

REVIEW OF THE FOOTBALL SEASON

THE EASTERN UNIVERSITY SEASON

THE task of him who would undertake the rating of the first dozen eastern college football teams of 1901 is less complex than in many seasons past. In the writer's judgment, the proper order would be about as follows:—

1—Harvard	7—Annapolis
2—Yale	8—Syracuse
3—Princeton	9—Columbia
4—West Point	10—Pennsylvania
5—Cornell	11—Dartmouth
6—Lafayette	12—Williams

Harvard, with a heavy, well-balanced, speedy eleven, working to the limit an attack of exceptional power, and, because of greater physical strength, able to repel the Yale tackle-back formations, is in a class by herself this year, just as Yale's team was in 1900. In her two great games she scored 55 points to her opponents' 6; rushed the ball (scrimmage play only) 728 yards to 109, and earned first down 71 times to 5.

The Harvard eleven, the heaviest of the year, met all the requirements of a first-class all-round team; the men were well instructed in the rudiments, carefully drilled, and eleven men went into every play in such unity that four or five were constantly pulling the runner while the rest of the team pushed him. As to speed they closely followed the David Harum axiom, and did to the other fellows what the latter would like to have done to them, and *did it first*. The natural tendency is to hail each season's winner as the "greatest ever," so that conservatism, if nothing else, serves as a restraint upon the present scribe in thus comparing present with past elevens; but it is certainly not too much to say that this year's Harvard team, adapting from Yale and Pennsylvania the most powerful system of attack yet devised, left nothing to be desired in the way of its execution, and put up a record as the strongest offensive team ever sent out of Cambridge.

YALE's team of 1900 illustrated the advantages of heavy weight formations starting from the back field; this year's eleven showed the disadvantages of relying upon that same system without the necessary heavy fast backs and tackles to force the play through. Yale's two tackles and four backs averaged 15 pounds lighter than those of 1900, hence, obviously, their inability to produce corresponding results when pitted against, greater weight and equal agility and strength. In other words, the lesson of 1901 football is that so long as the present systems of play are permitted under the rules, the team with the heaviest back

field and tackles, and the best unified mass formations will win. Under the Yale system, extra weight is most effectively employed in the two tackles and full-back. These three men should, taken together, average at least 190 pounds to do the best work. In the old days of more open play the ideal tackles of the Hillebrand, Lea, Murphy, Newell, Winter type approximated 175 pounds, and full-backs, such as Baird, Brooke, Butterworth or Young, 160 pounds; but under modern methods, men of these weights would find their usefulness much reduced. It is, too, far harder nowadays for a light, fast, team to win from a heavier, physically stronger team than it used to be.

Yale's attack has been uncertain, though powerful at times, throughout the year. Both Princeton and Harvard got the charge on her, but lack of strength and prominence of injuries prevented Princeton from doing what Harvard so easily accomplished, viz.: the breaking up of the plays before they were well under way. It was confidently expected that the Yale team would show substantial improvement in the week following the Princeton game, but it did not. In fact, its style of play did not do it justice. Its defensive work was equally strong, but, its attacks, considering them in their initiative rather than after they met the fiercer Harvard resistance, were clearly below those of the earlier game.

PRINCETON squad, mostly new or inexperienced men at the start, developed satisfactorily at first, learning rapidly and exhibiting a capacity for scoring which promised well. An easy schedule left the defense untried, however, until the Lafayette game, when its weakness led to a concentration of coaching effort upon it. The attack immediately suffered, and wholesale injuries retarded the further development of the eleven after the Cornell game. The result was that a team, not, up to the Princeton standard, was squarely beaten by a better Yale team (of about the average at Yale, but much below the 1900 eleven) which, in turn, was entirely routed by an unusually strong Harvard team.

The Princeton eleven never succeeded in "getting together," perhaps because of the irregularity of the line-up. Co-operation has rarely been more lacking than in this otherwise promising team, and though it invariably played better in the second halves of its matches than in the first, it reached only the borderland of

being a first-class team. In the Yale game, the team was not run to the best advantage. The kicking policy was adhered to much too long and the latter part of the second half was reached before Princeton set a good running game going. This she might have employed to much better advantage earlier instead of kicking so often on the first down, for it is hardly necessary to observe that while she was retaining the ball, Yale could not have been gaining ground with it. But mistakes, or the absence of them, are part of the game, and Yale, making fewer errors, both in policy of play and handling the ball, increased thereby her margin of victory.

