

6
62

Price Threepence.

The
Olympic Games
and the
Duke of Westminster's
Appeal for £100,000

*A HISTORICAL survey
of the movement for
better organization in the
British preparations for the
Berlin Games of 1916,
compiled from The Times
and official sources.*



SOLD FOR THE BENEFIT OF THE FUND.

1913.

National Library of Scotland



B000602911

PREFATORY NOTE.

The following pages have been written with a view to placing before the public in an easily accessible form such a summarized history of the Olympic Games as will enable every one to understand thoroughly the reasons for the present movement to enable the United Kingdom to make a better appearance at Berlin in 1916 than it succeeded in making at Stockholm in 1912. It is not possible, within the compass of such a pamphlet, to treat many aspects of the subject otherwise than in the barest outline. An attempt has been made, however, to cover everything that is of much importance. All vital official documents are given, it is believed, in full, and for other matters the compiler has had recourse to the files of *The Times*. It is hoped that a more general understanding of all the facts will help to make national sentiment more nearly unanimous in support of the Duke of Westminster's Fund.



CONTENTS.

	PAGE
I. HISTORY OF THE GAMES	1
II. THE GAMES IN LONDON AND STOCKHOLM	2
Britain's Record	3
Difference in Programmes	3
How Nations Have Scored	4
Britain and America	4
British Lack of Organization	5
III. PUBLIC APATHY AND FINANCE	6
Causes of British Weakness	6, 7
Expenses of 1908	8
IV. THE NEED OF REFORM	8
V. THE BEGINNING OF REFORM	8
<i>The Times</i> and the Council	9
Need of a Smaller Committee	9
Results at Stockholm	10
Lack of Management	11
Sir Arthur Conan Doyle's First Letter	11
VI. FOR AND AGAINST THE GAMES	11
Support for Reorganization	12
An American Opinion	13
Track Tactics and Amateur Sport	13
VII. THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE	14
Official Constitution	14
The Committee and the Council	15
The Question of Funds	15
Scheme for Novice Trials	16
Getting to Work	16
VIII. THE APPEAL FOR £100,000	16
Text of the Appeal	17
Support of the Press	17
The King's Message	18
Mr. Frederic Harrison's Criticism	18
The Duke of Westminster's Reply	19
Sir A. Conan Doyle's Reply	20
Objections from the Headmaster of Sherborne	21
Rejoinder by <i>The Times</i>	22
Mr. Theodore Cook's Explanation	22
Favourable Public Sentiment	23
The Special Committee's Statement	24
The Bogy of Professionalism	25
Is £100,000 Too Much?	26
The Need of Extra Funds	26
A Plea for Concentration	27
After 1916	29
Impossibility of "Standing Down" in 1916	29
APPENDIX A. SCHEMES OF THE VARIOUS ASSOCIATIONS	31
English Amateur Athletic Association	31
Scottish Amateur Athletic Association	31
Irish Amateur Athletic Association	31
National Cyclists' Union	32
Amateur Fencing Association	32
Amateur Swimming Association	32
National Amateur Wrestling Association	33
Amateur Gymnastic Association	34
Clay Bird Shooting Association	34
The Modern Pentathlon	35
APPENDIX B. RESULTS OF THE STOCKHOLM GAMES	35
APPENDIX C. A SCHEME FOR AN IMPERIAL TEAM	42
MISCELLANEOUS TABLES.	
Olympic Records	2
Standing of the Nations in 1908 and 1912	2
Results in Track and Field Events 1896-1912	4
Number of First Places Won by Various Nations	4
Results at Stockholm	16
Points Scored by British Empire at Stockholm	16
Successes of United Kingdom in 1908	39
Successes of Oversea British Empire in 1908	39
Complete List of Prizewinners in 1912	40, 41

AIMS and OBJECTS

of the

OLYMPIC GAMES FUND.

I.—HISTORY OF THE GAMES.

The credit of having originated the modern Olympic Games belongs to Baron Pierre de Coubertin. He had been much attracted by the way in which games were played and taught in English public schools and by the general devotion to sport of the British people, as shown in the popularity and the high standard of such events as Henley Regatta and the inter-University Boat Race. He had for many years taken an active part in encouraging the practice of athletics in France and in arousing public attention to the need of the better physical education of French youths. At what date he first conceived the idea of reviving the Olympic Games we do not know; but it was in November, 1892, at a meeting of the "Union des Sports Athlétiques" at the Sorbonne, that he first gave public utterance to his ambition and appealed to his hearers for support in the "splendid and beneficent" task of reconstituting on a larger international scale the old Hellenic festival.

Two years later, in 1894, an International Congress of Sport was summoned to meet in Paris. Before the meeting of the congress M. de Coubertin visited England, where the Prince of Wales, afterwards King Edward VII., gave his approval to the project. It also received support from the highest quarters in France, Belgium, Sweden, Greece, and other countries. The proceedings of the congress were marked by great enthusiasm. The International Olympic Committee was organized, and Greece, as was fitting, undertook to hold the first of the new Games in Athens in 1896.

The Games of 1896, in Athens, were followed by those of 1900 in Paris and of 1904 in the United States, at St. Louis. At a meeting of the International Olympic Committee, held in London in the last-named year, it had been proposed that the Games of 1908 should be celebrated in Rome.

In May, 1905, a meeting was held in the House of Commons at which a British Olympic Association was formed, and Mr. W. H. Grenfell, M.P. (now Lord Desborough), was elected chairman. In the following year the Italian Committee found that it would not be practicable to have the Games in Rome in 1908; and at a meeting of the International Committee in Athens Lord Desborough was asked whether it could be arranged to hold them in London. On his return Lord Desborough consulted the various athletic associations in this country. He found them entirely favourable to the idea. Time was short, but the British Olympic Council was immediately organized, consisting of one representative from the governing body in each branch of sport, and by energy and with the happy collaboration of the management of the Franco-British Exposition, arrangements for holding which at Shepherd's-bush were already under way, the Games of 1908 were successfully carried through in London on a much larger scale than had before been attempted. The Games of 1912 took place in Stockholm, and those of 1916 are destined for Berlin.

Before closing this very brief historical sketch (for many of the facts in which the writer is indebted to "The Fourth Olympiad," or the official report of the Olympic Games of 1908, prepared by Mr. Theodore A. Cook) it should be explained that an intermediate series of Games, also quadrennial, is held in Athens, the first of which took place in 1906 and the second in 1910. The third celebration will occur in 1914. Owing to the great munificence of M. Averoff, of Alexandria, the old Athenian Stadium has been sumptuously reconstructed in white marble. There was some suggestion that it should be used as the permanent home of the Olympic Games themselves. It was feared, however, that if that were done the Games would lose much of their international character and tend to become merely local. So the series of Athenian Games was instituted, falling midway between the celebrations of the Olympic Games proper.

II.—THE GAMES IN LONDON AND STOCKHOLM.

The immense increase in interest in the Games of recent years is shown by the fact that the entries in 1908 in London were 2,666, while those at Stockholm were 5,882. Allowing for duplications of entries, the actual number of competitors was about 4,000. Eight new "nations" were represented in 1912 for the first time—namely, Chile, Egypt, Iceland, Japan, Luxemburg, Monaco, Portugal, and Servia. None of them succeeded in scoring a point. The total number of nations competing at Stockholm was 29; and the growing keenness of the competitions and the raising of the standard of performances are shown by the fact that in the track and field events 14 new Olympic records were established. The programme, however, has not been the same at different Games. Only 15 track and field events were identical in London and at Stockholm, and in all but three the London record was beaten in 1912. The list of Olympic records which have now been established in track and field events is as follows:—

OLYMPIC RECORDS.

100 metres	10 4-5 sec.
110 metres hurdles	15 "
200 metres	21 7-10 "
400 metres	48 1-5 "
400 metres hurdles	55 "
800 metres	1.51 9-10 "
1,500 metres	3.56 4-5 "
3,200 metres cross country ..	10.47 1-5 "
5,000 metres	14.36 3-5 "
8,000 metres	25.11 1-5 "
10,000 metres	31.20 "
25 Mile Marathon Race ..	2.36.54 "
3,500 metres walk	14.55 "
10,000 metres walk	46.28 2-5 "
16,000 metres walk	1.15.57 2-5 "
400 metres relay race	42 2-5 "
1,600 metres relay race	3.16 3-5 "
Running High Jump	6ft. 4in.
Running Broad Jump	24ft. 11½in.
Standing High Jump	5ft. 4 3-8in.
Standing Broad Jump	11ft. 0 5-8in.
Pole Jump	12ft. 11½in.
Hop, Step, and Jump	48ft. 11½in.
Javelin, best hand	198ft. 11 3-8in.
Javelin, both hands	358ft. 11 7-8in.
Discus, best hand	148ft. 3 9-10in.
Discus, both hands	271ft. 10 1-8in.
Weight, best hand	50ft. 4in.
Weight, both hands	90ft. 10 9-10in.
Hammer	177ft. 7in.

In London the method of scoring adopted was to give five points for a first place, three for a second, and two for a third. The total number of points awarded was 885.

At Stockholm the method was to give three points for a first place, two for a second, and one for a third. The total number of points awarded was 605. Translating the Stockholm results into terms of the London scoring, the number of

points awarded would have been 913, the Stockholm programme being slightly the longer. The British Olympic Council in its official report on the Games of 1912 gives the following comparative table, showing the number of entries from, the points won by, and the rank of, each competing nation:—

STANDING OF THE NATIONS. 1908.

Nations.	Entries.	Points.	Order.
1 United Kingdom ..	839	446½	I.
2 Australasia ..	34	11	XI.
3 Canada ..	86	27½	V.
4 S. Africa ..	18	6	XV.
5 France ..	363	41	IV.
6 Austria ..	34	1	XVII.
7 Bohemia ..	31	1	XVIII.
8 Hungary ..	153	22½	VII.
9 Sweden ..	204	67½	III.
10 Holland ..	165	0	—
11 U.S.A. ..	160	153½	II.
12 Italy ..	115	14	IX.
13 Germany ..	110	26½	VI.
14 Denmark ..	101	5	XVI.
15 Belgium ..	88	14	X.
16 Russia ..	8	9	XIII.
17 Finland ..	67	9	XIV.
18 Norway ..	64	19	VIII.
19 Greece ..	20	11	XII.
20 Switzerland ..	4	0	—
21 Turkey ..	1	0	—
22 Argentine ..	1	0	—
	2,666	885	

1912.

Nations.	Entries.	Points.	Order.
1 United Kingdom ..	526	111	III.
2 Australasia ..	59	66½	
3 Canada ..	74		
4 S. Africa ..	119		
5 France ..	508	50	VI.
6 Austria ..	250	8	
7 Bohemia ..	167	0	VII.
8 Hungary ..	458	24	
9 Sweden ..	882	207½	I.
10 Holland ..	85	3	XIII.
11 U.S.A. ..	572	195½	II.
12 Italy ..	252	20	X.
13 Germany ..	337	69	V.
14 Denmark ..	297	27	VIII.
15 Belgium ..	99	16	XI.
16 Russia ..	369	9	IV.
17 Finland ..	224	76	
18 Norway ..	300	24	IX.
19 Greece ..	153	6	XII.
20 Switzerland ..	3	0	—
21 Turkey ..	10	0	—
22 Argentine ..	0	0	—
23 Chile ..	43	0	—
24 Iceland ..	2	0	—
25 Egypt ..	2	0	—
26 Japan ..	5	0	—
27 Luxemburg ..	66	0	—
28 Monaco ..	2	0	—
29 Portugal ..	13	0	—
30 Servia ..	5	0	—
	5,882	913	

BRITAIN'S RECORD.

What concerns us most here is the striking descent of the United Kingdom from first to third place; from a score of 446 to one of 111. As was said in a recent article in *The Times*:—"Having won over 50 per cent. of the total points in 1908 we could get but little more than 12 per cent. in 1912. We had three times as many points as the United States in 1908 and the United States had 75 per cent. more than we in 1912." On the face of the figures the United Kingdom was better than all the rest of the world put together in London, and four years later could only win third place among individual nations. The figures are worth repeating:—

	1908.	1912.
The United Kingdom ..	446	111
United States	153	195
Sweden	67	207

These figures, however, need some explanation. The programme of the Games has not heretofore been the same from one Olympiad to another. In 1908 there were competitions in Archery, Boxing, Hockey, Polo, Rackets, Skating, Tennis, Catch-as-Catch-Can Wrestling, and for Motor-boats, none of which figured in the programme at Stockholm. In these events the United Kingdom scored:—

	Points.
Archery	18
Boxing	47
Hockey	5
Polo	5
Rackets	16
Skating	17
Tennis	5
Catch-as-Catch-Can	35
Motor-boats	10
Total	158

In addition Great Britain did not compete at Stockholm in open-air Lawn Tennis or Yachting, in which in 1908 we scored 24 and 23 points respectively, or a total of 47. Further, in Cycling, Shooting, and Rowing there were extra events in the London programme by which we further profited to the extent of an additional 56 points. Adding these totals together, we arrive at the fact that at the London Games the United Kingdom scored 261 points in competitions which either did not take place at Stockholm or for which British competitors did not enter. This goes a considerable way towards accounting for our collapse of 335 points from 446 to 111.

DIFFERENCE IN PROGRAMMES.

There were, of course, off-sets to this, because, as has been said, the Stockholm programme was the longer of the two. But, with the greatest desire in the world to be fair, it is impossible that

the Home Country—the country, that is, in which the Games take place—should not derive considerable benefit from framing its own programme. The divergences in programmes have arisen not from any purpose on the part of the Home Country to get an advantage, but from the obvious fact that every country necessarily and honestly believes those events best worth competition which in its opinion rank highest as sports—that is to say, those which it most affects and practises.

Without an exact analysis of every event at the two sets of Games, then, it is evident that much of our inferior showing in 1912 was owing to the difference in programme. In London we included all the sports which we hold in high estimation, and at which we are therefore specially proficient. The Home Country has a further large advantage in being able to bring approximately its whole strength into the field and in being thoroughly accustomed to all the conditions.

None the less it has to be noticed that the United States was not the Home Country in either 1908 or 1912. It scored its points without entering for a great number of the competitions in London, or for the Football, Lawn Tennis (except one competitor who did not score), Rowing, Wrestling, and Yachting, at Stockholm. When the Games were held at St. Louis, in 1904, the United States had things all its own way.

What has been said above, indeed, in no way excuses the British performance at Stockholm. What it does suggest is that the advantage of being the Home Country concealed our weakness in many sports in 1908. In an all-round programme containing all the competitions which have any standing in Great Britain we can still hold our own, but we are never likely to get all these competitions included in the future, or not till very far in the future. A meeting of the International Olympic Council will be held in 1914 to draw up a "type" programme to govern future Games. This will doubtless reduce the advantage heretofore accruing to the Home Country. Whether it will, on the whole, be much to our advantage remains to be seen. Many games and exercises to which we in Great Britain attach importance are little practised in other countries and not likely to be as yet included in a permanent Olympic programme. Other things which we hardly practise at all are thought highly of elsewhere, and have an immovable position in the list of Olympic events. But apart from the extremes either way (omitting both those games which are almost peculiarly British and those of which we know nothing) it is also evident that both in 1908 and 1912 we did relatively much worse than our reputation in the past entitles us to expect in that large group of sports which are common to all countries. These must always form the nucleus of an Olympic programme. In these are included the majority of standard track and field events. The table on the next page, giving the results of these events at the last five Games, will be instructive:—

RESULTS IN TRACK AND FIELD EVENTS.

Events.	Athens, 1896.	Paris, 1900.	St. Louis, 1904.	London, 1908.	Stockholm, 1912.
100-metre dash	Burke, Am., 12sec.	Jarvis, Am., 10 1/2sec.	Hahn, Am., 11sec.	Walker, S. Africa, 10 1/2sec.	Craig, Am., 10 1/2sec.
200-metre dash	Burke, Am., 54 1/2sec.	Tewkesbury, Am., 22 1/2sec.	Hahn, Am., 21 1/2sec.	Kerr, Canada, 22 1/2sec.	Craig, Am., 21 1/2sec.
400-metre run	Flack, Eng., 2min. 11sec.	Long, Am., 49 2/5sec.	Hillman, Am., 49 1/2sec.	Halswell, U.K., w.o.	Redpath, Am., 48 1/2sec.
800-metre run	Flack, Eng., 4min. 33 1/2sec.	Bennett, Eng., 4min. 01 2/5sec.	Lighthbody, Am., 4min. 56sec.	Sheppard, Am., 4min. 52 1/2sec.	Berechth, Am., 1min. 51 1/2sec.
1,500-metre run	Curtis, Am., 17 3/5sec.	Kraenzlein, Am., 15 2/5sec.	Schule, Am., 15sec.	Sutton, Am., 15sec.	Jackson, U.K., 3min. 56 1/2sec.
110-metre hurdle	—	Tewkesbury, Am., 57 3/5sec.	Hillman, Am., 53sec.	Radon, Am., 55sec.	Kelly, Am., 15 1/2sec.
400-metre hurdle	—	—	—	Vogt, U.K., 25min. 11 1/2sec.	*Kohlemainen, Fin., 31min. 20 1/2sec.
5-mile run	—	Teato, Fr., 2hr. 59min.	Hicks, Am., 3hr. 28min. 53sec.	Larnet, U.K., 1hr. 15min. 57 1/2sec.	*Goulding, Can., 46min. 28 1/2sec.
10-mile walk	Loues, Gr., 2hr. 55min. 20sec.	Ewry, Am., 10hr. 6 1/2min.	Ewry, Am., 1hr. 4 1/2min.	Hayes, Am., 2hr. 55sec. 18 1/2sec.	*McArthur, S.A., 2hr. 36min. 54 1/2sec.
25-mile Marathon	—	Ewry, Am., 10hr. 6 1/2min.	Prinsehn, Am., 4hr. 11min.	Ewry, Am., 5hr. 11 1/2min.	Tschidras, Gr., 1hr. 0 1/2min.
Standing broad jump	—	Kraenzlein, Am., 23ft. 6 7/8in.	Prinsehn, Am., 24ft. 11in.	Irons, Am., 5ft. 2in.	Gudmes, Am., 5ft. 4 3/4in.
Running high jump	Clark, Am., 20ft. 9 3/4in.	Baxter, Am., 6ft. 2 1/2in.	Fones, Am., 4ft. 11in.	Porter, Am., 6ft. 3in.	Richards, Am., 6ft. 4in.
Running broad jump	Clark, Am., 5ft. 11 1/4in.	Prinsehn, Am., 47ft. 4 1/4in.	Prinsehn, Am., 5ft. 11in.	Ainearie, U.K., 48ft. 11 1/4in.	Richards, Am., 5ft. 11 1/4in.
Hop, step, and jump	Connolly, Am., 45ft.	Baxter, Am., 47ft. 4 1/4in.	Dvorak, Am., 11ft. 6in.	Gilbert-Cooke, Am., 12ft. 2in.	Richards, Am., 5ft. 11 1/4in.
Pole vault	Hoyt, Am., 10ft. 9 3/4in.	Baxter, Am., 10ft. 9 3/4in.	Flanagan, Am., 16ft. 6in.	Flanagan, Am., 17ft. 4 1/4in.	McGrath, Am., 17ft. 7in.
Hammer	Garrett, Am., 36ft. 2in.	Sheldon, Am., 46ft. 3 1/2in.	Rose, Am., 48ft. 7in.	Sheridan, Am., 154ft. 2in.	Macdonald, Am., 150ft. 4in.
Weight	Garrett, Am., 95ft. 7 1/2in.	Bauer, Hung., 118ft. 2 1/2in.	Sheridan, Am., 128ft. 10 1/2in.	Sheridan, Am., 154ft. 2in.	Talpaie, Fin., 148ft. 3 1/2in.
Discus, free st. le	—	—	—	Sheridan, Am., 124ft. 6in.	Talpaie, Fin., 124ft. 6 1/2in.
Discus, Greek st. le	—	—	—	—	Talpaie, Fin., 124ft. 6 1/2in.
Javelin, first style	—	—	—	—	Talpaie, Fin., 124ft. 6 1/2in.
Javelin, by the middle	—	—	—	—	Talpaie, Fin., 124ft. 6 1/2in.
Tug-of-war	—	—	—	—	Talpaie, Fin., 124ft. 6 1/2in.

* 10,000 metres. \$ Both hands.

HOW NATIONS HAVE SCORED.

Analysing the adjoining table, we find the number of first places won in all the events (relay races and steeplechases at varying distances are omitted) by the several countries to be as follows:—

	1896	1900	1904	1908	1912	Total.
America	9	13	17	14	11	64
United Kingdom	2	2	—	5	1	10
Sweden	—	—	—	2	3	5
Finland	—	—	—	—	4	4
South Africa	—	—	—	1	1	2
Canada	—	—	—	1	1	2
Greece	1	—	—	—	—	1
France	—	1	—	—	—	1
Hungary	—	1	—	—	—	1
Total	12	17	17	23	22	91

BRITAIN AND AMERICA.

This table puts the situation very clearly, showing the conspicuous pre-eminence of the American athletes in track and field events, and the comparative weakness, almost negligibility, of all other countries except America and the British Empire. Finland has produced Kohlemainen as well as javelin and discus throwers. When the Games were held in Stockholm Sweden took three points. Otherwise, besides Sweden's two successes in the javelin throwing in 1908, the only gold medals in all these events which have gone elsewhere than to America or to some part of the British Empire, are two to Greece for the Marathon (when the meeting was in Athens) and the standing broad jump, one to France for the Marathon (when the meeting was in Paris), and one to Hungary for discus throwing. Germany does not appear in the list, nor does Italy, Russia, Denmark, Belgium, Holland, or any other country.

What shows the same fact more strikingly is that among the 92 competitors left in to contest the final heats (which is, perhaps, a better index than the actual winner) in the six chief running events in the last two Games of 1908 and 1912 49 have been Americans, 24 British, six Swedish, five Finlanders, four Germans, two French, one Hungarian, and one Italian. That is to say that there have been twice as many Americans as British, and 25 per cent. more British than from all the rest of the world.

On this subject the Special Correspondent of *The Times* at the Stockholm Games wrote (in *The Times* of July 27, 1912):—

"In the aggregate number of points scored at the entire meeting Great Britain stands a poor third to Sweden and the United States. This is sad; but the sadness is mitigated by various considerations. In the first place, there is great advantage in being the 'home country'; and probably no one, not himself a Swede, for a moment supposes that Sweden would have headed the list if the Games had been held elsewhere than in Sweden. Next, to draw from the scores any general inference that British athletes were inferior to those of any other

country except the United States is purely absurd, the fact being that the bulk of the points scored by other countries were in branches of sport which are hardly practised in England, or in events in which we did not seriously compete. That we were systematically, or even frequently, beaten by any others than Americans in the things in which we are accustomed to take part is quite untrue, although one exception must be made in favour of the Long-Distance running of Hannes Kohlemainen, of Finland, who was seriously challenged only by J. Bouin, the Frenchman, and that only at one distance. As for other countries, the regularity with which, after the preliminary and semi-final heats in the track events, whether the distance was long or short, the survivors for the finals were confined to American and British representatives became monotonous. Had it not been for H. Braun and R. Rau, of Germany, there might, in effect, have been no other than the two Anglo-Saxon nations competing. The one running event in which Sweden or any other country achieved success was in the Cross-Country run, in which the course and conditions were almost ludicrously unlike those which we associate with that event in England.

"To talk of any other country than the United States as being on a par, or nearly on a par, with us in the track events (always excepting H. Kohlemainen) is nonsense. The exasperating thing was that, being, as we were, so easily second, our men, for mere lack of teaching, should have been made to seem almost like children by comparison with the American runners, when, in proper hands, rightly trained and told how to run, there was no reason whatever why the British athletes as a body should not have been a better 'pack' than the Americans or have divided honours with them at least evenly."

This refers, it will be seen, only to the track events. The British performances in the Games in general will be more closely analysed later. It is sufficient at present to note in general terms that the running events at Stockholm (still excepting Kohlemainen and Bouin) were on the whole a duel between the United States and Great Britain (or the British Empire). At long distances we showed an immense superiority over the Americans. At short distances they completely wiped us out. In such Stadium events as the javelin, discus, and standing jumps (with the pentathla) which we do not practise, we neither expected to win, nor did we win, a point. What is most discreditable is that the United Kingdom also failed to win a point in either of the running jumps, in the weight, hammer, or pole vault.

MISCELLANEOUS SPORTS.

In the miscellaneous competitions outside the Stadium we did very much better than the United States. Taking the Swedish system of marking, the comparison is as follows:—

	U.S.A.	U.K.	Empire.
Stadium events ..	87	15	28
Other sports	42	61	90
	129	76	118

But it has to be remembered that we competed in these "other sports" on a much larger scale than did the United States. While there were only 290 American entries in them there were 314 from

the United Kingdom and 193 from the rest of the Empire, or 507 altogether. But so far from Great Britain being "decadent" or "degenerate," there was nothing to show that we are not still the best all-round athletic people.

BRITISH LACK OF ORGANIZATION.

The exasperating thing (to quote from *The Times* Special Correspondent's article reproduced above) "was that, for mere lack of teaching, our men should have been made to seem almost like children by comparison with the American runners." This "lack of teaching" was only one manifestation of the generally slipshod way in which we competed at Stockholm. Nor is that any new thing. A glance back to the table on page 4 will show that the United Kingdom is not improving its position in the chief Stadium events. Omitting the year when the Games were held in London, in the first two meetings we scored four firsts out of a total of 29, and in the last two we scored only one out of 39. This is only the inevitable result of slackness which grows only more slack when all the rest of the world is becoming much keener and taking the Games more and more seriously.

As long ago as 1906 the Special Correspondent of *The Times*, who was at the intermediate Games at Athens, wrote:—

OUR SLACKNESS IN 1906.

"The truth is that a total absence of organization marked the arrangements for British representatives at the Games. In fact there were no arrangements at all, and the traditional English principle of leaving everything to individual effort and initiative was rigidly adhered to. In striking contrast was the excellent provision made for many of the foreign teams; the American, for instance, arrived in good time, accompanied by a trainer and physician; they found a comfortable house prepared for them and proper arrangements made for diet, baths, and all the equipment of an athletic establishment. Their training, continued regularly until the last moment, and the series of victories which they, the Scandinavians, and others achieved must be attributed to these sensible and, indeed, indispensable precautions. Owing to the apathy prevailing in England no real effort was made to secure adequate British representation on this interesting occasion." (*The Times*, May 6, 1906.)

IN 1908.

At the Games of 1908, in spite of the huge total of points which we scored, with the assistance of being the Home Country, our want of organization, especially in the lack of proper training of our competitors in the running and field events, was no less apparent. The Special Correspondent of *The Times*, summarizing the results of the Games, then wrote:—

"In many cases our men were as children beside the athletes of the United States. Or, to put it differently, they were as amateurs compared with professionals. They have not been so well taught. In many cases they have not been taught at all, but run and jump and throw the hammer and the weight simply by the light of nature. . . . Our haphazard methods of training have served very well as

long as we had only each other to contend with. . . . If we are to compete against the world, especially against such business-like athletes as the Americans with any hope of improving our performances this year, we must be businesslike too." (*The Times*, July 27, 1908.)

IN 1912.

