

Tower: "I am not attempting to influence the decisions of this organization in any manner, but I am merely trying to point out what I think has been the intent of the rules committee. What Mr. Bunn's reading to you has been the interpretation of the committee in the past, and I think it is an attempt to harmonize the New York group's attitude with that of the rest of the country, because although I have been in agreement with the great majority of the country on this matter of screening, I can see some point, a strong point, in the argument of the New York group. I find that parts of the country have interpreted this statement to the effect that a player is entitled to take a position on the floor not occupied by another player in an extreme way, and that is where the New York group hits a weakness. As that play was illustrated, I think that matter of proximity had a good deal to do with it. If I come up as close as this, I have taken a position not occupied by another player, but I am so close he cannot make a normal movement of his body without hitting me, and if I take that position I am responsible for the foul. The rule does not say merely a position not occupied by another player, but it says "not occupied by another player, provided personal contact does not ensue." If I take a position here, I am impeding his normal bodily movement and I am responsible. If I am a yard away, I am not impeding his normal movement. He has an opportunity to avoid me; and under the formal interpretation, it is his duty to avoid the contact. "There is one phase of it, if accepted, that meets one objection that the New York group has to the interpretation made in other parts of the country, and of course, it is a legitimate objection."

Following another brief demonstration, the meeting adjourned at noon until 2:00 p.m. that afternoon.

At the afternoon meeting Dr. George Edwards said that Norgrin brought up a point that morning when he stated that a man cannot screen from the rear; he must screen from the side. He pointed out that in the Temple Oilers game in New York City, the Oiler center was fouled three times for screening a man he didn't even know was there.

In a discussion that followed, Frank Keaney of Rhode Island State, said that: "An ideal solution would be to accept Mr. Tower's version of face-guarding, blocking, and screening."

A motion: "A player is entitled to take any position on the court not occupied by another player, provided that this position is not closer than approximately three feet to an opponent, that contact ensues when the opponent makes normal bodily movements," was carried. It was said that "position" takes care of side, rear, or back.

A motion, "A player is entitled to take any position on the court not occupied by another player, provided that this position is not taken in the path of a moving opponent so quickly that the latter cannot avoid contact," was explained through a demonstration.

Mr. Tower: "I have taken a position not occupied by another player, but in doing that, I have caused contact and the foul is on me. The fundamental is that I am permitted to take a position on the court not occupied by another player, provided I take that position without causing contact, it is legal, but if I do cause contact, the foul is on me. He couldn't possibly avoid running into me, because I jumped in there so quickly. In this case, I jumped in and am stationary. Some parts of the country have taken the position that because I have taken the position not occupied by another player, and am stationary, he was responsible for the contact."