The football season of 1901 added nothing of strategical importance to the play of the game, but it did markedly signalize the ultra development of the human battering ram. Where this premium-on-weight policy is going to lead us within the coming year or two, is difficult to say, but of one result at least I am convinced, viz., the finish of football, if something is not done to open the game, and to change the style of pounding play which has just about reached the point where it is too much for flesh and bone to stand. The Rules Committee has a great responsibility in directing the style of football, and it behooves the members to ponder earnestly before they determine upon their course. Their task is a serious one indeed, for on their action depends not only the fate of the game, but the physical entirety of players, may be; for we could scarcely escape another season without the internal injuries naturally incidental to such terrific pounding as forwards are subjected to by the modern play. We can stand for bruised muscles, even occasional broken bones—football is a hardy game and we would not have it emasculated—but when it comes to deep-seated contusions and other serious internal complications, it is time to make some changes in methods of play.

Hitherto the Rules Committee has obligingly tempered its legislative wind to the shorn football lambs left over at the colleges of the Committee’s respective members; indeed the welfare of the game at large has been quite secondary to a wish not to interfere with the team prospects for the coming season. College men won’t stand for this kind of legislation any longer. We have been for two years patiently awaiting the sound, wholesome rulemaking which the game has needed; and the time has come at last when the Rules Committee should administer to real and pressing needs of football, or make way for legislators who are big enough to rise above personal interest in the prospects of the forthcoming season.

Less Something must be done to lighten in the line from tackle to tackle, the hammering to which the men are subjected by the play of the day, that, whether it be guards-back or tackle-back, stands for the principle of the battering ram. I would not entirely do away with the principle—that the ram, however, should be made less crushing and more nearly within the capabilities of human bone and muscle to handle, all college men, with regard for the game’s prosperity, are agreed. It is senseless to maintain that the impact of six men hitting the line is practically no severer than that of three; it is literally untrue to assert that the number of men, who to-day can lawfully get into this style of play, leaves no impression on the lists of the injured. I can produce evidence in abundance which will uphold me in the statement that the injuries from these plays are distinctive and serious—so serious that either they must be eliminated or the game fall into the disrepute it would thoroughly merit under the circumstances.

The burning question is not whether the game shall be cleaned of this noxious feature, but, how best it is to be accomplished. Several ways will no doubt suggest themselves to such practical men as constitute the Rules Committee—and there are none better if they will, for the time being, forget their own colleges and consider the good of the game at large. The fundamental step, it seems to me, is to legislate that seven men invariably must be on the line until the ball is put in play; that would take much of its present overwhelming
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1. Thomas Hetherington Graydon, '03, full back.  
2. Oliver Frost Cutts, '02 Law, right tackle.  
4. Edward Bowditch, Jr., '03, right end.  
5. William George Lee, '02 M, left guard.  
6. Charles S. Sargent, Jr., '02, center.  
7. David Campbell, '02, left end.  
8. Albert William Restine, '02, right half-back.  
11. Crawford Blagden, '02, left tackle.  
12. McMasters (trainer).
power from the battering ram and relieve present urgent necessities.

But there can be no doubt among football students that the game needs opening; and the success of lightweight, comparatively-open-playing-Syracuse against Columbia, shows, if there be need of illustration, that all of football skill and winning is not confined to the hammer and tongs method of play. Merely to lessen the number of men forming the battering ram will not bring about the desired more open play; to bring that, we must put a premium on kicking, long passing, wide end running, etc., and increase the difficulties of advancing the ball by the crude process of hammering some one on the, opposing line into helplessness. We must put a premium on skill and speed, as against mere brute strength and weight.

With this end in view, it would seem to me advisable to lessen by one the number of downs permitted in gaining the requisite five yards, or to leave the number of downs as at present and increase the distance to be gained from five to ten yards; I rather favor the former, because it would disrupt present conditions less, and assure quick play with the ball changing hands more frequently.

In whatever way the Rules Committee encompass the existing difficulties of football none will care, so long as they arise to the occasion fittingly, that they must relieve the game’s pressing needs, however, college men insist.