In 1908, the Games being in London, we did not have the problem of organization for competition in a foreign country to contend with; in 1912, at Stockholm, we had. Of the character of our competitions on that occasion *The Times*, in a leading article at the time, said:—

"It is not that we are a decadent people—we are nothing of the kind—but that we do our best to appear so in the eyes of the world. . . . The line between professionals and amateurs is often hard to draw, but it is obvious that a large proportion of our best runners at Stockholm were amateurs in the most eclectic sense of the term. They ran by the light of nature and they did it for the fun of the thing; nor was it their fault, or any sign of decadence in England that they won no more than they did. . . . But we have to recognize that it is pointless to stake our national reputation in international competitions without creating the mechanism in this country which such competitions require. Two things are wanted—a determination to organize properly and funds. At present it is hardly an exaggeration to say that there is no organization at all. . . . The immediate and essential necessity is to prevent the public from maintaining the attitude of indifference which it has hitherto adopted towards the Olympic Games. We cannot now withdraw from the Games; and if we enter them at all, we should enter them with a due regard for the reputation which we stake." (*The Times*, Aug. 5, 1912.)

III.—PUBLIC APATHY AND FINANCE.

More than one reference has been made to the "public apathy" with which the Olympic Games are regarded in the United Kingdom. It is not necessary to demonstrate that such apathy has existed, for we all know it. But the reason why it exists when in almost every other country the Games are considered of the first importance is worth inquiring into. The causes are not far to seek. The words in which the Special Correspondent of *The Times* at the Stockholm Games summarized the chief of the causes and their effect on the showing which we made at the Games may be repeated here:—

OUR DISADVANTAGES.

"In the first place our ideal is not the Olympic ideal. We have, in fact, never yet brought ourselves to take the Olympic Games altogether seriously. To be entirely frank, they have not appeared to us to stand for the best in amateur sport; and it is undeniably true that the Olympic Stadium cannot have, and probably never will acquire, the atmosphere of Lord's, of Henley, of Cowes, or Wimbledon, or Queen's Club on the day of the University Sports. Measured by the standards to which we are accustomed, the Olympic Games have seemed to us to be rather second-rate things; and herein our very strength has been our

weakness. Other countries have no Lord's or Henley or Wimbledon. To them the Olympic Games stand alone, representing the very best. They have no 'Grand' and no 'All-comers' prize, and they do not understand how it is possible, nor do they believe us when we tell them, that the winning of these is more coveted than victory in the Olympic Regatta or on the Olympic lawn-tennis courts. This year the lawn tennis at Stockholm suffered not a little by conflict with the Wimbledon tournament; and the Games must always conflict with one or another of our meetings, be it Henley or Bisley or Wimbledon. It is reasonably certain that, unless we change our national point of view, our best men (or crews or teams, as the case may be) will not care four years hence to 'cut' our own meetings for the sake of going to Berlin. Other nations, however, will not understand our motives. They will only know that in the aggregate we fail to win points. Nor, perhaps, will they be sorry. But the actual clashing of dates, and the consequent loss of so many points in an individual event, is of less importance than the underlying fact that we alone of all peoples possess fixtures of our own of such importance that they make us think a little contemptuously of Olympic honours. As long as we place our own events first and take part in the Games only more or less incidentally and as it happens to suit us, so long must we be at a disadvantage as compared with those countries which are concentrating their efforts through the whole four-year period in bringing to the scratch their perfect strength in every competition which the new Olympiad will offer.

"Our strength, also, begets weakness in another way. If we had not played our games so much, and organized them so thoroughly in the past, we should not now have Governing Bodies which, while so useful (both in organizing the sports at home and as guarantors of a certain standard of amateurship), have, by allowing their sensitiveness and jealousy to weigh with them, been a serious embarrassment in securing representation at the Games by our full strength. In most other countries the Olympic authorities are, at least for Olympic purposes, supreme. They do not have to consider the sensitiveness and rivalry of old and deeply entrenched associations; nor do the people of other countries understand how that sensitiveness and rivalry can be permitted to stand in the way of 'patriotism.'

GAMES *versus* ATHLETICS.

"It is, again, to our disadvantage, from the Olympic point of view, that in Great Britain we attach so much larger importance to games than we do to pure athletics. As a nation we do not think much of track athletics. Crowds will not flock to an athletic meeting as they do to football and cricket matches; and at our public schools (and this is even more true

of the universities), while any talent that a boy may possess for games is certain to be brought out and developed, hardly any inducement is held out to him to find out what he is worth on the running path or at the jumps. When we produce, as not seldom we do produce, an athlete of the first rank, it is more or less by accident. The circumstances are different on the Continent and in the United States. And if we neglect track athletics, still more do we ignore gymnastics; and in the Stockholm Stadium, at the march-past of all the nations, it was impossible not to contrast the rather shambling, motley appearance of the mass of the British competitors with the magnificent marching and truly superb physique of the bands of trained gymnasts from, especially, the Scandinavian countries, and with the smart and businesslike look of the American contingent.

"We may believe, and we may rightly believe, that the discipline of our games is better for us as a people than the discipline of the track or the gymnasium. Just as we should be sorry to see our young officers forsake their polo and hunting for the pretty tricks of 'prize riding,' so it may well be that a hundred football players or cricketers are likely to be better men for the Empire's work than an equal number of the best trained gymnasts; and most of us know from our own observation that the development of muscle by no means breeds either initiative or resourcefulness in a man. The most beautifully developed gymnast, indeed, is often peculiarly *gauche* and inept at everything but his own speciality.

"But we are now, however, considering the world's opinion and our standing as compared with other nations in the Olympic Games. . . . More and more the nations of the world will base their estimates of the physical capacity of any people on its success as measured by its standing in points scored in the Olympic arena. Nor will much account be taken of the character of the competitions in which the points are scored. A certain especial *kudos* will always attach to the winning of a particular event, as of the 'Marathon' Race, but in general the peoples will look only at results and will aim, each in its degree, to pick up all such unconsidered trifles as the odd points in minor competitions. What will ultimately be reckoned to a nation's credit is its standing in total points in the whole meeting.

GOOD MATERIAL.

"In the background, of course, is our national disinclination to subject ourselves to discipline. The earnestness, for instance, with which the Swedes as a people are training, or with which the Americans have set themselves to conform to Olympic standards, is perhaps of a type to which our genius is not adaptable. Perhaps we are willing that so it should remain. Few

of us would care to see England take its games quite in the American spirit, and the admiration which we feel for those splendid bands of Scandinavian gymnasts is not unmingled, in the case of most of us, with a certain shamed contempt. But the choice is now plainly before us whether we shall hold to our present ways or whether we shall go with the rest of the world. It is, as the Americans would say, 'up to us' to decide. We have been pre-eminent in the field of sport in the past; but a new tribunal with new standards has been set up, and if we cling to our old traditions, we must be content to be ranked by that tribunal not first or even second among the nations. If we would hold our place we must conform to the new standards, adopt the new methods, and meet the world on even terms under the new conditions. We may question if the Olympic Games are good either in their influence on the spirit of sportsmanship or in their effect on international relations of a larger kind. We may regret that the Games were ever instituted. But, if we withdrew from them now, we should inevitably be regarded as having done so in petulance and under the mortification of defeat. We can continue to compete in our present random way, and be satisfied to let the world think of us as only 'second-raters' in the field of sport. Or we can set ourselves to take the Games seriously, and, by proper training, with enthusiasm and better management, bring our men and teams to the post in something like the condition and spirit which characterizes the Americans.

"That we have at least as good material as any country is universally acknowledged, and in no quarter more readily than among the trainers and experts of the other countries. But if we are to hold our own that material must be differently used. We must search out our best men, not at random, but systematically and continuously, and see that they are properly trained and coached. We must turn attention to many sports which we now neglect. We must have a competent and authoritative body in charge of the machinery for the selection and preparation of our representatives, which will see that they are put into the Stadium in a condition to do themselves justice. To attain all this will require a much larger popular interest in the Olympic Games than has been awakened so far; and that popular interest must be made manifest in the subscription of ample funds." (*The Times*, July 27, 1912.)

THE MATTER OF FUNDS.

In the Parliamentary Report in *The Times* of March 24, 1906, appeared the following paragraph:—

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER, replying to Mr. WATT, who asked whether, in view of the fact

that the French Government has granted 10,000*l.* towards the expenses of competitors at the approaching Olympic Games, and that the German and United States Governments have also made grants for the same purpose, he will make a similar donation from the British Exchequer for British competitors, says :— I have received no application for such a donation, and as at present advised I see no reason for granting any subsidy from public funds.

• Applications for Government appropriations in aid of our organization for the Games have been made since then, but with no better result. Nearly all the European Governments now make grants towards the expense of participation in the Games. In the United States there is no such grant because it is not needed. If Congress were asked for money, it would give it immediately; but such a course has not been necessary because the popular enthusiasm for the Games is such that private liberality has always been ready to furnish all the funds required. In England we have no grant; but unfortunately, in the absence of any popular enthusiasm, the raising of funds by private subscription has been very difficult.

THE EXPENSES OF 1908.

The celebration of the Games in London in 1908 of course called for the expenditure of money. By the "happy collaboration" which has been already spoken of between the British Olympic Association and the management of the Franco-British Exposition at Shepherd's-bush, the Association was relieved of all cost in connexion with the building of the Stadium. It is understood that the Stadium at Shepherd's-bush cost about £60,000. But besides building the Stadium, the Exposition agreed, in consideration of the Games being held in immediate proximity to the Exposition, to give the British Olympic Council a share of the Stadium "gate-money," on which it advanced to the Olympic Association the sum of £2,000 for urgent working expenses. Ultimately the Exposition handed over to the Olympic Council the sum of £6,007 1*6s.* 6*d.* The Council's general "administrative expenses" (including £2,000 for stationery and printing, and £1,317 for salaries) amounted to £4,410. The medals, badges, and diplomas cost £2,200, and the expense of police supervision, &c., was £979. In addition £2,231 was given as grants to various governing bodies of sports to assist them in preparing for and being represented at the Games. These items made a total necessary expenditure of £9,820, with postage, rent, and various minor expenses to be considered and no provision in sight for the entertainment of visiting athletes, or foreigners of distinction. Evidently the £6,000 received from the Exposition would not pay the inevitable expenses.

So at the last moment a fund for public subscriptions was opened by the *Daily Mail* which produced £15,851.

THE FUND FOR 1912.

The Council was enabled to spend £5,271 on entertainment and, after all minor calls had been

settled, it was left with a balance of £6,377 1*5s.* 9*d.* in hand. That, with some infinitesimal additions from private subscriptions, has been all the money that was available for the expenses during the next four years and all the cost of our representation at Stockholm. The British Olympic Council made some efforts to obtain further funds by issuing appeals for subscriptions, but the "public apathy" refused to be moved and the response was negligible. The sending out of 17,000 circulars brought in the discouraging harvest of three life members to the British Olympic Association and 31 subscribing members. In a "Preliminary Report" on the Games of 1912 the British Olympic Council insisted that "the failure to raise adequate funds was due to the apathy of the public and not to want of effort on the part of the British Olympic Council."

IV.—THE NEED OF REFORM.

The general public, not given to a close analysis of details, was satisfied with the results of the London Games of 1908. With the assistance of a wide programme, including most of the sports which were in the United Kingdom habitually practised, and having the advantage of competing at home, we had shown a crushing superiority over other countries. True, our performances in the running and field events in the Stadium had been humiliating; but in the whole Games we had earned more points than all the rest of the world put together. We have seen, however, in articles from *The Times* reproduced above, that the feeling of satisfaction was not universal. The evidences of our lack of thorough training and of our old happy-go-lucky way of doing things had been evident enough to anyone who had eyes to see them even at the Games in London, and there were those who trembled for what would happen when we came to meet the other peoples on less favourable terms in a foreign country. As time passed and there was no sign of any serious awakening to the danger that awaited us at Stockholm, while more than one of our sports were disturbed by internal dissensions, the need of some drastic reform became more and more imperative. And the conviction had been gaining ground that the British Olympic Council was, by its constitution, not the body so to introduce such a reform as to make it effective.

V.—THE BEGINNING OF REFORM.

The British Olympic Council, it has been explained, is made up of representatives from each of the governing bodies in the various sports. At present it has 46 members (according to the last published official document), representing some 30 different governing bodies, with additions from Oxford and Cambridge, the War Office, Hurlingham, the National Physical Recreation Society, and other bodies, and the directors of Naval and Military Gymnasia respectively. At the beginning of 1912 things were not altogether harmonious at the Council meetings, and, in any event, the body

seemed too big and unwieldy to be able to furnish the prompt and energetic management which the control of the Olympic affairs demanded. Rightly or wrongly, the athletic and sporting public, in spite of the universally high regard in which the chairman, Lord Desborough, as well as many of his individual associates, was held, had lost confidence in the Council. The dissatisfaction found utterance in an article which appeared in *The Times* on January 16, 1912, the immediate cause which prompted it being the quarrel then in progress between the Football Association and the Amateur Football Association, which threatened to result (as it did result) in our being represented at Stockholm by a football team from which at least half our best men would be, as they were, excluded. The situation in football was taken, as may be seen from the quotation below, as symptomatic of the general constitutional inability of the Council to secure our effective representation at the Games.

"THE TIMES" AND THE COUNCIL.

On January 16, 1912, *The Times* said :—

"Preparations to secure the proper representation of England in the Olympic Games, which will be held in Stockholm next July, should by now be far advanced towards completion, but the British Olympic Council, which meets to-day, is torn by internal dissension, which has caused much uneasy apprehension for some time in the minds of the sporting public. The murmurings of discontent have lately found very candid expression in the Press, and the time has come when public opinion must be enforced. There are many who are on principle opposed to international contests of all kinds as productive of dangerous friction and misunderstanding. There is unfortunately much reason in such an attitude, and it is doubly justified if our credit as sportsmen and players of games is not bravely upheld by representative competitors in each class. There is at present a deadlock between the Amateur Football Association and the Football Association which could not possibly occur if the control and management of the Olympic Games were in competent hands. There are many institutions in England which, although quite illogical in theory, work extremely well, and where practice is satisfactory there is no need to quarrel with theory. The constitution of the Olympic Council is quite anomalous, and it is difficult to realize how such an unwieldy body can have come into existence."

Then followed an outline of the difficulties in regard to the two football associations, concluding with a reference to the control of the fund of "some £6,000" remaining in the hands of the Council from the Games of 1908.

The article provoked rejoinder from officers and members of the Council, and a controversy raged in the columns of *The Times*, which, being taken up by the Press at large, served to focus attention on the Council and its management of our Olympic affairs. Nothing would be gained by going into the details of that controversy now. Lord Desborough (in a letter published in *The Times* on January 18, 1912) in defence of the British Olympic Council, explained how the Council came to be

formed to organize, at short notice, the Games of 1908, when "it was felt to be essential that the body which undertook that organization should be so constituted as to include at least one representative of every sport which could possibly find a place in the Olympic Games. It was the only possible method by which a due regard for the interest of all sports could be secured and the efficient carrying out of the competitions in all sports could be guaranteed." The British Olympic Council, Lord Desborough said, "has never been, and has never claimed to be, a universal governing body of British sport," but "is nothing more than a Parliament of sport."

This was, in effect, what the opponents of the Council contended. That it was the proper form for it to take in view of the specific objects for which it was formed (viz., the organization of the Games of 1908) is doubtless true. That, as a "Parliament of sport," it had and will always have useful and important functions may be agreed on all hands. Everybody may have a great respect for the individual members which compose it. But some smaller, more energetic, and more alert body was necessary to arouse public sentiment and to take hold of the organizing for the Games of 1912 in a thorough and efficient way. Writers in *The Times* urged Lord Desborough and the Olympic Council to anticipate any pressure from the outside and themselves to take in hand the formation of such a new body.

NEED OF A SMALLER COMMITTEE.

On January 25, 1912, *The Times* said :—

"If the Council is not now, and cannot be made, fit to do what the public has supposed that it was created to do, some other body must be formed to do it; and here comes in the proposal of a smaller committee framed on some such lines as have been indicated. The wonder is that the members of the British Olympic Council do not compete for the honour of being the first to propose that Lord Desborough take the formation of such a committee in hand. The Council might, from its present membership, associate with him anybody else it pleased, with instructions that they should call to their assistance such others from outside as they might see fit, to form a committee of, perhaps, not more than seven members, whose business it should be to see that Great Britain was properly represented at the Olympic Games. There is no lack of men worthy, some of whom at least would be willing, to act on such a body; the names come tumbling over each other as soon as one stops to think of them. Such a committee would not, of course, concern itself with the actual work of selecting teams or representatives; nor need it be invested with any power to do so. But, under a general mandate to see that Great Britain was not misrepresented or disgraced, it would, quarrels or no quarrels, quickly find a way to carry out its mission, and to set a precedent which would make a repetition of the like trouble in any future Olympiad impossible. The public would uphold it and rejoice. Lord Desborough is, most appropriately, at the head of an organization which is charged with a task of national importance; for it is of national importance that Great Britain, the mother of sports in the modern world, should show that she sympathizes, and sympathizes as a unit, with

the ideals which inspire this revival of the ancient festival."

INADEQUACY OF THE COUNCIL.

Again, three weeks later, attention was called to the fact that, with the Stockholm Games now only five months away, there were departments of sport in which "no satisfactory arrangement has been made for our proper representation":—

"The public has, of course, only one interest in the matter—namely, that Great Britain shall not be placed in a false position in the eyes of other nations by being inadequately represented. It does not care what the machinery may be by which that end is attained; but it has heretofore rested easily in the belief that such machinery existed in the British Olympic Council. By confession of the Council itself, it now appears that that body is inadequate, and disclaims any pretensions, to be able to do what has been expected of it; in which case the public has an undoubted right to insist that other and more competent machinery shall be provided. Suggestions have already been abundantly put forward as to how that can be achieved; as by the constitution of a new and less unwieldy body, which will be invested with proper authority to safeguard national interest and will, at the same time, command the public sympathy and respect. The right power to constitute such a body appears to be the Olympic Council itself; and it would be deplorable if the Council should decline or fail to take action until new troubles have developed, more serious perhaps than those now existing, which will compel interference from outside." (*The Times*, Feb. 14, 1912.)

The Council, however, declined to take any such action as was thus urged upon it, and we went to Stockholm unrepresented in several competitions, half represented in others, and with the same slipshod and inadequate preparation as had been shown at former Games even more conspicuous. Inasmuch as, in the meanwhile, other countries had been concentrating on the Games with much greater earnestness than ever before, the result was inevitable.

RESULTS AT STOCKHOLM.

We have already compared the results of the Games of 1912 with those of 1908 and seen what extenuating circumstances there were to account for our descent from a pre-eminent first place to a moderate third. In the former comparison the figures were given as translated into the method of scoring in 1908. The following table gives the list of nations scoring points in 1912 with the number of points gained by each under the method of scoring used at Stockholm, as officially published immediately after the close of the Games. This is, as has been said above, on the basis of three points for a first place, two for a second, and one for a third:—

Country.	Points.	Country.	Points.
Sweden ..	133	Norway ..	16
America ..	129	Canada ..	13
Great Britain ..	76	Italy ..	13
Finland ..	52	Australia ..	13
Germany ..	47	Belgium ..	11
France ..	32	Austria ..	6
Denmark ..	19	Russia ..	6
South Africa ..	16	Greece ..	4
Hungary ..	16	Holland ..	3

By the subsequent disqualification of Thorpe for professionalism, the United States surrendered five points, of which four would go to Sweden and one to Norway, making their totals 137 and 17 respectively. The combined score for the British Empire was 118 1-3:—

United Kingdom ..	76
South Africa ..	16
Canada ..	13 1-3
Australia ..	13

118 1-3

How these points were scored is shown in the following table:—

THE BRITISH EMPIRE.

	United Kingdom.	South Africa.	Canada.	Australasia.	Total.
Athletics ..	15	5	*7 1-3	—	27 1-3
Cycling ..	4	3	—	—	7
Fencing ..	2	—	—	—	2
Football ..	3	—	—	—	3
Gymnastics ..	1	—	—	—	1
Lawn Tennis:					
Covered Courts	12	—	—	1	13
Open Air ..	—	8	—	—	8
Rowing ..	10	—	—	—	10
Shooting ..	15	—	—	—	15
Swimming:					
Men ..	9	—	6	7	22
Women ..	5	—	—	5	10
Military Riding	—	—	—	—	—
Wrestling ..	—	—	—	—	—
Yachting ..	—	—	—	—	—
Totals ..	76	16	13 1-3	13	118 1-3

FINE PERFORMANCES.

It may be remarked that, meagre as this score is, it includes some very fine performances and the winning of a number of the most important events. First in the mile, first and second in the Marathon race, first and second in the long-distance walk, first and second in the open-air lawn tennis, first in football, first and second in the eights and first in the sculls, first and second in the 200-mile bicycle race and seven firsts in swimming, besides the water polo—this, in the importance of the competitions, is a vastly more creditable bunch of victories than any gained by any other country, except the magnificent series of performances of the Americans in the short-distance running and field events in the Stadium. But "our ideal is not the Olympic ideal." One victory counts no more than another, and, when all excuses are made, the fact remains that the aggregate number of points gained was sadly disappointing. And the sting of the defeat lay in the knowledge that we are entitled to something so much better.

* Tie with two others for third place in the pole vault.

It was the same story as has already been told of inadequate training and organization and slovenly management on the spot.

LACK OF MANAGEMENT.

The judgment of *The Times* Special Correspondent at Stockholm was expressed as follows :—

"Much might be written on the subject of the accommodation and handling of our men at Stockholm—of the crowding in inadequate sleeping quarters, of the unsuitable food provided, of the lack of discipline, and the futility of the training instructions. It is a fact that certainly the majority, and probably the whole number, of the British track athletes at Stockholm lost weight to an extent which in some individual cases amounted to over a stone. For men in training they were quite improperly nourished. The idea which has obtained currency, that the majority of them neglected training altogether, is untrue and unjust to the men. The majority did their best to keep in condition (though there were notorious exceptions), but that they did so was to their individual credit; nothing was done to put any heart or enthusiasm into them, to bring them to the post either physically fit or morally confident. There was probably not one of them but felt acutely that he ran, as it were, unbacked and single-handed against competitors made fit, by careful handling, to the last ounce, full of enthusiasm and *esprit de corps*, completely versed in all the technique of the track and the science of winning races. It was unfair to our men and unfair to our national interests. It is not the Olympic management under which, if we are to compete at all in the future, we can hope to compete successfully." (*The Times*, July 29, 1912.)

The British Olympic Council did not deny that in many respects our arrangements were inadequate, but pleaded that they were the best that could be made with the inadequate funds available. However valid the plea may have been, the feeling was widespread that a more energetic, less unwieldy, body than the British Olympic Council would somehow have managed to do better. Controversy once more raged in the Press, which was brought to a head by a letter from Sir Arthur Conan Doyle to *The Times* published on August 8, 1912, in which he recurred to and urged the adoption of the reform which *The Times* had proposed in the previous winter.

SIR ARTHUR CONAN DOYLE'S LETTER.

This letter from Sir Arthur Conan Doyle may be repeated in full. He wrote :—

"The debate as to our preparations for the next Olympic Games tends to take the shape of recrimination rather than of construction. Might I appeal to all concerned to let bygones be bygones, and to centre our efforts upon the future? The scoring of debating points over each other only darkens counsel. The chief offender in the past has been the easy-going public, which has not taken an interest until our comparative failure at Stockholm came to waken it out of its indifference. The first step now is that every one should be magnanimous enough to forget any quarrels of the past, to express regret for them, and to unite with the one unselfish ideal of forming the best instrument for the purpose in hand.

"I am aware that I speak with no authority

upon such a subject, but I have the advantage of complete independence since I do not belong now, and never could in the future, to any governing body, nor have I taken sides in any altercation. Perhaps, then, I may be allowed to make a suggestion as to organization. It is clear that this matter must be set right and endorsed by Press and public before any appeal for funds upon a large scale will have any chance of success.

"The Olympic Association of the past has worked against the great difficulty of public apathy. It has done some particularly good work—especially in the matter of the London Games, which will probably fix the Olympic type for ever. The Council consists of about 50 members, who include the presidents or representatives of nearly every branch of sport. Such a body is, as it seems to me, far too valuable to dissolve, and should always be retained as a final court of appeal in which any matter affecting the general policy of Great Britain towards the Games might be discussed and settled.

"It is clear, however, that such a gathering is much too large for executive purposes. The smaller a body the more does each member feel his personal responsibility and the greater the results achieved. The ideal executive committee would, as it seems to me, consist of a nucleus of four or five from the present Olympic Association, with as many more co-opted from outside—not only from the universities, but from popular athletic bodies throughout the country, and from men of affairs who are outside the ordinary circles of sport. Various committees for finance, training, and other purposes could be formed in such a way, each with wide powers in its own department. Such an arrangement would have the advantage that it could be taken in hand by the Association and put through without delay.

"My contention is that if some practical organization of this sort could be at once formed and gain the general endorsement and confidence of the public, we could then appeal for the large sum which will be needed without any danger of being refused. The public will want to know in advance what it is going to get for its money. If they see a definite practical scheme, and if the names which guarantee it show that the ranks are closed and all are of one mind, we shall have overcome the greatest difficulty which lies between us and Berlin."

In publishing the letter *The Times* added an editorial footnote, which said :—

"We are glad to be able to endorse Sir Arthur Conan Doyle's proposals. We are prepared to assure the Olympic Association that we quite recognize the unselfishness of their work and the individual devotion of members. We have thought it our duty in the past to point out matters of organization which were certainly capable of improvement, but such an addition of co-opted members as is here suggested would, we feel sure, be acceptable to the sporting public, who would without doubt examine with sympathy any programme recommended by such a body." (*The Times*, Aug. 8, 1912.)

This was the starting point of the serious effort at reform which has since been made.

VI.—FOR AND AGAINST THE GAMES.

The suggestions made by Sir Arthur Conan Doyle were not universally accepted without criticism. Mr. R. C. Lehmann was reported in *The Times* of July 21, 1912, as speaking in

opposition to the Games in an address to the boys at Highgate School :—

He said they were passing through a period of pessimism in regard to their national thews and sinews. He did not think it was justified.

It happened that in the Olympic Games at Stockholm our track athletes had not done so well as those who were trained on a peculiar system by another country. To do thoroughly well in those conditions they would have to make professional slaves of the boys or men who took part. He did not think so great an orgie of athletics, even although it only took place once in four years, was really a good thing.

The simple and natural proceedings of their home sports among one another were far better. A few years ago there was talk about "flannelled fools at the wicket and muddled oafs at the goals." Now they were taunted with not being flannelled enough and not sufficiently muddled. Let them observe moderation in these things. He had been an observer of the youth of the country for many years and he was confident that they had men still able to sustain the honour of this country in any sport so long as it was pursued, not on a professional basis, but on the purely amateur system in which they all delighted.

Subsequently, in an interview (published in *The Observer* on August 4, 1912), Mr. Lehmann said :—

"If England is to continue as a competitor in these Games, and I most sincerely hope she will not, then it is obvious that something must be done to put us on a plane of equality with the other nations. I understand it is proposed that a considerable sum of money should be expended during the next four years, in preparing athletes for the Games at Berlin. The methods of other nations, most notably America, are to be copied. Professional trainers are to be employed. Specialization will be rife, and sport will become a profession. Mind, I do not say the competitor will become a professional, but he will make what hitherto was a game so important that it will become a profession.

"The scheme that is being put before the public means specialization, and I cannot help saying that, in my opinion, sport would be ruined. The old idea of 'games for games' sake would go altogether. And such training and team development could, I think, only result in 'track tactics,' by which I mean the prevention of some one else winning when you cannot win yourself, so as to allow another of your own countrymen to win."

