

## ELIMINATE SECTIONAL DIFFERENCES

---

Tremors amounting almost to earthquake proportions shook the Eastern basketball world during January as an aftermath of two important intersectional games played in New York. A mid-West and a Southern team met two leaders of the Metropolitan area before packed houses in Madison Square Garden. Following the game visiting players and coaches noted many drastic differences in rules interpretations from those to which they were accustomed at home.

New York sports writers found these complaints a source of interesting comment. The resulting articles brought heated replies from Eastern basketball men who ridiculed the interpretations of the other sections. As usual, an unpleasant situation developed when the arguments began to include personal criticism. The climax found a game official quoted in the press as of the conviction that one of the visiting coaches deliberately taught foul tactics, and should be chased out of the coaching profession.

While these public arguments are not new to this or to other sports, the welfare of amateur athletics certainly should demand their elimination. The setting for this upheaval focused the attention of the nation's sports followers upon basketball in a manner that may or may not be detrimental. If such incidents bring popular ridicule the damage will be great. However, should the publicity spot light show us more clearly the game's imperfections and drive us to action which aims at their eradication, then the rumpus in New York will have been a valuable aid to basketball development.

The first obvious imperfection shown is the need of higher ethical standards among basketball authorities. Realization must be driven home that the game suffers when those responsible for its conduct insist upon turning honest differences of opinion into attacks of a personal character. We must demand that coaches and officials take more seriously one section of our Creed which reads:

"I believe in the exercise of all patience, tolerance and diplomacy at my command in my relations with all players, game officials and spectators."

Insufficient information regarding the incidents in New York disqualifies this writer as a judge in this dispute. It must be stressed, however, that the result is a blemish on our teaching of good conduct.

Another, and more familiar imperfection, here demonstrated deals with the wide differences in rules interpretations that appear to be prevalent in various sections. The situation often arises in which two men from different sections, reading from the same rule, reach vastly contrasting conclusions regarding certain parts of a play.

Probably the best informed man on the practices common in many sectors is Dr. H. C. Carlson, coach at the University of Pittsburgh, whose teams travel most widely. His comments on the differences in interpretations are timely and interesting. He writes:

"Coming from No Man's Land and having played in the East and West, we would like to contribute neutral suggestions to a more