And while the Rules Committee is cleaning up the game on the gridiron, let us have a readjustment of existing relations among Harvard, Yale, Princeton, Pennsylvania, Cornell, Columbia, and an unequivocal understanding common to all of the ethics of college sport. On a question so clear as sport for the sake of the sport, it is no less than extraordinary how many differing opinions may obtain, where all are professedly seeking to achieve the highest standard. It seems to me that we in the East have been at the game long enough to have arrived at years of discretion and unity. Such indeed is the situation in the Middle West, where faculty representatives of the leading universities meet annually to discuss and profit by experience—and the western universities have not had one third the years of athletic activity of the eastern universities. That the spirit of a given rule should be interpreted one way at one university, and differently at another; that, to give a concrete illustration for instance, the students’ playing period should mean at Harvard, four years in any and all games and at Yale, four years in any one game, is surely not only ill-advised confliction of custom, but actually harmful to college sport.

Experience has shown that faculty control is absolutely essential to the wholesome conduct of college sport, and wherever such system is perfected, there we find invariably the sport of the students on the most healthful plane. Within very recent years, all the leading educational institutions East and West, have come to this system, which consists of an athletic committee composed of faculty, alumni and undergraduates—all save Yale, where the undergraduates are said to be in complete control, and the captain of each team responsible for the ethical status of his men. If we judge by results, as of course we must, Yale’s system has proved a failure, for during the last two or three years, the period in which undergraduate control at New Haven has been rather prominently thrust before us, there have been more infractions of the spirit of college sport, than within the same time at Harvard, Princeton, and Pennsylvania combined, or at Yale throughout the long honorable period just previous, when George Adee’s guiding word was sought and heeded.

From the day Mr. Adee ceased to be the guiding spirit of Yale sport there has been worship of strange gods at New Haven. Now, why is it? Certainly not that Yale undergraduates are different from other undergraduates; emphatically not that Yale men are unmindful of ethics—on the contrary—practically all the Yale alumni of my acquaintance are earnestly and actively in sympathy with wholesome college sport; but solely because undergraduates, boys, of any college or any section have not the experience, the poise, or the perspective to enable them to handle so large and so burning a problem as the ethics of their college sport. It is beyond reason to expect it of them. What experience in such matters has the average boy of eighteen to twenty; many of them, coming from over all the country, hardly know the true sig-
nificance of the term amateur. Add to this his partisanship—without which he would be only half a rightful college boy—and keenness to have his alma mater win—and do you imagine the resultant boy is equal to sitting in deliberate unbiased judgment upon one of his fellows, who, perhaps, may be very valuable to a team? And is it fair to the boy captain to make him the judge of his own men? It is asking rather too much of human nature.

I have intended this as a deliberate review of facts, with no idea of reopening old cases, or of directing criticisms anew. Rather, I have sought to present the situation so plainly to Yale men that they must recognize the unwisdom of continuing the system of undergraduate athletic control, which now, so we are told, obtains at New Haven. There must be some responsible athletic head with whom other universities can deal, and who will spare this good old Yale the humiliation of having the bona fides of her athletic sons occasionally doubted.

For Harvard, Yale, Princeton and Pennsylvania and the rest to come together for a conference on common rules would be such a happy way to begin the New Year. There are only a few new rules that we want, though we want those sorely, but, intercollegiate sport very much needs agreement on several important questions. For instance, as to this summer baseball playing on teams professional, semi-professional, and where gate money is taken. This is now, perhaps, the most disturbing element in college sport, and must be handled without gloves. The Middle Western Intercollegiate Conference recently ostracized this kind of athlete, and none too soon either, for he was becoming a menace to the college sport of that section. So, also, the western colleges have cleared up the four-year playing rule; so that it now limits, as it should, the total playing period in any or all games to four years. Strange enough, the Western Conference failed to pass a one-year residence rule, but must see the importance of doing so soon, and when they do, the rule will be passed, for the West as a whole stands eminently for straightforward athletics, despite periodical irregularities in varying directions.

In the East we need more to get together in harmony on the rules already framed than to make others; but there are two new ones which I strongly advocate—(1) to forbid the varsity to all first-year men, whether or not they come from other colleges (this will stop recruiting among the “prep” schools); (2) to forbid thereafter to college teams any man who, while teaching at a small college or “prep” school, coaches or plays on a team of the institution where he is teaching.