In the Yale-Princeton game, Yale rushed the ball (scrimmages only) 206 yards in 69 rushes, an average of 3 yards; Princeton carried it 93 yards in 29 rushes, an average of 3.2 yards. Yale earned first down 26 times to Princeton's 10, and her punts netted her an average of 34.9 yards to Princeton's 34.4, although Dewitt's punts were longer in the clear. In the Yale-Harvard game, Harvard made 87 rushes for 337 yards, an average of 3.9, and Yale 19 rushes for 42 yards, an average of 2.2. Harvard earned first down 31 times and Yale twice. In punting Harvard netted 36.6 yards average and Yale 28.4.

CORNELL had the best team in her history, although it averaged in weight about ten pounds less per man than Princeton or Yale, and about twenty pounds less than Harvard. What it lacked in weight, however, it made up in strength, speed, and a good system of play. A hard, well-varied attack, cleaving the line of heavier opponents instead of trying to push it back, and giving the preference to runs between tackle and end, never failed to gain substantial ground except in the second half of the Princeton game, when the latter retained the ball and did most of the ground gaining. In the first half of this game, rushing honors were easy; in the second half, Ithacan statistics show 200 yards for Princeton to 65 for Cornell. Against Pennsylvania Cornell gained with the ball in hand 347 yards, an average 4.6 yards, to Pennsylvania's 150 yards, average 2.5 yards. Cornell earned first down 29 times, Pennsylvania 18.

WEST POINT also had the best record in her history, so far as scores go, for she lost to Harvard by a single touchdown, tied Yale and Princeton, beat Pennsylvania 24-0 and wound up with a victory over the Navy 11-5. Yet

a deeper analysis of conditions leads to the conviction that in the final stages of playing form Harvard was, at least, four touchdowns better, Yale two and Princeton one; for Harvard faced West Point in the experimental stage, Yale in the depths of a severe slump, and Princeton when weakened by five substitutes. West Point's real test came in the Navy game, when, thanks to the individual brilliancy of Daly, she won, although gaining less ground and showing rather poorer form as a team than the Navy.

In this game the Army rushed the ball (not including running back of kicks) 205 yards as against 278 for the Navy and earned first down 15 times to the Navy's 28.

LAFAYETTE's team was one of the strongest in the colleges, and as well coached as any. Her schedule was unusually poor, the games against Syracuse and Princeton giving her about the only chances to show her capabilities. In the first half of the Princeton-Lafayette game the Tigers had as hard a rub as they experienced at any time during the season. Lafayette was heavy and exceptionally strong in the center trio, had two aggressive tackles, one good end, and two brilliant heavy backs. Dr. Newton's use of guards-back was equal, so far as concerted action goes, to any execution of it by former Pennsylvania teams.

ANNAPOLIS was quite the equal of Columbia, and, indeed, rather a shade better, for the Navy boys came very fast after November 20th, and the team which faced West Point would have made it hot for anybody. As a team, in combination play, it was a distinct success. The men got together better than any other combination playing football, save Harvard and Syracuse.

SYRACUSE turned out a team which, in some respects, was the most remarkable of the year. It was the only successful light weight eleven. It weighed far less than Pennsylvania's, but possessed such amazing speed that its complex attack was often carried well into the enemy's country before the latter could locate or reach the runner. Much of the success of the eleven is due to the remarkable quarter-back and ends, than whom few better are to be found. In the game against Columbia, which Syracuse won, 11-5, they showed to best advantage. The team also beat Brown 20-0, and held Lafayette 0-5.

COLUMBIA had a see-saw season, with trying changes from tackle to tackle, new men con-

(Continued from page 492)

stantly in process of development and much uncertainty as to the line-up in every game. The wonder is that the team did so well. Its chief credit this year lies in the game with Yale; its victory over Pennsylvania, 11-0, was hollow; over Annapolis, 6-5, still more so, and Harvard, 0-18, Syracuse, 5-11, and Cornell, 0-24, thrashed Columbia soundly.

THE less said about Pennsylvania's team the better, for so unsuccessful an one has not been seen there since 1890. It was not merely lack of weight that caused the trouble, for other and better teams have also been light, but the hide-bound system at Pennsylvania was not easily adaptable to the physical conditions, and the rudiments of the game were comparatively unknown to the men; the tackling, for example, being simply atrocious.

