

Upon Re-Watching, I Still Think Pacquiao Won, But...

Written by Michael Woods
Tuesday, 12 June 2012 20:02



Three days on, and I'm still wrestling with the **Pacquiao-Bradley** decision. I'm still not sure what it was that my eyes saw. Fight night, I was certain. I was right there with the HBO crew, and that thank you heard from Park Slope, Brooklyn was the same thank you heard en masse in Vegas, and in the Philippines, and everywhere else people had access to the broadcast or

Upon Re-Watching, I Still Think Pacquiao Won, But...

Written by Michael Woods
Tuesday, 12 June 2012 20:02

stream of the fight. It was my jaw and your jaw, and probably hundreds of thousands of jaws hitting the floor when Michael Buffer got done telling us what we could scarcely believe..but could believe, without a lengthy bout of processing, because similar circumstance had forced us to pick up our jaw from the floor last month, and the month before that, and so on, and so forth

But then I kept ruminating, and marinating, and pondering some what ifs. What if there was a contrarian stance to take? What if a tsunami of emotion and opinion, coalescing around the new wonder that is social media, had turned a semi-screwy decision into a Brinks Job, a Madoffian fleeing. What if those two judges, Ross and Ford, weren't inept or worse, compromised, but actually turned in scores that were within the bounds of reason, based on the criteria they use to score fights. These were out there "what ifs," because on fight night, I saw the replays, I saw Manny throwing shots that had mustard on them, I saw him landing more than a couple straight lefts that landed flushed and tested Bradley's chin, I saw minute after minute in round after round of Bradley backing up, or throwing mushy shots which seemed to find Pacman's forearms and gloves as much as anything else. I also saw the CompuBox numbers, which helped cement my take, based on the hard, cold numbers, that Manny threw more power shots, and landed many more, and that Manny won the fight. But, I had to remind myself, these old pros didn't have those watching aids on fight night. They didn't get the benefit of the super slo mo replays, or the punchstat numbers, to help inform their scores. Course, word was that just about every media person present at the MGM saw Manny the victor, and we all heard that Bradley after apologized to promoter Bob Arum for not getting it done. But I felt like I owed it to those judges who've been getting slammed by everyone and their brother, raked over the coals with Lasik jokes and such to re-watch that fight, with the sound off, and lose the replay and CompuBox crutches.

On Monday and Tuesday I did that. I re-watched the bout. And guess what? Manny still won on my card.

I still saw him doing more, a bunch more, based on the main component I use to score a bout: effective aggression. He landed the cleaner, harder shots. Round after round. But..I re-watched with another purpose in mind. To try and watch the rounds and determine if they could PLAUSIBLY be scored for Bradley. And guess what? I saw, on second watch, a fight that was closer than it looked initially.

Now, maybe my mind is irrevocably tainted. Maybe I'm bending over too far backwards in sympathy to Ross and Ford, trying too hard to take that contrary stance. But I found it exceedingly hard to find a runaway round, the sort of round that a kindergartner could watch, and tell you who won. There were no knockdowns. There were no shots landed that buzzed a

Upon Re-Watching, I Still Think Pacquiao Won, But...

Written by Michael Woods
Tuesday, 12 June 2012 20:02

guy to his marrow, made his knees knock. There weren't more than a couple blows that sent sweat spraying off into the second row, a clear signal that damage has been done, solid contact has been made.

On fight night, I gave a single round to Bradley, and upon further review--sorry Tim--I only gave him one more than that. This might be derided as the wimpiest unofficial card ever produced, but remember, I re-watched with a new purpose, to give Bradley and Ross and Ford the benefit of the doubt...and I scored 5 rounds for Pacquiao, two rounds for Bradley, and five rounds even. And what that told me was that I am backing off terming this fight a "robbery." Bad decision, yep. Should Duane Ford beg and plead a moment of insanity for telling Steve Carp and the world he though Bradley gave Pacquiao a "boxing lesson?" I think he should...But there have been worse decisions than this one, and will be a half dozen more in the second half of this year, sad to say.

