The first decision made by the Committee was that it should devote itself to an examination and evaluation of the University's intercollegiate athletic program. This decision was made, first and primarily, because it was the sense of the Committee that this was the most important and significant issue within the scope of the Committee's area of competence. Moreover, and secondarily, in light of the history of the report submitted by last year's Committee, it was felt that such an examination and evaluation, in a sense, was unfinished business.

The Committee next determined that in order to make an intelligent evaluation of the intercollegiate athletic program it would be necessary to have information concerning the financial status of the program. Consequently, a letter requesting such information was sent to Henry W. Herzog, Vice President and Treasurer, with copies to President Thomas H. Carroll, Dean of Faculties O. S. Colclough, Chairman of the Executive Council of the Senate W. H. Kraus, and Chairman of the Administrative Committee on Athletics T. P. Perros. With the full cooperation of the University's administrative body, the financial information requested was compiled, prepared and submitted to the Committee.

This financial information for the academic year 1962-63 demonstrates that the intercollegiate athletic program is a deficit operation. The amount of the deficit may be arrived at by two different methods of computation, each giving a different deficit result. For purposes of identification, these deficit results may be labeled "gross deficit" and "net deficit." The gross deficit is arrived at by including as an item of expense the total amount of grants-in-aid assistance provided by the University. This gross deficit is $255,987.30.

The net deficit is arrived at by including as an item of expense only that portion of the grants-in-aid assistance in excess of tuition charges. This net deficit is $152,401.30.
It has been suggested, and, indeed, last year's Committee recommended, that a student activity fee should be imposed, all or a portion of which should be allocated as an item of income to be credited to the intercollegiate athletic program. It has been suggested that the imposition of such a fee could eliminate the deficit created by the intercollegiate athletic program. Of course, it is a mathematical truism that if the amount of the deficit were divided by the number of students who were to be charged such a fee, and the result were to be used as the amount of the fee and credited as income to the intercollegiate athletic program, the deficit would be eliminated. However, it is the sense of the Committee that such an expedient merely begs, or ignores, the essential question: Is the expenditure for intercollegiate athletics a wise expenditure for this University? If the expenditure is a wise one, the resulting deficit of the operation should not be too shocking; or, if it is determined excessive, it could be eliminated or reduced by the imposition of such an activity fee. On the other hand, if the expenditure, or any part thereof, is not a wise one for this University, the imposition of such a fee would do no more than to increase the cost of student attendance at the University for the purpose of facilitating an unwise expenditure.

In attempting to determine whether or not all or any part of the money spent by the University on the intercollegiate athletic program constitutes a wise expenditure, the Committee considered a variety of factors. For the sake of logical presentation, these factors will be set forth first within the framework of the intercollegiate football program.

The University’s football program is the largest single contributor to the overall program deficit. During the academic year 1962-63, it resulted in a gross deficit of $143,174.95 and a net deficit of $77,871.95; these figures
comprise over one-half of the gross and net deficit figures for the entire intercollegiate athletic program. In attempting to determine the wisdom of this expenditure, the Committee considered the factors immediately following.

1. Alumni Interest

A guest faculty member who appeared before the Committee stated that over an extended period of years he had attended a substantial number of alumni gatherings over a large part of the United States. He stated that he did not recall a single instance of any alumnus making any comment about, or inquiry concerning, the University's athletic program in general or its football program in particular. Another guest faculty member who appeared before the Committee stated that he had maintained correspondence with a substantial number of alumni over a period of years. He stated that, with the exception of two former intercollegiate athletes, no alumnus with whom he corresponded made any mention of, or inquiry concerning, the University's intercollegiate athletic program in general or the football program in particular.

In addition, it seems fair to assume that a substantial number of the University's alumni live in the Metropolitan Washington area and are potential spectators at our home football games. Yet the 40,000-odd empty seats at most of our home football games indicate an almost overwhelming lack of alumni interest in the football program.

2. Student Interest

The number of students who attended home football games during the 1962 and 1963 seasons, based on the number of student identification cards presented at each game, is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1962</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Furman</td>
<td>1602</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boston</td>
<td>829</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Army</td>
<td>2422</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richmond</td>
<td>1273</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1963

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Citadel</td>
<td>1522</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VPI</td>
<td>1356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Virginia</td>
<td>883</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brigham Young</td>
<td>1202</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

During the football season of 1963 our student enrollment, exclusive of the College of General Studies, was as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full-time undergraduate students</td>
<td>3081</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-time undergraduate students</td>
<td>1411</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-time graduate students</td>
<td>1230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-time graduate students</td>
<td>3149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-time unclassified students</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-time unclassified students</td>
<td>2249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>11246</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All of the students listed in the above table have identification cards entitling them to free admission to football games.

A limited sampling of the undergraduate student body undertaken by a guest faculty member who appeared before the Committee indicated what he described as a "surprising lack of apathy." It indicated, also, student dissatisfaction with our schedule ("Why don't we play Notre Dame instead of Furman?") and a belief that the football program was a profit-making venture, followed by inquiry as to why the "profits" realized were not used to improve intramural athletics.

From the point of view of the number of full-time undergraduate students, attendance at our home football games may be described as substantial for some games and considerably less than substantial for others. From the point of view of the total student enrollment, attendance at all home games would have to be described as insubstantial. Viewing the entire student body, and the composition of that student body, it is the opinion of the Committee that there is not overwhelming student interest in the football program and that it would be unrealistic to anticipate such interest.
3. Student Benefits

In assessing the benefits to our students arising from the maintenance of the football program, the Committee has considered the participating student and the spectator student.

Unquestionably, the participating student receives an exceptional program of physical training and discipline. However, the number of participants (approximately 35 a year) is rather insubstantial, and, it may be fair to assume, is comprised of those students least in need of such physical training.

In addition, it has been maintained that to the physical education major who participates in intercollegiate football, such participation constitutes a major career advantage. That is, upon graduation, the participant enjoys an advantage in securing a position in a high school or college physical education department over the physical education major who has not participated in intercollegiate football. While this may be true, the Committee feels that it is not substantially persuasive because (1) it involves a relatively small number of students (approximately 15 a year), and (2) it seems fair to say that those students would not be here in the first place were it not for the football grants-in-aid. To insist on the perpetuation of the football program with its grants-in-aid because of advantages to students who probably would not attend the University except for the grants-in-aid seems a bit like bootstrapping.

