

On group contests / Jakob Bolin.

Contributors

Bolin, Jakob, 1863-1914.

Publication/Creation

Cambridge, Massachusetts : Caustic & Claflin, 1899.

Persistent URL

<https://wellcomecollection.org/works/kzt5ht7d>

License and attribution

This work has been identified as being free of known restrictions under copyright law, including all related and neighbouring rights and is being made available under the Creative Commons, Public Domain Mark.

You can copy, modify, distribute and perform the work, even for commercial purposes, without asking permission.



Wellcome Collection
183 Euston Road
London NW1 2BE UK
T +44 (0)20 7611 8722
E library@wellcomecollection.org
<https://wellcomecollection.org>

Director H. Diesbeck

Compliments of the author

Edgar F. Ingram

ON GROUP CONTESTS.

JAKOB BOLIN, ESQ.,

7 WEST 112th STREET, NEW YORK, N. Y.

Reprinted from the *American Physical Education Review*, 1899.

CAMBRIDGE, MASS.:
CAUSTIC & CLAFLIN, PRINTERS,

1899.

WELLCOME INSTITUTE LIBRARY	
Coll.	welM0mec
Coll.	pam
No.	QT 255
	1899
	B 680

BOLIN



22500895591



303850
Op. ex. 66.

ON GROUP CONTESTS.

JAKOB BOLIN
New York.

IN 1894, Captain C. Nordlander published a valuable little article on the subject of group contests (*Tidskrift i Gymnastik*, Bd. IV, pp. 102-112). At a discussion last year under the auspices of the New York Physical Education Society, I made some remarks, using this article as a foundation. The brief report of my words at the time published in the *Review* (Vol. II, No. 1, p. 45) has brought me several separate enquiries for further details. From this I judge not only that there is a fairly widespread feeling of dissatisfaction with the present work of carrying on the training of our athletes and of holding the contests, but also that others like myself have some hope that an improvement may be looked for in the direction pointed out by Nordlander, or rather by the Swedish gymnasts through Nordlander, because his words are nothing but the reiteration of the fundamental principles of Lingism applied to gymnastics. These enquiries and this belief of mine may serve as an excuse for my imposing this brief sketch upon the *REVIEW* and its readers.

My first premise is this, that the desire to measure one's powers with those of another in some definite direction, is a practically universal characteristic of the human family, and perhaps more specially of its younger members. This desire may find its expression in a wrestling bout, a fisticuff, a game of cards, rivalry in dress or scholarly attainments, heroic deeds on the battlefield, quarrels by two distinguished men of science regarding priority in discovering some important law, or in any one of a thousand various ways, but it always exists in some form or other, and the educator should use it for result-gaining. So he does. And the physical educator as well as everybody else. He arranges physical contests in which his pupils may measure themselves against each other or outsiders in strength, endurance, rapidity of motion and so on. That is a correct procedure. Those in whom this desire for contest does not exist in some form or other, or in whom it is unusually weak, do as a rule not amount to much in this world of ours. In youth this desire should therefore be properly stimu-

lated, with a constant recognition, of course, of the possibility of over-stimulation. Those who are said to decry physical contests, are in reality only opposing an erroneous application of a right principle. They are by no means ready to abolish physical contests, even if they have their hearts set upon waging a relentless war against the contests now in general vogue.

Let us then agree that physical contests should be an integral part of our physical education. In this country the majority is undoubtedly ready to accept such a statement, and those who are not, are probably opposed to it simply because they see no way by which the good of the contests can be maintained, while the overshadowing evils are abolished.

Now, these evils are of various kinds, and I am not prepared to give even a brief synopsis of them. But among the most common objections are undoubtedly these: The athletic training takes too much valuable time from the studies. It is so arranged that only those who are physically superior to the great majority are induced to partake in it, while those who are on the highway to the dogs, physically speaking, are left to shift for themselves as best they can, and even to those who are happy enough to have physical powers beyond the average, it gives only a very partial training, developing in them preëminently such powers as they already possess in a very high degree, neglecting those in which their ability is smaller and their need consequently greater. Finally, the contests, depending as they do to a great extent upon the powers of one or a few men, awake such intense interest even in those whose share in them is only handclapping, shouting and betting, that they are more or less monomaniacs on the subject for a long period, their emotions being so aroused as to make intellectual processes impossible.

