

School Sports as Social Training: The Case of Athletics and the Crisis of World War I

*Timothy P. O'Hanlon**

I

Overview: The Preparedness Issue and The Social Role of High School Sports

Sports, Physical Education, and World War I

In 1915, Europe was engulfed in war. The question of the secondary school's role in preparing young men for the eventuality of America's entrance into the conflict became a controversial issue. Leading school and college administrators along with prominent physical educators argued strenuously that physical education programs (with a prominent place for sports) offered a means of fostering preparedness without encouraging militarism. Physical education and sports, they claimed, offered lessons in social discipline and cooperation no less valuable for citizens in an industrial society than for future soldiers.

Interestingly, their opponents who favored the introduction of military training into the high schools also evoked the goal of efficient citizenship. The conception of citizenship put forth by individuals on both sides of the military training debate was consistent in significant respects with that voiced by educators before preparedness became such a burning issue. The image of the productive citizen was consistent with the orientation of the reorganized public school. It was an image that endured, retaining essential features after the War, maintaining a strong association with schoolboy sports during the 1920s and 1930s.

The widespread use of athletic programs during the War sheds additional light on the social and psychological aims of athletics. When statements in behalf of school athletics are analyzed alongside those attesting the aims of sports in the military, the attributes associated with good citizenship bear an important resemblance to the qualities associated with becoming a good soldier.

*Mr. O'Hanlon, Ph.D., is a Visiting Lecturer in the Department of Educational Policy Studies at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, Illinois.

The controversy over preparedness and the actual employment of athletics in the war effort strengthened the drive for physical education programs in the schools. The prominence of sports during the crisis period also reinforced the move to make sports the centerpiece of the high school P.E. curriculum. Finally, the intercamp 'championship' competition and mass athletics supported by the military resembled the distinction between varsity sports and sports conducted through physical education and intramural programs, as those activities developed in the two decades after the War.

The years surrounding World War I mark an interesting chapter in the history of school sports. A careful study of this period also brings emerging values and trends associated with athletics into sharper focus. Such a study can serve not only to illuminate the role of organized sports, but also to clarify major social and educational concerns which preceded and extended beyond the war years.

The Social Role of High School Sports

Throughout the twentieth century, defenders of sports have maintained that organized athletics are beneficial because they prepare boys and young men for the hard knocks of life. Properly supervised competition, it is argued, develops courage, discipline, and other virile qualities. To some considerable extent, involvement in athletics, particularly the popular team games, has served as a rite of passage for millions of American males.

All sports, of course, even sandlot games, require cooperation as well as competition. Organized team sports such as football and basketball, however, expose youngsters to a highly rationalized form of competition. Candidates compete with each other as well as with members of other teams according to firmly established procedures. Success requires a considerable amount of cooperation, but in team sports that cooperation has traditionally assumed a distinctively corporate form. Cooperation involves not only teamwork but acceptance of one's assignment by the coach, even if that assignment is a lowly one. The coach justifies assignments on the basis of an individual's probable contribution to the team's performance. Cooperation for some team members includes acceptance of the idea that for the good of the organization, they might not get to play in the games.

Discussions about the social and educational values of school sports after 1900 reflected main currents in school reform. Educators and coaches, though often not motivated by the same concerns, both celebrated the cooperative values associated with team sports. Educators, in particular, including leading lights in physical education, cited athletics as an activity through which individuals would practice the kind of social cooperation applicable to a corporate industrial society. Many, while asserting the potential educational benefits of organized sports, were nonetheless critical of both the historical development

and the existing features of inter-school competition. The frequently harsh criticism, however, did not generate a sustained effort to eliminate varsity sports, but instead called for more careful regulation and greater emphasis on sports programming for the mass of students.

Interestingly, but perhaps understandably, discussions about athletics generally failed to address one of the most intriguing aspects of popular team sports. As varsity sports like football and basketball assumed their modern form under the tutelage of professional athletic coaches, they incorporated organizational procedures and practices which were similar to those which were taking hold in public schools.

The following paper will examine the debate over the place of sports in fostering military preparedness, the use of organized athletics during the War, and the emergence of high school sports programs after the War. The social role of sports, however, cannot be successfully analyzed apart from the larger context of public education. Therefore, before taking up the case of school athletics and World War I, the paper will trace the development of athletics as part of the history of twentieth century public schooling. This overview will encompass not only the years immediately preceding the war but also the two decades following the conflict. In it we will consider the uses of sports as envisioned by leading educators as well as points of divergence between the rhetoric of athletics and the reality.

Early in the twentieth century, reformers were restructuring public school systems in an attempt to make them more responsive to the perceived needs of an urban, industrial society. One major thrust of this effort was to establish schooling as an agency for channeling students into various labor market roles. The emergence of athletics as a highly regimented activity in a society where work was becoming increasingly routinized was no coincidence.

II

Public Schooling and High School Athletics, 1900-1940

School Reform and the Labor Market

At the turn of the century, leading educationists and their allies in business, civic, and professional organizations were engaged in the process of restructuring education to accommodate the increasingly diverse population flocking to the doors of the public high school. High school enrollments increased a dramatic 711% between 1890 and 1918. Despite these impressive figures, however, most children dropped out after grade school, and the majority of those who went to high school left before graduation. In 1918, the influential Commission on the Reorganization of Secondary Education reported that only one-third of all grade school students entered high school and only about one out of nine ever graduated.¹

Educators frequently blamed the high dropout rate on the schools' failure to meet the educational needs of their more heterogeneous clientele. Elite reformers agreed that the schools needed to assume a more extensive role in meeting the requirements of the industrial labor market, that is, in selecting and training students for different kinds of occupational roles. This vision of schooling was supported by the widespread acceptance of the modern corporation and the accompanying fragmentation of work roles into a steeply graded division of labor as necessary features of social and economic life.²

Claiming that student bodies had been "modified by the entrance of large numbers of pupils of widely varying capacities, aptitudes, social heredity and destinies in life,"³ educators moved to diversify the secondary school curriculum by adding alternative courses and programs of study. *The Cardinal Principles of Secondary Education* report issued by the Commission on the Reorganization of Secondary Education in 1918 expressed a firm commitment to a differentiated curriculum as a hallmark of the American comprehensive high school.⁴ In the words of that report,

The growing recognition that progress in our American democracy depends in no small measure upon adequate provision for specialization in many fields is the chief cause leading to the present reorganization of secondary education. Only through attention to the needs of various groups of individuals as shown by aptitudes, abilities and aspirations can the secondary school secure from each pupil his best efforts.⁵

The practice of offering some choice of coursework in high schools was not new. The Cardinal Principles document's endorsement of differentiation, however, reflected the increasingly vocational orientation of American schooling. During the early years of the twentieth century, sorting for the labor market usually took place before the high school years. Some urban school districts established industrial training or vocational programs in the upper elementary grades in order to reach youth before they went to work.⁶ As the average years of school attendance increased, differentiation centered on the high school. But with the persistence of high dropout rates, the schools not only shaped the aspirations of their charges, but continued to sort in a more passive sense by reflecting the economic constraints imposed on students and their families.⁷

By 1918, educational needs had become more closely identified with the capacity to perform various kinds of occupational roles. In the process, all schooling, both the academic courses and the less academic alternatives, had become more vocationalized in the sense of having become more strongly associated with labor market outcomes. Succeeding decades witnessed differentiation in a variety of forms. Some high schools offered alternative courses and patterns of courses. Others set up alternative curriculums or some form of tracking. There were offerings in vocational, commercial, industrial, domestic, and agricultural subjects as well as academic courses with a more practical focus for the less scholarly.

