



The following information was copied from message board posts appearing on TechSideline.com, the #1 independent web site covering Virginia Tech athletics.

The discussion took place in December of 2006, and it centered on a possible playoff in college football. TechSideline.com poster "Shut Up Brent" held court on what he believes are the real issues confronting a playoff in college football.

The posts were very interesting and have been saved into this PDF. Note that (1) no editing of Shut Up Brent's original posts was done; and (2) no other posts from the thread were saved into this document, just Shut Up Brent's posts.

Enjoy, and visit TechSideline.com for all the best information and discussion of Virginia Tech athletics. -- Will Stewart, General Manager, TechSideline.com.

=====

Subject: That's called the "Plus One". And it doesn't address the REAL problem

Posted by: Shut Up Brent on *Mon Dec 4 2006 5:32:29 PM*

Message:

with having a playoff: Who is going to run it.

That's the real battle, my friend.

We have two competing groups: the BCS schools (the 66 schools in the BCS conferences, plus ND) and the NCAA (the 300+ schools that also include the BCS schools).

The BCS schools want to maintain a certain degree of independence from the NCAA, for good reason. They earn 90%+ of the \$\$ in college sports, but the NCAA (heavily influenced by all the mid-major, I-AA, II, and III schools that make up the bulk of it) has official control of them. That chafes a little. Especially when 90% of the billion dollars or so made every year in the NCAA basketball tournament goes straight into the NCAA's pockets, not the pockets of the schools playing in the tournament.

What, how do you think Division III Women's Track and Field Championships are paid for? Or that pretty new NCAA headquarters in Indianapolis? Or Myles Brandt's salary?

When you see a situation that doesn't make sense, and the explanations don't make sense, somebody's lying. Rearrange the known, solid facts so they do make sense, and you've got a shot at understanding the truth. As far as I can tell, that's the closest thing to sense that comes out of the playoff discussion.

Now the question is, which way is best?

Options: 1.) BCS schools control a "Plus One" playoff. 2.) NCAA controls a playoff. 3.) No playoff.

I would find a BCS run playoff perfectly acceptable. We're in a BCS conference, after all. I don't want to see 90% of our football money going to Division III schools. But the NCAA would be functionally brain dead if they let that happen. And yes, the NCAA can keep it from happening. If you want a playoff, you need to play more than one post-season game. The NCAA has to approve that, and they'd be stupid to do it. Myles Brandt is not a stupid man.

I don't want to see an NCAA run playoff. Because it won't be a Plus One, it'll be a 16 team (minimum) playoff, and that WILL be the death of the bowls. The NCAA isn't going to have a playof and not invite the Sun Belt conference champion, even if it is a 5-7 North Texas team. Luckily, the BCS schools have enough clout to keep that from happening.

What we have here is two (politely) competing organizations, where neither can really overpower the other without causing a visible rift. Something that neither group wants, for good reason. So they both live with the compromise. The NCAA hoping the pro-playoff pressue will cause the BCS to buckle, knowing it probably won't, and the BCS schools happily counting the money they're making and ignoring the cries of the unaware masses.

=====
Subject: The problem isn't just a matter of "a smaller slice of a bigger pie".

Posted by: Shut Up Brent on *Mon Dec 4 2006 9:12:28 PM*

Message:

It's a power relationship.

As long as the BCS schools have an independent source of BIG revenue, they can technically hold a split from the NCAA over the NCAA's head. Now, we and they all know it won't actually happen, but neither the BCS schools nor the NCAA are stupid enough to push it.

If the NCAA controls football revenue as heavily as they control basketball revenue, what alternatives do the BCS schools have?

Let's say that there's a playoff, and there's a HUGE TV contract right off the bat. The NCAA gives the schools participating enough money that they come out ahead of what they would have gotten over the bowl system. Everyone's happy.

But in 10 years, when the TV contract has gone up tenfold, does the payout to the former BCS schools go up tenfold? Twofold? Analysis of the NCAA's basketball payout argues for a 50% raise, at most. The BCS schools could easily get much more than that going off the current system.

What do the BCS schools do, then? Split off? For what? Their members are going to be ingrained in that system, and they'll have lost their power position in college athletics. And they'll have lost their own forum (BCS membership) to seperate themselves from the rest of college football, if only in their own minds.

