



Off the Sports Cuff

by Jim Reed

HAROLD Keith, director of sports publicity at Oklahoma University, wrote a resume of the Gerald Tucker case in the current issue of the Sooner alumni magazine. In order to give our readers the case as Oklahoma saw it, we are reprinting parts of Keith's article:

Manhattan, Kan.
Jan. 2, 1942.

BIG SIX ELIGIBILITY COMMITTEE UNANIMOUSLY RULES GERALD TUCKER INELIGIBLE FOR ATHLETIC PARTICIPATION AT OKLAHOMA. RULE MADE ON ARTICLE ELEVEN. RULING REQUESTED BY A MEMBER INSTITUTION. DR. H. H. KING.

"The above telegram, sent to Prof. Walter Kraft, Oklahoma's faculty representative, bluntly notified Sooner athletic authorities that Gerald Tucker was ineligible for athletics at Oklahoma for life because Oklahoma had violated the migrant rule, which is rule eleven in the Big Six Conference code.

"The conference eligibility committee represented to have made the ruling is composed of Mr. King, the Kansas State faculty representative, W. W. Davis of Kansas, and H. B. Bergman of Iowa State.

"Mr. Kraft quickly put in long distance telephone calls to both Mr. King and Mr. Davis and discovered several irregularities concerning the decisions which he explained to the Oklahoma Athletic Council at a special meeting Sunday afternoon, January 4. Among them were:

(1) Oklahoma had not been given a hearing by the eligibility committee, nor an opportunity to present its side of the argument on the migrant rule question. The wisdom of such a hearing was evident at a later meeting before the entire conference when Oklahoma presented new evidence that speedily killed the migrant rule charge.

(2) Two of the three members of the conference eligibility committee that pronounced Tucker ineligible were from what turned out to be complaining schools and this raised a serious question of propriety.

(3) Mr. King misrepresented the vote of one of the committee members, Mr. Davis of Kansas, who told Mr. Kraft that he had never voted to disqualify Tucker on the basis of the migrant rule, but because of the residence rule. Mr. Davis repeated this at the Kansas City meeting, asserting that "Mr. King apparently misunderstood me over long distance telephone." Yet Mr. King's original telegram had stated that the three-man eligibility committee had unanimously disbarred Tucker because of the migrant rule. Mr. Davis is one of the three members of the committee, therefore the migrant rule and life disbarment decision wasn't unanimous and even appears to have been confused during the hasty long distance telephone poll Mr. King made to ascertain it.

(4) Mr. Davis's disavowal of having voted on the question of the migrant rule raises the question of what "member institution" requested the ruling on the migrant statute, as Mr. King's telegram claimed. It wasn't Kansas and it apparently wasn't Iowa State, and Nebraska and Missouri weren't polled. Did Mr. King, the chairman of the eligibility committee, take it upon himself to raise the question?

(5) No school made any objection to Tucker's eligibility until after the player had participated in five nonconference games in December, averaging 15.4 points per game. This appeared, to Oklahoma, a deliberate attempt to get Tucker just before the Big Six Conference season began early in January. Why wasn't the player protested before Oklahoma's first game with Southern Methodist at Norman, December 13?

IN FACE of all this improper procedure Oklahoma protested the decision vehemently and demanded a hearing before the entire conference membership, declaring she would play Tucker in the opening game against Kansas unless given a chance to defend herself. Mr. King granted the hearing which was scheduled for Kansas City on Monday, January 5, the day before the Oklahoma-Kansas basketball game at Lawrence.

MEANWHILE, Big Six territory newspapers aired the unusual case thoroughly. Oklahoma drew both support and ex-cori-ation from the press.

AT THE Kansas City meeting, Mr. Kraft presented an important piece of evidence that quickly killed the migrant athlete charges against Tucker. That portion of the migrant rule that Oklahoma was held to have violated reads: "It shall be the duty of the authorities of such institution (Oklahoma) to ascertain thru correspondence the validity of the reason or reasons for such transfer." In disbar-ring Tucker for life, the conference eligibility committee (with the exception of Mr. Davis of Kansas whose vote was misrepresented) had held Oklahoma did not comply with this section of the rule.

BUT Mr. Kraft showed at Kansas City the copy of a letter he had written to Mr. King on November 19, 1940, a few days after Tucker enrolled at Oklahoma, officially appraising Mr. King for information regarding any irregularity in the transfer, in accordance with the conference rule. Before he wrote the letter, Mr. Kraft had talked to Tucker and learned the player had left Kansas State simply because he didn't like the school.

MR. Kraft also presented at Kansas City a reply from Mr. King in which the latter pleaded for time and suggested the Oklahoma athletic director, who was then Tom Stidham, correspond with the Kansas State director concerning the migrant ruling. Meanwhile Oklahoma changed directors and in the resulting confusion, this was never done. Here lay Oklahoma's only vulnerability in the migrant charge, and it was a technical one. Someone in authority at Norman should have followed the matter to its full conclusion.

HOWEVER, the fact that Mr. Kraft had promptly asked for the information on the transfer showed Oklahoma was acting in good faith and altho the rule puts the burden of ascertaining this information upon Oklahoma, Oklahoma held it sent the original letter promptly and that had Mr. King co-operated as promptly, instead of delaying the matter, there would never have been any controversy over the migrant rule.

ONCE Mr. Kraft's correspondence to Mr. King was presented, the Big Six faculty representatives quickly and righteously dropped all charges connected with the migrant rule, including the life disbarment.

HOWEVER, Mr. Davis, the Kansas faculty man, introduced the further question at Kansas City of whether Tucker was eligible under the residence rule. This had been the basis of Mr. Davis's objection all thru the case, and Oklahoma gives him full credit for sincerity, Mr. Davis having called it to Mr. Kraft's attention by letter during the Christmas holidays while the Oklahoma team was on a long road trip into the East and North. However, it would have been far more fitting if the Kansas faculty man had written the letter in November, before Tucker had played in any games.

OKLAHOMA pointed out that Tucker had attended school thirteen months in residence at Oklahoma before playing his first basketball game, that he had transferred, after seven weeks of the first semester of 1940 at Kansas State into precisely the same courses at Oklahoma, finishing the last eleven weeks of the semester at Norman and taking his finals and obtaining his grades from Oklahoma.

OKLAHOMA protested that this portion of the residence rule, written in 1928 when the Big Six was formed, was designed solely to prevent tramp football players from enrolling at a Big Six school, playing thru the football season, withdrawing from the university at the football season's close and enrolling the following autumn and playing another season without penalty, which had been a popular custom in the old days.

