

Do you like basketball, Cont'd.

A case in point is the elimination of the center tipoff after a score. Purpose behind the elimination of the tipoff was to minimize the importance of a tall center. Maybe the change did that, but it still didn't eliminate the importance of height in the team as a whole.

Beyond that, the change brought up the reasons for the present criticism, giving the ball to the team which was scored on, out of bounds. Do the critics want to go back to the center tipoff, or do they have in mind a better way of putting the ball back in play after a score?

Another Change Failed of Purpose:

Another change that was designed as an improvement apparently has failed in its purpose.

That is the one that provides for moving the ball out of the back court within 10 seconds. The purpose was to eliminate stalling. In a way it may have done that, but it resulted in an objection even greater than the old-time stalling.

Whereas it is still possible to stall in the front court, the game is now limited to half the floor instead of the full court as once was the case. Defensive players no longer go beyond mid-court to obtain possession of the ball, but wait for the opposition to advance past mid-court. It is much like defensive hockey at its worst, with the defense scurrying back to defense of its own goal as soon as it loses possession of the ball.

These various matters are not pointed out as direct criticisms, but merely to illustrate the difficulties into which the rules committee can get itself if it listens and responds to all critics without giving due consideration to the new difficulties which changes may bring up.

* * * * *

SHALL THE BASKET BE ELIMINATED:

Things aren't official just yet, but the next major change in basketball (remember that game?) Will propose elimination of the BASKETBALL.

The suggestion is contained in a contribution to today's sportsdesk mail, which usually gets heavy around payday.

The correspondent is Frederic Brandes, superintendent of schools at Howard Lake, who incloses (postpaid) a claim he was originator of the eliminate-the-backboards move back in the more conservative days.

This move he regards as a necessary concession to spectators, who pay a pretty penny (even if Lincoln did need a shave). They pay their pretty penny to see two halves of a game, get filed away in pews back of the backboard and see only half the game. Elimination of the backboard, therefore, is a capital idea - at about half-a-cent capitalization.

That's about as much as any of the tampering with basketball rules is worth, as far as Mr. Brandes is concerned. He admits elimination of the basketball is something the public is not prepared for just now - growing must be prepared. The way to prepare it is with a rule-makers' spade that will dig the game's grave.

As other suggestions for rules "meddlers" Mr. Brandes adds other legislation from his 1940 edition

(1) Eliminating baskets, substituting a disc with a bull's eye; contact would set off a gong, light up a score on an automatic scoreboard; numbers with betting odds would flash for the more sporting patrons; (2) barring guards having 50-inch hips; (3) forbidding a dribble straight through the opposition - a player must advance 10 strides horizontally, 10 vertically, then pass; (4) making all shots from five two foot circles painted red; (5) allowing no player to make more than 10 points a game - is this fair to the opposition?