

BASEBALL,
Office of the Commissioner,
333 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago
February 24, 1942

In re PLAYER ANTHONY RAVICH

In 1939, this player was signed by New York American League Club scout to an agreement---

"to sign contract with the Norfolk Club at the close of my college career, in consideration of the following payments:

1st payment	June 1, 1939	\$250.00
2nd "	Sept. 15, 1939	250.00
3rd "	Aug. 15, 1940	750.00"

The agreement bears no date, but the context indicates it was made prior to June 1, 1939.

This agreement was withheld from filing and promulgation, in violation of the rules requirement that it be filed within 20 days of date made.

When the player was ready to report at the close of his college career, Norfolk decided it could not use him, and he was signed to contract with Amsterdam, another New York subsidiary, without the filing of any agreement by Norfolk transferring his contract to Amsterdam-- which was, of course, another rules violation.

Amsterdam decided his services were not worth the \$750 bonus contracted to be paid August 15, 1940, and released him, whereupon the player signed a new Amsterdam contract with \$250 immediate payment and "an additional bonus of \$500 if retained after June 1, 1941." This should not have been approved (as the rules prohibit reduction of first-year contract obligations to a player), but through an error in the National Association office it got by.

When the \$500 payment "if retained after June 1, 1941" came up, the player, as he states, "was once again approached to take part of the \$500 and let the remainder go to a later date; and I demanded the full bonus or my release." Thereupon he was released.

Notice hereby is given all clubs that such methods cannot be approved. A first-year player must be paid all moneys agreed to be paid him under the original contract, or he must be unconditionally released. If released, he cannot be re-signed by the releasing club (or by any other club directly or indirectly affiliated with it) except upon complete and exact fulfillment of the terms of the original contract. No exceptions can be made in the absence of contingencies for which the club has had no responsibility and which result in failure of the club to secure the contemplated trial of the player's services, in which case an extension of the trial date (equivalent to the lost period) may be approved.

As to the rules violation by withholding promulgation of the 1939 agreement, it is set forth by George Weiss, on behalf of the New York organization, that this was "solely because of the effect it (filing) would have on the player's college athletic career." (Another effect is that such non-promulgation enables the club to control, secretly, the services of all players held under such "confidential" arrangements, resulting in inability to check the number of players controlled by the club and often enabling the club to violate the player limits.)

It is further represented by Mr. Weiss that such secrecy is essential to enable clubs to give "the benefits of college assistance to players," and that these benefits to players "far outweigh the only criticism---namely, that such a player is under the impression he is obligated to the club assisting him." As noted in the foregoing paragraph, there is also the "criticism" that player control rules and limitations are evaded--- a factor which would be eliminated if the rules were changed (as occasionally has been suggested by clubs seeking to legitimize such agreements) to authorize "confidential" filing, with the Commissioner or National Association president withholding promulgation. That, of course, is inconceivable, as it would include them and the entire baseball