Altho Oklahoma accepted this decision, it wasn't generally popular over the state nor on the campus, where it was the general opinion that the conference had resorted to extreme interpretation of a phrase of the residence rule written for an entirely different purpose to save the face of its eligibility committee which had obviously erred on the migrant clause.

Harold Keith's letter to:--

✓ Chancellor Malott

Gov. Ratner

✓ Bob Busby

Parke Carroll

Dan Partnes

Chuck Elliott

Bruce Drake

Louis Menze

Maurice Breidenthal

Charles Chamberlain

Dr. Peete

Dr. Esterly

Earl Zalkentien

Geo. Edwards

Russell Peters

Correspondence re Oklahoma situation --

Harold Keith
George Powers
Julian Ralston
Dean Puckett
Clingenpeel
(Adams)

Mike Ahearn
In *H.H. King*

Et al.

... ..
... ..
... ..
... ..
... ..
... ..

... ..
... ..
... ..
... ..

... ..
... ..

NO ON SECRET PAY

Judge Landis Rules Against Club Pay to Promising College Athletes

Chicago, Mar. 7. (AP)—Secret baseball contracts—the kind in which a college baseball player usually gets financial assistance for promising to join the paying club after graduation, are legally worthless, says Commissioner K. M. Landis.

Landis made the ruling in a case involving Anthony Ravich and the New York Yankees of the American league.

In a statement accompanying the rule, Landis said all club officials know such pacts have no standing in court but he wondered if the college players knew it.

"However, there is and can be no question whatsoever, that these legally worthless documents do serve a purpose—First, of deluding many of the players signing them into an erroneous belief that they are obligated and second, of establishing a moral obligation to go thru with the agreement," Landis' statement read.

The commissioner quoted George Weiss, vice president of the New York club and general manager of its farm system, as saying that the agreement with Ravich was not certified to the commissioner's office within 20 days as prescribed by baseball law because of the "effect it would have on his college athletic career."

Players, publicly receiving such financial aid either directly or by their parents, customarily are declared ineligible for further college competition as was Lou Boudreau, now manager of the Cleveland Indians by the University of Illinois in 1938.

Landis pointed out that sub-rosa pacts made it impossible for his office to check the number of players controlled by the clubs and often enabled those clubs to violate the player limit.

The commissioner said there had been suggestions that such secret documents as the scout's agreement to pay Ravich \$1,000 for his promise to sign a Yankee farm contract upon graduation be filed confidentially with his office to enable the student to continue his collegiate career.

"That, of course, is inconceivable," Landis added, "As it would include the entire baseball organization in the false pretense, in which the player and the club have engaged, that the player is honestly complying with college athletic eligibility rules, which in fact are being deliberately violated.

"The obvious impropriety of that situation is in no wise diminished by the fact that college athletic officials often are fully cognizant of that violation and are participants in them."

The commissioner declared that in the future clubs and affiliates which signed undergraduates to secret contracts would be denied the chance to re-sign them after the players had been declared free agents and that in addition the clubs and officers involved would be fined.

March 6, 1942.

Chancellor Deane W. Malott,
University of Kansas.

Dear Chancellor Malott:

You doubtless saw that during the game at Norman I walked to the officials' bench twice during the first half. This was to kindly ask Mr. Harold Keith, the sports publicity director, who seems to be the best sportsman at the University of Oklahoma, to remove the photographer from directly in front of our bench. This photographer constantly shot flashlight bulbs into our faces. He was not photographing the players on the court, but rather trying to catch us in some pose that he had his own ideas about.

This was in direct violation of the coaches' agreement and preferring not to go to Coach Drake to ask anything of this nature I went to the publicity man. Being unsuccessful in my first two attempts during the first half, I took time out of the few minutes in between halves in my dressing room which should have been given to the boys, and wrote a letter to Harold Keith telling him that this was in direct violation of the coaches' agreement. I told him that the photographer was insolent and discourteous, and asked in the name of sportshmanship and fairness that he be removed from directly in front of our bench. This was done.

Coach Bruce Drake knew the rules both in regard to the practice ball and the photographers, because it was the coaches of our conference who made the rules. Bruce Drake was cognizant of both of these infractions of the rule.

I thought perhaps you would wonder why I was going to the desk, perhaps to protest a decision. When these lights were flashed on in the players' eyes it makes them blind for a few minutes and any player going in to substitute is rendered less efficient than if courteous rules were followed.

Very sincerely yours,

Director of Physical Education and Recreation,
Varsity Basketball and Baseball Coach.

A *

March 6, 1942.

Mr. Harold Keith,
Sports Publicity Director,
Athletic Department,
University of Oklahoma,
Norman, Oklahoma.

Dear Harold:

To me you have long been known as the fairest sportsman at the University of Oklahoma. Therefore, I write you to endeavor to correct some abuses that annually haunt us when we play at your institution. I would like to refer you to the minutes of the Big Six basketball coaches association as of December 9, 1941. The minutes show that Coach Bruce Drake was present at this meeting. In fact, he was the author of the motion that reads - "it was also agreed that two good basketballs of the type used by the home team should be available for the visiting team".

This suggestion was necessary because each of the different schools use a different brand of basketball -- some are molded and some are stitched. Therefore, Bruce suggested that two good balls be available for the visiting team.

When Oklahoma played at Lawrence the balls were placed near the Oklahoma bench and Coach Drake asked for them so that his team might practice with them. They were immediately handed to Coach Drake and they made use of them. Since we use a Spalding laceless stitched ball and since Oklahoma uses a Rawlings lastbilt molded ball, when we played at Norman and the practice balls were not forthcoming I made a request for them. A young man who apparently was one of the student managers brought me an old, scarred, unwashed, dirty ball. I told him that I wanted two good balls and that Bruce Drake had requested them at our place and had received them, and we wanted the same courtesy. Coach Drake then showed up and said they did not have any on hand and he was sorry. I told him that he had received the courtesy at Lawrence and naturally we expected the same courtesy at Norman. He said he was very sorry. And we were forced, of course, to do without the practice balls.

Now, the second infraction which was even more severe than the first -- we have a rule in the basketball coaches association that no photographer with flashlights shall operate on the court except at the end near the corner, and no flashlight pictures shall be taken at any time if they interfere with the play of the teams.

