
Soccer in America

Posted by jaybo76 - 2007/07/16 11:14

So Becham (sp?) is here and people in LA think he will be the savior of soccer in America. Well, I would put my money on soccer still being a very low attended and enjoyed sport here in America for years to come. One person just won't do that much for the sport. On ESPN radio on Friday night who ever it was had some really good reasons. One of them I really agree with was that you can't really tell how much of an impact one person has on a game unless he is scoring like 2-3 goals a game and that is so rare. There were some other reasons but I can't remember them.

I played soccer for 15 years growing up. I played on traveling teams and on varsity HS teams. If I were to change one rule that I believe would help soccer it would be the offsides rule. Any soccer fan give me ONE good reason for that rule. It is a lame and useless rule. The only excuse one soccer fan gave me was it prevents cherry picking.....ohmy: ummmm ok so why doesnt the nba have and offsides rule. Lame reason. I always played forward and I hated that rule it took no skill and the opposing team and our team for that matter would just jump up once in a while to get the call. So dumb. But really someone give me a good reason. If they took that rule out here in America I bet we would see 2-3 more goals a game and that is one of the biggest reasons soccer is such an unpopular spectator sport. Just my two cents in the offseason of football.

=====

Re:Soccer in America

Posted by B-Rex - 2007/07/16 11:31

The Offsides call is perhaps the most difficult of all calls in Soccer. Many do not understand the rule and therefore hate it. I'm sure those who play or coach soccer understand but others (mostly parents) do not.

In essence, an offensive player cannot be beyond the next to last defender when a ball is played. What that means it that they cannot be closer to the goalie when a pass is made (the goalie being the last defender). It's not when the pass is received, but when it is played. So many refs at the rec/AYSO/HS levels don't pay attention and make the call as the pass is received.

The rule probably has a lot to do with cherry picking but they call that advantage in soccer. Also, it takes skill to beat the defender and the goalie.

There is no offsides rule in the In-door league and small field summer leagues that my son plays in and there is a ton more scoring. In fact, the less skillful players can sit back or drift back undetected and get a good shot on goal.

I say leave the rule alone. Eliminating the off-sides rule would be like moving in the outfield fence in baseball to say 200 feet. Anybody could hit a home run and the significance to the game of a great player would be lost.

I think that Soccer will catch on in America when the 2nd generation is old enough to be corporate sponsors. My kids sit in front of the Soccer Channel all day and will watch just about anybody.

They are the second generation...

=====

Re:Soccer in America

Posted by Mingjai - 2007/07/16 11:50

I'm a little surprised that this is coming from a soccer player, but to each his own. I play a lot of ice hockey and would never suggest eliminating the offside rule (or the icing rule) because it would drastically change the game as we know it. I was glad to see the 2 line pass rule go, but offsides is a totally different story.

One thing offsides does in soccer is it allows for great slicing runs, sharp through passes, and nice breakaways. Since "fastbreaks" are a little more difficult on such a big field as compared to basketball, offsides allows for fast counterattacks because the rule encourages the defenders to play high in order to trap the attacker in the offside position. Without offsides in soccer, offensive players would try to cherry pick near the goal and defensive players would be hanging around with them, which would clutter the goal area and not allow strikers to break in behind defenders. Offensive strategies in soccer as we currently know them would disappear as the offenses become a lot more like half-court offenses in basketball, which tend to be relatively boring.

Remember when the NBA moved in the 3-point line in order to increase scoring? That failed because the wing players

would still bunch at the 3-point line (which was closer in by a foot or so). When the wing players passed in to the post men, the wing defender would collapse down, causing the post player to kick the ball back out to the wing player for an "open" 3 pointer. But because the wing player was camped out closed in, the defender who doubled down could make it back out in time to affect the 3 point shot. While everyone initially thought the shorted 3 point line would increase scoring, it actually had the opposite effect, and the line was moved back to the current location.

Post edited by: Mingjai, at: 2007/07/16 11:55

=====

Re:Soccer in America

Posted by jaybo76 - 2007/07/16 11:52

Some good thoughts, however I don't really agree with the comparison of moving the wall up because it would mean that the defense (outfielder) can do little to prevent a HR, however taking out off-sides would mean an adjustment in the defense. Some have said to make the goals wider or taller which I don't agree with because it does take away some of the skill but taking out off-sides just means that faster players will be in more demand and it still involves skill.

As I stated in my last post I played soccer all through my youth and loved every minute of it but watching it is still hard mainly because I want to be out there playen' but I still don't think soccer will ever catch on, it is like watching baseball and their bats are one foot long and the pitchers are 10 feet closer--It is just too hard to score and not enough people understand/appreciate the skill that these players have because there is just "not enough scoring" and therefore not enough to get excited about. Nevertheless, I enjoy watching it and could sit through a whole game but not too many people can say that and I understand why.

Yeah, your kids may watch it but paying money to go watch it is another thing.

=====

Re:Soccer in America

Posted by ammoncougar1 - 2007/07/16 11:52

I agree with BReX on the offsides being miscalled most of the time. I don't want to sound vain but I was quick enough to beat the defender when the pass was made and yet was called offsides frequently because of where I received the pass. Having said that I would take away the rule. The reason I would is found in the NBA where they keep changing the defensive rules to open up the scoring and teams just find a way around it and turn into the Pistons and the Spurs who keep winning titles with the most boring style of low scoring play ever!!!

