

Discrimination?

4-22

It is interesting to note that Bucknell is one of a group of American colleges and Universities that do not have a single subsidized Negro athlete on their campuses. This absence of Negro athletes is somewhat unusual in the face of certain facts. For example: of the top ten collegiate basketball players in the country this past winter, four were Negro, of the top twenty-two collegiate football players this past fall, five were Negro, every team to play in the Rose Bowl in the past five years has had at least four Negro members; the list is infinite.

There can be no denial of the fact that the Negro athlete has arrived on the American sports scene. Mr. A. E. Humphreys, Director of Athletics at Bucknell, has said that there is particular policy followed by the athletic department in the awarding of scholarships. We do not wish to imply the existence of a policy, but only to point out the complete absence of subsidized Negro athletes at Bucknell.

It is not that the school should go out of its way to have two or three Negro boys playing ball here so as to present an representative cross-section from consideration for an athletic scholarship because of his color. It does seem somewhat unusual that in the ast six years Bucknell has not had a single subsidized Negro athlete.

If the athletic department is genuinely sincere about wanting to do the most possible good, both for deserving athletes and Bucknell's teams, they might venture to Philadelphia where four of the five boys on the City Championship Basketball team are Negro. This same emergency of the Negro athlete is noticeable all over America. We do not wish to say that Bucknell is out of step with current trends in this area, but rather she may have been walking the wrong path.