To refresh your memory, I believe there were eight flashlight photographers on the court that night. Two at either end on either side of the basket and two at each sideline and near the corner. One of these photographer who was a very insolent individual stationed himself directly in front of me, and instead of taking pictures of the players, stationed himself with an assistant of his - perhaps a bodyguard - directly in front of our view of the game. He snapped pictures at every move that I made that he thought apparently might help his picture business. I first remonstrated with him telling him that this was against the rule of the coaches association and asked him to move.

You will agree that these flashlights snapped in the faces of substitutes certainly render them less efficient when they go into the game because it interferes with their vision. After much annoyance to our peace of mind and to our coaching efficiency, I finally left my bench and walked over to your table at the scorers' bench and asked you kindly to remove that photographer who interfered with our vision and our peace of mind. This photographer moved perhaps four feet to our left, but still in front of our players. We were seated four feet off the sideline and this photographer worked along that margin of space which definitely obstructed our players and our view of the game as it moved up and down the court. Remember, there was a bodyguard with him which added to the obstruction of view and annoyance to our players.

Had this photographer desired a picture of me drinking water, or in any other pose that he desired, I would gladly have given it to him without him becoming obnoxious and endeavoring to do the thing he should not have done. When we played at Nebraska this past year the Omaha-Herald photographer at Lincoln desired a picture of me drinking water from a gallon jug. The Quarterback Club at Lincoln had given me the gallon jug of water at the noon luncheon, and in order to get a story out of it he wanted that picture. I gladly accommodated him by posing for the picture so that he could use it in his paper. I do not believe there is any coach but what would cooperate with newspaper men and photographers in giving them what they wanted unless they wanted some derisive thing, and in my mind this is what the chap was after when he harassed us as he did in this Oklahoma game on February 27.

It certainly seems to me, Harold, when everything is against the visiting team that these well-known rules -- certainly well-known to Bruce Drake because he helped make them -- should not be used against the visitors. Every courtesy that is possible is shown to the visitors here at Kansas. Of course, a coach can say, "Well, I am sorry, I didn't pay any attention to it", but that doesn't excuse the situation. The responsibility is upon this home coach, and he can laugh it off or shake it off lightly, but that still doesn't excuse the situation.

I am not trying to alibi, but my purpose in writing you this letter is to get some information in proper hands so that the visitors will be insured and assured of courteous treatment in the future in such situations as this. Doubtless you would not know of the coaches' agreement regarding photographers, but Coach Drake does, and of course you knew nothing about the balls. But I would like for you to get the copy from Coach Drake's desk and read it.

Now, there is another item here that comes directly home. On the second page of the minutes there is an item under "Rules Interpretation and Conduct of the Game", number 3, as follows: "Coaches are to do everything in their power to stop anything off-color among the players."

In this regard I want to call your attention to the unsportsmanlike tactics of Gerald Tucker who, when Ralph Miller was fouled, ran his fingers through Miller's hair and disheveled it by violently shaking Miller's head. And then in a baby-like fashion he whittled his finger in Miller's face in a tsk-tsk manner, much to the delight of the Sooner home audience. That is a cheap and tawdry trick, poking a pointing finger in a derisive fashion in the face of a visiting athlete who is supposed to be accorded the courtesy of an opponent.

I am told that one of the Oklahoma dailys referred to this as "colorful Tucker's act". Well, I might say to you that this was discussed in the coaches meeting and the coaches brought the matter up with Coach Drake, that his players had at times shown unsportsmanlike tactics such as this. Ug Roberts and Allie Faine did it last year with Howard Engleman and other Big Six opponents. Here at Lawrence Reich did the same thing to John Buescher, and Buescher resented it and quite a flare was caused here at Lawrence in the Kansas-Oklahoma game. The Oklahoma players were accorded excellent and sportsmanlike treatment at Lawrence.

Apparently this goat-getting act could not continuously be practiced by the Oklahoma team if it received any discouragement from the coach. Two or three of the coaches mentioned this to Coach Drake this past fall at the meeting.

The reason that I did not put Gerald Tucker on my Big Six selection was because by his own volition he migrated, whereas had he stayed at Kansas State he would have had a chance to play ten full games, and further because of his unsportsmanlike action to Ralph Miller who responded with a smile and a pat on the back.

There is another incident that happened last year at Norman that I would like to call your attention to. There is a rule in the book to the effect that when players are substituted at the half it is not necessary for them to report to the referee. I made

such a change last year at the half and reported to the scorer, who happened to be Gerald Tucker, a freshman. Just about the time the game started Tucker stood up and yelled to the referee, "He didn't report, there's a foul on him." I said to him, "Young man, you are too young to know all the rules. It is not necessary that he report to the referee."

I only mention such things as this as unpleasant happenings that are brought on by the basketball administration at Oklahoma by not putting mature men in positions of responsibility. When freshmen are played up to such an unusual extent as was Tucker, then it is impossible to have a normal, modest, gentlemanly individual out of such a situation.

In all such positions of trust here we put faculty representatives and coaches who would not stoop to take advantage of a visitor. Boys do not have the equilibrium that men of responsibility have. Coaches on the faculty would not dare show that type of sportsmanship when they were supposed to be fair and impartial administrators.

Apparently the crime is in getting caught, and then to use propaganda to distort and discolor the true facts of the case.

I would much rather have rules that are agreed to - lived up to than have someone do lip service and violate the fundamental agreements that were made openly and with full expectation of being carried out as the rules were printed.

Now, Harold, so much for that, and I will forget it since I know that when you know it you will see that there is not a repetition of this thing happening to any of the visitors. But there is one thing regarding publicity that I haven't seen you print, and that is the comparison of the common opponents of the Sooners and the Jayhawkers. You will remember that DePaul decisively defeated Oklahoma with Tucker in the game in the Chicago Stadium during Christmas vacation, and you are also cognizant of the fact that Kansas defeated the same team in the Chicago Stadium 46 to 26.

I believe without exception that Kansas has defeated every team in the Big Six Conference, including Oklahoma, by a much wider spread of margin between the offense and defense than has Oklahoma. This statement goes for Nebraska, Kansas State and Iowa State, and tonight we will find out about Missouri. Of course, we may be beaten by Missouri tonight, and if we are of course Oklahoma will win and we will congratulate them. But if we defeat Missouri, then instead of talking about scoring more points on Kansas as Oklahoma did, why not bring out the true ratio between the offense and the defense and say that although the two teams are tied, Kansas is the superior team because the offensive-defensive ratio is so outstandingly large as to

leave no argument as to the superiority. Last year Kansas and Iowa State tied for the Big Six, but Iowa State was considered the superior team because they had a better offensive-defensive ratio. Therefore, if it was true last year, why would it not be true this year? Can you show one single common opponent that Oklahoma has scored more points on than has Kansas? That is sporting, is it not, Harold?