The expression of his views by Mr. Lehmann called forth the following letter from Mr. Hugh Legge in *The Times* of August 10 :—

"I venture to assert that there is a large number of folk who would be heartily glad if we avoided the Olympic Games altogether, in the interests of amateur sport.

"Many of the reasons for holding this view were admirably set forth by Mr. R. C. Lehmann in a speech to the boys at Highgate School reported in *The Times*. Apart from the questionable expedient of a general public subscription to enable amateurs to indulge freely in their favourite pastimes and the questionable methods which experience shows are certain to be adopted on occasion in a series of contests like the Olympic, it is surely not good that the spirited competitions between friends and neighbours at home should be regarded as technical schools for the production of specialists who are to meet specialists

abroad, or should be complicated by the introduction of strange pastimes, which elongate the programme without widening the public interest in sport for its own sake.

"Imagine the luckless 'Blues Committee' at Oxford and Cambridge next term being confronted with the demand that discus and javelin throwing shall be included in the annual match at Queen's Club, and a 'Blue' conceded therefor! (The latter amusement, by the way, is forbidden by the university statutes at Oxford, unless the proctors can be persuaded that it is identical with carrying a bow and arrows for fun. *Titulus XV. § 10. 'Statutum est quod nullus academicus, aut alius intra Universitatis ambitum, sive offensiva, sive defensiva arma vel tela de die vel de nocte gestet, exceptis qui honestæ recreations causa arcus cum sagittis portaverint.'*)

"There are, Sir, many who do not care two straws who wins at the Olympic Games, but they are deeply concerned for the interests of amateur sport, and they are by no means convinced that these interests will be served if the proposals which are now being set forth are carried out. Perhaps this partly accounts for 'the great difficulty of public apathy' alluded to by Sir Arthur Conan Doyle."

SUPPORT FOR REORGANIZATION.

The great weight of sentiment was, however, obviously in favour of Sir Arthur Conan Doyle's proposals. Some of the principal letters published in *The Times* may be quoted. On August 14 Mr. G. R. L. Anderson wrote :—

"It is perhaps a little unfortunate that Mr. Legge's suggestion that Great Britain should withdraw from the Olympic Games was not made a month before instead of a month after this year's competitions at Stockholm. We might then have stepped gracefully aside to contemplate the younger nations striving in the arena which we had once adorned, and cried 'Bless you, my children.'

"But now it is too late to stand upon our dignity and declare we are too grand to play. It is too late to say that we are old-fashioned, respectable people, who cannot be expected to compete with foreigners in these questionable sports. We have competed; and if we announce to the world in Mr. Legge's words that in the interests of amateur sport we mean to avoid the Olympic Games in the future, we shall convince nobody, least of all ourselves. Nor is it fair to all concerned to explain that we dare not risk our athletes being contaminated by the doubtful methods certain to be adopted at the Olympic Games, and that we do not wish our homely little sports to be converted into schools for the production of specialists, without first consulting the athletes themselves. And any one of those who competed at Stockholm will gladly admit that the average American or Swede is every whit as good a sportsman as the average Englishman, while the attempts made by many English newspapers to ascribe our failures to the unfair tactics of foreign competitors did not make defeat any the sweeter. He will go on to say that we were beaten because athletes in Great Britain have not studied the technique of their sport in the thoroughgoing manner which has been so successful in American athletics, and, I may add, in English rowing, in the science of which there is no greater expert than Mr. Legge himself.

"Whether or not we organize our athletics before the next Olympiad, it is inevitable that British competitors will travel to Berlin in 1916; they cannot be expected to stay at home in deference to views with which they may not agree, or to be

satisfied with parochial sports when they have the chance of representing their country. Go they will; no arguments can make any difference to the fact. It only remains to settle whether the British contingent is to consist of a keen but inglorious mob, or of a properly selected, properly trained team which will, it is to be hoped, do credit to the country."

AN AMERICAN OPINION.

An American athlete's views were given in a letter from Mr. Edward R. Bushnell on August 9. He wrote:—

"Will you permit an American to take part in the very interesting debate you have been conducting in your columns on England's future relation to Olympic athletics? Every Anglo-Saxon knows that your pride will not allow you to consider seriously the suggestion that you withdraw from participation in future Olympic meets; nor would such action be justified on any grounds in a nation which has done what yours has for the development of amateur sport.

"What I wish to call to the attention of your readers is the unfair assumption on the part of so many Englishmen that to be successful in future Olympic meets requires that you copy the alleged 'semi-professional' methods used to develop America's teams. We do not object to being copied, but we do protest against the implication that our methods are any less amateur than yours.

" 'Specialization' and 'track tactics' are the terms employed most frequently by our critics here, the apparent purpose being to imply that these refer to some unfair advantage which we employ. The superiority America enjoys is the result of scientific coaching. A few years ago one of our keen Philadelphia business men developed the idea of 'scientific management' applied to industry, by which he meant securing the maximum efficiency with the minimum expenditure of energy. That is the principle we have applied to athletics, and it is the sole explanation of our successes. You yourselves employ it in cricket and rowing. Why not in athletics?

"Let me give a concrete example of what this principle has done for our athletics. About 20 years ago M. C. Murphy, who coached the 1908 and 1912 American teams, introduced the crouching start for sprinters. As the result of experiments he had found that it increased the speed of his sprinters from one to two yards for 100 yards over the old standing start. Now this method is world-wide in its use. Next he taught his sprinters at what distance from the start the athlete should be running erect without injuring his stride. The result was to get the maximum speed from the minimum effort. What has been done in sprinting has been done in hurdling, jumping, and throwing the weights. We frankly admit that for our superiority in distance running we used England as our model.

"A most important factor in our strength for 1916 will be the result of the enthusiasm created by the 1912 performances. Every schoolboy in the country with athletic ambitions will wish to represent America four years hence. This is only natural, and if there were a similar enthusiasm in England, coupled with the adoption of a 'system' to your coaching, there would be no occasion for this general lament over the results of your 1912 performances at Stockholm."

Mr. W. R. M. Leake wrote, from Dulwich College Preparatory School, on August 19:—

"To an old athlete and a teacher of games at this present time to renounce the Olympic Games would seem almost an act of cowardice. If we have helped

to create in the mind of the world a belief in games, may we not still help to show how truly to play them? The curse of the Olympic Games is the thought of losing (or winning). Is it not the essence of a game that this thought should be subsidiary? Let the man do his best, and may the best man win! The true function of a game is to teach nobility in competition. It is immaterial to the Empire whether England or Australia shall win the Final Test, for 'the heart and the hump of the whole' is the game and the spirit thereof."

"TRACK TACTICS AND AMATEUR SPORT."

The controversy was at the same time being carried on in the columns of the Press in general, on much the same general lines, and it was evident that a good many people in the country sympathized with the views of Mr. Lehmann and Mr. Legge. *The Times* Special Correspondent at Stockholm summed up the situation in a letter on August 20:—

"There seems to be a number of people in England, for whom so far Mr. R. C. Lehmann has been the spokesman, who have an idea that if we set ourselves in earnest to compete with honour at the Olympic Games amateur sport in Great Britain is somehow going to be debased and 'professionalized.' But it is difficult to think that any of those who at present hold this opinion seriously believe that there is any danger of the sporting spirit at either our universities or our public schools becoming corrupted, or of our undergraduate runners degenerating into exponents of the beauties of 'track tactics.' What is really likely (indeed it is certain within one or two Olympiads) is that 'track tactics' themselves will become obsolete in the Stadium. There was a good deal of disgust—by no means confined to Englishmen—in Stockholm this year, and if the pressure of public sentiment has not killed some of the practices which were there exhibited before the meeting in Berlin, they will certainly be stopped (and it is one thing for which the British representatives on the International Olympic Council should press) by all possible events being run in strings. Those who have charge of affairs at Berlin are not likely to forget how Germany's best runner suffered this year from interference on the track. British runners are not going to adopt 'track tactics'; but they do hope to help to kill them. And they certainly cannot do it by withdrawing from the Games.

"As for the great mass of the youths of the nation, outside our public schools and universities, it will undoubtedly be to their advantage and to the physical betterment of the race if they are encouraged to take a larger interest in athletics than they do at present; and if that encouragement is given under the right auspices, radiating from a central authority which itself has the best interest of amateur sport at heart, the effect can hardly fail to be to raise the standard of the sporting spirit throughout the country rather than to debase it.

"There seems, moreover, to be no little confusion between the so-called 'track tactics' and the mere technique of running. To put all consideration of the former aside, what is quite certain is that year by year the Olympic standards are going to be raised and every world's 'record' lowered; and unless our athletes keep abreast of what is being done by other countries, at least to the extent of learning how to run properly, the British performances will fall further and further below the general standard. There is no talk of our ceasing to play our games for the games' sake, nor need we make the scoring of

points in the Stadium the end of our athletic lives. But we can, and ought to, use training for the Olympic Games as an instrument for our own national improvement.

"As for the new sports (throwing the discus and javelin, the standing jumps, hop-step-and-jump and pole vault), it would do us no harm to practise some of them. It might not even be a bad thing if the last-named became an item in the programme of the inter-university sports, an honour which, at present at least, no one, of course, contemplates for most of them. It is not, however, likely that in four years we can make ourselves proficient enough at any of these to be able to win points in them at Berlin. Nor is it immediately necessary that we should. What is necessary is that we should do the things which we do already better than we are doing them now; and the United States, it must be remembered, scored 129 points to Great Britain's 76 without so much as entering for the Lawn Tennis, Yachting, Football, or Rowing, and with the assistance of only one point in Riding and none in Fencing.

"As for withdrawing from the Games altogether, it is not good for a competitor in anything, having tried and been beaten, to sulk and say that the competition is not good enough to try again."

VII.—THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE.

It is not possible to give here even a summary of all the points brought up in the controversy which raged through the summer and autumn of 1912 around the question of British representation at the next Games, but the weight of sentiment appeared so overwhelmingly in favour of the formation of a new and smaller body which would actively take in hand the organization of our affairs for the Berlin Games, that negotiations were started with the cooperation of the British Olympic Council. The plan worked upon was to form a new Special Committee consisting of 11 members, five of which should be nominated by the British Olympic Council from among its own members, and five should be selected from the public at large, with a chairman who was agreeable to all parties. It was evident that membership of the Committee would not be a sinecure. There was a great deal of work to be done, and it was difficult to find gentlemen of authority in sporting affairs whose names would have weight with the public and who could afford, and were willing, to give so much of their time as would be required to what might prove a thankless task. It was not until March 14, 1913, that the composition of the Committee was announced in *The Times*, as follows on behalf of the British Olympic Council:—

CONSTITUTION OF THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE.

"The Council of the British Olympic Association have felt that, in view of the limited support afforded them in their preparation for the Games of 1912, and the absolute necessity that Great Britain should be adequately represented at Berlin in 1916, it was advisable to accept outside assistance proffered to them with the object of bringing them into closer touch with the public. In the considerable controversy which followed the last Games it was evident that an opinion was generally prevalent that

a body of smaller dimensions than the Council might appeal more effectively to the public, also that it would make such a body more representative of the general feeling if half the members were independent of the Council. At the same time, it was clearly recognized as impossible for the Council to abrogate its functions, because on that Council sit the accredited representatives of every form of sport, and it is the bedrock of British amateur sport that each section of it should manage its own affairs.

"It has therefore been decided to constitute a 'Special Committee for the Olympic Games of Berlin,' composed in equal proportions of members and non-members of the British Olympic Council, which shall be charged with the control of the financial arrangements connected with the British preparation for the Olympic Games of Berlin, 1916.

"To adjust the respective functions of this new Committee and the British Olympic Council has been a work of some delicacy, but those who have been concerned in it trust that a result has now been obtained which will command that support from the nation without which success is impossible.

"The first task was to complete this new Committee. It is hoped that the names finally adopted will command the complete confidence of the public. They are:—

Chairman.—Mr. J. E. K. Studd.	
Mr. A. E. D. Anderson	Mr. P. L. Fisher
Mr. B. J. T. Bosanquet	Mr. H. W. Forster, M.P.
Mr. T. A. Cook	Mr. J. C. Hurd
Mr. E. Mackay-Edgar	Mr. G. S. Robertson
Sir A. Conan Doyle.	

"Of these, the chairman, apart from his fame as a cricketer, has had very considerable administrative experience as President and Chairman of the Polytechnic, and will be generally regarded as singularly qualified to preside over the work which the new Committee will have to undertake.

"Mr. Fisher and Mr. Hurd are the honorary secretary and ex-honorary secretary respectively of the Amateur Athletic Association and of the Amateur Swimming Association.

"Mr. Forster and Mr. Bosanquet are well known as all-round sportsmen representing the best amateur traditions.

"Mr. Robertson has been associated either as a competitor or judge with many Olympic Games and is the honorary legal adviser of the Council.

"Mr. Edgar, though associated with amateur sport, is present as the financial adviser of the Committee.

"Mr. Cook is editor of the *Field*, has captained an Olympic fencing team, and is a British representative on the International Olympic Committee.

"Mr. A. E. D. Anderson represents track athletics.

"Sir Arthur Conan Doyle, who has given much time and work to the forming of the new organization, will serve upon it for at least a year.

"One other member will shortly be nominated.*

"It is now necessary to define the functions of the 'Special Committee for the Olympic Games of Berlin.' The chief function is that they shall be trustees of the public fund, that no portion of that fund can be spent without their assent, and no measure involving an expenditure from the public fund can be adopted except upon their recommendation.

"Each branch of sport in this country is self-governing. Each makes its own arrangements for the Olympic contests. But, where in those arrangements extra money is needed, it has to come to the British Olympic Council for the means to carry out its scheme, and the British Olympic Council must refer the application to the 'Special Committee,' without whose consent no grant can be made. Thus the Committee has a practical veto upon everything that is done, and the public has a guarantee that whatever sum it may subscribe will be expended to the utmost advantage. In due course an official statement and general scheme of procedure will be published, and a national appeal for funds will be made. The sum thus subscribed will be lodged with the 'Special Committee for the Olympic Games of Berlin,' and the administration of it will be on lines which will be more clearly indicated at a later stage.

"Besides the support of each separate branch of sport, the general arrangements proposed by the Council for the British competitors will require to be submitted to and approved by the Committee before funds to carry them out can be allocated.

"The Council of the British Olympic Association feel strongly that apart from the exertions necessary to make a creditable appearance at the Berlin Games, it is also essential to keep in view the general question of national hygiene and physical development. They aim at concerted action to promote and encourage all measures which may tend to a higher standard of individual national efficiency.

"The Council would deprecate the idea that the expenditure of this fund could, in any way, infringe the purity of amateur sport. The names of the Committee in themselves make such a suggestion ridiculous. But it is essential that so far as professional advice and material appliances go, our representatives should be on equal terms with their competitors.

"In America, Germany, Sweden, and France very considerable preparations are already afoot. Every effort will be made in those

countries to bring their men upon the ground with every legitimate advantage. It is necessary that we should do the same, and it is only to be done by having adequate practice grounds and proper preliminary training and competitions. Money will be needed for this, and the Council are confident that, when the appeal is issued, the public will show that they are ready to give generous support to their team.

"The 'Special Committee' will shortly begin its labours and will communicate its general plans and prospects from time to time through the Press."

THE COMMITTEE AND THE B.O.C.

It will be noticed that it is said in the above that to adjust the respective functions of this new Committee and the British Olympic Council was "a work of some delicacy." Correspondence in the Press, indeed, showed that these "respective functions" were not clearly understood; so, to clear up the misunderstanding, Mr. Studd, the chairman, issued the following letter, published in *The Times* of April 17, 1913:—

"May I endeavour to remove the misapprehension that seems to exist as to the functions of the new Committee for the Olympic Games, 1916? It is not a new governing body for all sport, but a Finance Committee, whose duty will be to give effect, so far as funds permit, to the most hopeful schemes and plans which the governing associations of the various sports are able to devise. The Committee is in no way intended to supersede the British Olympic Council or the governing bodies of the various sports.

"The first action of the new Committee has been to request the secretary of the British Olympic Council to obtain from each sports governing body what they consider an ideal scheme for their sport, especially with regard to the discovery of new talent and the training and preparation of athletes, with a view to the best representation of Great Britain at the Games of 1916. They have also asked that the approximate cost estimated to be necessary by the governing associations should be stated. Each scheme submitted will be carefully considered by the Committee, and, if approved, will, so far as funds permit, be supported. In addition to the carrying out of these schemes, funds will be required for the transport to and accommodation at Berlin of the teams finally selected to represent Great Britain in the Olympic Games of 1916. The Committee will be the trustees of the fund subscribed by the public and will be responsible for its administration.

"The schemes as they are approved will be communicated to the Press. They will then be open to criticism, and can be modified or extended as circumstances may require and funds permit."

THE QUESTION OF FUNDS.

When Mr. Studd accepted the chairmanship of the Special Committee, it was on the understanding that he, or the Committee as a whole, would not be burdened with the actual solicitation and collection of the required fund. Its business was to obtain, canvass, and approve the schemes for organization in each sport as suggested by the governing body or other representatives of such sport; to see that, with all these several schemes as a basis, there was formed a harmonious

*Sir Claude MacDonald, G.C.M.G., was subsequently added as the additional member.

plan for the proper representation of the United Kingdom in all the competitions at the Berlin Games, to estimate the money that would be required, and, when that money was furnished, to see that it was properly spent in carrying out the plan formulated. It set itself at once to the task, any appeal to the public being necessarily held in abeyance until the Committee had completed its plan and estimate of expense.

SCHEME FOR NOVICE TRIALS.

A preliminary announcement showing that the Committee was making some headway with its work was issued towards the end of May, 1913. Mr. Studd's letter, outlining the Special Committee's scheme for Olympic Novice Trials, was published in *The Times* of May 26 :—

The "Special Committee for the Olympic Games of Berlin, 1916," have been considering schemes submitted to them by various associations governing athletic sports, but have been unable to give more than provisional approval until the result of the appeal which is to be made to the public is known. The Committee felt, however, that it was essential to take immediate steps to ascertain if there was any talent existing in the country which might not be discovered in the ordinary course of events. They have therefore approved a scheme for Olympic Novice Trials which the Amateur Athletic Association have undertaken to carry out. Funds have been privately subscribed for this special purpose. The scheme is as follows :—

1. To hold a series of competitions at Olympic distances and events, to be called "Olympic Novice Trials."

2. The events to be level and open only to competitors over 17 years of age who have never won a prize at athletics—ordinary school competitions and junior sections of athletic clubs not to count as wins.

3. The entries in all cases to be free, the prizes to consist of gold, silver, and bronze medals of special designs not exceeding £2 in value.

4. These events to be allocated proportionately to sports meetings willing to accept the same in the North, South, and Midland districts of England, and to Scotland and Ireland.

5. The distribution of the competitions to be left to the discretion of the various governing associations who are the best authorities to deal with the matter and most likely to know the events to allot to advantage in special districts.

It is suggested that 150 events should be held in England, and 50 each in Scotland and Ireland, making 250 novice trial events during the years 1913 and 1914. The cost of prizes would then amount to £500.

The names of the novices showing promise to be carefully registered, the performances of the novices themselves to be watched, and every endeavour made to afford them special training facilities.

A report of the result of the trials will be made to the Special Committee in due course.

GETTING TO WORK.

Meanwhile the Committee found that unless the athletic year of 1912 was to be suffered to go by with nothing being done, some immediate expenditure was necessary; and in advance of the issuance of the public appeal it found, on its own initiative, the money for this necessary

expenditure. This was made known in the following announcement, given to the Press on July 18, 1913 (*The Times*, July 19) :—

The Special Committee for the Olympic Games at Berlin in 1916 appointed in March last have already accomplished a good deal of preliminary work. They have carefully considered the schemes submitted to them by various governing bodies of sport, and are prepared to support them so far as funds may be forthcoming.

Pending the public appeal for funds which will shortly be issued the Special Committee have obtained private subscriptions to enable an immediate start to be made in several directions.

(1) They have provided the Amateur Athletic Association with £1,200.

(a) £500 for Olympic Novice Trials with a view to discovering latent talent.

(b) £700 (i.) to assist affiliated clubs with prizes, provided they include approved scratch races at metric distances in their programme at an approved entrance fee. Such races to include scratch races for those in receipt of a certain start and also scratch races for backmarkers; (ii.) to provide training facilities at central quarters in London and other centres. Details of these training arrangements will be submitted and published at the earliest possible moment.

(2) They have provided the Amateur Swimming Association with £300 to enable them to hold time tests in each of the five districts of the Association. A schedule of time in three grades has been fixed, and candidates who succeed in these tests are to receive the gold, silver, or bronze badge of the Amateur Swimming Association.

(3) They have agreed to supplement the funds allotted by the National Cyclists' Union for sending two representatives to the World's Cycling Championships to be held in Berlin next August, thereby enabling the N.C.U. to send additional and younger riders to whom the experience would be valuable.

On July 16, 1913, Lieutenant Stuart D. Blair, R.N., was appointed Secretary to the Special Committee at a salary of £500 a year.

VIII.—THE APPEAL FOR £100,000.

It will have been noticed that in many of the letters and articles already quoted the wider training for the Olympic Games was regarded apart from its immediate object, as, in a sense, a measure of national reform for the better physical education of the youth of the nation. We may conjecture that to men like Mr. Studd, Sir Arthur Conan Doyle, and other members of the Committee, it was this aspect of the matter which chiefly made it seem worth while to give the time and labour which they have given to the cause. At all events it has to be kept clearly in mind that the attainment of the larger end is one of the main objects of the present effort at reform. With this big national end in view the Committee approached its duties in a thorough and comprehensive spirit, and it was not until the middle of August that an outline of a scheme

was sufficiently framed to permit an appeal to the public to be made.

TEXT OF THE APPEAL.

On August 18, 1913, the appeal was issued to the Press, in the following terms, invitations being made to the newspapers to assist the Fund by themselves receiving subscriptions and sending them to the Treasurer:—

We, the undersigned, appeal with confidence to our fellow-countrymen for the financial support which is necessary for the adequate representation of the United Kingdom at the Olympic Games of 1916 in Berlin.

It will be within the memory of all your readers that our representative athletes at Stockholm in 1912 were quite unable to do justice either to themselves or to their country owing to the lack of sufficient funds. The money available was quite inadequate for the purpose of finding out our best men or giving them real preparation or even caring for them properly in Sweden. Though we feel that there may have been excuses for the public apathy before that meeting, we are convinced not only that the results of Stockholm were a shock to every one who cared for sport in Great Britain, but also that such results must never again occur. We are in honour bound to send a team to Berlin in 1916 if possible; but it would be better to withdraw entirely from the Olympic movement than to repeat our experience in Sweden.

A widespread and immediate support will be necessary if we are to secure at least such advantages for the British team of 1916 as have been enjoyed by other nations in the past, and will certainly be at the disposal of the majority of their rivals in Berlin. It is, in our opinion, a national duty to provide funds which will enable us to make careful search throughout these islands for suitable athletic talent; to allot trainers and coaches in every district; to give standard medals for good performances at trial meetings; to organize and endow the efforts made by all the leading associations controlling British sport; to specialize training in those events of the Olympic programme which are at present unfamiliar to British athletes; and, finally, to secure a unity of purpose, unhampered by lack of means, among all those who are connected with the various branches of sport in which we shall compete in Germany. For all these plans we believe that money will be forthcoming from a generous public. The funds resulting from this appeal, which will be sent to every newspaper, will be controlled by the Special Committee elected for the purpose, who will see that the money is spent in ways approved by the associations governing sport, in accordance with the strictest amateur traditions. This Committee will account to the public for its expenditure. The members of the Committee are:—

Mr. J. E. K. Studd, Chairman
Mr. A. E. D. Anderson
Mr. B. J. T. Bosanquet
Mr. Theodore A. Cook
Sir Arthur Conan Doyle
Mr. P. L. Fisher
Mr. H. W. Forster, M.P.
Mr. J. C. Hurd
Sir Claude MacDonald, G.C.M.G., &c.
Mr. E. Mackay-Edgar
Mr. G. S. Robertson

It is not merely for the immediate purposes of the Games of 1916 and the arrangements set forth above that so large a sum as £100,000 is now fixed

as the total required. We venture to think that the processes of athletic organization here suggested will be of permanent national benefit not only to the men who are selected to be our representatives at Berlin or other meetings, but also to the great body of the nation's youth throughout the United Kingdom. The raising of the standard of physical capacity in the British Isles is one of the ideals which the Special Committee and the British Olympic Council will firmly keep before them. In such a task as this we may be confident of the enthusiasm created by international competition; but we must also count upon the definite financial help of all our countrymen of every degree. We therefore trust that you, Sir, will be able to acknowledge not merely the conspicuous generosity of a few donors, but also contributions of those small amounts which will typify the support and the good wishes of the population as a whole.

Subscriptions may be sent to the honorary treasurer of the committee (Mr. E. Mackay-Edgar, Basildon House, Moorgate-street, E.C.), to their bankers (Lloyds Bank, Limited), 16, St. James's-street, S.W., or to the Editor of —

(Signed) GREY.
HARRIS.
ROBERTS.
ROTHSCHILD.
STRATHCONA.
WESTMINSTER.

In response to this appeal it was agreed by the Editors of *The Times*, the *Daily Mail*, and some other papers to receive subscriptions, in their own name, but this particular suggestion was soon found to work inconveniently in practice. It was no use having a number of different centres of this sort. On August 20 it had also been announced that the Duke of Westminster, one of the signatories to the Appeal, would himself receive donations as well, and a little later, on September 11, the Duke of Westminster's Olympic Fund was made the central fund, and the organization was thus simplified. By the Press generally the appeal was well supported, but the leading article in *The Times* may be taken as representative in this respect.

A REASONED DEFENCE.

In its comment on the Appeal, on August 18, *The Times* expressed the hope that it would meet with a prompt and generous response, and started its own subscription list with a donation of £500. The leading article then reviewed the whole situation:—

"The new Committee, under the chairmanship of Mr. J. E. K. Studd, which will have the administration of the funds after they have been subscribed, has been subjected to much impatient criticism because this appeal has been so long delayed; but a sufficient answer to that criticism seems to be contained in the fact that whereas, during the earlier discussion of the subject in the Press, and up to the appointment of this Committee in March last, it was generally assumed that the amount of money which would be required would be about £40,000, the sum which is now asked for is £100,000. It is evident, since this larger sum is necessary, that if the Committee had hastened to issue its appeal for the amount which it was at first thought would suffice it must almost immediately have found

itself hopelessly embarrassed for lack of means. Since its appointment the Committee has been busied with obtaining from the governing bodies in the various sports suggestions for the best means of carrying out the work proposed, and with making estimates of the cost of the different plans. It now comes before the public, we may assume, sure of its ground and with a carefully elaborated programme in each department. A general idea of the work proposed in one and another department has already been made public and, as was recently announced in our columns, the Committee has already furnished, from private subscriptions, some £1,500 for immediate expenses to those governing bodies of which the need was most urgent. In its entirety the task which confronts the committee is, of course, something much larger than the mere equipment of Great Britain's representatives for the scoring of 'points' at the Berlin Games. The wider and better training of the youth of the country, quite apart from any immediate results which may be attained at Berlin, must be to the advantage of the nation; and this aspect of the matter, we imagine, will appeal strongly to a large section of the public; the fact that a wider and less slipshod physical training of our boys and young men cannot fail to improve the physique and manhood of the people. There is also the consideration that the national reputation is more deeply involved than perhaps we care to recognize in the demonstration of our ability to hold our own against other nations in the Olympic contests.

