Well, the regular season flew right by, and instead it was the bowl games that seemed to last for thirteen weeks. Somehow, a system that used to close up shop on New Year's Day with its signature bowl games has now decided it prefers something closer to MLK Day for its curtain call.

The powers that be extended the bowl bash from New Years Day all the way out to January 10th this year, and scheduled bowl games on seven of the eight days in between. They could learn a thing or two about building to a thrilling climax though, after filling space with Pitt-Kentucky, Nevada-BC, and Middle Tennessee-Miami (OH) in the first week of January.

Not that those were bad games, but at that point, with bowl fatigue setting in just a bit, they had the feel of games for games' sake. Following the Granddaddy with the grandnephew is bound to take some of the luster off the former. I hear there are even people who got sick of it all after about thirty bowls. That never happened to me, although there's only so much Mark May any man can take.

On the BCS

With apologies to TCU, I think the BCS basically got it right this year...which is to say they got lucky this year...by being able to pair the consensus No. 1 and No. 2 teams in their title game without too much griping from the peanut gallery. Up to this point I haven't been one of the more passionate advocates of a playoff system, partly because it would seriously alter the bowl system that is highly successful, if not totally satisfying now. But I might be coming around.

Because even though TCU acquitted themselves well in Pasadena, the idea that the Horned Frogs, now a Big East team, are playing in the Rose Bowl makes me wonder just exactly what hallowed traditions I'm grasping to hold onto here. On the other hand, a first round playoff game between Oklahoma and Connecticut in Norman doesn't excite me either. Nor does creating a 15- or 16-game season for the finalists.

The much-maligned BCS is out making their case...as in this speech by Bill Hancock , who claims that the bowl system would be ruined by instituting a playoff. He leaves out the part about the BCS already transforming the bowl system beyond recognition, but it's worth a read anyway.

In the other corner, Dan Wetzel, co-author of "Death to the BCS" , lays out a plan for a playoff in this year-old article .
Losing an early December first-round playoff game he claims, wouldn't preclude a bowl game for that team (a contingent bowl bid?) say, three weeks later.

The issue is complicated, but the debate is academic at this point. The BCS is with us, multi-year TV deal
in place, for the foreseeable future. (At a minimum, what it means is three more years of Mark May.) And the easiest prediction to make is that the flaws in the BCS system will be exposed...again...just as soon the experts fail to agree on the identities of the two best teams and the computers arrive at a controversial decision.

This will of course lead to many sternly-worded rebukes of the BCS by college football writers, after which the BCS will carry on, unfazed by the collective wisdom of the scribes. Wetzel's book sales will spike every Christmas, and he'll be out with a sequel before anything changes.

Random OSU and Sugar Bowl Thoughts