With all good wishes to you, and remembering you always as one of the fairest gentlemen that I have met, I am

Sincerely yours,

Director of Physical Education and Recreation,
Varsity Basketball and Baseball Coach.

FCA:AH

April 13, 1942.

Chancellor Deane W. Malott,
Professor W. W. Davis,
University of Kansas.

Gentlemen:

The original unpleasantry was first precipitated by the University of Oklahoma authorities, Messrs. Kraft, Haskell and Drake, when they each designated the disqualification of Gerald Tucker as a Pearl Harbor or a sneak attack, and they directly charged through the press that F. C. "Phog" Allen was responsible for it.

Replying to the attack of these Oklahoma gentlemen upon me I in turn exposed further flagrant and athletic irregularities of the Oklahoma school, such as baseball and football proselyting of other Kansas boys.

I desire now to point out that I in the beginning very properly wrote my superiors, Professor W. W. Davis and Mr. Quinn Henry, calling their attention to the breach of athletic rules on the part of the University of Oklahoma concerning the Gerald Tucker case. To date I have had no word from Mr. Henry, but Professor Davis acted very promptly on the matter.

Instead of keeping this communication within its bounds, the Oklahomans launched a personal attack upon me. Until their attack upon me I had made no public statement. Before I wrote Professor Davis and Mr. Henry there already had appeared a feature article in the Kansas City Star airing the Tucker case. Two persons, one from Topeka and the other from Manhattan, had inquired of the Star how Gerald Tucker could legally be included in the University of Oklahoma basketball line-up. Tucker already had played five games and was clearly ineligible, so the inquirers stated.

Mr. Harold Keith, the sports publicity writer of the University of Oklahoma, endeavored to explain in the Star's column why Oklahoma considered Tucker eligible to play. This appeared in the Sunday sport page as a feature article. The following Monday I wrote my superiors asking that the conference pay some heed to this infringement on the part of Oklahoma.

The cardinal weakness of the Big Six Conference is that there is no enforcing agency, hence it seems that the school that breaks the athletic rules is apparently the gainer. There seems to be no practiced inhibitions. Personally, I believe in subscribing rigidly to the rules

of an organization and we have done so with our basketball personnel. But when I find a fellow who does not subscribe and who expects me to subscribe, then I definitely expect to call such an infraction to the attention of my superiors.

Speaking upon the subject of the investigator from the University of Oklahoma, I note that Mr. Kraft did not send Professor Davis the correspondence that he had with Mr. Haskell, nor did he furnish Professor Davis a copy of Mr. Haskell's letter to Mr. Kraft. It would seem imminently fair that if an investigation were to be made by anybody it should be made by some disinterested third party. In this case an investigation could take on the complexion of something different than a "whitewash". When the University of Oklahoma is armed with confidential correspondence that was written a Kansan, and Kansas sees none of Oklahoma's confidential correspondence, then in any court of fair hearing it certainly would have no bearing.

Now, may I say a word regarding the investigator who made the trip to Wichita. The investigator was Dean Arthur B. Adams, of the College of Business Administration of the University of Oklahoma. I have a rather interesting experience to relate to show you how fair and impartial (?) Dean Adams might be in such an investigation.

When Kansas played the University of Oklahoma at Norman on February 27th, Mr. Maurice L. Breidenthal, president of the Security National Bank in Kansas City, Kansas, met with the Oklahoma bankers and the officials of the school of business at Oklahoma City. Mr. Breidenthal rode with our team from Oklahoma City to Norman the day of the game. Mr. Breidenthal told me that he had just been in a two day conference with the business leaders and there was one fellow at the University of Oklahoma who was especially vehement regarding "Phog" Allen. He told Mr. Breidenthal what a crook Allen was, that he had known him 'way back when. Adams was then the coach of Central College at Fayette, Missouri, while Allen was at Warrensburg, and he (Allen) won his games then by selecting crooked officials.

Mr. Breidenthal went on further to say that Adams could not be vindictive enough and that he, Breidenthal, "called" Dean Adams and said that he, Breidenthal, had been on the athletic board a great many years and that he did not agree with the statements Adams made.

Upon my return to Lawrence I wrote Dean E. P. Puckett of Central College, Fayette, Missouri, regarding Mr. Adams, as follows:

"Dear Dean Puckett:

"While I was down Oklahoma way last week I ran into a friend of mine who said that he knew Arthur B. Adams who is now dean of the college of business administration of the University of Oklahoma at Norman. This fellow told me that Arthur Adams stated that he used to coach at Central College when I was at Warrensburg.

"I cannot place Adams. I remember most of the Central College

coaches - Briggs, Cling, and the other fellows, but I do not place Adams. Will you kindly tell me at your very earliest convenience when Adams coached and what sports he coached? My friend was under the impression that he coached basketball, or maybe it was football.

"I will appreciate it greatly if you will write me at your earliest convenience, giving me the date when Mr. Adams was on your faculty and how long and what his activities there were.

.

I told Mr. Breidenthal that I expected to follow this through and let Mr. Adams prove some of these statements that he was making. Mr. Breidenthal wrote me as follows, on March 7:

"If I were you I would drop the Adams matter. There is no question about the statement which he made to me. There is just a bare possibility that it might have been someone other than Dean Adams, i.e. I might have thought that I was talking to Dean Adams when it was some one else. I feel positive, however, that it was the fellow who was introduced to me as Dean Adams. There is no question about the school because he mentioned Payette."

I have done nothing at all regarding this matter, but this shows you that when Mr. Breidenthal makes a statement his veracity cannot be questioned. When a man who coached at Central College back in 1912 and 1913 would make such statements as he made to Maurice Breidenthal in 1942, it would convince me that he is not a fair and impartial man to render fact findings.

I do not know whether you gentlemen want to know the exact truth about Oklahoma, or close the matter up and let it drop. I have proof and can substantiate it that Lester Layton had a secret baseball contract, the kind in which a college player usually gets financial assistance for promising to join the paying club after graduation.