As to the non-participating student spectator, it has been maintained that the home football games provide a needed therapeutic device; that is, an opportunity to "blow off steam." One of the guest staff members who appeared before the Committee stated that attendance at the home football games tends to keep the students out of the taverns and off the streets.

However, our usual football season provides only four home games a season.
The student who does attend a game spends about two and one-half hours in the stadium. Taking transportation time into account (approximately one hour a game), the football program provides only 14 hours a year for "blowing off steam." In the opinion of the Committee this is not a particularly substantial contribution to the student spectator.

Moreover, the Committee feels that the student with a predisposition to frequent taverns or lounge on the streets either will not attend the games or, if he does, will find them to be at best a comparatively brief interruption of the fulfillment of his predispositions.

4. Attraction of Students to The George Washington University

It has been maintained that because of the existence of the intercollegiate football program, the University Athletic Director, head football coach and members of his coaching staff are invited to and appear at many high school lettermen's banquets. Since these banquets are attended by substantial portions of the student bodies involved and their parents, it has been maintained that these banquets provide an opportunity for those representatives of the University to "sell" the University to the high school students. It also has been maintained that elimination of the football program would result in the termination of invitations to appear at such banquets.

It has been suggested, too, that the presence of former George Washington University football players in the physical education departments and in administrative positions in the area high schools serves to induce those high school students to enroll at this University. That is, that these former football players, now connected with area high schools, can and do direct high school students toward this University.
However, even assuming the elimination of the intercollegiate football program, the Committee believes that the University Athletic Director and the coaching staffs of the University basketball team and other intercollegiate teams would continue to be welcomed guests at the various lettermen's banquets, thus retaining the opportunity to "sell" the University.

In addition, it is the judgement of the Committee that high school faculty members and administrators, alumni of the University but not former football players, would continue to advise their students of the advantages of attending this University. In fact, the Committee feels that today's high school students have achieved a level of academic sophistication where a recommendation from a faculty member or administrator engaged in a purely academic field or having a purely academic background would be more influential than one from a faculty member or administrator in the physical education department or having primarily a physical education background.

Moreover, it is the Committee's feeling that if student recruitment is an important aspect of the University's function - and surely it is - that faculty members of the University's various schools and departments make regular recruitment visits to area and out-of-area high schools, somewhat in the manner in which such visits are conducted by members of The Law School at various colleges and universities.

In addition, in determining the effect of the football program in attracting students to this University, the Committee has considered both the out-of-area and the local high school student. As to the former, it is the Committee's feeling that, putting aside the appeal that a particular department or school may have, the University's principal appeal is its location in the nation's capital. And that as compared with the other universities in Washington, D. C., our principal
appeal lies in the fact that we are the only private, secular institution of higher learning. The Committee feels that if intercollegiate football is a substantial factor in a student's selection of a college or university, it is unlikely that an out-of-area student would come to this University, since presumably he could find a college or university closer to home playing a higher calibre of football.

As to the local high school student, presumably no longer entranced by the nation's capital, it is the Committee's feeling that our principal appeal lies in our being the only private, secular university in the area. If such a student considers football a substantial factor in his selection, it seems likely that he would select a neighboring university where, again, a higher calibre of football is undertaken.

In conclusion, it is the opinion of the Committee that intercollegiate football is not a substantial factor in attracting students to this University.

5. Geographic Location of the University

The Committee feels that the fact that we are an in-city University located in a major metropolitan area with many and varied attractions for our students and the general public militates strongly against any substantial improvement in attendance at or interest in our home football games. The Committee feels that it is unrealistic to anticipate that there will exist here at any time the atmosphere prevalent at many so-called college towns, where the school's football games constitute the most exciting diversion in town for both students and townspeople.

Moreover, the Committee is of the opinion that probably most of our students are not particularly desirous of such an atmosphere or they would have attended a small-town school rather than this University.
6. Public Opinion

It has been said, and last year's Committee report, in quoting from an earlier study, stated that, "Like it or not (and we do not), public opinion plays an important role [in determining whether or not to maintain an inter-collegiate athletic program]." (The bracketed language is that of this Committee.)

Whatever may be the general rule of public opinion concerning inter-collegiate athletics, specifically football, to the extent that public opinion can be measured by public attendance, there would appear to be an overwhelming lack of public opinion concerning our football program. The 40,000-odd empty seats at most of our home games offer mute but persuasive evidence that the public simply isn't much interested in our football games.

7. Physical Facilities

It has been said that we are fortunate to have the big, new, beautiful D. C. Stadium as a site for our home games.

However, in the opinion of the Committee, D. C. Stadium is a most inappropriate site. First, it is off-campus; almost as far off campus as a stadium could be and still be in the District of Columbia. In the opinion of the Committee this fact is and will continue to be an adverse factor in stimulating student interest in our football games. Second, the size of the stadium is peculiarly inappropriate for our football schedule. The sight of 40,000 empty seats at most of our home games is not conducive to enthusiasm on the part of the students or other spectators. On the contrary, 40,000 empty seats can have only a depressing and discouraging effect on those who do attend a game.
The Committee has considered the possibility of playing home games on a high school field. This would offer a site more appropriate for our attendance and might encourage area high school students to attend our games, thereby seeing the University's football team. However, the Committee has concluded that use of a high school field inevitably would result in the labeling of George Washington University football as "high school football" with a consequent diminution of whatever prestige may result from our football program, or even a negative prestige factor.

It is the opinion of the Committee that there does not now and will not, in the foreseeable future, exist a facility appropriate for George Washington University's home football games.

8. Prestige

It has been maintained, and accurately, that in the Metropolitan Washington area the University's football team receives widespread publicity by means of newspaper reports of games and radio play-by-play accounts. As a result, thousands of people in the area read and hear about the University's football team. In addition, it is fair to assume that at least the scores of the University's football games are published in newspapers outside the Metropolitan Washington area. Consequently, the football team secures a substantial amount of publicity for the University.

However, two problems exist in connection with this publicity. First, in view of the less than outstanding success of the football team over a period of years, there is at least some question as to whether or not this publicity can be equated with prestige. Second, and even more important, even assuming that this publicity does have some prestige value, two questions arise:
Prestige with whom? And how does this prestige benefit the University? Certainly there is no evidence that the thousands of people who read and hear about the University's football team are motivated thereby to make financial contributions to the University. It already has been noted that in the opinion of the Committee the football program, and the prestige arising therefrom, do not constitute substantial factors in attracting students to the University. It has been noted, too, that there seems to be very little alumni or general public interest in the University's football program. After viewing these factors and attempting to analyze the intangible aspects of this claimed prestige, the Committee feels that the publicity resulting from the University's football team does not bring substantial prestige to the University.

