

INTERCOLLEGIATE FOOTBALL RESEARCHERS ASSOCIATION™

# The College Football Historian™

*Expanding the knowledge and information on college  
football's unique past—today!*

ISSN: 1526-233x [February 2012... Vol. 5 No. 1] circa: Jan. 2008

Tex Noel, Editor (ifra.tcfh@gmail.com)

(Website) <http://www.secsportsfan.com/college-football-association.html>

*All content is protected by copyright© by the author.*

- With this issue of The College Football Historian, we kick-off our 5<sup>th</sup> season of presenting college football's unique history...as researched and compiled by some of the best researcher of the sport.

A special thank you goes out to the 419 subscriber that TCFH is sent to each month!

## **Woodrow Wilson: Student, Professor, President, Football Coach**

This first piece comes as a suggestion from IFRA subscriber Kevin Edds, the director of the recently released documentary *Wahoowa: The History of Virginia Cavalier Football*. His research on the film included a tangential investigation of 1879 UVa law school student, Woodrow Wilson, whose passion for football while at Princeton knew no bounds. Edds discovered accounts of Wilson's football life in the book *College Football. History. Spectacle. Controversy.* by John Watterson (a fellow IFRA subscriber). While an undergraduate at Princeton, Wilson wrote football editorials for the school newspaper, of which he was editor, set ticket prices, and arranged the schedules and venues.

Edds later noticed, in David Nelson's book, *Anatomy of a Game*, that Wilson "coached" at Princeton—while no in-game coaching was allowed at the time, Wilson did supervise practices and devise game strategies—as an undergraduate in the fall of 1878. But

## *The College Football Historian-2 -*

surprisingly, Nelson stated that Wilson also coached there in 1879. How could this be if Wilson was attending the University of Virginia Law School in the fall of '79?

IFRA Executive Director, Tex Noel, shared a 1933 *New York Times* article mentioning that Park H. Davis “recalls that... Woodrow Wilson was coach at Princeton in 1878, 1879 and 1890” – almost exactly the wording used by Nelson in *Anatomy of a Game*. While Davis’ recollection may have been cloudy (it did come 55 years after Wilson’s undergraduate career at Princeton) this did not *disprove* the possibility of Wilson as coach in '79.

Edds’ research also included a discussion with staffers at the Woodrow Wilson Library in Staunton, Virginia. Here Edds was told that while Wilson never wrote in his personal records of coaching Princeton during his tenure at UVa, it is confirmed that he was conspicuously absent from Charlottesville most weekends that fall—presumably to “court a young woman out of town” according to the museum researchers. Could Wilson have been "courting" his first true love... football at Princeton? A five-hour train ride from Charlottesville to Princeton on a Friday afternoon makes this scenario entirely possible—despite its improbability.

With Wilson at the helm, Princeton won the national championship in 1878, defeating Yale and Harvard for the first Big Three Championship. Princeton then won a share of the national title in 1879. Could the coach of the country’s best football team have simultaneously been a student at the University of Virginia School of Law?

Further research conducted by representatives at Princeton’s Mudd Library similarly brought up no additional information on Wilson coaching at Princeton, or any involvement at all, in 1879. If any IFRA subscribers reading this have any information on Wilson’s relationship to Princeton football in 1879 please contact Edds at [kevin.edds@gmail.com](mailto:kevin.edds@gmail.com).

A more in-depth look at Wilson’s passion for football was recounted in a November 14<sup>th</sup>, 1926 *New York Times* article praising Wilson for his many contributions to the game of football.

Here it states that his football record was made a “special study” at Princeton and Wesleyan, and that the late President was “a coach, adviser, inventor of plays, and pioneer in the early game.”

While as a history professor at Wesleyan in the 1880s he became deeply interested in the development of the sport. *The New York Times* refers to several Wesleyan men of

his day that compared Wilson's offensive strategies and plays with those of Walter Camp for Yale and Loren Deland for Harvard.

One of Wesleyan's most famous players, Henry Hall, described a scene of Wilson at a blackboard demonstrating football plays to the team on the morning in which they would go on to defeat Pennsylvania in New York City on Thanksgiving morning, 1889.

For another look at Wilson's football life, enjoy an excerpt of an article from Wesleyan's student newspaper, *The Argus*, in 1926 which describes the tall, thin, history professor's experiences.

### ***The Wesleyan Argus***

November, 1926

Professor Wilson was active in Wesleyan life in more ways than in the classroom and in stimulating undergraduate debating.

By most of the undergraduates of his day, he is largely remembered for his services as a coach of the football team and his keen interest in the athletics of the college was one of the greatest factors in warming the undergraduates' hearts. While a student at Princeton, he had taken a prominent part in athletic affairs, and was referee and one of the directors of the Princeton football team in the days when the football championship resided with that institution. It is said that one time he was kept from being on the victorious team only by a prolonged sickness.

### **Wilson's Work at Wesleyan.**

On his arrival in Middletown, he was made one of three members of the advisory board of the Wesleyan Football Association, the other members being Seward V. Coffin, '89, and Frank Beattys, '85. Throughout the weeks of the Fall practice, Professor Wilson also served as one of the coaches of the eleven, assisting Captain Slayback in devising new plays of gridiron strategy.

Football tactics underwent a change at that time, and these men mapped out a plan whereby the rush line was contracted so that the men stood side by side, about as today, while the backs were brought nearer to the rush line. Quick plunges and double crisscross passes were also worked out.

Football, of course, was in its infancy in those days, and while these plays seem old now, they were considered innovations at that time. And as a result, in 1889, the

University of Pennsylvania was defeated, 10-2; Amherst, 39-0; Williams, 20-17; Rutgers, 58-4; and Trinity, 6-4. These victories were interspersed here and there with some defeats, Princeton among them, which of course, nobody at Wesleyan cares to remember after the lapse of more than a quarter of a century.

These victories, however, gave Wesleyan the leadership among the minor colleges of New England, and as Lehigh had gained a similar ascendancy among the smaller colleges of her section, great importance was attached in the football world to the Wesleyan-Lehigh games that was played at Hampden Park at Springfield, Mass., of that year. In fact, the Lehigh supporters boasted that in case the laurels of victory came their way they would insist upon demanding Wesleyan's place in the old intercollegiate football association, which included Harvard, Pennsylvania, Princeton, Yale, and Wesleyan.

#### **Battle in a Sea of Mud.**

The day of the game brought a hard storm and the day's battle was fought in a sea of mud. The Lehigh team developed an altogether unexpected strength and the game was going their way. Twice Lehigh scored easy touchdowns, and it seemed as though Wesleyan faced certain defeat.

Then, suddenly, from the Wesleyan bleachers a man walked out in front, clad in heavy rubber boots and a raincoat. He shouted to the Wesleyan contingent, reproaching them for not cheering for their team, and at once began to lead them in the Wesleyan yell, beating time for them with his umbrella. He continued this violently until the Wesleyan cheers heartened Slayback's men in spite of their handicap and the tide of the game turned for two touchdowns as Peck, McDonald, Slayback, and Hall crashed into the Brown and White line and tied the score.