On March 7 Judge Kenesaw Mountain Landis ruled that such secret documents would cost the offending professional team a heavy fine and that in the future clubs and affiliates which signed undergraduates to secret contracts would be denied to re-sign them if the players had been declared free agents. At the University of Illinois Lou Boudreau was declared ineligible. The money was paid Boudreau's parents so that the parents could then pay Boudreau, thereby insuring Boudreau's eligibility at Illinois. Boudreau was declared ineligible by the Big Ten and is now manager of the Cleveland Indians. The Landis ruling was made in regard to Anthony Ravich and the New York Yankees of the American League.

This secret contract procedure has been indulged in by many college players. And it can be definitely proven that Layton is one of the recipients.

Mr. Haskell nor any member of the University of Oklahoma faculty has ever denied that Mr. Lawrence "Jap" Haskell is a paid scout

for the Boston Red Sox of the American League. It is a rather difficult thing to prove a fact when all of the Kansas correspondence is turned over to Oklahoma and none of the Oklahoma findings or communications are turned over to the University of Kansas. If we were to investigate it would take money, and certainly we have no desire to convict anyone beyond substantiating the fact that there were definite irregularities.

Mr. George Powers, of the law offices of Foulston, Siefkin, Bartlett & Morris, is a man of high integrity and unquestioned veracity. You gentlemen can appreciate the pressure that Dean Adams could put on Paul Good, the principal of one of the Wichita high schools, but he had little success with Mr. Powers.

My other informant was Julian Ralston, a graduate of the University of Kansas, an attorney in Wichita. The man Scheufler was alleged to have given Ralston the information. He is one of the umpires that Mr. Jap Haskell employs during the semi-professional play-off in Wichita. Mr. Haskell is the umpire-in-chief and it is during this tournament that Mr. Haskell has selected Cumberland, one of Oklahoma's star pitchers from Salina, and Lester Layton, as well as Herb Scheffler, from Springfield, Illinois. These coaches of athletic teams, like Mr. Haskell, are paid a bonus by the big leagues when they sign a player to their contract. If Mr. Haskell is in the employ of the Boston Red Sox as a scout and makes money by this procedure it is at least thinkable that he uses these college boys to develop them for the professional league.

Before we played the Oklahoma Aggies on February 25th we stopped in Perry, Oklahoma. While there I called on Mr. W. K. Leathercock, Governor of the 124th District of Rotary, and editor of the Perry "Journal". He is an old boyhood friend of mine. He told me in his office that Jap Haskell had called on him and stated that he had everything arranged and the boys all satisfied down at Norman now. They were paying the varsity men \$45.00 per month and the freshmen \$35.00. I am mentioning this fact to you to show you that doubtless if he would write such a letter and you would turn it over to Mr. Kraft and he would send it to Mr. Leathercock, doubtless Mr. Leathercock would deny making such a statement. Mr. Leathercock is on some board down there and influential people in Oklahoma told him that they got President Joe Brandt from the Princeton Press to lend culture to the University of Oklahoma and they got Jap Haskell to get winning teams. Mr. Leathercock said, "Is that not a paradox?"

Referring back to Gerald Tucker, the coach of the Winfield High School, Mr. Thomas, came to me and told me that Bruce Drake had called on Gerald Tucker in Winfield (definitely against Big Six rules) and had promised Gerald Tucker board, room, tuition and books, free voice instruction, and a job as his personal secretary at \$15.00 a month. Thomas said he did not want him to go to Oklahoma but wanted him to attend Kansas University, although Thomas is not an alumnus of the University. In the light of these things, how could Oklahoma profess a lily-white status?

At Governor and Mrs. Ratner's dinner to the basketball team, Mrs. Ratner told me that Governor Lon Phillips had personally ordered the University of Oklahoma athletic authorities to give Kansas all protection and show them all courtesy during the time of the basketball game. Although being an athletic letterman at the University of Oklahoma, Governor Phillips was quite distressed at the action of the University of Oklahoma and he personally said he would see that Kansas was accorded the courtesy of a visitor. It is my personal opinion that that accounted for much of the courtesy that was shown us during that time. You will remember that I told you of the unsportsmanlike attitude of the photographers when they shot pictures against the agreement of the Big Six basketball coaches association.

I expect to be in Wichita Wednesday and I hope to see Mr. George Powers and get some first hand information regarding Dean Adams' visit.

Someone has said, you know, that there are three sides to every story - your side, my side, and the right side.

I should also like to enclose an excerpt from a letter I received from Mr. C. O. Burnside, of Oklahoma City, a Kansas alumnus, and a member of the same fraternity, Phi Delta Theta, as is Gerald Tucker and Jap Haskell.

"You may be interested in knowing that I was surrounded by the Philistines Sunday in my annual role as toastmaster of the Founders Day banquet of the Phi Delta Thetas. I introduced Titanic Tucker who favored us with two solos. The boysis quite a crooner and I'll give him credit for having such fine poise, one far beyond his years, before a crowd. Then I gave Mr. Lawrence Jap Haskell, with all of his culture, to the visiting firemen, and the boys went to town, so you can see I am in bed with some bad boys down here and that I'm in bed with all of the bad boys in Kansas. What is it they say - 'Hell if you do, or hell if you don't?'"

I desire to call your attention to something that perhaps is none of my affair. On page 5, section 4 of the Big Six rules handbook on Faculty Control: Only institutions having faculty control of athletics shall be members of this association. Section 5. Representation. 1. Each institution shall be represented by a faculty representative and the director of athletics. 2. Faculty representatives. a. The faculty representatives shall be persons of professional rank who do not receive pay primarily for services rendered in connection with athletics or physical education.

I am wondering if this would qualify Mr. Walter W. Kraft, superintendent of the department of university utilities. Or was it because the man in this position controlled a great many jobs available for students?

The things that I am writing you gentlemen are entirely confidential and will not be given out in any form whatsoever by me. I would appreciate confidence on your part.

Very sincerely yours,

Director of Physical Education and Recreation,
Varsity Basketball and Baseball Coach.

FCA:AH

C O P Y

Department of
University Utilities

Walter W. Kraft
Superintendent

THE UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA

Norman Oklahoma

April 6, 1942

Dr. W. W. Davis, Faculty
Representative, M.V.I.A.A.
University of Kansas
Lawrence, Kansas

Dear Dr. Davis:

After the meeting of the Big Six Conference held in Kansas City on the 27th day of February, you handed me some correspondence which contained some charges of athletic irregularities affecting the University of Oklahoma Athletic Department. The letters referred to were one, dated February 8th, from an attorney in Wichita, Kansas, and another, dated January 26th, from an attorney in Wichita. These letters were addressed to Mr. Allen, copies of which were given to me. The correspondence also included two letters from F. C. Allen, one dated February 9th and the other February 10th. You requested that I investigate the charges made in this correspondence and advise you.