Moreover, it is the sense of this Committee that the funds currently expended for the football program could bring substantial and continuing prestige to the University if used to attract academically outstanding students to the University. It is the sense of the Committee that such a program, in addition to, and as a consequence of, raising ever higher the academic standards of the University would achieve the most substantial, basic and important kind of prestige for the University. Further, it is the judgement of the Committee that this kind of prestige is the type most likely to attract substantial financial grants to the University.

Basketball

Many of the factors considered above in the context of our football program have some degree of applicability to our basketball program. However, differences do exist, in degree, at least, if not in kind.
For example, while we lack an on-campus site for our basketball games, the off-campus facilities utilized (Fort Myer Field House and, on occasion, Washington Coliseum) seem much more appropriate in size for our basketball games than does D.C. Stadium for our football games. The facilities used for our home basketball games usually are substantially filled for those games.

In addition, while the football season usually offers only four home games for student (and general public) attendance, the basketball season offers 11 or 12 home games a season, and frequently those games are preceded by freshman games. And, finally, the operation of the basketball program results in a deficit substantially less than that incurred by the football program. In fact, the basketball program deficit (gross deficit: $55,964.43, net deficit: $35,724.93) is less than half of the football deficit. In the opinion of the Committee the basketball program can achieve for the University virtually all of the benefits claimed for the football program and is not subject in the same degree as is the football program to the inherent difficulties considered in the factors set forth above.

Conclusions

It is the sense of this Committee that consideration of the factors set forth above leads to the conclusion that the University's intercollegiate football program is unsatisfactory and that those factors which make it so are factors which will continue to exist in the foreseeable future.

In general, four approaches may be taken to an intercollegiate football program. First, a "big time" football program could be undertaken. In the
opinion of this Committee such an approach would be inconsistent and incompatible with the primary goals and objectives of this University. Second, a de-emphasized football program, which means, in effect, the substantial reduction or total elimination of grants-in-aid assistance, could be undertaken. In the opinion of this Committee such an approach would aggravate and exacerbate the presently unsatisfactory aspects of our football program. A de-emphasized program, of course, would require a de-emphasized schedule, and such a schedule very likely would have an adverse effect on alumni interest, student interest, interest on the part of the general public, and a diminution of whatever prestige may arise from our football program. In addition, it seems fair to assume that such a de-emphasized schedule would result in even more empty seats at our home football games.

The Committee's examination of the Constitution and Bylaws of the Southern Conference indicates that they are silent as to the obligation of a member school to continue to maintain an intercollegiate football program. The Commissioner of the Conference has stated to the Committee Chairman that if a member school were to discontinue intercollegiate football, the Conference probably would initiate the following procedures: First, the Executive Committee of the Conference would direct the Schools and College Committee of the Conference and the Committee of Athletic Directors of the Conference to conduct a full inquiry into the reasons for such action and into the entire intercollegiate athletic program of the member school. Upon the completion of such inquiry, those two committees would submit reports to the Executive Committee of the Conference. The Executive Committee of the Conference, in turn, would study these reports and then forward them, along with its recommendation, to the Conference as a whole. In this context, the "Conference as a whole" refers
to a body consisting of a faculty representative of each member school. That body would make a determination as to whether or not the member school should continue to be a member of the Conference.

It is the hope of this Committee that in light of the factors which have led this Committee to its conclusion, and in view of the University's entire intercollegiate athletic program, the Conference would decide to retain the University as a member school. However, even if an adverse decision should be made by the Conference, it is this Committee's considered opinion that the best interests of this University dictate the discontinuance of the intercollegiate football program.

Taking into account all of the factors set forth above, it is the opinion of the Committee that an intercollegiate football program is not in the best interest of the University and the expenditure for its maintenance is not a wise one. Viewing the factors as they exist and as they are likely to exist in the foreseeable future, it is the opinion of the Committee that an intercollegiate football program at this University cannot achieve a level of excellence, using that phrase in its broadest sense. In the opinion of this Committee it is unwise for the University to continue to expend substantial sums of money for a program which cannot achieve the level of excellence which the University is seeking in all of the areas of its endeavors.

On the other hand, use of funds currently expended on the intercollegiate football program to recruit and enroll at this University academically outstanding students would constitute a program calculated and likely to achieve a high level of excellence. While there may be substantial factors precluding excellence in our intercollegiate football program, there are not such factors precluding excellence in scholarship at this University.
Recommendations

The Senate Committee on Athletics recommends the following:

1. That the University's intercollegiate football program be discontinued.

2. That all other intercollegiate athletic programs maintained by the University be continued.

3. That existing contractual obligations between members of the football coaching staff and the University be honored by the University.

4. That financial commitments made by the University to currently enrolled students participating in the intercollegiate football program, or whose participation therein was contemplated, be honored by the University.

5. That to the fullest extent practicable present members of the football coaching staff be given the opportunity to accept positions as members of the University faculty or staff.

6. That until the obligations and commitments referred to in recommendations 3 and 4 be terminated, the University expend a sum of money equal to the net deficit realized by the football program (approximately $75,000 a year) to recruit and secure the enrollment of academically outstanding students, and that such funds be used for recruiting, scholarships, and direct financial assistance to such students; and, further, that such sum of money be in addition to any sum as may be expended presently for such purposes.

7. That upon the termination of the obligations and commitments referred to in recommendations 3 and 4, the University expend a sum of money equal to the total grants-in-aid assistance presently given to participants in the intercollegiate football program (approximately $140,000 a year) to recruit
and secure the enrollment of academically outstanding students, and that such funds be used for recruiting, scholarships, and direct financial assistance to such students; and, further, that such sum of money be in addition to any sum as may be expended presently for such purposes.

Respectfully submitted,

J. W. Skinner (Economics)
E. L. Stevens (Speech)
D. E. Seidelson, Chairman (Law)

April, 1964
Minority Report of the University Senate's Committee on Athletics

To enable the University Senate to evaluate more completely the Intercollegiate Athletic Program of our University, this Minority Report of the University Senate's Committee on Athletics is respectfully submitted.

At the second meeting of the Committee, on December 20, the financial statement on athletics was presented to the Committee. Immediately and unanimously the Committee with practically no discussion approved the intercollegiate athletic program with the exception of football.

