

CHAIRMAN BOSTER'S VIEW ON GRAVE SUBJECTS—THE BIG CHIEF ON UMPIRES AND PLAYERS NOT QUITE IN ACCORD WITH EFFECTUAL SYSTEMS IN VOGUE OF DISCIPLINING UNRULY PLAYERS.

By Dave Wyatt.

The following extract is from an interview with the Chairman of the Board of Directors of the western circuit of the proposed Negro National League.

As this—the coming season—will, perhaps, mark an epoch in the government of Colored baseball, the public, no doubt, will be greatly interested in knowing what system will prevail in the handling of that all important subject—umpire controversy.

I am a firm believer in preserving the utmost good order on the ball field. I am a strict disciplinarian, but far from a martinet. The only person who can preserve order on a ball field is the umpire, and in matters of discretion and judgment, where he is not specifically guided by rule, he should be supreme. I do not wish to be understood as meaning that an umpire should be a law unto himself; that his manner should be dictatorial, his attitude arrogant and his entire demeanor evince a self-satisfied air that would brook no argument or intercession. Right the contrary. I think an umpire should be pacific but firm, positive but polite, quick but unshowy, strict but reasonable. I have seen arguments on the field where I considered the umpire at fault. "A mild answer turneth away wrath." In my judgment, many a scene on the diamond could be prevented by a little

DISCRETION AND DELIBERATION

on the part of the umpire, who frequently uses his authority in an arbitrary manner. One of my principal aims will be to instill into the umpires a spirit of peace and discretion. You ask me whether I believe in at once disciplining the player, immediately on receipt of umpire's statement of the facts in the case. I could answer that question with one word, but I am going to adduce some reason to show why I am opposed to the general practice employed in meting out punishment to players for offenses committed on the ball field. In the first place, I was a ball player myself and naturally believe in them as a class. As a rule they are reasonable, honorable, clean-living class of men, and this thought should be considered in all dealings with them. In the second place, one of the

CARDINAL PRINCIPLES OF JUSTICE

is that every man should have an opportunity to be heard, to present his side of the case. If the player is guilty of the charges submitted by the umpire and has no reasonable defense, the ends of justice and the morale of discipline can be served just as well by suspending the player some days after the violation has occurred, and all the evidence received and investigated, as by immediate suspension following the report of the umpire. Then there is another view of the question, namely, that the club owner is really the one who suffers most by a player's suspension. If we fine the player, true he may loose a small sum as a result of his infraction of the rules, and his salary goes on while he is out of the game. But his absence weakens the team and in the long run the club is the real sufferer. Therefore, if the ef-

fect of discipline can be preserved and at the same time the interest of the owner conserved, there is no reason why such cases should not be considered in the most lenient attitude possible, and by all means obtain the facts in the case from both sides before the player is punished by suspension.

Indianapolis Freeman, Indianapolis, IN

Saturday, March 27, 1920, Page 7, Columns 4 and 5