Again, it's a power relationship. Smart leaders approach power relationships as long term problems, and seek long term solutions. Over the long term, a school gets "screwed" (more than 2 undefeated BCS schools) once every eight years in college football. That means out of the 66 power schools, over 8 years, 527 individual school-seasons go by for every ONE that a school should have been able to play for a championship and didn't get to. Translated, that gives the average person a 1-in-7 chance of their school actually getting screwed in their lifetime. Boo hoo.

Sorry, I don't have a whole lot of sympathy for a 1-loss teams. You KNOW in college football that if you lose a game you're at the mercy of the system.

An NCAA-run playoff is a short-term solution to an intermittent problem, with long-term negative consequences for the BCS schools. We're a BCS school. I don't feel like getting screwed for the rest of my life, the money MY school generates going to pay for the Division III women's field hockey championship, so I don't have to hear a legitimate complaint once every eight years.

Fairness is for chumps and children. This is the best BUSINESS model, and the best for the long-term for our school.

Would a Plus One run by the BCS be nice? Sure. But if the choice is between an NCAA-run playoff and the current system, I'm all ABOUT the current system.

=====

Subject: I think you misunderstand what extra game means. The NCAA doesn't give a

Posted by: Shut Up Brent on *Mon Dec 4 2006 10:04:15 PM*

Message:

rat's patoot about there being another game. You can add TEN extra bowl games for all they really care.

BUT NO SINGLE TEAM CAN PLAY IN TWO OF THOSE BOWL GAMES.

The NCAA limits teams to 12 regular season games. One conference championship game, if their conference has 12 or more teams. And One, Single, Solitary, bowl Game.

If you are limited to one, single, solitary bowl game, you CANNOT have a playoff. Because your first-round winners CANNOT play another game. Kind of hard to have a second round then, no?

The NCAA doesn't have to "interfere". They just have to not write a special rule allowing you to play 2 bowl games, because you're ALREADY not allowed to play 2 bowl games.

If you were, ND would get invited (and for the sake of argument let's say they'd accept) a bid to the Poinsettia Bowl on the 19th, the Emerald Bowl on the 27th, and then the Sugar Bowl on the 3rd of Jan, so they could rake in the money from all from all of those bowls. They can't. Because you cannot play in more than one bowl game. There's a rule about that.

=====

Subject: But here's the thing: the NCAA WOULD invite all the conference champs.

Posted by: Shut Up Brent on *Mon Dec 4 2006 10:15:44 PM*

Message:

Here's a little secret: the polls have no official standing within the NCAA. They mean nothing. Bupkiss. Zip. Wahoo. Absolutely less than nothing.

Look at EVERY playoff the NCAA runs. The basketball tournament we know, yes. But look at the I-AA football playoff, and every other playoff they run.

The NCAA invites the champions from each conference, and THEN fills out the brackets with top teams that aren't conference champions. It's the way they WORK. They WILL invite the Sun Belt conference champ, BECAUSE THAT'S WHAT THEY DO FOR EVERY PLAYOFF THEY RUN. It's how they do things, because they're all about being fair and nice to all the widdle widdle skwools in the widdle widdle confnences.

So under NCAA auspices, it'd be a 16 team playoff. Not eight. There are more than 8 conferences in I-A football. Not more than eight GOOD conferences, but that doesn't matter. Not to the NCAA.

So the CUSA, MAC, MWC, Sun Belt and WAC champs will be invited alongside the ACC, Big 12, Big East, Big Ten, PAC-10, and SEC Champs, BECAUSE IN THE NCAA MEETINGS THEY HAVE JUST AS MANY VOTES AS THE BIG TIME SCHOOLS.

North Texas is just as much a member of the NCAA as VT is. In the BCS, they're nobody, and we're a top dog. In the NCAA, officially, we're equals. In the BCS, we can discriminate against the widdle widdle scwools just as much as we want to, becuae WE own the game. Under NCAA control, they've got just as much clout as we do.

=====

Subject: To sum it up as simply as I can: The NCAA is the United Nations General Assembly
Posted by: Shut Up Brent on *Mon Dec 4 2006 10:20:31 PM*
Message:

In the G.A., the US is just another vote. We're the equal of Palau (I think they're a UN member).

If the NCAA is running things, we mean no more, and no less, than North Texas. We'd have a better shot at getting in as an at-large, but we'd be officially the equal of them if both schools were champs of their respetive conferences.

The BCS is the Security Council. It's where WE'VE got the power.