Programmatic expressions of differentiation varied, but the commitment to rationalizing access to positions in society through schooling remained well established. This commitment was buttressed by the continuing belief that schools had to accommodate widely divergent aptitudes which included, among other things, the idea that many students were not academically inclined. Academic subjects were assuming an added significance as screening devices which determined one's qualifications for higher white collar positions. Aided by the development of vocational guidance programs, reformers reorganized schools to accommodate the separation of planning from execution so characteristic of the twentieth century workplace. Academic programs came to signify training for "thinking" rather than "doing" jobs.⁸

The routinization of work roles placed constraints on human judgment, initiative, control, and skill. Lower level jobs subjected individuals to close supervision and relatively low status and pay. Educators acknowledged the unequal conditions and rewards of the workplace to some extent, but focused their attention on the divergent interests and aptitudes which they presumed to exist among the American population. Ellwood Cubberly of Stanford University, a powerful voice in school reform, urged that the schools needed to "give up the exceedingly democratic idea that all are equal, and that society is devoid of classes."⁹ Charles Prosser, an influential figure in the industrial training movement, observed that "we are swinging around to the idea that it is to be the mission of the schools in the future to select by testing and training—to adjust boys and girls for life by having them undergo varied experiences in order to uncover their varied traits and aptitudes and to direct and to train them in the avenues for which they display the most capacity."¹⁰

In practice, this meant channeling a portion of the student body into jobs which required little skill, save perhaps enormous toleration for boredom or frustration. The educational implication of uncovering "traits and capacities" was captured by the president of the school board in the famous *Middletown* study. Casting a retrospective glance at the role of the high school in his town from the vantage point of the 1920s, he noted that "for a long time all boys were trained to be president. Then for a while we trained them all to be professional men. Now we are training our boys to get jobs."¹¹

The language of intellectual and psychological differences made schooling seem less like a high stakes competition for a limited number of desirable jobs or an institutional means of rationalizing social and economic inequality, and more like a process of guiding students into work roles commensurate with their real talents. With the organization of production taken for granted, problems in the workplace were perceived as problems of testing, training, intelligence, and socialization. Although there was widespread recognition that many jobs were joyless and stultifying, it was up to the student to demonstrate his fitness for a dignified occupation.

Athletics and Socialization, A Blueprint for Citizenship

A second prominent feature of early twentieth century educational reform concerned the school's role in cultivating common values and allegiances among students from different social classes and ethnic backgrounds, students who would be funneled into different occupations. Extracurricular activities including school sports were touted as potentially powerful agencies for inculcating the kinds of attitudes and behaviors associated with effective citizenship.¹² According to leading educationists and physical educators, athletics could provide the kind of practical lessons in cooperation and social discipline required for participation in an industrial society. "The times," agreed Luther Halsey Gulick, a founder of the New York Public Schools' Athletic League, "demand men with high corporate morality and it cannot be learned from books or lectures." Gulick believed that athletics offered the schools a means of providing a genuine social education. Above all, sports "awakened" a wholesome sense of group consciousness that enveloped player and non-player alike. "There is," he concluded,

no other avenue open to us by means of which it is possible to develop the idea of corporate, of inter-institutional morality—that which represents the individuals but includes them as a whole—than inter-institutional athletics. No other agency can be so effective, for nothing else begins to have grip on the imagination and emotional life of our young men as do these athletics.¹³

Gulick's remarks, penned in 1911, captured some already popular themes concerning the benefits of properly supervised sports, themes which would be reiterated again and again over the next thirty years. Athletics could be an effective source of influence because sports were so popular. And athletics, particularly in the form of team sports, emphasized the kinds of values and forms of interaction compatible with participation in an industrial state.

Criticisms of laissez-faire principles were a characteristic feature of the rhetoric of school reform from early in the century to the second World War. In disparaging rugged individualism as an anachronistic vestige of the nineteenth century, however, educators were not really rejecting the value of competition, but seeking to rationalize it. Social cooperation was to be forged in the competitive atmosphere of the public school. The acceptance of common values meant, among other things, the acceptance of common notions of fairness, merit, and opportunity. The task of unifying the student body involved getting them to accept the procedures and criteria through which one was thought to earn, or fail to earn, a prestigious role in society. Cooperating in school became associated with a willingness to compete in approved terms and to accept the consequences.

Athletics emerges from the educational literature as a means of tempering individualistic qualities and superimposing on them the ethos of the team player. Addressing an annual convention of the National Education Association, Charles Whitten boasted that no other activity came close to athletics in

offering students the opportunity for the “actual practice” of the ideals learned in the classroom. Whitten, an educator and long-time Secretary of the Illinois State High School Athletic Association, maintained that “in addition to the personal qualities of alertness, determination, persistence and courage, the successful team must practice the virtues of self-control, teamwork and cooperation, the submergence of self in the interest of the group and unselfish devotion and loyalty to a social unit, virtues of which all society stands so much in need.”¹⁴ Educators’ concern with establishing a sense of community in a society beset with the centrifugal forces of class, ethnicity, and fragmented work roles helps to explain the consistent endorsement of the idea of mass athletic participation in the schools.

Interscholastic athletics, however, posed a particular set of problems for educators. Inter-school competition was well under way by the first decade of the twentieth century. As was the case with college sports such as football, high school teams frequently came into existence as the result of student initiative. The story of varsity athletics involved not only the proliferation of new programs under the guidance of faculty and administration, but also the attempt to wrest control from student administered teams. A 1907 study found that in more than one out of six cases surveyed (37 out of 192), school teams remained under student domination. The tide, however, was turning. The campaign for school control was successful, and by 1924, state high school athletic associations operated in all but three states.¹⁵

Although varsity sports prospered, they came under consistent attack for placing too much emphasis on winning. Charges of commercialism, bad sportsmanship, and bending the rules were as commonplace and predictable as the enduring popularity of games.¹⁶ Over the first four decades of the twentieth century, educators never stopped raising questions about the educational and social value of interscholastic athletics, but neither of the two main currents of athletic reform threatened their demise.¹⁷ The dominant view throughout the “20s and “30s, no doubt heavily supported by community sentiment, was that varsity sports could promote sound values if they were properly regulated. This position provided the rationale for the leagues and state associations which strove to regulate and standardize competition between schools. The maintenance of eligibility requirements and other rules governing athletic relations between schools constituted the heart of the campaign to reform the excesses of interschool contests.¹⁸

Interscholastic athletics not only drew fire for encouraging a “winning is everything” attitude but for failure to involve the average student. Efforts to promote mass participation made up the second major strand of reform. While schoolmen struggled in the early years of the century to gain control of athletics, physical educators were seeking to replace the older curriculum of formal exercises with one more oriented toward sports and games.¹⁹ Belief in the

social benefits of mass participation in sport for boys not only gained considerable currency among leading physical educators, but also garnered support from a more general movement for organized play and recreation.²⁰ Such “modern” programs of physical education, however, had apparently not been implemented on a very extensive scale in American high schools before the War. Spurred on by the preparedness crisis, the drive to establish sports-centered P.E. programs picked up steam after the conflict. By the 1930s, intramural athletics had won widespread recognition as an important means of cultivating mass participation and developing wholesome leisure habits. But, even though critics continued to tout the relative merits of intramural programs over varsity sports throughout the decade, the latter continued to dominate the high school sports scene.²¹

Ironically, the organization and conduct of varsity athletics came to resemble that of schooling much more closely than intramurals. Shaping the school into a more efficient instrument for allocating places in society, as noted earlier, constituted a major thrust of early twentieth century school reform. The introduction of differentiated curricula, vocational guidance, and the widespread employment of I.Q. testing after World War I reflected the effort to rationalize competition for work roles and establish schooling as a legitimate basis for determining one’s vocational aptitude.

The relationship between schooling and the labor market was a dynamic one effected by patterns of school enrollment which in turn were tied to social class, race, urban-rural, and regional variations. Using the school to gain access to jobs meant different things to different people. Despite impressive upward trends in years of formal education, many students still did not graduate from high school in the 1920s and “30s. Undoubtedly, teachers often encouraged promising working class students to pursue further academic training. For many, however, the prospects of finishing high school or preparing for college presented themselves as unrealistic expectations rather than foregone conclusions. Similarly, enrollments in vocationally oriented curriculums not only reflected assessments of academic potential but also projections of life chances made by counsellors, parents, and the students themselves. The programs and procedures instituted by educational reformers facilitated the long term development of schooling as the primary source of competition for jobs. Gaining higher level work roles, however, involved not only school performance, but the economic, social, and psychological resources to persist in the right kind of school program.²²

Access to the labor market through schooling was not the same as competing for positions on the football team. The influences of social class were different and more pervasive in schooling than in sports. Varsity athletics, of course, were not immune from racial discrimination. Leading educators openly opposed interschool programs for women. On the other hand, for those boys

who got a chance to try out, interscholastic athletics may have been conducted on a more clearly meritocratic basis with respect to social class differences than schooling was. Despite these and other possible differences, however, the parallels between schooling and sports are worth exploring.