Upon returning to Norman I immediately had a conference with Mr. Haskell, our director of athletics. I requested Mr. Haskell to furnish me a written statement covering these charges. I also called upon Mr. Cross, the business manager of athletics, for a statement as to whether or not any funds of the athletic department had been expended in paying the expenses of high school boys from Wichita, Kansas. I also talked to Mr. Lester Layton, a student at the University of Oklahoma.

Several days later Mr. Haskell furnished me with a complete statement in which he flatly denied any irregularities, and in which he requested further that I insist that Mr. Allen furnish specific proof rather than rumors and hearsay. It was quite evident to me that it would be necessary that I personally go to Wichita to interview the persons mentioned in the correspondence, or that I send someone there for the purpose of getting first-hand information from those supposedly involved. I preferred, of course, to investigate this myself.

Due to the press of business it was impossible for me to leave. I was hoping week after week that I could make the trip. However, finding that I could not go, I enlisted the services of a man in whom I have the utmost confidence, for the purpose of securing for me first-hand information from those mentioned in the correspondence. After several conferences with this man I furnished him the full correspondence and instructed him to interview each person involved and report back the situation as he found it. I have before me the report of this man, which I will be glad to show you at our next meeting.

The following is an excerpt from a letter addressed "Dear Phog", and dated January 26, 1942:

"I have been doing a little snooping around regarding the football situation at North High School. One of my closest friends is Paul Good, who is vice-principal of North High School. I talked with him yesterday in a confidential manner.

"He tells me that he personally talked to Doug Brown, who is the outstanding football player and captain of the team this year, regarding the trip of certain football players to Oklahoma University. Doug Brown told Paul Good that Jap Haskell had been up to Wichita and talked to them about coming down to visit Oklahoma University and that he agreed to pay all expenses of the trip.

"I believe they went in a car belonging to one of the boys, but expenses were paid by Oklahoma University. He questioned him particularly regarding whether it was Jap Haskell or his brother who had made the arrangements. He insists Doug told him that Jap Haskell came up.

"Paul Good asked him how he happened to go, and his reply was that of the typical high school boy -- that is, "Why not, if you could have a good trip with all expenses paid?". Incidentally, another group was taken down to Oklahoma A. & M. a few nights ago.

"Paul also informed me that if someone would talk to Mr. Groe, head of the Physical Education Department of North High School, they could find out about the baseball situation insofar as this Wichita boy is concerned. Paul told me that he was a very fine basketball and football player, but that he was not allowed to play anything except baseball and that he thought there was no question but that he was signed up with the Boston Red Sox.

"Furthermore, Good assured me that Doug Brown was the type of individual who would not lie for anyone, and if anyone wanted to ask him about the arrangements of the trip to Oklahoma, he would tell them the truth about it.

"Incidentally, Mr. Good and Mr. Groe are neither K.U. athletes, and neither has any interest at all in K.U. but definitely feel that these boys should go to some school in the State of Kansas, and that Kansas should retain their athletes in the State of Kansas. They have no particular school in mind but merely feel that we should not sit here and let the State of Oklahoma come into our territory and "buy" our outstanding players. Incidentally, someone should talk to this Doug Brown about going to K.U., as no one has shown any interest in him as yet."

"No Signature Given."

Referring to the above letter, the following persons were interviewed: Paul Good, vice principal of North High School, Doug Brown, student at North High School, B. E. Haskell, resident of Wichita and brother of Jap Haskell, and Mr. Groe, head of the physical education department of North High School.

There were four boys who made the trip to Norman, namely Doug Brown, George Ritter, Bill Jamison, and Don Comeaux. The trip was made in Don Comeaux's father's car. Of the four high school students mentioned, George Ritter and Doug Brown only were located in Wichita. Upon inquiry it was reported that Don Comeaux is now at the University of Kansas, and that Bill Jamison, together with another Wichita boy named Botkins, had enrolled at Oklahoma A. & M. College.

In addition to the above named persons, Mr. George Powers, Wichita attorney, was interviewed, as well as "Dutch" Scheufler.

My investigator's report, as to what each of these men had to say, is as follows:

Paul Good, vice-principal of North High School -- Mr. Good said he knew absolutely nothing when it came to facts. All he knew was just rumor, and what he had read in the Wichita papers. He explained that there were two newspapers in Wichita, and that the sports editors seemed to dislike each other thoroughly. The sports editor of the Beacon was condemning the University of Oklahoma, while the sports editor of the Eagle was condemning the University of Kansas. Mr. Good was of the opinion, and it was also the opinion of others with whom my investigator talked, that the sports editors of these two rival newspapers had selected the athletic reputations of two universities as their battleground. Mr. Good further stated that an attorney had called him and asked him what he knew concerning boys going to a ball game at Norman. Mr. Good said he told him (the attorney) that he did not know anything about it other than that he had excused the boys from school for that purpose since their parents had given them permission to go and it was therefore satisfactory with the high school authorities. Mr. Good then gave the names of the four boys who were excused to make the trip, namely Doug Brown, Don Comeaux, Bill Jamison and George Ritter.

Doug Brown -- Mr. Brown stated that what expenses were not paid by the boys themselves were paid by businessmen, perhaps alumni of the University of Oklahoma, residing in Wichita. He said that he went to Norman in a car belonging to Don Comeaux's father. He further stated that a couple of weeks prior to the game he and some other boys had been invited to Mt. B. E. Haskell's home in Wichita, and that all of the boys knew Mr. Haskell, whom they referred to as "Pat". Mr. Brown said that Pat told them that his brother, Jap, was there and that he would like to have them come over and meet him. It was suggested by both Pat and Jap Haskell that the boys come down to the University of Oklahoma sometime and look the school over. Nothing was said then about any definite time or arrangements for a trip to Norman, and it was a surprise to Brown and the other boys as well when Pat Haskell told them that arrangements had been made by a group of alumni living in Wichita to pay their expenses to see a basketball game at Norman. Mr. Brown stated that the expenses of the car, which amounted to \$15.00, were all that was received by the boys, and that he and the other boys paid for their own meals and room excepting the dinner at Norman which they ate with Mr. Luster, Dale Arbuckle, and others. He continued that later on four boys made a trip to Oklahoma A. & M. College, and that a boy named Botkins took the place of Don Comeaux.

