

September 16, 1943.

Miss Janie Chiles,  
Independence, Missouri.

Dear Miss Janie:

Some one very kindly sent me the Section B sheet of the Independence Examiner as of Friday, September 10. This page carried a very fine tribute to your wonderful teaching skill and exceptional personality.

I read the paragraph where I was not one of the recalcitrants. Really, Miss Janie, I thought I was. I think I caused you a lot of grief, but it is a wonderful thing that when a person grows older the memories of the rascal who caused you so much trouble become dim with forgiveness.

I want to congratulate you on the exceptional record that you made and the wonderful contribution that you rendered to youth in Independence. You are a symbol of friendliness and cooperative endeavor. And my wish for you is that you have many, many more days to remember the lovely things of life which you always exemplified.

With all good wishes, I am,

Sincerely, Your admirer,

FCA:AH

Director of Physical Education,  
Varsity Basketball Coach.



# Miss Janie Chiles Reminisces Over Forty Years of Teaching

**Chrisman Mathematics Instructor, While Admitting the Profession Actually Chose Her, Says She Would "Do the Same Thing Again"—Numbers Hundreds of Successful Business and Professional Men as Pupils.**

"Would I choose teaching again, if I could go back and start over?" Miss Janie Chiles, mathematics instructor at the William Chrisman High School, smiled at her questioner and in her eyes was the same youthful twinkle which has sparkled fondly for each of the hundreds of pupils whose careers she has helped to shape in the forty-two years that she has served the Independence school system.

"Of course I would choose teaching again. I enjoy the work and refuse to think too much about the years that have passed, so my contact with the continually flowing stream of young people keeps me at least from feeling old."

"But," she smiled reminiscently, "I really didn't choose teaching, anyway, in the first place. The job chose me. I had thought about the possibility, of course, and felt sure I would like to be a teacher. I had graduated from Woodland College in Independence and had helped to some extent in instructing undergraduates at the school. But it was when President C. A. Wood of Kansas City Junior College wrote Prof. George S. Bryant, the head of Woodland College of his need of an instructor and Prof. Bryant recommended me that I suddenly fell into the profession."

"Miss Janie," as she is affectionately called by her myriads of alumni and alumnae in Independence and all over the country, taught for a short period at Junior College and showed such efficiency in her work that J. N. Patrick, then superintendent of schools in Independence, asked her to come here to teach and she ac-

even a guess as to how many of the city's children she had taught in her years in the school system, but jokingly said, "Why, it seems to me that I have taught at one time or another nearly everyone in town."

She remembers especially some of the members of her first class at the old Ott School. Dr. Forrest C. (Phog) Allen, nationally known director of athletics at the University of Kansas, was a member of that class and while a large number of recalcitrants did find a place in her room, Miss Janie says that he definitely was not one of them. She also remembers that Floyd Burrus, who now lives at the corner of River Boulevard and Van Horn Road, was one of her pupils at that time.

Miss Janie remained at the Ott School only two terms when she was moved to the Central High School in the old Junior High School building which burned a few years ago. During her first year there she taught both English and history but after that term she was assigned to teach mathematics and has been teaching high school students the intricacies of algebra, geometry and trigonometry ever since.

Dr. Paul Rider, professor of mathematics at Washington University at St. Louis for many years and now an exchange professor teaching at the University of Mexico, is among the famous men she has helped along the way. Lawrence Gregg, with the Bethlehem Steel Company, is another of her pupils who has made good.

Marion Crews, representative of the Boeing Aircraft Corporation at Wright Field, Dayton, Ohio, was one of her finest pupils. He received his high school diploma about the year that the William Chrisman High School was completed and the old building was given over to the use of the board as a junior high school.

sat at her feet and learned the principles which keep their businesses solvent. Among these are C. C. and Albert Bundschu, Melvin and Carl Knoepker, Kenneth Bostian, Renick Jones, a member of the City Council, Harry Sturges, Frank Livesay, and many, many others.

"In fact," said Miss Janie, despairingly, "if I tried to name them all I would be sure to miss someone, so I simply won't try. I am glad to have known them all and to have had the privilege of teaching them and their children."

And then Miss Janie told an anecdote which illustrates one of the realities of life which should lend encouragement to the many pupils who are not quite as quick in mathematical matters as some of their brighter schoolmates.

"In spite of the fact," she said, "that I have seen many of my boys and girls go out and make marks for themselves, a pupil in whose achievements I take especial pride was a big, slow fellow who had a very difficult time keeping up with his work.

"For some reason this boy wanted to study engineering, and as I could see little hope of his success in that field, I tried to dissuade him and advised against his making that his specialty. But he was determined and used to come to my home evenings and together we would wrestle with his difficulty in grasping the fundamentals of mathematics.