"It is unnecessary now to thresh out once again the whole question of our participation in the Games. We may like them or we may not. We may or may not believe that their effects are wholesome. The fact remains that they are assuming larger and larger importance in the eyes of the rest of the world with each succeeding Olympiad, and that it was the holding of the Games in London in 1908 which invested them with the prestige which they now enjoy. At those Games Great Britain easily out-distanced all competitors. At Stockholm in 1912 we could do no better than win a not over-creditable third place. Whether we took that result very seriously ourselves or not, it was widely advertised in other countries as evidence of England's 'decadence.' If we withdrew from the Games now the world could only believe that we did so in a fit of sulks. If, on the other hand, we continue, as we must do, to take part, we must at least make an effort to dispel the impression created by our failure at Stockholm. That failure was agreed by all competent authorities to have been unnecessary. As much as six months before the Games attention was called, and called repeatedly, in articles in this journal to the inadequate character of the preparations which we were making, and the disaster which overtook us was foreseen. Those articles were met with denials and recrimination on the part of those then in control of our representation; but the event showed every statement which they contained to have been justified. The preparation of our athletes for the Games and the management of them at Stockholm were in deplorable contrast to the thoroughness and businesslike earnestness shown by some other nations. The controversy which followed was brought to a head by a letter from Sir Arthur Conan Doyle, published in *The Times* on August 8, 1912, in which he urged the adoption of the plan previously proposed in these columns—namely, the formation of a new Committee smaller and less unwieldy than the British Olympic Council, with its nearly half a hundred members, and the raising by public subscription of an adequate fund to enable that Committee to do some good. The lines suggested by Sir Arthur Conan Doyle were closely followed in the organization

of the new Special Committee (of which he is himself a member), and it is for the necessary funds that the appeal is issued.

"There is no need to combat again at any length the apprehension which has been expressed that anything which the Committee may sanction will tend to the 'professionalizing' of British amateur sport. The thorough training and discipline which British rowing men undergo, and by virtue of which at Stockholm they proved themselves once more the best oarsmen in the world, does not make them any the less good amateurs. Similar training and discipline will not make professionals of the runners and jumpers in our schools and colleges. A youth is not going to become a less honourable antagonist because he runs well instead of badly; nor a jumper because some one has taught him how to jump in proper form and has enabled him to clear a few inches more. Well-built boys, or girls for that matter (for the part which women play in the Olympic contests is too seldom recognized), will not be demoralized or lose their better instincts because, instead of taking part in games and athletic sports in the slouching, haphazard way that is so common, they are taught to use their muscles rightly and to take an honest pride in doing their best. It is true that we may not approve of many things which have been done in the Olympic arena; but some other nations have just as strong a dislike of those practices and 'tactics' as we have, and any attempt at their repetition will be closely watched for at Berlin. It should be our part to hold the standard of sportsmanship in international encounters at its highest, and both by example and precept to assist in the maintenance of the most honourable code. But our influence will not count for much unless we have the respect of the other peoples as athletes. The work which Mr. Studd, Sir Arthur Conan Doyle, and their colleagues on the Committee have in hand is one which fully deserves the support claimed."

THE KING'S SUPPORT.

On August 21, 1913, the first list of subscriptions to the fund was published, amounting to £4,127 10s. 0d., including £2,000 from Lord Northcliffe and £1,000 from the Duke of Westminster.

On the following day was published from the Duke of Somerset, chairman of the British Olympic Council, an announcement of the King's interest in the fund:—

The King has graciously expressed to me, as chairman of the British Olympic Council, his interest in the preparations for the Olympic Games at Berlin in 1916, and his hope that every effort will be made to ensure that the United Kingdom is represented by its best athletes on that occasion.

MR. FREDERIC HARRISON'S CRITICISM.

Meanwhile, however, from other directions the appeal for so large a sum of money was provoking a good deal of criticism, especially among athletes of the older generation. Mr. Frederic Harrison wrote to *The Times* the following letter, under the heading of "Professionalism and Gate Money" (August 26):—

"Surely this stir about the Olympic Games three years hence has a comic side! To be told that our lads cannot fairly compete in some foot-races and other trials of strength—*ἄλμα, ποδωκείην, δίσκον, ἀκοντα, πάλην*—unless a sum of £100,000 sterling

can be raised sounds rather droll. I am quite aware that Americans and others are raising huge funds and are making gigantic efforts to win prizes. And I know that unless similar efforts are made here, few pots will be brought home. But the whole affair stinks of gate-money and of professional pot-hunting.

"If young men who do not gain their living by performing in public for hire are to meet and run races, leap, row, and wrestle as genuine amateurs, nothing can be more wholesome. I am a devoted lover of games myself. At school and at college I went in with a heart for boat and eleven; I cheered Joe Chitty at Putney, and Ridding and Marsham at Lord's. But 60 years ago large sums were not wanted in order to win. The Eight or the Eleven lived their usual lives, went on with their work, even in training of a few weeks; and, for the most part, they gained high honours in their universities and schools, at the Bar, and in public life. All the 'preparation' they had was such as befitted real amateurs, and did not cost more than other kinds of holiday exercise. It did not take them out of their lives; it enlarged and strengthened their lives; it was an accomplishment, not a profession, and it helped to make them eminent men of their time.

"But what does £100,000 to be spent in three years mean? It means that an army of professional coaches are to be hired to go about and pick out men having a special turn of speed or some knack in leaping a bar—which is as often as not quite incompatible with an all-round athletic condition of body. A long list of possible candidates are to be tried in order to discover some 'latent talent,' and 90 per cent. of these will have to be turned away as 'non-stayers.' The 10 per cent. talent finally selected are, I suppose, to be practically taken out of their usual lives, to the loss of their industrial or professional careers, and then put into the training-stable mill, just as if they were Derby colts. The average youth who can run or leap well cannot afford to give up his life for three years to be treated as a racehorse, and also to meet the inevitable expenses of trainers, practice grounds, hygienic regime, trials, and all the machinery of a crack racing stable. The loss of time, money, and opportunity for any practical career must be made good in meal or in malt. It seems as if each British candidate at Berlin will cost £1,000 in some form. He has to be nursed, maintained, kept in racing condition by public money—in fact, to be hired. How does this differ from being a 'professional' performer in a kind of international circus? And how is an amateur to be defined unless it be one who plays a game for 'love,' himself and his fellow-players finding any incidental expenses?

"I am quite aware that in other nations this is being done. It is as dismal an act of rivalry as the race in armaments, which is crushing the life of the European Continent. In America it is easier to raise a million dollars for such a purpose than to raise £5,000 here. The United States have an aggregate wealth vastly greater than ours, and it is wealth waiting to be poured out and not ear-marked as ours is by social habits. Their population is much more than double that of the British and men of the athletic type and breeding are more than four or five times as many. The sources for raising such funds are practically unlimited. Our sport patrons might as well try to emulate the public gifts of a Rockefeller, a Morgan, or a Carnegie.

"And for what is all this money wanted? In order to meet on equal terms foreign athletes who are not real amateurs, some of whom cannot be trusted to play the game with absolute fairness as competitors, nor as spectators to behave like gentlemen with good humour, decency, and self-control. Blackguardly

yelling, graft, and sharp practice will soon degrade our Olympia to the level of a mob at an old-fashioned prize fight, the brutalities of which Jack Johnson is coming over to teach us.

"Of course, I shall be called by kindly friends a senile philosopher, or by unkind critics an effeminate crank. In my day I played most games with zest; and at Lord's, in the forties, I bowled in the Eleven of my school, and for my college at Oxford in 1850. To-day I am tramping over the moors in their autumnal glory of golden gorse and purple heather—not, indeed, with a gun, but with the stout stick with which for years I have ranged the Alps.

"The stories of Mynn and Pilch, of Clarke and Felix, which I see in your columns of late, recall to me the cricket of the forties. Often have I watched them all at Lord's, and have now and then stood up to a ball or two from the first Lillywhite, the original inventor of round-arm bowling at the beginning of the forties. It was a lesson in cricket to see Alfred Mynn with his gigantic swing of arm and stately delivery which looked as easy to send forth as Lablache's bass notes. His pace was certainly not equal to that of Fellowes, but it would be considered fast to-day. The match between Mynn and Felix was one of the events of that time. Tremendous bowling was matched against masterly batting and fielding—which at single-wicket was fatally handicapped.

"Alas! cricket—far the noblest of all games—is passing into mere professionalism, gate money, and contractors' jobs. In most counties the Eleven, except for an amateur or two, are professionals—i.e., hired men. The 'talent' passes to any club rich enough to pay their price and to find the cost of 'qualifying,' easy as this is. So, modern cricket is tending to become a struggle of purses, not of genuine home-bred county players. This football has long been. I wish a new rule could be made to restrict a county eleven to amateurs, with one professional bowler. It would then be an honest trial of local merit. At present the county which can pay the best men, without any real condition of birth, residence, or occupation, brings the highest 'gate.'

"And now the craze 'to collect Olympic dust' bids fair to be another case of 'gate'—professionalism—years of specialist coaching. I should myself prefer to see Britain decline to enter, as not liking the terms and devices on which the show is run, and then to challenge the world to meet us at cricket, football, or a steeplechase. This is better than trying to beat Jack Johnson or the miraculous Italian pastrycook."

THE DUKE OF WESTMINSTER'S REPLY.

This letter called forth immediate replies from a number of well-known men. A letter from the Duke of Westminster appeared in *The Times* of August 27 in which he wrote as follows:—

"Mr. Frederic Harrison, in common with hundreds of thousands of his countrymen and women, does not realize what England has lost in the various fields of sport. Here is a list:—

Polo	America	
Rackets	America	(Jack Soutar)
Yachting	America	
				(holders of the Cup)
Lawn Tennis (Singles)	New Zealand	
				(A. F. Wilding)
Lawn Tennis (Davis Cup)	America	
Tennis	America	(Jay Gould)
Boxing	France and America	

Billiards ..	Australia
Swimming ..	America and Australia
Rugby Football ..	S. Africa and N. Zealand
Lacrosse ..	Canada
Trotting Horse ..	America
Running Horse ..	America
Horse Jumping ..	France and Russia
Fencing ..	France
Shooting (King's Prize)	Canada
Skating ..	Sweden
Athletics (100 yds.) ..	America and S. Africa
" (220 yds.) ..	America
" (440 yds.) ..	America
" (880 yds.) ..	America
" Hurdles (120 yds.) ..	America
" High Jump ..	America
" Pole Jump ..	America
Putting the Weight ..	America
Throwing the Hammer	America

"This is a tale of national disaster. Is England to do nothing to recover her ancient supremacy as the mother of sport?"

"Mr. Frederic Harrison is too good a sportsman to wish to 'crab' the national appeal for £100,000 which is to provide the sinews of war, and I offer him a bet that his own subscription will not be among the last."

It is interesting to note that subsequently, on October 1, another letter from Mr. Harrison, addressed personally to the Duke, was published, in which he enclosed a subscription and acknowledged that the Duke had won the bet!

In a further letter to *The Times* (October 14) Mr. Harrison insisted that the prospects of the fund would be improved if the Special Committee would announce that after 1916 there would be no more British competition at the Games. Mr. Studd, however, promptly pointed out (October 15) that the Special Committee had no power to make any such announcement. They were appointed solely for the purpose of preparing for the Games of 1916. He added at the same time that one reason why he had accepted the position of Chairman was the hope that, if successful, the work of the Committee would enable Great Britain to retire from later Olympic contests without loss of honour or prestige, should she so desire.

FROM SIR A. CONAN DOYLE.

Together with the Duke's reply to Mr. Harrison appeared also a letter from Sir A. Conan Doyle. He said:—

"I have read with great interest Mr. Frederic Harrison's letter upon the Olympic Games. In common with all the world, I have the utmost respect for Mr. Harrison's character and opinions, but I have hopes that there are some aspects of this matter which have escaped his attention or upon which he has been incompletely informed.

"In the first place, it is admitted by the Appeal Committee that a hundred thousand pounds is a very large sum, but it is clearly stated that only a portion of it should be allocated to the Olympic Games, and that the fund shall be a nucleus for some such system of universal physical education as would be entirely outside the strictures which Mr. Harrison makes. Such a scheme, with its necessary provision of gymnasia and playing fields for the poor, must, I am sure, have his approval. It is impossible at this

early stage to give exact figures, but certainly a good proportion of the fund would be spent in such a fashion.

"Let us now come down to the balance which is expended upon the preparation for the Games themselves. Mr. Harrison implies in his letter that the British team would number about a hundred. Three times this estimate would be nearer the mark. He must remember that besides the single events there are many team competitions, football, gymnastics, physical exercises, hockey, rifle and clay-pigeon shooting, rowing, &c. If we make a full entry we must be prepared to look after at least 300 men. Mr. Harrison would admit that these men, who represent their country, should not have the burden of their expenses laid upon their own shoulders. They have to be conveyed to Berlin and back, and they have to be comfortably housed and carefully fed at a time of inflated prices. The sum will not be less than seven or eight thousand pounds for this item alone. How does Mr. Harrison propose to raise this, save by national appeal? Can he suggest any other course?"

"Mr. Harrison in discussing the general question of preparation for the Games draws a dismal picture of 'an army of professional coaches' over-running the country, and of the likely youths being drafted away and maintained by the nation during the long period of training and preparation. I am convinced that those who have the management of the Games in hand would reprobate such a programme as heartily as Mr. Harrison does, and that all his fears upon this head will prove to be baseless. The army of coaches does not and never will exist. The new developments will take the form of providing practice grounds where none now exist (in all London how many places are there where a man could practise throwing a hammer?), an providing places for winter practice, in providing the impedimenta of sport for those who cannot procure them, and, finally, in encouraging every form of sport to adapt its conditions or distances to those which obtain at the Olympic Games. This can only be done by offering special medals or prizes to be competed for at those distances. It may seem that no great expense is involved in these developments. Perhaps not in any single case. But the Olympic Fund will have to meet demands from every part of Great Britain and Ireland, each legitimate in itself, and together making up a considerable sum.

"Let us for a moment trace the evolution of that novice concerning whom Mr. Harrison has such misgivings. He is probably unearthed at one of the special novices' competitions which give him a chance where he will not be overshadowed by some crack. He would then be watched and reported upon by the officials of his amateur body, which must be affiliated to the Amateur Athletic Association of his country. If he continued to make good he would probably be inspected and advised by the professional coach of his district—one, perhaps, of half a dozen in the country. He would advise the youngster as to form, precisely as an amateur cricketer has always been advised by a professional. If he continued to make progress and made good his claim to represent the country in an Olympic event he would train at the last, as a 'Varsity Blue trains for the Boat Race, and he would have the advice of the best professional that could be found. At no time save perhaps for the final weeks would his ordinary work in the world be interfered with, and at no time at all could any direct or indirect remuneration be given to him. What is there in all this which can justify Mr. Frederic Harrison in his lurid picture of athletic degeneration?"

"If Mr. Harrison's contention was that we should

never have gone in for the Olympic Games at all, he might find many to agree with him. But, things being as they are, I would ask him to consider the courses open to us. One is to retire in the face of defeat and to leave the Colonies to put the Union Jack at the top when they can. As a good sportsman I am sure Mr. Frederic Harrison could not tolerate that. A second is to continue with our present haphazard half-hearted methods, and to see ourselves sink lower and lower from that third place which we now occupy. Surely that would not satisfy Mr. Harrison. There only remains one other course of action, and that is to do the thing thoroughly and well, to find out what talent we have, and to bring it to the scratch in the best possible condition. If Mr. Harrison will look at the names of those who have the matter in hand he will, I am sure, admit that they are very capable of devising means to this end, and that such money as is required will be spent wisely and in a manner which will be consistent with the best amateur traditions of this country. What our representatives could do when unaided by adequate national support was shown last year at Stockholm. Surely Mr. Harrison would not wish to see it repeated at Berlin. Can he devise any method to prevent such a misfortune save systematic and painstaking preparation, which in the end must mean money?"

OBJECTIONS FROM THE HEADMASTER OF SHERBORNE.

On the other hand, Mr. Nowell Smith, the Headmaster of Sherborne, wrote to *The Times* (August 27) in something the same strain as Mr. Harrison. He said:—

"I feel sure, and my feeling is confirmed by casual conversations with different men, that this 'humble remonstrance,' which I venture to entrust to your invariable readiness to give both sides a hearing, will voice the sentiments of many of that class of Britons whose love and cultivation of outdoor sports have for many years formed a prominent feature in any picture of the British national character.

"Some of the men I have spoken to have been old Blues; others, like myself, without having attained to any athletic distinction or devoted more than moderate time and attention to sport, have nevertheless habitually taken part in all sorts of outdoor amusement with thorough enjoyment and passable proficiency. We are just ordinary, though I fear rather old-fashioned, Britons; and we think these modern pseudo-Olympic Games are 'rot' and the newspaper advertisement of them and the £100,000 fund for buying victories in them positively degrading. We shall no doubt be brushed aside as old fogeys, and told that we must move with the times; and since latterly *The Times* itself, to our growing dismay, has shown signs of moving with the times too, instead of leading them or resisting them as occasion demanded, we shall soon have little hope of support. And yet—is there not something in our point of view? There seems to me so much that it is difficult to express it within the limits of a letter; but here at any rate are two or three considerations.

"(1) Is it not undignified to remind us from day to day that £100,000 are wanted to 'recover the prestige which we lost at Stockholm'? It is admitted that the public has hitherto shown great 'apathy' about these Olympic Games. Is it not possible that for once the public has taken a true measure of their value? I do not suppose that even the young or elderly lions of the sporting Press will have the hardihood to appeal to the real Olympic

Games of Ancient Greece in support of these modern imitations. The old Olympic Games had their very grave drawbacks and ultimately fell into a well-earned disuse: but at any rate they had grown up spontaneously and were intertwined with the whole life of the Hellenic world. It is difficult to see any vital connexion of these modern cosmopolitan meetings with the real life of modern nations, except in so far as they are a branch of the art of advertisement. They were started, if I remember rightly, merely to advertise that ambitious people which many of us, for sentimental reasons, have lately rejoiced to see winning a more durable reputation on the sterner fields of war and statesmanship.

"(2) Have these semi-professional modern athletic games and contests anything to do with the 'prestige' in sport of which we have been so proud? Surely our distinction lay in this—that Englishmen in their leisure devoted themselves *con amore* to field sports of all kinds, and in doing so developed certain qualities of pluck, resource, self-control, good fellowship, and what not, and went about the world as—with all their faults—conspicuously healthy-bodied and healthy-minded men. But what has this to do with these Olympic Games or with cup ties, or even with county cricket? Journalists may pay lip-service to the old ideas of sport by commenting sarcastically on the cigarette-smoking crowds at the Crystal Palace; but the whole weight of their profession—almost the only one that counts nowadays—is thrown in favour of the system which they deplore. Why? Because under their daily ministrations sport has become no longer the personal recreation of the male population, but the vicarious efforts of a small and almost entirely—directly or indirectly—professional class. It is ridiculous, as *Punch* has found no difficulty in illustrating, to pretend that heavily-financed efforts to win more events than Germany or America are going to foster sport throughout the population. Every one knows that a very few carefully selected and trained athletes will "recover our prestige" or not (as the case may be) whether the ordinary British boy or man plays games or not. The only question is, how long the ordinary British boy and man will think it worth while to pay. The prestige which we lost at Stockholm is after all—indirectly, I grant you, but none the less really—a question of money; and when it has gone for good, along with our Old Masters, to the land of the almighty dollar, perhaps we shall begin to value again, and recover, our prestige as a 'nation of sportsmen'.

"(3) As a schoolmaster I am not a little bewildered by the two voices of the Press on the subject of athletics. Once a year at least my colleagues and I are seriously lectured for the undue athleticism of the public schools. Like all other headmasters of my acquaintance, I am fully aware of the dangers of undue athleticism, and attempt, as far as in me lies, to see that a due mean is struck between athletic and other pursuits. Like them also, I know only too well that it is the cheap supply of 'sporting intelligence' which is the real enemy of intellectual progress in public schools far more than excessive time or energy allotted to games. But the yearly lecture comes. You yourself administer it from time to time, though hitherto not without a saving reference to *mens sana in corpore sano*. And yet now even you—and how much more the others!—even you, Sir, adjure us to subscribe £100,000 to win back our athletic prestige and talk as seriously of these athletic contests as of the contest for the supremacy of the sea or of the air! I see that some

papers suggest that we ought to have a Ministry of Sport. The money might be saved by abolishing the Education Department.

"Now, Sir, I have only jotted down these thoughts as briefly as I can, and I know how easy it would be to ridicule them—I could do it myself for a penny a line. But in all seriousness I appeal to those readers who still have an open mind on this subject to face the question whether, under the influence, mainly, of a too rapid dissemination of "news" and impressions, we are not becoming absurdly excitable about trifles, frivolous in our judgments, and dangerously blind to the big permanent issues."

REPLY BY "THE TIMES."

The Times replied both to Mr. Harrison and to Mr. Nowell Smith in a leading article on August 27:—

Mr. Harrison says that the whole affair stinks of gate-money and professional "pot-hunting"; Mr. Nowell Smith that these modern pseudo-Olympic Games are "rot," and "the newspaper advertisement of them and the £100,000 fund for buying victories positively degrading." This is strong language; but in the mouths of two such credible witnesses it advances, if it does not make out, a case which undoubtedly calls for careful consideration. How far do their arguments justify so sweeping a condemnation? How far are they right in decrying the efforts that are being made to provide a fund for the proper training of our Olympian athletes? On this important point Mr. Harrison's reasoning is not, we think, quite consistent. He exclaims that it is droll to be told that, unless a sum of £100,000 sterling is raised, our lads cannot fairly compete in the foot-races and other trials of strength which all the nations have accepted as the modern equivalent of the pentathlon. Yet in the same breath he practically admits that, in view of the action taken by other countries, we can do nothing without the fund. "I know," he writes, "that unless similar efforts are made here few pots will be brought home." But that is precisely the reason, or one of the reasons, that dictated the appeal for public subscriptions which we published ten days ago. We are not a nation of "pot-hunters"; but we do wish to cut a better figure in the Games of 1916 than we have hitherto done. Our national reputation as well as our national pride make that an object of real importance. Those who signed the appeal—Lord Grey, Lord Harris, Lord Roberts, Lord Rothschild, Lord Strathcona, and the Duke of Westminster—are sober and responsible men who by their services on the field of battle, in the councils of the Empire, in public affairs, and in the world of sport have earned a right to a respectful hearing. Their opinions cannot lightly be brushed aside as a comic and mischievous ado about nothing. Before issuing their appeal it may be assumed that they counted the cost. They have asked the nation to provide this money for the adequate representation of the country at the Olympic Games of 1916, and also for the general raising of the standard of physical capacity in the British Isles. We believe that in so doing they have taken a sound and sensible view of the position, and that, as things are, they have pointed out the only reasonable prospect of the recovery of our lost athletic prestige. We believe also that that prestige is worth recovering.

For various reasons our two correspondents think otherwise. Before proceeding to examine their views we may, perhaps, first reassure them both on

one point. Mr. Harrison need have no fear of being dubbed a senile philosopher or an effeminate crank, nor will anyone look upon Mr. Nowell Smith as an old fogey, because they have had the courage to protest against the undue glorification of athleticism. We have always opposed, and shall continue to oppose, the setting up of sport as an idol. In many other respects we find ourselves in agreement with our two correspondents. Mr. Harrison, for instance, gives a wholly admirable definition of an amateur as one who plays a game for "love," himself and his fellow-players finding any incidental expenses. That is just what, it is hoped, the £100,000 fund will do. The British representatives will be amateurs in the strictest sense; their incidental expenses will be defrayed by their fellow-players from all over the country. It is a mistake to talk as if amateur sport does not cost money. The University Boat Race is a case in point. It is one of the more costly forms of amateur sport, and yet it is more free than any from the taint of professionalism. Mr. Harrison also deplores the prospect that some of the foreign athletes may not be real amateurs, and cannot be trusted to play the game with absolute fairness as competitors, nor as spectators to behave like gentlemen with good humour and self-control. Here again, if history is to repeat itself, we agree. We protested strongly at the time against some of the incidents which disgraced the Games of 1908. But since then, though the Games at Stockholm were not altogether clear of reproach, a distinct advance has been made. We venture to believe that, owing to the greater length of its traditions, the British conception of sportsmanship has had a certain dominating influence in forming international opinion in this matter. If that is so, it may be reckoned as a really valuable result of the Olympic Games, and even as an argument for their continued existence. But in any case continue they must. Great Britain cannot at this stage, as Mr. Harrison wishes, retire from the contest. Not to go to Berlin would be an insult to our German friends and prospective hosts, as well as to the other nations engaged, which would be far more harmful than the possibility of international complications, which the Games have sometimes threatened to produce in the past. The country, as we have said more than once, is committed to the contest. That is why we support the appeal, which Lord Grey and his fellow-signatories have put before us, as a national duty. Not because we should look like sulky children who will not play in a game in which they have been beaten, but because we are in honour bound to send to Berlin the best team that we can get together, we commend the fund to the generosity and public spirit of our readers. Mr. Nowell Smith maintains that we are as a nation absurdly excitable about trifles, frivolous in our judgments, and dangerously blind to the big permanent issues. The criticism does not apply to this particular case. It is undoubtedly one of the big permanent issues that we should keep faith with our fellow-nations, even in the world of sport.

MR. THEODORE COOK'S EXPLANATION.

Among other letters which appeared in the voluminous correspondence which followed in *The Times* was the following from Mr. Theodore Cook, Editor of *The Field*, the British representative on the International Committee:—

"Mr. Frederic Harrison phrases his memory of sport in so charming a style that the task of answering him would be beyond my powers—as it is certainly against my inclination—were it not essential to

contradict certain errors of fact which have been published with the authority of his name.

"It will, perhaps, clear the ground if I deal with certain questions of general principle first. If Mr. Harrison desires us to withdraw entirely from the Olympic movement, I must remind him why we are 'in honour bound' to compete at Berlin. Germany would not have accepted the responsibility of the Games of 1916 unless she had previously satisfied herself that all the greater nations—including the United Kingdom—would send representatives. Australia, South Africa, Canada, New Zealand, will certainly compete. The Mother Country is bound to send a team. The fact that we organized the Games of 1908 and beat all our visitors to London would in itself provide an almost unanswerable reason. But perhaps Mr. Harrison's objection applies more strongly to the appeal for money than to representation in itself. Well, we have tried sending a team without sufficient money already, and the results of Stockholm were so bitterly and widely resented that the experiment is never likely to be repeated. Those who shouted loudest in 1912 will, of course, be the first to subscribe in order that 1916 may not suffer from the same mistake. It is quite clear that the public means to provide sufficient funds to give our representatives in Berlin the same advantages enjoyed by other nations.

"But there is still a third alternative. Mr. Harrison may not object to representation as such, or to a moderate subscription. What annoys him may be the total of £100,000, which he appears to consider is to be applied to Berlin alone. He is misinformed. It will not cost more than about £25,000 to carry out every detail of the programme of preparation laid down by the various associations governing different branches of amateur sport between now and the summer of 1916. In addition to this, we should be prepared with about £15,000 to transport about 500 men to Germany, to house and feed them in Berlin, and to get them home again.