The six-man Committee was equally divided in their evaluation of the question to continue or discontinue the football program. With the ex officio member not eligible to vote, the report to the University Senate resulted in a Majority Report representing three members and a Minority Report representing two members.

It should be noted that in 1962 the University Senate appointed a six-man Committee to evaluate the athletic program. This Committee recommended to the Senate by a 5-1 vote that the full existing program of intercollegiate athletics be continued. The report also recommended an activity fee to assist in the financial support of the program. On the basis of this experience, it appears that the Senate may very well expect continuing annual reports which reverse the recommendations of the previous year.

In the Majority Report made to the University Senate, abolition of the football program was recommended. The Minority members of the Committee consider this decision to be precipitous, unsupportable in fact, ill-advised in terms of University policy-objectives, and to constitute a negative approach toward the potentialities of this University.
The Rationale for a Full Athletic Program

The George Washington University has always been proud of its unique character as a non-sectarian institution of higher learning offering a comprehensive program of instruction and research in substantially all of the important professions and disciplines. Perhaps the basic assumption and most distinctive quality of the idea of the complete University is that such a concept fosters an appreciation for the diversity of attitudes, interests, and desires that are to be expected in a liberal, progressive university environment. It assumes a certain degree of respect for the interests, and even ideas, that span the total human perspective. The whole American experience reflects the prominent and vital role of intercollegiate athletics in a complete university program.

The George Washington University has an honorable tradition of participation in intercollegiate athletics. Some of its teams have been outstanding, such as the Sun Bowl Football Team of 1957. Our basketball teams have reached a position of national prominence during many seasons. Some of our former students who have been athletes, such as Leemans, Auerbach, Davis, Holup, Devlin, Hanken, Faris and (currently) Dick Drummond, have effectively and favorably spread the name of this University throughout most of this country. It is an obvious fact that one of the most energetic and active alumni groups within the University structure is the Colonials, Inc.

In our great urban University, which must wage a continuing struggle against an automated and impersonal complexion, no other activities can present the same dynamic rallying point for total University interest as can strong football and basketball programs. This is a lesson that the vast majority of prestige schools have learned and applied for many, many years.
These schools recognize that a football program does not merely benefit 70 students. It presents a bright focus of attention and interest for the whole University Community. It serves to make us all recognize that among our schools, departments, faculty, students, alumni, and especially prospective students, there is a basis for a true community of interests, even enthusiasm.

Our nation is emphasizing the need for upgrading the total fitness and physical fitness of our youth. The recommendation of the Majority Report is in direct opposition to the attention being focused on this subject by our Government. As an institution in the Nation's Capital, our actions should reflect national objectives. Each individual, school, and community must rededicate itself to making our nation strong.

The George Washington University Catalogue states, "A balanced program of student extra-curricular activities is an integral part of the University program." Certainly, football has always been considered an integral part of a balanced program of extra-curricular activities.

Football at our University dates back to 1894. It has provided an essential point for the manifestation of school spirit. It has appropriately complemented the University's main function of developing the intellect.

Our football activity has carefully conformed to the rules and regulations of the Southern Conference and the NCAA. Our football coach is president of the Southern Conference Football Coaches Association. The athletic director, a past president of the Southern Conference's Athletic Directors Association, is presently a member of the NCAA's Committee on Legislation. Students participating in football must and do meet the scholastic requirements of the University. The faculty, through its representatives on the Faculty Athletic Committee, has
both the opportunity and responsibility to review regularly the football program and to assure its institutional soundness.

This Committee, composed of members from the schools or departments of Medicine, Law, English, Science, and Education, support the moderate approach to intercollegiate athletics that our present program maintains.
Detailed Discussion of Factors Involved

The value of any activity, program, department, or school budgeted by the University cannot be solely measured by financial gain or loss. The vast majority of The George Washington University's activities, programs, departments, and schools operate at a financial loss. This obviously cannot be construed to mean that they do not make a positive net contribution to the University.

It is charged by the Majority Report that the net expense of football to the University of $77,871.95 is an unwise expenditure. The Majority Report further approves the net expense of $46,538.66 for the other sports. It is of interest to note in this connection that the average student attendance at basketball games is less than half of those attending football games. The presumption that the expenses for basketball and the minor sports are justifiable while the football expense is not, is supported by nothing more than bare assertion. The hard facts, however, lend no support to this assertion. The following specific and positive benefits are derived from our football program. Losses of these benefits could never be compensated for by the other activities of the athletic program.

1. Publicity and Public Relations values to the football program.
   a. Five-thousand-column-inches of space in the three local daily newspapers concerning The George Washington University. Purchasing such space would cost in excess of $45,000.
   b. Over fifty-seven hours of radio time. The purchase of such time could cost over $20,000. It is also noteworthy that the popular George Washington University Metroplex Radio Series of 39 half-hour shows per year
is an outgrowth of the football broadcasts. From WOL alone the University receives 750 spot announcements per season. Fifty minutes of radio time a year is devoted to promotion of various schools and departments by their representatives.

c. **Wire service coverage from coast to coast on each football contest.** This coverage includes announcements on radio and TV, the name of the University in every paper carrying football results, and a synopsis of our games in newspapers in cities such as Chicago, Kansas City, New York, Boston, Atlanta, Los Angeles, and Philadelphia. While the purchasing price of this national coverage of The George Washington University cannot be precisely computed, it is obviously substantial.

d. **Press releases originating from the Athletic Department concerning The George Washington University go to over 250 newspapers and radio and TV stations throughout the country each week during the football season.** The purchase of this publicity, which is in addition to our extensive local coverage, would be considerable.

e. **The motivation for the activities for possibly the most vigorous alumni group affiliated with the University, Colonials, Inc.** The University cannot afford to sacrifice the interest, the loyalty, or the substantial contribution in time, service, and money of this group. Many of the Colonials are annual contributors to the alumni fund. The Colonials, Inc. should be encouraged, not dismissed as unwanted.

f. **Members of the football staff receive and accept approximately 100 invitations annually to be the principal speaker at high school banquets and at functions of civic organizations.** The department policy prohibits remuneration,
such activities being considered a professional obligation to the University. Clearly, The George Washington University always figures prominently in these talks. The assumption that this practice could be continued at the same high level by just the athletic director and basketball coach is absurd. First, it would be humanly impossible for two men to undertake this schedule, and secondly, it is ridiculous to think that a basketball coach would be invited to speak at football gatherings or banquets.

g. The football staff makes over 300 personal visitations per year with high school students, principals, or guidance counselors, including all local secondary schools, and schools in Virginia, Maryland, Delaware, Pennsylvania, Ohio, New Jersey, and New York. Only by this approach have numerous principals and guidance counselors been made aware of the educational standards, the courses of study available, and the special advantages of pursuing an education in the Nation's Capital.