ROUND ONE Was it as effective as the most aggressive we've seen Manny on his best night? No, but he still pushed the action, looked to me to land half a handful of cleaner blows, plus Bradley landed on Manny's arms, up in front of his face. Manny's best shots probably landed in the last ten seconds, so if you were on the fence, as many could have been with this round, that late work might have nudged it to Manny. (Not fair to score with aid of replay, if you are trying to replicate the experience of the onsite judges; but replay showed Manny landing a clean, crisp left, the best of the round for either man, in the waning seconds. I think it was the waning seconds, I was watching with sound off, lest I be seduced by the smoothtalking seducers. Did that launch impress the judges like it did me? Not Duane Ford; he liked Bradley in the first.

The Round Winner: Manny Pacquiao

Could Bradley Have Won It, Plausibly: Yes

ROUND TWO No one separated themselves in this frame. Since we are undertaking this endeavor to test our initial reaction, and want to be as fair as possible, want to not be reflexively dismissive of friends and colleagues who saw a closer fight than we did, we tilt towards trying to view Bradley with open eyes and mind.

The Round Winner: Draw

Could Bradley Have Won It, Plausibly: I suppose so...though I keep getting visions of him being outfitted with little alligator arms as his jab falls short on Manny. Ross and Roth didn't agree on that front; they gave the nod to Bradley.

ROUND THREE Another tight one. No sharpshooter landing sniper fire. One Manny straight left stood out for me, in the middle third, but if you want to call this one a draw, power to you. I would have given a slight edge to Pacquiao, because, yes, I will typically reward you for trying

Upon Re-Watching, I Still Think Pacquiao Won, But...

Written by Michael Woods
Tuesday, 12 June 2012 20:02

to make the fight, "hitting" is the main aim of the game, but will bend over backward for Bradley here. Maybe I was being "too fair;" all three judges gave Manny the round.

The Round Winner: Draw

Could Bradley Have Won It, Plausibly: Yes

ROUND FOUR Manny got into fiery mode, and the boys traded some early, and the Filipino's power emerged for me here. The crowd told you, I think, who took this round, with their ovation after the frame. Bradley spent most of his energy trying to slip shots, moving his head here and there to evade. His offense wasn't top drawer here. All three arbiters were on the same page, for Pacquiao.

The Round Winner: Manny Pacquiao

Could Bradley Have Won It, Plausibly: Nah

ROUND FIVE Pacman tried to push the action, went forward, was the more aggressive man in this round. Did he miss a lot? Yes. Bradley was quite intent on focusing on defense here, and neglected a concerted offensive focus. But..only Jerry Roth saw it my way.

The Round Winner: Manny Pacquiao

Could Bradley Have Won It, Plausibly: Define "plausible." I don't think so. But Manny missed a good deal; if a judge digs D, then maybe he gave Tim the nod here. Grudgingly.

ROUND SIX Guess what else is new? No runaway winner here. Bradley did a ton of backing up, and used a pecking jab, which to my eyes didn't bother Manny a stitch. Neither man was very busy the first two thirds of the round and in the last third Manny did more. He actually went on the offensive whereas Bradley mostly focused on D. All three watchers agreed with me.

The Round Winner: Manny Pacquiao

Could Bradley Have Won It, Plausibly: If you are a BIG fan of a half-arse jab and think there was mastery involved in Bradley's gameplan. I guess..

ROUND SEVEN Bradley got into more of an offensive groove. Don't know if heard it in his corner after the sixth, because I was watching with sound off, but it seemed like he was fighting as though he did. Then, a graphic popped up that said Manny was outlanding him in the round by about a 3 to 1 margin, so..I don't know. As I'm watching this bending over backwards to see all the good Bradley is doing, maybe I give him too much credit. Siiighhhh. The judges, by the way, refuted the CompuBox info, and all gave the round to Bradley.