"Up to the time of his graduation from the high school he never quite found himself, but he persisted, attending a junior college and later a university, always with his ultimate goal before him.

"And then one day into the office of the principal of the high school came a letter from the university where that slow boy was a student, saying that he had become one of the most outstanding engineering students ever to study at that great state educational institution.

"When you see things like that happen," Miss Janie said, with a satisfied air, "you can't help feeling that the work of a teacher



cepted the position.

"Supt. Patrick left Independence during the period between that and the opening of the next fall term and G. M. Holliday took his place. I was assigned to teach in the old Ott School and when Supt. Holliday noticed that I had had some success with a few of what were termed 'bad boys,' he gathered, it seemed to me, all of the incorrigibles in the system and brought them to my room for me to teach."

And here Miss Janie paused to philosophize a little. "I have noticed one queer thing," she said. "It is usually the so-called bad boys rather than the good ones who come back and tell a teacher how much they appreciate the work she tried to do with them."

"Why, only recently I received a motto bearing a message of 'Friendship' from a boy who failed repeatedly and who came to my home many evenings to try to make a passing grade. "Why," Miss Janie chuckled, "I almost passed him just because he was willing to make the effort."

Miss Janie refused to venture

When the high school moved to its new building, Miss Janie made the fourth move of her long teaching career, but still remained a member of the same faculty. In all of those years and up to the present time she says that she has been blessed with exceptionally good health. Her only illness was from diphtheria, and she had that during the Christmas vacation, therefore missing very few days of school.

Mrs. Ruby Short McKim was a member of Miss Janie's English class in the year before she took up her work as a mathematics instructor.

Mayor Roger T. Sermon learned the principles of mathematics which have served him so well in putting the city on a sound financial basis from Miss Janie. She also taught his son, Roger T., Jr., and says that both were fine pupils. She even suggested that the younger Sermon might have shaded his dad just a little.

Fleming Pendleton, president of the Bank of Independence, learned to figure interest from Miss Janie, and he also serves as a member of the district school board. Two other members, or half of the present Board of Education, Dr. Floyd Yale and Mrs. Howard Hinde, were once members of Miss Chiles' classes.

Others of the present school faculty who used to be her pupils are Marshall Miller, principal of the Junior High School, Miss Nora Witthar, chemistry teacher, and Charles Huhn, coach of athletics at Chrisman.

Intricately woven into the business fabric of this, the Queen City of the Old Trails, are many who

has been well worth while.

"Yes," she said, "if I had the right of choice and could begin over again, I am quite sure that I should choose voluntarily the life mission into which originally I fell by chance."—K. A. M.

---



December 15, 1943.

Mr. Ralph Cannon,  
Esquire Magazine  
919 No. Michigan Ave.,  
Chicago, Illinois.

Dear Ralph:

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 foot goal for high school players. This is always the way when you do recommend something for college players - there is always an erroneous 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 now possesses, then I can see nothing sacred about the height of a 10 foot 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 night in which Henry Iba, the coach of Oklahoma A. & M., with his 7 foot Bob Kurland, and Joe Lapchick, coach of St. John's College, with his 6 foot nine inch Harry Boykeff, came out against the goal-tending type of defense. Sure, both coaches used this style of play because it is profitable. But the goal-tending is only half of the story; the goal-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 hold in a court of law nor should it hold 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 basket the offensive man may push it in, strike the ball, bat 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 basket 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 scored for the offensive side.

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



A higher basket that could not be touched by either player would be just for all concerned. Just because Dr. Naismith tacked the peach hamper on the running track of the gymnasium at Springfield College, Springfield, Mass., and that running track happened to be 10 feet from the floor is the only reason why we have a 10 foot basket at the present time. Why should not the basket be raised with the increasing height of the players? And players in basketball are getting constantly taller all the time.

We played Oklahoma A. & M. two games last year with 7 foot Bob Kurland, and we won both games, so I am not one of these coaches who are crying because we can't beat mezzanine peeping basketball hurdlers, but rather I am thinking of the game. I call these big boys "mezzanine hurdlers" because they are tall enough to touch the mezzanine floor.

It made me laugh audibly to see what some of these coaches said in their objections to a 12 foot basket. One, that it would make a little man shoot further than the taller man. A player shooting for a higher goal accommodates the muscles of his eyes to height the same as a player accommodates his eyes to distance. A player standing 20 feet out on the court and shooting for a 12 foot basket would arch the ball a little higher and further than he would for a 10 foot basket. The same parallel argument is always good when a player is standing 20 feet out on the floor and shooting for a 10 foot basket he will arch the ball a little higher and further than if he were standing out on the floor 15 feet from the basket. A player arching his shot for a 10 foot basket 15 feet out would not arch it as high as he would for a 12 foot basket at the same distance.