Football is the largest single source of publicity available to the University. This publicity is wholesome and positive, and is a credit to the University. Such publicity cannot be accomplished through letters to the editor, by advertisement of social or cultural functions, or by announcement of individual achievement awards. What other University source can demand daily publicity? The name of The George Washington University must be presented in the most favorable possible light throughout this country by every available communication source. Our existing football program clearly accomplishes more in this respect than any other single activity of the University.
Prestige

The maintenance of a sound, balanced intercollegiate athletic program, including football, definitely contributes to an institution's status and prestige. Since all colleges and universities periodically evaluate their athletic programs, it is interesting to note a few of those that continue to find positive value in their football programs: Stanford, California, U.C.L.A., Harvard, Yale, Columbia, Dartmouth, Army, Navy, Notre Dame, Temple, Holy Cross, Duke, Virginia; and the smaller schools such as Davidson, Amherst, Colgate, Swarthmore, Lehigh, and others. In the last decade institutions abolishing football have been Hardin-Simmons, Creighton University, Denver University, Marquette, St. Ambrose, and Scranton University.

The football scheduling policy at The George Washington University recommends a nine game schedule. Five or six of these games are scheduled with Southern Conference opponents. Two or three games are scheduled with institutions emphasizing a moderate football program that are located in various geographical regions of the United States. Normally these games are played in the New England or the Midwest areas. One game is normally scheduled with a "name school," such as Army, Navy, Florida, Vanderbilt, or the Air Force Academy.

The Student

Following World War II, during which we had no football team, football was brought back to the University because of student demand.

The truly collegiate activities program is oriented toward the full-time undergraduate student, not the graduate student or the part-time graduate or undergraduate student. In what direction is The George Washington University
presently moving? Statistics from the Office of the Registrar indicate:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1960</th>
<th>1963</th>
<th>Increase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All students</td>
<td>10,183</td>
<td>11,246</td>
<td>1,063</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-time undergraduates</td>
<td>2,354</td>
<td>3,081</td>
<td>727</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ninety-three per cent (93%) of the entering freshmen for 1963-64 were full-time students. The above figures indicate sixty-eight per cent (68%) of the increase was on the full-time undergraduate level. Commencing this fall, approximately 2,000 will be on-campus resident students. The Office of the Dean of Men states that over ninety per cent (90%) of these resident students will be full-time undergraduate students. An all-out University effort has as its goal 500 additional in-resident units each year commencing in 1965-66.

Contrary to the Majority Report, our University is not a commuter institution. In our future plans we cannot over-emphasize the changing concept of our campus from a commuting University to an in-residence University. The program of activities must be varied (dance, drama, music, athletics) in order to have a well-rounded program. Present students and prospective students expect a complete college atmosphere that includes the subject of this Report, namely an athletic program, and football in particular.

The Majority Report charges apathy among the students relative to football. This is an assertion; it is not supported by fact. The facts are that in the last 31 home football games over the past nine years, over fifty per cent (50%) of the full-time undergraduate students were in attendance. No activity can hope to appeal to one hundred per cent of the students. Student leaders in
other activities consider fifty per cent participation an exceptionally high percentage. Even though Lisner Auditorium seats only 1500, a full house at student events is rare, and Lisner is located right on campus.

It should be recognized, of course, that attendance at the four home games per year is only one part of the activities associated with intercollegiate football. There are pep rallies, float preparations, house and campus decorations, parades, election of queens, Homecoming drama productions, dances, open houses, etc. Why eliminate the focal point for these activities?

Contact with student leaders on the campus does not support the "student apathy" assertion of the Majority Committee Report. Our intercollegiate athletic program identifies the student with a tangible entity, one that provides a single cohesiveness for the entire student body. The following letter by a student co-ed, Student Activities Assistant, Linda Sennett, expresses an opinion concerning football at The George Washington University:

"Are you kidding? Why football could be one of the biggest things at G.W.U. Students talk about the team all the time. And don't you think they don't know what's going on, because they do. Maybe they don't go to all the games, but I guarantee they have their radios tuned in for most of the games. If students weren't interested in athletics, would the Hatchet devote a full page to athletics each week?

You ask why attendance is poor? Did you stop to think that if we had a winning team, no one would want to miss a game. How was attendance when our team was winning as compared to when we were losing? Think about that.

Another argument against abolishing football - students study all week long. On the week-ends they have to release their tensions. What better or healthier means could there be than an outdoor football game. Boys like to take dates to the football games on Saturday afternoons, and parties are held after the games. What better way to arouse school spirit?

About school spirit. The main complaint I've heard is that students do not identify themselves with The George Washington University. Why not? Don't you think that if we had a winning team people would not only feel an identification with their school, but would brag about it to others? What better way to publicize the name of the University and help get other students to come here. I suggest a winning team, not the abolishment of a team.
If we have student apathy now, what would it be without football? How does the University look without a team? How would this affect alumni contributions? How would this affect enrollment? How would this affect participation in other student activities?

I don't think the answer is removing football. This could create student apathy to such a point that an important aspect of college would be missing at George Washington. The individuals produced by the University would not be the student leaders and successful graduate students which we have had in the past, but book learners. This is fine, but does this teach people to work with others and to get to know them? Before you can be successful, you must learn to know people. What better way than to spend a day with them at a game, or cheer with them at a pep rally or compete with them in a float parade. Imagine Homecoming without a pep rally, float parade or a football game!

The answer is a better team, not abolishing the team."

**Student Activity Fee**

The Minority Committee suggests the University administration evaluate the benefits of establishing an activity fee. It is the practice in American colleges and universities to support university activities through this means. The vast majority of institutions operate at a financial deficit relative to football; however, the purpose of an activity fee is to lend financial support to the athletic program. Southern Conference members and local institutions are typical of universities throughout the country in their policy of charging an activity fee. The following fee per student is allocated to defray or eliminate athletic expenses at the following schools:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conference members</th>
<th>Local</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Citadel</td>
<td>Georgetown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William &amp; Mary</td>
<td>$35.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davidson</td>
<td>Maryland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Furman</td>
<td>20.00**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Washington</td>
<td>American</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richmond</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V.M.I.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V.P.I.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Virginia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Allocated 37% of total alumni contributions

** Assessed each student registered for seven or more hours.
The Minority Members recognize that it must be a matter of University fiscal policy as to whether an activities fee as such will be charged. We do want to bring to your attention, however, that such a fee is a practice accepted by the vast majority of universities to defray the cost of their athletic program. If this University prefers not to designate and assess a separate athletic fee charge, then it should expect to allocate the necessary amount from the overall tuition charge to support the athletic program.

