

Følgende artikkel stod på trykk i FIBA MAGAZINE i desember 1990. Filosofien bak praktiseringen av 3-sekundersregelen er ikke endret i mellomtiden. Ettersom den beskriver meget grundig og lettforståelig hvilke prinsipper som ligger bak vurderingen av fordel/ulempe med hensyn på denne regelen, kan vi bruke den også i 2001.



THE THREE SECOND VIOLATION

It is reasonably apparent that calling of the three second violation has almost disappeared in the modern game of basketball, particularly at top level competition such as the NBA, International FIBA events, and domestic National Leagues around the world. It might be prudent to consider why this is so, but first let's look at the rule itself.

Perhaps the most obvious approach in investigating why the three second rule was "invented" would be to imagine a game **without** it, a game which would feature a tangled congestion of 7 or 8 of the biggest players from both teams camping within what is now regarded as the restricted area.

A lot of offensive play would revolve around getting the ball inside to players stationed close to their opponents' basket, and defensive play would consist of trying to deny ball access to these players or trying to muscle them out of close shooting range.

Smaller players would find it almost impossible to penetrate this "jungle" on drives to the basket, and physical aggravation would assuredly be a major factor in any game. The game would be static and somewhat "constipated".

Introduction of the three second rule by FIBA at the 1948 London conference was an inspired innovation which had the effect of forcing offensive players away from the proximity of their opponents' basket. This motivated teams to create offensive patterns involving rotations, shuffles, screens, etc. in order to take maximum advantage of the spaces being opened up. As a by-product, smaller players gained back some ground lost when big players were jamming up the immediate vicinity of the hoop, and were now able to flash through the holes which were being created. The game became much more open, fluid and dynamic as a result. The evolution of the modern game has fully recognized the influence of the three second rule, yet the rule is being called so rarely that it appears to have become extinct. What is happening?

The key to answering this question is perhaps phrased most neatly by the late Dr. Ed Steitz whose thoughts on "Advantage/Disadvantage" in the FIBA Bulletin of June 1987 can be aptly applied to consideration of the three second rule.

The rule still exists but enlightened officiating now demands that the offensive player must gain an **unfair advantage** before he is called for a three second violation. Using a very simplistic form of logic, a definition of the "ultimate advantage" is to win against an opponent by scoring more points than he does. If a team wishes to score by using a post player, that player must first get the ball. Without the ball he cannot score or pass, and subsequently cannot gain an advantage (unfair or otherwise) over his opponents by remaining for more than three seconds in the restricted area. Therefore, with one exception, a "no call" on his violation would be appropriate.

This is not to say that the call is never made. If the post player, after having remained in the restricted area for three seconds or more, then receives the ball, the violation should be called the instant he receives it. This has the effect of reinforcing the rule when it really matters, and

discourages teams from reverting back to the congested type of offence which the absence of the rule would allow.

The one exception (as mentioned above) is if an offensive player, having been in his opponents' restricted area for too long, then sets a screen within that area which allows a drive off the screen by a team-mate. This three second violation unfairly creates the advantage of a direct scoring opportunity for his team, and must be called.

Resistance to this application of the rule inevitably comes from referees who ask, "What about all players just hanging around under the hoop?", or "What about the rebound advantage gained by the offensive team because they have men in the restricted area too long?"

In the case of the former, we have seen how the violation can and should be called if the violating player receives the ball. In the case of the latter, it is reasonable to assume that rebound are unpredictable in terms of where they fall. It is difficult to see how an offensive player gains an **unfair** advantage simply because he has been in the restricted area for more than three seconds. More accurately, he gets an **equal** opportunity.

If rebounding was that crucial factor relative to the three second violation, then a strong argument could be made for imposing the rule against the defensive team as well, since they gain an unfair advantage on all defensive rebounds otherwise, and it is hard to support any particular reason why they should

(Actually, statistics show that 70% of shots taken from right angles to the basket will, if the shot misses, produce a rebound which goes to the opposite side of the court. On these shots, therefore, if an offensive player as, by virtue of being too long in the restricted area, secured an inside position to the basket, he will have disadvantaged himself for the rebound, because he will be further from it than his opponent.)

In seeing the three second call in light of the above, it now becomes clear why it has almost disappeared due to infrequent calling. Once teams appreciate how the rule is being applied, they soon refrain from constant appeals for it to be strictly called. The game has fewer interruptions and flows just that little bit more because the call is not being made needlessly, and nobody is any worse off. The game has not suffered in the least, as teams continue to run their offensive patterns, post play remains a viable feature, and small guards can still penetrate the lane.

- Ross Little, FIBA Official (December 1990)

Norsk tilleggscommentar:

I kamper der det er enkeltspillere som er vesentlig høyere enn de andre spillerne, og dermed lett vil kunne ta de fleste returene, vil det være en urettmessig fordel at disse spillerne oppholder mer enn tre sekunder i feltet. Dette vil ofte kunne være tilfelle i aldersbestemte kamper der høydeforskjellen ofte er stor.

NBBF/Dommerkomiteen

November 2001-11-15

Jan Korshavn