Some coaches have raised the objection that a short man going in for a lay-up would be forced to jump two feet higher, which would be a disadvantage to a small man. This shows one thing, Ralph, 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 shoot at a 12 foot basket and none of them could accomplish a lay-in on account of the height. The poorest place to shoot at a 12 foot basket would be directly underneath the goal. That is emphatically the strong point of the 12 foot basket - in that they may not dunk it in the basket nor bat it away.

A hard drive toward the basket which produces 80 per cent of all the fouls by the defense in basketball are made for this very obvious reason -- because a player driving in for the basket is fouled or draws a pair of fouls 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 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.

The added height of the basket would measurable clear up the congestion that always exists under the 10 foot basket. The big, rugged guard who sets himself to block out the incoming man and the tall mezzanine hurdler who camps near the basket would of necessity have to move back on account of the higher arc of dispersement of the bounding ball from a 12 foot basket. Therefore, it would clear up that congested area, and it would give the shorter man a decided advantage because when a ball is arched for the goal, if by striking the basket the arc of dispersement would cause a further rebounding of the ball, the big man moves back away from the basket. Then the small man, should the ball miss the basket and drop down to the floor, could dart in and quickly steal the ball before the big man could cover this added space that he now protects and reserves for himself under this lower basket. By forcing the defensive man further back and away from the basket it would naturally give the shorter and speedier man more area to operate in without molestation. I believe that you can easily visualize this point. It would also strike a blow at the zone defense.

Many of these proponents of the 10 foot basket who are opponents of the 12 foot basket remind me of a young short-sighted farmer east of Kansas City who complained that his father was the most short-sighted business man that he had ever seen. He left him five hundred acres of the finest farming land in Jackson County that was worth a thousand dollars an acre. But the son complained that the father did not leave him one darned thing to farm it with. That remind me of these basketball coaches who would much rather inherit a tall player after their annual intensive search for mezzanine hurdlers than they would actually go to the trouble to install a 12 foot basket and try the game out under these conditions.

I believe that I can say without fear of contradiction that not ten per cent of all the coaches of the United States have seen a 12 foot basket. Therefore, some of these coaches who have derived their life income from the game have never put anything into it but have been constantly taking out. They sit around and complain about their players going out on four personal fouls, and yet they do no more about improving the game or correcting the difficulty, (than this Jackson County farmer.)

We have two 12 foot baskets in our gymnasium, and have had them installed for fifteen years. We use them for the purpose of teaching our players correct arching of the ball. And as for the cost of raising a goal two feet - that is a rare joke. Most goals are suspended from the ceiling and all you would have to do is shorten the pipe two feet. The bill for basketballs each year double exceeds the cost of raising the basket to 12 feet, so this plea for economy is rare. These coaches speak as if the cost of raising the baskets would come out of their own pockets and just try to get it from them.

*you*



Now, again, may I emphasize that I would not suggest the 12 foot basket for high school players because many of the gymnasiums in the East do have low ceilings, but this is not true in the West, and there is not a college gymnasium in America or a large auditorium in the big cities that holds any sizeable crowd but what could stand a 12 foot goal elevation without any difficulty. And by asking a raise to 12 feet this even keeps the 7 foot 6 inch player shooting for a goal and not dunking a goal. This height basket would for all time seal the gate of the gangling, inept player; but for the good, big, tall man - he would still be in the game and he could pass and shoot along with the rest of them. The premium on height would not amount to the great advantage that it does at the present time under the 10 foot basket.

There are some conferences so unprogressive that they are still using the "horse-and-buggy" four by six backboard rather than the new stream-lined board. Maybe some of these fellows couldn't hit a stream-lined board and they need that large area to stop the ball from going out of bounds. And the joke of it is that the board was never put up for a rebound board by Dr. Naismith, but rather it was to keep the spectators away from the basket. They would reach over the balcony and kick or knock the ball away from the basket, so they built a wooden barrier large enough to keep the crowd away, which proved to be the four by six backboard. Anyhow, the Big Ten and some of the unprogressive conferences still need that backboard to keep their players from throwing the ball out of bounds.

Much of this backboard is unfertile banking area and it obstructs the view of more than fifty per cent of the people who sit behind it. Olson says, "The worth of the 12 foot basket has not been demonstrated in connection with the tall 'geon' problem, and such a change would have many disadvantages -- chiefly the expense of changing the height of baskets all over the country at a terrific total cost." As if this large backboard if not obstructing the view of many people in many of the high schools who pay their good money to see the game and yet sit behind this large obstructing surface without anything being done about it. Certainly the expenditure of the people who pay to see a game and fail to see it far surmounts the so-called terrific total cost that Mr. Olson speaks about of raising the basket; and yet we are not asking that they raise the basket for high school boys but for college mezzanine hurdlers. I do not call these boys "geons". I think it is an unfair misnomer. Some of the finest athletes that I have seen have been boys over six feet six inches tall. "Mezzanine Hurdlers" seems to me a mere polite appellation.