In the opinion of most of my readers, some of these allegations are perhaps overdrawn. Maybe they are. But we frequently meet with them, and whether they are reasonable or not, it would certainly be a good thing for our physical education, if we could so arrange the training and the contests as not to lay them open to these attacks. Besides, I believe that they are only too true. Herein I am specially concerned with the second and third objections, which deal with the creation of specialists, and only indirectly with the other two.

Against the more formal gymnastic training based upon rational grounds, these objections are not raised, since specializations

are carefully avoided. There it is the constant endeavor of the conscientious teacher to give to all an all-sided development (by which expression I do not signify such development merely or mainly as can be tested by the tape measure), and if he makes any selection among the large number of pupils who come under his care, it is the weakest, the puniest, the most backward, which receive his special attention. If the gymnastic instructor finds a man generally hampered by physical weakness or defects, he gives more time, study and care to him than to the one robust in health, muscularly strong, with good coördinative power, short reaction time, etc. The athletic trainer, on the other hand, looks upon the former without interest and even with disdain, while he pounces with avidity upon the latter as suitable timber of which to make something. If the gymnastic instructor finds a good jumper with a weak waist, he sets about to develop the waist and urges him to further progress in jumping only in a very small degree until a more equal development has taken place. The athletic trainer says: "This man may become a record breaker as a high jumper! I will try to make him jump an eighth of an inch higher than any one before him, thus shedding glory upon his college, himself and me!" The idea of teaching him to throw the hammer does not enter his head.

in These are the main differences between a rational gymnastic instructor and the prevalent mode of athletic training. At the same time those are the differences between a rational and an irrational physical education. Which mode should be preferred? To ask the question is to find its answer. We cannot hesitate. It ought to be self-evident. But here comes our athletic friend and tells us that we are mistaken, that this is an age of specialists, that only he who chooses a small field in which to concentrate all his efforts can become prominent in any sphere, that our colleges should inculcate this idea into their alumni, should teach them concentration for the sake of ~~bravery~~, teach them that which life demands of them, educate them to choose one point where they are strongest, and then go ahead with all their might, unless the struggle for existence shall overcome them. Alas, how frequently do we not hear such statements even from persons who are ready in the same breath to proclaim and maintain with strong reasons that the purpose of a school or college of liberal arts is not to turn out Greek or Latin scholars, nor historians, nor mathematicians, but to lay that broad and firm foundation of a general ~~condition~~

brevit
condition

upon which later on a lofty tower of specialization may be erected if desirable! If these words are based upon a firm conviction and are not to be considered as a declaration of love of that which the popular fancy favors, why does not he work to prevent our colleges from turning out champion high jumpers, record-breaking sprinters, wonders in hammer throwing, instead of good all-around men? Or, maybe the cause is that same ignorance which sees in sloyd the preliminary apprenticeship in handicraft and judges it accordingly. Let us nail the falsehood that the only duty of a college is to make specialists, wherever and whenever we can. Let it remain in the pillory exposed to the eyes of the multitude until it becomes written in the souls of this multitude that its very statement is an educational crime.

