An unintended consequence of the lockout that cost the NBA sixteen games per franchise is that everybody is attempting to fix system issues. Most NBA fans are accustomed to watching games, looking at playoff standings, thinking about the draft and trade rumors. The lockout turned these discussions into those of BRI (Basketball-Related Income), parity, salary cap and the luxury tax.

Leading the charge is ESPN's Henry Abbot, from the Truehoop Network. If there is one thing that he would like to see changed about the NBA, it is tanking. He has the best of intentions with his premise, but I cannot help but feel that he is arguing that the league should make drastic changes to system issues over something that doesn't really exist.

Yes, you read that correctly. I do not believe that tanking exists.

The premise behind tanking is that teams that are not going to make the playoffs intentionally lose as many games as possible with the hope of landing a franchise-changing player with a high draft pick.

Look at the Cavs, for example. The players on the Cavs are looking out for their own best interest when they play games. They would never not try their hardest or intentionally lose games so a more talented player can come, take their minutes or roster spot and send them packing for Asia or Europe.

Coaches are in the same boat. According to the Truehoop Network blog Truth About It, the average tenure of an NBA coach is a little over three seasons. This does not mean that Byron Scott definitely has only one more year left in Cleveland, but time is not on his side if the Cavs do not start winning games. It would be in his best long-term interest to strategically coach to develop young players at the potential expense of losing games, but he is coaching for his future every single time he gets on the sideline. It would be nice if NBA owners would show a little patience with their head coaches, but the league operates under a "what have you done for me lately?" modus operandi. Byron Scott is not thinking about potentially drafting Anthony Davis, Michael Kidd-Gilchrist, Bradley Beal or Thomas Robinson. He is only concerned with winning each and every game and coaches with that mentality.

General Managers are probably the one member of the team that could be accused of tanking. For reasons that I cannot comprehend, General Managers are given more patience by owners than coaches. If a coach cannot win games, it is seen as his fault despite the fact that he only has the talent to work with that the General Manager provides him with. According to the Los Angeles Clippers General Counsel Robert H. Platt , the average tenure of a GM is less than five years. This is not a long time, but it gives the GM enough time to see if his vision is going to pay off. If he were held to the same standards as head coaches, General Managers would make short-sighted trades and other roster moves which could be detrimental to the team that he is trying to build.

As Ben Cox from Waiting for Next Year so eloquently put it, "We're talking about GM's setting up their roster for the future. Why is that a bad thing?" Sometimes a cigar is a cigar and sometimes a bad team is a bad team. The Charlotte Bobcats should not be punished by picking 30th overall because they are underachieving. That team is in dire need of talent. The 2011-2012 Charlotte Bobcats season is what happens when a team is mediocre for too long, is not in a desirable market and does not have the luxury of picking high in the draft. Their last high pick was in 2006 when they selected Adam Morrison third overall. That could be labeled as a "bad front office decision," but that is not the root of their problems. They are bad because they lack talent and do not have a way of improving that problem outside of the lottery. A proposed system that is supposed to "fix tanking" that leads to the worst team in the league being even worse next year is not a solution. It's piling onto the problems that the Bobcats have.

When you break it down, tanking doesn't exist from players and coaches. Even General Managers are simply trying to build a winner when they make trades for future assets. The goal is not to lose games, but to rid the team of guys who are not producing or who do not have a future with the franchise and to flip them for better players in the future. It is not the crime against organized sports or the slap in the face of competitive spirit that some bloggers would have you believe that it is.

The only place that tanking definitely exists is in the mind of fans. They do not have to deal with the stakes of risking professional success by winning or losing games. The only time that tanking exists is when a fan hopes that their team loses every game because it does not have enough talent to compete in the playoffs. Do we really need to overhaul the entire system and take away the one tool that the majority of teams have to build a winner because some fans (who do not have any say in personnel decisions) are cheering for losses? Is this that big of a problem that the proposed system is to take Las Vegas lines and to compare them to how the team actually performed? If I want to see the Cavs lose some games, that's my opinion and should not matter to anybody besides me. When fans want to see their favorite team lose games, it does not have an impact. Tanking does not exist in the real world and is only something that matters for fans. If Henry Abbott or Sam Amico are upset that some fans are rooting for their team to lose, that's their problem and they should not be pushing for drastic overhauls to change the system when the real issue is how few game-changers exist in every draft.