DARTMOUTH'S season was a notable one. After squeezing out a doubtfully-earned victory over Williams, she went from strength to strength, scoring twice on a relaxed Harvard Varsity and smothering Brown 22-0, her first victory since the series was inaugurated in 1894. The material was rather better than in recent years, and the coaching of Mr. McCornack was admirable.

Williams, too, had her best team in ten years. She had a lot of spirited and determined players, a good coach, Mr. Hazen, an excellent adaptation of current up-to-date systems of play, and the best team work of any of the minor eevens, except Syracuse. She held Columbia to 0-5, Dartmouth 2-6, and then beat Wesleyan 11-5, and Amherst 21-5 in her championship series.

Brown is shut out of the first dozen for the first time since the advent of Hopkins in 1893, almost the entire 1900 team being lost this year. The material was light and inexperienced though plucky, and Mr. Robinson had an unenviable task in trying to evolve a strong eleven. The worst calamities were Princeton 0-36, Harvard 0-48, and Dartmouth 0-22.

Wesleyan made a fine finish after a most unpromising beginning, but the rally came too late to save two of her important games—Williams and Dartmouth—although Trinity was disposed of (11-0) and Amherst, 15-11. Lack of enthusiasm and too much dependence upon one man are two of the reasons, perhaps, for early non-success.

Amherst made the best start of any of the smaller New England teams, and looked an easy winner in her class. The material was good, Mr. Swain's coaching thorough and in-

telligent, and, special attention having been given defensive work, the showing against Yale and Harvard was strong. Then the attack was worked up, and so much belated coaching crowded upon the team on the eve of its championship games that the men were harmed rather than helped.

THE ALL-EASTERN COLLEGE ELEVEN OF 1901.

Graydon (Harvard), full-back.
Kernan (Harvard) and Morley (Columbia), half-backs.
The latter to be captain.
Daly (West Point), quarter-back.
Bachman (Lafayette), center.
Barnard (Harvard) and Hunt (Cornell), guards.
Cutts (Harvard) and Blagden (Harvard), tackles.
Davis (Princeton) and Bowditch (Harvard), ends.

SECOND ELEVEN.

Cure (Lafayette), full-back.
Chadwick (Yale) and Weekes (Columbia), half-backs.
Brewster (Cornell), quarter-back.
Holt (Yale), center.
Lee (Harvard) and Mills (Princeton), guards.
Goss (Yale) and Bunker (West Point), tackles.
Campbell (Harvard) and Swan (Yale), ends.

THE captancy of this team narrows down to two men, namely: Morley or Daly, either of whom would fill the place admirably. Morley is selected because of his indomitable physical force, his excellent judgment and his remarkable ability to get the maximum amount of work out of any team over which he has control. It will be observed that this team, while not burdened with superfluous avoirdupois, possesses sufficient weight to enable it to carry out successfully the most recent formations under the guards-back or tackle-back system. At the same time the men selected are all conspicuous for aggressiveness and speed, and are sufficiently strong and sound to maintain a fast pace throughout the full championship period. The kicking would be admirably cared for by Daly, Morley and Kernan, while both Daly and Morley have more than once proved their ability undauntedly to drop goals from the field in the face of a fierce-charging line; the line men possess both speed and strength enough to jump their opponents into an oncoming tackle-back play before it could reach the line.

ENDS.—It is to be doubted if a speedier or physically stronger end than Davis has been seen on a college football field in many years. He is a born sprinter, a fierce, determined tackler of the Hinkley type, strong enough to smash the most formidable interference when on defense, or to box a giant tackle when on offense. I regard him the best all-round end of the year, and with five or six other eastern ends little below him, it is extremely difficult to decide which to choose. One would be justified in selecting as running mate to Davis, either Bowditch or Campbell

of Harvard, or Swan or Gould of Yale, Henry of Princeton, or Farnsworth of West Point. Bowditch is speedier than any of the others except Henry, and is so much harder to put out of the play that preference is given him on the first team. Campbell and Swan are chosen for the second team because they apparently come nearer to the well-balanced ability of the other men than do Gould, Henry and Farnsworth. Gould is, perhaps, the best offensive end playing football, and his all-round game during the fall has been very fine, but owing to his poor physical condition, he could not do himself full justice in the big games, although one must not infer from this that his playing against either Princeton or Harvard was not first-class. He lacks the speed of the other ends, however. Henry is relatively as strong in defense as Gould on offense, but his offensive playing is not as good. Farnsworth is one of the best men on the Army team, especially for offensive work. He rarely failed to box his tackles completely in the important games played by West Point.