The Round Winner: Draw

Could Bradley Have Won It, Plausibly: Yes. He wasn't backing up as much as in prior rounds, and that could/should be rewarded in my book.

Upon Re-Watching, I Still Think Pacquiao Won, But...

Written by Michael Woods
Tuesday, 12 June 2012 20:02

ROUND EIGHT Same thing here; no runaway winner. Another round where I cannot say, damn, that judge should be locked up, or suspended and sent to remedial ed. Manny wasn't busy in the first third, and Bradley made him miss a lot, with that underrated head movement the last two thirds. I don't like flipping a coin; if a round is close, I generally won't do it. I am unafraid to admit that I didn't see separation and thus, declared no clear winner. More judges doing so might encourage more fighters to fight more aggressively, so as to send a non-subtle message to the judges. I WANT TO WIN. (Note: After the round, the camera showed Mrs. Pacquiao at her seat, head bowed, concern on her face. her body language didn't say, "We got this in the bag. This thing is sewn up." Just sayin'...) Only Roth would've reassured her that her guy did better in this one.

The Round Winner: Draw

Could Bradley Have Won It, Plausibly: Yes.

ROUND NINE Pacquiao was a bit cleaner and more effective. A couple of Pacquiao's launches had a noticeable effect on Bradley. They moved him a half step, or knocked his head slightly to the side. No landslide of momentum, or knockdown to really put a Pacquiao stamp on it, but Manny won it. Ross and Roth agreed with my take. Ford dissented.

The Round Winner: Pacquiao

Could Bradley Have Won It, Plausibly: If I'm bending to the point where my back is breaking, I guess so...

ROUND TEN Manny showed his age here, no shame in that. Bradley just worked harder and while he still backpedaled for a goodly portion of the round, his offense sent note that he craved winning the frame. All three agreed.

The Round Winner: Bradley

Could Bradley Have Won It, Plausibly: Yessir

ROUND 11 Bradley was busier for much of the round, but you could argue that Pacquiao landed two maybe three power shots that had far more spicy mustard on them than anything Bradley threw, and thus, Manny's power should supersede Bradley's busy-ness. You know the drill--another close round, not easy for the best judge in the world to differentiate. Ford rewarded Manny's power here, the other two liked the reborn Bradley.

The Round Winner: Draw

Could Bradley Have Won It, Plausibly: Yes

Upon Re-Watching, I Still Think Pacquiao Won, But...

Written by Michael Woods
Tuesday, 12 June 2012 20:02

ROUND 12 This Bradley, who was often first, and countered super smartly when he wasn't first, and didn't let Manny get into a rhythm, this guy could have truly, legitimately won the fight. All three judges thought he won the round.

The Round Winner: Bradley

Could Bradley Have Won It, Plausibly: Yes

So, we will continue to talk about this one. Maybe more useful than looking back, and my robot judges jokes, would be brainstorming and implementing improvements to the system. I'm thinking using more ex professional boxers, who do tend to know what they are seeing in there, couldn't hurt. Coming up with standardized criteria, so all judges in all jurisdictions are working off the same playbook, seems to make sense as well. And being more judicious about using words like "robbery," I think, is something I will try to incorporate.

[Comment on this article](#)

SouthPaul says:

Thanks for the detailed article. Very good read! Personally, I won't rewatch to that extent. No need to turn the sound off-- No need to analyze frame by frame or rewind and fast forward. Not that kind of fight. My 3 year old niece could score it and come up with the correct winner which was Manny Pacquiao. Robbed, jobbed, bent over with no vaseline. Disgrace.

amayseng says:

big fan of woodsy, but if you are looking for ways to score a round for a guy, tim in this instance, if you are pressing and looking hard enough then you will find a way to do it unless it is ridiculously one sided..

by the rules of scoring a professional bout, manny dominated..

also, whatever happened from taking the title from the champion?

tim was in retreat and hesitant so much he looked frozen and often not on pacs level

SouthPaul says:

I've never subscribed to the suggestion of "[B]taking the title from the champion[/B]". That's favoritism, you're now giving an unfair edge or cutting slack to the champ. That's a big bozo no no for me. Two fighters step in the ring - they're doing so even up--- clean slate--- no benefit of

Upon Re-Watching, I Still Think Pacquiao Won, But...

