

YALE ALUMNI WEEKLY

VOL. VII. No. 29.

NEW HAVEN, CONN., THURSDAY, APRIL 14, 1898.

PRICE TEN CENTS.

THE SOUTHERN TRIP.

Yale Beaten Twice—Batting is Improving—Fearey Shows Improvement.

The annual Southern trip of the Yale University nine just completed has demonstrated that Yale has a fairly strong fielding nine; that the men are learning to bat, and that the battery is better than was feared. Fearey did excellent work in two games and Sullivan's backstop record was fine. Wallace, Wadsworth, Wear, and Sullivan led in batting. Wallace did particularly good work with the stick.

Yale was beaten twice in six games. She is always at some disadvantage in these early games with Southern nines, and the Southern nines are apt to be very good anyway. The trip developed team play and gave much experience. The management was excellent and the weather was generally good.

The reports of the trip were received by the WEEKLY by mail and wire, from its Athletic Editor, accompanying the Nine.

Yale, 3—Manhattan, 10.

The first game of the trip was played Wednesday, April 6, at Jasper Field, New York, against the Manhattan College nine. Yale lost by a score of 10 to 3. The weather was cold and disagreeable and the field in poor condition. Cadwalader pitched the first six innings for Yale and was relieved by Chauncey. Yale's defeat was largely due to the unsteady work of these two. McBride, on the contrary, put up an effective game in the box for Manhattan, striking out eight men and allowing seven scattered hits. A running catch by Greenway and the all-around work of Agnew were features of the game.

The score:

YALE.		AB.	R.	H.	PO.	A.	E.
deSaulles, 2b.	4	0	0	5	1	0
Wadsworth, 1b.	4	1	0	6	0	0
Wear, cf.	4	0	1	1	0	1
Greenway, lf.	4	0	1	4	0	0
Hazen, 3b.	4	0	1	0	0	0
Camp, ss.	3	0	0	1	1	0
Wallace, rf.	4	0	2	2	0	0
Cadwalader, p.	2	0	0	0	0	1
Chauncey, p.	1	1	0	0	2	0
Sullivan, c.	4	1	2	5	1	1
Totals	34	3	7	24	5	3

MANHATTAN.

	AB.	R.	H.	PO.	A.	E.
G. Cotter, lf.	3	1	0	0	0
D. Cotter, rf.	2	3	0	3	0
Garvey, 1b.	2	2	0	11	0
Agnew, c.	4	2	2	8	1
Castro, ss.	3	0	1	1	2
McBride, p.	4	0	0	0	5
McQuade, 3b.	4	0	0	1	2
Burns, cf.	4	1	1	2	0
Shea, 2b.	4	1	0	1	0
Cohalan, 2b.	0	0	1	0	0
Totals	30	10	5	27	10

Score by innings:

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Yale	0	0	1	0	0	1	1	0	0—3
Manh't	0	0	0	2	3	0	4	1	x—10

Summary: Three-base hits—Greenway. Stolen bases—Wadsworth, Chauncey, G. Cotter, D. Cotter, Garvey (2), Castro, Agnew. Double plays—deSaulles to Camp. Bases on balls—Off

THE YALE NINE AND SUBSTITUTES.

Robson, 3b. (sub.) Hazen, 3b. Cadwalader, p. (sub.) deSaulles, 2b. Fearey, p. Hall, p. (sub.)
Chauncey, p. (sub.) Wadsworth, 1b. Greenway, l.f. Wallace, r.f. Sullivan, c.



Wear, c.f.

Camp, s.s.

Kiefer, c. (sub.)

Bronson, s.s. (sub.)

Eddy, r.f. (sub.)

[Photograph by Pach.]

Cadwalader, 6; off Chauncey, 4; off McBride, 1. Hit by pitcher—By Chauncey, 1; by Cadwalader, 1. Struck out—By Cadwalader, 2; by Chauncey, 4; by McBride, 8. Passed balls—Sullivan, 1; Agnew, 1. Wild pitch—Chauncey. Time of game—Two hours 25 minutes. Umpire—Horan.

Yale, 5—Georgetown, 3.

Yale won the game with Georgetown University on Thursday, by a score of 5 to 3. The match was thoroughly satisfactory from a Yale standpoint, as it afforded the first opportunity of judging the real strength of the Nine. Fearey's work in the box was especially gratifying. He held the opposing team down to five well scattered hits, struck out ten men and allowed only one base on balls. His control and speed were uniformly good throughout the game. Sullivan's support was excellent. The entire team fielded sharply except in the fourth inning, and played steadily at critical points. Yale's batting was also encouraging.

Yale scored first in the second inning. Hazen was given his base on balls, reached third on a passed ball and crossed the plate on Camp's single. In the fourth, Georgetown took the lead when three errors and Downe's hit to center field allowed three men to score. Hits by Camp, Fearey and Sullivan tied the score in the fifth. The scoring ended in the sixth, when Wear and Camp came home on Wallace's three-base hit.

[Continued on 2d page.]

CRITICISM OF COLLEGES.

Why Is It Not Justifiable in the Public Press?

To the Editor of YALE ALUMNI WEEKLY:

Sir: The report in the YALE ALUMNI WEEKLY of the speeches made at the banquet that followed the recent Yale-Princeton debate says that Mr. James W. Alexander of the Princeton Board of Trustees, "referred to the newspaper war over Yale's English Department," and said "that the same loyalty which would prevent a man from disclosing his mother's failings in public should prevent him from attacking faults of his alma mater in the newspapers. Such attacks may be of value in their place; but their place is not in the public press, where an invidious public may see and glut [gloat?] over them."

This has a familiar sound. It is not uncommon for a trustee, a director, an office-holder, to protest against public criticism of a condition for which he and his associates are responsible on the ground that such criticism is disloyalty to the institution or cause they represent. The Emperor William of Prussia is not the only potentate who construes and punishes doubt of his perfect wisdom in administration as high treason to the State. It is the foible of men who are responsible in the public eye for the conduct of any institution to imagine that they and the institution are one, and that criticism which impeaches their judgment, in any particular, can have no other motive than hostility to the welfare of the institution. As a general rule, this

peculiar sensitiveness is most demonstrative when the need of calling public attention to an existing condition is greatest. It becomes desperately insistent when there is no other available defence.

Let us scrutinize this imputation of disloyalty in order to see if it is warranted by sober reason.

In the first place, when an alumnus criticises any condition of his alma mater, not inherent and remediless, neither constitutional nor organic, but only an accidental circumstance due to the error or neglect of those who are temporarily in charge of her interests, the criticism is no sign of want of affection. To utter it may be the highest duty of loyalty, a clear proof of sincere zeal that the ideal of her honor and services shall suffer no prolonged degradation. When trustees and faculties resent such criticism as mere impertinence and assume that only they and those who uphold them are competent to express an intelligent opinion of alma mater's welfare, it suggests the case of a son who, because his brothers have intrusted to him the immediate care of their dear mother, imagines that they have abnegated their share of responsibility and relinquished her entirely to his discretion and pleasure, so that, even if he should be remiss in any respect, they would have no privilege of protest, no right to invoke the influence of all friends of the suffering mother to effect a correction of his mistaken action.

A college is not the alma mater of its official trustees only, nor of its trustees and faculty only, nor of those only who have graduated. The maternal function did not end with the last degrees conferred. The undergraduates

[Continued on 8th page.]