After the game the Lehigh players, inquiring about the magnetic cheer leader, were informed that he was Wesleyan's Professor of History, Dr. Woodrow Wilson.

"Well," returned the Lehigh men, "he is all right, for he saved you."

Professor Wilson's loyalty to his own Alma Mater and his enthusiasm as coach of the Wesleyan eleven were put to a severe test on Election Day, 1888, the day on which Benjamin Harrison was elected to the office that the Professor was later destined to fill. On that day Princeton and Wesleyan were matched on the gridiron and Walter Camp was the referee of the game. There was probably no other college than

Princeton whom Professor Wilson would have accepted that year to administer a defeat to Wesleyan.

\* \* \*

Permission to use granted by The Express-Times; on its website, lehighvalleylive.com. (Jim Deegan, Managing editor and Alyssa Young, Assistant Managing Editor/Online)

## **Almanac Feb. 3, 2012**

Originally published: Friday, February 03, 2012

By **Pete Brekus | The Express-Times**

### **100 years ago today**

1912: Red Zone blues; messing with the rules of football: "Parke H. Davis, of Easton, left yesterday morning for New York City to attend the annual meeting of the football rules committee. Mr. Davis is a representative of Princeton. A number of changes in the rules were discussed, one of which was a proposition to add an additional down, making five downs to gain 10 yards. Those in favor claim that frequently a team works the ball to within a short distance of the goal and then the defense braces to such an extent that the ball cannot be taken over on four downs. Another proposed change would be that the team carrying the ball be required to make only five instead of 10 yards within the 20-yard line."

\* \* \*

*Submitted by Richard Topp*

**Source:** *The Kalamazoo Gazette, Oct. 10, 1907*

## **YOST'S MEN ARE STILL WESTERN CHAMPIONS**

Michigan Was not defeated by the University of Chicago in 1905

### **INCOMPETENT OFFICIATING**

Recent Decision Handed Down by the Rules Committee Declared Ball Was Dead When It Crossed the Line. Score, therefore, 0 to 0.

**(Gazette Special Service.)**

Ann Arbor, Mich., Oct. 9—Is Michigan still the football champion of the west?

After generally conceding this title to the University of Chicago since the memorable game of 1905 Michigan now steps forward and claims the championship, basing her assertion on the principle that a champion retains the title until defeated. Moreover, the Wolverines claim that Michigan was defeated and that the 2 to 0 game really ended with the score tied at 0 to 0.

This may sound absurd, but it is entirely in accordance with the decision handed down by the rules committee Saturday at their annual meeting in New York. At the time of the game the referee awarded Chicago a safety, counting two points, when Clark was thrown back over his own goal line while attempting to run out a punt. According to the stand taken by the rules committee the ball was dead before Clark was thrown back to the line, and consequently it should have been Michigan's ball on her own-five-yard line.

**How Play Was Made.**

The play in question was this: Eckersall for Chicago punted—a long low drive which the entire Michigan backfield misjudged. Clark, however, got the ball back of the goal line and started to run it out. He had gone about five yards from the goal when he was nailed simultaneously by Catlin and Megis, who hurled him back over the goal line for what the referee hold to be a safety. Accordingly Chicago won the game and relieved Michigan of the championship.

However, the rules committee hold that the rule stipulate that the ball is dead the instant the forward progress of the man in possession of the ball is stopped. As Clark was running forward it was necessary from all natural laws that he must have stopped for however brief a space of time before he could be thrown in the opposite direction.

When asked for his opinion of the affair Coach Yost said that it looked as if the committee had taken a reasonable view of the matter although, he had never thought of it in that way.

\* \* \*

## **IFRA Remembers**

### **< Obituaries >**

Longtime Wisconsin football radio voice Jim Irwin; he was 77...Former Cincinnati quarterback Greg Cook. He was 65...Longtime Ohio State sports information director D.C. Koehl. He was 61... Steve Kittrell, 64; Texas Tech...Victor J. Paternostro, 68, Notre Dame... Dominic A. "Dom" Fusci, 89, South Carolina (two-time All-Southern Conference tackle)...John A. Gustafson, age 53, University of New Mexico and later at Northern Michigan University...James Scott Harrell, age 60, Southern Illinois University.

### **<Hall of Fame>**

New Mexico State sports information director Dave Lopez and former player Tony Wragge...Clayton Wagner, Georgetown University Athletic Hall of Fame...Louisiana Tech wide receiver Roger Carr, former Florida State football player and Warrick Dunn, former Ole Miss running back Deuce McAllister, former Southern head coach Pete Richardson and former LSU running back Terry Robiskie have been selected to the state of Louisiana Sports Hall of Fame...Gary Danielson, C.S. "Pop" Doan coach and administrator, (assisted with the creation of the Old Oaken Bucket Game) and Jeff Zgonina.

### **<Announcements>**

College Football's winningest coach **John Gagilardi** has announced he will return for his 60th year at St. John's (Minn.). He holds a 484-133-11 career record.

*If anyone reads of an accomplishment from your local paper or Alma mater, please send it to the editor (ifra.tcfh@gmail.com)...Thank you!*

\* \* \*

### **Caspar Whitney's Ranking of 1906 Teams**

- |               |                  |                 |
|---------------|------------------|-----------------|
| 1. Yale.      | 5. Carlisle.     | 9. West Point.  |
| 2. Princeton. | 6. Pennsylvania. | 10. Swarthmore. |
| 3. Harvard.   | 7. Cornell.      | 11. Minnesota.  |
| 4. Annapolis. | 8. Brown.        | 12. Chicago.    |

This ranking is not based only on comparative scores, but on style of play, conditions under which games were contested, relative importance of games on the schedule—especially with regard to each team's "big" game, for which it was particularly trained—as well as the season's all-round record of the elevens under discussion. My interest in the study is its object lesson on comparative Foot Ball development throughout the country.

\* \* \*

*Sporting Life, 1887/as is*

## INTERCOLLEGIATE FOOT BALL

### **Two Referees to be Appointed and Rough Play to be Stopped**

The Intercollegiate Foot Ball Association held meeting in New York, City. Harvard was represented by Captain Brooks, University of Pennsylvania by William C. Posey, Yale by captain Beecher and ex-Captain Corbin, Princeton by Captain Cook and ex-Captain Savage and Wesleyan by the Messrs Beatty.

At a meeting held a month ago the Harvard delegates stated that unless the unnecessary roughness could be done away with their faculty would prevent the games at Harvard. The Harvard faculty offered the scheme of two referees, one to look after the game and to decide all points relating to the possession of the all, the other to have charge of the players with the authority to disqualify. This scheme did not meet with the approval of the delegates and a communication was addressed to the Harvard faculty by the convention, in which the objections to the scheme were stated.