=====

Subject: IMO, the only recent team to have a legit complaint is Auburn.
Posted by: Shut Up Brent on *Mon Dec 4 2006 11:11:55 PM*
Message:

All the other teams were 1-loss teams. This is college football. You know going in that if you lose a game you no longer control your own destiny.

In 2004, Texas only lost one game. If the three undefeated regular season teams had all lost, why shouldn't Texas be considered for the MNC game? Yes, they lost to Oklahoma, but Texas had no control over Auburn or USC.

ANY one-loss team is in the same boat as Texas in '04. But nobody cares about Texas in '04, do they? They only care about that one-loss team when there aren't 2 (or more) undefeated teams. I'm not crying for you if you lose a game, and you're left out of the MNC game, even if another 1-loss team gets in.

I *do* feel for Auburn. I really do. But since 1982, when the I-AA/I-A split heralded the modern era of college football, more than 2 undefeated non-probation major conference schools has occurred exactly 3 times:

1987: Miami, Syracuse, Oklahoma. 1992: Alabama, Miami, Michigan. 2004: Auburn, USC, Oklahoma.

Note: in 1993 Auburn, WVU and Nebraska were undefeated in the regular season, but Auburn was on probation. In 1994, Nebraska, PSU and Texas A&M were undefeated (TAMU was tied once), but TAMU was on probation.

That's 3 times in 24 years. That's once every 8 years. For the 66 major conference teams, that's 528 team-seasons played for ONE "wasted" undefeated season.

I can live with a system that doesn't go out of it's way to cater to that eventuality.

=====

Subject: The problem is, will the NCAA *let* the BCS do it? Or is the BCS even interested
Posted by: Shut Up Brent on *Tue Dec 5 2006 12:47:01 AM*
Message:

in running a playoff?

Let's be honest: the BCS schools have little interest in dealing with all the administrative crap. That's a major reason why they haven't left the NCAA. Yet.

The chattering of talk radio and/or the fans doesn't mean enough to the NCAA or the BCS admins to really make them do anything. And yeah, that sounds a lot like JW. But they're also RIGHT.

This ain't a democracy. It's not even a democratic republic. This is business, plain and simple. And no, the customer is NOT always right, because if the customer were always right I'd be getting a LOT more from the cute waitress at Red Robin than my hamburger and drink.

=====

Subject: NCAA Basketball Tournament Points
Posted by: Shut Up Brent on *Tue Dec 5 2006 1:13:57 AM*
Message:

Just an explanation of how badly the kind and benevolent NCAA screws over the schools in their basketball tournament.

The current TV contract for the NCAA Basketball Tournament is \$6 billion over 11 years. That's roughly \$550 million a year.

Tickets for a tournament game go for (face value) around \$150 for bad seats. Call it an average of \$200 per. In a 20k seat venue, that's \$4 million per game. 65 games (I think there are 2 play-in games now), that's \$260 million.

Being a little conservative on merchandising, tie-in deals, etc., call in \$1 billion even per year for the NCAA in net revenues, minus the venue costs and the non-athlete labor costs.

An NCAA Tournament "point" is earned by each game each team plays. The play-in winners, for instance, earn 2 points. One for the play-in game, one for the first round game where they get killed.

Each point is paid the year it is earned, and then for (I believe) the four years following for the total of five years. That's how Tech and VCU got screwed in the Metro Conference deal: CUSA walked away with the residual points we had helped earn.

Each point is worth roughly \$200k per year. That's a guess, and a generous one, based on points being worth about \$120k back in the late 90s, the last time I actually got someone to respond to me from the NCAA website contacts.

65 games X 2 teams per game X \$200k X 5 years is roughly \$125 million. Not chump change. Not at all.

But \$125 million when you're making \$1 billion?

That's how the NCAA makes its money. That money all goes back to member schools, yes. But it mostly doesn't go back to the member schools that helped earn that money. It goes to the D-III schools, the D-II schools, etc.

What, you think the Stagg Bowl in Roanoke actually pays for itself? Big-time bowl games, with big TV contracts usually can't make a paper profit. What makes you think a D-III football game pays for itself?

Now, I don't have a real problem with that. I don't. I WANT some kid in D-III to be able to get a scholie, and go to college, and to compete in a national championship. Even one for a D-III national championship.

I'm fine with basketball helping pay for all that. But that's where I am drawing the line. And apparently the BCS schools agree. I don't want all the money our football team earns going for all that crap, too.

Paying for OUR Olympic sports? Sure.