The beauty of soccer is the understanding of the game that allows the specator to watch the build up of a play and see the culmination of it with a goal in the back of the net. Is it a game for everyone? NO! Just like hockey if you ask me. But is there a niche that can be filled by it in the USA? YES! Will stadiums be packed like overseas? I don't see that for many generations if ever. But will it be a viable sport that can be sustained by the fan base it has and will get in the future? Yes. I believe it will.

Having said that, I would offer these changes as possible improvements:

1) For every five (insert your #preference here) fouls called on a team during a given game the result would be a one on one PK but not the traditional place the ball 12 yards away and run and kick it. It would be a true one on one with the keeper like hockey where the ball is advanced from 30 or so yards out and shot within a prescribed time limit. Hopefully this would discourage the embarrassing flopping that takes place.

2) Like indoor soccer already does, impose a 2 minute man advantage for intentional/dangerous fouls. Allowing "power plays" would give the offense a chance to be up one man and hopefully score more frequently.

3) Eliminate shoot-outs to decide games. As a HS senior we (WX) played Bountiful for the state championship and it ended with a shootout with our asst. coaches son sending the ball over the posts for our loss. If the game cannot be settled on the field in a prescribed time frame the reschedule it. Or

4) Add more substitutions. This is one rule that needs to go for sure. Why have 18+ players on a team when the maximum you can play in a given game is 14 IIRC. (11 on the field with 3 subs max)

Otherwise, I love the game and will continue to watch and play as often as my time permits!

Go Cougs!!!

=====

Re:Soccer in America

Posted by jaybo76 - 2007/07/16 11:57

Some really good points Mingjai that I hadn't thought of. Still, it would be interesting to actually see how it would turn out rather than just speculating. I know that I would watch more soccer but your points are quite valid. But I still say soccer will never take off.

On a side note, the ESPN commentator said that he could go out on the soccer field and play a whole game and no one would notice that he has never played soccer before, but in football, golf, basketball, water polo, they would notice right off. He said he would just have to run around the field for 90 minutes and people would probably compliment him on his abilities. I disagreed but thought it was pretty funny.

=====

Re:Soccer in America

Posted by Hengst - 2007/07/16 12:04

As to the original question. I think Beckham may have been able to save soccer had he come over here 8 years ago, but now he's gotten to the end of his career. I don't think he'll have that big of an impact.

This is kind of like Michael Jordan going to play for the wizards.

One comment on shootouts. I actually prefer those to overtime in soccer. I think they should get rid of the 2 over times and just go straight to the shoot out.

=====

Re:Soccer in America

Posted by kitic77 - 2007/07/16 12:13

Some of my change ideas:

Remove the offsides call from the field. Put an official or two up in the box to call offsides. How many times is offsides called, and then you see a replay from up above the field and can tell that it was the wrong call. It wouldn't be hard to put a light behind the goal that is controlled by an official upstairs that goes off to notify the ref of an offsides. Or even just use a buzzer on the ref.

I would also add an additional on-field official and thereby cutting in half the amount of players and ground each ref has to cover. It's worked wonders for hockey. Currently the ref:player ratio in soccer is 1:22. That's too many for one official. In football it's 7:22, baseball it's at least 4:10 (6:10 in the playoffs), basketball is 3:10 hockey it's 4:12.

I would implement post-game replay and punish divers. They can be issued blue cards for each dive. Five blues and you miss the next game.

I would also make sure every third World Cup is held in America - for my own selfish reasons.

Personally, I think Beckham is going to be a huge deal and that soccer's profile in the States is going to really start growing. ESPN, not ESPN2, will be showing multiple LA Galaxy games. Simon Fuller is now getting involved with the team since he's involved w/ Team Beckham. If you don't think ESPN and Simon Fuller (American Idol, etc) can make soccer big time, you're not thinking straight. It is now in ESPN's interest to make soccer lucrative. Don't be surprised if over the next five years (the length of Beck's contract) several ESPN "soccer haters" like Cowherd, Berman, Mike & Mike and others become much more receptive of soccer.

Soccer will continue to grow. It wouldn't surprise me to see multiple games on a week on ESPN (not just Thursdays like now). 15 years from now, I think it will be bigger than hockey and will be much more a part of the big 4 than hockey was.

=====

Re:Soccer in America

Posted by cougarfan1 - 2007/07/16 12:13

I actually really like the offsidess rule. I think it adds more strategy in soccer. Without offsidess I think there would just be a bunch of cherry picking and kickball. However, I would be willing to make a compromise and make a quarter field line, so that offsidess would only work beyond the quarter field line instead of the half line.

I think a good way to improve scoring would be to increase goal size. That would of course make penalty kicks even easier...maybe the penalty kick line could be moved back a little to compensate.

=====

Re:Soccer in America

Posted by Mingjai - 2007/07/16 12:18

Hengst wrote:

As to the original question. I think Beckham may have been able to save soccer had he come over here 8 years ago, but now he's gotten to the end of his career. I don't think he'll have that big of an impact.

This is kind of like Michael Jordan going to play for the wizards.

One comment on shootouts. I actually prefer those to overtime in soccer. I think they should get rid of the 2 over times and just go straight to the shoot out.

The MLS got Beckham one stop earlier than most thought. Most people thought Beckham would come to the US after one more stint with a European club.