Facetiously I might suggest that in your questionnaire you ask the public, the sportscasters and the sports editors how many 12 foot baskets they have ever seen. There are none in the Smithsonian Institute, but we have two here in Robinson Gymnasium. Then if you want to get a thousand per cent negative answer ask how many coaches have actually put up a 12 foot basket and played a game under these conditions.

It is interesting to note that in your questionnaire 52.14 per cent of the public voted for a higher basket. Doubtless the sportscasters and



the sports editors were tinctured by the opinion of many of the coaches who doubtless had expressed their opinion on the 12 foot basket to the sportscasters and the sports editors. I ask how otherwise would the sportscasters and the sports editors know, unless they were just guessing it wouldn't be a good thing, because I am sure they haven't seen any 12 foot baskets.

Many Mark Cox has seen a pair. If he hasn't his guess on the baskets would be as good as the fact when he said the Eastern Intercollegiate play-offs were played in Independence Hall in Philadelphia in his article in Esquire.

You mentioned several of the coaches who were against the raising of the 12 foot basket. Wouldn't it have been fair to have mentioned more than Ward Lambert as favoring the idea - say Henry Iba, Bruce Drake, and a score of others?

The elevated basket will come as sure as death and taxes. There is no way that these administrators can frame a rule that will not be discriminatory and I am going to get a great chuckle out of watching these boys that oppose a 12 foot basket view these 7 foot boys like Kurland. In their confusion they wouldn't know what to do, and they get licked. However, there is a way to beat a team with a 7 foot player but you have to spend many weeks in preparing for just that one team and one player. We will beat many teams with tall players and we have had very few tall centers. So I am not kicking on my own personal account, but I am endeavoring to improve the game. And please remember that there is no 12 foot basket suggestion for high school players, - just for college and independent teams.

With all good wishes, I am

Sincerely yours,

Director of Physical Education  
Varsity Basketball Coach.

FCA:AH

P.S. My suggestion always has been if and when such a rule should be enacted in elevating the basket that there should be a moratorium of three years in order to permit any player new in the game full play under the 10 foot basket. The incoming tall players would naturally play under the new rule. Also, the free throw is suggested from a distance of 20 feet on account of the increased height of the basket making the trajectory easier for the thrower.

F.C.A.



# BROOKLYN DODGERS FOOTBALL CLUB

Follow the Dodgers!



REPRESENTING BROOKLYN IN THE NATIONAL FOOTBALL LEAGUE

TELEPHONE  
TRIANGLE 5-9092

215 MONTAGUE ST.  
BROOKLYN 2, N.Y.

May 11, 1944

Mr. Forrest C. Allen  
Kansas University  
Lawrence, Kans.

Dear Mr. Allen:

Permit me to thank you for your telegram in response to ours concerning your ex-players who were in the draft list. This was helpful to our management in making choices of players. It is greatly appreciated and I hope you will call on me when I can do a favor for you.

Here is hoping that things will move along smoothly for you this fall during these unsettled days.

Will all best personal wishes,

Sincerely yours,

A blue ink handwritten signature that reads "Pete".

Pete W. Cawthon  
Coach

PWC/lt



April 17, 1944.

Mr. B. W. Crone,  
Associated Press Office,  
Kansas City Star Building,  
Kansas City, Missouri.

Dear B. W.:

Confirming our conversation of Saturday, I am sending you my statement concerning my opinion of the new rules promulgated by the basketball rules committee of the N.C.A.A.

The so-called Goal Tending rule, or the rule Against the Defensive Player Touching the Ball on its Downward Flight: This rule previously forbade the defensive man from touching the ball while the ball was on the rim of the basket or while the ball was above the perpendicular cylinder of the basket. This new rule substitutes the one just mentioned. I am going into a little detail with you for fear you might not have followed all of the angles of the new rule. The rule-framers had in mind that if this defensive player touched the ball while the ball was in its downward flight this would correct all the trouble, but it will not because we have run tests on this rule.

At a clinic meeting at Cedar Rapids, Iowa, the other day I had the boys shoot for the basket and did not tell them what I had in mind. A group of us studied the ball when it started on its downward flight. We found that a tall player standing in front of the basket and moving to either side could intercept most of the balls before they started on the downward flight because the impetus was given to the ball to carry to the basket, and many shots that would carry to or over the basket were still going up in their flight from the floor. Only the ball with a very high arch would begin its descent before it got above the plane of the basket.