The Prospective Student

The Majority Report expressed "opinions," "feelings," and "judgments" relative to the appropriate approach for the recruitment of prospective students for The George Washington University. These three opinions of the individual members presented no facts or research. The two members of the Minority Committee with extensive recruiting experience with high school principals, students, and guidance counselors are well aware of the pressures by colleges and universities seeking the enrollment of well qualified high school students.

The Majority Report further states that the recruitment program should be carried on by the members of the faculty of the University's various schools, both in the local area and in out-of-town high schools. Theoretically, this is an excellent suggestion. This is, however, mere speculation. The fact is that a systematic recruitment of undergraduate students by members of the faculty has been the exception, not the rule. It is fact, not speculation, that the staff members of the Athletic Department make 300 high school visitations a year and are requested as guest speakers at 100 high schools each year. There is no remuneration for either visits or speeches.
The Majority Report further states, "A recommendation from a faculty member or administrator engaged in a purely academic field or having a purely academic background would be more influential than one from a faculty member or administrator in the physical education department or having primarily a physical education background." There is no foundation for such an attack on the Physical Education major of this University. Last year a Physical Education major and a participant in the football program, Frank Pazzaglia, received the Phi Delta Kappa Award as The Most Outstanding Graduate in the School of Education. In 1961-62 the same honor was awarded to Woodbury Weimorn, a Physical Education Major.

The Majority Members' "feelings" that these high school faculty members with athletic background have less influence on their students than their purely academic colleagues is completely refuted by the evidence. A recent survey conducted by Dr. Ellsworth Tompkins, Executive Secretary, National Association of Secondary School Principals, related that 65% of all secondary school principals had physical education backgrounds or coaching experience during their professional careers. Further, Dr. William J. Ellenda, Assistant Secretary, Association of School Administrators, stated that in a recent survey of 10,160 school superintendents, over 50% coached at one time during their professional teaching and school administrative careers.

Today, very few high school graduates would select a University solely because it has a football team. However, the qualified high school graduate does desire to be associated with a University of high academic standards which also provides him an opportunity as a student to participate in a full range of activities available at the great majority of universities.
The elimination of a University activity is clearly not an attraction to a prospective student. Most prospective students associate the University atmosphere with dormitory life, sorority and fraternity affiliation, campus politics, and a balanced athletic program. Elimination of any of these accepted activities would be injurious to the University's future recruitment program. This judgment is supported by the following letters from T. E. Smith, Educational Counselor, and G. W. G. Stoner, Assistant Director of Admissions.
April 7, 1964

TO: Dr. J. H. Krupa

FROM: T. E. Smith

SUBJECT: Athletics and Student Recruitment

As you know, I have been responsible for student recruitment for the past ten years.

This job required school visits from New York to Norfolk and as far west as Chicago, and resulted in my talking to an average of between 2500 and 3000 high school students each year. These students want to know the following things:

1. Admissions requirements
2. Costs
3. Academic offerings
4. Academic standing of specific departments
5. College life with marked interest in fraternities and athletics.

If these points were not covered in the general presentation, someone would ask a direct question. If our team was particularly good or we had an outstanding player, some student would invariably mention it to me. I was impressed by the fact that students at a distance from Washington often knew more about our football than one would expect. A top-flight team generates interest. It seems that a really good football team hits the headlines across the country and arouses the curiosity of students who otherwise might never look at our catalogue.

Students seem to identify with a successful football or basketball team. There is great vicarious participation and enjoyment. School spirit is generated and students boast of the prowess of their team. All of this publicity is a great aid to general student recruitment because the feeling seems to be, if the school is that good in matters of minor importance, it must be very much better in the academic matters which are of major importance. Where all other things are equal, a student will prefer to go to a school that has a good football team to one that has none.

I have discussed this subject with the directors of admissions for American University and the University of Maryland. They concur in the statements made above.
April 8, 1964

TO: J. H. Krupa
FROM: T. E. Smith
SUBJECT: Football

In my previous memo, I did not include the statements of Father John Divine, Director of Personnel at Georgetown University. He said that football is a very excellent source for consolidating the spirit of the student body in the Fall. It gives a very healthy outlet for student exuberance and unifies the student body in a very strong and desirable way. In the absence of this unifying force and source of outlet, the students often find undesirable means of letting off steam. Georgetown has tried to take advantage of this by intramural football. It has met with some success but there has been (according to statements of another official) more examples of undesirable student enthusiasm than existed when intercollegiate football was conducted. Georgetown took a step last year toward meeting some of the natural desire of students for intercollegiate football by scheduling a game with Frostburg State Teachers' College. This was cancelled due to the assassination of President Kennedy. The plan had called for expanding the schedule to include such schools as Gallaudet and other colleges whose teams are composed of non-scholarship athletes.

John Wakefield, at American University, stated that the question of intercollegiate football is brought up regularly by students; they argue that it creates and consolidates school spirit. Three years ago at the instigation of the student council, a thorough survey was made and it was found that there were not enough students on campus capable of playing football. Excluding football scholarships, it would cost $190,000 to get started. Therefore, it was determined to put their efforts on getting a fieldhouse that could adequately take care of the crowds for basketball games. However, it is Mr. Wakefield's opinion that it won't be long before students will again be agitating for football. Both men stated that high school students frequently ask whether or not the college has football and they both believe that the newspaper publicity derived from successful athletic teams gives assistance in publicizing the name of the school that could not be derived in any other way. There is no doubt in their minds about the value of this publicity in student recruitment.
April 8, 1964

Memorandum to: Dr. Krupa

From: G. W. G. Stoner

Subject: Account of Trip Impressions

1. Background: During the early part of March, I interviewed over a hundred prospective students and applicants from the Boston-Hartford-New Haven area. The trip afforded an excellent opportunity to describe the University, its programs and standards to a maximum number of students from a wide variety of different secondary schools in a minimum amount of time.

