

Page four -

use by any firm, whether its name is Whosit, Porter or Sam Lung. In a nut-shell the case boils down to what in geometry would be termed reductio ad absurdum.

The report overlooks the good-neighbor policy and takes a crack at Canada. The reasoning is sylogistic.

Major premise--Purge the Rules Committee of those who will not bow down.

Minor premise--The Canucks will not conform. (They like the molded basketball, the small backboard and other rules which the Committee has adopted.)

Conclusion--"Why is Canada--given two representatives on the Rules Committee," end quote.

The report objects to an Athletic Journal article "You Can't Stand in the Way of Progress". The article gave some facts to dispel some of the wild rumors about the development of some of the rules of basketball. It was written at the request of the editorial department. Anyone who is interested in how rules which legalized the smaller basketball which is now universally used, the 4-foot end zone, the screening rule, the larger court, the molded ball and the small backboard, ought to read it. Of course, it takes some of the glamour out of the whispering campaign about "pressure groups" and the manufacturing octopus. It shows how these things originated in the school and institution groups in response to definite needs -- not because some ogre was expecting to make a profit. The report would have its readers believe that it is alright to throw rocks but it is very unethical for anyone to throw them back. Are cases needed? Refer to Esquire Magazine of April 1941. This is just after the National Rules Committee had followed the instructions of the Coaches Association representatives to "have the guts to take a stand" and declare a type ball and a type backboard as the one toward which all should work. Here is a quotation from the article by a high official of the same group: "If these changes (the small backboard) were motivated altruistically, I wouldn't mind so much."-----
"Most major courts have already installed glass backboards which give more visibility than the streamlined monstrosities." Associated Press releases flooded the country with derogatory statements emanating from meetings presided over by officials of the same group and referred to the molded ball (which is used and liked by three-fourths of the high schools and by a majority of the small colleges) as the "rubber ball" or the "jack-rabbit ball" and the small backboard (which has proved to be so popular that 16 state high school associations, the larger schools and colleges in Canada, many U.S. colleges and army and navy camps have already adopted it) as the "bean-shaped board". Here is a quotation from one such press release. It was headed "Patented Fan-Shaped Bank and Rubber Ball Rejected at Special Parley". Here is a statement in the article: "This leaves a potential market of more than \$5,000,000 for the manufacturer whose product will be the only one anyone may legally use." Aside from the fact that the small board can not be patented since it was developed by the schools themselves and that there is no limit to who can make the board, and some question about the figures, (considering the fact that the new board and bridgework costs only a fraction of that for the old), the article is fairly accurate. This and similar articles were broadcast over the country. Would the report have us believe that only this group has a right to cast stones and that no individual with the facts at hand should have the temerity to give out the information on request? Mister God, if this is ethics, the ring-tailed cat is a baboon.