On Saturday night a letter from Professor (*letters in the name were not legible and as a result, no name could be presented*) representing the athletic committee of the Harvard faculty, was read, the content being to the effect that unless the convention approved the plan of two referees Harvard would have to withdraw from the League. On motion of Yale it was decided to appoint two referees in every championship game.

A committee was appointed by the president to draw up a constitution and submit it to the meeting in October next.

All the captains expressed their intention of training their teams for next year so that there would not be a repetition of the rough play of former years. The earnestness with which they expressed themselves as willing to co-operate to obtain this good result would indicate that in the future no complaint can be made by college faculties of the game being too rough.

\* \* \*

**Bo Carter Presents the College Football Hall of Famers born or died in the month of...**

**February**

- 1 (1908) Albie Booth, New Haven, Conn.
- 1 (1915) Gaynell "Gus" Tinsley, Ruple, La.
- 1-(d – 1964) Clarence Spears, Jupiter, Fla.
- 1-(d – 1928) Joe Thompson, Beaver Falls, Pa.
- 1-(d – 1978) John Orsi, Naples, Fla.
- 1-(d – 1989) Everett Bacon, Southampton, N.Y.
- 2 (1945) Loyd Phillips, Ft. Worth, Texas
- 2-(d – 1956) Truxton Hare, Radnor, Pa.
- 3 (1938) Joe Fusco, Wilkinsburg, Pa.
- 3 (1940) Fran Tarkenton, Richmond, Va.
- 3 (1945) Bob Griese, Evansville, Ind.
- 3 (1956) John Jefferson, Dallas, Texas
- 3-(d – 1968) Homer Hazel, Marshall, Mich.
- 3-(d – 1974) Bob Suffridge, Knoxville, Tenn.
- 3-(d – 2006) Johnny Vaught, Oxford, Miss.
- 4 (1933) Leo Lewis, Des Moines, Iowa
- 4 (1938) Wayne Harris, Hampton, Ark.
- 4 (1940) Billy Neighbors, Tuscaloosa, Ala.
- 4 (1960) Tom Deery, Oaklyn, N.J.
- 4-(d – 1950) Everett Strupper, Atlanta, Ga.
- 4-(d – 1962) Pat O'Dea, San Francisco, Calif.
- 4-(d – 2005) Malcolm Kutner, Tyler, Texas
- 4-(d - 2010) Bill Dudley, Lynchburg, Va.
- 5 (1903) Morley Drury, Midland, Ontario, Canada
- 5 (1915) Walter Gilbert, Fairfield, Ala.
- 5 (1933) Bill Manlove, Barrington, N.J.
- 5 (1942) Roger Staubach, Cincinnati, Ohio
- 5 (1943) Craig Morton, Flint, Mich.
- 5 (1947) Ron Sellers, Jacksonville, Fla.
- 5 (1950) Terry Beasley, Montgomery, Ala.
- 5 (1951) Charles Young, Fresno, Calif.
- 5-(d - 1969) Dick Romney, Salt Lake City, Utah
- 5-(d – 1994) George Sauer, Waco, Texas
- 6 (1886) Jack Hubbard, Hatfield, Mass.
- 6 (1889) Bill Alexander, Mud River, Ky.
- 6 (1948) Major Harris, Pittsburgh, Pa.
- 6 (1948) Dennis Onkotz, Northampton, Pa.
- 6 (1950) Rich Glover, Bayonne, N.J.
- 6-(d – 1979) John Baker, Sacramento, Calif.
- 7 (1905) Wally Butts, Milledgeville, Ga.
- 7 (1917) Banks McFadden, Ft. Lawn, S.C.
- 7 (1922) Paul Cleary, North Loop, Neb.
- 7 (1933) Calvin Jones, Steubenville, Ohio
- 7 (1934) Ron Beagle, Hartford, Conn.
- 7 (1959) Neal Lomax, Portland, Ore.
- 7-(d – 1932) Forrest Geyer, Norman, Okla.
- 7-(d – 1952) Wilbur Henry, Washington, Pa.
- 8 (1920) Bruce Smith (Minn.), Faribault, Minn.
- 8 (1925) Rod Franz, San Francisco, Calif.
- 8 (1942) George Bork, Mt. Prospect, Ill.
- 8-(d – 1968) Doc Fenton, Baton Rouge, La.
- 8-(d – 1994) Bobby Reynolds (Stanford), San Rafael, Calif.

- 8-(d – 2005) Parker Hall, Vicksburg, Miss.  
9 (1950) Rod Cason, San Angelo, Texas  
9 (1952) Danny White, Mesa, Ariz.  
9 (1957) Dan Ross, Malden, Mass.  
9-(d -1994) Bud Wilkinson, St. Louis, Mo.  
9-(d – 1998) George Cafego, Knoxville, Tenn.  
10 (1946) Dick Anderson, Midland, Mich.  
10-(d – 1992) Doyt Perry, Bowling Green, Ohio
- 
- 11 (1882) John Tigert, Nashville, Tenn.**  
**11 (1938) Jim Sochor, Oklahoma City, Okla.**  
**11 (1949) Murry Bowden, Colorado City, Texas**  
**11 (1949) Jim Stillwagon, Mt. Vernon, Ohio**
- 
- 12 (1885) Frank Murray, Maynard, Mass.  
12 (1895) Dick Romney, Salt Lake City, Utah  
12 (1925) Lee Tressel, Ada, Ohio  
12 (1963) Brent Jones, Santa Clara, Calif.  
12-(d – 1944) Bill Warner, Portland, Ore.  
12-(d – 1959) Charlie Daly, Pacific Grove, Calif.  
12-(d – 1979) Ben Ticknor, Peterborough, N.H.  
13 (1919) Eddie Robinson, Jackson, La.  
13 (1933) Kenneth Dement, Poplar Bluff, Mo.  
13-(d - 1945) Bill Mallory, in combat in Italy  
13-(d – 1996) Charlie Conerly, Memphis, Tenn.  
13-(d – 2006) Bud McFadin, Victoria, Texas  
14 (1913) Woody Hayes, Clifton, Ohio  
14 (1919) George Kerr, Brookline, Mass.  
14-(d – 1978) Paul Governali, San Diego, Calif.  
15 (1897) Earl “Red” Blaik, Detroit, Mich.  
15 (1920) Endicott Peabody, Lawrence, Mass.  
23 (1943) Fred Biletnikoff, Erie, Pa.  
23 (1950) Jim Youngblood, Union, S.C.  
23-(d – 1914) Alex Moffat, New York City  
23-(d – 1957) George Little, Middlesex, N.J.  
24 (1903) Warren Woodson, Fort Worth, Texas  
24 (1906) Bennie Oosterbaan, Muskegon, Mich.  
24 (1910) Fred Sington, Birmingham, Ala.  
24 (1923) Bob Chappius, Toledo, Ohio  
24 (1952) Fred Dean, Arcadia, La.
- 15 (1929) Fred Martinelli, Columbus, Ohio  
15 (1931) John Michels, Philadelphia, Pa.  
15 (1940) John Hadl, Lawrence, Kan.  
15 (1957) Marc Wilson, Bremerton, Wash.  
15 (1960) Darnell Green, Houston, Texas  
15-(d – 1963) Ira Rodgers, Morgantown, W.Va.  
16 (1931) Dick Modzelewski, West Natrona, Pa.  
16 (1964) Teel Bruner, London, Ky.  
17 (1872) Pat O’Dea, Melbourne, Australia  
17 (1892) Bob Neyland, Greenville, Texas  
17 (1905) Andy Oberlander, Chelsea, Mass.  
17 (1920) Jackie Hunt, Huntington, W.Va.  
17 (1936) Jim Brown, St. Simons Island, Ga.  
17 (1938) Jim Christopherson, Wadena, Minn.  
17-(d – 2009) Brad Van Pelt, Owosso, Mich.  
18 (1895) George Gipp, Laurium, Mich.  
18 (1947) Leroy Keyes, Newport News, Va.  
18 (1962) Gary Reasons, Crowley, Texas  
18 (1963) Chuck Long, Norman, Okla.  
18-(d – 1994) Jake Gaither, Tallahassee, Fla.  
19 (1918) Forest Evashevski, Detroit, Mich.  
19-(d – 1962) Dick Harlow, Bethesda, Md.  
19-(d - 2011) Ollie Matson, Los Angeles, Calif.  
20 (1912) Francis Wistert, Chicago, Ill.  
21 (1921) Bob Dove, Youngstown, Ohio  
22 (1899) Matty Bell, Fort Worth, Texas  
22 (1864) George Woodruff, Dimmock, Pa.  
22 (1886) Bill Hollenbeck, Blueball, Pa.  
22 (1915) Mickey Kobrosky, Springfield, Mass.  
22-(d – 1998) Warren Woodson, Dallas, Texas  
23 (1877) Bill Edwards, Lisle, N.Y.  
23 (1934) Dick Strahm, Toledo, Ohio  
23 (1937) Tom Osborne, Hastings, Neb.