Schooling, whatever the shortcomings of its meritocratic pretensions, was becoming associated with occupational success, both in perception and in fact. It was increasingly recognized as the place where youngsters proved their fitness or lack thereof for better kinds of job. By the 1920s the institutional mechanisms for guiding students into different levels of the labor market were well established. Cries of overemphasis in varsity football and basketball during the “20s and “30s obscured the interesting ways in which these team sports had adapted organizational procedures similar to those employed in schooling. Candidates for the team competed with one another for a limited number of starting and starring roles. In sports as in schools, individuals were subject to continuous evaluation and ranking in accordance with standards developed and administered by professional experts. By placing youngsters in similar situations and exposing them to similar institutional demands, interscholastic athletics supported a major ideological component of schooling. The structured competition of schooling helped to legitimize social stratification and a stratified workplace. Varsity athletics contributed by reinforcing the idea that unequal rewards were the fair result of unequal ability determined through standardized competition. Just as schooling reinforced the premise that relatively unsuccessful students did not deserve the better jobs, sports practiced the idea that less able athletes did not deserve to play. Playing time was a matter of coaching strategy, not an inherent right of team membership. Athletes were continually called upon to demonstrate their abilities and usefulness to the team in order to maintain their positions.²³

The coach’s teaching role was constrained by the overriding goal of organizational proficiency. His problem of developing team spirit in athletics resembled the problem of cultivating cooperative citizenship in schools. In team sports, jealousy and resignation loomed as twin stumbling blocks to team efficiency. If players accepted the idea that they had to demonstrate their abilities to the satisfaction of the coach, then he stood a good chance of enlisting their wholehearted cooperation in carrying out their assignments for the good of the team.

School personnel confronted the task of fostering common values and a spirit of cooperation among students heading for unequal work roles. Coaches encountered the task of forging a spirit of teamwork among competitors who held positions of unequal rank and prestige. In both settings, successful management depended on maintaining the legitimacy of the reward system. For those who worked hard, there was the promise of promotion. But hard work, after all, often was not a sufficient condition for advancement. Some would not rise, no matter how hard they tried.

Through civics classes, guidance counselling, and a variety of curricular and extracurricular activities, schools attempted to instill the idea that the well being of the nation and individual enterprises depended upon each person performing his allotted task to the best of his abilities. For unsuccessful students or those otherwise unable to acquire the right kind or amount of schooling, the blueprint for cooperative citizenship often included training for a subordinate role in the labor market. Coaches sought to reconcile their charges to the unequal consequences of competition by emphasizing that the team's success depended on the effort of each member. Each athlete was exhorted to contribute his talents to the fullest and to play his designated role with enthusiasm, no matter how humble it turned out to be.²⁴ "The key to team spirit," wrote Coleman R. Griffith, author of *The Psychology of Coaching*, "lies in making every man feel that his contribution to team-play is an important contribution and a matter of personal satisfaction to the coach." According to Griffith, the coach was "responsible for helping his men to see that real greatness lies in placing a generous value upon *any* contribution made by any man."²⁵

Varsity team sports were organized and conducted in ways that reinforced patterns of socialization in schools. The popularity of such sports also indicated that the influence of interscholastic athletics in molding conceptions of fairness and cooperation, however effective, extended to the majority of non-participants.

One more point is worth noting here. The attempt to cultivate allegiance and cooperation in contentious situations was not confined to schools and to the athletic field. Corporate managers also struggled with this problem as a crucial issue of control. Welfare schemes, employee-representation plans, pension plans, work incentive programs, and promotions policies all involved the attempt to enlist loyalty and unity in a hierarchical situation. Managing students, athletes, and employees shared some common ground.²⁶

III

School Athletics and the Crisis of the First World War

The Preparedness Controversy

As the clouds of war loomed menacingly on the horizon, most educators agreed that schools should contribute to keeping America mentally and physically prepared for whatever challenges lay ahead, but they disagreed, sometimes rather heatedly, over the means. Critics of military training for schoolboys focused on forms of military drill which were thought to be characteristic of high school programs. Educators frequently offered physical education as an alternative to military drill. They argued that a sound program of physical education (which would in most cases include a prominent role for sports) offered a means of preparedness training in that it developed soldierly attributes without encouraging a lockstep military mentality. On the contrary, ac-

ording to many supporters, athletics helped to cultivate the physical and, most particularly, the psychological traits essential for both war and peace.

Military training programs were in existence in some American high schools at the outset of the War in Europe. High schools in Boston had apparently required drill since Reconstruction.²⁷ The New York Public Schools Athletic League offered competition in rifle marksmanship for high school boys as part of its massive sports and recreation program.²⁸ Military training, however, was not a systemic component of American secondary education. One source counted only 113 high schools “giving military drill of any kind” in 1915 and reaching an estimated total of 14,500 boys.²⁹

In 1916, the New York state legislature in an otherwise undistinguished session passed two companion laws designed to implement preparedness.³⁰ The Welsh Bill prescribed mandatory physical training for all students above the age of eight, beginning with the 1916 school year. The law specified 20 minutes a day as minimum and included private as well as public schools.

The Slater Bill was more controversial. It set up a Military Training Commission whose purpose was to establish and oversee military training for young men between the ages of 16 and 19. In accordance with the provisions of the bill, the Commission could legally compel military training for a maximum of three hours per week in addition to the regular physical education provided by the Welsh Bill. Only those boys who were regularly engaged in working for a living were exempt. The law also permitted the Commission to create summer military camps which would last from four to six weeks. The legislature appropriated only \$10,000, however, which forced the Commission to establish priorities among various eligible groups. According to one magazine account, secondary schoolboys were at the top of the list.³¹

The laws generated a great deal of discussion, most of it critical. Besides objections registered against the principle of compulsion, critics charged that the training was inadequate. The *School Review* joined this second group of naysayers in attacking the New York scheme, even though elsewhere the journal had published a series of editorials favorable to the idea of military training in the schools. Casting a retrospective glance at the program in April 1918, the *Review* observed that attendance in many high school drills had dwindled from a beginning figure of three or four hundred to 30 or 40.³² In the next issue, the journal produced additional figures to substantiate its indictment:

Acting Superintendent Straubenmiller, of the New York City Schools, reports that military training is being sadly neglected. Only four high schools have an average attendance of 50 percent of the boys enrolled for the training. Attendance in various schools ranged from 2 to 89 percent. One report shows that of 10,898 boys enrolled for drill, 4,489 were present, 3,575 absent.³³

The journal pointed to boredom as a prime cause of the depressing statistics,

noting that the training consisted almost entirely of close order drill. Furthermore, it noted, the boys received no academic credit for their after-school efforts.

The “Wyoming Plan” constituted another controversial yet apparently more popular alternative to the New York experiment. The Wyoming idea was conceived by Lieutenant Edgar Z. Steever, while serving a tour of duty as Inspector-Instructor of the state National Guard. Steever’s plan called for the division of student cadets into units which remained the same throughout the school year. The units engaged one another in a series of competitions beginning with wall scaling and calisthenics during the fall. The second semester featured competitions in drill, troop leadership, and field firing. Beginning in May, there was an increased emphasis on interschool contests. The program attempted to recreate the flavor of military life by ending the year with 14 days of summer camp.³⁴

The Wyoming plan soon spread beyond the confines of its rather isolated birthplace. Late in 1916, *Everybody’s* magazine began a concerted campaign to promote Steever’s brainchild. The publication set itself up as the official headquarters of the High School Volunteers of the United States, a confederation of cadet organizations which had adopted the Wyoming Plan.³⁵ The Wyoming scheme received approval from the U.S. Army War College and some support in Congress. Secretary of War Newton Baker also came out in support. As a result, schools which put together cadet brigades of 100 or more were entitled to an instructor and equipment provided by the Federal Government.³⁶

The majority position in the educational press seemed to favor physical education over military drill or the Wyoming Program as a desirable means of building preparedness. Many attacked military drill as a useless and obsolete form of preparedness. In 1915, the Massachusetts Commission on Military Education issued a report which opposed military training for boys between the ages of 14 and 21. The Massachusetts study was widely cited by critical schoolmen.

The overwhelming weight of opinion from school teachers, military experts, officers of both the regular army and the military and the general public is against military drill It is generally agreed that the military drill which a boy receives in school is of little or no advantage to him from the point of view of practical soldiering. As far as available evidence goes, drill in the schools has had no beneficial effect in promoting enlistments in the military except in a few isolated localities.

In fact, stated the report, drill had the opposite effect. It created an aversion to military life.³⁷

Other critics, speaking individually and in association with peace groups, raised the ominous spectre of militarism. To the venerable Charles W. Eliot of

Harvard, military training in the schools smacked of despotism. "I have heard a great deal of talk lately about the importance of a boy's acquiring the habit of implicit obedience," he noted; "that is the worst habit a boy can acquire after he ceases to be an infant, because it implies the subjection of the boy's own will."³⁸

David Starr Jordan, Chancellor of Stanford University, maintained that mandatory drill in the schools constituted an entering wedge for compulsory training under state control. He argued that in order for training programs to be effective, they would have to include the majority of boys who either dropped out or failed to attend high school. At that point the state would take authority out of the hands of the school boards because military drill would no longer be an educational activity in a strict sense.