The thing about Beckham is that he's not a dominating player when the ball's in play. Sure he deliver some good crosses when he's out wide, but dominating the field like Cristiano Ronaldo, Ronaldinho, or Zidane was never his game. What Beckham does best is deliver stunning free kicks. In England's past few matches, he's been good for a goal a game because of his ability to put free kick on the heads of his teammates. Just the fact that England brought him back says a lot about where his abilities stand. If he were really washed up, you'd think a country like England would have enough young studs in the stable to replace him in a second.

Any player who is good enough to play on the English national team is a better player than anyone who has ever played in MLS. America's best and brightest never get more than a sniff by England's big four clubs.

=====

Re:Soccer in America

Posted by cougfan1 - 2007/07/16 12:57

kitic77 wrote:

I would also add an additional on-field official and thereby cutting in half the amount of players and ground each ref has to cover. It's worked wonders for hockey. Currently the ref:player ratio in soccer is 1:22. That's too many for one official. In football it's 7:22, baseball it's at least 4:10 (6:10 in the playoffs), basketball is 3:10 hockey it's 4:12.

I would implement post-game replay and punish divers. They can be issued blue cards for each dive. Five blues and you miss the next game.

I also think more referees are needed. Maybe one for each half of the field and a lead referee that floats around. I would still maintain the offsidess referees but I do agree that they can often make bad calls. I think this needs to be revisited to improve calls...especially when the offsidess call can change the result of a game.

I also agree about diving. When I played soccer I could not stand it. I was a halfback and forward and I knew that I could get calls if I dived...but it was just too hard for me to fake it. I think I didn't want to look weak and always fought through slide tackles. It is even worse to see a guy rolling around on the ground, acting like they broke a leg. Then when the stretcher or the trainers get there, they just pop up...or on the reply you see they were tapped in the shin and they are holding there knee. That's why I think some people watch a game and think soccer players are wimps.

=====

Re:Soccer in America

Posted by cougfan1 - 2007/07/16 12:57

Double post. :angry:

Post edited by: cougfan1, at: 2007/07/16 12:57

=====

Re:Soccer in America

Posted by lovelldog - 2007/07/16 13:12

jaybo76 wrote:

So Becham (sp?) is here and people in LA think he will be the savior of soccer in America. Well, I would put my money on soccer still being a very low attended and enjoyed sport here in America for years to come. One person just won't do that much for the sport. On ESPN radio on Friday night who ever it was had some really good reasons. One of them I really agree with was that you can't really tell how much of an impact one person has on a game unless he is scoring like 2-3 goals a game and that is so rare. There were some other reasons but I can't remember them.

I played soccer for 15 years growing up. I played on traveling teams and on varsity HS teams. If I were to change one rule that I believe would help soccer it would be the offsides rule. Any soccer fan give me ONE good reason for that rule. It is a lame and useless rule. The only excuse one soccer fan gave me was it prevents cherry picking.....ohmy: ummmm ok so why doesnt the nba have and offsides rule. Lame reason. I always played forward and I hated that rule it took no skill and the opposing team and our team for that matter would just jump up once in a while to get the call. So dumb. But really someone give me a good reason. If they took that rule out here in America I bet we would see 2-3 more goals a game and that is one of the biggest reasons soccer is such an unpopular spectator sport. Just my two cents in the offseason of football.

Of course you hated the offsides rule, all you wanted to do was score. In reality I am a bit surprised even though you were a forward that anyone that had played soccer would want to get rid of the offsides rule. It would turn soccer into a boring game of kickball and the tactics and beautiful skills that soccer players have at moving the ball around would become irrelevant.

As for Beckham saving US soccer, MLS is so boring and slow compared to Serie A in Italy or other major leagues around the world that it would take a lot more than one player to get it exciting. However he might produce a spark in Americans and become a hero which could entice other international players on the downhill (but nevertheless better than what is currently here) to the US league as well. Although, in my opinion Beckham has never been one of the greatest players in the world he is one of the most followed and so if there is someone who can do it it might be him.

=====

Re:Soccer in America

Posted by B-Rex - 2007/07/16 14:15

We call the players who take a dive either "Floppers" or "Posers". Technically, a flop or dive is a yellow card but you only see it in the most egregious circumstances of if a Ref is biased toward one of the teams.

I strongly dislike most of the refs because they are so bad.

=====

Re:Soccer in America

Posted by Mingjai - 2007/07/16 14:49

B-Rex wrote:

We call the players who take a dive either "Floppers" or "Posers". Technically, a flop or dive is a yellow card but you only see it in the most egregious circumstances of if a Ref is biased toward one of the teams.

I strongly dislike most of the refs because they are so bad.

There's a diving penalty in hockey, but it's rarely used. Diving is less of a problem in hockey because the good players

have learned this valuable adage: "it's a lot easier to score when you're on your feet." I remember an analyst criticizing a hockey players game, saying that he was too strong and had too good of balance such that he was taking hit that should have been penalties but were not being called because the player wouldn't go down.

=====

Re:Soccer in America

Posted by kitic77 - 2007/07/16 14:50

cougfan1 wrote:

I also think more referees are needed. Maybe one for each half of the field and a lead referee that floats around. I would still maintain the offsides referees but I do agree that they can often make bad calls. I think this needs to be revisited to improve calls...especially when the offsides call can change the result of a game.

I'm not opposed to sideline referees, they're still needed for out-of-bounds, although I'd like to see another one on both sides of the field so a ref isn't relying on a guy 60+ yards away to tell if a ball went out.

My point on the offsides is that they're not necessarily in the best position to determine if a player was actually offsides when the ball was played. An official upstairs in the box would have both a better angle and be in a better position to tell when the ball was played. I think he would be much more accurate in his calling of offsides.