And that phrase about the struggle for existence! And the survival of the fittest! Where does the athletic specialist survive? As a lawyer, as a statesman, as a theologian, as a merchant? No, a thousand time no! He survives in his own specialty and nowhere else. If his purpose is to be a Jimmy Michael, a Corbett, a Fitzsimmons, a professional "sport," then he may survive by his specialization, at least for a time. But at the bar, in the legislative halls, in the pulpit, at the business desk, he needs all his faculties well trained, well educated, well cultured even, and he will survive better in the same ratio as the previous training has made of him an all-around man. If the athletic training is its own purpose, or if it is only a preliminary to making money at public exhibitions or to bedecking the chest with medals and crowding the mantelpiece with trophies, let the specialization go on. If it is an educational process in order to fit for life, let it disappear forever. Moreover, in speaking for the struggle for existence and the survival of the fittest, we must not forget that society, during its evolution, sets more and more limits to the former in order that the latter group may be as large as possible. If we constantly harp upon the importance of letting the survival of the fittest go on unhampered, and plead it as an excuse for making the strong stronger while allowing the weak ones to fall by the wayside, then we should not be afraid of taking the step which leads us back to the Spartan exposure of weakling infants instead of using the advances of science for the saving even of those already half dead. Such a procedure differs from the athletic one only in degree, not in kind. Nobody denies that the Spartans became a physically superior race. The same process in our day would undoubtedly

have a similar effect, but the simple fact meets us that our moral nature revolts against such a policy. So it ought also to revolt against the selection of the fittest in our time for a more careful training. The survival of the fittest is a natural process taken care of by nature. The ultimate object of life in society and of all the processes which make life worth living, education among them, is to assist all—not a favored few—in making their individual struggle as effective as possible, while depriving it of its harshness. Any process which is not adapted to the needs of the many is a failure as a general educational means. An educational process adapted only to unusually well developed, unusually strong, unusually healthy persons is a failure. If for athletics as now practiced is claimed a place among educational processes, it is a failure, because it has nothing to offer to the great majority, because it is aristocratic instead of democratic, because it caters to the classes and scorns the masses.

And it is further a failure because within the favored class it creates classes as already said: pitchers and catchers, hammer-throwers and pole-vaulters, sprinters and long-distance runners. But if I have those powers which make of me a naturally good sprinter, a sprinter considerably better than the average of my fellowmen, is there any reason why I should endeavor to tower still higher above them in that direction? There are undoubtedly many such reasons. If I am *at the same time* above them in all other directions. If one may say that there is any intention in nature, it should certainly be that one should make the best of his opportunities, use the powers that nature gave him to the best advantage. But if she has been kind enough to give us without our own endeavors, preëminence in one special direction while treating us like stepchildren in any other, it naturally behooves us to correct what appears to be her errors, to develop our weak points. Athleticism does not do so. Athleticism is synonymous with emphasizing, and make more prominent these errors. —ing

No disease can be cured except by the removal of its cause. Therefore, why is there such a general tendency among athletes to create a few wonderful specialists, instead of many well-trained all-around men? Because the spirit of contest, good in itself as already said, is allowed to run mad instead of being bridled and kept under control. Because those in charge are so far carried away by the excitement of the contest as to consider the victory more important than the process which leads up to it, because

they forget the kernel for the shell, because they are more anxious to break a record than to make men, because individual records are looked upon more favorably than general improvement of the great mass. Because we have slowly passed down the inclined plane until our colleges stake their honor, so to speak, on the performance of one or a few men, with the result that the majority stand aside, wondering, excited, shouting, betting, goading on their champions, exactly as was the case during the decadence of the ancient physical education. And if we do not awaken to the danger, the result in the future must be the same as in the past—the dark ages will come.

The remedy therefore—as seems logical—should be the abolishing of individual contests in our colleges and schools. Do not give the palm of victory in running to the college which has the one best runner in the college-world even if all his fellow-students are regular slow-coaches, but yield it unhesitatingly to that institution which shows the average best runners! If one school challenges another for a contest in hammer-throwing, let them each put forth a hundred and more contestants, and judge their standard by the ability of all! Let that college be champion-hurdlers, whose average score of a thousand individual hurdlers is better than a similar score of the rival!

If such were the policy, there would soon be kindled a more general *active* interest in athletics, the general student would show his interests in deeds instead of limiting it to bedecking himself with his college colors, hiring a tally-ho and making the air vibrate. He would find that upon his endeavors the honor of his Alma Mater would partly depend. But each individual would at the same time be of less importance than the present contestants. Hence the trainer, even if he keeps his eye riveted to the final contest, will find it more profitable to take the masses in hand and thus advance them all a little, than to make a phenomenon of one.

