



IT WAS back in 1981 that English football led the way by introducing three points for a win.

Coventry legend and television pundit Jimmy Hill was at the heart of the calls for change.

Prior to that, clubs received two points for a win. It meant the draw – worth one point – was valuable. How often did you hear managers saying they would be happy if their team won at home and picked up a point on the road? It was a recipe for success.

The only thing was it didn't encourage teams to go all-out for the victory. A draw, with goals or without, would provide a decent return.

The new system helped bring about a change in mindset. No longer was a single point so precious when you could get two more for a victory.

Thirteen years after the visionary Hill's idea came to fruition, it was used in the 1994 World Cup finals, a ringing endorsement of the initiative.

Since then it has been commonplace in football. Truth be told, the current points system isn't something that is often talked about – everyone seems to accept it and be happy with it.

But does it have to be three points for a win, one for a draw and nothing for a defeat? Do we just accept that and say it's the end of the matter? Or should we open up our minds to something different, something potentially better?

Well, a group from Switzerland, led by mathematician Peter Hammer, reckon we should do the latter to encourage teams to play more attacking football, to score more goals – and, at the end of the day, entertain the paying public.

They got in touch with us at Late Tackle to let us know all about their idea. It's radical, some people will no doubt dismiss it, but surely it's worth listening to and thinking about. If nothing else comes of it, at least it could open a debate, bring other ideas to the table.

IT'S ALL ABOUT THE SEVEN POINTS!

JOHN LYONS EXAMINES A RADICAL PLAN THAT WOULD CHANGE THE FOOTBALL LANDSCAPE FOREVER...



So, what is it? Well, it's based on the idea that the new points system would revolve around the number seven. Yes, seven.

There are four key outcomes from a match:

If a game ends in a draw (0-0, 1-1, etc), both teams get three points.

If there is a one-goal difference, (1-0, 2-1, etc), the winners get five points and the losers get two.

If there is a two goals difference, (2-0, 3-1, etc), the winners get six points and the losers get 1.

If there is a three or more goals difference, (3-0, 5-1, etc), the winners get seven points and the losers get 0 points.

So, what are the positives from this new set-up? Well, one of the major ones is that it incentivises teams to win

games by a bigger margin. One of the gripes of the Swiss group is that matches can become boring when a team is leading by one or two goals and cruising to victory. They may take their foot off the pedal and settle for what they've got.

Here, though, they've got a reason to get there lead up to at least three goals – the prospect of a maximum seven-point haul.

In addition, a team that is on the receiving end of a potential hammering has the incentive to keep going. If they can cut the deficit, they could yet walk away with one or two points.

Another of the Swiss team's complaints about the current system is that it doesn't make any difference if you win 1-0 or 5-0 (apart from giving you a