Jordan cited Australia as a living example of his fears. He pointed out that some 22,143 had been prosecuted in less than three years under Australia's compulsory service laws. "In general," he concluded, "no nation with compulsory military service can long retain its sanity or its freedom. The first purpose of compulsory service is to make subservient industrial as well as military units of the young men of the country." In adopting a policy of militarization, a nation flirted with totalitarianism. "The docile army is the right arm of privilege," argued Jordan, "and the reliance of the industrial exploiter. Military drill accustoms men to blind obedience. They are taught to regard frightfulness in terms of exalted patriotism."³⁹

Friends of the Wyoming idea attempted to counter the charges that military training killed initiative and fostered lock step obedience. Steever defended his program as an alternative to old style military drill. He contended that the Wyoming Plan was modelled on nothing more sinister than competitive sports. "Our military instruction has been adopted to the game notion," declared Steever in the 1917 symposium in the *School Review*. "We have taken the old lock-step, routine work out of military instruction and we have adapted it to the game." By pitting high school cadet units against one another, he claimed, "we get all the dash and all the efficiency of the football team in our national-defense games."⁴⁰

Regarding the question of individual initiative, Steever attempted to turn the tables by taking a critical glance at the authority structure of varsity sports. In a statement cited by journalist George Creel, Steever invited the reader to observe typical baseball and football teams. He expressed confidence that the observer would soon be disabused of the notion that varsity athletics developed initiative. "You rake the school or college for the strongest and most skillful and put these chosen few in the hands of specialists who demand the blindest sort of obedience."⁴¹ The Wyoming idea not only placed more of a premium on initiative, according to Steever, but provided a chance for all boys to participate.

From the outset, the Wyoming approach was sold as a means of fostering preparedness by inculcating the qualities of effective citizenship. The laudatory piece by George Creel, which was read into the *Congressional Record* in February 1916, emphasized Steever's statement that the Wyoming Plan would create citizens instead of soldiers. "Your boys," Steever reportedly told parents at the outset of his efforts in Wyoming, "will be taught the advantages of a strong body and a clean mind, the value of self-control and decent restraints, civic duties and responsibilities." The goals then were in line with the social orientation of the public school. His program aimed at "full development of the fraternal instinct, the community-of-interest spirit, so that every youngster will grow up in the understanding that no group, whether it be a cadet company, city, state, or nation, is stronger than its weakest member."⁴²

The United States Army War College, in a published description of the Wyoming Plan, accepted the claims made in its behalf and recommended its adoption by local school boards as a citizenship training program.⁴³ Statements in *The Outlook and Everybody's* also advanced this view and presented the Wyoming idea as a means of avoiding militarism.⁴⁴ The slogan of the High School Volunteers even during the war years was "For Better Citizenship."

Concern with personal fitness, national unity, and individual and social discipline may have intensified as the war drew closer. Similarities in the rhetoric of educators across the first seventeen years of the century may underestimate the sense of crisis after 1915 and its possible effects on ideas of citizenship. Conceptions of democratic citizenship may well have differed in important respects, not only among those who supported physical education but also between the proponents and opponents of military training schemes. Similarities in the rhetoric of preparedness and citizenship may have masked significant social and political disagreements regarding such vital questions as civil liberties.

Nevertheless, with the proponents of military training stressing the role of those programs in developing good citizenship, the controversy took an interesting turn. The emphasis on social discipline and cooperation advanced by apologists for the Wyoming idea and opponents of military training was not new. This suggests that both sides were invoking conceptions of citizenship which were rooted in the response to social and economic changes in American life at the turn of the century. Disagreements over the adequacy of different training programs for high school boys were on one hand a response to a burning issue of the day, the possibility of war. In a larger sense, however, the preparedness issue also reflected well established aims of schooling and citizenship training.

Both critics and defenders of the Wyoming Plan named a competitive games

approach as an alternative to military drill. Steever and others for their part presented the Wyoming idea as a kind of intramural program combined with Boy Scouts, where group games were modified to meet the general needs of national strength and vigilance. Those who opposed both military drill and the Wyoming Plan threw their support behind systematic physical education, which called for the liberal employment of athletics. Schoolmen may have feared militarism but they had few scruples about using organized play as a means of social conditioning. They continued to express the hope that sports programs could help the schools shape a more disciplined and cooperative social order. Individuals would continue to contest one another for individual rewards, but they would compete according to well defined rules and be willing to abide by the consequences.

In 1917, the National Education Association's Committee on Military Training in the Public Schools issued a report recommending that schools institute compulsory physical education as part of a comprehensive drive for national unity and security.' The Committee stood foursquare against the introduction of "any form of instruction which is distinctly or specifically military into the elementary or secondary schools."⁴⁵ The document, sprinkled liberally with the statements of authorities, argued that early military drill was at best ineffective and at worst deleterious to health, peace, and freedom of thought. One such negative comment was provided by Captain H. J. Koehler of West Point.

The use of the musket as a means of physical development for anyone, be he man or boy, is more than worthless. It is, in my opinion, positively injurious. I deny absolutely that military drill contains one worthy feature which cannot be duplicated in every well regulated gymnasium in the country today. A thoro physical training develops all the necessary soldierly qualities to the greatest degree and it does it without injury. If we have athletics, we shall never be without soldiers.⁴⁶

Though fearful of injecting a spirit of militarism into the public schools, the authors recommended marching as one of several activities within a physical training regimen including sports, gymnastics, and calisthenics. The report also made a point of urging school systems to "develop and intensify" their efforts to instill loyalty and patriotism, particularly among immigrant children. Committee members, like many educators who adamantly opposed military training in high schools, held no such reservations for older men. Accordingly, the report advocated universal compulsory training for young men beyond the age of 19.⁴⁷

Those critical of military training often pressed a line of argument similar to that of proponents of the Wyoming Plan. They contended that physical education built the kind of toughness and discipline that made good soldiers, but without encouraging either the belligerent or the servile attitudes identified with militarism. Thus, went the reasoning, physical education prepared youngsters for peace every bit as much as for the eventuality of war.

The opposition to military training on democratic grounds did not prevent

many educators from equating the requirements for citizenship in modern America with the qualities that went into making a good soldier. Descriptions of these qualities remained virtually the same as those ascribed to athletics and physical education some years earlier. Charles Eliot, for example, preferred physical education because it “would give the boy the best preparation he could receive at that time of his life for a soldier’s future and it would also give the boys the best preparation the schools can give for service in the industrial army.” In a quote appearing in the *School Review*’s symposium on military training, Eliot came out in favor of voluntary enlistment. He attacked both conscription and the discipline of the professional soldier as infringements of personal liberties. “What we want in the form of discipline in the army,” he argued, “is just what we want in industries; it is the cooperative work; it is the sense of comradeship, fellowship, which in sports we call ‘team-play’.”⁴⁸

What Eliot missed was that schools, industries, and varsity sports teams, like the Army, attempted to elicit cooperation from individuals slotted into roles of unequal prestige and reward. Educators’ concern with “team play” whether involving capital and labor or members of an intramural team did not reflect a commitment to egalitarian goals. On the contrary, “team spirit” referred to the problem of developing a sense of unity among members of a hierarchical society, a society which leading educators took for granted as the necessary outgrowth of “industrialization.”