Paying for the Dickinson College (Carlisle, PA) lacrosse team? No way.

Again, these are rough numbers. I'm not going to break down the cost of each venue's tickets, and how many each venue seats (and how many tickets are comped/gifted), etc., etc., etc. But a \$824 million profit each year can absorb a LOT of the fluff in that estimate, and I was being VERY generous to how much the NCAA is paying out and deliberately low-balling their revenues.

=====

Subject: Dream up a compromise, then, that'll be acceptable to both sides.

Posted by: Shut Up Brent on *Tue Dec 5 2006 8:37:00 AM*

Message:

Ain't happening.

BCS participation in an NCAA-run playoff is the ONLY real hole-card the BCS schools have. Once the BCS schools start participating, you can't put the genie back in the bottle. Once the BCS schools are used to playing in an NCAA-run playoff, their ability to break away from the NCAA (the MAD threat they hold over the NCAA) is severely damaged.

Then, ten years down the line, what's to prevent the NCAA from keeping (again) the lion's share of the money the BCS schools generate for the NCAA? What will stop the NCAA from then deciding that all bowl games should end (a bowl game needs NCAA approval to exist).

The NCAA holds ALL the cards, except BCS school participation in an NCAA-run playoff. They can wait ten, fifteen, twenty years before they put the screws on to the BCS schools.

Screw that.

=====

Subject: I freely admit it's a LOT of speculation. But obviously the "take too much time

Posted by: Shut Up Brent on *Tue Dec 5 2006 9:01:24 AM*

Message:

from class" line is BS. It just doesn't make sense.

So you put together the known facts (NCAA needs to approve more than 1 bowl game appearance per team, NCAA revenue from the basketball tournament, who put together the BCS, etc.) and you try to put together a picture that DOES make sense.

The "known facts" I've just picked up over the years, looking into this sort of thing and paying attention when case studies come up. See below about Tennessee, for instance.

I'm more than happy to listen to alternative explanations as to why there isn't a playoff right now.

"Oh, the bowl don't want it, and they've got all the power."

Do they? If the BCS schools (the schools run the BCS: the BCS Bowls are their serfs/partners, not their bosses) decided to put together a playoff, why would they care if the bowls screamed bloody murder? They'd still be getting their money.

What power do the bowls have over the NCAA? The bowl registration fee to the NCAA is something like \$10k. That's it. That's all. Contrawise, the NCAA has very little power over the bowls. When Tennessee was found cheating a few years ago, especially in their MNC '98 season, the NCAA could do NOTHING to take away their bowl win or the MNC they won there.

I'm not a black helicopter conspiracy theorist. As a rule, I think conspiracies are BS, just because you can't keep more than 3 people quiet about a surprise birthday party forever, let alone a giant conspiracy.

I don't think this is a conspiracy. This is just two powerful organizations with a single point they disagree on, politely. And both organizations are smart enough to know that a public rift would be bad for business.

It's all about the money, folks. Nothing wrong with that, but in those fights you need to know which side of the bread you're buttered.

=====

Subject: Fine. Raze Lane Stadium and every other college stadium in the country and
Posted by: Shut Up Brent on *Tue Dec 5 2006 10:56:25 AM*
Message:

build a bunch of cookie-cuttter 30k stadiums for all college football teams.

Money matters. Go with a pie-in-the-sky-hippie lifestyle if you want to, but money matters.

And for what? Because ONCE EVERY EIGHT YEARS a school (like Auburn in '04) is legitimately screwed? Once in eight years? Once in eight years? Once in eight years?

And yes, it's a small sample size, but the trend is for it occuring LESS often. The last time more than 2 non-probation major conferene schools finished the regular season undefeated before '04 was in 1992.

Our entire tenure in the Big East (well, for round-robin play) occurred between those screw-jobs.

Go on and philosophize with a Bill Walton impression about "It's How You Play The Game". Iron on some patches to the elbows of your tweed jackets, and break out the fine tobacco pipe with your trusty dog "Hunter" bringing your smoking jacket and slippers to you.

Out here in the Real World, you make pragmatic realistic decisions based on the long-term good of the program. The RIGHT attitude for an athletic director or anyone else in charge of running an individual athletic department or a collection of them is the long-term health of the program(s) they're in charge of. Period.