Written by Michael Woods
Tuesday, 12 June 2012 20:02

the doubt for either man.

ultimoshogun says:

Interesting read...this sounds like what I read over at BLH sunday after some had rewatched the fight. There was a handful of guys who still gave Manny the nod but felt the fight was much closer. They also didn't agree with some of the compubox numbers and mentioned that Lampley's commentary over sold alot of Manny's offense...TSS member gibola posted on one of the other articles that he watched the fight with Russian commentary and had Manny by one point I believe. Guess i'll see for myself saturday.

Buzz Murdock says:

the loser mayweather.

brownsugar says:

Bradley was in Pac's face early and often. He traded frequently to his own detriment and he may not have been effective enough to win enough rounds, but he never stopped trying, even when he looked like he wanted to fold
...he just got beat by a better fighter. Most of the TSS said he'd be "Hatton'd" in three rounds, MR Lee should still serve his crow. Saw the fight 7 times now. ..gave Bradley 4 at the most . Seen worse robberies , just never saw it happen to in this decade to boxer as famous as pac.Still don't make it right.

brownsugar says:

Lampley called ficticious punches worse than he did during Cotton/May weather. The guy inserts his brazen hallucinations into every fight. Merchant usually keeps Lampley in check.... as he used to keep Foreman in check. Without Merchant. Lampley runs Amok. I hear you Gibola and UltimoShogun.

sonnyavila says:

I agree. If you look hard enough, turning the sound off, then you might find something to justify the actions of the three judges. But that's not how boxing is watched, thats not how 48 of 51 seasoned boxing journalists saw it. Thats not how an Irish betting facility saw enough to refund Pacquiao bettors their money under a "justice payment" scheme. A fair result would only emerge under the same conditions in which the three judges, the HBO judge, the members of the media saw the game that day. The fact that you still think the Pacquiao won under clinical conditions should be the best incentive to sign the petition. Were the judges judging by Olympic scoring rules? I think, this would be the only way to justify their act. But we go here by the rules of scoring a professional bout.

sapaya says:

Upon Re-Watching, I Still Think Pacquiao Won, But...

Written by Michael Woods
Tuesday, 12 June 2012 20:02

i believed bradley won the title...only..

but...pacman won the fight. tim had two judges for the title but pacman had millions shouting he won the fight.the judge arrogantly declared he was not an AI judge and thought tim was giving pacman a boxing lesson.millions dont agree and to some...boxing lesson was meant how to kiss pacman's gloves gracefully.the judges cant be blamed for handing their decisions . that is their job. but giving the wrong decision was smelling badly that millions cant be silenced and taken for granted. they must reflect why millions saw it differently. they cant be wrong!!!! if they have to watch it with the aid of slow motion and compu box and they found they gave a wrong decision.... it is not a bad idea to admit it like the judge in the first pacquiao marquez bout even without taking back the belt from tim. it is only a belt without any glitter. without giving so much thought about what millions are saying only reinforced the idea that bad hands controlled the outcome

SouthPaul says:

We need to hear form these two judges. Enough of the being sheltered by the commission. They need to explain themsevles out in the open to the boxing public. Make us understand how y'all had Bradley winning. We aren't ever gonna agree with the goofy sonsabitchesssssss but at least make the attempt. Duane Ford one of the good ol' insiders so I want to especially hear from him. Talk to me, hoss, tell me how much you raked in on those 6/1 odds. Holla', gramps!