And this brings me to perhaps the most vexatious case of the year—that of Cutts, which presented one of the hardest problems any Athletic Committee ever had to solve. It was so long ago, I should not pass opinion on it were it not that my published judgment has been requested. Previous to going to Harvard, Cutts taught and was paid for teaching mathematics at a small college; he also, while at this school, took some casual supervision over the boys’ athletics; this was something he rather grew into through his athletic taste, and which was not mentioned on his original engagement, and for which he received no pay. Nevertheless, with the idea common at small institutions of swelling the list of branches of instruction, Cutts was catalogued as instructor of “mathematics and athletic director.” As I say, he was not paid for athletic instruction, and we have it on the sworn testimony of the head master of the school that had Cutts ceased his athletic instruction, it would have made no difference in his salary.

Had the case been presented to me two weeks before the Yale game, I should have declared Cutts ineligible; not that I believe his mathematics a subterfuge, and his salary given really because of his athletic instruction—on the contrary, I believe in his bona fides; but because his was a clear violation of the letter of the law, which must be applied rigidly to protect college sport against those whose spirit could not be trusted. It is, too, unfortunate we must sometimes wound the true spirit in upholding the letter.

But the case was presented just on the eve of the Harvard-Yale game—two days before it, in fact; Cutts’ previous association with the small college had been known all the season, and he accepted as an amateur qualified for the team. Under all the circumstances, I do not see how, in simple justice to Cutts, the Harvard Athletic Committee could have decided other than it did, i.e., to play him. Not to have played him
would have been to stigmatize him as a professional, and a man who had deceived his fellows and was unworthy to represent Harvard. That, under the circumstances, would of course have been outrageous.

At the same time, if the Harvard Athletic Committee was familiar with all the conditions of the case early in the season; it merits criticism for not withdrawing Cutts from the football squad, and sparing him and Harvard violation of the law's letter.

This case emphasizes the desirability of an understanding among universities that no protests be made within ten days of a game.

In the matter of football ranking for the season of 1901, Harvard has earned the distinction, attained in 1900 by Yale, of being in a class by herself. In fact the Yale eleven of 1900, and the Harvard eleven of 1901, are the two most powerful teams to have been developed by the modern style of American Rugby. What a magnificent contest the two would make! The winner? Ah, that is indeed a hard one; moreover, what a shame it would be to spoil a post-prandial topic of such limitless dispersive possibilities!—so I pass it on.

Harvard used Yale's play of 1900, the tackle-back—and though the weight of her men made the shock of the impact perhaps a bit greater, the play moved with less speed than Yale had put into it the year before, and was unchanged in any of the essentials. Harvard made no improvements of her own, but no team in football history was ever so entirely together, not even Yale's great team of last year. Therein lay Harvard's really great strength, as many as six, and at times seven, men constituting the ram with which she battered holes through any point of Yale's line. No amount of skill, in a team averaging twelve to fifteen pounds the less per man, can withstand such a united onslaught; it's a question of concentrated brute strength. The back field was the swiftest and most mobile of the year and imparted the speed element to Harvard's plays. Ristine, Graydon, Cutts and Blagden did the ground gaining—Marshall showing well, too—and Kernan did the punting, and did it well. Blagden, I observe, has been mentioned but casually in connection with the splendid and spectacular line bucking of Cutts in the tackle-back formation, but I want to record here that Blagden was the man who did the heavy work of that play and that without him, or one equally as good, it would not have proved so irresistible. I want also to mention Greene, who, although called upon at the eleventh hour, played his game so well as to challenge the superiority of one of the best centers in the college world. Head coach Reid deserves great praise, for his task was no easy one; the physical condition of the team, too, was superb, thanks to Dr. Brooks, and the trainer; it was the first Harvard team in three years trained to the hour of its Yale game.