=====

Re:Soccer in America

Posted by B-Rex - 2007/07/16 14:55

Mingjai wrote:

There's a diving penalty in hockey, but it's rarely used. Diving is less of a problem in hockey because the good players have learned this valuable adage: "it's a lot easier to score when you're on your feet." I remember an analyst criticizing a hockey players game, saying that he was too strong and had too good of balance such that he was taking hit that should have been penalties but were not being called because the player wouldn't go down.

I used to tel the kids "you can't play soccer on your but!" I still had too many who tried to slide-tackle and were totally taken out of the play.

The great ones stay on their feet.

One other thing I strongly dislike are players that try and make the Off-sides call. They stand around waving their hand in the air and the play goes on without them. Play the game, let the refs officiate.

Post edited by: B-Rex, at: 2007/07/16 14:56

Post edited by: B-Rex, at: 2007/07/16 14:56

=====

Re:Soccer in America

Posted by NC-Puma - 2007/07/16 15:14

jaybo76 wrote:

So Becham (sp?) is here and people in LA think he will be the savior of soccer in America. Well, I would put my money on soccer still being a very low attended and enjoyed sport here in America for years to come. One person just won't do that much for the sport. On ESPN radio on Friday night who ever it was had some really good reasons. One of them I really agree with was that you can't really tell how much of an impact one person has on a game unless he is scoring like 2-3 goals a game and that is so rare. There were some other reasons but I can't remember them.

I played soccer for 15 years growing up. I played on traveling teams and on varsity HS teams. If I were to change one rule that I believe would help soccer it would be the offsides rule. Any soccer fan give me ONE good reason for that rule. It is a lame and useless rule. The only excuse one soccer fan gave me was it prevents cherry picking.....ohmy: ummmm ok so why doesnt the nba have and offsides rule. Lame reason. I always played forward and I hated that rule it took no

skill and the opposing team and our team for that matter would just jump up once in a while to get the call. So dumb. But really someone give me a good reason. If they took that rule out here in America I bet we would see 2-3 more goals a game and that is one of the biggest reasons soccer is such an unpopular spectator sport. Just my two cents in the offseason of football.

I played forward too but I'm not in favor of getting rid of the offsides rule. I think the comparison of soccer to NBA is apples and oranges. The main reason is this: In basketball, when you're on defense you can't afford to consistently leave a guy back on the offensive side to cherrypick because it's way to difficult to defend a good offensive team with 4 guys. So in the NBA "onside" play is enforced by the nature of the game. In soccer, it's easier to defend a man or two down, so the defensive team could usually afford to leave a couple players down by the opposing teams goal which would lead to a lot of cherrypicking.. zzzz boring. Personally, I love the strategy that the offsides rule brings to the game.

However, there are 2 things that make me turn off the tv on a soccer game:

1. Diving. As you guys have said, this needs to be penalized way more often. I can't stand it.
2. Bad calls in critical moments. Bad calls at critical times (like any call inside the box) need to be able to be overturned by a quick instant replay up in the box. Like when Oguchi Onyewu gave up a PK in last world cup on a total dive against the African team (forget which one). WAY TOO much is riding on a PK call for it not to be at least briefly reviewed... and that sort of call screw-up happens all the time.

=====

Re:Soccer in America

Posted by Hawkeye-Coug - 2007/07/16 15:50

The offsides penalty simply allows poor defense at the expense of team play. On defense you should stay between your man and the goal - simple as that. Offsides encourages large, slow defenders who can head balls and push people around, but that are not agile.

Second, it also devalues team play. A team should work together, passing the ball, to set up an easy goal. The offsides penalty takes it away.

If I am ever a reff I will simply explain to the opposing coaches before the game that I am not going to call offsides, so they had better play D and pass the ball.

Go Cougs!!!!!!!!

P. S. They really need to eliminate one man in soccer as well.

=====

Re:Soccer in America

Posted by B-Rex - 2007/07/16 16:32

NC-Puma wrote:

2. Bad calls in critical moments. Bad calls at critical times (like any call inside the box) need to be able to be overturned by a quick instant replay up in the box. Like when Oguchi Onyewu gave up a PK in last world cup on a total dive against the African team (forget which one). WAY TOO much is riding on a PK call for it not to be at least briefly reviewed... and that sort of call screw-up happens all the time.

I too hate the fact that the officials can interject their bias into the game. I would love to see one instant replay official in the box that could look at the entire field and then review a call quickly. The problem is that play has already stopped so they would need to let the play continue and then overrule if necessary.

Watching the U20 play from Canada, I could not believe the inconsistency of the play calling. Every PK should need an instant replay confirmation, because they are almost automatic anymore.

=====

Re:Soccer in America

Posted by cougfan1 - 2007/07/16 16:38

Hawkeye-Coug wrote:

The offsides penalty simply allows poor defense at the expense of team play. On defense you should stay between your man and the goal - simple as that. Offsides encourages large, slow defenders who can head balls and push people around, but that are not agile.

Second, it also devalues team play. A team should work together, passing the ball, to set up an easy goal. The offsides penalty takes it away.

I would say that offsides creates good defense. If you have ever played "Stopper", as some call it, you are in charge of coordinating the defensive line. The defense has to work together as a team in order to make sure the last line of defense works efficiently and uses offsides in an effective way. Defenders still are taught to maintain position between forward and the goal. Defense actually takes more talent and attention in order to balance maintaining position between the player and the goal and using offsides as an effectively.

