In the last part of your article when Nibs mentioned Chuck Hanger he states that "the extra effort which would entail him going two feet higher on lay-ins and follow shots would be nothing as compared to that which a smaller man would have to make." This shows one thing, Mr. Neal, that none of these coaches have tried a 12 foot basket. There would be no lay-ins on these shots because each player would be required to shot at a 12 foot basket. The poorest place to shoot at a 12 foot basket would be underneath the goal. That is exactly the strong point of the 12 foot basket. The hard drive-ins and lay-ups which produce 80 per cent of all the fouls by the defense are made for that very reason - because a player driving in is fouled and the official awards the offended player two free throws.

If you could cut out 80 per cent of the fouls and practically all of the double shots caused from players throwing these fouls, then you would have a much cleaner, open game where field goal shooting would be the dominant point rather than foul shooting which seems now to be the case. A field goal would count 3 points and a free throw would count 1, which was again Dr. Naismith's idea as to the evaluation of a field goal and a free throw. The whistle blowing of the officials would be cut down immeasurably because there would be fewer fouls on account of the fact that it would be to the advantage of a player to shoot at the basket from a distance of 8, 10, or 12 feet rather than have the big boys camp under the basket and jab or dunk them in.

I call these big boys "mezzanine hurdlers" because they are tall enough to touch the mezzanine floor.

You will please understand that I am not appealing for a 12 foot basket only for college and independent players, not for high school boys. But when men of maturity reach such heights as they now possess, then I can see nothing sacred about the height of a 10 foot basket that should not be changed. And too, I am not one of the coaches seeking a change because my teams lose more than they win, but because I think it would immeasurably improve the game. The height of the basket would not change one thing but this - it would drive out of the game the tall player who constantly camps underneath the basket and counts only on his height and not on his action in winning games. And it would give the shorter man a decided advantage because when a ball is arched at the ggal if it hit the basket the arc of dispersement would cause the ball to bound out further away from the goal than from the 10 foot basket.

Therefore, the defensive man would be forced to play back further away from the basket to get this rebound. Now, if an arched ball should miss the basket and fall to the floor a fast, speedy man could lay in and capture the ball before the big, husky fellow could move from his position and secure possession of the falling sphere. I believe that you can visualize this point.