The attributes necessary for an industrial society and for military preparedness often turned out to be remarkably similar. New Jersey school superintendent D. C. Bliss launched a blistering attack on military training programs in the pages of the *School Review*. But, on the other hand, he argued that any school which did not take as its “fundamental aim” the development of those attributes “which shall be possessed by every upright, useful citizen” was derelict in its responsibility. “The moral virtues of obedience, patriotism and self-sacrifice,” he asserted, “are no more desirable for the soldier than for anyone else.”⁴⁹

Many individuals who desired to substitute physical education for military training in the schools subscribed to the views of Harvard’s Dudley A. Sargent. Sargent, already a leading light in physical education, took an active role in opposing military training in the Massachusetts schools. His testimony before the Special State Board of Military Preparedness was frequently cited and used to buttress the cases of such groups as the School Peace League and the Women’s Peace Party of New York. In 1916, the American Physical Education Association gave Sargent’s views its official stamp of approval at its annual convention.⁵⁰

Sargent claimed that “the same qualities that are of most value for war are of

most value for peace” and that military drill was inadequate on both counts. Military drill did not offer the “opportunity for struggle” afforded by the playground or athletic field. It was in the rigor of competitive games, not in the “tin soldierism” of the drill field, where boys developed courage and a spirit of competition and self-sacrifice.⁵¹ The problem, as always, was that the schools offered the vital lessons of athletics only to an elite. “What America needs,” concluded Sargent, “is some way of providing more athletic students and fewer student athletes, some way of providing more soldierly schoolboys, instead of schoolboy soldiers.”⁵²

Jesse Feiring Williams of Columbia, who would emerge as a leading spokesman for the role of athletics in physical education during the 1920s and ‘30s spoke out against military drill at the same 1916 gathering which endorsed Sargent’s views. In an address entitled, “Proposals for Preparedness in Physical Education,” Williams proclaimed the superior capacity of athletics to arouse an emotional commitment to the group. In fostering preparedness without militarism, said Williams, athletics played a vital role in the creation of socially responsible citizens which was “the growing task of physical education” and indeed of schooling in general.⁵³

The arguments of Williams and others bore an interesting relationship to broader educational concerns. The idea that authoritarian forms of control were undemocratic and ineffectual was becoming a common theme in discussions of school discipline and citizenship training before 1910. The nominal rejection of more overt methods of control and socialization, however, did not mean that educators were abandoning the predetermined goals of citizenship training. Old fashioned methods may have seemed unduly restrictive to individual freedom, but shaping attitudes and behavior through group activities such as sports evoked little moral outrage in the councils of education.

A parallel situation seemed to exist in the preparedness debates. Military forms of training and discipline were condemned but little heed was paid to the possibility that athletics also might constitute a coercive, albeit more appealing method of training. Athletics, like other student activities, relied on peer group pressure, emotional involvement, and conditioning more than rational reflection, to achieve its residual social objectives such as loyalty and cooperation.

Athletics for the Armed Forces

The military made extensive use of sports during World War I. Sports were used to distract the troops from less wholesome forms of amusement.⁵⁴ In addition to serving as a weapon in the war against vice, athletic games also became a part of the military training program itself. A competitive games concept was employed on several levels. Taking a page from the Wyoming Plan, the military incorporated a group games approach to training exercises.

Squads of trainees competed against one another in relays, equipment races, and trench exercises. Team competition, according to the athletic officer at Camp Pike, encourage the kind of competitive *esprit de corps* which was essential to any efficient fighting unit.⁵⁵ Joseph Raycroft, a professor of physical education at Princeton and the Director of the Army athletic programs in the training camps, counted “group games” a part of the educational phase of training. In games, a young recruit learned to react quickly under competitive pressure, to adapt to changing circumstances, and to keep his emotions in check.⁵⁶

The military also encouraged widespread participation in a variety of sports. The Army and Navy both set up extensive boxing programs. Movements in boxing were thought to parallel those in bayonet fighting.⁵⁷ As was the case in schools, athletics were not merely considered a source of physical training, but an important agency for developing dispositions and attitudes.

Sports like boxing and football allegedly built confidence and aggressiveness. They taught young recruits, as one observer put it, “to get bumped and not to mind it.”⁵⁸ Preparing for war was a grimmer business than going to school and one should be wary of carrying the similarities between citizens, soldiers, and athletes too far. With that caution duly registered, however, it is important to note the resemblance between the role of athletics articulated by men involved in administering activities for the military and the “educational aims” of school sports. In both cases teamwork involved the efficient coordination of men in specialized ranks and roles carrying out orders from the top.

In addition to incorporating games-oriented training exercises and mass athletics as integral parts of basic training, the armed forces also encouraged inter-camp competition. The latter was the equivalent of school varsity competition as individual encampments sought to put their best teams on the field. As a means of boosting morale after the War, the American Expeditionary Forces staged a far-ranging series of elimination tournaments in several sports. The tournament winners participated in the Inter-Allied Games, a kind of Olympics held in Paris during July, 1919. John Griffith, an athletic officer during World War I and later Commissioner of the Big Ten Athletic Conference, argued that championship play complemented the goals of mass participation by encouraging interest in sports.⁵⁹ Prominent men such as James McCurdy, Physical Director for the A.E.F., and Raycroft shared Griffith’s views concerning the complementary relationship between mass athletics and championship competition. Raycroft and Griffith both held prominent positions in the National Collegiate Athletic Association after the War. In 1921, Griffith became the first editor of the *Athletic Journal* and for over two decades ardently proclaimed the educational and social value of interschool sports.⁶⁰

The preparedness issue did not go away immediately after the conflict. Com-

mentators expressed horror over the large numbers of American youth who had been rejected by the armed forces as physically unfit. There were still those who advocated military training as a solution to the problem. *Everybody's*, as of 1919, was still engaged in an effort to promote the High School Volunteers.

Educators continued their support for physical education as an alternative to military training. A National Committee on Physical Education drafted a model bill and agitated for its passage among the various states. The Committee also lobbied within both major political parties prior to the general election of 1920. Their efforts paid off as both the Republicans and the Democrats adopted physical education planks in their respective platforms.⁶¹

States moved rapidly to adopt physical education laws after 1919. Prior to 1915, only Idaho, Ohio, and North Dakota had physical education laws on the books. In the next three years, eight more states passed physical training laws of one sort or another. Between 1919 and 1925, however, the movement for physical education gained momentum as 22 states passed enabling legislation. Before the end of the decade, 36 states had passed laws pertaining to P.E. in the schools. Apparently not all of these statutes made instruction compulsory, however. A 1927-28 nationwide survey, for example, revealed that only 254 out of 464 high schools required physical education.⁶²

The growth of physical education programs ushered in an increased emphasis on athletics. Historian Guy Lewis was substantially correct when he argued that the 1920s witnessed the triumph of the movement to make sports the focal point of P.E., a movement which began shortly after the turn of the century.⁶³ By the early 1930s, there was substantial support for intramural athletics, fueled by indignation over varsity contests and concern with the cultivation of leisure interests. Intramurals, however, were an addition to, not a replacement for, interscholastic athletics.

The use of sports by the military boosted the drive for mass participation programs after the War, but their influence on the subsequent relationship among varsity athletics, physical education, and intramurals is harder to assess. The relative prestige and the predominance of interscholastic sports were bound up with patterns of popular culture which are too complicated to explore here. Nevertheless, it is worth noting that the establishment of inter-camp competition supported the notion that the more elite forms of participation were compatible with mass play. Through some combination of conviction and expedience, this was the viewpoint which won the day in American public high schools.

The debate over military preparedness, the use of sports during the War, and the successful effort to integrate sports into the physical education curriculum

all had the effect to solidifying and reinforcing the association between athletics and the conception of effective citizenship which was emerging during the early years of the twentieth century. Concern with efficiency, organization, order, and unity marked the efforts to transform the public school during the Progressive Era. By the end of the War, educators had succeeded in reconstituting the school as a more effective instrument for meeting the needs of the industrial labor market. In the process, they set out to cultivate, to impose if necessary, the virtues of the team player on a student populace headed for unequal work roles. Athletics promised not only to cultivate competition, but more importantly to discipline it. As was the case in the military, educators sought in mass athletics an agency for counterbalancing the divisive effects of ranking, sorting, and testing. Varsity team sports, whether educators fully realized it or not, were organized to socialize by replicating the rationalized competition and institutional forms of cooperation found in schooling.

The critical period surrounding the War served to invest the task of building social discipline and cooperation with a greater sense of urgency, but the goals themselves were not new. The frequent claims that athletics prepared men for peace or war reveal as much about the consistent commitment of the schools to the goal of social efficiency as they do about the concern with national security brought on by the war in Europe and its aftermath. Educators, while eschewing militarism, proclaimed sports as the medium for the soldierly qualities of loyalty, self-sacrifice, and group spirit. The point then is not that the crisis of the War years militarized the concept of citizenship, but that the whole military training issue served to illuminate the strong emphasis upon organization, regimentation, and social discipline which was already present and would linger long after the War.

Notes

1. The figures on increased enrollments are taken from David Tyack, *The One Best System* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1974), 183; see also Edward Krug, *The Shaping of the American High School*, Vol. 1 (New York: Harper and Row, 1964), 169-175. The figures on the attrition rate are taken from "Cardinal Principles of Secondary Education," *U.S. Bureau of Education Bulletin*, No. 35 (1918), 8.

