induction and deduction leaves little doubt in the minds of readers but that our game is a battle and should be prohibited, while Rugby is a delightful sport and should supplant the American game in all the colleges of the country. President Jordan has listed almost every criticism ever made against the American game, most of which have been eliminated by the new rules that have never been tried at Stanford. He also uses the four great objections of President Elliott in 1905 when that gentleman was advocating more open play. The objections were: "(1) The immoderate desire to win intercollegiate games; (2) The frequent collisions in masses which make foul play invisible; (3) The profit from violation of the rules; (4) The misleading assimilation of the game to war as regards its strategy and its ethics." To these President Jordan adds that the game is "totally unfit" for preparatory schools. He deplores the publicity given the games, and asserts that without it, and without "hosts" the American game would be no more. He states that in our game the sole idea is victory, and that this condition leads to hostility between colleges. He adds that interference ruins the sport for the spectator, and asserts that mass plays are still the feature of the American "battle," thus justifying his quotation from Dr. Elliott's attack on the old "five-yard game." President Jordan also states that the number of injuries is frightful.

In building up his argument on the side of Rugby, or the "Sport", Dr. Jordan fails to note the fact that the majority of his attacks upon the American game apply partly, if not wholly, to the English. Rugby, he writes, is a game "involving adroitness and co-