

---

## The MWC is better than the Pac-10

Posted by timmyboy - 2007/12/27 21:56

---

The Mountain West Conference is better than the Pac-10 conference this year. I know this is only my opinion and others may have other opinions, but let me explain why I have this opinion.

If each MWC team played each Pac-10 team 10 times, here is who I think would come out with the most wins.

1. USC
2. BYU
3. Air Force
4. Utah
5. Arizona State
6. New Mexico
7. Oregon State
8. TCU
9. Arizona
10. California
11. UCLA
12. San Diego State
13. Oregon
14. Washington State
15. Wyoming
16. Washington
17. UNLV
18. Stanford
19. Colorado State

The Pac-10 is a two-team league: USC and ASU.

I do think USC is a pretty good team. I think they'll beat Illinois fairly soundly. Arizona State is a decent team but they are nothing to write home about, especially after watching them against Texas (though Texas is a very good team). I'd take BYU, Air Force, and Utah over Arizona State.

The rest of the Pac-10 is pathetic. Oregon without Dixon couldn't beat Provo High School. The only other Pac-10 team with a winning record is Oregon State and they are clearly not that great of a team.

The MWC is a four-team league: BYU, Air Force, Utah, and New Mexico. The rest of the league has struggled but no more than Stanford or Washington.

The bottom of the Pac-10 and the bottom of the MWC are closely matched, but the MWC is more top heavy than the Pac-10. The MWC is a stronger conference, in my opinion.

=====

---

## Re:The MWC is better than the Pac-10

Posted by ND/BYU - 2007/12/28 08:59

---

timmyboy wrote:

The Mountain West Conference is better than the Pac-10 conference this year. I know this is only my opinion and others may have other opinions, but let me explain why I have this opinion.

If each MWC team played each Pac-10 team 10 times, here is who I think would come out with the most wins.

1. USC
2. BYU
3. Air Force
4. Utah
5. Arizona State
6. New Mexico
7. Oregon State
8. TCU
9. Arizona
10. California

11. UCLA
12. San Diego State
13. Oregon
14. Washington State
15. Wyoming
16. Washington
17. UNLV
18. Stanford
19. Colorado State

The Pac-10 is a two-team league: USC and ASU.

I do think USC is a pretty good team. I think they'll beat Illinois fairly soundly. Arizona State is a decent team but they are nothing to write home about, especially after watching them against Texas (though Texas is a very good team). I'd take BYU, Air Force, and Utah over Arizona State.

The rest of the Pac-10 is pathetic. Oregon without Dixon couldn't beat Provo High School. The only other Pac-10 team with a winning record is Oregon State and they are clearly not that great of a team.

The MWC is a four-team league: BYU, Air Force, Utah, and New Mexico. The rest of the league has struggled but no more than Stanford or Washington.

The bottom of the Pac-10 and the bottom of the MWC are closely matched, but the MWC is more top heavy than the Pac-10. The MWC is a stronger conference, in my opinion.

No idea how to respond but the laugh. I am not sure this is worth commenting on, especially after we struggled against UCLA.

---

## Re:The MWC is better than the Pac-10

Posted by timmyboy - 2007/12/28 10:48

---

ND/BYU wrote:

No idea how to respond but the laugh. I am not sure this is worth commenting on, especially after we struggled against UCLA.

Hmmm... don't know how to respond to your brilliant insights but to laugh. Why don't you actually explain why you disagree with my assessment. Instead, you pull out the often used but clearly stupid argument: well, we barely beat the team in the middle of the conference so we'd have no chance against the top of the conference and since we are the best in our conference nobody else in our conference would have a chance either. Maybe you should wait until you actually understand football before responding to a post in such a conclusory manner. It's fine to disagree with me, but why don't you use rational reasoning to explain why?

Using your brilliant logic, we can only conclude that the following teams are pathetic and equal to bad teams in theirs and others' conferences because of their close games against bad teams.

Clearly, the SEC doesn't hold a candle to the Pac-10 because the third best team in the SEC (Tennessee) lost to a bad Pac-10 team (Cal). Gosh. That's brilliant.

2. LSU - lost to Kentucky (7-5); barely beat Alabama (6-6).
3. Virginia Tech - barely beat East Carolina (7-5) and North Carolina (4-8).
4. Oklahoma - lost to Colorado (6-6).
5. Georgia - lost to South Carolina (6-6); barely beat Alabama (6-6) and Vanderbilt (5-7).
7. USC - lost to Stanford (4-8); barely beat Washington (4-9), Arizona (5-7), and Cal (6-6)
8. Kansas - barely beat Kansas State (5-7) and Colorado (6-6).
9. West Virginia - lost to Pittsburgh (5-7); barely beat Louisville (6-6).
10. Hawaii - barely beat Louisiana Tech (5-7), San Jose State (5-7), Nevada (6-6), and Washington (4-9).
11. Arizona State - barely beat Washington State (5-7), UCLA (6-6), and Arizona (5-7)
12. Florida - barely beat Mississippi (3-9).
13. Illinois - lost to Iowa (6-6).
14. Boston College - lost to Florida State (7-5) and Maryland (6-6).
15. Clemson - lost to Georgia Tech (7-5); barely beat Florida State (7-5) and South Carolina (6-6).
16. Tennessee - lost to California (6-6), Alabama (6-6); barely beat South Carolina (6-6), Vanderbilt (5-7), and Kentucky

(5-7).