rude M says:

You always find what you're looking for. When people take sides, they always see what they want to see. This explains how the brain works. When Michael rewatched it with the clear purpose of seeing it through the judges eyes, he actually changed his mental channel and his brain responded by tuning in only to scenes that were in Bradley's favor, almost disregarding the rest. But does that make Mr Woods' analysis right this time? Boxing scoring is subjective hence unreliable no matter the credentials of the officials. Add to it the different angles from which each judge view a fight. Having seen replays 2x myself, I guess I have to side with the majority. Even known Pac-haters like Floyd Sr, Teddy Atlas, ODLH, nemesis Marquez, Paul Magno, FightHype writers all agreed it was an 11-1 to 8-4 win range for Pacquiao and never any closer.

scaryghost says:

this is a crazy article if not stupid...

see, you have to give MAJOR BIAS towards a boxer, to be able to tilt your opinion - a little bit.

and yet, you still found Pacman winning the bout, despite leaning towards Bradley... giving him the benefit of the doubt.

what if you try and score the bout, with bias in favor of Pacman... will you give Pacman 24 rounds and Bradley -12? lol

Upon Re-Watching, I Still Think Pacquiao Won, But...

Written by Michael Woods
Tuesday, 12 June 2012 20:02

give it up Woodsy, you are just making yourself look stupid. if boxing is judged according to this article, then the sport is truly DEAD.

ponder on that as I roll on the floor laughing. lol

amayseng says:

[QUOTE=SouthPaul;17260]I've never subscribed to the suggestion of " [B]taking the title from the champion[/B]". That's favoritism, you're now giving an unfair edge or cutting slack to the champ. That's a big bozo no no for me. Two fighters step in the ring - they're doing so even up--- clean slate--- no benefit of the doubt for either man.[/QUOTE]

i concur, i dont believe just because one guy is the champ he should have bias, what i mean is, when you have tim bradley getting the brakes beat off him and walking back to his corner in between rounds discouraged hanging his head, it is clear the fighter is not "taking it from the champion"

that in itself should have been another sign one fighter was feeling he was coming up short.

MisterLee says:

After rewatching, I would have given Bradley rounds 1 & 2. In round 1 Pacquiao almost took the round b/c of his 3 straight lefts at the end, but Bradley controlled the tempo and was countering effectively for 2:50 of the round so I gave it to Bradley. I dun know what's with pple's obsession with power these days esp. in a matchup like Pacquiao vs. Bradley. Isn't the Sweet Science "hit and not get hit", and controlling the tempo and effective aggression? Are pple telling me that Pernell Whitaker would have no chance agst Bradley, or that he would have no chance agst Julio Caesar Chavez or Oscar De Hoya (two pple with monstrous power in their divison . I would also give Bradley rounds 10-12 on the score card, thus 7-5 Pacquiao. Pacquiao didn't DO shy*t in rounds 10-12 except walk towards him, clap his gloves, and miss shots, and get countered and hit to the body. Was Pacquiao staggered in rounds 10-12? No, but he was outworked and being outboxed and Bradley had timed him correctly by then so that the straight left was no longer landing. HOWEVER, watching live I felt that Bradley was AFRAID of the straight left the whole fight, or round 2 on, and thus any moment could be a staggering or knockout moment, and with that in mind, even Pacquiao's walking forward like a mummy in the later rounds were scored for Pacquiao imo at the time because you just felt that menacing energy and forward aggressive movement versus Bradley's survival tactics. So if that were the case with the judges at ringside, it's not inconceivable to see that one or two judges could give a round or two that were close to Bradley thus making it a draw or a close on for Bradley. WITH THAT, I still feel Pacquiao won, but his legs got tired, he high stepping from leg cramps as early as round 1 or round 3, he only fought in spurts which is NOT vintage Pacquiao, his right hook was more in effect than the Marquez and Mosley fight, and he did not fight only in straight lines in those two fights, and he was pretty slick in dodging the left hook and coming back with his looping left. Pacquiao's defense was not bad, though he was not on his toes and nor had that superior footspeed (besides some advances) that defined his career nor the superior combinations. I now feel a Floyd Pacquiao fight would be bunk b/c both of them are slower, both of their legs are shot, Floyd is not as fast and therefore throwing more combinations and hard

Upon Re-Watching, I Still Think Pacquiao Won, But...