But it may be argued that if too much valuable time is withdrawn from the studies now when only a few partake in the training and contests, that same objection would be put forth with much greater strength and plausibility if many were to enter. This appears probable on the ~~fact~~ of it; but a closer examination shows reasons for holding the opposite view. It is not so much the time actually spent on training by the athletes which is begrudged them, though it must be admitted that some objections are made against it, but it is the loss of time due to the frenzy in f

which the student body is thrown, it is the loss of time due to excitement. If athletics became, so to say, the daily bread of all, that excitement would be minimized, diluted, spread over a large field, instead of being concentrated. There would undoubtedly be some excitement,—such as is good for youth because it is natural,—but insanity on the subject would be wiped out. Each would feel a healthy interest, but none would be carried away. All would be able to attend to their intellectual studies with the *requisite* power, and thus an actual saving of time would result. This would be true still more because of the improved physique and improved moral condition of the mass of students.

Such are my reasons for pleading for group contests instead of individual contests. But I take the opportunity also to say a few words against individual contests in another sense, not as a struggle between individual and individual, but as a contest in one individual and single event. That we send forth our men to compete in only one or a few events, and that we train them for such single event, thus specializing still further the specialists, is as crying an evil as that of picking the best men. No contest should ever be authorized which does not embrace as many events as give a fair expression of the all-around ability of the participants, in order that the specialist may be obliged to give some attention to the work in which he is not a star and thus acquire a more general training than is the case at present. The pentathlon of the Y. M. C. A. is a step in the right direction, though a contest consisting only of a 100-yard dash, throwing the hammer, running high jump, pole-vault and a mile run does not fulfil even very moderate demands for an all-sided training. Either a greater number of events should be introduced or others substituted in this pentathlon. We ought to have some form of climbing, some type of exercise requiring a more desired balancing power and so on, while we might well be satisfied with either the dash or mile run, though they present considerable difference.

In connection herewith, we should make the demand that every exercise which from its nature may be performed on either side, should in a contest be executed an equal number of times on each side. In hurdling, the hurdler should be taken alternately from the right and left foot, the hammer should be thrown and the shot put alternately from the right and left side; tennis should be practiced with either hand, and in match games, every other game should be played with the left, and so on.

In the present mode of training for contests, the main object constantly in view is victory. To that end all faculties are strained. If the event is a running high jump the question is to clear the bar as high as possible, no matter how. The jumper may double himself up in any form, land, as a bag of flour thrown over, on feet, knees and hands, head even. It does not matter so long as he gets over. That is another cause for charging the athletic training with failure in reaching the objects of physical education. One of its main purposes is to gain that coördination power which results in perfect control of the body as shown by "form" or "grace." If athletics are a necessary or desirable part of physical education, there seems to be no valid reason why the athlete should not strive for this object as well as the gymnast. To do the high jump as usual is one thing, but to clear the bar with every part of the body under full control during the whole movement, landing in good form without falling or wobbling, is a feature of quite a different kind, showing a far higher education, a true physical culture, to use this very much abused term in its real sense. Therefore each event must be judged not only according to the "ability" of the contestants but according to their form.

If these requirements were fulfilled, athletics would gain in value. But even then there remains one very important condition before it may be said to have reached the level of a rational physical training. Whatever one's opinion may be of that particular sequence of gymnastic exercises which is known as the Swedish day's order, for which I do not plead at present, one must recognize that an indiscriminate sequence is not conducive to the best results, but that the greater amount of work may be accomplished and the greater benefits gained by some definite succession in which the different exercises follow each other. For instance, all are ready without argument to concede that the work of highest intensity must not begin the day's lesson. If, consequently, some such sequence, some such "day's order" be recognized as desirable in gymnastics, there can be no reason why such a sequence should not also be followed in applied gymnastics, *i. e.*, athletics. Consequently, I make the further demand that in athletic training as in gymnastic contests, the events follow each other in a definite order, in that definite order which their physiological and psychological effects, as shown by gymnastic experience, point out. What the order is does not matter here. It may be a topic for discussion, a subject for investigation. But we should recognize the principle. Such arrangement of the different exercises or events

