

operation," which he apparently does not believe to be a requisite for success in the American game.

President Jordan emphasises that since Rugby uses four more men to a team, thus giving exercise to a greater number, it comes nearer being a healthful sport. But does it make it as good a game? American football is an offspring of Rugby, which has undergone many changes since its introduction into the United States in 1876. But American authorities claim that through this process of evolution the game has been improved. They have found that the fifteen-man team is too cumbersome, and impossible to organize with any degree of perfection. One hundred men could play in an American game if necessary or fifty could be placed in a basketball game but what would be the result?

It is impossible here to answer fully all the attacks made by President Jordan, or to deal with many of the defects of Rugby; but a few fundamental differences between the games must be dealt with to show that the American system is not entirely a battle nor less of a sport than Rugby. The games differ radically in regard to interference. In Rugby the player with the ball must be ahead of his team mates, while in the American game there is no rule to this effect, and the success of end runs, forward passes, and in fact of any play, depends upon getting men ahead of the "runner" to give protection from opponents. Perfection in this feature is science.

In Rugby when a player is tackled the game is still on, while the action in our game ceases until play is started again by a secret signal from the attacking side. There is where the American game justly claims superiority. It places upon the value of possession and position gained by a planned and consistent attack, by virtue of which scores are usually made. In Rugby, position makes relatively little difference, the ball being now in one part of the field, now in another. Rugby has the chance and individual element contrasted against the deliberate generalship and the months of study which are requisites of success in the American game.

It is questioned whether the American revised game is "totally unfit" for secondary schools. How many serious injuries have been reported since the new rules have taken effect? In Rugby this year two California players had legs broken. Such a football accident has not been recorded in the southwest in years, so why should Rugby be so positively claimed as a safer game for high-school players?