And offside does not encourage slow defenders. You still need to be fast as a defender because balls are played behind the defensive line into space for those in a forward position to speed past the line of defense. If defenders were slow, I would argue that you would see more goals because forwards would be running past them all the time. It is much easier to score a goal when you are 1 vs. 1 than having a crowd around the goal. Yes defenders are sometime taller and bigger, but just like positions in other sports, there is a balance. Basketball doesn't have offsides, yet the center is still slow, tall, and big.

If you don't have offsides, it actually discourages controlled passing. The game would turn into kickball because there is too much open space. The only way to counteract that is to make the field smaller...then it is a totally different game.

The reason people hate offsides is because they see players speed ahead of the defensive line before the ball is sent to them and get disappointed when offsides is called. They also see the big gap behind the defensive line and get mad that the forward can't just camp out there and wait for the ball. Without offsides there would be some cherry picking, but you would mostly see defenders just hanging back against the goal...leaving huge gaps between offense and defense. You would rarely see the defense playing so far up the field. There wouldn't be nearly as many breakaways, just a bunch of crowding around the goal. Once again, to solve this problem (without offsides), you would need a small field with less players...then you get something that resembles indoor soccer.

=====

Re:Soccer in America

Posted by cougfan1 - 2007/07/16 16:39

Double post again...:angry: :angry:

Post edited by: cougfan1, at: 2007/07/16 16:39

=====

Re:Soccer in America

Posted by NC-Puma - 2007/07/16 16:41

Mingjai wrote:

I'm a little surprised that this is coming from a soccer player, but to each his own. I play a lot of ice hockey and would never suggest eliminating the offside rule (or the icing rule) because it would drastically change the game as we know it. I was glad to see the 2 line pass rule go, but offsides is a totally different story.

One thing offsides does in soccer is it allows for great slicing runs, sharp through passes, and nice breakaways. Since "fastbreaks" are a little more difficult on such a big field as compared to basketball, offsides allows for fast counterattacks because the rule encourages the defenders to play high in order to trap the attacker in the offside position. Without offsides in soccer, offensive players would try to cherry pick near the goal and defensive players would be hanging around with them, which would clutter the goal area and not allow strikers to break in behind defenders. Offensive strategies in soccer as we currently know them would disappear as the offenses become a lot more like half-court offenses in basketball, which tend to be relatively boring.

Remember when the NBA moved in the 3-point line in order to increase scoring? That failed because the wing players would still bunch at the 3-point line (which was closer in by a foot or so). When the wing players passed in to the post men, the wing defender would collapse down, causing the post player to kick the ball back out to the wing player for an "open" 3 pointer. But because the wing player was camped out closed in, the defender who doubled down could make it back out in time to affect the 3 point shot. While everyone initially thought the shorted 3 point line would increase scoring, it actually had the opposite effect, and the line was moved back to the current location.

Post edited by: Mingjai, at: 2007/07/16 11:55

That's a good point. I wouldn't be surprised if getting rid of offsides would actually decrease scoring, mainly at the highest levels of soccer. At lower levels (weekend warrior soccer), I could see cherrypick scores happening but good soccer teams would adjust and not allow it. The end result would be a cluttered box, which would spell doom for the US. The US seems to only be able to score on counterattack.

=====

Re:Soccer in America

Posted by Mingjai - 2007/07/16 22:43

NC-Puma wrote:

I wouldn't be surprised if getting rid of offsides would actually decrease scoring, mainly at the highest levels of soccer. At lower levels (weekend warrior soccer), I could see cherrypick scores happening but good soccer teams would adjust and not allow it. The end result would be a cluttered box, which would spell doom for the US. The US seems to only be able to score on counterattack.

As much as I like to think your comment about the US only scoring on counterattack is only referring to one player (Landon Donovan), you've pretty much summed up every goal the U.S. has scored against Mexico. Well, that or a set piece (which likely came because of a counterattack).

=====

Re:Soccer in America

Posted by Hawkeye-Coug - 2007/07/17 13:42

I would say that offsides creates good defense.

If it is good defense, it will be played with or without offsides. If it is not good defense, then offsides will make a difference. So, what you are saying is that players use offsides to bail them out on defense. That is what I am saying too, and that is why I oppose it. I would prefer the last line of defenders working together to stop a goal, as opposed to working together to use a petty and inappropriate rule. There is a goalie back there who can use his hands - isn't that enough of a defensive advantage relative to the other 10 players on the team? Even if offsides should be used in professional soccer, it should never be used in youth soccer due to the bad habits it encourages.

And offside does not encourage slow defenders. Offsides does cover for slower, less agile defenders. Or, perhaps more accurately, it covers for defenders who decide to play slow simply because an offsides will bail them out. Thus, there is an advantage in choosing defenders that are big and physical, who can head balls. Their weakness in agility is partially covered by offsides. I also think the basketball analogy is off. Soccer/futbol is much more like football. DB's in football are small and fast to be able to cover the WRs. Can you imagine football outlawing the long bomb simply because there wasn't a defender between the WR and the goal line?

If you don't have offsides, it actually discourages controlled passing. Perhaps you should tell that to football teams. Since there isn't a rule prohibiting the long ball, it discourages controlled passing. Threading a ball between defenders to an open man is exciting in either soccer or football, and is certainly controlled passing. Indeed, the skill displayed is much higher in soccer due to the use of the foot instead of the hand, and the spin of the ball. Controlled passing would be much more valuable and creative without the offside penalty.

