

B  
May 11, 1943.

Mr. Hal Middlesworth,  
Sports Editor,  
The Daily Oklahoman,  
Oklahoma City, Okla.

Dear Hal:

I am answering your good letter of April 22nd regarding the N.C.A.A.'s operation. Yes, the organization does have and has had for years sufficient income to keep it functioning without any financial difficulties. The organization charges every college in the United States that is a member of the N.C.A.A. outfit \$25.00 per year. This more than pays their expenses because they have always had a sizeable sum in the treasury.

There are no salaries paid in the N.C.A.A., therefore you can see that there is no great need for a large income. You state that if they did not have a source of income "it seems the setup is entitled to enough money to keep it alive as a governing body." Don't you agree with me that it would be better to take it from all sports than one sport? Since football produces the greatest revenue, would not a small per capita tax be better even if they did not have the \$25.00 dues per year?

I agree with you that any parent body has the right to exist by calling on its subsidiaries. I believe the parallel that you draw is hardly a likely one because the athletic association at a college has charge of all funds, and of course being faculty controlled the athletic association has the right to spend this money for the upkeep of other sports.

I would not be selfish enough to want to feel that basketball shouldn't pay its way. But when the N.C.A.A. sold basketball down the river to the A.A.U. for the purpose of nominating the coaches in the Olympics in track, crew, wrestling and swimming, and then when they levied on all the income from these tournaments in the N.C.A.A. national, it would be just as logical to levy on a certain amount of income from the Rose Bowl and other bowl games.

Our committee of Bunn, Olsen and I settled on 20% of the income from the N.C.A.A. tournament going to the organization and 80% to the competing teams. I am sure that you have enough confidence in us that we would not be foolish enough to want the N.C.A.A. to get nothing. However, in track and all other tournaments conducted by the N.C.A.A. it was never more than 10% taken from these meets or tournaments for the governing body. Why would they now take 55% of one sport and only 10% of all other sports?