2. On the role of the school and the labor market, see Paul Violas, *The Training of the Urban Working Class* (Chicago: Rand McNally, 1978), Chs. 1, 6, and 7; David Nasaw, *Schooled to Order, A Social History of Public Schooling in the United States* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1979); W. Norton Grubb and Marvin Lazerson, "Rally 'Round the Workplace: Continuities and Fallacies in Career Education," *Harvard Educational Review* (November 1975); Robert S. Lynd and Helen Merrell Lynd, *Middletown* (New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, Inc., 1929/1956), Sections I and III.

The statements of leading educators in journals and in addresses before such organizations as the National Education Association reflect an acceptance of large scale corporate forms of production and the division of labor which they were producing. For examples of this attitude, see Violas, Chs. 1, 6, and 7; Nasaw, Chs. 8-10; Grubb and Lazerson; and "Cardinal Principles."

With the possible exception of the "Cardinal Principles of Secondary Education," the above sources discuss the fragmentation and routinization of work roles throughout the twentieth century. For additional sources, see Harry Braverman, *Labor and Monopoly Capital* (New York: Monthly Review Press, 1974); C. Wright Mills, *White Collar* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1956); James O'Toole, *Work, Learning and the American Future* (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1977). For an analysis of the relationship between automation and skill levels, see James R. Bright, *Automation and Management* (Boston: Harvard University Graduate School of Business, 1958), Ch. 12.

3. "Cardinal Principles of Secondary Education," 8.

4 See Joel Spring, "Education and the Rise of the Corporate State," *Socialist Revolution* 2 (March-April 1972), and Krug, Vol. 1, Ch. 15. I am grateful to Spring for first bringing the complementary relationship between the schools' sorting and unification functions to my attention in his analysis of the Cardinal Principles report. I have used his conceptual framework extensively in my work.

5. "Cardinal Principles," 21.

6. See Violas, 154-60.

7 See Edward Krug, *The Shaping of the American High School*, Vol. 2 (Madison: The University of Wisconsin Press, 1972), Chs. 2-5; and Lynd and Lynd, Ch. 3.

8. See "Cardinal Principles"; "Issues of Secondary Education, Report of the Committee on the Orientation of Secondary Education," *National Education Association, Department of Secondary Schools Bulletin* 20, 59 (1936), 180-81; Violas, Chs. 6, 7, and 8; Grubb and Lazerson; Lynd and Lynd, Ch. 3; Krug, Vol. 2, Chs. 1-5 and 10. For further accounts of the growing emphasis on differentiating the curriculum to meet the educational needs of those who were thought to lack the aptitude for the more challenging academic work, see Tyack, 177-216. In that section, Tyack discusses the development of I.Q. tests as a sorting mechanism. For another provocative account of intelligence testing and its assumptions, see Clarence J. Karier, "Testing for Order and Control in the Corporate Liberal State," in *Roots of Crisis* (Chicago: Rand McNally, 1973).

9. Elwood P. Cubberly, cited in Violas, 137; also cited in Nasaw, 130, and Tyack, 188.

10. Charles A. Prosser, cited in Violas, 210.

11. Cited in Lynd and Lynd, 194.

12. For a few examples of the conception of citizenship embodied in arguments for school athletics, see Luther Halsey Gulick, "Team Games and Civic Loyalty," *School Review* 14 (November 1906), 676-78; Theodore Roosevelt, "Value of an Athletic Training," *Harper's Weekly* (23 December 1893), 1236; F. D. Boynton, "Athletics and Collateral Activities in Secondary Schools," *National Education Association Proceedings* 43 (1904), 206-14; Lee F. Hamner, "School Games and Athletics," *The Child* 1 (October 1910), 43-5 1; George W. Wingate, *New York Public Schools Athletic League Official Handbook*, 1911-12 (New York: The American Sports Publishing Company, 1912), 35.

For a more thorough documentation of the educational and social aims of school athletics, see Timothy P. O'Hanlon, *Interscholastic Athletics, 1900-1940: Shaping Citizens for Unequal Roles in the Modern Industrial State*, unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Illinois, Urbana, 1979 (hereinafter cited as *Interscholastic Athletics*, Diss.). See also Timothy P. O'Hanlon, "Interscholastic Athletics, 1900-1940: Shaping Citizens for Unequal Roles in the Modern Industrial State," *Educational Theory* 30 (Spring 1980), 89-103 (hereinafter cited as "Interscholastic Athletics," *Educational Theory*).

13. Luther Halsey Gulick, "The New Athletics," *The Outlook* 98 (July 15, 1911), 599-600; see also his "Athletics and Citizenship," *The Child* 1 (April 1911), 595-596. Gulick was co-founder of the Camp Fire Girls and a moving force in the playground movement. During the 1890s, he served as president of the American Physical Education Association and also edited its professional journal, *The American Physical Education Review*. His name is frequently mentioned with James Naismith's regarding the invention of basketball, and he has been given credit for designing the inverted triangle which stands as the official emblem of the YMCA.

14. Charles Whitten, "The Place of Interscholastic Athletics in the High School Program," *National Education Association Addresses and Proceedings* 63 (1925), 627, cited in *Interscholastic Athletics*, ed. Julia E. Johnson (New York: The H. W. Wilson Company, 1929), 51. The *National Education Association Addresses and Proceedings* will hereinafter be cited as *NEA Proceedings*.

15. Guy S. Lowman, "The Regulation and Control of Sports in Secondary Schools of the United States," *American Physical Education Review* 12 (September 1907), 245. See also J. H. McCurdy, "A Study of Characteristics of Physical Training in the Public High Schools of the United States," *American Physical Education Review* 10 (September 1905), 202-13. For a good source on the development of state high school athletic associations, see Lewis Hoch Wagenhorst, *The Administration and Cost of High School Interscholastic Athletics*, Teachers College Contributions to Education, No. 205 (New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1926). For the reference to the number of state high school athletic associations in 1924, see pp. 9 and 15.

16. See, for example, Harry Keeler, "The Financial Responsibility of High School Managers of Athletics," *School Review* 11 (May 1903), 316-20; C. S. Hicks, "The Influence of Faculty Supervision on the Moral Effects of Athletics in High Schools and Colleges," *NEA Proceedings* 50 (1912), 1146-1150; E. V. Robinson, "Discussion," *School Review* 11 (May 1903), 346-47.

See also Whitten; Carroll Atkinson, "Athletic Success (The High Price of Overemphasis)," *Clearinghouse* 13 (February 1939), 360-62; Eldon W. Mason, "Administrative Problems in Interscholastic Athletics," *Minnesota Journal of Education* 19 (May 1939), 396-97; Howard J. Savage, *American College Athletics*, The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, Bulletin No. 23 (New York: The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1929); Frederick Rand Rogers, *The Future of Interscholastic Athletics* (New York: Bureau of Publications, Columbia University, 1929); William Ralph La Porte, "Is Our Athletic Philoso-

phy Sound'?" *Journal of Health and Physical Education* 10 (December 1939), 580-81 and 604-605; J. B. Buehler, "Why Interscholastic Athletics?" *Sierra Educational News* 28 (December 1932), 34-35 and 52.

17. Surveys and statements by school administrators indicate that interscholastic athletics held its position of prominence throughout the 1920s and '30s. See "State Championship Basketball," *Athletic Journal* 12 (May 1932), 18-22, 30-49; "State Championship Basketball," *Athletic Journal* 13 (May 1933), 8-39; "Problems in Interscholastic Athletics," *Mind and Body* 32 (May 1925), 535-41; "The Status of Athletics in New Jersey," *New Jersey Education Bulletin* 13(10) (Trenton, NJ: Department of Public Instruction, June 1927), 407-422; John M. Booth, "An Investigation into Interscholastic Athletics in Northwestern High Schools," *School Review* 36 (November 1928), 696-706; "Interscholastic Athletic Standards for Boys—A Committee Report," *Journal of Health and Physical Education* 10 (September 1939), 371-74 and 423; "The 1939 Basketball Championships," *Athletic Journal* 19 (June 1939), 8-32; P. Roy Brammell, *Intramural and Interscholastic Athletics*, National Survey of Secondary Education, Monograph No. 27, United States Office of Education Bulletin No. 17, 1932 (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1933); B. J. Rivett, "The Relation of Athletics to the High School Program," *North Central Association Quarterly* 14 (January 1940), 275-279; E. E. Morley, "Report of the Committee on Athletics in Secondary Schools," *North Central Association Quarterly* 8 (April 1934), 454-464; Morley, "Report of the North Central Committee on Athletics in Secondary Schools," *North Central Association Quarterly* 5 (December 1930), 332-39; Morley, "The Work of the Committee on Interscholastic Athletics, North Central Association," *Junior-Senior High School Clearinghouse* 5 (November 1930), 132-34; E. E. Morley et al., "Athletics in Secondary Schools," *North Central Association Quarterly* 7 (December 1932), 287-290; O'Hanlon, *Interscholastic Athletics*, Diss., Ch. IV.