---

## Re:The MWC is better than the Pac-10

Posted by detmer4prez - 2007/12/28 11:13

---

I would just have a hard time believing that SDSU would beat pretty much any team in the Pac 10. They are a bad team.

---

## Re:The MWC is better than the Pac-10

Posted by ND/BYU - 2007/12/28 11:36

timmyboy wrote:

ND/BYU wrote:

No idea how to respond but the laugh. I am not sure this is worth commenting on, especially after we struggled against UCLA.

Hmmm... don't know how to respond to your brilliant insights but to laugh. Why don't you actually explain why you disagree with my assessment. Instead, you pull out the often used but clearly stupid argument: well, we barely beat the team in the middle of the conference so we'd have no chance against the top of the conference and since we are the best in our conference nobody else in our conference would have a chance either. Maybe you should wait until you actually understand football before responding to a post in such a conclusory manner. It's fine to disagree with me, but why don't you use rational reasoning to explain why?

Using your brilliant logic, we can only conclude that the following teams are pathetic and equal to bad teams in theirs and others' conferences because of their close games against bad teams.

Clearly, the SEC doesn't hold a candle to the Pac-10 because the third best team in the SEC (Tennessee) lost to a bad Pac-10 team (Cal). Gosh. That's brilliant.

2. LSU - lost to Kentucky (7-5); barely beat Alabama (6-6).
3. Virginia Tech - barely beat East Carolina (7-5) and North Carolina (4-8).
4. Oklahoma - lost to Colorado (6-6).
5. Georgia - lost to South Carolina (6-6); barely beat Alabama (6-6) and Vanderbilt (5-7).
7. USC - lost to Stanford (4-8); barely beat Washington (4-9), Arizona (5-7), and Cal (6-6)
8. Kansas - barely beat Kansas State (5-7) and Colorado (6-6).
9. West Virginia - lost to Pittsburgh (5-7); barely beat Louisville (6-6).
10. Hawaii - barely beat Louisiana Tech (5-7), San Jose State (5-7), Nevada (6-6), and Washington (4-9).
11. Arizona State - barely beat Washington State (5-7), UCLA (6-6), and Arizona (5-7)
12. Florida - barely beat Mississippi (3-9).
13. Illinois - lost to Iowa (6-6).
14. Boston College - lost to Florida State (7-5) and Maryland (6-6).
15. Clemson - lost to Georgia Tech (7-5); barely beat Florida State (7-5) and South Carolina (6-6).
16. Tennessee - lost to California (6-6), Alabama (6-6); barely beat South Carolina (6-6), Vanderbilt (5-7), and Kentucky (5-7).

Do not want to get into a long drawn out debate that no matter the logic you will disagree. One example is how high you have Utah despite the fact they lost to Oregon State who you have multiple spots below. Sure the PAC 10 had a bad year but to compare to the MWC is really bad. I believe top teams in the MWC could compete in the PAC 10, but top to bottom the PAC 10 is better no question. What is next are we going to talk about how the MWC would compete with the SEC?

---

## Re:The MWC is better than the Pac-10

Posted by AF\_Puma - 2007/12/28 11:41

---

Those are some thick Cougar-blue lenses you have on my friend. Go post that over at a Pac-10 forum for the fun of it and see what kind of response you get!

---

I'm not quite following how you have Utah above Oregon St since they did play this season and OSU kicked Ute butt.

=====

## Re:The MWC is better than the Pac-10

Posted by cszjr - 2007/12/28 12:05

---

I view the pac-10 this way. USC is head and shoulders above everyone in the country. When they are healthy, they are great.

The rest of the pac-10 is just average. And being just average, they would be competitive with the teams in the MWC. No conference would dominate the other. We'd win some and they'd win some.

=====

## Re:The MWC is better than the Pac-10

Posted by timmyboy - 2007/12/28 12:11

---

AF\_Puma wrote:

Those are some thick Cougar-blue lenses you have on my friend. Go post that over at a Pac-10 forum for the fun of it and see what kind of response you get!

I'm not quite following how you have Utah above Oregon St since they did play this season and OSU kicked Ute butt.

Simple. Utah is playing much better than Oregon State right now. Yes, they got killed by Oregon State but they have won 8 of their last 9 and I believe that if those teams played again, Utah would consistently beat Oregon State. Here's what I want to know: Utah killed UCLA who killed Oregon State. How does that fit into your arguments?

Using this same logic as to who is best, Kentucky beat LSU, so Kentucky is the better team. Right? So, Kentucky has a better claim at playing in the national championship game than LSU. Such arguments are completely fallacious. That's the beauty of college football.

