Toquir Manaino

1100 To Mionigan Aveo

Lour Dalpha

I was interested in your Sports Poll, and there are some things that I would like to say about it. First, I have never recommended a 12 feet goal for high school players. This is always the way when you do recommend senething for college players - there is always an erreneous impression that carries over in some other field of activity. But for college players, men of maturity, when they reach such heights as the tall player new pessesses, them I can see mething sacred about the height of a 10 feet basket. There is no reason in the world why it should not be changed.

I was rather interested in the AP article out of New York last might in which Henry Iba, the coach of Cklahema A. & M., with his 7 feet Beb Kurland, and Jee Lapchick, coach of St. John's College, with his 6 feet mine inch Harry Beykeff, came out against the gealtending type of defense. Sure, both coaches used this style of play because it is prefitable. But the geal-tending is only half of the story; the geal-dunking is the other half of the story, and that is where the rule-makers have made an unconstitutional rule according to any law in the land. It is discriminatory and therefore could not held in a court of law nor should it held in a court of fair reasoning.

The discrimination I speak of is discrimination in favor of the offense. If the ball is on the rim of the backet the effensive man may push it in, strike the ball, but it in, or strike the rim when he dunks his arm about eight inches through the rim with the ball, and the goal counts in all of these situations.

But a defensive man guarding the goal may not tap the ball or reach over the perpendicular plane of the backet in knocking the ball away from the hoop. Again, if the ball should be on the edge of the basket and the defensive man should knock it off or touch the goal two points are secred for the effensive side.

Do you not agree with me that that is discrimination for - in the one case, and against in the other?