Therefore, my comment, I think, is well taken.

The New Injury Rule, permitting the Official to call Time Out for Injury for Either Side: This rule has been tried before and found wanting.

The Unlimited Substitution Rule: This has always been a good rule, but the basketball rules committee was afraid to put it in even after the football rules committee had done so. My criticism of the rules committee being susceptible to pressure groups is shown by their slow action in this rule. The fact that football with more than twice the number of people participating could have adopted it for



several years without much criticism shows that basketball could have done so with profit much sooner. I have contended for this rule for a number of years because the crowd was always "on" the coach because they claimed he was coaching from the sideline. By permitting unlimited substitution and permitting this fellow to communicate with his fellows immediately upon going on the floor removed the criticism of coaching from the sideline. The master-minding of coaches is done away with by this rule.

The Personal Fouls Rule, permitting an increase from four to five, is a necessity because the rules committee by the elimination of the center jump had made it such a wild game that no good official can officiate the game properly.

I explained to you Saturday that the high school commissioners or executive secretaries have been asked by a certain publication of wide circulation to express their views. I told you off the record that these high school people are taking a hand in the matter because they do not like the "whittling remedy" that the rules committee has dished out to them. They are favoring a conscientious study of the game in an endeavor to eliminate as many of the inequalities of the game as possible. They state, "We high school fellows have been thinking about certain desirable changes for some time but have taken no active part in the controversy of higher goals and the curbing of the performances of the extra long boy. Since the rules committee has acted, however, it appears to me that the subject is as much ours for consideration as it is for anyone else. I am not endeavoring to agree with anyone in his particular view. All of us are entitled to our own views provided we are honest about them and use ordinary judgment in presenting them. This I have tried to keep in mind in preparing this article."

The point that I brought forth in my conversation is that there seems to be wide unrest among the high school people, and since they are unhappy they doubtless will do a lot of researching on their own account.

I purposely have stayed out of any suggestion for higher goals for high school people feeling that we college people had no right to suggest rules for them. But they have taken the initiative now and they want some questions answered from their angle. Therefore, I am sending you in confidence some of the questions that they want answered. I do not want you to publish the questions they have asked, but I am sending them to you to show you that they are moving in their questions, at least, toward the very thing that I have contended all the time -- that the only fair way to meet this situation and to not discriminate against anyone, is to raise the goal. According to their communication I am submitting in confidence these questions.

"Here are a few of the questions that should be answered:  
1. Is it desirable that the game of basketball provide, as nearly as possible, equality of opportunity for all players?"



2. Does the present 10-foot basket give the extra tall boy an abnormal advantage over his opponents of reasonable and average height?
3. Is there anything sacred about the 10-foot basket now in use? If so, how was it decided that ten feet is the proper height?
4. Would those who oppose a higher basket also oppose a lower basket? If so, would their objection be that it would give the tall players too much advantage? (It should be observed that the 10-foot basket provides more advantage to the tall player now than a basket nine feet, six inches high would have provided twenty-five years ago).
5. If it is desirable to neutralize the advantage to the tall player, is there any way to do it except to raise the basket to a height that will not permit interference with opponents' bona fide shots and will not permit tall players to 'jump up and drop it in' without any chance of interference by shorter opponents?
6. Will it remove the abnormal advantage to the tall player if the baskets are raised so that every goal scored will have to be the result of a 'shot' whereby the 'shooter' must throw the ball at the basket and not merely 'lay it in'?
7. Will the raising of the baskets take away from the game some of the spectacular plays now enjoyed by players and spectators?
8. Does the rules committee have in mind further changes that will curb the offensive activities of the long, tall boys in order to compensate for curtailment of possible defensive demonstrations?

After the war there will be thousands of high school gymnasiums and athletic plants built. The old style low-ceiling basketball court will be entirely passe within a few years. Provisions for greater seating space will be necessary and if there are to be other requirements for more floor space, higher basketball goals, or any other facilities, then we should begin our plans to get ready for them and the basketball rules committee should act in a positive, educational way to solve the pending problems that will confront us, instead of resorting to negative performances of the new 'whittling' variety. "

Last week on April 12 "Dutch" Lonborg, one of my old players and captain of my University of Kansas basketball team in 1920, came out with the statement from Chicago that he didn't think the officials would have such a terrible time and thought the rules were pretty good. While on the other hand, Nick Kearns, veteran mid-western official from Chicago, denounced the rules the day before stating that the changes are placing too heavy a burden on the official. "Dutch" stated, "It is okay. It will de-emphasize offenses built around the tall boy and at the same time forces coaches to discard defenses which employ goalies. No coach will use a set up which might cost him five or six baskets in a single game."