presupposes that we have studied them so as to be able to classify them according to their effects or purposes. Here again we can not at present agree upon the basis for classification. The Germans would probably classify them mainly according to their psychic effects, while the Swedes would mainly look to physiology to furnish them with the basis for classification. However, I am well satisfied that even here we should have much common ground if we began in earnest with the main principles, fully determined to seek the truth only. Personally, I am not so well acquainted with the athletics of this or any other country as to attempt a classification of the different athletic exercises in accord with the usual classification of the gymnastic exercises by the Swedes. All vaults, jumps and sprinting belong in the "precipitant family." "Pole vault" has also characteristics of a heave movement and strongly those of "alternate side movements." Hammer-throwing, shot-putting and wrestling I would consider as side movements, the latter with strong characteristics of the "back family." "Tug-of-war" is a back movement. "Taming the steer" is a good contest belonging to the abdominal group. So is "pushing the pole," though milder and less definite perhaps. Heave movements should, as before said, be represented in contests by some form of climbing, while exercises on the horizontal bar would in certain forms be suitable additions to the programme in this family. And so on. For contests in such families where at present no suitable form of athletic exercise is found, new forms should be invented or the pure gymnastic forms should be used. Why could it not, for instance, be a suitable contest in balancing movements to have two ranks on balancing beams about six feet apart trying to push each other off the beams?

But, comes the objection of our athletic friend to whom the proper result, the score, is the vital point, how shall we be able to judge rightly of who is victor and who vanquished? Each individual may of course be judged singly and the average group used as a standard of comparison, but this would require too long a time or too many judges and be therefore a practical impossibility.

To answer this objection I am only able to say that a definite statement how the scoring should be done in each event cannot be made before these events themselves are decided upon. If, however, the opinion should gain ground that group contests embracing numerous events are far preferable to individual contests in single feats, a little good-will on all sides will soon find a way

out of the difficulties. Absolute correctness can never be gained. Even now we frequently hear the decision of a referee questioned. At the colleges and large schools where large sums are annually expended for athletics and large fields are kept for athletic purposes, I hold it even to be quite easy.

Twenty-five poles could easily be erected in a straight line at one end of the field. There could easily be attached to them, at an expense inconsiderable compared with what is actually spent for similar purposes, an electric arrangement by which a current may be closed and broken at will, making a record in some one of the usual ways. These poles would then furnish apparatus for twenty-five simultaneous climbers, each of whom could make his own score by pressing a button at a certain height, for twenty-four simultaneous runners or sprinters whose records would be made automatically by breaking a thread spread from pole to pole, for twenty-four simultaneous high-jumpers or pole-vaulters, and so on. The whole outlay would by no means be prohibitive. I do not claim, however, that such arrangements would be necessary. In fact, I am firmly convinced that we have got our contests "down to too fine a point." I believe it would be much better for amateur sport if there were more freedom from the constant anxiety to score, if the rules were not so strict about what is and what is not a foul, which more properly ought to be left to the common sense and gentlemanly honor of the contestants. Too many and too strict rules foster a tendency to break the spirit of the law while keeping its letter. Americans have altogether too much legislation prohibiting this, that and the other, leaving nothing to the general moral nature of man. Thus this nature is stifled. So in civic life, so in sport. Therefore, it would also be better if there were not so exact apparatus for scoring, but instead a more thorough reliance on the general impression which is a good enough guide.

I cannot give a better idea about a proper mode of judging and scoring in group contests than by furnishing a translation of the programme and score cards at a combined gymnastic and athletic contest under the direction of Captain Nordlander, together with his explanations taken from the aforesaid article.

PROGRAM FOR A COMBINED GYMNASTIC AND ATHLETIC
CONTEST, 1894.

1.

Order movements.

2.