- 24-(d – 1953) Hunter Carpenter, Middletown, N.Y.
- 24-(d – 1963) Jack Harding, Miami, Fla.
- 24-(d – 1990) Lloyd Jordan, Richmond, Va.
- 25 (1942) Carl Eller, Winston-Salem, N.C.
- 26 (1914) Gomer Jones, Cleveland, Ohio
- 26 (1930) Vic Janowicz, Elyria, Ohio
- 26-(d – 1970) Bennie Owen, Houston, Texas
- 26-(d – 1978) Pooley Hubert, Waynesboro, Ga.
- 27 (1887) Tad Jones, Excello, Ohio
- 27 (1932) Jim Ray Smith, West Columbia, Texas
- 27-(d – 1996) Vic Janowicz, Columbus, Ohio
- 28 (1885) Ray Morrison, Sugar Branch, Ind.
- 28 (1929) Hayden Fry, Odessa, Texas
- 28 (1945) Bubba Smith, Beaumont, Texas
- 28-(d – 1965) Paul Hoernemann, Strongsville, Ohio
- 29-(d – 1972) Tom Davies, Pittsburgh, Pa.
- 29-(d – 1992) Don Heinrich, Saratoga, Calif.
- 29-(d – 2008) Buddy Dial, Houston, Texas
- 29-(d – 2008) Jerry Groom, Sarasota, Fla.

\* \* \*

<b>1906</b>	
<b>Dan McGugin's South teams</b>	
Vanderbilt	Alabama
Sewanee	Georgia
Georgia Tech	LSU
Clemson	Mississippi State
Auburn	Mississippi
Tennessee	

\* \* \*

*Golf Illustrated & Outdoor America, 1915*

## **AFTER-THOUGHTS OF THE FOOTBALL SEASON**

*By AN OLD STAR*

THE season's football record affords an abundance of material for reflection. And doubtless the chief subject of public comment has been the humiliation of teams that a little while ago were considered unbeatable due to the class they had placed themselves in by their records in past years.

We are all aware that the "big four" of the East were subjected to occasional defeats, but these reverses were in what were commonly called "practice games."

Their cause was possibly due to the use of too many substitutes. Bad blunders were also responsible, but when we consider them in conjunction with the fact that the halves were considerably shortened and no periods played, the superiority of the larger teams was often not given time enough to make up for some fatal blunder.

This year we have seen Yale and Pennsylvania, as well as the Army and Navy being consistently defeated one Saturday after another. The natural reflection is that, in some way or another, the larger colleges have lost an advantage which they held twenty odd years ago. What is it that has been responsible for this loss of advantage? As I see it, the high schools and small preparatory schools in the past were not turning out boys coached by special instructors, whereas the schools that did so and had teams of any account were feeders for the big colleges alone.

The small colleges were therefore deprived to a very great extent of players who entered with any knowledge of football according to the best

principles. But today we find that all schools make an effort to secure ex-college players to coach their teams and therefore the handicap upon the small colleges has been very much lessened by a class of material entering them that knows as a rule as much football as that which enters the so-called "Big Four or Six."

Then again the small college teams who generally relied in the past upon the captain or some men on the squad to do the coaching are now offering fancy prices to football instructors and men. Who devote their energy to this one branch of work. There remains, therefore, but one factor in which the large college has the advantage and that is the quantity of material they have to choose from.

To an extent this is offset in many cases by the elasticity of the eligibility rules of the smaller colleges and the stiffer entrance examinations to the larger colleges. All these factors together with the demoralization of the coaching situations have tended to put the once invincible Yale and Pennsylvania, not as the saying goes, "in their places," but "out of their places."

For several years before the new game came in, and for one or two years after, the defense was so far superior, as developed in the larger colleges, especially at Yale, that the paying public demanded a change.

They claimed the game was uninteresting, that injuries were due to the style of play, etc.

The result was that an extra down was added, the distance increased from five to ten yards, and the on-side kick and forward pass were introduced. The burden of the coaches became serious and the situations more complex.

The new game, changed somewhat from time to time, has made it possible for any team to be a source of worry to any other team. There is one point never realized by the defense of olden times, which the new rules enforce, namely, the neutral zone. This is a great advantage to the defense.

When the offensive lines used to play slap up against the defensive lines, they could open holes much easier, and could get by their opponents' hands much quicker. I believe were the old game returned to, one would still see the defense creating a neutral zone not enforced by the rules. As a player of the old game, I must admit that I could have enjoyed playing the new game more, and that is saying a great deal. There is only one part where I like the old game better, and that is having the ball downed where the man is thrown. A man should be downed, when tackled cleanly and singly, where he is thrown. Nothing gave quite so much satisfaction as the throwing of a runner for a substantial loss.

