

Not Idealism - Improvement by Bill Nye

P Before we lose the thread, this idea of refereelessness being "ideal" must be diffused. To paraphrase Winston Churchill's view of democracy, having no officials in ultimate is the worst possible way to control the game - unless one considers any other way. Listen everybody, I am not an idealist who believes in "holistic perspectives" or bemoans the rarity of holistic perceivers. The reason we can play ultimate competitively is not because disc players are stricken with a higher consciousness, but because the ~~the~~ nature of the game is different. The game just doesn't need referees.

It has been alleged that my chief reason for not wanting referees is that ultimate players are unique - they are ^{more} emotionally balanced than most people et cetera. I have even been quoted as saying "We are better than they are," * That I wrote this is undeniable. However, the line can ~~not~~ be taken neither literally nor out of

context. It might best be sung to the tune of "My Dog's Better Than Your Dog". A reader could figure this out. No where else in the article do I discuss the nature of the players. Instead, my article focuses (a.G. Sharpism) on the nature of the game. Furthermore, in my previous article "On Observers" **, I speak at length about red faced screaming players. In fact, I make fun of the "mellow persons who 'like man, don't get into arguments, man'. They don't exist (as I point out). What do you want? I did not ever assert, nor am I asserting that ultimate players are different from everyone else! It's the game that's different!

IP

I propose that we make some slight, but ~~nevertheless~~ fundamental rule changes to enable the players to control the game. The first and obvious change is this deal where the diving receiver declares his/her catch clean and springs to his/her feet screaming "it's my call". The rules should include provisions for nearby players to help make the call. This really makes a lot more sense. This

"involved player makes the call" thing came from the throwing foul. The only guy who knows for sure if the thrower got smacked on the knuckles is the thrower. Here, the present rule is great. It should be modified to enable ~~other~~ noninvolved players to call plays where appropriate.

IP The second change that I think will be a big help is to specify a "replay" to resolve controversy. If the call is disputed or invisible ~~or errant~~, then just take the play over. The thrower gets another shot and the offensive players must hold their positions. The defense submits the disc when it's ready. I know the replay to be an excellent way to resolve disputes. I've seen it work countless times. If the replay were incorporated in the rules, players would soon accept that it is consistency that wins ultimate; much like any other sport. When the other team calls your big play back, well, you just have to come up with another one. It's hard on your team. It's hard on both teams. It's not perfect, but it's better than having some guy whose not even playing decide for you.

Ⓐ The third rule change would be to ~~eliminate~~ play to a predetermined score rather than until time runs out. This was suggested by me in "Ultimate's Challenge" * and by New Zealand's Michael Pace *** in the very last Frisbee disc World. This would accomodate the replay, ~~and~~ it would eliminate the errors of the timekeeper, and would make players concentrate ~~ed~~ on playing rather than hurrying or waiting. ~~The ~~is~~ thing~~ We say to doubters, ~~is~~ "try it". It makes a better game.

Ⓐ If we have observers instead of referees, how long will it be before the game or, rather the players degenerate into asking the observer for or about everything. It's just going to become a refereed game this way. There are those of you who argue that this is not a bad thing. Well, it is a bad thing if for no other reason than the message of the old adage: If something does not need to be included, then that thing needs not to be included. Just as a machine should have no unnecessary parts. The game should not go out of its way to include unnecessary personnel on the field.

#

The nature of ultimate is different from almost any other game. In basketball, the game is decided by ~~so~~ few points compared with how many are scored and the officials call about half the total. You just couldn't play hoops without ref's. In soccer, one play can easily win the game. The dreaded "penalty shot". Although ultimate produces some close games, its rhythm is different, and its number of callworthy plays is much lower. The observer/official/umpire/reference will end up making calls that he just shouldn't be involved in. This is clearly a bad thing.

#

#

It has been argued that referees (or observers) will keep the game moving and buffer antagonism between teams. I think these arguments are ~~a~~ misinterpretations of the ever popular cause and effect. Players and fans decide how fast a game moves. Players get antagonized by players and by referees too.

#

In baseball, the players argue with the umpire — the fans boo, the ump does nothing. In hockey, the players fight and ignore the ref — the fans cheer, the ref skates to safety. Either way, the official ~~does~~ not have the answer.
effect the emotions

P

The thing that bugs me most about incorporating officials is the big chance were missing. As Tom McNiven mentioned, society has improved its goals through the centuries hopefully (I mean it as an adverb) moving toward a more civilized civilization. Along with this, we have used documents to document our ideals. The permanence of the Magna Carta or the U.S. Constitution is remarkable. It is part of being civilized. The recorded thoughts are more careful—more complete. I am pointing out that a well written set of rules could be used to resolve disputes on the field, rather than more (i.e. observers) interpret people trying to ~~the~~ ~~a~~ less concise rules. We already have 14 opinions, why compound the problem. The thing is, if we give in now, we will never have another chance. If we stumble along with inconcise and debilitating rules (it's my call) and get ref's to tangle them further, we will not have even tried to progress.

P

Let's try orienting the rules to the players so that they can control the game. If it doesn't work, then we can observe. But I feel we've ~~g~~ have to try. Let's improve the rules rather than add more opinions.