18. The above references not only indicate the continuing popularity of varsity sports, but also show the emphasis on supervision, regulation, and standardization. They serve to illustrate that rationalizing and controlling competition constituted the pressing effort in interschool athletic reform.

For sources indicating the acceptance of varsity sports by high schools, see Buehler, 34-35; Lourence O. Janssen, "Interscholastic Athletics in California," *California Journal of Secondary Education* 15 (February 1940), 89; Harry M. Thrasher, "High School Athletics in Illinois," *The Illinois Teacher* 19 (September 1930), 33; Morley et al., "Athletics in Secondary Schools," 287; Rivett, 275-79; Brammell, 42 and 127; Morley, "Report on the Committee on Athletics," (1934), 454-464.

For a discussion on the movement to regulate interschool competition, see O'Hanlon, *Interscholastic Athletics*, Diss., Ch. IV. For information on state high school athletic associations, see Wagenhorst.

19. For sources dealing with the views of leading physical educators on the purpose of P.E., see James H. McCurdy, "Editorial Note and Comment," *American Physical Education Review* 12 (September 1907), 279-81; Colonel Charles W. Lamed, "Athletics from a Historical and Educational Standpoint," *American Physical Education Review* 14 (January 1909), 1-9; James H. McCurdy, "Play and Physical Education for Boys over Ten," *American Physical Education Review* 16 (May 1911), 315-20; George L. Meylan, "The Contribution of Physical Education to National Health and Education," *American Physical Education Review* 14 (April 1909), 191-96; Henry S. Curtis, "Playground Training," *American Physical Education Review* 16 (May 1911), 302-308; George J. Fisher, "Athletics Outside Educational Institutions," *American Physical Education Review* 12 (June 1907), 109-20; R. Tait McKenzie, "The Chronicle of the Amateur Spirit," *American Physical Education Review* 16 (February 1911), 79-94; see also "The Athletic Research Society—Resume of Organization, Work and Plans," *American Physical Education Review* 17 (November 1912), 585-98; "Aims, Scope and Relations of Physical Training," *School Life* 6 (February 1, 1921), 1-2; Guy Lewis, "Adoption of the Sports Program, 1906-39: The Role of Accommodation in the Transformation of Physical Education," *Quest* 12 (May 1969), 34-46; O'Hanlon, *Interscholastic Athletics*, Diss., Ch. II, 11-26.

20. See O'Hanlon, *Interscholastic Athletics*, Diss. Ch. II, for a discussion of the efforts to promote sports as part of the larger movement for organized play and recreation which was under way during the first decade of the twentieth century. See also Violas, for an analysis of the play movement.

For sources dealing with intramural athletics, see Brammell, 9, 11, 38, and 42-43; Galen Jones, "The Efficient Control and Administration of Physical Education and Athletics in Secondary Schools," *Junior-Senior High School Clearinghouse* 5 (November 1930), 143; J. T. Giles, "Symposium—Are High School Athletics Overdone?" *Journal of Education* 110 (September 30, 1929), 236; Morley, "Report of the Committee on Athletics," (1934), 454-464; and O'Hanlon, *Interscholastic Athletics*, Diss., Ch. IV.

21. For criticisms of varsity athletics compared to the benefits of intramurals, see Buehler, 34-35 and 52; Nathan C. Tolman, "What's Wrong with Secondary School Athletics?" *Sierra Educational News* 30 (December 1934), 29-33; O'Hanlon, *Interscholastic Athletics*, Diss., Ch. IV. The sources cited in footnote 17 above show the dominance of interscholastic athletics through the 1920s and '30s.

22. For enrollment and graduation figures for the 1920s and '30s, see Tyack, 183, and Krug, Vol. 2, 42 and 218-219. For illustrations of social class and aspirations to continue in school during the 1920s, see Lynd and Lynd, Ch. 3, and Krug, Vol. 2, Ch. 5. See Violas, Ch. 8 for a discussion of the origins of vocational guidance. In Chs. 6-7, Violas discusses differentiated curricula in the form of vocational programs as training for subordination.

23. For figures on the percentages of boys participating in varsity sports, see "Interesting Data on High School Athletics," *Illinois High School Athlete* 3 (October 1930), 3-4; Brammell, 56, 9; Morley, "Report of the North Central Association Committee on Athletics," (1930), 337, 333; Morley, "Report of the Committee on Athletics," (1934), 457.

For coaches' statements on the utilization of players, see Albert Dowden, "Suggestions for Coaching a High School," *Athletic Journal* 6 (February 1926), 22; Robert Zuppke, quoted in Neil M. Clark, "What Makes Men Fight? An Interview with Robert Zuppke," *American Magazine* 110 (November 1930), 19; William B. Braucher, "One More Way of Coaching a Basketball Team," *Athletic Journal* 15 (February 1935), 42. See also p. 40; F. B. Foreman, "Reducing the Strain of Tournament Play," *Athletic Journal* 15 (February 1935), 14.

For more extensive discussions of coaching and the conduct of interscholastic athletics, see O'Hanlon, *Interscholastic Athletics*, Diss., Ch. V, and "Alienated Play: Athletic Coaches and the Conduct of High School Varsity Sports Programs, 1920-1940," unpublished paper, 1981. In "Interscholastic Athletics," *Educational Theory*, I present essentially the same argument on the similarities between procedures in varsity team sports and schools.

24. My analysis of the institutional values of interscholastic athletics, the kinds of organizational procedures which were typically followed, the kinds of social experiences they were designed to promote, and the managerial role of the athletic coach, is based on observations of various aspects of interscholastic athletics. Not everyone got to play, and coaches clearly felt no responsibility to substitute if it would place victory in jeopardy. See references in footnote 22. Coaches themselves and books on coaching stressed the importance of cooperation, teamwork, and unselfishness. See Frank Wilton, "Football and the Development of a Wholesome Personality," Part 2, *Athletic Journal* 16 (March 1936), 34-38; William Campbell and Ralph King Reed, *Coaching High School Athletics* (Los Angeles: Claude G. Crawford, 1932), 99-105; Paul Dawson, "How to Develop Team Morale," *Athletic Journal* 20 (December 1939), 46 and 12.

Coaches also attempted to exercise as much control over team play as possible in order to make the conduct of sports more predictable, less prone to game-losing blunders. See J. W. Wilce, "Essentials and Non Essentials to be Observed by a Young Football Coach," *Athletic Journal* 8 (October 1927), 5; Glenn S. Warner, *Football for Coaches and Players* (Palo Alto, CA: Glenn Scobey Warner, Stanford University Press, 1927), 2-3; Knute Rockne, "Field Tactics," *Athletic Journal* 2 (October 1921), 5-9, 14; Jess Hawley, "Football—The Past, the Present, and the Future," *Athletic Journal* 10 (September 1929), 13-14; Clark Shaughnessy, "Things that Football Coaches Should Stress," *Athletic Journal* 8 (September 1927), 22, 26; O'Hanlon, "Alienated Play," *Interscholastic Athletics*, Diss., Ch. V. For a similar argument on the conduct of varsity sports, see O'Hanlon, "Interscholastic Athletics," *Educational Theory*.

For an analysis of the concept of citizenship cultivated through activities other than sports, see O'Hanlon, *Interscholastic Athletics*, Diss., Ch. III. For references to social studies and civics texts with respect to the question of citizenship, see Ch. IV, 190-192.

25. Coleman R. Griffith, *The Psychology of Coaching* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1926), 197

26. For discussions of managerial practices designed to win the allegiance of the work force, see Richard Edwards, *Contested Terrain* (New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1979), particularly Ch. 6; James Weinstein, *The Corporate Ideal in the Liberal State, 1900-1918* (Boston: Beacon Press, 1968); Joel Spring, *Education and the Rise of the Corporate State* (Boston: Beacon Press, 1972), particularly Ch. 2.

