

Others involved in the game should be of more assistance to the officials, but this has been difficult since good sportsmanship frowns upon criticism by coaches, players, fans, and sportswriters. Many times a hint dropped by a coach that a few decisions have been wrong is misinterpreted by the official who feels that his high percentage of correct decisions have been overlooked. To avoid this coaches uniformly say little and often leave the impression that a poorly handled game has been worked all right. Thus, much criticism of constructive nature has been lost.

We have given fully to legislation and technique but have fallen down on administrative features. Lack of emphasis is responsible. Our discussions have dealt with rule changes and player performances. Enough has been accomplished along these lines to permit a digesting and assimilation of what we now have rather than to seek for bizarre and untried changes. Members of this Association might well concentrate on improving the administration of basketball.

IS BASKETBALL GOING BACKWARDS?

During the first two decades of the life of basketball three organizations; the A.A.U., the Y.M.C.A., and the N.C.A.A., independently sponsored the spread of the game. Each adopted rules fitted to its membership, and gradually these regulations became so different that confusion reigned. So seriously was the welfare of basketball threatened that a compromise was effected by the formation of a Joint Rules Committee with each of these organizations equally represented. Except for the time length of periods fitted to the younger players, the game has been uniform for all competition in amateur circles since the committee was formed. This uniformity has been a contributing factor in the tremendous growth of the game.

From the outside only one incident has marred the apparent harmony among the rules makers. In the late 20's the representatives of the A.A.U. and the Y.M.C.A. united to out vote the N.C.A.A. men on the question of limitation of the dribble. The announcement brought protests from the nation's coaches who not only opposed the change but resented such a dictatorial attitude. A coaches indignation meeting was held in Des Moines and an organized drive to check the arbitrary changes was instituted. From that temporary organization came this Association which has attempted to cooperate with the code drafters in an advisory capacity.

Later the high schools formed a National Federation and united in a demand for more direct power in the regulation of the most popular game played by their students. That they deserved such recognition was so obvious the committee, with a minimum of public commotion, made places for high school representatives by reducing the number of members from the A.A.U. and the Y.M.C.A. Last year the National Basketball Rules Committee was composed of eight men from the N.C.A.A.; four from the high schools; and two each from the A.A.U., Y.M.C.A., and Canada.

At the annual meeting of the committee last spring the men from the A.A.U., and the Y.M.C.A. "took a walk". Then they met, formed a new National Rules Committee, and issued their own set of rules. A variety of reasons have been offered for the rebellion, but the main one seems to be a jealousy of the power held by the N.C.A.A. Coaches, on the whole, know so little of the internal bickerings of the rules makers that they have evinced no concern over revolt, but the possibilities of future trouble for basketball are so great that it cannot be ignored.

Right now there is only one major difference in the two sets of rules. The N.C.A.A.-High School regulations apply the three second limitation to the whole freethrow lane and circle as was done last year. The A.A.U. - Y.M.C.A. rules modify that section by including only that part of the lane and circle that lies between the freethrow line and the end line. The difference may be important but certainly is not drastic enough to justify a basketball civil war.