B. E. Haskell -- My investigator talked to Mr. Haskell for a few moments, and Mr. Haskell informed him that he lived close to North High School, that he took a great interest in the athletic affairs of the high school as a fan, and that he knew most of the boys on the teams. He said that it was his idea to have the boys come over and meet his brother, Jap Haskell, and that he raised the money to pay the car expenses of these boys to Norman. Mr. Haskell furnished a cancelled check showing that he had paid D. G. Comeaux \$15.00 on January 10, 1942. I have that check in my file.

Mr. Groe, athletic director of North High School -- Mr. Groe stated that he did not know anything about the reports and rumors except those which had been in the Wichita papers, and that he had not paid very much attention to them since he was not concerned. He offered to make a statement concerning Lester Layton, which is

that Mr. Layton came to him for advice as to what school he should attend. Mr. Groe said that Layton was a boy who loved baseball, and that he knew he meant to make a profession of playing it. Mr. Groe advised Layton that he could not recommend any particular school, but that Layton would have to look over a number of colleges, and their records, to determine for himself where he would be most benefitted. Mr. Groe stated that he mentioned, among other schools, the University of Texas and the University of Oklahoma, and that he saw nothing unusual in the fact that Layton had selected the University of Oklahoma since Oklahoma has had a fine record in baseball over a period of years. Mr. Groe also said that the O.U. alumni group in Wichita was solidly behind their high school team and had taken a great interest in sports, even when they were not winners. He stated that he was personally glad they took an interest in boys who were on the athletic teams.

George Ritter, student at North High School -- My investigator found that the statements made by Mr. Ritter were practically identical with those made by Doug Brown. It was Ritter's understanding that the expense money was paid to Mr. Haskell and that he in turn wrote a check for the amount, paying it to the owner of the car.

George Powers, Wichita attorney -- My investigator reports on Mr. Powers as follows:

"I had a strong feeling that Mr. Powers had written a particular letter to Phog Allen. I explained to him over the telephone who I was and my purpose in being there and asked for an opportunity to talk with him. He told me to come to his office, and he would be glad to talk with me and glad to meet anyone from Oklahoma. He went on to say that he certainly did not have any information that would concern the situation because he knew absolutely nothing about it, and that furthermore he was not even interested in it and had never taken any interest in it because he had other things to do. I went to his office to see him and he told me the same thing, assuring me that he had never had anything to do with the situation. I asked his opinion on several matters and we talked back and forth for some time before I told him that I had a letter with me which I felt sure that he had written. I read the first paragraph of the letter then so that he would recognize if it he had written it. His face turned red. The paragraph I am referring to stated that the letter was of a confidential nature. Mr. Powers said, "Well it doesn't seem to be very confidential since you have it." He then admitted that he had written the letter and stated that it gave his views exactly. I could get no further information from him."

I wish to call your particular attention to paragraph 7 of the letter dated January 26th, and addressed to "Dear Phog", which said: "Incidentally, someone should talk to this Doug Brown about going to K.U., as no one has shown any interest in him as yet." It seems to me that the thing proposed by your alumnus and attorney in Wichita is exactly what some of the alumni of O.U. in Wichita have done, and that is to encourage these boys to go to their particular school. The alumnus writing this letter to Mr. Allen suggests that someone should talk to Doug Brown. He evidently suggests that Phog Allen do something about it. I am merely calling your attention to this statement to show that it is more or less the natural thing for an alumnus to want to interest a good athlete in his own university, and I feel that it is just as legal for the alumni of O.U. to do this thing as it is for the alumni of K.U.

Referring to the letter addressed to Dr. Allen on February 8, 1942, concerning an alleged conversation that your informant had with "Dutch" Scheuffler, in this connection I wish to say that the letter seems so ridiculous that it doesn't merit much comment. However, my investigator interviewed Mr. Scheuffler, who stated that he had never given out any such interview as is related in the letter, and vehemently denied making the statements charged by your informant. It seems strange to me that your informant accuses "Dutch" Scheuffler of being a "tramp", and at the same time is willing to accept a statement of condemnation of rumored actions of the University of Oklahoma, based upon statements given him by a man he classes as a "no account".

Especially significant is the next to the last paragraph, which says: "I can't prove any of these statements but they look genuine to me and I'm confident Dutch was telling me these things just as they happened. He is one of these fellows who always likes to brag and seem important and have connections with men who are in the places of importance in the athletic world."

Your informant, an attorney of Wichita, is willing to believe statements about the University of Oklahoma and its athletic department, coming from a man he immediately accuses as being unreliable and a worthless braggart.

Referring to Mr. Allen's letters of February 9 and 10, 1942, we find that Mr. Allen refers to the Burton Cossey case which in no way concerns the University of Kansas. I made a complete statement of this case at the Big Six Conference meeting held late in February. The athletic authorities of Oklahoma A. & M. College and the University of Oklahoma investigated this entire matter and are in complete agreement on the case. I wish to state for your information, however, that no person on the athletic staff of the University of Oklahoma in any way urged, induced, or otherwise tried to influence Mr. Cossey to return to the University of Oklahoma.

In his letter, Mr. Allen makes the following statement concerning two letters which he received from certain attorneys in Wichita: "It takes the information that the two lawyers have to make the case against Haskell a perfect one". Statements made in the two letters are based on hearsay and rumor, and in a court of law such evidence is not even admissible. Furthermore I had every charge investigated, with the results as reported above. The case against Mr. Haskell doesn't contain any of the elements of a case, much less a perfect case.

Mr. Allen refers to the Layton case in his letter, and I wish to state that I have before me a photostatic copy of an affidavit, signed by Lester Layton and by both his father and mother, denying the existence of a professional baseball contract between Lester Layton and any baseball club.

I want to state that it will require some other proof other than the unsupported statements of Mr. Allen or the statements from his attorney friends, who base their information on hearsay and rumors, to make the University of Oklahoma authorities believe that the parents of Lester Layton have sworn falsely. Mr. Allen further states that he believes that secret or sub-rosa arrangements exist between Layton and the Boston Reds, which he terms a "gentleman's agreement". It seems to me that before any further cognizance should be given statements by Mr. Allen, he should be required by the University of Kansas authorities to furnish concrete evidence or to cease his child's play.

For Mr. Allen's information, Buster Mills, after graduating from the University of Oklahoma, played with Cleveland and not with the Boston Red Sox.