- a. Stretch stride toe standing double knee bending.
- b. Standing double arm extensions in various directions.
- c. Standing head bending backward. Standing alternate head turning.
- d. Bend prone stride standing double arm extension upwards (sidewards).
- e. Stretch close standing, trunk bending sidewards.
- f. Wing standing preparation for free jumps.

3.

Tense bending double heel raising with living support, followed by stretch standing trunk bending forwards and downwards.

4.

- 1st sect. Once vertical climbing } ropes.
- " " arm traveling }
- 2d " Vertical arm traveling on rung pole } hands to the same rung.
- The even members on vertical ladder }
- 3d " Underhanging horizontal arm traveling (bom).
- 4th " Horizontal hanging pendular climbing upwards (arch rope).

5.

Wing hook half standing, knee stretching backwards.

6.

Running race (plain running, obstacle running 150 meters) followed by derivative movements.

7.

(a) Gymnastic pedagogic form. (b) Applied gymnastic (athletic) form.

- a. 1st and 2d sects. Bend horizontal foot grasp half standing double arm extension upwards (ladderwall).
- 3d and 4th " Bend transverse prone arc lying double arm extension upwards (sidewards) (benches), followed by depth jump from collected start.
- b. Tug-of-war (section against section).

8.

(a) Gymnastic pedagogic form. (b) Applied gymnastic (athletic) form.

- a. 1st and 2d sects. Stretch foot grasp half standing trunk bending backwards (ladderwall).
- 3d and 4th " Bend fall foot grasp sitting double arm stretching upwards (sidewards), benches.
- b. Pushing the pole (section against section).

9.

(a) Gymnastic pedagogic form. (b) Applied gymnastic (athletic) form.

- a. 1st and 2d sects. Rest side foot grasp half standing, trunk bending sidewards with living support.
- 3d and 4th " Half stretch grasp side lying leg separation (ladderwall). Followed by stretch stride standing quick trunk twisting and trunk bending sidewards.
- b. Wrestling in ranks (section against section.)

10.

Wing standing preparation for free jumps.

11.

(a) In the ranks. (b) By sections.

- a. Free jumps in ranks without, with facings, etc.
- b. 1st sect. { Straddle vault with running start. Buck. Gradually increasing height.
Running high jump. Begins with height of 0.80 meter.
- 2d sect. { Through vault with running start. Double bom.
Running high jump. Begins with height of 0.80 meter.
- 3d sect. { Inside and outside pommel vault without and with facing. Bom.
Running high jump. Begins with height of 0.70 meter.
- 4th sect. { Overgrasp hanging inside pommel vault with running start.
Double bom.
Running high jump. Begins with height of 0.70 meter.

12.

Athletic form.

Exercises on track with six obstacles, carrying rifle and light equipment.

13.

Toe march and common march, etc.

14.

Yard (a) standing double arm flinging.
Standing double arm raising forward-upwards and sinking sideways downward with double heel raising and sinking.

DESCRIPTION OF THE OBSTACLES.

Number One. Two parallel banks of earth, 1.5 meter high, inclination one in one. Distance between their upper inner edges 6.5 meters. Between the banks an excavation is made, so that the depth from upper edges of the banks to the bottom is 2.6 meters. Across the excavation and firmly fixed to the banks are four rafters with an even side of 12 c.m. The length of the banks is 8 m.

Number Two. Three poles driven into the ground in a straight line, being the support for two crossbars, of which the upper edge of the lower one is 1.25 m. from the ground, the upper one 1.73 m. Distance between the external poles, 7 m.

Number Three. A trench, 10 m. long, 1 m. deep at the farthest (?) edge and with an even inclination to the level of the ground at the nearest edge. Width 4 m.

Number Four. A hurdle of brush (10.7 m. long, 1.5 m. high) with a trench behind (0.7 m. deep, 2 m. upper width), and behind this a bank, 1 m. high.

Number Five. A trench (0.4 m. deep, 10 m. long, 6 m. wide) with four rafters loosely placed over it. Breadth of rafters 10 c.m.

Number Six. A board wall, 6 m. long, 6.1 m. high. The boards are nailed to three posts firmly attached to the ground and the external ones secured by shores.