   Many questions were asked about athletic facilities and intramural programs on campus. There was a widespread interest in a strong active intramural athletic program.

   Whenever the opportunity arose, I made a point of asking men in particular to express their views on the importance of an intercollegiate athletic program at an urban institution such as ours. The consensus was that the program could play an important role in helping to build esprit de corps among the student body, even without a winning team. Most were aware of our football schedule and record and referred to our recent basketball record at Charlotte, N. C.

GWGS:1nn
The Physical Education Major

The football program provides an important additional component in the instructional program of the Physical Education major who plans to follow the teaching-coaching profession.

It is stated in the Majority Report that an average of 15 students receive baccalaureate degrees in Physical Education per year. The Report further refers to this number as insignificant. It is interesting to note that very few majors exceed this number, and it may be somewhat surprising to some to note how many majors have less.

"A Summary of Degrees by Major for Academic Year 1962-63" including Physical Education, but excluding Education, is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Business Administration</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrical Engineering</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Affairs</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Literature</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Science</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economics</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pharmacy</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Education</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zoology</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounting</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemistry</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Affairs</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Thought and Civilization</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course</td>
<td>Credits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art History and Theory</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthropology and Sociology</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociology</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil Engineering</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanical Engineering</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physics</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speech</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor of Science in Engineering</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biology</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drawing and Painting</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French Language and Literature</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Medical</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geography</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journalism</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosophy</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish Language and Literature</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthropology</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial Art</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statistics</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematical Statistics</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical Technology</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Botany</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business and Economic Statistics</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Dramatic Art 1
Geology 1
Germanic Language and Literature 1
Latin American Civilization 1
Sculpture 1

The 109 baccalaureate degrees in Education:

Elementary Education 37
Physical Education 19
English 13
Home Economics 10
Social Studies 8
Business Education 6
French 4
Geography 2
Chemistry and Physics 1
General Science 1
History 1
Mathematics 1
Russian 1
Social Studies, English 1
Spanish 1

Of the 19 Physical Education students to receive baccalaureate degrees in 1961-62, 11 did not receive grants-in-aid; in 1962-63, 10 did not receive grants-in-aid.
The above degrees granted in major fields indicate eight major areas exceed the number of degrees granted in Physical Education and that 36 major areas grant fewer degrees. The elimination of football would seriously endanger the continuation of the Physical Education major. We have a responsibility to the community and to society to prepare young men to teach a subject demanded by law in at least 48 of the States.

The Alumni

One of the largest and, without doubt, one of the most active alumni groups is The Colonials, Inc. Because of the football program this group has a very close association with the University and makes numerous contributions to our school.

The George Washington University Letterman's Club is very active locally. A women's auxiliary of this Club is being formed. In addition, Lettermen's Clubs are being formed in New York City and Chicago.

These groups include many alumni in the younger age bracket. We must encourage these people to find a facet of University activity that will promote continued association with The George Washington University.

No organized fund-raising campaign for athletics has been conducted because the University has never approved such action. Neither the Alumni nor anyone else is apt to contribute funds unless asked. However, it may be interesting to the University Senate that one of the largest, if not the largest, alumni contributions to The George Washington University is the Pairo Fund. The following is extracted from a letter dated April 24, 1964, to Professor Seidelson from Henry W. Herzog, Vice President and Treasurer:
"1. The Pairo Fund bequeathed to the University in 1930 by Richard E. Pairo, an alumnus of our Law School, is 'for the use and benefit of the Athletics of the University, either by using the principal for the purchase of a Campus, or the building and equipping of a Gymnasium, or investing the principal and devoting the income thereof in promoting the Athletic Sports of the University as the Trustees and Faculty of the University may deem wisest and best.'

The Board of Trustees at its meeting February 21, 1957, acknowledged the action taken by the Faculty Committee on Athletics in behalf of the Faculty of the University, and designated Square 57, bounded by 22nd, 23rd, F and G Streets, N.W., for the development of athletic facilities of the University.

This fund in the original amount of approximately $500,000 has been used for the purchase of real estate in this square. The University continues to purchase real estate in this square as in other squares of the University area. When all the property in Square 57 has been acquired, it can be used as designated."

The land purchased by this fund has, therefore, greatly contributed to University expansion.

With reference to the lack of communications from the alumni concerning athletics, as indicated by the Majority Report, representatives of the Department of Athletics and the Department of Physical Education for Men can very positively state that inquiry about our athletic program is a daily occurrence.

It may be of interest to the University Senate that although some of us never, or seldom, attend the Senators' baseball games, we are vitally interested daily in the baseball results and we are avid non-attending fans. The assertion that all alumni must attend games to manifest an interest in The George Washington University's football team is pure supposition.

Instead of running down the substantial alumni support that is shown for our football program and hence, for the University as the Majority Report does, it would be much more constructive to University purposes to channel and stimulate this existing interest into constantly increasing support.
Facilities

The Majority Report bemoans the fact that we do not have a football stadium wholly suited for our specific needs. This is a criticism that can be made of many University activities, but surely is no cause to abolish them. Certainly, all contests do not offer the sight of 40,000 empty seats as the Majority Report so erroneously stated. It could be little more than a personal observation if empty seats are found depressing. The thousands of people viewing our football games do not share this opinion.

Let us consider the advantages that accrue to the University through our access to the new D. C. Stadium. We are able to rent this facility, which is recognized as one of the finest in the country, for only $10,000 a year, with no capital outlay and no maintenance costs. Maintenance and repairs alone for a University-owned stadium would exceed $25,000 per year. This financial fact dictates our present policy of leasing D. C. Stadium at an expenditure envied by most universities. Secondly, this Stadium affords the University the opportunity of hosting a national power such as Army. This game attracted 26,000 spectators and provided the University nation-wide publicity. Another game attracted 20,000 and two other games attracted 12,000 each.

The Majority Report found little fault with the off-campus basketball facilities indicating they are of a more appropriate size and substantially filled. The facts are (1) Washington Coliseum is old and dirty; it is an ice-skating rink, not a basketball facility, and (2) Fort Myer, while more convenient, cannot seat the crowds of some of our games.
Value of Conference Affiliation

The University has attained national stature by membership in the Southern Conference, a Conference recognized by the National Collegiate Athletic Association as one of the 14 major conferences throughout these United States. Each Southern Conference member maintains a football program, and the Conference constitution prohibits admission to a new member to the Conference that does not include football in its athletic program. Further, the Conference treasury has cash assets in excess of $200,000 of which over fifty per cent is derived from football income.