The forward pass has been neglected by the teams of larger colleges and only touched but slightly by pass should result in the passing side losing five yards or going back to the point from where the ball was passed. An intercepted pass should result, not in the loss of the ball, but a loss of ground equal to the distance from the point of interception and point passed.

Some such arrangement would tend to the play being more used and at the same time impose no greater burden on the defense.

Cornell and Harvard in the East are the top of football. Both universities may well, and can only, the smaller ones.

There is no doubt but that this play requires a great deal of time and careful attention before it can be relied upon.

But the throw from catcher to second base, in baseball, a very important defensive play, also requires and receives a like amount of attention. If baseball teams went into games having only played that throw as often as the forward pass is made, it would be no more successful and probably less so. This play requires a man very clever in throwing, but more than that, he must possess presence of mind, and his eye and muscles must act instinctively together to make the most of the play. It was disappointing to see the large teams with such men as Haughton, Sharp and Rush fail to have this play developed to a point where their team had the confidence to use it. Something is wrong with the play. It should be so fixed that it could be used oftener and at the same time not impose too much more of a

burden on the defense than it has already. I think that an incomplete give the credit to their coaches, Sharp and Haughton.

Sharp left Yale and took with him the ideas and fundamentals which had been taught him there year in and year out. He built on them, and I imagine has improved them wherever necessary to meet the new game. I can see in Harvard's style of game, the way she runs her attack, so much of the style of the old Yale ideas, that I think Haughton has learned some lessons during the long number of years he witnessed Yale's successes. From these, together with his own clever applications of the rules, and a system, which corresponds to and rivals German military efficiency, he has created something which Yale can only meet by reverting to her own good ideas and taking advantage of all that Haughton plus "Reggie" Brown has shown Yale, but which Yale has consistently, for the last several years, ignored.

In looking the field over for head-coach material, one is limited by the fact that any man who can successfully handle a situation like this at a big university, one who has the necessary football knowledge and at the same time a personality that the heads of universities wish associated with their students, is generally making so much of a success in a business or professional way that he cannot even temporarily be persuaded to take up this line of work.

A man, to get results on a football field, where there is liable to be confusion on account of a large squad; a great number of interested graduate coaches; where the time is limited to possibly two hours of an afternoon, must have a great deal of executive ability. He must be a man who can appeal to young men of an age from nineteen to twenty.

He must have the capacity of being intimate and yet exact on the field the utmost attention and respect. At Yale, Harvard or Princeton, where so many ex-varsity players return, the man in charge runs the risk of much bad advice, much harmless talk, and a great deal of "I told you so." Hence the greatest asset a coach can have under these conditions is to be able to take the cream of advice and tactfully reject the rest. He is up against the proposition of having around him one or more coaches who are very valuable for a particular detail, but whose ideas on other points are more than worthless. It is the lack of the very small things that

oftentimes lose the big games. In fact, the smallest points as to finesse and detail of position play are most necessary for a completely successful season.

In Sharp and Haughton, Cornell and Harvard have found men who have all of the above qualifications.

There is one element which has been developed to a fine art in the last ten years in the big universities, an element which can very well be done away with for the good of the sport, and that is this scouting system. It has grown to such an extent that the large teams have done away almost entirely with open practice. It would seem that opponents could agree and trust each other not to spy on one another's practice. It used to be one of the pleasures of college life for the student body to go regularly to the field every afternoon and witness the practice, see their room-mates or class-mates playing well and trying to make good. But this situation has been quite reversed, and the undergraduates are quite as unfamiliar today with the various men on the team as the alumni who attend the weekly games. I, for one, would like to see an agreement made whereby no representative from another college should attend the practice of a rival.

This scouting has reached such a fine point that a man is specially chosen to attend every game their coming opponent plays during the year, and some go so far as to take down every minute observation on paper. It has reached a pretty pass where a college will arrange a weak game just previous to their final big game, so that a big bulk of their first team attends their next opponent's game. It might be perfectly proper for a man, who is so crippled that it is unwise for him to play to attend such a game. I should think that a team which has had to play a substitute team for several years might very wisely have a clause in their contract, binding their opponent to play against them their best men, who are physically fit. Also, the paying public are somewhat entitled to see a first team play when a game is advertised as such.

These abuses will be carried so far that public opinion will take a hand in the matter.

All those interested in football are now asking themselves or each other, could Cornell beat Harvard again this fall, or could they not? No one is in any position to say. This year's scores should prove conclusively that fact. One has only to consider what happened on November thirteenth. Yale beat Princeton 13-7; Colgate who had beaten Yale two weeks before 16-0 was beaten 38-6 by Syracuse, who a few weeks before that had held Princeton 3-0. Now who is going to pretend they are wise enough to say that Cornell could not or could beat Harvard a second time this season.

In closing a few reflections upon the season's play occur to me. The new game has more than justified the hopes of the men who were responsible for the changes in the rules. It has had the effect of reversing the old order of things by making the coaches worry more about building defense rather than offense. Then the mental attitude of a team has shown itself to be a factor that must be reckoned with in forecasting the results of important matches.

And, finally, the execution of plays, especially by Harvard, has demonstrated the fact that it counts more than the plays themselves.

\* \* \*

*Baseball Magazine, October, 1912*

A Forecast of the Coming

Football Season

Signs of Life on the Gridiron—A Few Reflections on the

Season of 1911 and the Prospects for 1912

By M. V. B. LYONS

While it is impossible to predict the brilliant records that will be made on the gridiron this fall, every season is, at least in a measure, a reflection of the season which has gone before.

Football changes in every department, the rules are revised every year, and every year the championship falls with steady impartiality upon some new contender.

Last year was a glorious year for Princeton. Her triple victory over Dartmouth, Harvard and Yale was alone sufficient to gain for her possession of the coveted football crown. It is a rare event when Princeton defeats Yale and still rarer when she wins undisputed possession of the championship of college football.

\* \* \*

## BY 1914 W. J. Menke

In 1914 the W. & J. eleven mingled in eleven gridiron battles. It won ten. Its only defeat was at the hands of Harvard, by a 10 to 9 score—and it had Harvard beaten until almost the last minute of play, when a stroke of luck enabled the 1914 football champions to score a goal from field.

The Closing Match of the scheduled series of games of the Inter-Collegiate Association's championship contests for 1886, took place at Princeton on Thanksgiving day, under the most unpromising conditions or a satisfactory issue of the contest it would be possible to imagine.

The contestants were the elevens of Yale and Princeton; and two teams of the Association clubs never entered a field under conditions better calculated to elect ill-feeling and give Princeton did on this occasion.

In the first place the lay to bad temper than the players of Yale and ground was unfit for play, owing to the rain-storm which prevailed during the contest. Secondly, the arrangements for the accommodation of the crowd were simply wretched, and lastly, the course pursued by Princeton in insisting upon playing on such a field, when a model neutral field, like the St. George ground, at Staten Island, was at command, led to a very bitter feeling of animosity between the contesting elevens.