"But this is far from including the whole programme of the British Olympic Council, I admit that we are not yet bound to enter again after 1916, but it is probable that this country will be represented in 1920, and even in 1924. With care, the sum now asked for would suffice. But neither the results of one meeting, nor the possibility of other meetings, exhaust the programme in which the King—interpreting the national sentiment—so graciously expressed his interest. By the mere progress of centralization and training necessitated by our preparations for Berlin we shall have given such a stimulus to the athletic youth of the whole country that a general improvement in the physical standard of the community must inevitably result. By the system of standard medals, by the spread of skilled instruction, by the opportunities given to undiscovered talent, a widespread and invaluable impetus will be given to energies which are at present scattered and incapable of improvement. Sport will not be professionalized by being better organized.

"But Mr. Harrison suggests the dangers both of professionalism and of specialization. He writes delightfully of the days of Mynn, of Felix, or of Lillywhite. Does he realize that all his memories of first-class cricket centre in professionals? Does he consider that these men would never have reached the eminence which so attracted him if the stress of competition had not developed their natural talent? They were specialists, if you like. But what is one of the outstanding features of the Berlin Olympic programme? The Modern Pentathlon, the finest all-round event in the history of sport.

What gloomy views does Mr. Harrison take of the man who in shooting, fencing, riding, running, and swimming does better than all the rest of the world in 1916? And is it specialism which introduces half a dozen new contests in the athletic section alone, and gives their true value to those field events which have gradually and unfortunately lost their legitimate prominence in this country?

"Mr. Harrison rightly chooses the late Mr. Justice Chitty as a type of the athlete of his day. He might have added the names of A. L. Smith, Macnaghten, and Esher—all men who rowed in their university crew and became Judges in the High Court of Appeal. But modern developments have not stopped their successors from doing almost as well. And no first-rate oar has ever been born who did not give up at least three years of his playtime to his favourite sport. It has done no harm to other athletes to do the same. All we ask, in view of Berlin, is that during this same amount of time men will practise under proper instruction and with proper precautions. Not one of them will get a farthing, personally, from the fund subscribed. That money will be expended by the amateur associations on the lines they have themselves laid down. They are as eager to preserve the true amateur spirit as any one could desire.

"Mr. Harrison would like the rest of the world to meet us at home at football. They did so in 1908. It is our turn to meet them in 1916. He would like them to play cricket against us at Lord's. Does he realize that this would be equivalent to the United States challenging us at baseball, or Spain at pelota? No game is suitable for international competition unless at least six nations can play it. Mr. Harrison has very delightfully expounded the charm of the days in which he played the games he loved. Every one will agree with him. No one wants that charm to fade. All we ask for to-day is a little more keenness and a little more organization. We have done our share of theory in giving the world the first international code for 20 games accepted by 20 different nations. We can scarcely refuse our share of practical achievement for fear of being beaten. We can scarcely preach the tenets of true sport and deny the necessity for giving any personal examples. And in spite of all our modern developments we need not lose our love for the old quiet days of domesticity; nor is our attitude so different as Mr. Frederic Harrison imagines from the glad spirit which infused his youth."

FAVOURABLE PUBLIC SENTIMENT.

Important letters, taking the same line in favour of the Appeal, appeared also in *The Times* from Mr. Sidney Abrahams, Mr. S. P. B. Mais, and other athletes. Correspondence on the subject flourished in almost the entire Press of the United Kingdom, and served to show that while there were here and there men of the older school who were strongly opposed to a general scheme of training or to anything else which would tend to the glorification of the Olympic Games, the judgment of the country as a whole recognized in an overwhelming proportion that we cannot avoid participation in the Games and must make some sort of preparation for them. In their editorial columns newspapers generally have warmly supported the Duke of Westminster's appeal and the Special Committee, and, what is more important, sentiment in the athletic associations is practically unanimous (whatever differences or jealousies there may be on individual details) as to the need

of the fund to enable us to make a creditable showing at Berlin. The Amateur Rowing Association alone has officially declined any participation in the movement or in the fund; but rowing is, perhaps, the one sport in this country in which training and organization are carried nearest to perfection, and the Association itself has no need of any assistance. It is to be noticed, also, that some rowing men (like Mr. Theodore Cook) are among the warmest advocates of the scheme. For the rest, it is not unjust to say that expert opinion and the sentiment of all those who have been at all in touch with the progress of events, is unanimous on one side, while criticism is based chiefly on a dislike of the Olympic Games at all, growing out of a conservative, if honourable, devotion to the old careless traditions of British Sport which served us so well when we were the only sport-loving people.

THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE'S STATEMENT.

In behalf of the Special Committee Mr. J. E. K. Studd contributed to the discussion a general survey of the situation, which dealt with the various points which had been raised in criticism of the appeal for funds. His letter, published on September 5, was as follows:—

On behalf of the Special Committee for the Olympic Games, Berlin, 1916, may I say a few words with regard to (1) the question at issue; (2) the procedure adopted; and (3) the expense involved?

(1) The first and vital question is, Is Great Britain to be represented at Berlin or not? Whatever opinion one may personally hold of the value or evil of modern Olympic Games, other nations—our competitors in the world's business—have adopted them, and are displaying them to the world as a test of national efficiency. It is too late to find fault with Olympic Games and conditions. They have been imposed on us, and we must act accordingly. Were it possible to start *de novo* much that opponents to the appeal have urged would have great weight. But now we are not in the fortunate position of being able to choose our path. Had the British cause been adequately represented at Stockholm the nation might conceivably have withdrawn from future contests, but now such a course is not open to us.

It was not so much the lack of success in the respective events which made Stockholm a "national disaster" as the too evident lack of careful and organized effort. It was this that so unfavourably impressed the world in general, and this country in particular. The appeal for funds is made in order that every possible care may be taken to avoid a similar misfortune happening at Berlin; also to prevent any justification for the excuse that Great Britain has the men but cannot equip them so that they shall do her and themselves justice. Those who for any cause do not recognize such national obligation will not contribute and will continue, if they think well, to oppose the effort. The appeal has been made, and continues to be made, to those who are convinced that Great Britain must be represented at Berlin and represented by her best men.

(2) PROCEDURE.—The next question is what to do and how to do it. Here again it is not possible to have a free hand. Time does not permit a reconstruction of our athletic organizations, even

if such a course were deemed advisable, which we do not admit. We should be "swapping horses while crossing the stream." All that is possible is to support, encourage, and inspire existing governing bodies of sports to do their utmost, and then to co-ordinate the result of their efforts into a national representation.

The question of amateur and professional status of what can or cannot be done will and must rest with the governing bodies themselves, and not with the Special Committee. The appeal for and granting of funds does not affect the matter. Change in any amateur definition could only be induced by the pressure of public opinion on the governing bodies of the sports concerned.

The Special Committee would welcome any definition of an amateur which would receive the approval of all nations competing in the Olympic Games. But preparations cannot be delayed till this ideal definition is framed.

It has been suggested that sport is not democratic and that the fund asked for is to encourage snobbery. It is hard to reconcile this statement with facts:—

(a) That of the nine A.A.A. Championships retained by this country seven were won by representatives of the people who were not university men.

(b) That the Amateur Rowing Association, whose definition of an amateur is objected to, has officially declined to be identified with the fund.

It is, of course, those who have least money to spend on sport who will derive most help from the fund. One aim of the fund is to give the "man in the street" the benefit of the expert training and advice which hitherto have been beyond his reach.

(3) THE EXPENSE.—The dissatisfaction expressed at the Stockholm arrangements and results was so widespread that negotiations were entered into with the British Olympic Council for the formation of a Special Committee. This Committee was inaugurated in March last. It was appointed to receive and administer a fund to be raised by public appeal. The Committee made a preliminary survey of the situation by asking each sports governing body to submit for consideration an "ideal scheme" to ensure the best possible representation at Berlin of its own sport. The Committee found:—

(a) That with the exception of rowing and football no association possessed funds for Olympic affairs, though each was officially represented on the British Olympic Council. This position was well expressed by the hon. treasurer of the A.A.A.:—"The point I wish to make clear is that the A.A.A. have no funds for the purpose of Olympic Games, and I as hon. treasurer have no authority to expend our funds in that direction."

(b) That there existed no organization for ascertaining results and developing athletics as a whole with a view to achieving the best results.

(c) That though in cricket and rowing great care was taken to train boys and men so that they should acquire correct style and methods, and so make the best use of their powers, no such attention was given to athletics and other branches of sport. As a consequence boys in public and other schools and lads in business houses and elsewhere were acquiring styles that were not good, developing muscles that were useless, and often injuring themselves for lack of skilled advice.

(d) That the "ideal schemes" submitted to them called for a sum of over £39,000, apart from

any fund required for central training ground and quarters, or for the transport of British representatives to and from Berlin and for their accommodation while there. Several schemes have yet to be submitted.

(e) That in addition several sports governing bodies were anxious to go beyond the mere discovery and training of a limited number of athletes and to make provision for placing the athletic training of our youths on a permanent and satisfactory footing. In such a manner that after the Olympic Games of 1916, whether the nation decided to continue the Olympic Games or not, provision would have been made for steady progress in physical efficiency.

The Committee reported accordingly, and the appeal for £100,000 was issued. The appeal having been issued over the signatures of those whom the nation honours and trusts the decision rests with the people of Great Britain.

The money is not needed and will not be used to secure a "team of gladiators." It will be used to create an organization which has hitherto not existed—to support the amateur sports associations in organizing and extending their respective sports on scientific lines; to enable them to secure the best men possible to represent the country at Berlin, and to make the necessary arrangements at Berlin for Great Britain's representatives. Whether more first prizes will be gained at Berlin or not is another matter and will depend on the ability of the men sent—*Palmas qui meruit jerat*. If our country is represented by its best men and those men are afforded every facility to do their best for their country, however unpleasant defeat might be, it would not be humiliating.

I have tried as concisely, clearly, and temperately as I could to give the point of view of the Special Committee and have only to add that the Special Committee and its chairman will gladly give way to those more competent should the subscribers to the fund consider that the work would be better done by others. Whatever is done must be done quickly, for time is an essential factor of the situation.

"PROFESSIONALISM."

The bogey of "professionalism" (for a bogey is undoubtedly is) was raised by a number of correspondents in the course of the controversy, and *The Times* dealt with the subject in a leading article on September 13 as follows:—

It is plain, we hope, to those who have followed the correspondence on the Olympic Games Fund in our columns that the fears expressed by some as to its possible employment in turning amateur athletes into professionals are groundless. There is no more risk of that happening than there is in the case of the members of next year's Oxford boat or Eton eleven, on both of which a considerable sum of money will be spent before they appear at Putney or Lord's. The maintenance of the University Barge, the wages of boatmen and other servants of the O.U.B.C., the cost of a new light ship for the race, the hire of launches, and a whole host of other incidental expenses will be provided for, as they have been for the last 70 years or so, out of funds to which the actual members of the Oxford crew will contribute a relatively insignificant proportion. In the same way at Eton, only a modest fraction of the money spent on the mowing and rolling of Upper Club and Agar's Plough, the salaries of the staff of professional coaches, and all the other odds and

ends that are part of the recognized scheme of Eton cricket, will come out of the pockets of the boys who eventually get their Eleven. Yet no one will dream of accusing either of these bodies of young athletes of being tainted with professionalism, because they do not themselves defray the whole of the expenses connected with the sports in which they represent their university or school. They will be rowing and playing cricket on strictly amateur lines, incurring the same kind of expenses, and meeting them in exactly the same way, if Mr. Nowell Smith will forgive us for saying so, as at Winchester and Sherborne and New College, and all the other schools and colleges, and all the amateur rowing and swimming and cricket and football and lawn tennis and archery and fencing and athletic clubs of the United Kingdom.

There is no need, however, to labour this point, except to add that there is every reason to believe that Mr. J. E. K. Studd, of the Eton and Cambridge Elevens, and the Select Committee for the Olympic Games of which he is chairman, are not the sort of men to be blind to the urgent importance of so administering any funds with which they may be entrusted in accordance with the best traditions of British sport. For the present we wish rather to turn to an aspect of professional sport which we are too apt to forget. Men are apt to speak of "the taint of professionalism" as though professionalism were one of the deadly sins. Yet if we think for a moment of the professionals that we know—in golf, cricket, rackets, tennis, and practically every other form of sport—we realize at once that they are deservedly one of the most respected classes in the community. Vardon and Ray and Braid and Taylor and the other professional golfers are, as most of us know from personal experience, all men who play the game with absolute fairness and honour, even though they play it for money. It is the same thing with Hirst and Hobbs and Woolley and Blythe, and the whole profession of paid county players. They are good fellows and good sportsmen to a man. Unless they were, is it likely that they would be chosen to stand as umpires in first-class cricket? But there is no need to insist upon the point. Everybody knows it. Every amateur numbers not only among his acquaintances but among his friends professionals of one sort or another for whose ideals of sport and sportsmanship he has the highest respect. When Mr. Frederic Harrison expresses a wish that county elevens should consist of ten amateurs and one professional, he forgets that in the good old days of simple old-fashioned cricket there were probably just as many professionals in the county teams as there are to-day. In saying this we must not be taken to imply that we underrate the importance of the amateur element in first-class cricket. But it is as well to face facts as they are, and not to sigh for an ideal state of things—if it is ideal—which has never existed. As a matter of fact it never can exist. The supply of young amateurs with sufficient means and leisure to play regular county cricket is necessarily limited, though there are probably quite as many in the country as is good for it or for them. From one point of view it is not highly desirable that a large number of well-educated young men should spend too many of the best summers of their lives in playing a game—however fine a game—for the delectation of the multitude. With the professionals it is different. For them cricket is the business of part of their working life, and though we may talk of the taint of professionalism, we honour them for the way in which they conduct that business.

But perhaps what we really mean when we use the phrase is the taint of veiled professionalism. That



is a very different matter, upon which it would be difficult to look too sternly. In setting their faces against any appearance of this evil, as they will do, the Olympic Select Committee will have behind them the whole force of healthy public opinion. With that check on their actions, to say nothing of their own amateur traditions, there can be little fear of their tolerating any abuse of the Olympic fund. Leaving out of the question the great body of athletes who make a living or part of a living, by their skill in running and jumping and other athletic sports without any chance of qualifying as a competitor in the Olympic Games, there is in fact only one game, and only one branch of that game, in which professionalism is a distinct and troublesome problem. We need not, however, enter now into the question of League football. It is large and difficult and in any case has no bearing on the Olympic Games. It is enough for the present to urge these two points on our readers—that the Olympic authorities are fully alive to the dangers of veiled professionalism, and that true professionalism, in practically every branch of sport, is one of the most satisfactory and characteristic features in the athletic life of the nation.

Is £100,000 Too MUCH ?

Much of the apprehension of the possibly injurious effects of the proposed scheme arose undoubtedly from the unexpected magnitude of the sum asked for. This feeling was voiced in such letters as the following, which appeared in *The Times* of September 13, from Mr. Edgar Fifoot, Manager of *The News of the World* :—

It is unfortunate that the public are being asked to subscribe such a large sum when it is admitted that the whole amount will not be required for the actual purpose in hand.

At the last contest many of the British competitors were badly trained, badly housed, and improperly fed, while the general organization of the team left much to be desired.

If the public were asked to subscribe only such an amount as would be adequate to remedy these deficiencies on the next occasion I believe that the appeal would be more readily responded to.

It is not, however, to be supposed that those who have charge of the matter can have any desire to make their task harder by asking for a larger sum than is required. We have seen that, in the days immediately following the Games of 1912, it was thought that a fund of £40,000 might suffice for all purposes. But before the Committee of Appeal, for which the Duke of Westminster is spokesman, issued its call for subscriptions, Mr. Studd's Committee had been at work going over the details of the various plans submitted by the several Governing Associations for some months. In the middle of September the Secretary to the Committee issued a rough statement of some of the chief items of expense for which the money was required.

THE OFFICIAL ESTIMATE.

According to this estimate the following amounts

roughly would be required for the work of Specific Associations :—

Amateur Athletic Association—		
£4,000 per annum for four years	..	£16,000
Irish Amateur Athletic Association—		
£900 per annum for four years	..	3,600
Scottish Amateur Athletic Association—		
£250 per annum for four years	..	1,000
National Cyclists' Union—		
£860 per annum for three years, with an additional £150 for final training	..	2,730
Amateur Gymnastic Association—		
1913	..	£215
1914	..	430
1915	..	430
1916	..	870
..
..
..	..	1,945
Amateur Clay Bird Shooting Association		
		500
Amateur Wrestling Association—		
£600 per annum for three years and £250 for Olympic Team	..	2,050
Amateur Swimming Association	..	5,577
Amateur Fencing Association	..	810
		<hr/>
		£34,212

Estimated cost of sending 500 athletes to Berlin a fortnight before the meeting at £30 each	15,000
	<hr/>
	£49,212

In addition to the above estimates there would be the expenses for central training quarters; expenses for chief trainer and trainers for central training quarters; training arrangements in other big centres; cost of field events apparatus; indoor training quarters and office expenses. There were also a few remaining schemes which had not yet been submitted by some of the governing bodies of sports.

THE NEED OF EXTRA FUNDS.

It is plain, however, that this statement of the mere contributions to be made to nine Governing Associations, with the estimate of the cost of actually sending the competitors to Berlin, represents no more than a portion of the total necessary cost. In the list of things appended to the figures, for which no estimate of cost is given, it will be seen that no mention is made of any outlay for the Committee itself, for the cost of getting the money, or of the necessary printing, postage, travelling, and other "over-head" expenses which are inevitable in any large undertaking. And when it is remembered that this is intended to be the basis for a national reform in the physical education of the people, the sum asked for is not large. Nor is it large in comparison with what other nations spend or are planning to spend on the Games of 1916.

In the course of a letter published in *The Times* of October 17, 1913, Mr. Frank W. Rolt said, on the subject of the size of the fund asked for :—

We are asked to believe that with the comparatively moderate sum of £100,000—to be spent in a period of three to four years—the Olympic Games Committee are going to demoralize the country—by building up a vast and evil system of professionalism, by reproducing modern imitations of the schools of gladiators of the ancients, by diverting undergraduates from their studies, and by teaching our young men to worship the false gods of athleticism. Of a truth,

if all or even part of these dreadful things can be done for the money, it does not cost very much to demoralize a nation! Of course, it is quite true that £100,000 is in itself a large sum, but considered as a fund with which it is hoped to create a widespread organization and to assist the efforts of a very large number of people it is certainly not an excessive amount. Supposing we compare it, for instance, with the annual expenditure in these islands on golf balls. At a low estimate there must be 100,000 people who play golf more or less regularly, and if on the average each player does not spend 30s. per annum on balls he gets off uncommonly cheap. This produces a total outlay of £150,000 per annum, and every one knows that what is spent on balls is only a fraction of the annual expenditure on golf! Upon my word, when the members of the Olympic Committee contemplate such noble figures as these they may well be surprised at the moderation of their appeal. So much for the matter of filthy lucre. Now as to one or two other points. The example of the Americans has been freely used to point a moral for us, and to show us what we may come to if we try to organize ourselves athletically. The Americans, of course, are well able to look after themselves, and in any case it is not my duty to defend them. But when I see it stated that they have systematized their games to such an extent that only the super-excellent performer continues to play and the average man has become merely a spectator, I can only say that such a condition of things has not come under my observation, though I have spent a great many years in the United States and Canada and still pass most of my time in the latter country.

The truth about the Americans is, I think, that a certain number of their men are deadly keen about anything they take up, not only games, but all kinds of pursuits. Moreover, they have recognized that in order to excel they must organize themselves and must consent to be taught how to do things properly. No doubt many of our men, too, are keen enough, but in most departments of athletics we are mere haphazard by-the-light-of-nature individualists as compared with the Americans. This condition of affairs is so well recognized that I have seen no attempt to deny it or explain it away on the part of the opposition. Yet, as far as I can understand the matter, it is because the Olympic Committee are proposing that our men shall be taught and trained in a systematic manner that they and their proposals have been most heartily denounced. For the life of me I cannot understand why it is held to be right, wise, and meritorious to teach a young Englishman how to row, play cricket, fence, shoot, and perform gymnastics, and why it is highly undesirable, in fact almost immoral, to teach and train him to run, jump, throw the hammer, and put the weight.

A pertinent comment was added next day by Mr. A. B. George, the honorary secretary of the Athletes' Advisory Club, who wrote:—

In Mr. F. W. Rolt's excellent letter on the Olympic Games Fund he points out that £100,000 is a small sum in comparison to the annual expenditure on golf balls. May I supplement his remarks by stating that annually the New York City Park's Department spends £20,000, the Board of Education £60,000, and the Public Recreation Committee £7,000 on the upkeep of athletic grounds and running tracks and the payment of trainers, &c. ? Upwards of 200 other American cities are carrying on a like work in the endeavour to improve the physique of the nation. In comparison our appeal for £100,000 appears a mere bagatelle, and it will be well when the whole matter is taken in hand by the State.

A PLEA FOR CONCENTRATION.

A general "Review of the Situation" was given in *The Times* on September 22, from the pen of its Special Correspondent at the Games of 1912. His comments may usefully be reproduced here:—

"Let us unite (he wrote) on certain things to start with—namely (1) that no one has any other motive but that of public spirit, no object except to decide what is best and most wholesome for Great Britain, and (2) that we are all equally concerned in maintaining and, if possible, improving the present standard of British amateur sport. A good deal will be gained at the outset if every one will divest himself of suspicion that some one else is plotting to corrupt the amateur spirit of the country, and will believe that others have just as high ideals as and an equal earnestness of purpose with himself.

"Standing, then, on this common ground, we can find other general propositions on which we can agree. First, none of us has an exaggerated opinion of the Olympic Games in themselves. To be quite frank, few of us have ever been able to bring ourselves as devotees of British sport to regard them as a first-class fixture. They cannot hold the same place in our affections as is held by our own meetings at Henley, or Lord's, or Wimbledon, or Hurlingham, or Bisley, or at Queen's Club when the Universities come together. But, secondly, it is indisputable that we have allowed ourselves to become associated with the Games or to have been 'drawn into' them, as it has been phrased. By our action in 1908 we gave them our active support and encouragement; it was the holding of the Games in London in that year that suddenly lifted them in the eyes of the sport-loving peoples of the world to a new plane of importance. Probably very few people in Great Britain understood what had happened. In 1908 Great Britain very easily held her place as the leading athletic nation—that is to say, we won vastly more 'points' than any other people. This was sufficiently in accordance with precedent that it did not surprise us; and in comfortable self-complacency—still not caring much nor holding great opinion of the Games—we went to Stockholm.

THE LESSON OF STOCKHOLM.

"But (and this is a third point on which we can all agree) the result at Stockholm was hardly what we had expected. It has been pointed out more than once in *The Times* that we did not do as badly at Stockholm as the public, without any close analysis of results, generally believed. But we did badly enough to cause us considerable mortification at home, and to make it to be widely advertised about the world that the British, as athletes, were a degenerate people. Other nations (which have no Henley, Lord's, Wimbledon, Hurlingham, and so forth) think much more highly of the Games than we; and the British failure at Stockholm was interpreted by them more seriously than we at home believe that it deserved, ascribing it as we do chiefly to the casual way, as compared with other nations, in which our preparations for the Games were made, and to lack of training, discipline, and organization. Each of us may have a different opinion as to how much better we can do another time if our organization be more complete, but there is no disagreement as to the fact that in 1912 our organization was, at best, indifferent. Those who had charge of our affairs do not deny it. What they say is that they had no money, though they asked

the public to furnish it, and that they did the best they could under the circumstances.

CAN WE WITHDRAW FROM THE GAMES ?

"So far, it is hoped, we are still on common ground. Now emerges the question of what to do in the situation which confronts us. There are plainly the usual three courses. We can withdraw from the Games altogether. We can compete as we did last time. We can take the thing more seriously, and by proper organization do our best to make a better showing at Berlin. We may push aside for the moment, for the sake of agreement, the fourth possible choice—namely, of competing at Berlin with a pre-announced intention of withdrawing afterwards. Let us leave our conduct after 1916 for later discussion. The immediate question is, What are we going to do about Berlin ?

"The present writer does not believe that among those who have faced the facts there is really any disagreement about this. In the first place, we simply cannot withdraw now. There can be no two opinions as to the interpretation which would be put upon such a withdrawal by other countries. We should be generally regarded as having withdrawn after defeat in a fit of sulks. And the trouble is that this would be true. Whatever we may say to comfort ourselves about the demoralizing character of the Games, the fact remains that if we had repeated at Stockholm our success of 1908 nothing, or nothing serious, would have been heard about not competing in 1916. We know in our hearts that that is true. We should have ambled along—still not caring much—and have gone to Berlin in the same random way as we went to Stockholm.

"Have those, if still there are any, who think that we should now withdraw considered how rude it would be to Germany ? Have they thought how contemptuously it would be received by our own self-governing Dominions, by Australia, South Africa, and Canada, who are all intending to compete ? Perhaps even more cogent is the argument that withdrawal is literally impossible. If the nation gave our athletes no support they would compete at Berlin just the same. This is a fact which those who are out of touch with our amateur athletic organizations do not take into account. British athletes are going to Berlin. The only question is whether they shall be left to go unorganized and once more in deplorable contrast with the representatives of other countries, or whether they shall go decently and in such a way as to have some chance of reflecting at least no discredit on Great Britain.

HALF-HEARTED COMPETITION.

"It is in fact only a question of how we shall compete, not of whether we shall compete or not. But no one who was at Stockholm can possibly desire to see a repetition of what occurred there. No one who was not at Stockholm, if he understood, could possibly desire to know that the things which happened there were being repeated, even though he might not be there to see. Apart from the discourtesy of our entering against other nations, and at the same time saying to them, 'We are not really trying, you know ; we could do much better if we didn't think the Games rather a poor thing,' apart from the absurd ill-manners of such a course, it is not pleasant to think of letting the impression of our incompetence which was created at Stockholm crystallize, by a similar display at Berlin, into active and confirmed contempt for us.

"So strong and seemingly universal was the feeling in England that this could not be tolerated, in the weeks immediately succeeding the Stockholm Games,

that, as the immediate result of correspondence which then appeared in *The Times*, certain gentlemen entered into collaboration with the British Olympic Council, and as a result of their joint labours, which are believed to have been considerable, there was constituted the new Olympic Special Committee. The objects for which this committee was organized were to investigate and find out what steps would be needed to enable Great Britain to make a worthy showing at Berlin, and what would be the expense of carrying out those steps. An appeal was then to be made to the public to furnish the necessary funds, and the committee would see that the funds when furnished were duly applied to the objects for which they were subscribed.

THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE.

"Nobody has questioned the entire fitness of the members of the Special Committee for their task. Nobody can suspect these gentlemen—Mr. Studd, Sir Arthur Conan Doyle, Mr. H. W. Forster, M.P., Sir Claude MacDonald, Mr. Theodore Cook, and the rest—of having any other than patriotic motives, of being any less devoted than any one else to the maintenance of the best traditions of British sport, or of being likely to do anything but set themselves in a serious and business-like way to the undertaking before them. As a matter of fact, the committee is known to have done a great deal of patient hard work since it was organized last spring. It has obtained suggestions from all the leading amateur athletic bodies as to what reforms are needed and what is the lowest cost at which they could be carried through. It has analysed all these suggestions and brought its own knowledge, as well as all the expert advice that it could command, to bear upon them. As a result, guided always by the idea that what was now being done should be made the basis of a general scheme for the better physical training of the youth of the nation, it decided that the public should be asked for £100,000. Having confidence in the judgment of the committee and sympathizing with the general objects of the movement, the Duke of Westminster, Lord Roberts, Lord Grey, Lord Rothschild, Lord Strathcona, and Lord Harris associated themselves in issuing the public appeal. It is the magnitude of the sum asked for which has precipitated the recent correspondence.