Now, if you really think Oregon State would beat Utah 6 times out of 10, as the thread stated at the beginning, that's one thing. I, for one, don't think it would come out that way. I'd take Utah 8 times out of 10 against Oregon State.

=====

## Re:The MWC is better than the Pac-10

Posted by cougarfan87 - 2007/12/28 12:14

---

Since we are throwing out our subjective who would beat whom ideas to determine which conference is better I will add mine below:

#1--BYU vs. USC. I am an optimist, but not optimistic enough to think we could take USC. Pac-10 1-0-0 MWC 0-1-0

#2--Air Force vs. Arizona State. AZ State, though they lost to Texas, would still handle Air Force pretty easily. Pac-10 2-0-0 MWC 0-2-0

#3--Utah vs. Oregon State. Seeing as how Oregon State handled Utah, Oregon State gets the win here. Pac-10 3-0-0 MWC 0-3-0

#4--New Mexico vs. Oregon. Oregon takes this game with or without Dixon. Pac-10 4-0-0 MWC 0-4-0

#5--TCU vs. UCLA. Both great defenses. It depends on which team shows up. I think you have to call this one even. Pac-10 4-0-1 MWC 0-4-1

#6--San Diego State v. UA. We have played Arizona. Is there any doubt that Arizona could take SDSU. Not in my mind. If you are being honest you have to give Arizona the advantage in this game. Pac-10 5-0-1 MWC 0-5-1

---

#7--Wyoming v. Cal-- Wyoming has had some good years, as has Cal. But this year, I think you have to give Cal the win. Pac-10 6-0-1 MWC 0-6-1

#8--Colorado State v. Washington State-- I think this would be a pretty good match-up. Having watched both play, I would have to give the slight edge to Washington State. Pac-10 7-0-1 MWC 0-7-1

#9--UNLV v. Stanford/Washington (#10)-- Now that would be a great pillow fight. Unfortunately, I am going to give the edge to Stanford/Washington since Stanford has more wins and beat USC. Pac-10 8-0-1 MWC 0-8-1.

In sum, BYU could probably be a pretty good Pac-10 team right now, along with TCU, New Mexico, and Utah. But, these teams are not better than the upper echelon of the Pac-10, and the MWC suckier teams are way suckier than the Pac-10 sucky teams.

=====

## Re:The MWC is better than the Pac-10

Posted by JaredCowley - 2007/12/28 12:17

---

The Pac-10 is overrated, but they're still a better top-to-bottom conference than the MWC.

USC: better than every team in the MWC

Arizona State: better than every team in the MWC except maybe BYU

Oregon: if healthy, better than every team in the MWC (even BYU); without Dixon, you're right, they're not good, but they'd still be a middle-of-the-pack team in the MWC.

Oregon State: better than every team in the MWC except BYU

UCLA: better than every team in the MWC except BYU, Utah, maybe Air Force (I think TCU is overrated)

The rest of the Pac-10 stinks, but so does the rest of the MWC.

Jared Cowley

=====

## Re:The MWC is better than the Pac-10

Posted by ND/BYU - 2007/12/28 12:33

---

cougarfan87 wrote:

Since we are throwing out our subjective who would beat whom ideas to determine which conference is better I will add mine below:

#1--BYU vs. USC. I am an optimist, but not optimistic enough to think we could take USC. Pac-10 1-0-0 MWC 0-1-0

#2--Air Force vs. Arizona State. AZ State, though they lost to Texas, would still handle Air Force pretty easily. Pac-10 2-0-0 MWC 0-2-0

#3--Utah vs. Oregon State. Seeing as how Oregon State handled Utah, Oregon State gets the win here. Pac-10 3-0-0 MWC 0-3-0

#4--New Mexico vs. Oregon. Oregon takes this game with or without Dixon. Pac-10 4-0-0 MWC 0-4-0

#5--TCU vs. UCLA. Both great defenses. It depends on which team shows up. I think you have to call this one even. Pac-10 4-0-1 MWC 0-4-1

#6--San Diego State v. UA. We have played Arizona. Is there any doubt that Arizona could take SDSU. Not in my mind. If you are being honest you have to give Arizona the advantage in this game. Pac-10 5-0-1 MWC 0-5-1

#7--Wyoming v. Cal-- Wyoming has had some good years, as has Cal. But this year, I think you have to give Cal the win. Pac-10 6-0-1 MWC 0-6-1

#8--Colorado State v. Washington State-- I think this would be a pretty good match-up. Having watched both play, I would have to give the slight edge to Washington State. Pac-10 7-0-1 MWC 0-7-1

---

#9--UNLV v. Stanford/Washington (#10)-- Now that would be a great pillow fight. Unfortunately, I am going to give the edge to Stanford/Washington since Stanford has more wins and beat USC. Pac-10 8-0-1 MWC 0-8-1.