Written by Michael Woods
Tuesday, 12 June 2012 20:02

power shots and Pacquiao is not as fast therefore is just not as good, and Floyd's defense and countering are not what they once were but not as declined as Pacquiao's offense. I still think Bradley has a bright future. I wish he'd stay off the weights some, he was quicker before and did not load up as much at 140 as he does at 147. I think Bradley should have stuck to his swarming tactics. I feel those were his best traits, and his Marquez imitations was not as effective. I also DO feel Bradley's body work did eventually get to Pacquiao in the later rounds (Pacquiao basically did nothing in the later rounds but clap his gloves), and pple need to get off the "BRADLEY HAS NOT POWER HE ONLY HEADBUTTS" war cry. And Bradley still is pretty smart in the ring otherwise he would not have been able to adjust and pull some rounds out at last minute even if they were somewhat as futile as throwing out 5 three pointers in the last minute of a 20 point basketball game. Have a nice day TSS! And no crow shall be handed, b/c I thought Pacquiao won. Take care!

MisterLee says:

BTW- Once again, Compubox is bunk. I can't trust it. 3 pple clicking a button and scoring phantom punches, and not scoring another boxer's punches. I don't like how pple refer to these as objective stats rather than opinionated, crowd/hype-swayed pointers. And Brownsugar is right, HBO were screaming "straight left lands!" when Bradley slipped a lot of them or when they missed. Then Lampley would talk about Pacquiao's amazing offense and power after that miss. Just sick and not objective. BTW- I was SUPER surprised at how Pacquiao's power affected Bradley seeing how Cotto, Margarito, and Clotey took single shots quite well. Bradley had that look of shock that Hatton had when he was first tagged. That's it . Holler!

Radam G says:

It's just time to move on and suck it up. There muthajokes with reality distortion and pure hatred in their hearts are just glad that Tim Bradley won -- HOOK, CROOK or by the BOOK! We -- with operating brains -- know that he won by CROOK, and it nothing for us to do but move on, suck it up, and quit giving the time of day to those with actuality make-believe and pure fantasy.

Bradley was not in the fight from round one. He fought like a scary-arse Bambi, just as I thought he would. Power to him, he lasted and got the gift of a lifetime. Holla!

SouthPaul says:

[B]amayseng[/B]

Tim's words and body language said it all in the post fight interview. So yea, if he himself didn't believe he won why should anyone else, eh? That's wasssssup!

deepwater says:

the reality is pac won easy. no need to keep studying it. a=a reality is reality. bob arum and his judges smell

Upon Re-Watching, I Still Think Pacquiao Won, But...

Written by Michael Woods
Tuesday, 12 June 2012 20:02

Radam G says:

DANG! Now OakTown Andre "SOG" Ward just slammed Tim Bradley and said that Bradley should give his WBO alphabet-sanction organization TITLE belt BACK! WOW! That is why I have much luv for Cali -- no homebody no-matter-what-loyalty SH*T goes on! Most D.C. homeboys stick together at all cost.

Take Lamont Peterson. Dude has been caught trying to hide ROIDS all up in pellet shots straight up the anal to da poop. WTF! And the IBF and WBA have not suspended him, taken those title belts and reinstalled Amir "Da Great" Khan. WHY? God Knows!