I maintain that the coaches will still employ the goalie, using the theory that the officials won't bother about many of the questionable plays because they will be too busy with the boys making fouls on the floor. And too, they can bat away fifteen or twenty shots which might find lodgment in the basket while taking a chance on being penalized two or three times during the game. In other words, there is a certain football philosophy among a certain group of coaches that it is better to take a chance on being caught holding on an end run once or twice in a game while getting by with interference that may net three or four touchdowns during a game. I think you get my point, do you not?

It is going to have to be a sure shot situation before the officials will rule against the ball when they must be positive it is on its downward arc.

If there is anything that is not clear to you, please feel perfectly free to call me at K.U. 83 and I will endeavor to elucidate.

Very sincerely yours,

Director of Physical Education,  
Varsity Basketball Coach.

FCA:AH



Defensive player forbidden to touch ball on downward flight -

The National Basket Ball Rules Committee at their last meeting proved itself to be a "model" rules Committee - see Webster - "a model is a small imitation of the real thing. The Rules Body temporized.

They did not meet issues squarely. The Rules Committee did nothing about the extremely tall player on the offense. But they humored a pressure group <sup>which</sup> ~~that~~ protested against the giant goal tender on defense. Symptomatically they dabbled awkwardly in the same direction of their mistakes the previous year. Why discriminate against the defense while permitting full freedom to the offense as the <sup>same</sup> ~~rule~~ <sup>in principle</sup> ~~rule~~ <sup>rule</sup> both baskets. extremely tall player under ~~the~~ <sup>an</sup> ~~rule~~ <sup>rule</sup>

The newly enacted goal tending rule will be only about ten percent efficient. I predict that Hank Iba and other crafty coaches with goal tending giants will still place their goal tenders <sup>in front and</sup> under the defensive basket. Had the Rules Committee members done any research <sup>previous to their</sup> ~~hasty~~ <sup>hasty</sup> action



Insert A

Few officials will bother themselves regarding the questionable arc of the ball when they are paid to watch the actions of the players for fouls and violations on the floor. Certainly this distraction of the officials eyes away from the playing floor cannot improve the calibre of this already difficult game to officiate.

Nick Kearns  
Dutch Loubanq



2.

and studied the flight of the ball toward the basket  
- they would have discovered that an extremely tall  
player can still steal most shots before the  
ball gets to the basket. The ball does not begin  
its downward arc <sup>generally</sup> until it gets above the basket.  
most players shoot "skimmers" - low shots -  
just clearing the rim. The ball leaves the  
players hands, at a height of less than six feet  
and the basket is ten feet high, hence tall  
defensive players will get the ball while it is <sup>still</sup> going up.  
offensive shooters cannot readily learn a  
new arch shot just for the benefit of the  
hyper-tall goal tender without seriously  
affecting their shooting accuracy.

<sup>affecting</sup> <sup>insert</sup> A → I challenge the <sup>read</sup> ~~National~~ Basketball Rules  
Committee or the National Coaches Assn. to show  
me substantial research of project accomplished  
in the past ten years.  
Freeze the rules for a three year period  
with the intention of ~~appointing~~ <sup>formulating</sup> a research  
committee for intelligent rules study and research.  
Instead of the <sup>N.C.A.A.</sup> confiscating the  
major portion of the basket ball receipts for  
a "hobby pot," insist that a Basket Ball  
Foundation be formed with research by  
competent full time men to study the ~~viability~~  
vital needs of the game.



Time Out injury Either side rule 3 -

The new injury rule is an old rule in a new garb. There was a time when <sup>wily</sup> ~~crafty~~ and <sup>unprincipled</sup> coaches taught their players to fake injuries when the opponents had the ball in a favorable scoring position. The rule had to be changed to the one just abolished, since officials cannot rule on intent, doubtless this new rule will plague the officials and rule makers before many months.

Unlimited Substitution Rule - Basketball  
Again the rules committee has been fast asleep on the free substitution rule. Football has had <sup>it</sup> in operation for several years using double the number of players with splendid success. This long over due rule will take the curse off of ~~the~~ the so called ~~side line~~ coaching from the bench. With players substituting freely the master minding of the coach is reduced to a minimum.

Personal Fouls to 5.

As a case in point of treating symptoms <sup>rule</sup> instead of intelligently studying <sup>the cause</sup> the elimination of the center jump <sup>rule</sup> I wish to cite the members who advocated these rule changes. The center jump elimination claimed that the rule would drive the exceptionally tall player out of the game. All the rule makers did was to add more out of bounds plays to the already too many and in addition they created this fire wagon, <sup>Larum</sup> <sup>scam</sup>



4

type of game that has placed a heavier burden on the poor officials. As now played the game leaves the players, officials and spectators fatigued and dizzy after forty minutes of hectic, kaleidoscopic, shuttle-~~basket~~ hockeyed basket ball jargon. And ~~the rules body~~ <sup>with them</sup> have a taller fellow than they had ever dreamed, together with a game that cannot be well officiated. Maybe six or eight personal fouls <sup>allowed</sup> would be the just and proper limit considering the conditions of the game.

