

reduction of scoring is an improvement. Those who wish a higher basket insist that it will equalize the height advantage enjoyed by the tall man; that it will relieve under-basket congestion by causing longer rebounds; that it will stop goal tending and dunking; that shooters will soon adjust to the change and will score readily enough to maintain proper balance between defensive and offensive play. They say, however, that this should apply only to mature players and that high school or college intramural players will definitely find the 12 foot basket a handicap to their play.

Opponents counter with the definite proof that scoring will drop off 30%; that the distance of rebounds is more dependent upon the angle of deflection than on the height of the basket; that goal tending and dunking are now adequately controlled by the rules; that it is unsound to make a change which affects thousands in order to restrict possibly 100 players; that all courts must be prepared for both 12 foot and 10 foot baskets which, aside from the cost, would necessitate adjustable backstops which have been unsatisfactory in all past experience.

Standing between these two groups is the Rules Committee which in an approved democratic procedure calls for votes. Those who believe the present height should not be changed outvote the others by hundreds to one. When and if a czar is given control of athletics, and when dictatorship rules this country we may have a "progressive" committee that will override the wishes of the majority, but in the meantime I will side with the group that holds on to a basket elevation under which a comparatively new game has enjoyed phenomenal growth in popularity.

I will remain opposed to a higher basket, whether or not I am on the Rules Committee, until adherents of the change show statistical proof in the form of thousands of shots taken from a large number of angles and distances by players of a variety of degree of experience, and then amplify this by records taken in a number of games. When such accurately and objectively collected data indicates that a higher basket is an improvement I'll change my support.

9. The present goal tending rule perhaps is discriminatory as you stated. When the change was discussed, though, the only problem presented concerned the defensive actions of the tall men. No objection was raised concerning scoring activities of the tall man since Rule 9, section 9 requires that the hand must be away from the ball when the ball reaches the imaginary cylinder above the basket. Dunking, therefore, when strictly defined is penalized by the rule.

That the taller man should be required to throw the ball still further, at least on pivot turn shots, now appears to be demanded although it was not mentioned as a evil last year. The most prominent suggestion along this line appears to be Hobson's experiment with 12 foot lanes.

10. Your statement that coaches have quit reseach in favor of a search for tall men describes a situation which is not new in basketball. When Dr. Naismith invented a game with elevated goals he placed a premium on height. Other things being equal every coach has attempted to find or to develop the skill of tall players. Two ways to nullify this advantage are (1) place a height limit on team members similar to that done for the cancelled 1940 Olympics; or (2) lower the basket to about 5 feet so all can reach it.