morality, which said that drinking was evil, in fact grew out of the original economic concerns.

The baseball experience shows that any moral-economic dichotomy is false, and temperance was not an expression of a single capitalist mind set. Players and other workers who drank were not, on their own terms, "immoral," any more than pre-industrial work practices were less desirable than work as it was defined by the factory owner. Drinking players simply had a different set of morals, one consistent with the pre-industrial society out of which baseball emerged.

Summer Baseball: The Second "Vexation"

Scott McQuilkin
Whitworth College, Washington

NCAA Secretary Frank Nicolson recounted in 1912 how, of all the major issues before the Association at its inaugural meeting, only in summer baseball had the membership failed to achieve satisfactory results. The "standing challenge to the wisdom of the Association," and, in Nicolson's view, an issue necessarily solved to justify the NCAA's existence, centred on college players who had for years turned to baseball as a means of summer employment. The question before college officials, then, was whether college students who accepted pay for playing baseball during the summer, when participation would not interfere with their studies, had thereby become professionals and should suffer the loss of their intercollegiate eligibility. The debate over summer baseball would be fought, however, on a broader basis than just college baseball. Many athletic authorities reasoned that the entire amateur concept was at stake. Any compromise on professionalism in baseball, they believed, would lead to rapid growth in professionalism in other sports. Compromises were eventually made, and arguably professionalism did encroach upon other sports. More significantly, college baseball stood alone in the latitude its players were granted with regard to adherence to amateur law. If Nicolson's criterion for the assessment of NCAA progressive reform was therefore employed, and the lack of summer baseball reform denoted as a lone measuring stick, the NCAA would have been hard-pressed to extol its collective powers of persuasion.

The summer baseball question has been investigated in the historical context of the first two decades of the twentieth century, which define an era of widespread efforts at collective reform and an optimism that such endeavors would result in societal progress. During this Progressive Era, many Americans embraced the notion that society was harmonious and merely in need of technical adjustments. Conflicts in the political system, in business, and among the disparate social classes could be assuaged, it was believed, if solutions were levied by well-intentioned experts armed with progressive social scientific theories. This reliance upon collective forces to

impose order was true as well for United States colleges and universities for whom inter-institutional control, seen in the creation of the NCAA, became the means whereby athletic ills such as summer baseball could seemingly be remedied.

Two sources of primary material have been investigated for the purpose of studying the debate concerning the shape athletic reform should take. The addresses, debates, and individual institutional rules contained within the NCAA minimal (1906-1930) indicate that faculty were overwhelmingly united over their belief in the need for effective change in the conduct of intercollegiate baseball. These same faculty, however, were demonstrably divided on the extent of the reform required to remedy this athletic problem. Some athletic leaders favoured total elimination of college baseball. Others desired an expanded influence for the educated faculty elite lest amateur statutes be compromised in other sports as they had been in college baseball. Still others favoured minimal faculty intrusion into traditionally student-run intercollegiate athletic programs. The viewpoints of progressive reformers of both a general and sports-related nature were also examined in contemporary journals. Their writings provide ample proof of what many considered the futility of reform due to the competing interests and ideologies of progressive reformers.

Remember the Black Sox?: The 1919 World Series Scandal and Social Memory

Daniel A. Nathan
University of Iowa, Iowa City

As might be expected, much has been made of the allusion to the Black Sox scandal in F. Scott Fitzgerald's The Great Gatsby (1925). Summarized briefly, after learning that the enigmatic gambler Meyer Wolfsheim was "the man who fixed the World Series back in 1919," Fitzgerald's Nick Carraway says, "I remembered, of course, that the World Series had been fixed in 1919, but if I had thought of it at all I would have thought of it as a thing that merely happened, the end of some inevitable chain. It never occurred to me that one man could start to play with the faith of fifty million people - with the single-mindedness of a burglar blowing a safe." Although it is certainly worth noting the symbolic importance that Fitzgerald attributed to the scandal, what interests me here is the process of remembrance, specifically the formulation of social memory. For Fitzgerald and his initial audience, the Black Sox scandal was a living memory, it still had some degree of immediacy. But as the years passed and the scandal faded in individual memories, how and why did the story of the fixed World Series remain active in American social memory? That is, in the years before the scandal was constructed in popular literature, history, and film, what forms - both written and non-inscribed - did it take? To what uses was it put, and by whom? If sociologist Maurice Halbwachs is correct and collective memory is socially