The two teams were made up as follows-

*Princeton.*—Rushers—H. Hodge, Cook, Cowan, George, Irvine, Moore, Wagenhorst; quarter-back—R. Hodge; half-backs—Price and Ames; fullback—Savage, (captain).

*Yale.*—Rushers—Wallace, Gill, Woodruff, Corbin, Carter, Burke, Corwin, (captain) quarter-back—Beecher; half-backs—Watkinson and Morrison; full-back—Bull.

We have not space for any details. Suffice it to say, therefore, that during the first half not a point was scored on either side which was acknowledged by Referee Harris. In the second half, however, Yale scored a touchdown, thereby securing 4 points to 0 in the game.

Before the second half could be Concluded, darkness and the increased inclemency of the weather necessitated the calling of "Time" before the regular limit time had been reached, avoidable delays having rendered the playing out of the full time before dark impossible,

The final result was that Yale claimed a victory by 4 to 0, and Princeton claimed a drawn match on the ground of full time not having been played out.

The question was left to the Inter-Collegiate Association to settle, and on November 27, at a meeting held in New York, the contest was officially declared a drawn match.

This leaves Princeton in possession of the championship which they won in 1885. Princeton afterward challenged Yale to play at the Polo grounds on December 4, but Yale stood by the decision of the Association meeting.

\*            \*            \*

## Recent Football at Harvard.

### A. Longdrop, Outing, October, 1891

The Rugby game of football was introduced here from England in 1876 by Harvard, and the first championship was won by Harvard. Since that time, or rather during the following decade, most

of the credit for improving and adapting the game here belongs to Yale. Harvard having ushered in the game, seemed to lose her initiatory grip, and Yale, being favored by a succession of men who showed special aptitude and interest in this new sport, made extraordinary progress and for many years held almost uninterrupted sway over the football field.

During these years, 1876-1886, football continued to occupy a larger place among American games, until it came to be what it now is, a most attractive feature of the school and college life in this country and a delight to all who have any understanding of it.

It was not until 1886 that Harvard Cumnock's influence upon his men was very great, both in and off the field, and he was ably assisted by the coaches of his choice, for it is a well-known fact that a share of the success of the team belongs respectively to Mr. George Adams, ex-Captain "Joe" Sears, Mr. Geo. A. Stewart and Dr. Conant among other helpers.

George Adams was the chief instigator in getting football at Harvard on its feet again, and W. A. Brooks was made captain of the team. This was the fall of 1886. Adams coached the team and was induced to play end rush toward the close of the season.

The final match of the season was something of an anti-climax, for it was hardly to be supposed that Princeton could recover sufficiently from the Manheim defeat to turn the tables upon Yale, and thus tie all three, Pennsylvania, Princeton and Yale, for the Intercollegiate championship. Princeton played a far stronger game than was expected, and Yale, with the exception of the first two minutes, in which, by beautiful execution, she made a touchdown, played with but little vigor and dash.

Before the largest audience of the year, variously estimated from 35,000 to 45,000 people, the Yale and Princeton teams met on Thanksgiving day. The weather was clear and cold, but just suited for the players. Yale came upon the field with everything in her favor, all the machinery of her game having been thoroughly tested and proved in two hard-fought matches.

There was no substitute on her team: the same eleven men that had faced and beaten first University of Pennsylvania, and then Harvard, lined up for the final contest of the year. It was an undefeated and a veteran team, and it looked it as the men came out upon the field. Princeton, on the other hand, had lost prestige by the defeat at the hands of Pennsylvania. Some of her men had by no means recovered from the tremendous efforts they made in that game to stem the tide of defeat which had set in so heavily against them, and finally they must have felt the effect of the lack of confidence expressed in them by many of their own friends and sympathizers. It looked as though Yale would win by a large score, but the result proved that there was not nearly the fancied difference between the playing of the two teams.

Yale opened with the ball, and the wonderful precision of her play during the first few minutes showed the possibilities of her game. Starting with a wedge, her team moved up ten yards. Then the ball was passed to C. D. Bliss, who carried it five yards ahead and twenty yards to the left. Instantly upon the lining up the ball went to L. Bliss, who, swinging over to the other side of the field, gave his interferers a chance to fall in, and behind that little bank of three men went straight down, and, crossing line after line, finally deposited the ball behind the Princeton goal. Such an opening must have made Princeton's task a doubly hard one, for the game was uphill from the very start. Yet from this point there was little to choose between the two teams. Princeton forced the play near enough to the Yale goal to try twice for a field kick, but neither attempt succeeded. A stopped punt of Homans, well followed down by Stillman, gave Yale a second touch-down and goal in the second half; but when Yale, toward the end of the game, had the ball almost on Princeton's five-yard line, the orange and black out-played the blue and forced the ball out of the danger point by a wonderful rally, and the game finally ended with the score 12 to 0 in Yale's favor, which was far closer than the score of the previous season.

\* \* \*

George Macor presents Joe Paterno's record vs teams ranked in the weekly AP Polls

*RECORD OF COACH JOE PATERNO AT PENN STATE  
WHEN HIS TEAMS PLAYED COLLEGES  
RANKED IN THE ASSOCIATED PRESS WEEKLY POLLS*

GAMES:	#1	TOP 5	TOP 10	TOP 25	NR	<i>COACH JOE PATERNO WON AP CHAMPIONSHIPS IN 1982 &amp; 1986</i>
WINS:	4	15	36	84	325	
LOSSES:	9	35	46	81	55	
TIES:	0	0	0	1	2	
PCT:	0.308	0.300	0.439	0.509	0.853	<i>CAREER: 409-136-3, 0.749</i>

NR = NOT RANKED

SEASON	GAME SITE	GAME DATE		RANK	W/L	SCORE	OPPONENT	OPP
		MONTH	DAY					RANK
1966	AWAY	SEP	24	NR	L	8-42	MICHIGAN STATE	1
1966	AWAY	OCT	15	NR	L	11-49	UCLA	4
1966	AWAY	NOV	12	NR	L	0-21	GEORGIA TECH	5
1967	HOME	OCT	7	NR	L	15-17	UCLA	3
1967	HOME	NOV	11	NR	W	13-0	NO CAROLINA ST	3
1968	ORANGE BOWL	JAN	1	3	W	15-14	KANSAS	6
1969	HOME	OCT	11	5	W	20-0	WEST VIRGINIA	17
1969	ORANGE BOWL	JAN	1	2	W	10-3	MISSOURI	6
1970	AWAY	SEP	26	4	L	13-41	COLORADO	18
1971	COTTON BOWL	JAN	1	10	W	30-6	TEXAS	12
1971	AWAY	DEC	5	5	L	11-31	TENNESSEE	12
1972	AWAY	SEP	16	6	L	21-28	TENNESSEE	7