Cali -- though it too has a lot of problems -- doesn't play dat syet. When James "Lights out" Toney came up dirty. The title that he won from John Luis Ruiz was taken and given back to Ruiz. Nonetheless, with that said, boxing is "the theatre of the unexpected," so don't be surprised that the Sin City super stanks and scumbags will find Tim Bradley DIRTY. Holla!

deepwater says:

Clean punching, effective aggression, ring generalship, and defense. pacman swept it. judges corrupt.

Robert Curtis says:

I didn't watch and re-watch the fight as closely as Woods, but I gotta say, Pac was nothing special last weekend. He stalked and landed more punches, sure, which I guess you could call "effective aggression". But not effective enough, huh, folks? Bradley moved backward often, but so did Ali, Ray Robinson, Holmes, and many others as part of their regular fight plans. Bradley was barely marked afterwards. Bradley was tentative, but I wouldn't call him timid, or unafraid to trade. So Manny punched a little more. So what? It was too dull a fight all around to be called any kind of robbery. Robbery is what happened to the fans when Liston went down in Lewiston doing an imitation of a clubbed haddock. I got a friend who got \$1500 stolen out of his account by a gas station debit scam two days ago. That's robbery. Last weekend was just an ordinary fight with a somewhat skewed decision. They say Manny was raised in the streets surviving however he could. Whoever that hungry kid was then, he wasn't in the ring last weekend. He missed his snatch at the roast pig and will have to go hungry for a while. Hopefully hungry enough to win the re-match by an early KO, in five rounds or less, which was within reach last weekend. I was shocked that Pacman couldn't put Bradley away. Shocked. Bradley's chin was there and touchable the whole time, and Manny touched it enough, with aggression, I suppose, but maybe not so effective after all? Did Manny have cramps in his legs again? Was he thinking pacifist or divine thoughts? Maybe drafting a political speech in his head? Give me the Manny who gutted Oscar like an old trout. Give me that Manny again. Manny accepted this odd defeat with total class. But I want to see the tiger once more. I want the whole cat out of the bag next time.

amayseng says:

Upon Re-Watching, I Still Think Pacquiao Won, But...

Written by Michael Woods
Tuesday, 12 June 2012 20:02

robert curtis, you, like many others have to realize that manny is now 33, a far difference from being 30 or 28. it is natural to slow down a bit, no shame in it. manny landed harder, thudding punches throughout the entire fight and had bradley hurt, staggered or buzzed in at least 5-6 different rounds from those straight lefts. ali boxed backwards by landing razor accurate punches while controlling the fight and setting traps. bradley was in retreat mode shooting fake double jabs only with the intentions of getting an extra step out of range in retreat from pacs punches. that is the difference. bradley won round ten convincingly, that is it. round 12 was close, even but pac landed harder and more damaging shots so he gets that round as well, round 1 was bradleys but then pac landed 3 straight lefts to close the round and those lefts were hard staggering shots, those beat 10 slaps all day. this is not the amateur scoring system it is a pro scoring system where damaging shots beat volume.

Radam G says:

@Bobby C, your eyes and belief system are playing tricks on you. All the great fighters that you named, never in a single fight, that I saw, did what Bambi -- I mean Bradley -- did. [The bytch ran to survive, not to win.]

Those greats, that you named, played optical illusions on you by moving side to side and angling off at 45 to 60 degrees to get punching room on the suckas rushing them. And those great hit those rushers' arses -- not punched da dang air. Now that moving that they did, you can call it moving back, but the sweet science properly moving-back way -- not the Bambi's run-yo-arse-away way.

Eyeballs watching don't do any justice to one who does not know the full science, art and poetry of an action, such as the sweet science. You must know the sweet science's direction, deception and distortion to know what you saw. Inattention blindness is vast by many, even the experts, until they remove all types of prejudices and see the actuality and reality, not the wanna-see distorted hyper-imaginative jive. Holla!

You see stuff the way that you believe, until someone in the know shows you what da real haps were. And that is how any science rolls. Holla!

