

These two teams were distinctive units and in my opinion it is no exaggeration to say that primarily the offensive play of the Western team was responsible for winning the Eastern Athletic Club championship and Metropolitan Club championship in 1934 and the Eastern Club Championship again in 1936. There is no denying the fact, however, that the man to man defensive ability of the Eastern group was greatly responsible for keeping the score of the opposition down to a great extent. However, observation during this period of time conclusively proved that the Eastern style of play was already out-moded and it was no surprise to me that shortly after Ned Irish opened up in Madison Square Garden with big-time basketball that Western teams consistently defeated those of the East.

The first Metropolitan big-time team which, in my opinion, has turned to Western methods is N.Y.U., and I believe that their record this year is conclusive proof that the style of play is the winning style. Howard Cann, able N.Y.U. coach has seen the handwriting on the wall and has revised his system accordingly. Fordham, under the capable Ed Kelloher, is turning to this method and their young sophomore team is showing up much better than far more experienced opponents who cling to the old style of conservative play. I don't believe it will be long before almost all Eastern teams will adopt the wide-open game.

A recent article in the Saturday Evening Post by Stanley Frank, has created a great amount of controversy in basketball circles. Frank quotes Coach Mooney, of Columbia, to the effect that the best way to prevent "altitudinous" players from ruining the game is to remove the back-boards and extend the out-of-bounds lines four feet behind the basket. He further stated that this was the system used in the old New State League. He forgot to mention, however, that in the State League, huge "fish nets" surrounded the basketball court so that in effect the ball could never go out of bounds. Unless a similar provision is suggested to supplement Mooney's suggestion, it occurs to me that the spectators will be handling the ball as often as the players. If such a suggestion is made, there are bound to be justifiable objections raised in regard to the effect on the player's health. Loud and long were the squawks raised by many of our foremost coaches when a rule was put through to give the opposition the ball out of bounds after a score had been made. They claimed that this speeded the game up to the point where the player's heart might be affected. Should it be necessary to use "fish nets" it is obvious that there would be absolutely no chance of a player getting a moment's rest because there would be no out-of-bounds plays.

The most sensible and logical suggestion for elimination the premium being placed on the use of extremely tall players seems to be to raise the baskets to twelve feet. If the running track at the old Stringfield "Y", where the game originated, had been twelve feet above the floor, that is the point at which the "peach baskets" would have been placed and no controversy would ever have arisen. The architect of the building, however, see fit to put the track only ten feet above the floor, and that is the only reason why the rules today contain a provision that the baskets should be ten feet above the floor. There is no doubt in my mind that the ultimate solution lies in simply raising the basket two feet. Why penalize a player because he happens to be tall- let him enjoy the sport too- just put the basket out of his reach.