Without offsides there would be some cherry picking, but you would mostly see defenders just hanging back against the goal...leaving huge gaps between offense and defense. You would rarely see the defense playing so far up the field. There wouldn't be nearly as many breakaways, just a bunch of crowding around the goal. There is quite a bit of crowding around on the goal on free kicks and corner kicks, yet they somehow manage to score more often on those plays than others. I think with the elimination of the offsides you would see much more man defense, and much less zone. You would also see people flashing in front of the goal, trying to attack through the seams in the defense. It would be much more interesting near the goal than it is now.

I also would favor eliminating a man on each team. At any moment of the game there are 2-3 players on each team standing around, not including the goalie. Take away a player, and allow free substitution at half time.

One more thing. Get a real clock, with real stoppages, so everyone can see. This whole thing of "don't let the players see the time" is totally stupid, and impossible to enforce.

Go Cougs!!!!!!!!!!!!!!

Re:Soccer in America

Posted by Hawkeye-Coug - 2007/07/17 13:43

Double Post

Go Cougs!!!!!!!!!!!!!!

Post edited by: Hawkeye-Coug, at: 2007/07/17 13:47

Re:Soccer in America

Posted by kitic77 - 2007/07/17 14:18

Hawkeye-Coug wrote:

Perhaps you should tell that to football teams. Since there isn't a rule prohibiting the long ball, it discourages controlled passing. Threading a ball between defenders to an open man is exciting in either soccer or football, and is certainly controlled passing. Indeed, the skill displayed is much higher in soccer due to the use of the foot instead of the hand, and the spin of the ball. Controlled passing would be much more valuable and creative without the offside penalty.

Um, actually, in football you can't be behind the defense before the ball is played. In fact, you can't even move forward on offense before the play begins. You must be in front of the defense when the ball is snapped. It's the exact same in soccer, you can't be behind the defense when the ball is snapped/kicked.

And your football analogy doesn't work, because they are different sports. You can't say one rule in one sport doesn't work because look at another sport. Like clock. It's a moot point to argue that there should be a clock in baseball because they have three outs instead. Each game is different

Re:Soccer in America

Posted by Hawkeye-Coug - 2007/07/17 17:20

Um, actually, in football you can't be behind the defense before the ball is played. In fact, you can't even move forward on offense before the play begins. You must be in front of the defense when the ball is snapped. It's the exact same in soccer, you can't be behind the defense when the ball is snapped/kicked.

That is totally stupid. In soccer you can't be in front of the "line" until the ball is in play either. However, after the ball is in play you can be in back of the defense in football, and you should be able to make a play on the ball in soccer.

Soccer supporters talk in glowing phrases about the flow of the game, and the tradition of sportsmanship. Well, how does the gamesmanship of manipulating the offsides penalty factor into those admirable qualities? It slows the flow of the game, lessens the teamwork, is arbitrarily called by any measure, and rewards laziness.

One last thing. Why are you trying to convince with large green type? Is it because none of the arguments made by the offsides apologists have ever made any sense, and never will?

Go Cougs!!!!

Re:Soccer in America

Posted by kitic77 - 2007/07/17 18:50

Hawkeye-Coug wrote:

That is totally stupid. In soccer you can't be in front of the "line" until the ball is in play either. However, after the ball is in play you can be in back of the defense in football, and you should be able to make a play on the ball in soccer.

This is the point I was trying to make. You can look at the offsides rule in soccer and from a certain point of view, it is the same as in football. Once the ball has been snapped you can get behind the defense and make a play. In soccer once the ball has been kicked you can get behind the defense and make a play. The difference is when the play starts in soccer requires a higher degree of timing, whereas in football you have a snap count.

Soccer supporters talk in glowing phrases about the flow of the game, and the tradition of sportsmanship. Well, how does the gamesmanship of manipulating the offsides penalty factor into those admirable qualities? It slows the flow of the game, lessens the teamwork, is arbitrarily called by any measure, and rewards laziness.

You clearly don't watch much soccer. It does not reward laziness, defenders must remain alert and aware of where their teammates are so that they hold the line and they're not the one to keep someone onside. An effectively executed offsides trap actually requires a great deal of teamwork - but by the defense. If the four defenders are not in sync, then the forward is on a break away against the keeper. And it certainly doesn't slow the game any more than stopping the game and clock after every single play for 40 seconds like they do in football.

Look, I don't think it's an either/or argument with soccer. Is soccer a great sport? I think so. Does it have issues with how it is played that are holding it back? Probably. Could it be improved? Probably. Is it still fun in its current, imperfect form? I think so.

Do I still watch both football and soccer? Yep.

One last thing. Why are you trying to convince with large green type? Is it because none of the arguments made by the offsides apologists have ever made any sense, and never will?

Umm no. The large green font is my trademark. I've been using green on Cougarblue for a long time. I just don't think it's fair to criticize soccer because of a "weird" rule, because every sport has their quirks.

Go Cougs!!!!

Amen.

=====

Re:Soccer in America

Posted by A_King - 2007/07/18 01:14

Personally, I thought the Football "snap the ball" analogy was a pretty good one in explaining the Offsides rule in soccer.

Think about it, the defenders are having to watch alot of action, and anyone who has watched soccer knows how fast the ball can go from one Keeper to the other end of the field, LONG BEFORE a player could physically run there unless he anticipated it and started before the kick from the keeper.