Certainly the elimination of the center jump was not the answer for the <sup>equalization</sup> ~~standardization~~ of this Gargantuan player who possesses such an unequal advantage under a low basket.

Before the N.C.A.A. Basket Ball Rules Committee treats symptoms again without research or study suppose we freeze the rules before more blunders are made.

Science has now discovered a growth hormone which makes ordinary rats grow to about the size of small dogs. These growth hormones without doubt will be in great demand. Some basket ball coaches doubtless will feed them to their altitudinous behemoths with the idea of developing a flock of basket ball drinkers. Instead I would feed the growth hormones to the ten foot basket with the idea of increasing the height a couple of feet.



GOAL TENDING  
or  
DEFENSIVE PLAYER FORBIDDEN TO TOUCH BALL ON DOWNWARD FLIGHT

The National Basketball Rules Committee at their last meeting proved itself to be a "model" rules committee - see Webster - "a model is a small imitation of the real thing". The rules body temporized. They did not meet issues squarely.

The rules committee did nothing about the extremely tall player on the offense. But they humored a pressure group which protested against the giant goal tender on defense. Symptomatically they dabbled awkwardly in the same direction of their mistakes the previous year. Why discriminate against the defense while permitting full freedom to the offense as the same rule concerns in principle the extremely tall player under both baskets.

The newly exacted goal tending rule will be only about ten per cent efficient. I predict that Hank Iba and other crafty coaches with goal tending giants will still place their goal tenders in front and under the defensive basket.

Had the rules committee members done any research previous to their hasty action and studied the flight of the ball toward the basket they would have discovered that an extremely tall player can still steal most shots before the ball gets to the basket. The ball does not begin its downward arc generally until it gets above the basket.

Most players shoot "skimmers" - low shots - just clearing the rim. The ball leaves the players hands at a height of less than six feet and the basket is ten feet high, hence tall defensive players will get the ball while it is still going up. Offensive shooters cannot readily learn a new arch shot just for the benefit of the hyper-tall goal tender without seriously affecting their shooting accuracy.



Few officials will bother themselves regarding the questionable are of the ball when they are paid to watch the action of the players for fouls and violations on the floor. Certainly this distraction of the officials' eyes away from the playing floor cannot improve the calibre of this already difficult game to officiate.

I challenge the NCAA basketball rules committee or the National Coaches Association to show one substantial research project accomplished in the past ten years.

Freeze the rules for a three-year period with the intention of formulating a research committee for intelligent rules study and research. Instead of the NCAA confiscating the major portion of the basketball gate receipts for a "hobby pot", insist that a Basketball Foundation be formed with research by competent full-time men to study the vital needs of the game.

THE NEW INJURY RULE PERMITTING THE OFFICIAL TO CALL TIME OUT  
FOR INJURY FOR EITHER SIDE

The new injury rule is an old rule in a new garb. There was a time when wily and unprincipled coaches taught their players to fake injuries when the opponents had the ball in a favorable scoring position. The rule had to be changed to the one just abolished. Since officials cannot rule on intent, doubtless this new rule will plague the officials and rule makers before many months.

UNLIMITED SUBSTITUTION RULE

Again the basketball rules committee has been fast asleep on the free substitution rule. Football has had it in operation for several years using double the number of players with splendid success. This long overdue rule will take the curse off of the so-called coaching from the bench. With players substituting freely the master minding of the coach is reduced to a minimum.



## PERSONAL FOULS TO FIVE

As a case in point of treating symptoms instead of intelligently studying the causes, I wish to cite the elimination of the center Jump rule as an example. These rule committee members who advocated the center jump elimination claimed that the rule would drive the exceptionally tall player out of the game. All the rule makers did was to add more out of bound plays to the already too many and in addition they created this fire wagon, harum-scarum type of game that has placed a heavier burden on the poor officials. As now played the game leaves the players, officials and spectators fatigued and dizzy after forty minutes of kaleidoscopic, shuttle-hockeyized basketball jargon.

And the rules body now have with them a taller fellow than they had ever dreamed, together with a game that cannot be well officiated. Maybe six or eight personal foul allowed would be the just and proper limit considering the conditions of the game.

Certainly the elimination of the center jump was not the answer for the equalization of this gargantuan player who possesses such an unequal advantage under a low basket. Before the NCAA Basketball Rules Committee treats symptoms again without research or study suppose we freeze the rules before more blunders are made.