In sum, BYU could probably be a pretty good Pac-10 team right now, along with TCU, New Mexico, and Utah. But, these teams are not better than the upper echelon of the Pac-10, and the MWC suckier teams are way suckier than the Pac-10 sucky teams.

I agree, but was too lazy to write out this detailed of a post. Seems pretty logical to me.

---

## Re:The MWC is better than the Pac-10

Posted by PlayoffDude - 2007/12/28 14:13

I do not think the MWC is better than the PAC 10, but the gap is much closer than the nation gives credit.

I definitely agree that the PAC 10 had only two good teams after Dixon went down for Oregon. Before that, however, the Pac 10 would have had three.

I agree that BYU, Air Force, Utah, and New Mexico probably would have finished ahead of Oregon St., Arizona, California, and Oregon (after Dixon went down). But I do not think the Mountain West has anyone that could have knocked USC or Arizona St. out of the first two spots. Of course, BYU would have had the best shot, but USC would beat BYU 7-8 times out of 10. Arizona St. would beat BYU probably 6 times out of 10.

If BYU and either Utah, Air Force, or New Mexico were in a PAC 12 this year, I think the conference would have looked like this:

### PAC 12 North

1. BYU
2. Oregon (they would have won enough games before Dixon went down)
3. Utah/Air Force/New Mexico
4. Oregon State (don't give me that OSU beat the U argument. It was clear that when Johnson went down, that made ALL the difference in that game!)
5. Washington St.
6. Washington

### PAC 12 South

1. USC
2. Arizona St.
3. UCLA
4. Arizona
5. California
6. Stanford

USC would beat BYU in the conference championship game. This year, the PAC 12 South would have been a stronger division than the North, simply because of USC and Arizona St. I think the PAC 12 South would generally be a stronger division than the North, probably 3 out of every 4 years.

---

## Re:The MWC is better than the Pac-10

Posted by SeattleCougar - 2007/12/28 17:21

how many pac-10 games did you watch last season, and in season's past?

---

## Re:The MWC is better than the Pac-10

Posted by sjcougfan - 2007/12/28 19:50

---

USC is a good team and would most likely beat BYU this year, but you guys think way too highly of ASU IMHO, I watched ASU play several times this year and they're nothing special, BYU would beat them. By the way Hall is a much better QB than Carpenter.

=====

## Re:The MWC is better than the Pac-10

Posted by timmyboy - 2007/12/28 20:32

---

Oregon State is so awesome that they are struggling against a terrible, terrible Maryland team. This is demonstrative of who this team is. Come on guys, let's not give the Pac-10 some "aura" of respect that they don't deserve. BYU, Utah, Air Force, and New Mexico would all dominate Oregon State at this point.

=====

## Re:The MWC is better than the Pac-10

Posted by MizzouCoug - 2007/12/28 20:42

---

Why are we treating ASU as some perennial power? They are not comparable to USC by any stretch of the imagination when it comes to annual dominance. We take them on any given chance when Pac-10 refs are not involved.

=====

## Re:The MWC is better than the Pac-10

Posted by gordito - 2007/12/29 11:49

---

This thread doesn't even fly on the bluest of blue boards--let alone in reality.

=====

## Re:The MWC is better than the Pac-10

Posted by Hengst - 2007/12/29 11:51

---

nope, they're not. Stanford would blow out UNLV and possibly san diego state, and BYU would lose to USC. They might have a small chance if USC came to cougar stadium, but since BYU only beat a lousy UCLA team by a point, I don't have a lot of confidence in them beating USC.

=====

## Re:The MWC is better than the Pac-10

Posted by timmyboy - 2007/12/29 21:16

---

Hengst wrote:

nope, they're not. Stanford would blow out UNLV and possibly san diego state, and BYU would lose to USC. They might have a small chance if USC came to cougar stadium, but since BYU only beat a lousy UCLA team by a point, I don't have a lot of confidence in them beating USC.

I agree with you on BYU-USC, but not on Stanford-UNLV. Stanford is, statistically speaking, one of the worst teams in college football. They are not going to blow out anyone at this point. In fact, both UNLV and San Diego State are stastically better than Stanford (albeit with UNLV it is only a slight edge). I'd take San Diego State 7/10 times against Stanford and UNLV 5-6 times out of 10.

Check out these beauties for Stanford:

Total Offense 322.5 yds 106th  
Total Defense 435.5 yds 100th  
Points Scored 19.6 pts 123rd  
Points Allowed 28.3 pts 80th

---

=====

## Re:The MWC is better than the Pac-10

Posted by timmyboy - 2007/12/29 21:17

---

gordito wrote:

This thread doesn't even fly on the bluest of blue boards--let alone in reality.

Ahh... the classic straw man attack. Beautiful logic.

=====

## Re:The MWC is better than the Pac-10

Posted by Island Pipeline - 2007/12/30 03:37

---

timmyboy wrote:

The Mountain West Conference is better than the Pac-10 conference this year. I know this is only my opinion and others may have other opinions, but let me explain why I have this opinion.

