

harmonious interpretation of the rules. We feel that both sides are honest in their opinions even if they disagree. The East has some very fine officials as does the West. Both sides are honest in their opinions even if they disagree.

"There is less trouble in the West this year on the pivot post play than there is in the East, because there is less cheating by both defensive and offensive players in the West. Personal experiences and opinions are being inflicted upon a situation where common sense should be applied. The coaches at the New York convention two years ago doubted my demonstration and description of the defensive tactics on the pivot man in Eastern games, but Keogan and Rupp now can add their testimony to mine. The answer is not that someone may be a crook, but rather that we should get together. The pivot play solution will come more easily and quickly than will the solution to so-called pick off, screen, or block plays.

"Basically, the East favors the defense and the West allows more privileges to the offense. In the East, if there is a collision between players, the offense almost invariably is held guilty. In the West it is assumed that both sides have contributed somewhat, and the event is disregarded. In the East if a man without the ball assumes a position and a teammate cuts around him for a free shot, it is almost a capital crime. This is the professional influence, and is a deep rooted conviction, at least in Philadelphia and New York. Further complication is added by the practice of the defensive player, who is losing his man, of "stepping into" some offensive player and then crying, "Pick-off". This type of activity is not common in the West.

"It might be well to announce again that the playing space is practically cut in half by the mid-court line. With lessened space and just as much movement there is bound to be more contact. Just as long as nobody is hurt a lot of needless whistle tooting can be eliminated. Personally, I think the western policy can result in greater consistency with less projection of the officials into the forefront of our game."

Two methods are available by which ruling everywhere can be made more uniform. Both are more or less slow and painful processes, but the results appear reasonably certain. Local and sectional rules clinics serve to clarify the code and are very valuable as far as they go but their influence seldom is far reaching.

The first move must be an extension of collegiate intersectional schedules. Discrepancies in interpretations will thus be brought more strikingly to our attention. We would be a narrow group indeed if we cannot iron out our difficulties after playing a large number of these games under sane, cooperative agreements between coaches and officials. Unless this is done each section will develop the sport along such peculiar lines that a coach or player cannot transfer from area to another without great loss of efficiency. One solution, then, is to **SCHEDULE MORE INTERSECTIONAL GAMES.**

A second move to standardize interpretations is found in the activities of the National Basketball Coaches Association. Through its bulletins and at its convention each area has an opportunity to express its own opinions and to adjust these to practices in other sections. The friendly contacts between coaches that develop