Radam G says:

@Bobby C, BTW, Bradley was marked up and swollen up really bad. Once again -- and I've said this a ton of times -- having dark skin hides scars and buises on dark-skinned black combatants to television, cyberspace and big-screen audiences. [Yall can't see syet, unless a beaming light is put on dark-skinned black fighters.]

Bradley got the double fudge syet beat out of his mug and torso. His face was swollen and damaged with tiny-opened cuts. And his body had scratches and Pac-punch burns all over it. Don't take my word for it. Just ask one of the scribes, who you know was at the fight -- live and in living color. Holla!

SouthPaul says:

Upon Re-Watching, I Still Think Pacquiao Won, But...

Written by Michael Woods
Tuesday, 12 June 2012 20:02

Next person to suggest watching the fight with the sound off needs to be cococked. I'd never watch any fight with the sound off no matter how annoying and persuasive the commentators became. Listening to the sound of the event is all part of scoring the bout. Gives you an idea of the impact of some of the punches landed. Just one of many reasons to leave the volume alone. Rewatch the fight by all means but be realistic and don't get over zealous. Otherwise you're liable to score the bout a effffin' shutout for Bradley.

DaveB says:

I have to really say that I didn't find the fight to be a robbery. I had it 5-5-2. So it wasn't that far out to call the fight for Pacquiao, Bradley or even. Pacquiao only fought for the last 30 - 60 seconds in a lot of those rounds. Just because he hit Bradley with one or two big punches in those rounds does not do enough to negate the fact that Bradley fought all the way through the round. I don't think because one guy hits harder automatically gives him the advantage in scoring. Hitting harder aids in wearing your opponent down but not necessarily in scoring better. Cotto is a good example of what I mean. When Cotto stands with his gloves high, if his opponent is throwing punches, even if hitting gloves and arms, and Cotto does nothing, IMO his opponent wins the round because of ring generalship and controlling the action. Then if Cotto bounces up and down and moves in missing a lot but hitting a few hard body shots that doesn't win the round after doing nothing for most of it. Another thing is Pacquiao does not hit that hard at 147. I just don't believe that anymore. He hits good but he is living off the reputation he got from when he fought at the lighter weights. His knockout percentage is dropping. When he fought Cotto and hit him a thousand times he couldn't knock him out. If he had such devastating power that fight would have only lasted a few rounds. Pacquiao also threw and missed a lot of wild punches against Bradley. Bradley should not be penalized for an unpopular decision. Either have a rematch or let Pacquiao and Bradley move on to other things. I've never heard of any fighter giving back a belt that the judges awarded it to them for the goodwill of the fans. If nothing can be proved as far as corruption and I don't think there will be as that was a competitive fight, that is about all there is to say. Mayweather's day is coming too because no one can walk away from that type of money which is why most fighters lose eventually. Both guys will go out with legitimate losses before it is all over and they will never have fought one another unless they fight one another when no one cares.

Radam G says:

It is the pros, not the amateurs. One does not need to fight every second of a round to win it in the pros. The cheat was in, plainly and simply. Holla!

DaveB says:

Says who? Sometimes I guess you have to agree to disagree. Judges will always have things they favor against how other judges judge it. There will never be a perfect decision when every one will be happy. I just can't award a round to the fighter that tries to steal it. Just isn't right. That isn't something you can require in boxing judging 101. I'll always favor the man who stays busy. That's my story and you know the rest.

Upon Re-Watching, I Still Think Pacquiao Won, But...

Written by Michael Woods
Tuesday, 12 June 2012 20:02

Radam G says:

Says the rules and the powers that be of the game. It is a know FACT. Get a rule book of both the amateurs and pros and check it out. Enough said. Holla!

Robert Curtis says:

I'm not excited about the so-called robbery. I'm not excited about a rematch. I can't believe I'm saying this about Manny Pacquiao who brought the only sport I love back to life. If a rematch is set, Manny better knock the mammajamma out, or take up preaching, politics, or singing full time.