Mr. Allen refers to Mr. Noble, of the Board of Regents of the University of Oklahoma, as the president of the Board and the chief athletic getter. I cannot help but feel some resentment in Mr. Allen's statement, since it contains no element of the truth. Mr. Noble is not president of the Board of Regents of the University of Oklahoma, and so far as I know, and I feel that I should know more about it than Mr. Allen, he has not interested himself in securing athletes for the University of Oklahoma. Mr. Noble is a very busy man, and although he is interested in all phases of University administration, he has made no attempt to run the affairs of the athletic department.

I realize that in these times it is exceedingly hard to keep irregularities from creeping into college athletics. Although the University of Oklahoma may not be sprouting wings, I do not believe that the University of Kansas is entirely free of suspicion. Mr. Haskell submitted to me a list of prominent Oklahoma athletes who made a fine athletic record at the University of Kansas. In that list were such athletes as Standifer and Earnest Bradley of Cherokee, Ad Lindsey of Kingfisher, the two Johnson brothers, great basketball players, from Oklahoma City, T. C. Bishop and T. P. Hunter of Oklahoma City, Tom Poor of McAlester, and Ormand Beach of Pawhuska. These are just a few of the many athletes who have gone to the University of Kansas from Oklahoma. In many instances alumni and friends of the University of Oklahoma have been very suspicious about these boys leaving under the very shadow of the University of Oklahoma to go to Kansas University. We have taken the position that if a student prefers to go to Kansas University or any other university rather than to come to the University of Oklahoma, it is his privilege to do so and we bid him God speed and hope that he makes a success. On the other hand, we certainly are not going to turn down a promising athlete because he happens to come from Kansas.

You must also remember that we have a great many graduates of the University of Oklahoma living in southern Kansas, and many of these graduates are loyal to their alma mater, and it is not surprising that some of them interest high school students in coming here.

I resent the statement made by Mr. George Powers of Wichita when interviewed by my investigator. He stated, after first denying that he had anything to do with the charges, that the University of Oklahoma had sent the investigator there merely for the purpose of whitewashing the whole situation. I want to repeat that I sent the investigator to Wichita to find out and report to me the true situation. I had given him no instructions other than to find the truth. The situation, as I have related it, is the situation as he found it.

In the light of all information now in my hands, I feel that I am in a position to arrive at reasonable conclusions concerning this situation. My conclusions are as follows:

1. No funds of the athletic department of the University of Oklahoma were used to defray the expense of bringing these boys to Norman.
2. The funds used to provide transportation from Wichita to Norman for four boys were provided by businessmen residing in Wichita, presumably alumni or friends of the University of Oklahoma.

3. Lester Layton has furnished definite proof that he is not under contract with any professional baseball club.
4. "Dutch" Scheufler has no official connection with the University of Oklahoma or its athletic department. I don't feel that it is my privilege or duty to advise Mr. Haskell whom he shall select as his associates or summer co-workers, and I certainly have a firm conviction that it doesn't concern Mr. Allen one iota.
5. Mr. Scheufler had nothing to do with the four boys' visiting in Norman, and certainly didn't bring them to Norman.
6. The rivalry existing between two Wichita newspapers, and the bitter feeling between the sports writers on these papers, was responsible for the unfavorable publicity given the two universities and was responsible in a large measure for the information given Mr. Allen by his attorney friends in Wichita.
7. Mr. George Powers, an attorney of Wichita, wrote the letter dated January 26, 1942. When interviewed he first denied knowledge, and when faced with a quotation from his letter he admitted writing the letter and then stated that those were still his views. When faced with statements of those whom he had presumably quoted, he admitted that his information was hearsay and rumor. I feel that this was just a case of an overjealous alumni desirous of supporting his friend, Mr. Allen.
8. The letter written by another Wichita attorney, dated February 8, 1942, deals with "Dutch" Scheufler and Jap Haskell's brother. As stated above, this letter is so devoid of facts that it doesn't merit much consideration. The attorney states in his letter that he can't prove any of his statements. Under these circumstances no further time could be wasted on the letter.
9. I want to be charitable to Mr. Allen, and therefore just wish to say that he apparently has been overeager to punish and otherwise discredit Jap Haskell. The occasion of the newspaper fight in Wichita only furnished Mr. Allen a little more ammunition.

I want you to know that I appreciate your kind consideration in submitting this information to me, and I realize that it was necessary for me to be very thorough in making this investigation. I personally have no thought of producing an operation known as whitewashing. Our people here at the University of Oklahoma are human, and being so are subject to human errors. At times, due possibly to not knowing what should be done, they make errors.

We have the very highest regard for the University of Kansas, for you personally, and for your athletic staff. I know that you have often expressed the hope that our relations might always remain relations of complete confidence in each other, and of respect for the institutions of the Big Six. I am personally appreciative of your counsel and friendship. I hope that in the future we may always continue to be perfectly frank, and yet friendly.

With kindest personal regards, I am

Very truly yours,

(Signed)

WALTER W. KRAFT
Faculty Representative, M.V.I.A.A.
University of Oklahoma.

March 9, 1942.

Governor Payne H. Ratner,
Topeka, Kansas.

Dear Governor Ratner:

You doubtless saw that during the game at Norman I walked to the officials' bench twice during the first half. This was to kindly ask Mr. Harold Keith, the sports publicity director, who seems to be the best sportsman at the University of Oklahoma, to remove the photographer from directly in front of our bench. This photographer constantly shot flashlight bulbs in our faces. He was not photographing the players on the court, but rather trying to catch us in some pose that he had his own ideas about.

This was in direct violation of the coaches' agreement and preferring not to go to Coach Drake to ask anything of this nature I went to the publicity man. Being unsuccessful in my first two attempts during the first half, I took time out of the few minutes in between halves in my dressing room which should have been given to the boys, and wrote a letter to Harold Keith telling him that this was in direct violation of the coaches' agreement. I told him that the photographer was insolent and discourteous, and asked in the name of sportsmanship and fairness that he be removed from directly in front of our bench. This was done.

Coach Bruce Drake knew the rules both in regard to the practice ball and the photographers, because it was the coaches of our conference who made the rules. Bruce Drake was cognizant of both of these infractions of the rule.

I thought perhaps you would wonder why I was going to the desk, perhaps to protest a decision. When these lights were flashed on in the players' eyes it makes them blind for a few minutes and any player going in to substitute is rendered less efficient than if courteous rules were followed.

Very sincerely yours,

Director of Physical Education and Recreation,
Varsity Basketball and Baseball Coach.

FCA:AH