

Reply to a query : **IS 'CATCH' TO BE CONSIDERED A SPORT ?**

As we know it, and as catch is usually practised when it receives its impetus from shrewd businessmen, we certainly answer in the negative. The exhibition match of catch is a sheer piece of bluff which brings discredit on real sport. The men who go in for catch follow a type of calling which entails strict training without a doubt, as well as tiresome rehearsing. The performances are usually very well organized, and we are ready to admit that a certain section of the public not only shows a keen interest, but actually becomes passionately fond of catch. In this respect, we agree with the views of Mr. Gaston Meyer of l'Equipe' when he says : "It is when we observe the form of procedure assumed by these catch performances, that we begin to disagree also over the ceremonious form of introduction, the presence of a referee (often as good a showmann as the catch performers themselves), then worst of all, the giving out of results all these tend to create a deplorable confusion. In all good faith, the spectators

may believe that catch is a *bona fide* sport, just as serious and dramatic as boxing. While it is perfectly obvious, that were these catch performances something else than a mere parody and imitation of a real fight, one of the catch players (if not both) would certainly have to be taken to hospital. At any rate, he would not be in a fit condition to go on with his engagements, nor could he resume his exhibitions matches in a different town every night. If the organizers are of opinion that the public could not take seriously a fight which is not sanctioned by results given out, if they maintain this sham sport, is it not precisely in view to keep up this equivocal attitude ? In this case, it is very obvious that real sport in the long run will suffer and become discredited. For, how could the average spectator see for himself the difference ?" This is what we think of catch.

The Editor.