1972	SUGAR BOWL	DEC	31	5	L	0-14	OKLAHOMA	2
1973	ORANGE BOWL	JAN	1	5	W	16-9	LOUISIANA STATE	13
1974	HOME	SEP	14	8	W	24-20	STANFORD	20
1974	HOME	NOV	2	10	W	24-17	MARYLAND	15
1974	THREE RIVERS STADIUM	NOV	28	10	W	31-10	PITTSBURGH	18
1974	COTTON BOWL	JAN	1	7	W	41-20	BAYLOR	12
1975	AWAY	SEP	20	7	L	9-17	OHIO STATE	3
1975	HOME	OCT	11	9	W	39-0	WEST VIRGINIA	10
1975	AWAY	NOV	1	9	W	15-13	MARYLAND	14
1975	THREE RIVERS STADIUM	NOV	22	10	W	7-6	PITTSBURGH	17
1975	SUGAR BOWL	DEC	31	8	L	6-13	ALABAMA	4
1976	HOME	SEP	18	7	L	7-12	OHIO STATE	2
1976	THREE RIVERS STADIUM	NOV	26	16	L	7-24	PITTSBURGH	1
1976	GATOR BOWL	DEC	27	20	L	9-20	NOTRE DAME	15

*The College  
Football  
Historian- 22-*

1977	HOME	SEP	17	10	W	31-14	HOUSTON	9
1977	AWAY	NOV	26	9	W	15-13	PITTSBURGH	10
1977	FIESTA BOWL	DEC	25	8	W	42-30	ARIZONA STATE	15
1978	SUGAR BOWL	SEP	2	1	L	7-14	ALABAMA	2
1978	AWAY	SEP	16	5	W	19-0	OHIO STATE	6
1978	HOME	NOV	4	2	W	27-3	MARYLAND	5
1978	HOME	NOV	24	1	W	17-10	PITTSBURGH	15
1979	HOME	DEC	1	19	L	14-29	PITTSBURGH	11
1979	LIBERTY BOWL	DEC	22	NR	W	9-6	TULANE	15
1980	HOME	SEP	27	11	L	7-21	NEBRASKA	3
1980	AWAY	OCT	4	17	W	29-21	MISSOURI	9
1980	HOME	NOV	28	5	L	9-14	PITTSBURGH	4
1980	FIESTA BOWL	DEC	26	10	W	31-19	OHIO STATE	11
1981	AWAY	SEP	26	3	W	30-24	NEBRASKA	15
1981	HOME	NOV	14	6	L	14-31	ALABAMA	5

1981	AWAY	NOV	28	11	W	48-14	PITTSBURGH	1
1981	FIESTA BOWL	JAN	1	7	W	26-10	SOUTHERN CAL	8
1982	HOME	SEP	25	8	W	27-24	NEBRASKA	2
1982	BIRMINGHAM	OCT	9	3	L	21-42	ALABAMA	4
1982	AWAY	OCT	23	9	W	24-0	WEST VIRGINIA	13
1982	AWAY	NOV	13	5	W	24-14	NOTRE DAME	13
1982	HOME	NOV	26	2	W	19-10	PITTSBURGH	5
1982	SUGAR BOWL	JAN	1	2	W	27-23	GEORGIA	1
1983	GIANTS STADIUM	AUG	29	4	L	6-44	NEBRASKA	1
1983	HOME	SEP	17	NR	L	34-42	IOWA	13
1983	HOME	OCT	8	NR	W	34-28	ALABAMA	3
1983	HOME	OCT	22	NR	W	41-23	WEST VIRGINIA	4
1983	FOXBORO	OCT	29	NR	L	17-27	BOSTON COLLEGE	19
1983	AWAY	NOV	19	NR	T	24-24	PITTSBURGH	17
1984	AWAY	SEP	15	12	W	20-17	IOWA	5
<i>The College Football Historian-23-</i>								
1984	GIANTS STADIUM	SEP	29	NR	L	3-28	TEXAS	2
1984	AWAY	OCT	27	19	L	14-17	WEST VIRGINIA	18
1984	HOME	NOV	3	NR	W	37-30	BOSTON COLLEGE	9
1985	AWAY	SEP	7	19	W	20-18	MARYLAND	7
1985	HOME	OCT	12	8	W	18-17	ALABAMA	10
1985	ORANGE BOWL	JAN	1	1	L	10-25	OKLAHOMA	3
1986	AWAY	OCT	25	6	W	23-3	ALABAMA	2
1986	FIESTA BOWL	JAN	2	2	W	14-10	MIAMI-FLA	1
1987	HOME	SEP	12	11	L	13-24	ALABAMA	19
1987	AWAY	OCT	17	10	L	21-48	SYRACUSE	13
1987	HOME	NOV	21	NR	W	21-20	NOTRE DAME	7
1987	CITRUS BOWL	JAN	1	20	L	10-35	CLEMSON	14
1988	AWAY	OCT	29	NR	L	30-51	WEST VIRGINIA	7
1988	AWAY	NOV	19	NR	L	3-21	NOTRE DAME	1
1989	HOME	OCT	28	14	L	16-17	ALABAMA	6

1989	HOME	NOV	4	16	W	19-9	WEST VIRGINIA	13
1989	HOME	NOV	18	17	L	23-34	NOTRE DAME	1
1989	AWAY	NOV	25	22	W	16-13	PITTSBURGH	19
1989	HOLIDAY BOWL	DEC	29	18	W	50-39	BRIGHAM YOUNG	19
1990	HOME	SEP	8	21	L	13-17	TEXAS	23
1990	AWAY	SEP	15	NR	L	14-19	SOUTHERN CAL	6
1990	AWAY	OCT	27	NR	W	9-0	ALABAMA	4
1990	AWAY	NOV	17	18	W	24-21	NOTRE DAME	1
1990	BLOCKBUSTER BOWL	DEC	28	7	L	17-24	FLORIDA STATE	6
1991	GIANTS STADIUM	AUG	28	7	W	34-22	GEORGIA TECH	8
1991	AWAY	OCT	12	9	L	20-26	MIAMI-FLA	2
1991	HOME	NOV	16	8	W	35-13	NOTRE DAME	12
1991	FIESTA BOWL	JAN	1	6	W	42-17	TENNESSEE	10
1992	HOME	OCT	10	7	L	14-17	MIAMI-FLA	2
<i>The College Football Historian-24-</i>								
1992	HOME	OCT	17	9	L	32-35	BOSTON COLLEGE	20
1992	AWAY	NOV	14	22	L	16-17	NOTRE DAME	8
1992	BLOCKBUSTER BOWL	JAN	1	21	L	3-24	STANFORD	13
1993	HOME	OCT	16	7	L	13-21	MICHIGAN	17
1993	AWAY	OCT	30	12	L	6-24	OHIO STATE	3
1993	HOME	NOV	6	19	W	38-31	INDIANA	17
1993	AWAY	NOV	27	14	W	38-37	MICHIGAN STATE	25
1993	CITRUS BOWL	JAN	1	13	W	31-13	TENNESSEE	6
1994	HOME	SEP	10	8	W	38-14	SOUTHERN CAL	24
1994	HOME	OCT	15	3	W	31-24	MICHIGAN	5
1994	HOME	OCT	29	1	W	63-14	OHIO STATE	21
1994	ROSE BOWL	JAN	2	2	W	38-20	OREGON	12

