

3, 5, and 6. Your belief that a brief interval following a score would be helpful to the game finds support here. However, my reasons do not parallel yours. I believe it would be worthwhile solely because of its dramatic effect in that it will allow everyone a time to appreciate the making of a score just as a good comedian pauses long enough to let his joke register. Such a pause could be obtained by allowing possession in all cases as the present rules provide, but carry the ball to the center sideline for the pass-in instead from the end line under the basket.

Your suggestion that all free throws follow the technical foul procedure, I am sure, will be met by vigorous objection because it adds a lot to the penalty for a foul by giving not only a chance for the point but definite ball possession to the offended team. The majority, I think, feel that the present punishment of a chance for the point plus the record against the offender is sufficient punishment for a foul.

Perhaps your idea might be incorporated along this line, though. How about using the technical foul regulation when a personal foul has been punished by two free throws?

Also, don't you think that the argument that your proposal is good because it prevents tip-ins following missed free throws would be countered by fact that most of the fouls are called on the guard of the tall man. I recall that Kurland, for instance, was fouled approximately 17 times by Oklahoma. To give the Aggies ball possession whether he made or missed the free throw certainly would have been welcomed by the tall man.

4. The five personal fouls allowed this year was not a confession that the game has become confusing. The reason stressed concerned the additional playing time made possible by modification of the center jump. Under the old jump rules the ball was in play from 20 to 24 minutes. Four fouls thus had a relationship to the playing time of 1 to 5 or 6. Without the jump playing time was increased to about 30 minutes. Thus, five fouls establishes the same time relationship that prevailed previously.

Recently there has been an unfavorable reaction against five fouls. The Questionnaire Committee has called for a statistical study and will probably revote on that rule. Returns from this area indicate a vast majority favoring the five fouls, and I feel obligated to support it.

7. The adoption of uniform jumping situations was tried in K.C. while I coached at Westport, and again in the Big Six. It met with favor in this area but other sections outvoted us. I have presented it every year, and last year obtained the agreement to have it on the questionnaire. I will urge its adoption.

9. Naturally you arouse the ire of all members when you infer that lack of "progressiveness" of the present group prevents elevation of the basket. Adherents of a higher basket have submitted only unproved and untried theories to substantiate their contentions. Opposed to them is one scientific test made by Roy Mundorff that a 12 foot basket reduces scoring accuracy by approximately 30%, and practically eliminates the running lay-in close shot.

Progress, as I understand it, is a movement or action leading to improvement. In common with the vast majority of coaches I don't feel that