If each MWC team played each Pac-10 team 10 times, here is who I think would come out with the most wins.

1. USC
2. BYU
3. Air Force
4. Utah
5. Arizona State
6. New Mexico
7. Oregon State
8. TCU
9. Arizona
10. California
11. UCLA
12. San Diego State
13. Oregon
14. Washington State
15. Wyoming
16. Washington
17. UNLV
18. Stanford
19. Colorado State

The Pac-10 is a two-team league: USC and ASU.

I do think USC is a pretty good team. I think they'll beat Illinois fairly soundly. Arizona State is a decent team but they are nothing to write home about, especially after watching them against Texas (though Texas is a very good team). I'd take BYU, Air Force, and Utah over Arizona State.

The rest of the Pac-10 is pathetic. Oregon without Dixon couldn't beat Provo High School. The only other Pac-10 team with a winning record is Oregon State and they are clearly not that great of a team.

The MWC is a four-team league: BYU, Air Force, Utah, and New Mexico. The rest of the league has struggled but no more than Stanford or Washington.

The bottom of the Pac-10 and the bottom of the MWC are closely matched, but the MWC is more top heavy than the Pac-10. The MWC is a stronger conference, in my opinion.

OKAY I THOUGHT I HEARD EVERYTHING BUT THIS ONE TAKES THE CAKE! Dude were you sleeping when you thought up this message?:unsure:

=====

---

## Re:The MWC is better than the Pac-10

Posted by Mars - 2007/12/30 04:00

---

- 1 SOUTHEASTERN (A) = 80.54
- 2 BIG EAST (A) = 78.76
- 3 PAC-10 (A) = 78.63
- 4 BIG 12 (A) = 77.29
- 5 ATLANTIC COAST (A) = 76.36
- 6 BIG TEN (A) = 75.99
- 7 MOUNTAIN WEST (A) = 70.67
  
- 8 WESTERN ATHLETIC (A) = 62.41
- 9 I-A INDEPENDENTS (A) = 62.10
- 10 MID-AMERICAN (A) = 60.33
- 11 COLONIAL (AA)= 59.43
- 12 SOUTHERN (AA)= 59.08
- 13 SUN BELT (A) = 58.60
- 14 CONFERENCE USA (A) = 58.55

<http://www.usatoday.com/sports/sagarin/fbc07.htm>

---

## Re:The MWC is better than the Pac-10

Posted by cougarfan87 - 2007/12/31 09:52

---

Mars wrote:

- 1 SOUTHEASTERN (A) = 80.54
- 2 BIG EAST (A) = 78.76
- 3 PAC-10 (A) = 78.63
- 4 BIG 12 (A) = 77.29
- 5 ATLANTIC COAST (A) = 76.36
- 6 BIG TEN (A) = 75.99
- 7 MOUNTAIN WEST (A) = 70.67
  
- 8 WESTERN ATHLETIC (A) = 62.41
- 9 I-A INDEPENDENTS (A) = 62.10
- 10 MID-AMERICAN (A) = 60.33
- 11 COLONIAL (AA)= 59.43
- 12 SOUTHERN (AA)= 59.08
- 13 SUN BELT (A) = 58.60
- 14 CONFERENCE USA (A) = 58.55

<http://www.usatoday.com/sports/sagarin/fbc07.htm>

Interesting. The Gap between MWC and the Big Ten is less than the Gap between the WAC and the MWC. Hmmm.

---

## Re:The MWC is better than the Pac-10

Posted by Knucklehead - 2007/12/31 10:22

---

I have a lot of love for the MWC. Gulp, I even pull for Utah when they are playing teams out of our conference, but I do think the PAC-10 is tougher conference, top-to-bottom then the MWC.

However, I can buy the argument that over the last 5-10 years it has been USC that has carried the load for the prestige of the PAC-10.

I know this would never happen, but I would be interested to see how the power rankings would look if the MWC were to dump its last place team and replace it with USC. Where would our conference be ranked among conferences in the power rankings?

---

By the way, is it just me or does it seem like every year the Holiday Bowl hosts an old-fashioned butt-whopping for whichever PAC-10 team is playing there?

=====

## Re:The MWC is better than the Pac-10

Posted by gordito - 2007/12/31 10:39

---

timmyboy wrote:

gordito wrote:

This thread doesn't even fly on the bluest of blue boards--let alone in reality.

Ahh... the classic straw man attack. Beautiful logic.

No, not straw man, just my opinion (logical or not).

Definition of straw man fallacy:

A straw man argument is an informal fallacy based on misrepresentation of an opponent's position. To "set up a straw man" or "set up a straw man argument" is to create a position that is easy to refute, then attribute that position to the opponent. Often, the straw man is set up to deliberately overstate the opponent's position.