27. D. C. Bliss, "Military Training in the High School," *School Review* 25 (March 1917), 164.

28. George W. Wingate, "The Public Schools Athletic League," *Outing* 52 (May 1908), 172-74, and "President's Address," *New York Public Schools Athletic League Official Handbook, 1912-13* (New York: The American Sports Publishing Company, 1913), 31.

29. "H.S.V.U.S., What We are Trying to Do," *Everybody's* 39 (October 1918), 103.

30. For the account of New York's laws on military training for schoolboys and the characterization of the 1916 legislation, I rely on Winthrop Lane, "The Militarist Laws of New York," *The Survey* (17 June 1916), 313-14. See also "Compulsory Military Training in Schools and the National Need for Physical Preparedness," *Current Opinion* 61 (August 1916), 115.

31. Lane, 314

32. "Lax Military Training for Boys," *School Review* 26 (April 1918), 289.

33. "Military Training," *School Review* 26 (May 1918), 366.

34. "Military Training for School-Boys," *The Outlook* (16 February 1916), 351-52; see also Edgar Z. Steever, "The Wyoming Plan of Military Training for the Schools," *School Review* 25 (March 1917), 145-50; George Creel, "Wyoming's Answer to Militarism—Five Years of Training Schoolboys to Think True, Live True, and Shoot True," *Everybody's* 34 (February 1916), 150-59. This article was reproduced in *Selected Articles on Military Training in Schools and Colleges Including Military Camps*, compiled by Agnes Van Valkenburgh (New York: The H. W. Wilson Company, 1917); Edgar Z. Steever, "Jimmy Junior," *Everybody's* 36 (January 1917), 114-18.

35. "About That Boy of Yours," *Everybody's* 36 (January 1917), 113.

36. *Ibid.*, and "H.S.V.U.S.—Secretary Baker Heads High School Volunteers of the United States," *Everybody's* 36 (May 1917), 619; "The Wyoming Plan, Outline for Military Training in Public Schools of the United States, Prepared by U.S. Army War College," *Selected Articles on Military Training in Schools and Colleges Including Military Camps*, 43-46. (This document apparently was originally published as "Outline of Plans for

Military Training in Public Schools United States. prepared by the U.S. Army War College, War Department Document, No. 524).

37. "Massachusetts Commission on Military "Education," *School Review* 25 (March 1917), 169-176.
38. Charles W. Eliot, cited in "Massachusetts Commission on Military Education," 170.
39. David Starr Jordan, "Military Training in American High Schools," *Selected Articles on Military Training in Schools and Colleges Including Military Camps*, 165-66. For further arguments that military training in public schools posed dangers to a democratic society, see Alexander Meiklejohn, "A Schoolmaster's View of Compulsory Military Training," *Selected Articles on Military Training in Schools and Colleges Including Military Camps*, 128-29. Meiklejohn's article was taken from *School and Society* (1 July 1916), 9-14; see also Nathan C. Shaeffer, "Should Our Educational System Include Activities Whose Special Purpose is Preparation for War?" *NEA Proceedings* 53 (1915), 338.
40. Steever, "The Wyoming Plan of Military Training," 146.
41. Cited in Creel, 153.
42. *Ibid.*, 152.
43. "The Wyoming Plan, Outline of Plan for Military Training in Public Schools, Prepared by U.S. Army War College," 43-46.
44. See "Military Training for Schoolboys," 352, and articles in *Everybody's* cited above. For arguments that the High School Volunteers functioned to educate good citizens, see "H.S.V.U.S., Why We Are," *Everybody's* 39 (November 1918), 87, and "H.S.V.U.S., What We Are Trying to Do," *Everybody's* 39 (October 1918), 103.
45. "Report of the Committee on Military Training in the Public Schools," *NEA Proceedings* 55 (1917), 790.
46. Cited in *ibid.*, 787.
47. See the Summary and Conclusion of "The Report of the Committee on Military Training," 788-90.
48. Eliot, cited in "Massachusetts Commission on Military Education," 170.
49. Bliss, "Military Training in the High School," 167.
50. "Military Drill in the Public Schools," *American Physical Education Review* 21 (October 1916), 429-32.
51. Dudley A. Sargent, "Military Drill in the Public Schools," *Selected Articles on Military Training in Schools and Colleges Including Military Camps*, 168-69.
52. *Ibid.*, 170.
53. Jesse Feiring Williams, "Proposals for Preparedness in Physical Education," *American Physical Education Review* 21 (November 1916), 455-56; see also 453-54.
54. During the military expedition against Pancho Villa prior to World War I, the Army and Navy branches of the YMCA supplied sports equipment to some of the camps as a means of providing recreation. See Guy Lewis, "World War I and the Emergence of Sport for the Masses," *The Maryland Historian* 4 (Fall 1973), 111. See also Joseph Raycroft, "Suggestions for Colleges from the Army Experience in Physical Training," *Proceedings of the National Collegiate Athletic Association* 13 (1918), 54-55 (hereinafter cited as *NCAA Proceedings*). Later during the war, the Army and Navy established separate Commissions on War Camp Training Activities, both under the chairmanship of Raymond B. Fosdick. Through these agencies the military managed to institute a variety of leisure activities including sports programs. See Edward Frank Allen and Raymond B. Fosdick, *Keeping our Fighters Fit* (New York: The Century Co., 1918), and Lewis, "World War I and Sport for the Masses," 111. The military also used sports to combat vice overseas. See Newton D. Baker, "Address," *NCAA Proceedings* 14 (1919), 83.
55. John L. Griffith, "The War Department Commission on Training Camp Activities: Suggestions From the Field," *NCAA Proceedings* 13 (1918), 65; see also Raymond B. Fosdick and Edward F. Allen, "Athletics for the Army," *Century Magazine* 96 (July 1918), 367-74.
56. Raycroft, "Suggestions for Colleges," 58-59.
57. Allen and Fosdick, *Keeping our Fighters Fit*, 49, 53-58; Fosdick and Allen, "Athletics for the Army," 372-73; and Joseph Raycroft, "Training Camp Activities," *NCAA Proceedings* 12 (1917), 63.
58. Allen and Fosdick, *Keeping our Fighters Fit*, 42. For arguments about development of aggressiveness within a team context, see 42-48, 54, and 13-14. See also Fosdick and Allen, "Athletics for the Army," 367-74, and Raycroft, "Suggestions for Colleges," 58-60.
59. Griffith, "The Commission on Training Camp Activities," 64-66.
60. Raycroft, "Suggestions for Colleges," 60-61; For a proposal reflecting the ideas of James McCurdy, see William Howard Taft (ed.), *Service With Our Fighting Men*, Vol. 2 (New York: Association Press, 1922), 30. See also 26-29.

For a discussion of the career of John Griffith, see O'Hanlon, *Interscholastic Athletics*, Diss., 246-250. See also John L. Griffith, "Presidential Address," *NCAA Proceedings* 31 (1936), 87-89.

61. "Educational Notes and News," *School and Society* (10 February 1917), 170, and Lewis, "World War I and Sport for the Masses," 114.

62. Thomas A. Storey, Willard S. Small, and Elon G. Salisbury, *Recent Legislation for Physical Education*, U.S. Bulletin of Education, Bulletin No. 1, 1922 (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1922), 5, 15; Emmett A. Rice, *A Brief History of Physical Education* (New York: A. S. Barnes and Company, 1926), 239-41; Lewis, "World War I and Sport for the Masses," 114.

Storey et al. claimed that three states had laws relating to physical education before 1915. Rice seemed to concur. The author of the U.S. Bureau report also noted that eight more states passed legislation between 1915 and 1918. Rice again confirmed this picture. Storey et al. and Lewis agreed that 17 states enacted laws between 1919 and 1921. There seems to be some discrepancy, however, between Lewis' claim about physical education laws prior to 1918 and those registered in the Bureau report. Lewis claimed that eight states required students to take physical education courses prior to 1918. Perhaps the discrepancy has something to do with the voluntary vs. compulsory nature of the legislation.

Rice contended that 22 states passed laws "in favor of P.E. between 1919 and 1925." Lewis contended that 36 states required students "to complete" courses in P.E. by 1930. Perhaps some of this legislation did not apply to high schools. Edward Krug cites a 1927-28 survey discussed above in the text which claimed that only 254 out of 464 high schools required P.E. See Krug, Vol. 2, 58.

63. Lewis, "World War I and Sport for the Masses," 114-16. See also Lewis, "Adoption of the Sports Program, 1906-39." For an analysis of Lewis' views and a discussion of the development of physical education prior to 1940, see O'Hanlon, *Interscholastic Athletics*, Diss., Appendix A.