It has been said that Yale did not show up against Harvard as strongly as expected, and that is perfectly true; but the reason is not, as alleged, that Yale failed to do herself justice, but because Harvard revealed a great deal more strength than was generally estimated she had to develop. Yale's 1901 team was not, of course, so strong as that of 1900, but it was quite up to the Yale average, which means that it was a thoroughly first-class eleven. What chance it had it played first-class football against Harvard, though not being in such remarkable unison as Harvard, the Yale line and back field gave the impression by comparison of not being together. Against Princeton, it must be admitted, Yale did not play first-class ball, in fact the quality of that game averaged about the poorest I have seen in a Yale-Princeton game since 1890. The truth of the Harvard-Yale game is that Yale's offense never got the chance to get going, while the defense was crumpled by a human engine which with the greater weight and skill, crashed through Yale's forwards with a force irresistible. Yale was overwhelmed; and all overwhelmed teams appear not to do themselves justice. Princeton had hard luck all through the season, with so many crippled men that her team was never intact two games in succession; in addition there was rather questionable judgment in the Yale game, which directed so long a period of defensive tactics. Princeton's attack was long delayed, and when it did come off in the last of the second half, it emphasized the folly of its tardiness. Yale gained 153 yards to Princeton's 69 in the last half, but the significant feature of Princeton's gain, is that sixty of those yards were made in the last
ten minutes. However, there was never doubt of the winner; Yale was clearly superior, though not so aggressive as usual, better team work, better handling of the ball, better physical condition; had she not appeared to grow careless because of the easiness of the conquest, she must have largely increased the score. Princeton played up to its 1901 form; the line men did their work well, and the ends are stars; but the back field was so disintegrated as to neutralize the work of the forwards. It was the poorest back field among the leading teams of 1901, and the means of dropping Princeton lower on the season's ranking than she has been for years. The Yale-Princeton series beginning with 1877 now stands: Yale 13, Princeton 9, one tie and two unfinished games. A fumbling microbe seemed all season to infest the Harvard-Yale-Princeton atmosphere.

Next to Harvard, the team of the year to attract most attention is West Point, not that it is comparable with Harvard in her final form, or that it could successfully defend itself against defeat by Yale, but because its showing for the season is second to none. It played Harvard, Yale, Princeton, and scored eleven points to opponents seventeen; and half of the latter were secured through merest good luck. It is argued that Harvard, Yale and Princeton were not at their best when they met West Point—of course not—neither was West Point. True West Point was going off in condition when it met Annapolis, but its playing form was only slightly affected. The Army's triumph over the Navy has been alluded to as a one-man victory, but that is superficial reasoning. It is to be remembered, that the West Point team was coached and its play arranged to make the most of Daly's drop kicking and running. Without the fine team West Point had behind him—Daly could not have made the splendid exhibition he did. His touchdown from kick-off, for example, was the result of as good team work as ever I saw; every Navy man was so completely put out of the play that Daly ran 100 yards without at any time being even in danger of a tackle. Daly was in better form than last year, but has never since equaled that of '98 and '99.

There is no question in my mind of West Point being entitled to rank next to Yale among the eastern college teams.

Annapolis finished a somewhat variable, but on the whole thoroughly commendable, season with an impressive exhibition of football skill and pluck on Franklin Field, against West Point. It is a curious fact that in the games between these two National Academy teams, the Navy has almost invariably excelled, and the Army not quite equaled the expectations of their friends. And this year the Navy outdid its previous record, for although outweighed four pounds to the man, and younger by eleven months, it outrushed the Army team. On the total distance gained with ball, Army made 421 yards, Navy 344; exclusive of Daly's 100 yards run from kick-off the Army shows 321 yards rushed; on running the ball back on kicks the Army earned 198 yards to 109 for the Navy. In short, the lines were about evenly matched; Annapolis superior on end runs, West Point superior on handling kicks and in open field running. It was a thoroughly first-class game with few errors, and second in quality only to the Harvard-Yale game. The record of the Army-Navy series now stands:

- 1890 Navy, 24; Army, 0.
- 1891 Army, 32; Navy, 16.
- 1892 Navy, 12; Army, 4.
- 1893 Navy, 6; Army, 4.
- 1899 Army, 17; Navy, 5.
- 1900 Navy, 11; Army, 7.
- 1901 Army, 11; Navy, 5.

Cornell had a well rounded team, the best in its history, with an aggressive line and a strong back field; it is so near Princeton that there is really no choice between them, other than that prompted by personal bias. But for that exhibition of a running game in the last fifteen minutes of the Yale match, Princeton would certainly fall below Cornell in the season's ranking.

Both Columbia and Pennsylvania have had lessons this year which should be of great profit in years to come. Columbia will not again, I fancy, endeavor to play all the big teams on earth, or seek reinforcement from ex-athletic club players. Pennsylvania will set to work building football teams from the foundation and not from the second story. It is a pity George Woodruff could not have been retained to put the finishing touches on the teams—for, in that particular, I doubt if he has a superior.
I am lacking the space this month, and perhaps nothing of interest could be added, to take up in detail the individuals chosen; besides there is abundant comment on most of them in the eastern and western reviews which I indorse save in such particulars as differ from my selection herewith.