TO THAT END, it's best to take care of your athletes. It's best to get those who don't go on to pro careers graduated and on to productive careers in whatever they choose to do. It's best to prepare them for the real world. And yes, it's best for the program(s) in question to make lots and lots of money while maintaining as much independence as possible from an organization that often does NOT have your best interests at heart, because it holds the best interests of the other 300 or so NCAA member schools as more important than your best interests.

=====

Subject: What if the NCAA doesn't cave, and the BCS schools make that threat?

Posted by: Shut Up Brent on *Tue Dec 5 2006 2:01:25 PM*

Message:

What, carry OUT the threat?

To steal from Atlee below, it's MAD. When you've got a nuke, you DON'T want to use it or even openly threaten to use it. Doing so actually weakens your position. Which tells you something about N. Korea, but that's for the UWS board.

And what happens when the NCAA flips it on the BCS schools?

Press Release: the BCS schools are now going for a big money grab, and they're abandoning the virtuous goals of the NCAA. Now they wish to be free to ignore Title IX, use steroids, and bribe families to get their children to attend their so-called universities.

Never mind that the NCAA is just as money-hungry as the BCS, they can spin that like a mother and come out ahead.

I don't see the NCAA and BCS as having an adversarial relationship. It's a business relationship. If you're in business, don't you have someone you deal with that you would just LOVE to screw over and that you have to protect yourself against being screwed over, but at the same time you're vital to each other's interests and make a lot of money together? That's the NCAA and the BCS.

=====

Subject: The problem is that the bowl committee members don't really care all that much

Posted by: Shut Up Brent on *Tue Dec 5 2006 7:32:01 PM*

Message:

about whether the bowl makes or loses money.

The bowl committee members are restaurant owners/regional managers, hotel owners, nightclub owners, etc., etc. Tourist trap businesses.

Bowls are about selling hotel beds, not game tickets.

Now, the Gator Bowl is losing \$1 million, but the REAL hurt is in the lack of hotel beds sold, meals sold, drinks sold.

The BOWL may be able to get insurance, but how can a restaurant get insured for how many people come through their doors? Heck, if insurance companies offered that, my family's first, second, or third attempts at starting a business would have worked, and we never would have gotten to #4.

=====

Subject: So what's the solution? Seriously? Just Pollyanna along and ignore the real
Posted by: Shut Up Brent on *Wed Dec 6 2006 12:53:57 AM*
Message:

problems facing both organizations?

Pro-playoff people are perfectly okay with the NCAA running things entirely? No checks and balances, all the mid-majors, I-AA, II, and III schools living off of OUR team's work and OUR money going to pay for their programs.

Because that's what it'll take for the National Championship to not be "mythical."

The ONLY thing that would make the national championship "real" is an NCAA sanction. Period. That alone would make COIN FLIPPING for the championship "legit". Without it, a 64 team playoff run by the BCS WOULDNT produce a legit champion.

This is what really chaps me about the pro-playoff crowd: the insane short-sightedness of them. They're the same people that if you offered them a deal with the Devil that Tech would win the national championship (real, mythical, whatever) next year, but VT would then suffer 2 decades of 0-12 seasons, they'd JUMP at the chance. They'd figure they could cheat their way out of it at some later date.

I have bigger goals for Tech than that kind of shortsightedness. Those clowns are just DYING for a championship that they'll throw away VT's future for it. I don't want Tech to win one national championship. I want Tech to win a dozen. Two dozen. I want the bowl streak record. I want the all-time wins record. I want Tech to be Michigan, Notre Dame, Penn State. And not just be able to beat those teams in any given year. BYfreakinU had that in the 80s. I DON'T WANT TECH TO BE A FLASH-IN-THE-PAN BYU TEAM!!!!

Tech has a strong, strong program. Tech's built the program up the right way (no thanks to those calling for Jim Weaver to get fired). If you're in the hunt for enough years, you're going to get in. That's just the way it is. Programs like TEXAS went decades without a championship BECAUSE IT IS HARD TO WIN ONE. And now some people GURAN-FREAKIN'-TEE that we're going to win one within 5 years? PETE CARROL can't gurantee USC will win one in the next five years.

I want Tech to have the keys to the kingdom of college football, AND WE CAN HAVE THEM. After 40 years in the wilderness, we are FINALLY on the path to truly do it, AND NOW ALL THESE CLOWNS WANT TO THROW IT AWAY IN THE STUPID FIT OF BLIND OPTIMISM AND OUTRIGHT STUPIDITY.

