

13
January 7, 1938.

Mr. Floyd A. Rowe,
Board of Education,
Cleveland, Ohio.

Dear Floyd:

I was in Des Moines, Iowa, until December 30, and upon my return we had two games, and have another one tonight, so I have just simply not had time to answer your letter before this. It is 4:08 p.m. and we are playing Oklahoma tonight at 7:30. However, I felt that I must get this information on the way to you as you are desirous of answering St. John.

I heartily agree with you that we should simplify. Personally, I have never had any difficulty with the administration of the rules. My notion would be that the division line is just as you say, in effect a boundary line with the exception that the team in possession of the ball has twice as long to get it into play as they would have out of bounds.

The only difficulty in permitting them too much leeway around the division line is that you put a certain burden upon the official in determining his ten second count. When the player with the ball is standing out of bounds it is an easy matter for the official to count the five seconds while the player is out of bounds, but in the case of the division line, if the official is watching the play up the field and counting his seconds progressively, about seven seconds is used up when the player comes astride the division line.

If he begins to pivot and holds the ball for any length of time I can see that it might prove confusing to the official to continue his count and earnestly watch a scrimmage play in which the original player handling the ball has not lost possession of it.

My notion has been that when a player carries the ball on a dribble across the division line and then comes to his stride stop, we should in effect rule that the player has actually carried the ball into the front court, providing that the player could raise his front foot or he could stand still and pass the ball to another player who is standing on the division line. But if he passed the ball into the back court