Length of track 88 m.

SCORE CARD FOR EACH SECTION.

Section No.	POINTS.				Total.
	Family of Movements.	Willingness Determination Power.	"Form."	Ability.	
1 Order movements.....					
2 Introductory movements....					
3 Tense bendings.....					
4 Heave movements.....					
5 Balance movements.....					
6 Running race.....					
7 Movements for back:					
(a) Pedagogic form.....					
(b) Athletic form.....					
8 Movements for front:					
(a) Pedagogic form.....					
(b) Athletic form.....					
9 Alternating side movements:					
(a) Pedagogic form.....					
(b) Athletic form.....					
10 Leg movements.....					
11 Precipitant movements:					
(a) On ranks.....					
(b) By section.....					
1. Vaults.....					
2. Jumps.....					
12 Obstacle track.....					
13 Marches.....					
14 Respiratory movements.....					

"Each company commanded by its "officer of gymnastics" — all of the eight companies have during the encampment their own "officers of gymnastics" and these are under the direct guidance of a "captain of gymnastics" — was divided into four equal sections, numbered from 1 to 4, arranged according to strength, ability and possibly previous training. Sections of the same number from the different companies were compared exclusively with each other, and their rank was judged by two "officers of gymnastics" appointed for each such pair of sections. The "captain of gymnastics" was referee in case of different opinions, and he also scrutinized the result of judging. Points from 1 to 10 were given in common by the two controlling officers — after a little practice it was quite easy to judge fairly justly — according to the formulæ in the scorecards for (1) willingness, determination, power in the execution of the movements, (2) form of movement, (3) ability (see scorecards A and B)."

As may be seen from "scorecard B" several factors have been taken into consideration in judging of the ability in the athletic forms and in the precipitant movements. In the running race the time was noticed both for "first" and "last men" (*i. e.* the time needed by the whole company) and also the number of "first," "second" and so on men who arrived simultaneously. Suppose for instance that the first section of the third company

SPECIAL SCORE CARD.

	Sect. No.								
Running race.	}	Time for best men	Number of best men	Time for last men	Number of last men	}	Average points	=	
		=	=	=	=		=		
Tug of war.	}	Number of victors	Number of vanquished			}	Points	=	
		=	=	=					
Pushing the pole.	}	Number of victors	Number of vanquished			}	Points	=	
		=	=	=					
Wrestling.	}	Number of victors	Number of vanquished			}	Points	=	
		=	=	=					
Precipitant movements by sections: 1. Vault.	}	Smallest height	Increased height	Increased height	Greatest height	}	Average points	=	
		=	=	=	=				
2. Jumps	}	No. men	No. men	No. men	No. men	}	Average points	=	
		=	=	=	=				
	}	Smallest height	Increased height	Increased height	Greatest height	}	Average points	=	
		=	=	=	=				
	}	No. men	No. men.	No. men	No. men	}	Average points	=	
		=	=	=	=				
Athletic exercises on track with obstacles	}	Number of men clearing					Time for taking all obstacles	Average points	=
		1st obstacle	2d obstacle	3d obstacle	4th obstacle	5th obstacle			
		=	=	=	=	=			

(1-III) needed 27 seconds to get in, while the corresponding section of the fifth company used thirty seconds, then 1-III got 3 points more than 1-V. If 3-III got in 4 "first men" in the same time that 3-V had 6, then the last named section got a plus of 2 points and so on. Of all these figures the average was taken. In a similar manner the score was decided according to the numbers of victors and vanquished in the athletic forms of Nos. 7, 8 and 9."

"In the precipitant movements (No. 11 of the program) notice was taken of that number of men who, while maintaining the purest form, could clear the different apparatus which were gradually raised by 10 c. m. each time. The smallest height was previously determined and differed for the different degrees of sections"

This mode of scoring is undoubtedly not perfect. It may perhaps be greatly improved. Are there not sufficient reasons at hand why we should adopt the principle endeavoring to perfect the details according to our own conditions and prevailing circumstances?