**All-America Eleven for 1901.**

Graydon (Harvard), full-back
Kernan (Harvard) and Morley—captain, (Columbia), halves.
Daly (West Point), quarter
Bowditch (Harvard) and Snow (Michigan) ends
Cutts (Harvard) and Blagden (Harvard) tackles
Barnard (Harvard) and Hunt (Cornell) guards
Bachman (Lafayette), center.

**Substitutes.**

Cure (Lafayette), full-back
Chadwick (Yale) and Larson (Wisconsin) halves
Brewster (Cornell), quarter
Campbell (Harvard) and Davis (Princeton) ends
Bunker (West Point) and Curtis (Wisconsin) tackles
Lee (Harvard) and Mills (Princeton), guards
Holt (Yale), center

**Ranking of Teams:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Team</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Harvard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Yale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Michigan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>West Point</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Princeton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Cornell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Lafayette</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Annapolis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Syracuse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Columbia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Minnesota</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Dartmouth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Williams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Northwestern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Illinois</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Chicago</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Iowa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Tennessee</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Speaking generally for the West, there is more appreciable progress in the development of football skill, than in the East. This is partly accounted for by the later adoption of the game and partly because of the alertness of mind and intolerance of mediocrity which have served to make the great West what it is to-day. Moreover, I consider the spirit of play and the spirit in which the games are legislated for to be superior to that in evidence throughout the East. Of course, there are groups of institutions in the East, where the highest ideal is observed—but I am comparing the sections at large. Western men, as a rule, are more genuine than eastern men, resemble less, are more stalwart in their actions and more faithful to their ideals. There is a real sense of the game for the game's sake among the faculty members of the leading middle western universities who meet annually to better their athletic conditions.

To, be sure the middle western colleges are not above criticism, but the spirit is moving and the evils being gradually eradicated. The semi-professional baseball player has been a thorn in the flesh, but he has now been declared ineligible. A one year's residence rule is needed, and should be forthcoming.

Michigan and Wisconsin in football are this year to the West, as is Harvard to the East, and between the western teams choice is difficult indeed, though Michigan has the remarkable total of 50 points scored to none against her. Each has a strong, heavy line and a good back field—especially Wisconsin, whose Larsen and Driver are just about as good as any in the country. In style of game, in running with the ball, and in punting, these two teams stand well up towards the very head of American football; in the handling of kicks and in highly developed team play, however, they are quite a bit inferior to the eastern leaders. In respect to ethics of the game Michigan is easily the leader in the West, with Chicago and Iowa a good second and third. I shall hope to see much clearing of the atmosphere at the other institutions this year.

I was deeply impressed by the conduct of the two final great games of the West, Michigan-Iowa, and Wisconsin-Chicago, in Chicago. The play went on without delay and without some agent or other of one side frequently running onto the field to deliver some message from the coach, and carrying sponge or bottle or pail by way of subterfuge. There was no coaching from the side lines; there were no men on the side lines but the single coach of each team; there were only the substitutes and the two or three assistant coaches inside the fence. Think of it—ye Eastern men—a field with no side line benches to accommodate the friends of the college management. These were the best conducted games I have ever seen, and put our Harvard-Yale, Yale-Princeton games to very shame by comparison. Evarts Wrenn and Ralph Hoagland are two officials who have done much to bring about this praiseworthy state of affairs in the West.
Confusion in the Southern Intercollegiate Association. In the South there is need of a re-adjustment in the Intercollegiate Association which will save it from criticism that now falls upon it on account of a confusion of ideas as to the interpretation of certain rulings. The South is far behind the West in respect of clear legislation and fearless enforcement of its rules. There have been several instances this past season of men clearly ineligible, allowed to play through unusual interpretations of simple rules. There is no longer excuse for the South; it is high time the university faculties cleaned their teams of semi-professional ball players, and others who have received money for play.

Tennessee appears to be entitled to first rank among southern teams, with Gallaudet, Georgetown, St. Johns, Virginia, North Carolina and Sewanee, worthy of especial mention. No player has shown All-America quality, but Tutweiler, Walker and Bennett, of Virginia; Counselman and Ware, V. P. I.; Johnson, V. M. I.; Given, Kerns, Sullivan and Hart, Georgetown, and one or two men behind the lines of North Carolina and Sewanee, are men that appear to stand out more prominently than others. George-town, I am happy to see, has turned a new leaf, and Manager Thompson is to be congratulated. There is no reason why this excellent institution should not keep its teams free of semi-professionalism.