O'Neill and Wilbur of Williams made a fine pair of ends, the latter being especially hard to pass. Taussig and Tydeman were Cornell's ends, but the former was severely retarded by injuries and hardly equalled his last year's form. Other good ends were Gardiner of Pennsylvania, one of the few men on that team who knew how to tackle, Brown of Lafayette, a strong defensive player, Ackert of Wesleyan, Blanchard of Amherst, Bartlett of West Point, and O'Connor of Dartmouth. Boland and Weir of Syracuse were also great players.

TACKLES—Harvard's pair, 196 pounds apiece, bulls at rushing and bulwarks in defense, hold the palm. Cutts is the best tackle at Harvard since "Ma" Newell won all hearts. He is fast, strong, persistent, versatile. Yale had a good pair in Goss and Hogan, the former being slightly better all-round. Hogan's offense was, however, very good indeed. Princeton turned out one good tackle in Pell and one fair one in Dewitt. The gains through Pell were, not his fault, but rather due to poor backing up by the rush-line back; considering his physical condition, his game against Yale was admirable. Dewitt is a brilliant runner and fair punter, but is not a tackle. His position should be guard. Bruce of Columbia was a strong offensive player, and Webb of Brown was the best man on that team, Bunker of West Point was a good line breaker, fast in going down on kicks, and an

indefatigable worker. Adams of Annapolis, Lueder of Cornell, Lamson of Lafayette, Hatch and Jones of Williams, Place of Dartmouth, Newton of Wesleyan, and Morse of Amherst, also deserve honorable mention.

GUARDS—Not so completely filled as in 1900, but there were some very able ones nevertheless. Harvard's were excellent, Barnard having a shade the better of it, and in Hunt and Warner, Cornell was nearly as well equipped. The former is one of the coming players, strong, alert, a fine ground gainer. Mills of Princeton played the best game of his career, though crippled in the Cornell and Yale games with a broken Achilles tendon, Dana's injuries made it impossible to maintain his usual good game.

Although Yale's guards were good, they were relatively the weakest part of her line. Olcott, a splendid player, was so much under weight that he could hardly hold his own, and Hamlin was a bit below the Yale standard. Penn's guards were too light to be very effective, though Bennett did some strong individual work at times. Lafayette turned out a first-class pair in Ernst and Trout, the former being slightly the better. Both are fine ground gainers and rank very high on the list. Lawrence of Williams, Silliman and Pike of Wesleyan, Belknap of the Navy, and Goodspeed of the Army, were valuable men.

CENTERS—There is no one in the class with Bachman this year. He handles his 195 pounds like an antelope, is sure in snapping, lightning fast in charging, and gets down the field like a breeze. Of the others, Holt of Yale and Fisher of Princeton, are about on a par, steady, careful, strong, though lacking in brilliancy. Both should show improvement in another year. Kent of Cornell made the most of his light weight but would not have been able to have withstood the plunges of the heavy Harvard or Yale attack. Montgomery of Wesleyan was very active and a good tackler. Green of Harvard who fully held his own with Holt, put up an amazingly fine game for a man called upon, without previous experience, at the last moment to enter so important a contest.

QUARTER-BACKS.—A puzzle to class them. More good ones for this position than for any other, save end. Daly, Brewster, DeSaulles of Yale, and Marshall of Harvard, are all in a class; with Freeman of Princeton, Howard of Pennsylvania, Scudder of Brown, Moore and Jayne of Williams, Daniels of Amherst, Witham of Dartmouth, and McNair of Anna-

polis, not far behind. Indeed a poor quarter-back was a *rara avis* last fall.

Daly's work was the best in his career. He never punted (*e. g.* average 40 yards against the wind in the Navy game) nor drop-kicked so well for Harvard; his generalship, running back and interference were of the highest order. Even allowing for luck, and he certainly had that, his success entitles him to first place, for it is the player who gets there which counts. Brewster punts as well as Daly and is the most deadly interferer of all the quarter-backs of the year. As he is physically stronger than DeSaulles and much less liable to fumble or to get hurt, he is the safer man for second choice. DeSaulles made a brilliant record for Yale and except for the reasons named would be the choice. Marshall's fine game against Yale put him up in the first division.

