

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 measurably 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 reminds 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