But the institution in the South to deserve perhaps more credit than any other for its showing is St. Johns at Annapolis—which with its only 125 boys has yet from time to time defeated the southern leaders, and, meanwhile, attained the unique distinction of keeping its sport clean.

Encouraging Elk Teeth Traffic in Wyoming. It will be remembered by the readers of OUTING, that I have during the last six or more months had quite a bit to say concerning the unlawful killing in Wyoming of wapiti for their tusks. For those who don’t know, I should say that these tusks are the canine teeth carried in the upper jaw, one on each side, immediately back of the incisors. They have been adopted as an insignia by a society known as the “Elks,” which draws its membership very largely from the stage, and has branch lodges throughout the country. This has made a market for the teeth, and wapiti are being slaughtered in season and out, to supply the demand. Wyoming is the scene of a great deal of this lawlessness, and since this is, in many respects the greatest of our big game States, it will interest sportsmen to learn how the game laws are being enforced there.

Recently two sportsmen of Philadelphia, Messrs. W. Worrell Wagner and Sherbourne W. Dougherty, had an experience which speaks for itself; while hunting this last autumn in the Gros Ventre mountains, they encountered two men claiming to be prospectors, but whose outfit and general appearance, together with the nature of the country, rather indicated them as market hunters. As it happened, Mr. Wagner and his party entered the locality through which these men had preceded them by about ten days, therefore when carcass after carcass of wapiti was found, from which only the tusks had been removed, there seemed slight doubt as to the culprits. The guides of Mr. Wagner’s party, Nelson and Silas Yarnall, and the cook, Jack McCabe, were determined to arrest these teeth hunters, and so when the party had been driven out of the mountains by a snow storm, they set forth with a small pack train. Going up the Wind River, they met the teeth hunters near the Ram’s Horn. Giving the impression that they were hunting for a bunch of strayed horses, the Yarnalls and Jack back-tracked at night, held up the law breakers at the rifle’s muzzle, searched them and their camp and found twenty-six pairs of elk teeth, representing of course twenty-six elk.

The teeth hunters were taken to the nearest Justice of the Peace, Richard Green at Dubois, where one of them, Rudolph Rosen- crans, pleaded guilty, and was fined $25 and costs, the total being $38.80!! That is to say, this wholesale infraction of Wyoming’s law protecting one of its most valuable possessions, its big game, was punished by the infliction of the minimum penalty, the maximum being a fine of $100 and imprisonment for six months. Even the maximum would seem, in this instance, to be totally inadequate.

Thirty-eight dollars and eighty cents for twenty-six elk! less by $1.20 than the non-resident license fee for the privilege of shooting two! There seems to be no hope for the game of Wyoming short of National supervision. Evidently nothing is to be expected from internal action; the spirit of
the State apparently makes for individual license, irrespective of results so far as the game is concerned. No State in the Union is so richly endowed, and none is so unmindful of its treasures. If ever there was a case of killing the golden-egg-laying goose, it is on exhibition this same day in Wyoming under the very noses of Governor Richards, and his game warden, Albert Nelson.

Thirty-eight dollars and eighty cents for slaughtering twenty-six elk for their teeth! If Governor Richards is the sportsman he claims to be he will see that the State laws are employed to protect the game rather than as they seem now to be for the protection of the market hunter.

Much of the criticism which falls upon the heads of the state game wardens, should be, I am convinced, directed against the legislatures and governors that by a niggardly policy, make it utterly impossible for a warden to entirely fulfil his duty. For example, I have been recently looking into the situation in Wyoming where so much dissatisfaction exists over the inadequate protection given the game. Here is a sparsely settled territory, where the people have been accustomed to kill game for meat in season or out, yet the State makes no appropriation whatever to enforce the laws of protection which its Legislature has enacted, or to aid the game warden in his patrol of nearly 100,000 square miles. There is a game fund dependent entirely on the revenue derived from shooting licenses which is the sole financial support of the warden's office. One year this fund reached $8,000, most years it does not run so high. The warden is allowed, of this fund, $1,200 for his services, but out of his salary he must pay his own traveling expenses, office stationery and the printing of the game laws. What can be expected from such a policy? In other words, eastern sportsmen foot the bill for what poor protection is now afforded Wyoming game, while the State without putting up a dollar reaps a considerable harvest from their various expeditions. The non-resident must pay a forty-dollar license fee for the open season. The resident pays one dollar! Our right, therefore, to call the Governor of Wyoming to an accounting cannot be denied, especially since it is the Governor's particular instruction to the game warden not to "incur any indebtedness to the State under any circumstances." At the same time, and entirely apart from the question of fitness of the present game warden, there is no doubt of his not having money enough at command to properly patrol the game regions of the State, but it does also appear to be true, that better use in the way of real protection, might be made of the money he has, and which is paid into the State by eastern sportsmen for shooting licenses. Governor Richards must give us some practical evidence of his "deep interest in the protection of our game," else we must continue to view him as a decidedly negative influence in the protective movement. In the meantime we recall several instances of his official indifference to game law violation, and his disregard of a special plea for an amendment to the present insufficient law, prohibiting sale or barter in elk teeth.

