

Through the years a coach will run on to such situations after having a pretty rough game pop up all at once. And I never would have said anything to Hank had he not immediately after the contest come over and said, "I don't like that, I'll tell you that." And then a little resentment that I had kept way back flared up and I said, "That goes double for me, too, Hank." And he said, "What?" And I repeated my statement, saying, "I certainly don't like it."

We perhaps were talking about two different things, but had not the Chancellor taken his position and had not the spectators (who, by the way, do not influence my action) made such a united protest, then perhaps it would have been an incident lightly passed over. But members of the Athletic Board, many of them, have spoken to me since, saying that they thought it was a mistake to play games like that.

When I was in Stillwater I was very frank and open when I spoke to the Quarterback Club with Hank and our other friends seated close by. I told them there at Stillwater that we did not like games of that kind and I only wished they might have a couple of them down there to see how really unsatisfying it was. But every game up until this last one at Stillwater, has not been a rough affair. However, the game of February 17th was rough and resulted in some flare-ups.

I like Hank Iba. I think he is a fine coach and he is a good fellow, and I am sure that if he and I were to play again, and I hope we do some day soon, that there will be no repetition of any of this rough stuff. I think he got a little overanxious in talking to his boys in his desire to lick us, and they being a new bunch went further than he had expected them to go.

I have gone to quite some length to explain to you that I had no great pique over the Lawrence game, and it certainly would not have had any bearing when it came to making an ultimate selection.

Thank you for your congratulations, but as I wrote George Edwards the other day, I would not have been interested in playing in Kansas City. I have some rather definite ideas regarding the N.C.A.A. and their money-grabbing. There is no more reason to expect the N.C.A.A. to take 55% of the total income than it is to expect the N.C.A.A. or the Rose Bowl promoters to take all the money there and divide it 18 different ways after the money-grabbers take 55%. Nor is there any reason to expect the National Commission to take all the money and let the players have a mere dribble. There is no entertainment feature for the boys. They are limited to a mere \$5.00 a day and taxicab fare is not even paid for them. There is no show entertainment or anything else, so if anybody can get a kick out of playing for the big-wigs who teach amateurism in its strictest sense and practice professional money-grabbing, then I am just all wrong.

I trust some time that I may have the pleasure of sitting down and talking with you. My conception is that the colleges who make this tournament are entitled to the major returns and that the N.C.A.A. should have a maximum of 20% of the net. In all of the other N.C.A.A. promotions they get but 10% of the income from all the other sports, individually and collectively. But basketball, which they sold once down the river