THE APPEAL FOR £100,000.

"Is it such a very large sum for the purpose ? Germany at least is spending very much more, probably several times as much. The United States in 1912 spent between £30,000 and £40,000 on merely taking its men to Stockholm and looking after them while they were there ; and such expenses, only for the last few weeks at Berlin, are merely one detail of what the committee has to provide for. Sweden last year is said to have spent £110,000. In at least five other European countries the movement is receiving Government support, and preparations are already actively under way on a national scale and with State encouragement. It is an entirely false analogy to speak of this as if it were a competition between two public schools. This is not Eton matching itself against Winchester, but Great Britain matching herself against Germany and America and Sweden and France and all the other nations, not in one event but in a hundred events, to compete in which we must probably put in the field about 500 men. At Stockholm there were 98 events, and the United Kingdom made 526 entries. The Special Committee has from time to time published outlines of what it is proposed to do in the way of preparation in various branches of athletics. It

has also issued a statement of how it proposes to allocate about £50,000 of the £100,000 asked for. It is obvious to any one who looks at it that the individual items of expenditure enumerated in that statement can be only a portion, the skeleton as it were, of the general scheme. It is known that the committee sees that it will have difficulty in spending less than £60,000, quite apart from the actual transportation of our 500 men to and from Berlin and the care of them when there.

ROWING MEN AND THE AMATEUR SPIRIT.

"What is it, then, in the committee's scheme that is criticized? There are certain sports which we in Great Britain consider peculiarly our own, and at which at Stockholm we showed ourselves invincible. They are the sports which we habitually practise on a large scale. Conspicuous among them is rowing. Why are we so nearly supreme in rowing? Simply because in that one sport more than in any other we do, in fact, subject ourselves to discipline and training as other nations do in other sports. If our teams to compete in other events at Stockholm had been trained and coached as were the Leander and New College eights, there would have been another tale to tell. It seems particularly ungracious for any rowing man to oppose the proposed large schemes of training, for if he was an Oxford or Cambridge oar he is the one man who received in the highest degree all those advantages of which it is now desired to extend some part to athletes in other lines. If anything which is now proposed would make 'professionals' of our amateurs, then must every University oar be 50 times professional. It cannot be hoped to give to our swimmers, our bicyclists, our runners and jumpers, and other athletes all over the country, anything like the care and lavish facilities which the Universities and individual colleges, through the boat clubs, give to all their men, but it is desired to put within the reach of hundreds of thousands of others—potentially just as good amateurs in spirit as any man at the University—the opportunity, if they be good enough, of getting some share in the same sort of facilities.

WHAT IT IS HOPED TO DO.

"Of the 500 British representatives at Berlin at least 450 will have to be drawn from among non-University men. Probably upwards of 400 will not have been to a great public school. How can any University man, remembering what he has himself enjoyed, say that these men must not have a track put at their disposal, the implements of their particular game wherewith to practise, or expert advice to help them in their training? And if there is to be some such general extension of the facilities for practice and for training, must it not be to the benefit of the physique of the nation? How are we going to ensure that they—this mass of non-University men—will have the right doctrine preached to them and the true sporting spirit instilled, better than by having the whole matter under the oversight of such gentlemen as compose Mr. Studd's Special Committee?

"The object of this article, however, is not to precipitate controversy on incidental matters, but to point out how much common ground there is, and to focus attention on essentials. Putting aside all futile talk about degrading sport, when we are all equally intent on upholding it and dignifying it, what actually confronts us is that we have to compete at Berlin and must make some kind of preparation for it. It is intelligible that, in people who have come only recently in accidental contact with the subject, a personal distaste for the Games should

make it difficult to descend to the discussing of details. Have they then any other general scheme than that which the committee proposes? Will they consult with the committee and help it? Are there particular features of the proposed plan itself with which they disagree? Is there any way in which the end desired can be attained without spending money or so much money? Any suggestion of an economy which has been overlooked by the committee would surely be most gratefully welcomed. But if we are generally agreed as to nine-tenths of the matter, and if the carefully-matured proposals of the committee hold the field alone, the one thing needful is to pull together and give prompt and generous support to the Duke of Westminster's fund."

AFTER 1916.

On the question whether we should continue to compete at the Games *after* those at Berlin in 1916, Mr. J. E. K. Studd wrote to *The Times*, in a letter published on October 15, as follows:—

Mr. Frederic Harrison suggests that the Special Committee would do well to announce that Great Britain would take no part in the Olympic Games after 1916. May I point out that the Special Committee have no power to make any such announcement? They are appointed solely for the Berlin Games and will cease to exist as soon as those Games are over.

The decision of continuing or not continuing rests not with the Special Committee, but with the British Olympic Council, which is composed of representatives of the Sports Governing Bodies.

Speaking for myself alone, one of the reasons that induced me to accept the position of chairman of the Special Committee was the hope that if successful the work of that committee would enable Great Britain to retire from future Olympic contests without loss of dignity or prestige should she desire to do so.

As has been said above, however, the immediate question is not what we shall do after Berlin, but how we are to make a worthy appearance there.

THE IMPOSSIBILITY OF "STANDING DOWN" IN 1916.

The case was succinctly put by Sir Arthur Conan Doyle in a short letter to *The Times* (September 13):—

I should like to ask one question and receive a definite reply from all those persons, including Mr. Punch, who are making our Olympic task more difficult. It is this:—"Are you prepared to stand down from the Berlin Games altogether?" In answering it they would do well to bear three points in mind—that we were defeated at the last Games, that the Games *are* in Berlin, and that all the chief nations have already announced their intention of seriously competing. If in the face of this they are prepared to stand down, then their attitude is, I admit, perfectly consistent. If they are not, then what is it that they want to do?

We are, of course, not going to "stand down." British athletes are certainly going to enter and compete at the Berlin Games, and ultimately it is not possible to doubt that the money will be forthcoming to enable them to compete in such a way as to do some credit to us. But those who,

from a dislike of the whole notion of the Olympic Games and an attachment to the old Arcadian village-green era of British sport, choose to indulge in more or less diffused and impractical criticism of the Committee's plans make very hard work for those who have the raising of the subscription in hand and are bent on seeing it carried to a

successful conclusion. It remains only for all those who wish to see British credit maintained in an international contest to provide the sinews of war for the purpose of organizing victory. The Appeal on behalf of the Duke of Westminster's Fund is for £100,000, of which on October 18th about £9,500 had been subscribed.

APPENDIX A.

SCHEMES OF THE ASSOCIATIONS.

The Special Committee has from time to time issued outlines of the plans which it is proposed to follow in co-operation with the Governing Bodies in the respective sports. These are given below :—

ENGLISH AMATEUR ATHLETIC ASSOCIATION.

1.—PUBLIC SCHOOLS CHAMPIONSHIPS.

The necessity to arouse enthusiasm in the schools and systematically develop a taste for athletics ; to obtain the approval and co-operation of the headmasters, and to form a committee from the schools to accept entries and to manage the meeting.

2.—COUNTY CHAMPIONSHIPS.

To arrange for these to take place in counties where they do not at present exist at metric distances.

3.—TRIANGULAR OLYMPIC CONTESTS.

To arrange triangular contests between England, Scotland, and Ireland at metric distances.

4.—OLYMPIC FIELD EVENTS.

To include these in the Amateur Athletic Association Championships, and introduce such field events which are not at present included, and if possible to arrange for a two days' meeting.

5.—SCRATCH RACES.

To assist affiliated clubs with prizes, provided they included approved scratch races at metric distances in their programmes. Such races to include :—

(a) Scratch races during 1913 and 1914 for novices, open only to competitors who have never won a prize at athletics, ordinary school competitions not to count.

1. A series of competitions at Olympic distances and events to be called Olympic novice trials.
2. The events to be level and open only to competitors over 17 years of age who have never won a prize at athletics, ordinary school competitions and junior sections of athletic clubs not to count as wins.
3. The prizes to consist of gold, silver, and bronze medals of special designs.
4. These events to be allocated proportionally to sports meetings willing to accept the same in the North, South, and Midland districts of England, and to Scotland and Ireland.
5. The distribution of the competitions to be left to the discretion of the various governing associations who are the best authorities to deal with the matter and most likely to know the events to allot to advantage in special districts.

The proportion to be 150 events to England and 50 each to Scotland and Ireland in the two years.

The results of the effort to be reported, the names of novices showing promise to be carefully registered, and the novices themselves to be watched and have special training facilities provided.

(b) Scratch races for those in receipt of a certain start.

(c) Scratch races for back-markers.

6.—STANDARD MEDALS.

To award standard medals, gold, silver, and

bronze, to athletes beating standards at Olympic distances, these standards to be fixed for all metric scratch and field events, no athletes to hold more than one medal of each class at any one distance.

7.—GYMNASTIC CLUBS.

To arrange for gymnastic clubs throughout the country to promote competitions during the winter for the following items :—

Standing high and long jumps.

Running high and long jumps.

Putting the weight.

8. To support the Northern Counties and Midland Counties in holding an annual championship meeting at Olympic distances, the support to take the form of guaranteeing the meeting against financial loss up to a specified amount.

9.—TRAINING.

The question of training has been considered at length, and it was agreed that necessary arrangements should be made for central quarters in London and other centres, such as Manchester, Birmingham, Cardiff, and Newcastle, where an official trainer and adviser would be on the track at a set hour to advise and help approved athletes.

10. To provide proper sets of impedimenta for field events at various centres.
11. To hold Olympic trials in 1915.
12. To urge every affiliated club or permitted body to include a field event in their programme.

SCOTTISH AMATEUR ATHLETIC ASSOCIATION.

1. That Novice Trials should be held as arranged in the Amateur Athletic Association scheme.

2. That national contests should be held as arranged in the Amateur Athletic Association scheme.

3. Sports Meetings.—That special sports meetings should be held in Inverness, Aberdeen, Dundee, Dumfries, and the Border District. The facilities for holding sports in these centres are not such as obtain in Edinburgh, Glasgow, and the West of Scotland, yet it is from this source that an influx of new athletic blood must be looked for so far as Scotland is concerned. The meetings to be guaranteed against loss up to a specified amount.

4. Field Events.—That grants be given to clubs holding sports in order to include in all programmes a certain number of field events.

5. Training.—A grant to be given for trainers in Edinburgh (1) and Glasgow (2).

6. That it is essential that a contest be instituted between the Scottish Universities and the Rest of Scotland, and that a sum be set aside to meet expenses.

IRISH AMATEUR ATHLETIC ASSOCIATION.

1. The institution of Irish Schools Championships at Olympic distances.

2. To encourage clubs to hold sports meetings at Olympic distances in isolated districts by guaranteeing them against loss up to a certain specified sum.

3. To encourage holding Provincial Olympic Championships.

4. The purchase of apparatus for field events with a view to lending them to sports promoters, clubs, and athletes at a nominal fee.

5. The establishment of training headquarters and the appointment of trainers.

6. The creation of a Register of Approved

Athletes, who shall receive special training and advice.

7. To make a grant for administrative expenses in carrying out the above.

In addition to the above as part of the Amateur Athletic Association scheme already approved there would be :—

(a) Olympic Novice Trials (50 events in the two years).

(b) The holding of a triple international contest.

NATIONAL CYCLISTS' UNION.

The following is the suggested scheme of preparation for the National Cyclists' Union :—

1.—CENTRES.

The division of the country into districts with honorary Olympic Games representatives appointed for each district.

2.—TRAINING.

Honorary Advisory Training Committee to supervise training arrangements.

Professional trainers to be appointed in London, Birmingham, Liverpool, Leeds, Newcastle, Bristol, and other towns. A special trainer (with assistance) to be appointed for road racers. These trainers to work under the direction of the Honorary Training Committee.

3.—STANDARD MEDALS.

British Olympic Medals to be offered to all riders who accomplish certain standards at or near Olympic distances subject to the following conditions :—

(a) That the British Olympic Medals are for events that would form part of the programme at Berlin in 1916 ;

(b) That the standards are so approximately near record as to make them sought after by those who will be suitable representatives at Berlin ;

(c) That in all cases the conditions of the races should approximate as nearly as possible to those which will be in force at Berlin, such as cement track, &c.

4.—REGISTRATION.

That after accomplishing a standard ride the rider be placed under the guidance of the Honorary Advisory Committee, who will advise as to future work under the direct supervision of professional trainers, who will be paid by arrangement.

5.—SCRATCH RACES.

That National Cyclists' Union centres be urged to organize independently or through approved clubs scratch races at Olympic distances both on road and path for likely competitors, and that financial assistance be given for prizes.

6.—NATIONAL TRIALS.

That each year the best riders compete together in National Olympic Trials. This meeting to be considered a Championship Meeting and that the cyclists of Scotland, Ireland, and Wales be invited to compete, and that one event at least shall be open to the whole world ; such meeting to be guaranteed against loss up to a limited amount.

7.—FOREIGN RACES.

That selected riders be sent abroad to compete in the World's Championships and also in approved races.

8.—FINAL TRAINING.

Prior to the Olympic Games of Berlin the nominated representatives compete in National Olympic Trials, arrangements to be made for strict training before the trials and the trials to be in ample time

before the entries close. One month before the Berlin Games to be devoted to strict training in England and Berlin.

9.—ROAD TRIAL.

That a trial road event (240 kilometres) be run each year under the auspices of the National Cyclists' Union.

10.—CO-OPERATION OF SCOTLAND AND IRELAND.

That the National Cyclists' Union should co-operate with the Scottish Cyclists' Union and the Irish Cyclists' Association.

AMATEUR FENCING ASSOCIATION.

1. The Amateur Fencing Association, being a society of encouragement, as well as a governing body, is of opinion that no special scheme is wanted to supplement its ordinary activities in this direction, but every effort will be made to discover and encourage fresh fencing talent.

2. For the same reason no special scheme is wanted for the preparation and training of fresh fencing talent as distinguished from other fencing talent ; but, when the date of the Games approaches, the following general scheme should be put in hand with a view to providing the best possible representation :—

(a) It is essential that for one month before the Games take place the representatives finally selected should be provided with professional instructors ; one for each of the three weapons, foil, épée, and sabre. These instructors should be obtained from the Continent. Accommodation for these instructors to carry on their work would have to be secured in the London Fencing Schools or Clubs.

If any of the fencing at Berlin takes place out-of-doors on a gravel " terrain " (as the A.F.A. strongly urges should be the case with the épée at any rate) a suitable practice ground should be provided in a central situation in London.

(b) It is advisable that the above scheme should commence two months before the Games, not one ; in which case it would, of course, be applied to all " possible " and " probable " representatives until the final selection is made, after which it would apply solely to the actual representatives.

(c) It is desirable, should funds permit, that the above scheme should commence three months before the Games, not two.

AMATEUR SWIMMING ASSOCIATION.

1. The institution of Swimming Scholarships so as to assist the more promising boys and girls to continue their swimming training after leaving school.

2. Arrangements whereby the services of amateurs of experience may be enlisted to advise and instruct in special strokes. Also to arrange for expert amateurs to give exhibitions at school swimming entertainments.

3. The appointment of professional instructors skilled in the various swimming strokes.

4. The encouragement of High and Fancy Diving.

5. Time tests are to be arranged in each of the five districts of the Association. A schedule of times in three grades has been fixed, and candidates who succeed in these tests are to receive the Gold, Silver, or Bronze badges of the Association.

The Management Committee appointed to control the working of the scheme have got out the following estimate of the amounts that will be required for the first year's working :—

1. Scholarships	£100
2. Expenses of expert amateurs for exhibitions at School Galas	100

3. Professional Instructors	£1,050
4. Diving and the installation of diving stages —	
5. Time Tests—Candidates and officials' expenses	200
Badges	95
6. Administration expenses for management and five District Committees and Local Committees	200

In drawing up a scheme for the improvement of swimming, the Amateur Swimming Association had two specific purposes in view. First, swimmers of known ability should be looked after with a view to possible improvement. Also there should be a thorough scouring of the country for potential champions, who would require only a few hints from an expert, together with practice, to develop the latent speed or stamina. The second object was to commence a new era in swimming. It was recognized that hot-house methods are not possible. Record breakers are not manufactured to order. But if the standard of swimming could be raised all round, the field of selection would in later years be very much wider, and the doing of it would be of great benefit to the rising generation.

Item 1.—Scholarships. Education and bath authorities throughout the country have recognized the advantages of teaching swimming to their scholars, and in most of the large towns this is done during school hours. A recent pronouncement by the Minister for Education foreshadowed a more sympathetic attitude on the part of his department, and there is every probability of more time and attention being devoted to swimming in the future.

The A.S.A. decided to take advantage of these factors and endeavour to get hold of the more promising out of the thousands of boys and girls whose school days finish each year. The scholarship part of the scheme is intended to achieve this object. The best swimmers will be taken in hand and a continuation of their swimming education provided for.

In devising ways and means, it was recognized that the maintenance of the scholarships could not be effectually managed from any central fund, and that they must be instituted and maintained entirely by local effort. But in order to set the necessary machinery to work, some outlay would be unavoidable. It is for this preliminary work only that the scholarships figures in the estimate.

That this innovation will be successful is already amply proved. Local authorities appreciate the advantages that will accrue, and have required little persuasion to grant the necessary free bathing facilities. As a definite means of ensuring more and better swimmers in the future, this part of the scheme must be successful.

Item 2.—An arrangement whereby it may be possible for amateur swimmers, expert in the various strokes, to give demonstrations at schools and other entertainments is intended to supplement the scholarships. Imitation plays an important part in the making of swimmers, and it is suggested to make use of this fact. To carry out this part of the scheme necessitates railway fares, and £100 has been inserted in the estimate to cover this expense.

Item 3.—When the scheme for the improvement of swimming was first mooted it was felt that there might be, in various parts of the country, swimmers who with some attention from expert professional instructors could be developed into championship form. Steps have already been taken to find out swimmers of more than average ability, and who have not passed the age when improvement

may be looked for. The returns already to hand suggest that this plan is capable of showing important results.

The amount estimated is to cover the cost, including travelling expenses, &c., of seven professional instructors whose services would be retained during several months each year. Competent instructors are available, and all that is lacking is the wherewithal to meet the bill.

Item 4.—The improvement in diving presents problems that are not so easy to solve. The art is practically restricted to towns in the South of England, and even there the available places are few. Two reasons are responsible for this, viz.:—the cost of proper diving stages and the necessity for sufficient depth of water. The height of the stage and the depth of the water necessary preclude the use of covered-in swimming baths; open air ponds that fulfil requirements and which are accessible to populous centres are difficult to find. Steps are being taken to overcome these difficulties. Meantime nothing is included in the estimate for this branch of the sport.

Item 5.—This part of the scheme is intended as an incentive to swimmers and divers of different ability. The tests cover three grades, for which the rewards are respectively Gold, Silver, and Bronze badges. The main expense is brought about by the cost of bringing the candidates to the common centres in which the tests will be held. In order to minimize the cost, it has been decided that each of the five districts, which comprise the Association, shall conduct tests. Only those who justify the outlay will have their expenses refunded. The cost of candidates and officials for all tests is estimated to be £200, whilst the badges for successful candidates are estimated at £95.

Item 6.—Administration. The amount (£200) is expected to cover the whole of the expense necessary to carry out the scheme. The meetings of the management and District Committees (which involve considerable cost in rail fares) are included together with all stationary, printing, and postages. There are no charges for clerical work included, the necessary work being done entirely by honorary officials.

It will be seen from the details set forth above exactly the sums that have been specified and the purpose for which each is to be devoted. In order to compute the amount that would be required by the A.S.A. up to the time of departure for Berlin, it will be necessary to take the amount already spent, or likely to be spent this year, as approximately £500. In 1914 and 1915 the full estimated amounts would be required, whilst in 1916 only a portion of the money could be spent, as the swimming season is only properly opened out at the time of the year when the Games take place.

NATIONAL AMATEUR WRESTLING ASSOCIATION.

1. The development of a higher standard of technical efficiency.
2. The utilization of much of the fine raw material as yet unused.
3. An improvement in physical training and preparation.

These objects are attainable by the following means:—

- (a) By providing efficient instruction, facilities for more frequent competition, proper appliances and improved conditions for practice, and by obtain

ing permission from local authorities for open-air wrestling on Public Recreation Grounds.

- (b) By cooperating with existing athletic organizations and clubs having established headquarters, *i.e.*, athletic, cross-country, boxing, and gymnastic clubs, providing necessary appliances and arranging for instruction of honorary nature. By this means it is hoped that men would be attracted to the sport and later avail themselves of the organized system of professional instruction. By enlisting the co-operation of Navy and Army Officers towards the encouragement of wrestling throughout the Services, leading up to the institution of regimental, inter-regimental, and Service Championships, and by bringing before the Universities, Public Schools, Services, and other educational establishments the desirability of encouraging and promoting internal wrestling.

The essential features of the scheme will include (a) the organization, as certain defined centres, of a system of professional instruction in wrestling and physical training under competent paid instructors. The management to be in the hands of a properly constituted local body acting under the control of the Amateur Wrestling Association. The holding in these centres of periodic Novices and Annual County or District Championship Competitions. (b) The procuring greater facilities for the practice of the sport by assisting needy clubs, arranging for practice at public grounds, and at the headquarters of other athletic organizations, and the dissemination of literature upon physical training, hygiene, and wrestling.

Particular attention to be paid to the following :—

- (a) To concentrate every effort and attention upon "Catch-as-Catch-Can" wrestling.
- (b) The formation of special centres with skilled trainers.
- (c) Eliminating competitions to ascertain the most promising talent.
- (d) The provision of special facilities for training and practice for winners of these competitions.
- (e) That an endeavour be made to arouse interest in wrestling in Scotland.
- (f) The appointment of a supervisor to give effect to the details proposed by the scheme.

AMATEUR GYMNASTIC ASSOCIATION.

BASIS OF ESSENTIAL SCHEME.—The broad principles of the scheme which it is necessary to lay down under the heading of "Essential" brings us at once to the fact of the German authorities' fixed intention to give a specially prominent position to Gymnastics. It is therefore obvious that the maximum number of competitors should be entered in the

1. Team Event ;
2. Individual Competition ;

and in preparing for these items arrangements could be made for

3. Special Displays.

These three items form together, in view of the proposed extensive scope of the German Gymnastic Programme, the smallest limits on which we can base our work.

SELECTION OF MEMBERS.—Amateur gymnasts would be drawn from our kindred Associations in the United Kingdom, those nominated being :—

1. Leading gymnasts ;
2. Gymnasts thought capable of improvement to the desired standard of efficiency by the early part of 1916 ;

due regard being paid to

- (a) Ability and willingness to devote time and

attention to correct training under supervision at preparatory centres ;

- (b) Ability to travel to Berlin at the appointed time.

TRAINING CENTRES.—Arrangements would be made for the use of Gymnasium Halls fitted with the necessary apparatus and conveniently situated in the several centres to enable those nominated in or near any particular district to periodically practise together.

Combined practices would also be held at intervals which all would be expected to attend, thus enabling those responsible to particularly note the progress made, recommend desirable changes, and, in fact, closely follow up the whole of the scheme.

PROGRAMME OF WORK.—It is desirable that preliminary training be commenced without delay. Immediately on receipt of definite information from the German Gymnastic Committee a suitable series of exercises will be arranged, alterations and additions being made from time to time according to the capabilities of the members. This will continue up to a reasonable time preceding the actual month fixed for the Games, when a decided programme will have been arrived at which will be strictly adhered to.

ORGANIZATION.—Any scheme of preparation necessitates the appointment of a thoroughly competent number of officials who will accept entire responsibility and carry out in an enthusiastic and whole-hearted manner the work from start to finish. The list of officials will be :—

- (1) Honorary Organizer ;
- (2) Honorary Secretary and Treasurer ;
- (3) Honorary Assistant Secretaries ;
- (4) Honorary Sectional Leaders ;
- (5) Chief Coach ;
- (6) District Coaches ;

and such other officials as may be considered necessary.

COMPETITIONS.—The annual competition between England, Ireland, Scotland, and Wales, taking the form of a Team Contest between the four countries, should be revived, thus enabling the picked gymnasts, say six or eight from each country, to be brought together in keen competition, with officials present to carefully note the whole of the work, thereby affording exceptional opportunities for the discovery of fresh talent. Special badges to be awarded. Financial reasons alone have prevented these contests from taking place during the past three years. Financial help might also be extended to competitors entering for the Open Individual Challenge Cup Gymnastic Championship: this would be the means of increasing the entry and act as a lever to keep the men in constant practice.

CLAY BIRD SHOOTING ASSOCIATION.

1. For the discovery and encouragement of fresh talent, a matter to be undertaken as promptly as possible, it would be desirable to institute a system whereby the monthly percentage averages of the best shooters at the grounds of the affiliated clubs should be codified for periods in each year, say of three months. Shooters who during this period qualify with a specified minimum percentage of kills should then be eligible to shoot annually in a match, preferably in London. In that way the best shots from the various clubs could be brought together once a year, so that their form could be gauged with accuracy.

2. Having thus brought together the best representatives from the clubs in the various parts of the country, a scheme should be set on foot to provide,

under limits very carefully defined, facilities for practice based upon the conditions actually laid down for the competitions at Berlin. In the spring of 1916 Test Shooting Trials should be held, and the expenses of these Test Matches should be defrayed. The procedure would follow closely the lines adopted in 1908 and 1912. After the Test Matches the composition of the team would be decided upon and team practice would continue until the eve of the competitions in Berlin.

To subdivide the scheme :—

- (a) After the selection of the team, with its reserves, proper and thorough training shall be undertaken.
- (b) Facilities for practice on club grounds should be provided where such encouragement may be deemed necessary.

THE MODERN PENTATHLON.

The British Olympic Association has appointed a Committee for the special encouragement of

competitors in the Modern Pentathlon, which consists of the following events :—Revolver or pistol shooting at a whole figure decimal target, distance 25 metres ; swimming, 300 metres, free style ; fencing (épée) ; riding across country, 5,000 metres ; cross-country running, 4,000 metres. The Committee consists of the representatives on the British Olympic Council of the sports concerned, together with the officers of the Council. The Committee is charged with the discovery, selection, and preparation of candidates who are able to show sufficient reason for the consideration of their claims to be competitors representing Great Britain at the Olympic Games of Berlin in 1916 and appeals to all those who think of offering themselves as candidates for inclusion in the British Team for this event to communicate with the secretary of the British Olympic Council, 108, Victoria-street, London, S.W.

APPENDIX B.

RESULTS OF THE STOCKHOLM GAMES.

In a series of articles published at intervals in the month of September, 1913, *The Times* gave a survey of the lessons taught by the Stockholm Games :—

I.—TRACK AND FIELD EVENTS.

Now that the work of raising funds for the preparation of British athletes for the next Olympic Games has been seriously taken in hand, it may be well to refresh our memories as to just what happened in Stockholm a year ago. And what it is most necessary, in the first place, to insist on is that Great Britain's representatives did not do nearly as badly as is commonly supposed. We only won third place among the nations in the total number of "points" gained, Sweden being first with 133 points, the United States next with 129, and Great Britain third with 76. The total of the British Empire as a whole was 118 ; and we have to remember that the question of the whole Empire's competing as a single "nation" at future games is one of the most important matters to be decided. After Great Britain came Finland with 52 points, Germany with 47, France with 32, and so on. The points were awarded on a basis of three for a first place, two for a second, and one for a third.