Forest Reserves

These are some of the reasons why every intelligent student of this country's needs is in favor of extending the range and the influence of the forest reserves; no question of deeper import to the internal economy of our land will come before Congress this session. By way of a beginning the Yellowstone National Park should be increased to about double its present size, especially extended on the south to take in if possible the Gros Ventre range. It is beyond the present southern boundary of the Park that in recent years great herds of sheep have come and wire fencing been stretched to destroy a one time winter range of the elk which summer in the Park. Really the Park should be extended east to include the Big Horn mountain district where in summer sheep from the south literally swarm over the Government land. The number of settler's claims in this country touching the Park south and east is very small, but were it great the Government should take possession of the country, if only to reinforce its own good work in making the original reservation.

What is true of the Yellowstone Park region is true also of a number of other widely separated districts which at one time or another have been set apart as forest reserves. That which has been done is only a beginning of a work which must be carried to finality if permanent good is to ensue;
the present reserves are like the ten-foot shaft the miner sinks to prospect his claim; having found "pay dirt" he must dig deeper and wider to realize results. There are thousands upon thousands of acres of land in the West which have no value whatever for settlement purposes; and wherever these occur they should be taken over by the Government to extend the present scheme of forestry preservation. With the Forest Reserves enlarged and hunting absolutely forbidden within their precincts as is the case in the present National Park, there will be some assurance of protection to both tree and animal life.

Still Seeking Types at the Horse Show. Each year it seems as if we must have reached the limit in heavy harness horse quality, and yet every succeeding horse show at the Madison Square Garden has something still better to reveal. This year was no exception; the ribbon winners in the under and over 15.2, were really superb, and quite above the average of any previous year. Yet it is all a matter of individual rather than of class excellence; we seem to be no nearer an evolved type than half a dozen years ago; and the judges are apparently as much at sea as those, who, from outside of the ring, watch, and, at times, marvel, at their decisions. A review of the several years' winners for the Waldorf-Astoria challenge cup "for best horse suitable for a gig," would alone confuse any studious horseman who sought an official consensus upon a type for this kind of trap. But there is no doubt of the superb quality of the various individuals which from year to year have been put forth by the judges as a type.

Where I notice most general improvement, as it seems to me, is in the less showy but more serviceable road horses, if I may so call the horses which we use in the four and the tandem and the cart, out of town, to distinguish them from those extravagantly high actors which occasionally we see in the parks, but for the greater part appear only in show rings. The road fours at Madison Square were unusually fine—ahead of any year I remember.

We do not seem to get on very rapidly towards a saddle horse type; the judge of every year appears to have in mind a different one from that of the judge in the preceding year; and this year an imported judge seemed really to be of two minds. There were a few good individuals, but the class was not much to be proud of after ten years of endeavor.

Generally speaking, the hunter classes seem to have become classes for show-ring jumpers; this was especially true of the so-called novice classes, where scarcely any were of hunter conformation, but all jumped in a form which bespoke long experience in the ring. An amount of jumping is necessary, I suppose, to appease the spectators who pay admission expecting spectacular events, but it's a pity a rigid division can not be made between show-ring jumpers and hunters. Rarely do we see nowadays the real hunter at Madison Square, though some good imitations of him, I must confess, find their way from Canada into the New York ring.

The half-bred hackneys did well this year, made the best showing indeed that they ever have; perhaps we are after all to have some permanent useful members of the horse world from this breed—certainly we have awaited them with due patience.