=====

## Re:The MWC is better than the Pac-10

Posted by scott715 - 2007/12/31 11:29

---

Well Air Force is up 21-7 over Cal in the 2nd quarter. If they win that game that will be two MWC team wins over Pac-10 teams. I think the PAC-10 is a stronger conference but it is much closer that most people think. I wish Sagrin would update the rankings during bowl season. There is a chance that we pass up the Big team after all of these wins.

=====

## Re:The MWC is better than the Pac-10

Posted by sjcoug - 2007/12/31 11:45

---

You guys are all talking about this year, right? Because my goodness it would be laughable to even compare the two conferences over the years. Neither conference had a great year this year and no one from the MWC faced anyone from the top of the PAC-10 so its really tough to say and look- Cal is coming back against Air Force.

=====

## Re:The MWC is better than the Pac-10

Posted by timmyboy - 2007/12/31 16:23

---

After watching the Cal-AFA game, I think that Air Force with Shaun Carney is a better team than Cal and would have won that game. I would also take them over several other Pac-10 teams. I would also give them a fighting chance over Arizona State although I am not convinced I would take them over ASU any longer.

However, I considered Oregon w/o Dixon and I am therefore now forced to consider Air Force w/o Carney. This team drops significantly as evidenced by the loss to Cal. I'd put them middle of the road MWC and therefore no longer as high as they are.

Also, it is clear that Oregon has recovered somewhat from losing Dixon. I'd move them up the rankings several spots. However, I'd still put them as a middle of the road Pac-10 team and nothing more.

All told, the Pac-10 has probably pulled itself ahead of the MWC in my book with the loss of Carney and the somewhat recovery of Oregon. I'd still say it's a lot closer than most of you will admit.

---

## Re:The MWC is better than the Pac-10

Posted by timmyboy - 2007/12/31 16:25

---

gordito wrote:

timmyboy wrote:

gordito wrote:

This thread doesn't even fly on the bluest of blue boards--let alone in reality.

Ahh... the classic straw man attack. Beautiful logic.

No, not straw man, just my opinion (logical or not).

Definition of straw man fallacy:

A straw man argument is an informal fallacy based on misrepresentation of an opponent's position. To "set up a straw man" or "set up a straw man argument" is to create a position that is easy to refute, then attribute that position to the opponent. Often, the straw man is set up to deliberately overstate the opponent's position.

Fair enough. I mischaracterized your opinion as a straw man. However, it is still fallacious in that it is an "Appeal to Ridicule." <http://www.nizkor.org/features/fallacies/appeal-to-ridicule.html> .

No personal offense intended, I just don't see the value of such a comment. If you want to say that I am dead wrong because of A, B, and C, that's fine. Otherwise, we are just turning into CougarBoard.

=====

---

## Re:The MWC is better than the Pac-10

Posted by draider - 2007/12/31 16:56

---

timmyboy wrote:

The Mountain West Conference is better than the Pac-10 conference this year. I know this is only my opinion and others may have other opinions, but let me explain why I have this opinion.

If each MWC team played each Pac-10 team 10 times, here is who I think would come out with the most wins.

1. USC
2. BYU
3. Air Force
4. Utah
5. Arizona State
6. New Mexico
7. Oregon State
8. TCU
9. Arizona
10. California
11. UCLA
12. San Diego State
13. Oregon
14. Washington State
15. Wyoming
16. Washington
17. UNLV
18. Stanford
19. Colorado State

The Pac-10 is a two-team league: USC and ASU.

I do think USC is a pretty good team. I think they'll beat Illinois fairly soundly. Arizona State is a decent team but they are nothing to write home about, especially after watching them against Texas (though Texas is a very good team). I'd take BYU, Air Force, and Utah over Arizona State.

The rest of the Pac-10 is pathetic. Oregon without Dixon couldn't beat Provo High School. The only other Pac-10 team

---

with a winning record is Oregon State and they are clearly not that great of a team.

The MWC is a four-team league: BYU, Air Force, Utah, and New Mexico. The rest of the league has struggled but no more than Stanford or Washington.

The bottom of the Pac-10 and the bottom of the MWC are closely matched, but the MWC is more top heavy than the Pac-10. The MWC is a stronger conference, in my opinion.

I dont even know where to start with this one. First off as someone else has pointed out we lost to UCLA this year and to a terrible Arizona team last year. We barely beat UCLA in the bowl game(god won it for us if you ask Austin Collie just a joke but thats another topic)i think we would be behind we wouldnt do terrible but thats us the thread says mwc and we as a conference suck compared to them on a regular basis.. why do you think they have an automatic bcs bowl bid...you got it right if you guessed its because they would destroy almost any team in our conference with any team in their conference pretty much every year this isnt even an argument because we dont have one. Yes BYU could compete with some teams year to year in the MWC but our winning % would go down quite a bit.

---

## Re:The MWC is better than the Pac-10

Posted by yutka - 2007/12/31 16:59

---

Did someone start a thread about Chadders?

timmyboy wrote:

we are just turning into CougarBoard.

