

the desire for winning teams is not a characteristic peculiar to the alumni of Kentucky. As Judge Streit points out, this is equally true of the alumni of most of the educational institutions in America as well as the American public generally.

2. One of the most serious charges in Judge Streit's statement is that unqualified students have been admitted to the University on athletics scholarships. Judge Streit referred specifically to the cases of Nicholas Englis and Walter Hirsch. We have before us the high school transcripts and the college records of these two students, together with University bulletins for the years in which they were admitted, wherein are published the entrance requirements of the University. There can be no doubt that these students were technically qualified to enter the University under the rules of the University Faculty. In fairness to Judge Streit it should be pointed out that his statement was based upon an erroneous remark made to him by the Dean of Students who did not know that an earlier admissions rule had been changed in 1943 at a time when there was no football team at the University.

3. Judge Streit charges that cribbing by Groza, Beard, and Barnstable was "encouraged and tolerated by University officials". The basis for this charge is statements by the three boys that when they had been absent from examinations they were permitted, in some cases, by their instructors to take the same examination which had been previously given to the class. This, of course, gave them an opportunity to converse with other students and to learn something of the nature of the examination. However, this opportunity was available not only to athletes but to any student who might for any legitimate reason have missed the examination. This practice was confined to a few members of the faculty whose trust was sometimes betrayed. We believe that faculty members should use every possible means to remove temptations for cheating. But we are of the opinion that Judge Streit's conclusion that these few instances actually constitute condoning of cribbing by University officials is a gross distortion of the truth.

4. Charges were made that Coach Rupp discussed point spreads with his teams and there is an insinuation that he was in liaison with gamblers. Coach Rupp has stated that on a few occasions he pointed out to his team that they were favored to win by a lop-sided margin. This information was published in every metropolitan newspaper in the land for all who were interested to read. We can understand how Judge Streit, from his point of view, might read a sinister meaning into such an act. We can also appreciate that Coach Rupp and other coaches would use this information only to stir their teams to greater efforts.

5. It appears to us that Judge Streit has labored to establish a relationship of intimacy between Coach Rupp and a Lexington bookmaker. He points to two occasions during a week in New York when this individual visited Mr. Rupp's table in a night club and two visits which Coach Rupp made to the bookmaker's home in Lexington. However, Judge Streit's own statement explains that the bookmaker was not a member of Mr. Rupp's party in the night club but that he happened to be there coincidentally with him and called for a short time at Mr. Rupp's table. Judge Streit also explains that the visits to the bookmaker's home in Lexington were for the purpose of securing a contribution to the Shrine Crippled Children's Hospital. While we certainly do not condone even a casual relationship between any University employee and a professional gambler, it appears to us that Judge Streit has taken a rather accidental affair and given it an appearance of evil that is not warranted.