HALF-BACKS.—Kernan, brilliant, fast, heavy, the longest punter (save Cure) of the year, a good helper, a strong rush-line back, is first of the season's backs. Morley, stocky, muscular, not to be denied his two yards help or no help (and three times two means six, or a first down, you know!) able to repeat indefinitely, the best interferer in present day football, a forty yard punter and a drop-kicker who can actually score—here is a running mate for Kernan who will insure us steady progress when our team starts its offense. Weekes is far better than in 1900, because he is less dependent upon Morley. His broken field running, line plunging and tackling are all of the highest order. Chadwick is a grand player, although not physically able to turn out his best work in Yale's big games, but as a plunger who can keep his feet, run low and hold the distances he gains, he has few equals. Graves, of Williams, and Platt, of Lafayette, would probably have made any team in the East, and they, with Ristine of Harvard, are out of the blue-ribbon class simply because there is no room for more.

Purcell and Coffin, Cornell's pair, also rank

up in the same company, but seemed to lack the staying qualities of the others. McClave of Princeton has no superior as a rush-line back in defensive work and is a hard plunger as well, but has fumbled badly this year. Reynolds of Pennsylvania, Corscaden of Wesleyan, Watson of Williams, Brown and Patterson of Dartmouth, Casad of West Point, Freyer of Annapolis, and Biram of Amherst, were all excellent players, as were Brown and Henderson of Syracuse.

FULL-BACKS.—There were several giant plungers of the new type, any one of whom would be good enough for our first team. Graydon of Harvard is a fierce line plunger, excellent interferer, carries his opponents from one to ten yards after being tackled, and is always "on his game." Cure of Lafayette, 193 pounds, is a hard plunger and the longest punter in the colleges. Davidson of Pennsylvania, 186 pounds, did phenomenal work almost unaided. He has no superior in offensive or defensive work in his position. Inglis of Wesleyan is another full-back who, barring his injuries, would have reached the top of the ladder. If he had played for one of the big universities his praises would have been sounded from Maine to California. Bates of Brown is a full-back of the good old style and was punting in ideal fashion when injuries forced him from the game. Peabody of Williams, Knibbs of Dartmouth, Schoelkopf of Cornell, Nichols of Annapolis, and Graves of West Point, are all players deserving recognition.

There are in fact, many players of the Trinity, Lehigh, Union, Hamilton, Bowdoin and other teams of excellent quality, whose work during the 1901 season entitles them to warm commendation and encouragement.

SCORES FROM NOV. 16 TO END OF SEASON.

Yale, 12, Princeton, 10; Harvard, 22, Yale, 0; Cornell 24, Columbia 0; Cornell, 24, Pennsylvania 6; West Point 24, Pennsylvania, 0; Columbia, 40, Carlisle, 12; Dartmouth, 22, Brown, 0; Pennsylvania, 16, Carlisle, 14; Williams, 21, Amherst, 5; Georgetown, 17, Virginia, 16; Virginia, 23; N. Carolina, 6; Virginia, 23, Sewanee, 5; Georgetown, 22, Lehigh, 0; Tennessee, 12, Georgetown, 0; Tulane, 22, Louisiana Univ., 0.

CHARLES EDWARD PATTERSON.

THE MIDDLE WESTERN UNIVERSITY SEASON

THE season of 1901 was the most impressive in the history of Middle Western football. The only undefeated teams are Michigan and Wisconsin, in a class by themselves. Unfortunately they could not meet.

ALL-WESTERN COLLEGE FOOTBALL TEAM OF 1901.

Driver (Wisconsin), full-back.
Heston (Michigan) and Larson (Wisconsin), half-backs.

Weeks (Michigan), quarter-back.
Page (Minnesota), center.
Stahl (Illinois) and Flynn (Minnesota), guards.
Curtis (Wisconsin) and Shorts (Michigan), tackles.
Snow (Michigan) and Juneau (Wisconsin), ends.

Michigan scored 501 points against opponents' nothing, which entitles them to be ranked with the best teams in the country on offense, and the fact that the total number of first downs gained by Chicago, Beloit and Iowa