

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 backed 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 those 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 makes me laugh audibly to see what some of these coaches say 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, 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