



A few days have passed since the Cleveland Cavaliers traded Ramon Sessions and Christian Eyenga to the Lakers for their 2012 first round pick, the right to swap picks in 2013 and other pieces. Sessions made his season debut for the Lakers on Friday. He came off the bench and played relatively well. It has been quite some time that the Lakers didn't rely on Derek Fisher's diminishing skills to run the offense, so the result was national media and Lakers fans being a little too overjoyed about his 7 points and 5 assists.

Cleveland is getting killed nationally for what is perceived as giving Sessions away for nothing. As Jason Lloyd of the Akron Beacon Journal pointed out in his article "[Lack of Scoring Punch Could Cause Cavs to Regress Next Season](#)," what is being overlooked is the fact that Cleveland was going to lose Sessions to free agency after this season. Isn't it better to get a first round pick and an improved pick next year as opposed to keeping Sessions as the backup point guard during the second half of a season that will not result in a playoff birth?

ESPN's David Thorpe is one of the national media members who believes that Cleveland did not make a good trade. He was on the NBA Today podcast with Henry Abbott on Friday. When the topic of the Sessions trade came up, he had the following to say:

*"There's lots of irony here that the owner of Cleveland who was so concerned about guys like David Stern doing everything they can to help the big market teams and Cleveland may have given LA literally a real chance to get back to the finals now. I don't know if they will. but adding Sessions who is a legitimate point guard and is a quick little guy that they needed*

*(because) they get destroyed by quick, little point guards against other teams. This was a nice coupé for the Lakers. I don't know what Cleveland was doing."*

If there are two things that bother me with the NBA media, it is laziness and easy narratives. The problem with this quote is that it ignores one major aspect of the Sessions trade: Dan Gilbert was not doing it to help the Lakers. There are clear-cut benefits to making this trade for the Cavs and ignoring them is an easy way to take a jab at Cleveland in a post-Comic Sans letter world. The Cavs were able to pick up an extra draft pick and have the ability to potentially move up multiple draft spots next year, but it is easier to call the Cavs hypocritical for vetoing the Chris Paul trade to the Lakers.

Another lazy aspect to that comment is that it was not solely Dan Gilbert's doing to renege on that trade. The NBA got into a can't-win situation when it allowed for the Hornets to be owned by the other 29 teams. To assume that one of the 29 NBA owners had enough pull within the entire NBA to cancel a trade between the Lakers, Hornets and Rockets is baffling. It is a fact that Dan Gilbert was not happy with the cancelled trade, but it is ridiculous to assume that one owner was the reason that Chris Paul ultimately ended up with the Clippers. One confusing aspect of the backlash towards the NBA for nixing the Chris Paul trade is that the Hornets appear to have gotten a better package from the Clippers because they are getting young and talented players as opposed to overpaid veterans who are on the downturn of their career. It is fashionable to joke about the NBA's [explanation](#) for canceling the trade, but I feel that they got a better package.

Thorpe is arguing that Dan Gilbert is a hypocrite for trading Sessions to the Lakers and making them a contender. Where this perspective fails is that the Cavs had a legitimate reason for making this trade. Additionally, Ramon Sessions is not and will never be at the level of Chris Paul. Lastly, the trade was done with his own personal interest in mind as was his vocal displeasure with the Chris Paul trade that was nixed. Maintaining your own best interest in both situations should not be seen as a hypocritical move.

Ramon Sessions will make the Lakers better. The 2012 first round pick and the right to swap picks with the Lakers in 2013 will make the Cavs better. Shedding Luke Walton's salary will be financially beneficial to the Lakers and taking on salary to be closer to the salary cap floor will help out the Cavs. I am looking at a fair trade that helps out both teams and this is somehow being presented as one that makes the Cavs front office hypocritical for something that happened in December. Thorpe looked at the trade with blinders on and made a mountain out of a molehill. Once again, laziness prevails. Instead of considering what Cleveland is getting out of the trade, it is easier to be hyper-critical and pass judgement. Never-mind that Sessions'

time in Cleveland was ending after the season and that the market for point guards was slim this year, it helps paint Cleveland as incompetent by telling half-truths. Perhaps the only thing that will change history's perspective on this trade is if the Cavs move up significantly in the draft next season because the Lakers are an aging team without a lot of depth.

I am not writing this to defend Dan Gilbert. I have mixed feelings on the Cavaliers owner. What I am hoping to accomplish is to show the other perspective that is largely ignored by the scribes at ESPN. The "Worldwide Leader" has at their disposal some of the best NBA minds in the world. It is always disappointing to hear such misinformed opinions being masqueraded as facts by guys like David Thorpe.