What made this result so bitter was, of course, the contrast with the outcome of the Games in London in 1908, when Great Britain not merely stood first in the list of nations, but earned over three times as many points as her nearest competitor, and something more than the total of all other nations combined. The marking at the London Games was on the basis of five for a first, three for a second, and one for a third. Translating the 1908 results into the same terms, the standing of the leading countries is shown from the following table, adapted from the Official Report of the British Olympic Council :—

Nation.	1908.	1912.
Great Britain	446	111
United States	153	195
Sweden	67	207

The total points for the whole Games were in 1908 885, and in 1912 913 ; so that Great Britain, having won over 50 per cent. of the total points in 1908, could get but little more than 12 per cent. in 1912.

We had three times as many points as the United States in 1908, and the United States had 75 per cent. more than we had in 1912. No one, of course, supposes that there had been any such reversal in the relative athletic competence of the two peoples in four years. The suggestion is absurd ; and absurd, therefore, is the idea that the results were any evidence of England's "decadence." A nation does not "decay" with any such rapidity. Much of the difference was due to the fact that in the former year Great Britain was the "home country" ; and to the same fact Sweden in 1912 owed her leap from third place to first. It will not be surprising if Germany, which could get no higher than sixth place in 1908, with a total of only 26 points, and, on the same basis, fifth in 1912 with 69 points, should head the list in 1916, in spite of whatever may be done in the way of formulating a "type" programme.

But after making all allowances for the incidental advantage to the country in which the Games are held, it is evident that something else is needed to explain Great Britain's catastrophic descent ; and it is now sufficiently notorious that the "something else" in the case was the lack of training and bad management of our men. Behind these shortcomings and in a measure justifying them, there was of course an absence of popular interest in Great Britain in the Olympic Games and a disinclination to take them seriously. Now that the popular interest seems to be awakening the important question is how this lack of training and bad management showed themselves and what ground there is for supposing that with proper organization our comparative failure can be redeemed.

They showed themselves in a multitude of ways and from the very beginning of the Games. Few Englishmen who were in the Stadium at the parade of the competitors of all nations with which the Games opened can have failed to be humiliated and depressed by the showing which the British contingent made beside the representatives of the other leading nations. In comparison with the smartness of the Americans and the splendid physique of the bodies of trained gymnasts from, especially, the Scandinavian countries, Great Britain's quota, for all that it contained so many fine men, looked shambling and disorderly. It was typical of the whole situation and of the way in which Great Britain, the teacher of the world in sports, has come to be worsted by her

pupils, that the costume of the Americans, which looked so well—white flannels, blue serge coat cut blazer-fashion, and straw hat—was in every detail typically English. A few years ago white flannels and blazers were unknown in the United States, except as they happened to be seen on a visiting Englishman.

But the difference was not a mere matter of costume. Even more was it a matter of bearing and of seeming confidence of spirit. And the disorderliness and lack of discipline and control soon showed themselves in innumerable ways. Complaints of the quarters in which some of our men were lodged, of overcrowding, and of inadequate food were bitter. It is a fact that some of our men went on to the track without any one in authority having addressed one word to them on the subject of training either before they went to Stockholm or when they were there. Nearly all our men lost weight to an excessive extent, some to an amount of over a stone. None can have gone into the Stadium without a feeling that he went almost unbacked and neglected, to meet, at least so far as the United States was concerned, an organized body of opponents pumped full of confidence and trained to the last ounce. The moral effect of it all was extremely bad. The common belief which got abroad, however, that our athletes habitually disregarded all training rules while in Stockholm is wrong and unjust to the majority of them. There were conspicuous instances of individuals who did so, and they came to utter grief. We also had a good many men there who should never have gone; and it cannot be too clearly understood that it is worse than useless to send second-rate men to future Olympic Games. The best of our men, however, bore themselves well and did all that they could do by individual pluck and by the example that they set to others to atone for the absence of any proper management. They showed that we had material which under equally good handling would have been not incomparable with the Americans.

And it must be remembered that, although in the field events in the Stadium we were practically nonexistent, in the running events there was no other nation to be considered except ourselves and the Americans. The older Kohlemainen from Finland was, of course, the bright particular star of the Stockholm Games; and it was hard luck that Bouin, the Frenchman, had such a man to meet. There were Braun and Rau from Germany, who both deserved to do better than they did. But, barring the Americans, no country had anything like such a group of men as we had in Anderson, Jackson, Hutson, Applegarth, Moore, Baker, MacMillan, Seedhouse, Powell, Lord, Porter, and Webb, without counting MacArthur, Gitsham, Patching, and Goulding from other parts of the Empire. No amount of management on our part could have prevented Anderson's falling or Applegarth from being accidentally judged out (if he was judged out) of a heat which he is believed to have won in the 100 metres; nor, as we were not in command of the track, could it have prevented some of our men from being fouled. But it could have kept certain others in training, and it could have put our runners in general on the track in fit condition, with a better idea how a race should be run and with some feeling of confidence and pride. As it was, in all the track events, whether inside the Stadium or outside (including the Marathon race, the long-distance walk, the bicycling and cross-country run) the Empire won 28 points out of a possible 102 (on the 1912 plan of marking), which, though the thanks are largely due to South Africa and to Canada, was by no means a discreditable performance. Yet in all the distances under a mile

we won nothing but a solitary third place in the 200 metres race.

It is preposterous to suppose that that represents the best that we can do. In the field events, out of a possible 96 points the Empire won 5, all of which were gained by Canada (by second places in the hammer and long jump and third place in the pole vault) and none at all by Great Britain. How much we can improve on this has yet to be seen. But what is certain is that, as the standard of the Olympic contests is bound inevitably to be higher at each succeeding Games, if we take part in the same haphazard way as we did last year, we shall make if possible an even poorer figure.

The Stadium events, of course, are only a portion of the Games. Though they receive by far the largest advertising they represent only a little more than one-third of the total points, for the shooting, swimming, rowing, fencing, riding, yachting, lawn tennis, and football (according to the Stockholm programme) all took place elsewhere. In some of these things we did well. How largely our performance in others was affected by the lack of management is a question to be discussed in another article. (*The Times*, Sept. 8, 1913.)

II.—COMPETITIONS OUTSIDE THE STADIUM.

We saw in a former article that at Stockholm in all the running events at distances under a mile (apart from one relay race, where, it is to be feared, we owed our success chiefly to disqualification of our opponents) Great Britain succeeded only in scoring one single point, for a third place in the 200 metres; and that in all the field events—jumping, pole-vaulting, weight, hammer, discus, and javelin throwing, and combinations of these—we failed to win any point at all; although for the Empire Canada succeeded in annexing five points, with seconds in the hammer and broad jump and third in the pole-vaulting. The total number of points awarded for all these events was 126. That Great Britain should be able to score no more than one point out of 126 is preposterous. In all the field and running events together at all distances Great Britain took 15 points and the United States 85. Outside the Stadium we did much better; but it will be interesting to notice first the contests outside the Stadium in which we failed to score.

There were no entries from Great Britain for the open-air lawn tennis, where, had we thought it worth our while, we could surely have picked up half-a-dozen points at least, although some of them must have been at the expense of South Africa. Nor did we enter for the yachting, in which France, Sweden, Norway, Finland, and Russia divided the 24 points between them. It was Sweden's five points in the yacht races that at the very end gave her the final victory over the United States. Needless to say that, had British yachts entered, we could have won some points, perhaps another half-dozen. In wrestling the rules were farcical: there was no catch-as-catch-can competition, and the Græco-Roman rules were altered so that the contests became absurd. So far as we competed we were outclassed; but with different rules another time we can reasonably hope to pick up a point or two, though probably not many. In military riding we sent over only four competitors with seven horses, while Germany had 14 men, Sweden 20, and Russia 11 and 14 horses. Our men had had no special preparation as a team and hardly any as individuals; and, having so few altogether, when two of them were injured we were left without a team. We were quite good enough to win points, and had there been six men there instead of four we should undoubtedly have done so. It is earnestly

to be hoped that the War Office will take the thing more seriously at Berlin.

Here, then, were four classes of contests—open-air lawn tennis, yachting, wrestling, and military riding—in which we failed to score at all. Had we entered in earnest in three of them (leaving wrestling out of the question), we could as easily as not have picked up at least 15 or 20 points. It only needed 16 points to put the British Empire as a whole at the head of the list of nations. There still remain to be considered those other competitions outside the Stadium in which we did do something.

In some of these events we were in a class by ourselves. Our football team represented something like one-half our national strength; but it was immensely better than any team opposed to it. It is doubtful if in all the other events there was more than one man—possibly there were two—who showed what would be considered international form in Great Britain. The water polo we won with similar ease. In rowing there were only two first-class events (as against four in 1908), and we won them both. Leander, the Australians, and New College, Oxford, were beyond doubt the three best eights in the regatta, and Kinnear was lengths better than any foreign sculler. We were beaten in the fours with coxswains, probably by a better boat, although Thames rowed under great disadvantage in their craft. In these things we showed that in those competitions which, partaking rather of the nature of sports than of pure athletics, appeal more strongly to our national temperament we can still hold our own. So far as they go we can take most of the points that are to be won. But the trouble is that at the Olympic Games they count for very little. All our rowing, football, and water polo victories together counted 16 points, and Sweden won 15 in running-deer shooting! As has been said more than once in *The Times*, the Olympic ideal is not our ideal. Whether in course of time it will come more near to it remains to be seen; in the meantime we have to take the Games as we find them, or as the majority of the nations decide that they are to be.

There still remain to be considered the gymnastics, fencing, cycling, swimming, and shooting. In gymnastics we did well to secure one third place. The competitions altogether represented 24 points. Perhaps another year may add a point or two to our score; but it is not to be counted on with any certainty. In fencing, also, we did well to take a second in the *épée* competition. We suffered somewhat by the rules and, it is believed, by the judging; but any disadvantage was probably counterbalanced by the absence of French competitors, and if France competes another year we shall do well if we improve on our position. In cycling there was only one race, with awards for individuals and for teams. We won seconds in both, while South Africa, for the Empire, won first in individuals. With more events another year we can probably win more points.

In swimming, out of a total of 78 points (not counting water polo), Great Britain scored 10 points and various parts of the Empire 18 more, making 28 in all, or within a couple of points of a quarter of the Empire's total score in the Games. Of the 28 points, ten were scored by ladies, and we were unlucky in losing by illness, during the competitions, our best lady swimmer. On the whole we cannot complain of this result, but that we could have done better with better organization is hardly open to doubt. None of our representatives, perhaps, suffered more from the inferior quality of their accommodations than did some of the swimmers.

The shooting competitions represented a total of

no fewer than 103 points, or as much as all the field events and running races in the Stadium at distances of less than a quarter of a mile, put together. They included competitions with Army rifles, any rifles, duelling pistols, revolvers, miniature rifles, and at clay birds and running deer. Of the 108 points we took 15. In two at least of the competitions we suffered badly from unfamiliarity with the rules and conditions. In the Army rifle match we suffered, as compared with the United States, by inferiority of weapons; but hardly less important than the better weapons was the vastly superior organization of the American team. One of our pistol teams arrived in Stockholm too late for one of the competitions, and practically all suffered from lack of opportunity to practise. We did not, on the whole, do badly; some of our men did very well. But that under proper management, by getting on the ground in plenty of time, being thoroughly informed about the rules and conditions and ensuring the opportunities for practice under them, there is no possible doubt that we should have done much better. It was, in fact, the same tale as in so many other things; only the fact that we had some really first-class material pulled us through without discredit in spite of our happy-go-lucky lack of organization. (*The Times*, September 8.)

III.—SUGGESTIONS FOR THE FUTURE.

In two former articles a summary has been given of the results of the Games at Stockholm, showing how many points Great Britain and the Empire scored in the several events and, in a general way, wherein we failed and how far we succeeded. What is necessary is that we should get a clear understanding of the significance of these results so as to apply whatever lesson there is to be learned from them to our conduct in the future.

In the first place, then, we have to recognize that we cannot do ourselves justice at Berlin or at any Games thereafter unless we take the whole thing more seriously. If we are to take part in the contests at all we ought to send our best representatives for all the competitions. Great Britain was not represented in the open-air lawn tennis (the date of which conflicted with Wimbledon) or in the yacht races. The four officers who competed in the military riding, although individually very good, were numerically too few to give us any chance against the other leading nations. It has already been suggested that in these three competitions alone we might not improbably have won enough points to put the Empire at the head of the list, though Great Britain would still have been only third.

In saying this, however, it must be understood that the opportunity which we thus neglected at Stockholm will not occur again. If British players enter in force for the open-air lawn tennis at Berlin, so will Americans, Germans, and Frenchmen. In yachting, our best boats will hereafter have to meet the best boats of all nations. The military riding will be much more desperately in earnest. The whole standard of keenness and of excellence throughout the Games will assuredly be much higher another year and the chance of picking up unconsidered points in any competition will be slight. But if we intend, whether for Great Britain or for the Empire, to make a better showing in the future, we cannot afford to neglect any of the events in which we have a chance of winning.

Next to the lack of seriousness in our whole attitude towards the Games is to be considered the fact that the programme at Stockholm contained many events which, from our point of view, were not

first class, while many others were contested under rules or conditions which seem to us irregular and even improper. We cannot expect the nations to agree to frame a programme to suit us. None the less we have had a wider and longer experience in sport than any other country and the weight of our opinion (however much it may have been lessened by the events at Stockholm) is still considerable. It is the imperative duty of our representatives at the forthcoming meeting for the purpose of drafting a "type" programme to use every effort to force on that meeting an acceptance of our views as far as possible, not in our own interests, but in the interests of sport.

In the matter of ordinary field athletics we shall have to adapt our view to that of other nations. We may have strong opinions as to the right of discus and javelin throwing, the standing jumps, and the hop-step-and-jump to be considered first-class sports; and it may appear to us an aggravated absurdity that in the throwing contests there should be separate competitions for the right and left hands; but we shall have to accept that, although it may not be unreasonable to press for a reduction of the number of points awarded for some of the events. After the representative of Finland, by throwing the discus with his best hand, has scored as many points as the Leander eight won by its victory in the regatta, it seems ridiculous that he should then have been able to go out again and, by throwing with the other hand, win another batch of points equivalent to all that our football team won by fighting its way through three hard matches. Akin to this is the lack of perspective (from our view point) of allowing Sweden to win five times as many points (15) for running-deer shooting as, for example, were awarded to Jackson (3) for his win in the mile, and three times as many as South Africa earned by first and second places (5) in the Marathon race. In rowing, again, we do not consider either the race for inrigged fours or that for outriggered fours with coxswains as first-class events. At least they should not be on the same plane with the eights and the single sculls. Nor was there any race for pairs. In bicycling it appears to us wrong to have only one event, namely, a 200-miles ride over roads which imposed a heavy penalty on those competitors whom the luck of the draw compelled to start late. The rules which governed the wrestling and fencing competitions were open to great objection; and similar criticisms could be made on a number of details throughout the programme. All these matters will have to be considered when the "type" programme is being formulated; and while we have no right to expect that programme to be drawn up to suit our special needs, on many of the matters common sense is obviously on our side; as it will be if we insist on a penalizing at Berlin of all attempts to "beat the pistol" at the start of running races and on the keeping of a much stricter watch for illegitimate practices on the track.

Closely related to these are a number of things connected with details in rules and practice. Our representatives suffered in many events by the unfamiliarity of the conditions and the seeming eccentricity of rules; but that we should have been taken unaware by them was more to the discredit of the management of our affairs than it was to those who adopted those conditions and rules. Much has been made of the fact that our tug-of-war team had to pull in sand. Whether they would have won on hard ground we cannot guess; but competent management would have forewarned our men of the conditions to be met. So with

the hurdles. The obstacles used at Stockholm were neither our rigid hurdles nor those with the displaceable top bar which are employed in America, but semi-stable erections like towel horses, which, when Anderson (having cleared eight in succession) caught his spike in one, came down all of a piece and threw him, while permitting certain other competitors to butt them down, with their knees or heads or anything they pleased, without catastrophe. They may be a good type of hurdle, but we ought to have known well in advance that they were to be used and our men should have had ample chance of getting accustomed to them. In almost all the shooting contests, with whatever weapon, our men were confronted with regulations or conditions to which they were not accustomed. They ought to have been fully informed and enabled to familiarize themselves with anything that was likely to be new to them.

These things, with the casual way in which our men arrived in Stockholm, in some cases at the last minute, and even too late, generally without any special preparation and almost invariably unorganized as teams, not seldom to go into competitions under unfamiliar conditions without any practice on the spot, sometimes indifferently housed and without the proper care and nourishment to keep them fit, with little or no oversight or helpfulness to give them confidence or keep the *esprit de corps* alive, were all of a piece. We seem to be setting out in earnest to discover "talent" for the Berlin Games. It is most necessary that we should; and the new committee is evidently disposed to back up every governing body in any reasonable scheme that it proposes. In the days when other peoples practised even less than we did, our old haphazard methods were good enough to keep us in the front. But most other peoples are now practising, at least in special lines, in some cases with the aid of the Government, much more and more systematically than we, with the result that the competition which we have to meet grows severer year by year. A long jump of 25ft. is almost in sight, and the high jump is creeping up to 7ft. The times for any or all of the running races may be expected to be lowered at Berlin to extents at which we cannot guess. What have been considered first-class performances heretofore are not going to be first class in future Olympic Games, and to win the bigger events a man must not be merely good, but superlatively good. It would be worse than useless to send a mob of second-raters, like many of those who went to Stockholm, to Berlin.

We have, throughout these articles, necessarily measured everything by the standard of "points," because it is the only standard available; but the real thing is not whether we score a dozen more points or a dozen less, but whether we are to be held by other peoples as athletically incompetent. As it looks to other nations now, it merely is that heretofore we have held our reputation as an athletic and sporting people only because others did not take the trouble to beat us. Now that they are taking that trouble, we have suddenly been exposed as pretenders. This we say is how it looks to the world; and so it will look unless we also take trouble. And if we do take this trouble we shall in the process make ourselves a stouter and better people.

But even more important than the mere discovery of "talent" is, as has been shown, the proper encouragement of that talent, its preliminary training, and its management on the spot. Those who had charge of our arrangements at Stockholm have earnestly pleaded that they were unable to do what

they wished to do because of a lack of funds. That embarrassment, at least, should not exist in Berlin. And when the nation has supplied the funds it will expect to hear nothing about lack of preparation and incompetent management; but we must enter, as nearly as we can to our full strength, in all competitions, and our men must in each be made thoroughly

familiar with the conditions under which they must compete, and must be brought to the scratch in fit condition. (*The Times*, September 19, 1913.)

The following tables are from the Official Report of the Games of 1908 issued by the British Olympic Council:—

I.—EVENTS IN WHICH OLYMPIC MEDALS WERE WON BY THE UNITED KINGDOM.

Event.	First.	Nation.	En-tries	Second.	Nation.	En-tries	Third.	Nation.	En-tries	Time, Distance, &c.
ATHLETICS.										
*1 200 Metres ..	Craig ..	U.S.A. ..	12	Lippincott ..	U.S.A. ..	12	Applegarth ..	U.K. ..	12	21 7/10sec.
*2 1,500 Metres ..	Jackson ..	U.K. ..	12	Kiviat ..	U.S.A. ..	12	Taber ..	U.S.A. ..	12	3min. 46 4/5sec.
*3 5,000 Metres ..	Kolehmainen ..	Finland ..	4	Boulin ..	France ..	12	Hutson ..	U.K. ..	12	14min. 36 3/5sec.
*4 400 Metres, Relay ..	—	U.K. ..	6	—	Sweden ..	6	—	Germany ..	6	42 2/5sec.
*5 1,600 Metres, Relay ..	—	U.S.A. ..	6	—	France ..	8	—	U.K. ..	6	3min. 16 3/5sec.
*6 3,000 Metres, Team ..	—	U.S.A. ..	8	—	Sweden ..	8	—	U.K. ..	8	3min. 44 3/5sec. (Berna)
*7 Cross Country, Team (8,000 metres) ..	—	Sweden ..	12	—	Finland ..	8	—	U.K. ..	12	—
8 10,000 Metres, Walk ..	Goulding ..	Canada ..	1	Webb ..	U.K. ..	6	Altmani ..	Italy ..	2	46min. 28 2/5sec.
*9 Tug of War ..	—	Sweden ..	—	—	U.K. ..	—	—	—	—	—
CYCLING.										
10 200 Miles, Indiv. ..	Lewis ..	S. Africa ..	1	Grubb ..	U.K. ..	32	Schutte ..	U.S.A. ..	12	10hrs. 42m. 39s.
*11 200 Miles, Team ..	—	Sweden ..	12	—	U.K. ..	—	—	U.S.A. ..	—	—
FENCING.										
*12 Epee Teams ..	—	Belgium ..	8	—	U.K. ..	8	—	Holland ..	8	—
FOOTBALL.										
*13 Football (Assoc.) ..	—	U.K. ..	—	—	Denmark ..	—	—	Holland ..	—	—
GYMNASTICS.										
*14 Teams (not Swedish style) ..	—	Italy ..	32	—	Hungary ..	35	—	U.K. ..	32	—
LAWN TENNIS.										
COVERED COURTS.										
15 Men's Singles ..	Gobert ..	France ..	3	Dixon ..	U.K. ..	8	Wilding ..	Australasia ..	1	—
*16 Ladies' Singles ..	Mrs. Hannam ..	U.K. ..	3	Miss Castenschild ..	Denmark ..	1	Mrs. Parton ..	U.K. ..	3	—
*17 Men's Doubles ..	Gobert and Ger- mot ..	France ..	2	Setterwall and Kempe ..	Sweden ..	8	Dixon and Beamish ..	U.K. ..	8	—
*18 Mixed Doubles ..	Dixon and Mrs. Hannam ..	U.K. ..	6	Barrett and Miss Aitchison ..	U.K. ..	6	Setterwall and Mrs. Fick ..	Sweden ..	8	—
ROWING.										
*19 Eights ..	Leander Club ..	U.K. ..	2	New College ..	U.K. ..	2	—	—	—	—
*20 Fours (with cox) ..	Ludwigshafen ..	Germany ..	2	Thames R.C. ..	U.K. ..	1	—	—	—	—
*21 Sculls ..	Kinnear ..	U.K. ..	2	Veirman ..	Belgium ..	2	—	—	—	—
SHOOTING.										
ARMY RIFLE.										
*22 International Teams ..	—	U.S.A. ..	6	—	U.K. ..	6	—	Sweden ..	6	—
MINIATURE RIFLE.										
*23 50 Metres, Team ..	—	U.K. ..	4	—	Sweden ..	4	—	U.S.A. ..	4	—
*24 50 Metres, Indiv. ..	Hird ..	U.S.A. ..	10	Milne ..	U.K. ..	11	Burt ..	U.K. ..	10	—
*25 25 Metres, Team ..	—	Sweden ..	6	—	U.K. ..	6	—	U.S.A. ..	6	—
REVOLVER.										
*26 50 Metres, Team ..	—	U.S.A. ..	6	—	Sweden ..	6	—	U.K. ..	6	—
*27 50 Metres, Indiv. ..	Lane ..	U.S.A. ..	12	Dolfen ..	U.S.A. ..	12	Stewart ..	U.K. ..	9	—
*28 30 Metres, Duel Team ..	—	Sweden ..	11	—	Russia ..	6	—	U.K. ..	6	—
CLAYBIRDS.										
*29 Team ..	—	U.S.A. ..	6	—	U.K. ..	6	—	Germany ..	6	—
SWIMMING.										
30 400 Metres, Free ..	Hodgson ..	Canada ..	1	Hatfield ..	U.K. ..	5	Hardwick ..	Australasia ..	6	22min.
*31 400 Metres, Breast ..	Bathe ..	Germany ..	3	Henning ..	Sweden ..	5	Courtman ..	U.K. ..	3	6min. 29 3/5sec.
32 1,500 Metres, Free ..	Hodgson ..	Canada ..	1	Hatfield ..	U.K. ..	4	Hardwick ..	Australasia ..	3	22min.
33 800 Metres, Team ..	—	Australasia ..	4	—	U.S.A. ..	6	—	U.K. ..	4	10min. 11 1/5s.
*34 Water Polo ..	—	U.K. ..	—	—	Austria ..	—	—	Belgium ..	—	—
LADIES.										
35 100 Metres, Free ..	Durack ..	Australasia ..	2	Wylie ..	Australasia ..	2	Fletcher ..	U.K. ..	6	82 1/5sec.
*36 High Diving ..	Johanson ..	Sweden ..	12	Regnell ..	Sweden ..	12	White ..	U.K. ..	1	—
*37 400 Metres, Team ..	—	U.K. ..	5	—	Germany ..	4	—	Austria ..	4	5min. 52 4/5sec.

* Events marked with an asterisk are those in which no medals were won by the British Empire outside the United Kingdom.

II.—EVENTS IN WHICH OLYMPIC MEDALS WERE WON BY THE BRITISH EMPIRE OUTSIDE THE UNITED KINGDOM.

Event.	First.	Nation.	En-tries	Second.	Nation.	En-tries	Third.	Nation.	En-tries	Time, Distance, &c.
ATHLETICS.										
*1 Marathon Race ..	McArthur ..	S. Africa ..	4	Gitsham ..	S. Africa ..	4	Strobino ..	U.S.A. ..	12	2hrs. 36m. 54s.
2 10,000 Metres, Walk ..	Goulding ..	Canada ..	1	Webb ..	U.K. ..	6	Altmani ..	Italy ..	2	46min. 28 2/5sec.
*3 Running Broad Jump ..	Guttersen ..	U.S.A. ..	12	Bricker ..	Canada ..	4	Aberg ..	Sweden ..	11	24ft. 11 1/4in.
*4 Pole Jump ..	Babecock ..	U.S.A. ..	11	Wright ..	U.S.A. ..	11	Happenny ..	Canada ..	1	12ft. 11 1/2in.
				Nelson ..	U.S.A. ..	11	Uggle ..	Sweden ..	12	—
*5 Hammer ..	McGrath ..	U.S.A. ..	9	Gillis ..	Canada ..	1	Murphy ..	U.S.A. ..	11	—
CYCLING.										
6 200 Miles, Indiv. ..	Lewis ..	S. Africa ..	1	Grubb ..	U.K. ..	32	Schutte ..	U.S.A. ..	12	10hrs. 42m. 39s.
LAWN TENNIS.										
COVERED COURTS.										
7 Men's Singles ..	Gobert ..	France ..	3	Dixon ..	U.K. ..	8	Wilding ..	Australasia ..	1	—
LAWN TENNIS.										
OPEN AIR.										
*8 Men's Singles ..	Winslow ..	S. Africa ..	3	Kitson ..	S. Africa ..	3	Kreuzer ..	Germany ..	8	—
*9 Men's Doubles ..	Winslow and Kit- Kitson ..	S. Africa ..	2	Zborzil and Pipes ..	Austria ..	6	Canet and Meny ..	France ..	6	—
SWIMMING.										
*10 100 Metres, Free ..	Kahanamoku ..	U.S.A. ..	11	Healy ..	Australasia ..	5	Huzzagh ..	U.S.A. ..	11	62 2/5sec.
11 400 Metres, Free ..	Hodgson ..	Canada ..	1	Hatfield ..	U.K. ..	5	Hardwick ..	Australasia ..	6	5min. 24 2/5sec.
12 1,500 Metres, Free ..	Hodgson ..	Canada ..	1	Hatfield ..	U.K. ..	4	Hardwick ..	Australasia ..	3	22min.
13 800 Metres, Team ..	—	Australasia ..	4	—	U.S.A. ..	6	—	U.K. ..	4	10min. 11 1/5s.
LADIES.										
14 100 Metres, Free ..	Durack ..	Australasia ..	2	Wylie ..	Australasia ..	2	Fletcher ..	U.K. ..	6	82 1/5sec.

