

Ned Irish's professionally promoted tournament. The N.C.A.A. always contended that the colleges should promote their own tournaments, and for Ned Irish, a professional promoter, to do that was revolting to their ideals. The travesty of the situation is now that the N.C.A.A. is going hand in glove with Mr. Irish, not only accepting him but putting on their own tournament in his own bailiwick.

I have no differences with Mr. Irish personally, except that he is a professional promoter and he is not interested in stamping out gambling, only just keeping the criticism away from his tournament so far as possible. Mr. Irish knows that if public opinion would get strong enough to prevent the colleges from entering his tournament, then he would be interested as a business man in stamping it out. But Mr. Irish's Madison Square Garden is nothing but a gambling den where over sixty per cent of the people attend for that purpose. The gamblers buy up blocks of seats and Mr. Irish sells his tickets in a season ticket block. Mr. Average Spectator never gets those seats because Mr. Average Spectator cannot put out over a hundred dollars for a season ticket for all the games. Therefore, the astute Mr. Irish sells them in season ticket blocks, and the forty per cent of basketball fans who go for the sport and not for the gambling, get the poorer seats in the place.

The Worlds' Championship (Chicago) that you mention is not a worlds' championship, it is only a national championship. We Americans are prone to magnify and elaborate. How could it be a worlds' championship with nobody competing, only people from this nation? But why should I tell you these things? You know them better than I. You are in Chicago where one of the big boys determines the odds on all betting events. The gamblers are the ones that the newspaper boys quote as to the odds on this or that team all over the nation, regardless of any sport.

Unless any one of these organizations puts someone in charge to organize a sport in a way that there is some power to fight gambling, then these sports will go the way of horseracing where it is admittedly known that horseracing could not exist without the gambling. But you will always have enough gamblers following these tournaments to make them a success, and only the better people, so-called, suffer. All athletic directors and coaches know this well enough, but you can get few of them to say so. The Pollyanna attitude of these officers in high places in these organizations is only lip service.

In your question #2, on the systems of officiating, I would say that the present system is better because the officials follow the ball more closely, and if there is good teamwork between two highly efficient officials then they are generally pretty much on top of the plays and they can see the game better moving in and along with the plays than the sideline or endline officials can see in a stationery position.

The crow's nest officiating would be perhaps helpful in using the present system of officiating with the man in the crow's nest being the arbiter should either of the two present officials conflict on a decision that would be made on the same play. Even then I am not sure that it would provide much aid. The difficulty, of course, is in getting good officials. That is a very tough job and the gamblers have made officiating very, very