1995	HOME	OCT	7	12	L	25-28	OHIO STATE	5
1995	AWAY	OCT	21	19	W	41-27	IOWA	18
1995	AWAY	NOV	4	12	L	10-21	NORTHWESTERN	6
1995	AWAY	NOV	18	19	W	27-18	MICHIGAN	12
1995	OUTBACK BOWL	JAN	1	15	W	43-14	AUBURN	16
1996	GIANTS STADIUM	AUG	25	11	W	21-7	SOUTHERN CAL	7
1996	AWAY	OCT	5	4	L	7-38	OHIO STATE	3
1996	HOME	NOV	2	15	W	34-9	NORTHWESTERN	11
1996	HOME	NOV	16	11	W	29-17	MICHIGAN	16
1996	FIESTA BOWL	JAN	1	7	W	38-15	TEXAS	20
1997	HOME	OCT	11	2	W	31-27	OHIO STATE	7
1997	HOME	NOV	8	2	L	8-34	MICHIGAN	4
1997	AWAY	NOV	15	6	W	42-17	PURDUE	19
1997	HOME	NOV	22	6	W	35-10	WISCONSIN	24
1997	CITRUS BOWL	JAN	1	11	L	6-21	FLORIDA STATE	6
<i>The College Football Historian-25-</i>								
1998	HOME	SEP	5	13	W	34-6	SO MISSISSIPPI	21
1998	AWAY	OCT	3	7	L	9-28	OHIO STATE	1
1998	AWAY	NOV	7	9	L	0-27	MICHIGAN	22
1998	AWAY	NOV	21	16	L	3-24	WISCONSIN	13
1999	HOME	AUG	28	3	W	41-7	ARIZONA STATE	4
1999	AWAY	SEP	18	3	W	27-23	MIAMI-FLA	8
1999	HOME	OCT	16	2	W	23-10	OHIO STATE	18
1999	AWAY	OCT	23	2	W	31-25	PURDUE	16
1999	HOME	NOV	13	6	L	27-31	MICHIGAN	16
1999	AWAY	NOV	20	13	L	28-35	MICHIGAN STATE	16
1999	ALAMO BOWL	DEC	28	13	W	24-0	TEXAS A&M	18
2000	GIANTS STADIUM	AUG	27	22	L	5-29	SOUTHERN CAL	15
2000	AWAY	SEP	23	NR	L	6-45	OHIO STATE	12
2000	HOME	SEP	30	NR	W	22-20	PURDUE	22

2000	AWAY	NOV	11	NR	L	11-33	MICHIGAN	20
2001	HOME	SEP	1	NR	L	7-33	MIAMI-FLA	2
2001	HOME	OCT	6	NR	L	0-20	MICHIGAN	14
2001	AWAY	OCT	20	NR	W	38-35	NORTHWESTERN	22
2001	AWAY	NOV	10	NR	L	28-33	ILLINOIS	15
2002	HOME	SEP	14	NR	W	49-7	NEBRASKA	8
2002	AWAY	OCT	5	20	W	34-31	WISCONSIN	19
2002	AWAY	OCT	12	15	L(OT)	24-27	MICHIGAN	13
2002	AWAY	OCT	26	18	L	7-13	OHIO STATE	4
2002	CITRUS BOWL	JAN	1	10	L	9-13	AUBURN	19
2003	AWAY	SEP	13	NR	L	10-18	NEBRASKA	18
2003	AWAY	OCT	11	NR	L	14-28	PURDUE	18
2003	AWAY	OCT	25	NR	L	14-26	IOWA	16
2003	HOME	NOV	1	NR	L	20-21	OHIO STATE	8
2004	AWAY	SEP	25	NR	L	3-16	WISCONSIN	20
<i>The College</i>								
<i>Football</i>								
<i>Historian-26-</i>								
2004	AWAY	OCT	2	NR	L	7-16	MINNESOTA	18
2004	HOME	OCT	9	NR	L	13-20	PURDUE	9
2004	HOME	OCT	23	NR	L	4-6	IOWA	25
2005	HOME	OCT	1	NR	W	44-14	MINNESOTA	18
2005	HOME	OCT	8	16	W	17-10	OHIO STATE	6
2005	HOME	NOV	5	10	W	35-14	WISCONSIN	14
2005	ORANGE BOWL	JAN	3	3	W(3OT)	26-23	FLORIDA STATE	22
2006	AWAY	SEP	9	19	L	17-41	NOTRE DAME	4
2006	AWAY	SEP	23	24	L	6-28	OHIO STATE	1
2006	HOME	OCT	14	NR	L	10-17	MICHIGAN	4
2006	AWAY	NOV	4	NR	L	3-13	WISCONSIN	17
2006	OUTBACK BOWL	JAN	1	NR	W	20-10	TENNESSEE	17
2007	HOME	OCT	13	NR	W	38-7	WISCONSIN	19
2007	HOME	OCT	27	24	L	17-37	OHIO STATE	1
2008	AWAY	SEP	27	12	W	38-24	ILLINOIS	22
2008	AWAY	OCT	25	3	W	13-6	OHIO STATE	10
2008	HOME	NOV	22	7	W	49-18	MICHIGAN STATE	17
	ROSE BOWL	JAN	1	6	L	24-38	SOUTHERN CAL	5

*The College  
Football  
Historian-27-*

<b>2008</b>								
<b>2009</b>	<b>HOME</b>	<b>NOV</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>L</b>	<b>7-24</b>	<b>OHIO STATE</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>2009</b>	<b>CITRUS BOWL</b>	<b>JAN</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>W</b>	<b>19-17</b>	<b>LOUISIANA STATE</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>2010</b>	<b>AWAY</b>	<b>SEP</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>L</b>	<b>3-24</b>	<b>ALABAMA</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>2010</b>	<b>AWAY</b>	<b>OCT</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>L</b>	<b>3-24</b>	<b>IOWA</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>2010</b>	<b>AWAY</b>	<b>NOV</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>NR</b>	<b>L</b>	<b>14-38</b>	<b>OHIO STATE</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>2010</b>	<b>HOME</b>	<b>NOV</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>NR</b>	<b>L</b>	<b>22-28</b>	<b>MICHIGAN STATE</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>2011</b>	<b>HOME</b>	<b>SEP</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>L</b>	<b>11-27</b>	<b>ALABAMA</b>	<b>3</b>

\* \* \*

<b>2011</b>	<b>Teams Allowing 500+ Points</b>
595	Lincoln Mo.
568	Tiffin
546	Concordia Mich.
525	Kansas
500	New Mexico