* Events marked with an asterisk are those in which the United Kingdom took no medal.

III.—COMPLETE LIST OF PRIZE WINNERS IN THE OLYMPIC GAMES OF 1912.

Event.	1st Prize.	Time, Distance, &c.	2nd Prize.	3rd Prize.
I. ATHLETICS.				
1. 100 Metres	R. C. Craig, U.S.A.	10 45sec. Won by 2ft. . .	A. T. Meyer, U.S.A.	D. F. Lippincott, U.S.A.
2. 110 Metres, Hurdles	F. W. Kelly, U.S.A.	15 15sec. Won by a long yard . .	J. Wendell, U.S.A.	M. W. Hawkins, U.S.A.
3. 200 Metres	R. C. Craig, U.S.A.	21 710sec. Won by half a yard . .	D. F. Lippincott, U.S.A.	W. R. Applegarth, U.K.
4. 400 Metres	C. D. Reidpath, U.S.A.	48 15sec. Won by half a yard . .	H. Braun, Germany	E. F. Lindberg, U.S.A.
5. 800 Metres	J. E. Meredith, U.S.A.	1min. 51 910sec. Won by bare two yards.	M. W. Sheppard, U.S.A.	I. N. Davenport, U.S.A.
6. 1,500 Metres	A. N. S. Jackson, U.K.	3min. 56 45sec.	A. R. Kiviat, U.S.A.	N. S. Taber, U.S.A.
7. 5,000 Metres	H. Kolehmainen, Finland	14min. 36 35sec. Won by inches . .	J. Bouin, France	G. W. Hutson, U.K.
8. 10,000 Metres	H. Kolehmainen, Finland	31min. 20sec. Won by 300 yards	L. Tewanima, U.S.A.	A. Stenroos, Finland
9. Marathon Race (about 25 miles)	K. K. McArthur, S. Africa	2hrs. 36min. 54sec. Won by 58sec.	C. W. Gitsham, S. Africa	G. Strobino, U.S.A.
10. Relay Race, 400 metres	U.K.	42 25sec.	Sweden	Germany
11. Relay Race, 1,600 metres	U.S.A.	3min. 16 35sec.	France	U.K.
12. Team Race, 3,000 metres	U.S.A.	8min. 44 35sec. (T. S. Berna)	Sweden	U.K.
13. Cross Country Race, 8,000 Metres (about):				
A. Individual	H. Kolehmainen, Finland	45min. 11 310sec.	H. Andersson, Sweden	J. Eke, Sweden
B. Team	Sweden	—	Finland	U.K.
14. 10,000 Metres Walk	G. Goulding, Canada	46min. 28 25sec. Won by 85 yards	E. J. Webb, U.K.	F. Altimari, Italy
15. Running High Jump	A. W. Richards, U.S.A.	1-93 metres (6ft. 4in.)	H. Liesche, Germany (ent. for stg. high jump)	G. L. Horine, U.S.A.
16. Standing High Jump	Platt Adams, U.S.A.	1-63 metres (5ft. 4 38in.)	Ben W. Adams, U.S.A.	C. Tsiclitiras, Greece
17. Running Broad Jump	A. L. Gutterson, U.S.A.	7-60 metres (24ft. 11 14in.) . . .	C. D. Bricker, Canada	G. Aberg, Sweden
18. Standing Broad Jump	C. Tsiclitiras, Greece	3-37 metres (11ft. 0 58in.)	Platt Adams, U.S.A.	Ben W. Adams, U.S.A.
19. Hop, Step, and Jump	G. Lindblom, Sweden	14-76 metres (48ft. 5 12in.) . . .	G. Aberg, Sweden	E. Almlöf, Sweden
20. Pole Jump	H. S. Babcock, U.S.A.	3-95 metres (12ft. 11 12in.) . . .	†M. S. Wright, U.S.A.	†B. Uggla, Sweden
			†F. T. Nelson, U.S.A.	†W. Happeney, Canada
			†F. D. Murphy, U.S.A.	†F. D. Murphy, U.S.A.
21. Javelin, Best Hand	E. Lemming, Sweden	60-64 metres (198ft. 11 38in.) . .	J. J. Saaristo, Finland	M. Kovács, Hungary
22. Javelin, Right and Left Hand	J. J. Saaristo, Finland	109-42 metres (358ft. 11 78in.) . .	W. Siikaniemi, Finland	U. Peltonen, Finland
23. Discus, Best Hand	A. R. Taipale, Finland	45-21 metres (148ft. 3 910in.) . .	R. L. Byrd, U.S.A.	J. H. Duncan, U.S.A.
24. Discus, Right and Left Hand	A. R. Taipale, Finland	82-86 metres (271ft. 10 18in.) . .	E. Niklander, Finland	E. Magnusson, Sweden
25. Putting Weight	P. McDonald, U.S.A.	15-34 metres (50ft. 4in.)	R. W. Rose, U.S.A.	L. A. Whitney, U.S.A.
26. Putting Weight, Right and Left Hand	R. W. Rose, U.S.A.	27-70 metres (90ft. 10 916in.) . .	P. McDonald, U.S.A.	E. Niklander, Finland
27. Throwing Hammer	M. McGrath, U.S.A.	54-13 metres (177ft. 7in.)	Duncan Gillis, Canada	C. C. Childs, U.S.A.
28. Tug of War	Sweden	—	U.K.	None
29. Athletic Pentathlon	J. Thorpe, U.S.A.	—	F. R. Bie, Norway	J. J. Donahue, U.S.A.
30. Athletic Decathlon	J. Thorpe, U.S.A.	—	H. Wieslander, Sweden	C. Lomberg, Sweden
II. CYCLING.				
31. Road Race round Lake Mälär, about 320 kilometres (200 miles):				
A. Individual	R. Lewis, S. Africa	10hrs. 42min. 39sec.	F. H. Grubb, U.K.	C. O. Schutte, U.S.A.
B. Team	Sweden	—	U.K.	U.S.A.
III. FENCING.				
32. Foils, Individual	N. Nadi, Italy	—	P. Speciale, Italy	R. Verderber, Austria
33. Épée, Teams	Belgium	—	U.K.	Holland
34. Épée, Individual	P. Anspach, Belgium	—	I. Osier, Denmark	P. le H. de Beaulieu, Belgium
35. Sabre, Teams	Hungary	—	Austria	Holland
36. Sabre, Individual	J. Fuchs, Hungary	—	B. Bekessy, Hungary	E. Mészáros, Hungary
IV. FOOTBALL (STADIUM)				
37. Association	U.K.	4 goals to 2	Denmark	Holland
V. GYMNASTICS (STADIUM)				
38. Team Competition, with exercises according to Swedish system	Sweden	—	Denmark	Norway
39. Team Competition, with exercises according to any system except the Swedish	Italy	—	Hungary	U.K.
40. Team Competition, with free movements	Norway	—	Finland	Denmark
41. Individual Competition	A. Braglia, Italy	—	L. Séguira, France	A. Tunesi, Italy
VI. HORSE RIDING.				
42. "Military":				
A. Team	Sweden	—	Germany	U.S.A.
B. Individual	Lieut. Nordlander, Sweden	—	Oberleutnant von Rochow, Germany	Capt. Cariou, France
43. Prize Riding	Grefve C. Bonde, Sweden	—	G. A. Boltenstern, Sweden	Friherre H. von Blixen, Finecke, Sweden
44. Prize Jumping:				
A. Individual	Capt. Cariou, France	—	Oberleutnant von Kröcher, Germany	Capt. de Blommaert, Belgium
B. Team	Sweden	—	France	Germany
VII. A. LAWN TENNIS, COVERED COURTS.				
45. Singles, Men	A. H. Gobert, France	—	C. P. Dixon, U.K.	A. F. Wilding, Australasia
46. Singles, Ladies	Mrs. Hannam, U.K.	—	Miss Castenschild, Denmark	Mrs. Parton, U.K.
47. Doubles, Men	A. H. Gobert and M. Germot, France	—	G. Setterwall and C. Kempe, Sweden	C. P. Dixon and E. A. Beamish, U.K.
48. Doubles, Mixed	C. P. Dixon and Mrs. Hannam, U.K.	—	H. Roper Barrett and Miss Aitchison, U.K.	G. Setterwall and Mrs. Fick, Sweden
VII. B. LAWN TENNIS, HARD COURTS (OPEN AIR)				
49. Singles, Men	C. L. Winslow, S. Africa	—	H. A. Kitson, S. Africa	O. Kreuzer, Germany
50. Singles, Ladies	Mlle. Broquedis, France	—	Frl. Köring, Germany	Frl. Bjurstedt, Norway
51. Doubles, Men	H. A. Kitson and C. Winslow, S. Africa	—	A. Zborzil and F. Pipes, Austria	A. Canet and M. Meny, France
52. Doubles, Mixed	Frl. Köring and H. Schomburgk, Germany	—	Frl. S. Fick and G. Setterwall, Sweden	Mlle. Broquedis and M. Canet, France
VIII. ROWING.				
53. Eights, outriggers	Leander Club, U.K.	Won by one and a half lengths . .	New College, Oxford, U.K.	None
54. Fours, outriggers	Ludwigshafen, Germany	Won by three lengths	Thames R.C., U.K.	None
55. Fours, inriggers	Denmark	Won by four lengths	Stockholm R.C., Sweden	None
56. Single Sculls	W. D. Kinnear, U.K.	Won by two lengths	P. Veirman, Belgium	None

U.K.—The United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland..

†Both awarded silver medals.

‡All three awarded bronze medals.

LIST OF PRIZE WINNERS—(Continued).

Event.	1st Prize.	Time, Distance, &c.	2nd Prize.	3rd Prize.
IX. SHOOTING.				
Army Rifle Shooting.				
57. International, Team	U.S.A.	—	U.K.	Sweden
58. 600 Metres, Individual	Paul Colas, France	—	C. T. Osburn, U.S.A.	J. E. Jackson, U.S.A.
59. 300 Metres, Individual	A. Prokopp, Hungary	—	C. T. Osburn, U.S.A.	E. C. Skogen, Norway
Any Rifle.				
60. 300 Metres, Team	Sweden	—	Norway	Denmark
61. 300 Metres, Individual	P. Colas, France	—	L. J. Madsen, Denmark	C. H. Johansson, Sweden
Miniature Rifles.				
62. 50 Metres, Team	U.K.	—	Sweden	U.S.A.
63. 50 Metres, Individual	F. L. Hird, U.S.A.	—	W. Milne, U.K.	H. Burt, U.K.
64. 25 Metres, Team	Sweden	—	U.K.	U.S.A.
65. 25 Metres, Individual	Lieut. Carlberg, Sweden	—	Lt. von Holst, Sweden	Engineer Ericsson, Sweden
Revolver and Pistol.				
66. 50 Metres, Team	U.S.A.	—	Sweden	U.K.
67. 50 Metres, Individual	A. P. Lane, U.S.A.	—	P. J. Dolfen, U.S.A.	C. E. Stewart, U.K.
68. 30 Metres, Duel, Team	Sweden	—	Russia	U.K.
69. 30 Metres, Duel, Individual	A. P. Lane, U.S.A.	—	A. Palén, Sweden	J. H. von Holst, Sweden
Clay Birds.				
70. Team	U.S.A.	—	U.K.	Germany
71. Individual	J. R. Graham, U.S.A.	—	H. Goedel, Germany	M. Brau, Russia
Running Deer.				
72. Team	Sweden	—	U.S.A.	Finland
73. Individual	O. G. Swahn, Sweden	—	A. Lundeberg, Sweden	N. Toivonen, Finland
74. Double Shot	A. Lundeberg, Sweden	—	E. Benedicks, Sweden	O. G. Swahn, Sweden
X. SWIMMING.				
A. Men.				
75. 100 Metres, Free Style	D. P. Kahanamoku, U.S.A.	62 25sec.	C. Healy, Australasia	K. Huzzagh, U.S.A.
76. 100 Metres, Back Stroke	H. Hebner, U.S.A.	1min. 21 15sec.	O. Fahr, Germany	P. Kellner, Germany
77. 200 Metres, Breast Stroke	W. Bathe, Germany	3min. 1 45sec.	W. Lützow, Germany	P. Malisch, Germany
78. 400 Metres, Free Style	G. R. Hodgson, Canada	5min. 24 25sec.	J. G. Hatfield, U.K.	H. Hardwick, Australasia
79. 400 Metres, Breast Stroke	W. Bathe, Germany	6min. 29 35sec.	S. L. Henning, Sweden	P. Courtman, U.K.
80. 1,500 Metres, Free Style	G. R. Hodgson, Canada	22min.	J. G. Hatfield, U.K.	H. Hardwick, Australasia
81. High Diving	W. E. Adlerz, Sweden	—	H. Johansson, Sweden	K. J. E. Jansson, Sweden
82. High Diving, Plain, and Variety	W. E. Adlerz, Sweden	—	A. Zürner, Germany	G. Blomgren, Sweden
83. Springboard Diving	P. Günther, Germany	—	H. Luber, Germany	K. Behrens, Germany
84. 800 Metres, Team	Australasia	10min. 11 15sec.	U.S.A.	U.K.
85. Water Polo	U.K.	—	Austria	Belgium
B. Ladies.				
86. 100 Metres	Fanny Durack, Australasia	1min. 22 15sec.	Wilhelmina Wylie, Australasia	Jennie Fletcher, U.K.
87. High Diving	Gerda Johanson, Sweden	—	Lisa Regnell, Sweden	Belle White, U.K.
88. 400 Metres, Team	U.K.	5min. 52 45sec.	Germany	Austria
XI. WRESTLING, STADIUM.				
89. Græco-Roman, Feather	K. Koskela, Finland	—	G. Gerstacker, Germany	O. A. Lasanen, Finland
90. Græco-Roman, Light	E. E. Wäre, Finland	—	G. H. Malmström, Sweden	E. Matiason, Sweden
91. Græco-Roman, Middle, A	C. E. Johansson, Sweden	—	M. Klein, Russia	A. Asikainen, Finland
92. Græco-Roman, Middle, B	No First Prize awarded	—	Å. O. Ahlgren, Sweden	B. Varega, Hungary
93. Græco-Roman, Heavy	U. Saarela, Finland	—	Å. T. Böling, Sweden	S. M. Jensen, Denmark
XII. YACHTING, NYNÄSHAMN.				
94. 6 Metres	G. Thubé (Mac Miche), France	—	Consort; O. Reedz-Thott (Nurdug II.), Denmark	Dan Broström (Kerstin), Sweden
95. 8 Metres	T. Glau (Taifun), Norway	—	B. Heyman (Sans Atout), Sweden	G. Estlander (Örn), Finland
96. 10 Metres	N. Asp (Kitty), Sweden	—	H. Wahl (Nina), Finland	A. Wischnegradsky (Galila II.), Russia
97. 12 Metres	A. W. G. Larsen (Magda IX), Norway	—	N. Persson (Erna Signe), Sweden	E. Krogius (Heatherbell), Russia
XIII. MODERN PENTATHLON.				
98.	G. Lillichook, Sweden	—	G. Ashbrink, Sweden	G. de Laval, Sweden
XIV. ART.				
99. Painting	G. Pellegrini, Italy	—	—	—
100. Music	R. Barthelemi, Italy	—	—	—
101. Literature	G. Hohrod, M. Eschbach, Germany.	—	—	—
102. Sculpture	W. Winans, U.S.A.	—	—	—
103. Architecture	G. Dubois, France.	—	—	—
	Monod and Laverrière, France.	—	—	—

§Both received second prize.

NOTE.—In the ATHLETIC PENTATHLON Thorpe (U.S.A.) scored as follows:—

Long Jump, 7'07 metres	1st
Throwing the Javelin, 46'71 metres	3rd
200 Metre Flat, 22'9sec.	1st
Throwing the Discus, 35'57 metres	1st
1,500 Flat, 4min. 44'8sec.	1st

The ATHLETIC DECATHLON (also won by Thorpe) included races at 100, 400, and 1,500 metres, and 110 metres hurdles; high jump, long jump, and pole jump; weight, discus, and javelin.

The MODERN PENTATHLON (won by Sweden) comprised duel-shooting, swimming, fencing, riding, and cross-country running.

APPENDIX C.

A SCHEME FOR AN IMPERIAL TEAM.

From time to time there has been a good deal of discussion of the wisdom of splitting up the strength of the British Empire into five or six separate units at the Games instead of competing as one "nation." In advance of the Games of 1912 there had been talk of the contingents from different parts of the Empire on their way to Stockholm meeting in London for joint training before the Games. There has been no official explanation why the project fell through. At the Stockholm Games the first suggestion that the Empire should compete as a unit seems to have come from the Special Correspondent of *The Times*, who wrote on July 5, 1912, urging such a course. In the course of his letter he said:—

An obvious point which one is tempted to make is that, without wishing to encroach on the legitimate pride of our great self-governing Dominions, South Africa, Australia, and Canada (which has still to come into the scoring) are naturally at least as much a part of "England" as, let us say, the Sandwich Islands are a part of America. The young New Yorker or Bostonian who goes to Alaska, the Philippines, or Honolulu to seek his fortune still represents the United States; and the American athletes do, in fact, include negroes, Red Indians, and one full-blooded Hawaiian. But this whole question of what may be called the racial aspect of the Games (with especial bearing on the problem of amateurship) with the polyglot, many-coloured character which the body of competitors at future Games is likely to assume is a fascinating subject which deserves consideration by itself. Meanwhile, we may note that, though "England" at present stands only third in the list of competing countries, the British Empire is, at the end of the first period of the Games, comfortably in the lead.

Ten days later he recurred to the subject in the following article:—

THE EMPIRE AND THE GAMES.

STOCKHOLM, JULY 15.

From conversations with athletes representing Canada, Australia, and South Africa here I gather that they are all in favour of entering one team from the whole Empire at future Games instead of, as at present, dissipating our strength by breaking it up into four separate units. There is no doubt that the representatives from the United Kingdom desire it; but it is, presumably, the preference of the Colonials that we should chiefly wish to consult. To judge from the opinions of those to whom I have spoken they are even more strongly in favour of consolidation than are the "Englishmen of England."

At the close of the second, and chief, period of the Games the scores in points of the leading nations are:—America, 128; the British Empire, 110; Sweden, 110. Then, after a long gap, follow Finland, 46; Germany, 37; France, 21, and so forth. But the British total is broken up into items as follows:—England, 68; South Africa, 16; and Australia and Canada, 13 each.

These scores are individually creditable to each of the Dominions. South Africa has won four gold

medals with as many "firsts"—namely, two in Lawn Tennis, one in the "Marathon" Race, and one in the Long-Distance Bicycle Race. Canada was first in the Walking and in Swimming. Australia's points came chiefly from Swimming. The glory which accrues to the individual Dominions is but moderate in amount, and the sentimental satisfaction which each derives from its separate representation cannot be great. Certainly the Colonials themselves feel that it would be vastly better to be associated with a powerful Empire team, the flag of which everybody at the Games knows and respects, and to help to keep that Empire in its place at the head of the nations.

We have the analogy of the United States before us, to the total of whose points negroes, Red Indians, and Hawaiians all contribute. We may hesitate to draw to the same extent upon the subject races within the Empire; but it would surely be well, for larger than mere Olympic reasons, that the world should be accustomed to regard the Empire as a unit. There can be no doubt that here in Stockholm its partition has prejudiced our standing in the eyes of other peoples, and has given excuse for not a little patronizing talk of England's decadence. Such talk would not be possible, nor would it have occurred to anybody to use it, if our strength was massed and the winnings of the Empire were all counted as one. Nor are there any obstacles in the way of such a course which cannot be overcome. (*The Times*, July 18, 1912.)

On the same day appeared the following letter from Sir Arthur Conan Doyle:—

TO THE EDITOR OF THE TIMES.

Sir,—We have four years in which to set our house in order before the Berlin Olympic Games. Might I suggest that the most pressing change of all is that we should send in a British Empire team instead of merely a British team? The Americans very wisely and properly send Red Indians, negroes, and even a Hawaiian amongst their representatives. We, on the contrary, acquiesce in our white fellow-subjects from the Colonies contending under separate headings. I am sure that if they were approached with tact they would willingly surrender the occasional local honours they may gain in order to form one united team in which Africans, Australians, and Canadians would do their share with men from the Mother Country under one flag and the same insignia. I would go further and see whether among Ceylon or Malay swimmers, Indian runners, and Sikh wrestlers we cannot find winners among the coloured races of the Empire. Such a movement would, I think, be of the highest political importance, for there could not be a finer object lesson of the unity of the Empire than such a team all striving for the victory of the same flag.

Yours sincerely,

ARTHUR CONAN DOYLE.

Windlesham, Crowborough, Sussex, July 15.

Some discussion of the subject followed, generally of an entirely favourable character.

Immediately after the Games, on August 1, 1912, a meeting was held under the auspices of the Athletes' Advisory Club at the Manchester Hotel, Lord Desborough being in the Chair, when the

subject was discussed at some length. The Report of the meeting in *The Times* of August 2 says :—

Most interesting of all, perhaps, was the strength of the sentiment displayed in favour of uniting the Empire in the eyes of the world through representation by one common team. The significance of the discussion of this point was increased by the presence of Mr. J. G. Merrick, on behalf of Canada, who testified to the willingness of the great self-governing Dominions to sink their individuality if thereby they would contribute to the Empire's benefit, and from him it was learned that the suggestion had been favourably discussed a year before the Stockholm meeting by the Olympic representatives of both Canada and Australasia, and that the chief difficulty was with Great Britain. The Canadian competitors at Stockholm, it appears, came to England in the belief that the athletes representing all parts of the Empire were to meet and train together in London with a view to mutual cooperation and encouragement at the Games, and were deeply disappointed that nothing to that end was done, though by whose fault it was that it failed to be done did not appear.

The tone of the meeting throughout was strongly in sympathy with all that has been said in the many articles in *The Times* upon the subject and with the suggestions put forward in these columns by Sir Arthur Conan Doyle, from whom a letter was read embodying his views.

In the course of his remarks, Mr. J. G. Merrick (President of the Amateur Athletic Union of Canada) was reported as saying that there were two difficulties in the way of an Empire combination :—

One was whether the sentiment of the Colonies

would be favourable to having their identity completely extinguished in the general Empire plan. His opinion was that they would gladly do so if they felt assured that the combination would redound to the credit of the Empire. A more serious difficulty was the Continental acceptance of that point of view, particularly by the smaller countries. He was of the opinion that insuperable difficulties would be placed in the way of such a combination, but there could be no obstacles to the team training and travelling together. If they could, in the 1916 Games, bring their forces together and have a cooperation on the field and the track, they would achieve the material parts of the Empire combination. He would do his best to forward that in Canada, and he knew the same sentiment prevailed in Australia and the Cape. The chief difficulty up to the present had been with Great Britain, and it rested with the athletic authorities here to take the lead.

The difficulties in the way of the suggestion may be said to be three :—

(1) There is needed the assured desire for union on the part of all the Dominions.

(2) There might be difficulties of adjustment in cases where the entries from one "nationality" were limited, as in the case of a single rifle team in the shooting or of two boats in the eight-oared race.

(3) It is very doubtful whether the International Olympic Council would consent to the amalgamation of the Dominions with the Mother Country after the former have been granted standing as "nationalities" at their own request.

As an index to Australian opinion, the following

THE OLYMPIC GAMES FUND

The Duke of Westminster's Olympic Fund is the central fund to which subscriptions should be sent. Letters containing cheques, postal orders, or stamps should be addressed to the Duke of Westminster, at Grosvenor House, London, W. Cheques and envelopes should be marked "Olympic Fund." All subscriptions will be acknowledged by the Duke and forwarded to the Hon. Treasurer of the Special Committee, Mr. E. Mackay-Edgar, Basildon House, Moorgate Street, London, E.C. Donors may " earmark " their contributions to be devoted to any particular sport in which they may be interested. The form herewith may be cut out and used if desired.

OLYMPIC GAMES.

To His Grace the Duke of Westminster,

Grosvenor House, London, W.

My Lord Duke,

I have much pleasure in enclosing a donation of £..... to the above Fund.

Yours faithfully,

Name.....

Address.....

letter from Mr. Hugh D. McIntosh, which appeared in *The Times* of August 29, 1913, is of interest :—

AN IMPERIAL ATHLETIC TEAM.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE TIMES.

Sir,—We Australians are in hearty agreement with all that the Duke of Westminster has said about the Olympic Games. But if you will permit me to say so, I think it is a thousand pities that the search for talent and the raising of the means to that end should be confined to Great Britain alone. The people of the Overseas—at any rate those in Australia—would like to help sustain the athletic prowess and, if possible, the supremacy of the British race. In our Commonwealth, sparsely settled though it is, genial climatic conditions and the social surroundings of a young British nation in a rich, undeveloped country have enabled us to accomplish somewhat surprising feats in many branches of amateur sport. Healthy rivalry with the Mother Country has led to the discovery of athletes of world-wide renown.

Some of the championships we already hold; others we have every chance of winning. I would suggest that it is a mistake to dissipate our strength as a people by excluding the Dominions from the qualifying Olympic test. The spirit of our times is one of unity and federalism within the Empire. In the domain of amateur sport there is surely ideal opportunity for that cohesion and common action which should command success. Under present conditions we may nullify our efforts by an unnecessary though friendly antagonism. How much better would it be to think and act Imperially?

So certain am I of the generous response of our Dominion to such a call that I am prepared to guarantee that £5,000 will be raised in Australia

toward the finding and training of likely champions. This would considerably reduce the burden upon lovers of athletics in Great Britain, while materially extending the area of the hunting ground for talent. I am aware that the present Olympic programme contemplates Great Britain playing a lone hand, but the reconsideration of this decision and the broadening of the scheme would, I am convinced, be warmly welcomed overseas and have an appreciable influence in deepening the growing sense of Imperialism amongst our far-flung people.

I am, &c.,

HUGH D. McINTOSH.

Hotel Cecil, W.C., Aug. 28.

On the other hand, there have been pronouncedly unfavourable opinions expressed in some Colonial newspapers. In Great Britain sentiment appears to be divided. Mr. Lehmann, in the interview already quoted, expressed himself as opposed to it. Many others think that, as a matter of pride, the United Kingdom should continue "on her own."

Perhaps the strongest argument in favour of union is a political one. The Olympic Games offer an admirable opportunity for exhibiting the solidarity of the Empire to the world. Many people are of the opinion that it is unfortunate that other nations should see the different parts of the Empire competing among themselves in an international event. Public opinion, however, is very far from being crystallized on the subject; and there remains the physical difficulty of winning the consent of the International Olympic Council.





6
62

Price Threepence.

The
Olympic Games



*better organization in the
British preparations for the
Berlin Games of 1916,
compiled from The Times
and official sources.*



SOLD FOR THE BENEFIT OF THE FUND.

1913.