---

## Re:The MWC is better than the Pac-10

Posted by scott715 - 2008/01/01 20:37

---

I think if we played in the Pac-10 that it would be very challanging. Probably would lose a few more players to injury through the season. But after a couple of years we would be in the top 3. There is just no substitute for playing good teams week after week.

Look at the BYU soccer team in the semipro league. First year was a struggle now we are winning the conference. That is how you get better. Playing good teams that push you. Yeah we are undefeated in conference for two years but are we being pushed enough?

---

## Re:The MWC is better than the Pac-10

Posted by mormonrasta - 2008/01/02 11:47

---

What makes the Pac-10 a hands down better league in football than the MWC is USC. However, if you compare the other 9 teams vs. the 9 teams in the MWC, the MWC is very competitive. The last 4 seasons. . .

Head to Head: Pac-9 14 wins; MWC 10 wins

Bowl record: Pac-9 10-8; MWC 11-5

BCS appearances: Pac-9 0; MWC 1

Teams in Final Top 25: Pac-9 8 (unless Oregon or OSU climbs back into the poll); MWC 5

As you can see the Pac-9 still holds an edge, but the gap is closing and isn't as far as many people perceive.

---

## Re:The MWC is better than the Pac-10

Posted by Airwolf84 - 2008/01/02 16:49

Timmyboy...

Combined W-L record of Pac 10: 68-57 (.540)  
Combined W-L record of MWC: 60-53 (.530)

Pac 10 avg. strength of schedule rank: 12th  
MWC avg. strength of schedule rank: 64th

The Pac 10 has a 1% better win-loss percentage than the MWC with a strength of schedule ranking 5 1/2 times more difficult. Not only that, the Pac 10 has 17 wins against top 30 teams, while the MWC has... drum roll please... 0! Saying the MWC is better than the Pac 10 is just plain ludicrous.:laugh:

=====

## Re:The MWC is better than the Pac-10

Posted by kitic77 - 2008/01/02 17:36

---

I think BYU would be like most PAC-10 teams if they were there. A middle of the road team that would go 5-3, 4-4 or 3-5 most years with a special season where they go 7-1 or 6-2 every five years or so.

Outside of USC, this is what most teams do in the PAC-10. The win 8 or 9 games, go to a bowl, sometimes win, sometimes lose and then every few years, things come together and they put together a special 10 or 11 win season.

=====

## Re:The MWC is better than the Pac-10

Posted by timmyboy - 2008/01/02 18:50

---

Airwolf84 wrote:  
Timmyboy...

Combined W-L record of Pac 10: 68-57 (.540)  
Combined W-L record of MWC: 60-53 (.530)

Pac 10 avg. strength of schedule rank: 12th  
MWC avg. strength of schedule rank: 64th

The Pac 10 has a 1% better win-loss percentage than the MWC with a strength of schedule ranking 5 1/2 times more difficult. Not only that, the Pac 10 has 17 wins against top 30 teams, while the MWC has... drum roll please... 0! Saying the MWC is better than the Pac 10 is just plain ludicrous.:laugh:

See my other post in your other thread with the same post.

=====

## Re:The MWC is better than the Pac-10

Posted by mithrandir - 2008/01/02 19:10

---

There's no way the MWC is better than the PAC-10. Even with my blue-tinted glasses firmly in place I don't see BYU beating USC...not even in LES. I think BYU, Utah and TCU are on par with most of the rest of the PAC-10, but, our bottom feeders (SDSU, UW and UNLV) get worked by the pac's cellar dwellars.

You might be able to argue that the PAC minus USC isn't heads and shoulders above the MWC, but, not much more.

=====

## Re:The MWC is better than the Pac-10

Posted by Mars - 2008/01/03 05:08

---

---

yutka wrote:

Did someone start a thread about Chadders?

Didn't they get sued into oblivion? Or are they still open for business?

---

## Re:The MWC is better than the Pac-10

Posted by imuakahuku - 2008/01/03 07:46

---

Airwolf84 wrote:

Timmyboy...

Combined W-L record of Pac 10: 68-57 (.540)

Combined W-L record of MWC: 60-53 (.530)

Pac 10 avg. strength of schedule rank: 12th

MWC avg. strength of schedule rank: 64th

The Pac 10 has a 1% better win-loss percentage than the MWC with a strength of schedule ranking 5 1/2 times more difficult. Not only that, the Pac 10 has 17 wins against top 30 teams, while the MWC has... drum roll please... 0! Saying the MWC is better than the Pac 10 is just plain ludicrous.:laugh:

Although I don't believe that the MWC is stronger than the Pac-10 it is very close. SOS is a VERY bad statistic. You are now changing the playing field because you are giving Stanford and WA a better rating than SDSU BECAUSE they are in the PAC-10. It's like saying I can do more pushups than you and therefore I am stronger than you. I know an awful lot of boys back home that I can make look silly in a pushup war but lets go head to head and they will twist me into a pretzel. The SOS arguement can only be used if it is translated correctly (see AoF v8). What would the MWC SOS be if they were BCS instead of the Big-(L)East?