In appointments throughout all classes, the standard was very high, as high indeed, as it can well be, and superior to anything to be seen at either the London or the Paris shows.

Governor Odell of New York, after claiming, as does Governor Richards of Wyoming, that none than he has deeper interest in protecting game birds and animals, vetoed, recently, a bill to prohibit spring duck shooting. It was a bill fathered by the New York Association for the Protection of Game and Fish, an honorable body which has done much for this State's game interests, and indorsed by not only all the sportsmen of New York, but by the more intelligent members of that class of shooters who go afield solely to "kill something." The bill passed the Legislature and awaited the Governor's signature to become law; Odell fiddled along over it until the last day and then announced he had no time to seriously consider it, but if it came to him again he would give it his attention—implying he would sign it. Again the Legislature reported favorably on the bill and again it was before the Governor, only
needing his signature to put an end to the slaughter of ducks during their mating and breeding season. Again Odell fiddled; and, at the eleventh hour—vetoed the bill!

No doubt the Governor thinks there are more votes to be had among the market hunters of Long Island, whence comes the only opposition to prohibited spring shooting, than among the sportsmen of the State. —but that is where the Governor makes mistake number two. Mr. Odell will long be remembered by sportsmen, after he has sunk below the political horizon; during the gubernatorial incumbency he has distinguished himself as an opponent of worthy legislation for the protection of the State’s game interests. Perhaps the Governor feels the need of distinguishing himself in some direction.

The Amateur Athletic Union has recently taken two very commendable actions—one looking towards the rigid separation of amateur and professional events at sportsmen’s shows and similar organizations; and the other in resolving “that the trap-shooters who shoot for a sweepstake be declared professional athletes.” Some trap-shooters have presumed to question the A. A. U.’s right to make such a ruling—but such objection need not disturb the A. A. U. officials. The A. A. U.’s position not only cannot be assailed, but it has the moral support of all sportsmen. There is an absurdly illogical feeling among certain classes of trap-shooters, that amateur and professional are distinguished on personal income rather than on ethical grounds, i.e., he who “doesn’t need the money” he shoots for is an “amateur,” but he who reckons on the purses he wins as one of several means of income—why he is a professional. Of course, a man who shoots or runs or drives or walks or indulges in any game for a money prize is a professional. The A. A. U. merits the gratitude of sportsmen in declaring ineligible to its amateur events those trap-shooters who compete for money.

As for these water polo and other exhibitions at the winter sportsmen’s shows, in which amateurs take part, too much care cannot be taken to keep the amateur end clean. Indeed, it would be wiser in my judgment, to forbid amateurs competing at exhibitions of this character, or at any exhibition or show which was not directly under the control of an athletic organization. To my way of thinking, the introduction of water polo games as side shows into the purely commercial atmosphere of these public industrial exhibitions, is undignified and hazardous.

Should the suspicions of the English Amateur Athletic Association be verified that Messrs. Kranzlein, Duffy, Tewksbury, Baxter, Long, Flanagan and Sheldon exacted and received “liberal expenses for competing at the smaller meetings throughout England, Scotland and Ireland,” in 1900 and 1901, the Amateur Athletic Union must and will, of course, respect the English Association’s finding and disqualify the accused athletes. Meanwhile, it behooves Pennsylvania and Georgetown universities to sift the matter thoroughly on their own account, and to act promptly and vigorously for the sake of their own athletic integrity.

Help a Grand Work

Those who are concerned in the preservation of our birds of song and plumage, should without delay, send substantial evidence of their encouragement to Abbott H. Thayer, Monadnock, New Hampshire. The smallest subscription will be thankfully received; put a one dollar bill in an envelope if you can afford no more, and it will all go toward helping the American Ornithological Union in its fight with milliners and their agents. The work accomplished by this Union last year, was amazing on the amount of money expended, and is a lesson to other associations and states. The entire work of patrolling the Atlantic coast from New Brunswick to Louisiana, including journeys to visit legislatures and inspection of wardens’ work, was done for $2,000. And the work was thoroughly done, so thoroughly that the remaining sea-bird colonies along the coast were unmolested by milliners’ agents for the first time in years. Half the work of the Union is in securing protective laws, and then watching lest they be scuttled in the next legislature by amendments instigated by dealers; the other half is maintaining wardens who see that the laws are respected and violators arrested.

The subscription fund out of which the expense of this splendid work is paid, is about exhausted, and money is needed.