Yeah, it pisses me off. Because NONE of the pro-playoff people has offered a SINGLE solution to the deadlock facing college football. They just want to wave a magic wand and say "fix it". When THEY can actually articulate a way to fix it (and no, the millionth "Oh, I invented this new way to do things!" that inevitably turns out to be the Plus One concept or at best a minor variation of it doesn't count), I'll listen.

Because most of the time, the pro-playoff people sound like mescaline-high hippies. "Dude, if we just all get together and drum our peace drums and think happy thoughts, we can do anything!" "Dude, we just have to stop being so materialistic, maaaaaan. If we just give, karma will give us everything back, maaaaaan."

Yeah, that worked out REAL well for the Commies, didn't it? Morons like that managed to kill more people than Hitler. Geez, as evil as THAT bastard was, at least he was occasionally competent. Managing to kill 20+ million people in the 20th century out of sheer stupidity is just pathetic.

=====

Subject: I'm sorry, but you're STILL not resolving the basic issues, here.

Posted by: Shut Up Brent on *Wed Dec 6 2006 10:18:17 AM*

Message:

You're ignoring them, and la-la-ing along pretending they either don't exist or they'll magically get fixed.

And all of this because once every eight years, or once every 528 team-seasons, a team gets screwed.

Get it through your heads: this year's "contreversey" is BS. The "contreversey" next year, in all likelihood, will be BS.

In 1999, did Nebraska deserve a shot at the National Championship? There was no contreversey over VT-FSU, was there? Last year, did PSU deserve a shot at the National Championship? No real contreversey over USC-UT, was there?

What about the '99 UNL team or the '05 PSU team is different than either Michigan or Florida? NOTHING. All four teams lost a game in the regular season. All were very, very strong teams THAT LOST A GAME. And in college football, when you lose a game you give up the power to control your own destiny. Period. You still have a chance at the MNC game, but it's not up to you, it's up to forces outside your control.

The only schools that can legitimately claimed to have gotten screwed without a playoff are the once-in-eight-year #3 undefeated teams, like Auburn in '04. But it's only once in every eight years. That's a pretty good record, really.

Fan want a playoff because they somehow think it'll increase their school's chances of winning a national championship.

REALITY CHECK: WITH A PLAYOFF THERE'S STILL ONLY ONE CHAMP PER YEAR. At least with the current system, there's occassionally 2 champs per year. OUR CHANCES OF WINNING AN MNC/NC GO DOWN WITH A PLAYOFF. I'll say it again: any given team's chances of winning a national championship go DOWN with a playoff. But, again, the Pollyanna crowd thinks it increases their team's chances, somehow. Magic, or God Is A (Insert Nickname Here), or something.

=====

Subject: BC over Miami? The Flutie Hail Mary? As much as we hate them, WVU over UGa

Posted by: Shut Up Brent on *Wed Dec 6 2006 10:43:31 AM*

Message:

last season? Rutgers over Louisville this year?

It's not that college football doesn't have great underdog moments. IT'S THAT COLLEGE FOOTBALL HAS THEM ALL THE BLOODY TIME.

They just don't necessarily occur in the post-season. But people still remember the Flutie Hail Mary game to this day.

TO THIS DAY, a regular season game between two teams that had no place in either the championship picture or even arguably in a playoff if there had been one, is one of the most remembered games of all time.

TO THIS DAY, a REGULAR SEASON GAME is one of the most memorable games in college football.

Let's grab another great moment in college football. The 1979 Cotton Bowl, the "Chicken Soup Bowl" where Joe Montana led ND over Houston. That was a game between an 8-3 ND and a 9-2 Houston team. NO ROOM IN THE NC HUNT for those two teams, but they gave one of the greatest games of all time to the viewing audience.

How about last year's USC-UT game? But no, that game didn't matter at all, did it?

How about this year's tOSU-UM game? Without the current system, it's just another tOSU-UM game, albeit with Bo dying the day before. WITH our current system, it was instantly the BEST GAME of a series that has been played continuously since 1918!!!! World War ONE!!!! had ended just 19 days before their 1918 game was played!!!!

Don't sit there and boo-hoo, "Oh, this evil bowl system keeps us from having great memories." This GREAT bowl system GIVES us AWESOME memories every year. You're just not looking for them.

=====

Subject: People argue and debate the wrong thing.

Posted by: Shut Up Brent on *Wed Dec 6 2006 5:37:49 PM*

Message:

It isn't about what shape a playoff or bowl system would be. It isn't about what it looks like.