Science has now discovered a growth hormone which makes ordinary rats grow to about the size of small dogs. These growth hormones without doubt will be in great demand. Some basketball coaches doubtless will feed them to their altitudinous behemoths with the idea of developing a flock of basketball dunkers. Instead, I would feed the growth hormones to the ten foot basket with the idea of increasing the height a couple of feet.



GOAL TENDING  
OF  
DEFENSIVE PLAYER FORBIDDEN TO TOUCH BALL ON DOWNWARD FLIGHT

The National Basketball Rules Committee at their last meeting proved itself to be a "model" rules committee - see Webster - "a model is a small imitation of the real thing". The rules body temporized. They did not meet issues squarely.

The rules committee did nothing about the extremely tall player on the offense. But they humored a pressure group which protested against the giant goal tender on defense. Symptomatically they dabbled awkwardly in the same direction of their mistakes the previous year. Why discriminate against the defense while permitting full freedom to the offense as the same rule concerns in principle the extremely tall player under both baskets.

The newly enacted goal tending rule will be only about ten per cent efficient. I predict that Hank Iba and other crafty coaches with goal tending giants will still place their goal tenders in front and under the defensive basket.

Had the rules committee members done any research previous to their hasty action and studied the flight of the ball toward the basket they would have discovered that an extremely tall player can still steal most shots before the ball gets to the basket. The ball does not begin its downward arc generally until it gets above the basket.

Most players shoot "skimmers" - low shots - just clearing the rim. The ball leaves the players hands at a height of less than six feet and the basket is ten feet high, hence tall defensive players will get the ball while it is still going up. Offensive shooters cannot readily learn a new arch shot just for the benefit of the hyper-tall goal tender without seriously affecting their shooting accuracy.



Few officials will bother themselves regarding the questionable are of the ball when they are paid to watch the action of the players for fouls and violations on the floor. Certainly this distraction of the officials' eyes away from the playing floor cannot improve the calibre of this already difficult game to officiate.

I challenge the NCAA basketball rules committee or the National Coaches Association to show one substantial research project accomplished in the past ten years.

Freeze the rules for a three-year period with the intention of formulating a research committee for intelligent rules study and research. Instead of the NCAA confiscating the major portion of the basketball gate receipts for a "hobby pot", insist that a Basketball Foundation be formed with research by competent full-time men to study the vital needs of the game.

#### THE NEW INJURY RULE PERMITTING THE OFFICIAL TO CALL TIME OUT

##### FOR INJURY FOR EITHER SIDE

The new injury rule is an old rule in a new garb. There was a time when wily and unprincipled coaches taught their players to fake injuries when the opponents had the ball in a favorable scoring position. The rule had to be changed to the one just abolished. Since officials cannot rule on intent, doubtless this new rule will plague the officials and rule makers before many months.

##### UNLIMITED SUBSTITUTION RULE

Again the basketball rules committee has been fast asleep on the free substitution rule. Football has had it in operation for several years using double the number of players with splendid success. This long overdue rule will take the curse off of the so-called coaching from the bench. With players substituting freely the master minding of the coach is reduced to a minimum.



## PERSONAL FOULS TO FIVE

As a case in point of treating symptoms instead of intelligently studying the causes, I wish to cite the elimination of the center jump rule as an example. These rule committee members who advocated the center jump elimination claimed that the rule would drive the exceptionally tall player out of the game. All the rule makers did was to add more out of bound plays to the already too many and in addition they created this fire wagon, harum-scarum type of game that has placed a heavier burden on the poor officials. As now played the game leaves the players, officials and spectators fatigued and dizzy after forty minutes of kaleidoscopic, shuttle-hockeyized basketball jargon.

And the rules body now have with them a taller fellow than they had ever dreamed, together with a game that cannot be well officiated. Maybe six or eight personal foul allowed would be the just and proper limit considering the conditions of the game.

Certainly the elimination of the center jump was not the answer for the equalization of this gargantuan player who possesses such an unequal advantage under a low basket. Before the NCAA Basketball Rules Committee treats symptoms again without research or study suppose we freeze the rules before more blunders are made.

Science has now discovered a growth hormone which makes ordinary rats grow to about the size of small dogs. These growth hormones without doubt will be in great demand. Some basketball coaches doubtless will feed them to their altitudinous behemoths with the idea of developing a flock of basketball dunkers. Instead, I would feed the growth hormones to the ten foot basket with the idea of increasing the height a couple of feet.



Goal Tending (1)

or  
Defensive Player Forbidden to Touch  
Ball on Downward Flight

(2)  
The New Injury Rule  
Time Out (Injury) Either Side Rule

(3)  
Unlimited Substitution Rule



4

Personal travels to 5.