Based on the above, it is inconceivable that this University or any other conference member could continue membership within the Southern Conference without a football program. Without Conference affiliation a moderate athletic program cannot survive. As an independent, an institution must either be "big time" or have their program dictated by the conferences. A select few "Big Name Schools" are successful as independents. New conferences occasionally are founded, and practically all independents seek admission to these newly organized groups.

Dean Nutting emphasized in the University Senate discussion on March 13 the importance of conference affiliation. Director of Athletics Robert K. Faris stated that Conference membership contributes to a stabilized athletic program and affords the scheduling and playing of contests with institutions under strict eligibility regulations.

Institutions participating in athletics as independents, by necessity, contract for games against opponents not of their preference, but with those institutions with varied entrance, academic, and athletic policies.
The Southern Conference, the oldest athletic conference in our nation, affords us the opportunity to promote a friendly though spirited rivalry between schools; regulates athletic competition; equalizes competitive opportunities; facilitates schedule making; promotes local and national publicity; demands ethical practices; standardizes eligibility; provides a means of discussing and deciding mutual problems; results in better officiating; maintains athletics under faculty supervision; and focuses attention on educational values of athletics.

This University would be very naive to entertain the suggestion that without football we could continue our Conference relations.
III

Conclusion and Recommendation

Detrimental Effects of Abolishing Football

The Majority Report shows an astonishing disregard for the consequences of its recommendation. Just where would abolition of football leave the various University groups and activities affected? How would this action strengthen the University's program or its public image? What, specifically, would any School or Department gain? How would abolition of an activity that at least half of our full-time students find stimulating and wholesome enhance student morale and sense of University pride? We know that many prospective students inquire about our football program, not necessarily as their sole interest in the University, but as part of the attraction of a complete University. How can one have any doubt but that dropping football would inevitably be a negative factor with these students? We know that many alumni are strongly in favor of the sport and support it energetically. If the interest of these people is lost, how can we expect to gain in alumni interest? We know that the public has our football activities and hence the University itself brought to its attention throughout the fall by write-ups of our games. What publicity is to replace this? We know that we now have the advantages and convenience of a conference affiliation that is of enormous assistance in arranging for a full schedule of intercollegiate sports. The Majority Report indicates that our varsity athletic program is most desirable other than for football. Does it not then border on the reckless to recommend a course of action which will almost certainly drastically weaken, even completely undermine, our over-all collegiate athletic program by depriving the
University of its conference affiliation? The Majority does not deny this likely result. It ignores the fundamental question by alluding to the hope, repeat hope, of the Majority Members, that "the Conference would decide to retain the University as a member school."

The Serious Deficiencies of the Proposed Alternative

Members of the Committee making the Majority Report apparently felt the necessity of recommending an alternative use of the funds devoted to the football program by proposing that certain academic scholarship grants be provided. Apart from the somewhat presumptuous assertion of University priorities as reflected by the Majority Report, this recommendation should be critically examined. Of course, there are literally hundreds of ways in which the University might spend $77,871.00. And no one is opposed to more scholarships. The real question then is what assurance is there that such a scholarship program will contribute more (or anywhere near as much) to overall University objectives as does the football program? There is an extremely interesting statement in the Majority Report to the effect that the scholarship program has none of the disabilities that attach to the football program. But there was complete silence about the positive benefits of the football program and the complete inability of the proposed academic scholarships to compensate for such loss. In fact, a vast void in total University assets would result.

Since we must accept the proposition that the proposed scholarships would cost essentially the same as the football deficit, we must ask: How is a rational judgment to be made in this matter? Just what benefits will flow from such scholarships which will show a net gain over the obvious advantages of the current football program? Surely, if the academic scholarships would
have none of the disabilities of the football program, neither would they have any of the benefits. For example:

1. In what conceivable way would 25 (or even 50) new academic scholarships accrue to the benefit or enjoyment of the other students at the University?

2. How many new students would be attracted to the University just by knowing that we have, say, 1016 rather than 966 scholarships (number of scholarships and fellowships we now actually award).

3. What assurance is there that applicants for such scholarships would have promise of more prominent professional careers than do the football scholarship holders?

4. How much newspaper space or radio or TV time would the new scholarships receive?

5. How much additional alumni-giving would result if the University offered 50 new scholarships?

Merely asking these questions should convincingly demonstrate that 25 or even 50 new academic scholarships would contribute little or nothing in terms of the criteria by which the contribution of our football program to total University objectives is judged. This is in no way meant to minimize the importance of scholarships. But it is meant to emphasize the fact that the football program makes a very special contribution to the University from almost every perspective -- from the standpoint of students currently enrolled, prospective students, alumni, and in the impact of our activities on the general public. In fact, measured in terms of the cost/benefit ratio, the football detractors are challenged to show that any other scholarship program of comparable cost provides a greater net benefit to the University than does the football program.
The mere enumeration of the concrete benefits derived from the football program should convince any fair-minded person that not only do the positive gains from the program far outweigh the financial cost, but that the football program contributes substantial, distinct, and special values to the University Community that cannot be replaced by any other activity.

Obvious Inadequacy of the Majority Inquiry

As reported, only three faculty members were invited to the Committee hearings.

It was recommended by the Athletic Director and the two Minority Members that the Committee Chairman invite a more representative group of the University Community to the hearings. However, no member of a student organization, no one directly involved with student recruitment, no one involved in University alumni relations, nor any member of an alumni organization was invited to the hearings.

The Director of Athletics and the Minority Members also requested that the Committee hear representatives of local non-football schools, representatives of other urban universities having or not having football programs, and representatives of some of the prestige schools who do have football programs.

The Majority of the Committee paid no heed to these suggestions. Without this information how can the Majority Members conceivably contend that they have even examined the relevant sources of information, let alone developed a rational foundation for their drastic recommendation.

It is unfortunate that the Majority of the Committee felt that the urgency of filing a report was a more important consideration than the need for a thorough and deliberate assessment of the value of this significant program to the University's image and objectives.
The Minority Members of the University Senate's Committee on Athletics recommend:

1. That football be continued at The George Washington University as part of our present moderate intercollegiate athletic program.

2. That the Athletic Department reconsider every feasible means of increasing football attendance and of conferring with every segment of the University Community on ways in which the football program can be made of maximum usefulness to University activities and objectives.

Respectfully submitted,

Howard C. Pierpont, M.D.
Joseph H. Krupa
Robert K. Faris