The issues has little to do with the SHAPE of a playoff. It has everything to do with who RUNS the playoff, and who makes the money from it.

Your system is very pretty. And without the NCAA passing approval on it, there isn't a snowball's chance in hell of it happening. And the chances of the NCAA passing approval on it are very, very low.

The REAL debate is who runs a playoff, and what has to be done to make both the BCS and the NCAA happy with a playoff.

The BCS won't be happy unless they get to run it. The NCAA won't be happy unless THEY get to run it.

We all KNOW what the "solution" is. A (4, 6, 8, 16) team playoff, held in place of or after the bowls. THAT'S NOT THE PROBLEM. It's a matter of getting the NCAA to trust the BCS to hand over money in Brinks truck quantities, and the BCS trusting the NCAA not to just take over the bloody system whenever they've got the votes to make it happen.

The BCS schools' trump card is splitting from the NCAA. But once the NCAA owns the BCS schools' avenue towards a football championship, it becomes a LOT harder for the schools to split. I can see most of the SEC going it alone and creating a new version of the NAIA, but that won't make nearly the money the current BCS does.

(long-winded analogy, feel free to skip) It's a lot like the gun control debate. Most everyone can agree that licensing guns like you do with cars and driver's licenses is a reasonable compromise.

The problem is the NRA knows they can't trust the gun control lobby not to push that registration system into a recall of all guns, and the gun control lobby doesn't trust the NRA to write the actual law (which is stupid: it's the only way the NRA would come on board, and the gun control laws the NRA has written are consistently the most effective of the type).

Everyone from the outside looks and sees a GREAT short-term solution. Let's have a Plus One! What NOBODY except the administrators of both groups sees are the second- and third-order consequences of those initial decisions.

What happens in 15, 20 years, with the NCAA running things? What happens in 15, 20 years, with the BCS running things? The NCAA is probably frankly terrified that a truly successful BCS playoff would make it INSANELY easy for the BCS schools to split away from the NCAA. What happens to the NCAA if 99% of their funding walks out the door?

Without the BCS schools, the NCAA is a bloated version of the NAIA.

=====

Subject: Again, short-term thinking. You might, *maybe* get an 8-team playoff

Posted by: Shut Up Brent on *Wed Dec 6 2006 6:43:35 PM*

Message:

with minimal mid-major participation at first. But eventually, it'll grow into a 16-team playoff with conference champ autobids.

It's what the NCAA does. Period.

You're gambling the independence of the BCS schools (of which Tech is one) because you have convinced yourself the NCAA isn't that divorced from reality that they wouldn't make all conference champs get an autobid. Held in a vacuum, away from your desire to have a playoff, there's no WAY you'd come to that conclusion.

Gambling on the NCAA not being divorced from reality is like gambling that there's no way the French could be that cowardly, the Nazis hate Jews that much, the Khmer Rouge being that psychotically paranoid, or Bobby Knight be that much of a donkey.

You're gambling by placing your entire life savings not on red or black, but on one of the green spots on the roulette table. Not because you're paying attention to the odds, but because you're entirely focused on how much you can WIN. You want that winning bet (or the playoff) so much you can TASTE it, and you're deluding your own good sense to say (and you've actually SAID this) "There's no way the NCAA could be that divorced from reality."

Jesuc Christ on a tractor, READ that bloody sentence!

"There's no way the NCAA could be that divorced from reality."? THERE'S NO WAY THE NCAA COULD BE THAT DIVORCED FROM REALITY????? WHAT???????

The mid-major conferences will, if they're smart, agree to anything in the short term because they'll know they can OWN everything over the long term. There are MORE OF THEM. Give them a way to make money as I-A in football, and entire conferences of I-AA schools will start going to I-A to cash in on that! The OVC, the CAA, the Big West, would all come crashing over into I-A, and then they can darn well VOTE themselves all the money the BCS schools generate.

Democracies endure until the population at large realizes they can vote themselves the largesse of society as a whole, and of the wealthy in particular. It's true in politics, and that's why there are all sorts of checks and balances to slow down that eventuality.

Well, the NCAA was never designed to stop that. In the end, the ONLY real check on it is the fact that the big-time schools that make all the money have an independent source of revenue away from the NCAA. Take that away, and the mid-majors, I-AA, II, and III can vote themselves all of your Hokie Club donations they want to.

I don't know about you, but I kind of like my \$\$ going to Virginia Tech, not West Virginia Tech. WADR to WVT.