So, the offsides rule is JUST like the Football offsides before the snap rule.

You can't let offensive players hang out behind the defense who are paying attention to every pass upfield and gauging when to join the offensive position for a strike.

If you did, it would be like letting the WR go to the endzone before the ball was snapped and all the QB had to do was drop back a step or two and launch it to the WIDE OPEN receiver.

A keeper can LAUNCH the ball in nano-seconds and a forward chilling with the opposing keeper would be that WR sitting in the Endzone UNFAIRLY too early.

Kitic's example was pretty good, if you ask me. :D

=====

Re:Soccer in America

Posted by cougfan1 - 2007/07/18 08:24

A_King wrote:

Personally, I thought the Football "snap the ball" analogy was a pretty good one in explaining the Offsides rule in soccer.

Think about it, the defenders are having to watch alot of action, and anyone who has watched soccer knows how fast the ball can go from one Keeper to the other end of the field, LONG BEFORE a player could physically run there unless he anticipated it and started before the kick from the keeper.

So, the offsides rule is JUST like the Football offsides before the snap rule.

You can't let offensive players hang out behind the defense who are paying attention to every pass upfield and gauging when to join the offensive position for a strike.

If you did, it would be like letting the WR go to the endzone before the ball was snapped and all the QB had to do was drop back a step or two and launch it to the WIDE OPEN receiver.

A keeper can LAUNCH the ball in nano-seconds and a forward chilling with the opposing keeper would be that WR sitting in the Endzone UNFAIRLY too early.

Kitic's example was pretty good, if you ask me. :D

On top of that, if defenders started to hang around the endzone for the long bomb, then the quarterback could throw underneath passes to a WR while all the defense is hanging back...similar to prevent defense. It would be difficult too difficult to cover.

Re:Soccer in America

Posted by A_King - 2007/07/18 13:02

I think that it is different in Football though because you get to stop and MAKE CLAIM to yardage gained and try another play. In soccer, you have to keep trying to make something out of one play, you can't reset and keep the ball there at your advantage offensively unless of course there is a penalty.

Re:Soccer in America

Posted by B-Rex - 2007/07/20 10:31

Hawkeye-Coug wrote:

And offside does not encourage slow defenders. Offsides does cover for slower, less agile defenders. Or, perhaps more accurately, it covers for defenders who decide to play slow simply because an offsides will bail them out. Thus, there is an advantage in choosing defenders that are big and physical, who can head balls. Their weakness in agility is partially covered by offsides. I also think the basketball analogy is off. Soccer/futbol is much more like football. DB's in football are small and fast to be able to cover the WRs. Can you imagine football outlawing the long bomb simply because there wasn't a defender between the WR and the goal line?

There is very little in soccer that can cover for a slow defender (except another defender). Defense is about speed and smarts. A smart defender can be a little slower, but then there is always a switch that happens after that defender gets beat. Offsides can not compensate for a slow defender.

Re:Soccer in America

Posted by Mingjai - 2007/07/20 11:11

B-Rex wrote:
Hawkeye-Coug wrote:

And offside does not encourage slow defenders. Offsides does cover for slower, less agile defenders. Or, perhaps more accurately, it covers for defenders who decide to play slow simply because an offsides will bail them out. Thus, there is an advantage in choosing defenders that are big and physical, who can head balls. Their weakness in agility is partially covered by offsides. I also think the basketball analogy is off. Soccer/futbol is much more like football. DB's in football are small and fast to be able to cover the WRs. Can you imagine football outlawing the long bomb simply because there wasn't a defender between the WR and the goal line?

There is very little in soccer that can cover for a slow defender (except another defender). Defense is about speed and smarts. A smart defender can be a little slower, but then there is always a switch that happens after that defender gets beat. Offsides can not compensate for a slow defender.

Offsides doesn't encourage slower defenders and here's why: When playing the offsides trap, the defense will basically line up straight across as far as 40 yards out from goal to force the offensive players to stay back. Not only that, to play the trap properly, the defenders must be disciplined enough not to back-pedal--they must be near stationary to hold their line. What does that do? It creates 40 yards of space between any players and the goal that the offense can exploit with a well timed through ball or lob, with the speedy recipient starting off even with the defenders. If the defenders are slow or not agile, there would be no way for them to recover and it would attacker versus goalie every time.

Imagine if the soccer offsides rule were instituted in football, so that the receiver may not be deeper than the deepest defender when the ball is thrown (to that receiver). Would that encourage teams to play shallow and have slow defensive secondaries to trap receivers in the offsides position? I doubt it because if the pass is thrown when the streaking wide receiver is just even with the DB, a slow DB isn't going to recover in time to knock the ball away. Teams trying to play "offsides trap" (imagine 4 DB's lined up straight across 15 yards from the line of scrimmage) with slow DBs would get burned long early and often.

Re:Soccer in America

Posted by spidy - 2007/07/20 11:36

I think the game is just to slow. I love playing soccer but can't stand watching it. Face it, it is just to long to cheer for a game that ends up 1-0.

My suggestion is shorten the field some to force more action and higher scoring games!

Re:Soccer in America

Posted by Mingjai - 2007/07/20 12:10

spidy wrote:

I think the game is just to slow. I love playing soccer but can't stand watching it. Face it, it is just to long to cheer for a game that ends up 1-0.

My suggestion is shorten the field some to force more action and higher scoring games!

In any sport, there are more things to watch than just scoring points. You could find any sport slow if you don't understand or appreciate the skills on display. I find a 1-0 soccer or hockey game more exciting or suspenseful than a 101-95 basketball game.