---

## Re:The MWC is better than the Pac-10

Posted by Airwolf84 - 2008/01/04 13:58

---

JaredCowley wrote:

The Pac-10 is overrated, but they're still a better top-to-bottom conference than the MWC.

USC: better than every team in the MWC

Arizona State: better than every team in the MWC except maybe BYU

Oregon: if healthy, better than every team in the MWC (even BYU); without Dixon, you're right, they're not good, but they'd still be a middle-of-the-pack team in the MWC.

Oregon State: better than every team in the MWC except BYU

UCLA: better than every team in the MWC except BYU, Utah, maybe Air Force (I think TCU is overrated)

The rest of the Pac-10 stinks, but so does the rest of the MWC.

Jared Cowley

Agree 100% Jared! Well said post.

---

## Re:The MWC is better than the Pac-10

Posted by UliUli79 - 2008/01/04 15:54

---

Mars wrote:

yutka wrote:

Did someone start a thread about Chadders?

Didn't they get sued into oblivion? Or are they still open for business?

Nah, they're still around. It takes like 4 hrs. just to get a freaking burger though. You'd think that In-N-Out would take it

as a hint that they might do well up here.

---

## Re:The MWC is better than the Pac-10

Posted by Mars - 2008/01/05 02:03

---

UliUli79 wrote:

Mars wrote:

yutka wrote:

Did someone start a thread about Chadders?

Didn't they get sued into oblivion? Or are they still open for business?

Nah, they're still around. It takes like 4 hrs. just to get a freaking burger though. You'd think that In-N'-Out would take it as a hint that they might do well up here.

You know how In-N-Out has scripture verses on the bottom of their drinks cups? Well, supposedly the chain doesn't extend to the state of Utah because their ultra-Christian owner hates Mormons. Probably not a Mitt Romney fan either. :S

---

## Re:The MWC is better than the Pac-10

Posted by mormonrasta - 2008/01/05 07:27

---

Mars wrote:

You know how In-N-Out has scripture verses on the bottom of their drinks cups? Well, supposedly the chain doesn't extend to the state of Utah because their ultra-Christian owner hates Mormons. Probably not a Mitt Romney fan either. :S

That's nice rubbish.

The real story about In-N-Out Burger and their limited expansion has to do with the freshness of their meat. They don't freeze their meat and their beef is only raised in California. Therefore, they will only go into areas that can be driven to in a day from California. That's why the most eastern location of In-N-Out is Tucson.

---

## Re:The MWC is better than the Pac-10

Posted by Hawkwing - 2008/01/05 11:47

---

There has actually been an In-N-Out planned in St. George for well over 3 years now, maybe bordering on 5. They already own the land and have planned to have it up and running before now, but other things have kept coming up.

---

## Re:The MWC is better than the Pac-10

Posted by CougarPeasant - 2008/01/05 17:42

---

mormonrasta wrote:

Mars wrote:

You know how In-N-Out has scripture verses on the bottom of their drinks cups? Well, supposedly the chain doesn't extend to the state of Utah because their ultra-Christian owner hates Mormons. Probably not a Mitt Romney fan either. :S

That's nice rubbish.

The real story about In-N-Out Burger and their limited expansion has to do with the freshness of their meat. They don't freeze their meat and their beef is only raised in California. Therefore, they will only go into areas that can be driven to in a day from California. That's why the most eastern location of In-N-Out is Tucson.

I have heard the same thing. It's about quality. They are also consumed with the quality of their burger buns, which are

---

produced locally.

If they are open in St. George, that's great news. In time, they get the quality distribution set up in the west, they will rule the fast food chains.

=====

## Re:The MWC is better than the Pac-10

Posted by njustus7 - 2008/09/14 18:24

---

Oh, boy where to start.

First off using SOS to define a conference's actual strength is like using a word to define itself - iow it's inherently flawed logic.

Second - using TV rating? Come-on. This has the Big Least as number 2, I think we can all agree that's no the case...

Third - How someone comes up with a scenario where the Pac-10 is all of a sudden 10-0-1 against an opponent they just went 0-4 against is beyond me, talk about twisting the data.

Finally, I'm a TCU fan and trust me there is no love lost between BYU and us (notice they mentioned New Mexico and Airforce with Utah and BYU, even though we're 18-6 in the leagues over the last three years, and 11-2 in recent history against BCS - the best non-BCS vs BCS winning percentage in the country - Fresno is not even close...) but I could see BYU giving USC a run for their money this year and two years ago, I mean heck, USC almost lost to Fresno two years ago, and trust me BYU can take Fresno.

The real lesson from all of this is there just isn't that much difference between the so call BCS and Non-BCS. If BYU runs the table, it will be a more impressive feat than if USC does given what has transpired this week - and don't ask me, go to Sports Illustrated.com, b/c that's their evaluation too. If if they do, they should be playing for the national championship...

Heck any team that sweeps the MWC this year and goes undefeated should be in the National Championship Game... Go FROGS..!!!

=====