Just as many Americans think soccer is too slow, foreigners think fooball is too slow because teams have to reset before every single play. Heck, if football changed it's scoring so that a TD was worth 1 point and a FG worth 0.5 points, there would be quite a few 2-1 scores and maybe every once in a while you might see a 0.5-0 score.

To each his own, I guess.

Re:Soccer in America

Posted by spidy - 2007/07/20 12:16

Maybe its just the ADHD side of me coming out, but I don't like watching low scoring football games either. I suppose my big problem is I just don't feel any personal connection with any soccer teams. I did watch and cheer during the olympics, but heck I was cheering for the USA regardless the sport then.

=====

Re:Soccer in America

Posted by A_King - 2007/07/20 12:17

I get why you think it is a slow game...but in reality:

Soccer has two non-stop 45 min halves with 15-20 halftime in between. There are no commercial breaks, at the most 4-5 mins is added on to each half, and counting all that up it really isn't that long at all.

90 min game, 10 min extended time at the most, then add 20 min if it is a long halftime. 120 mins. 2 hours is the longest you can expect a game to go unless you have overtime and a shootout. (And those are extremely FUN to watch.)

Football lasts up to 4 hours sometimes, Jazz against Rockets game 6 was 2hrs and 29mins, Cards vs. Phillies went 2hrs and 50mins long, and NHL in 2003 had an average game length of 2hrs and 19mins.

It's one of the shortest, and I would dare say on average THE shortest professional sport to watch on TV. So, I would argue that it isn't too long a game to cheer for a 1-0 game.

=====

Re:Soccer in America

Posted by spidy - 2007/07/20 12:23

I see what you guys are saying, I just think it would be funner if it were a little smaller field (not indoor, just enough to press the action a little more) allowing more speed to the game.

Again I think my biggest thing is no personal connection to the game. My good friend didn't like soccer either, but went to a couple REAL games and now loves it. I liked watching my nephew play soccer in high school, but I grew up collecting football and baseball cards ...not soccer. Just no connection for me.

Back to the speed of the game ... other examples golf, like to play Hate to watch, Baseball again i like to play, hate to watch.

maybe I played to many first person shooter games and have now fried my brain...ohmy:

Post edited by: spidy, at: 2007/07/20 12:30

=====

Re:Soccer in America

Posted by A_King - 2007/07/20 13:56

spidy wrote:

...maybe I played to many first person shooter games and have now fried my brain...ohmy:

:D Haha, seriously. Our microwave generation really doesn't have the attention span humans used to.

=====

Re:Soccer in America

Posted by B-Rex - 2007/07/23 06:53

spidy wrote:

I think the game is just to slow. I love playing soccer but can't stand watching it. Face it, it is just to long to cheer for a game that ends up 1-0.

My suggestion is shorten the field some to force more action and higher scoring games!

Soccer is not slow. There may not be a ton of scoring, but it's a game that can turn at any moment. After a team scores you always hear talk about an insurance goal so a quick score can't tie the game. Then you hear fans hoping for a third score so two quick scores can't tie the game.

The lower scoring adds to the excitement and tension of the game.

Personally, I grew up a Dodger fan and I love a 1-0 ballgame because the game hangs on every pitch.

And I loved watching BYU hang 40+ points (60+ if you're SDSU) on all comers during the early 80s (from the stands...).

On a side note, This is now the longest thread in the soccer forum!!!

Post edited by: B-Rex, at: 2007/07/23 06:54

=====

Re:Soccer in America

Posted by Mingjai - 2007/07/23 13:41

Does anyone else find the recent slew of friendlies between international clubs and MLS clubs to be both interesting and annoying?

The MLS All-Stars are now 4-0 against top-flight international clubs having beat defending Scottish Premiership champs Celtic 2-0 (they've beat Chelsea, Fulham, and CD Chivas). Chicago led by Blanco was able to force a 1-1 draw with Celtic.

Everton, who placed sixth in the English Premier League (no small feat when you have Arsenal, Chelsea, Liverpool, and Manchester United cemented in the top 4), went down 2-0 to RSL, the worst team in MLS. Columbus also managed to play Everton to a draw.

Then of course there's Chelsea, who was only able to get one goal against the Becks and Los Galacticos de los Angeles--the same Galaxy team that got waxed by Tigres UNAL.

It's cool to see the MLS get some big wins over respectable competition, but in the end, no one cares! Why? Because all these teams are in the pre-season while the MLS sides are in mid-season form. If the international side wins, it's because they were supposed to given their talent-loaded rosters. Even a First Division team would be expected to beat a "Sunday morning pub" team. If the MLS side wins, it's because the international team was (1) rusty from the off season, (2) taking it easy to avoid injuries, or (3) not taking the game seriously. It's pretty much lose-lose for the MLS team. And the worst part about it is that the teams and their fans can get a false sense of security if they take the result too seriously.

Oh well, I guess the Superliga starts this week, so we can see how the MLS stacks up against the best clubs in Mexico.

=====

Re:Soccer in America

Posted by msmith - 2008/08/27 11:11

Agreed Jaybo! But without an offside rule the center forward would be standing with the opponent goalkeeper and wouldn't be good at all. I'm sure it would add to more than 2-3 goals per game but then the whole concept of the game would change. We could start another game altogether with those rules but it shouldn't be called soccer.

.....
Micheal Smith
Wyoming Drug Addiction