
Olympic Roundtable

Richard W. Pound
Chairman, World Anti-Doping Agency
Montreal, Quebec

John Hoberman
Professor of Germanic Languages
University of Texas at Austin

On 1 and 2 October 2001 Wilfrid Laurier University's Department of Kinesiology and Physical Education hosted its second Olympic Roundtable. Discussion topics included the future of the Olympic Movement, doping in sport, and athlete funding in Canada. Speakers and panelists for the two-day program, organized by Stephen Wenn and Bill McTeer, included IOC members Richard Pound and Johann Olav Koss, Canadian Olympians Marnie McBean and Nathalie Lambert, Canadian Olympic Association officials Mark Lowry and Lou Ragagnin, journalists Stephen Brunt, Randy Starkman, and Karlo Berkovich, and academics John Hoberman (University of Texas at Austin), Bruce Kidd (University of Toronto), David Whitson (University of Alberta) Robert Barney, Angela Schneider, and Kevin Wamsley (The University of Western Ontario); and Scott Martyn (The University of Windsor). The event was supported by Laurier's Vice President-Academic, Rowland Smith, Dean of Research and Graduate Studies, Barry McPherson, and Dean of Science, Art Szabo.

Following are the verbatim keynote addresses of Richard Pound and John Hoberman on the challenges facing the Olympic Movement, and specifically the World Anti-Doping Agency, with respect to doping in sport. Appreciation is extended to both speakers for consenting to have their remarks published in this fashion, and to Marie Weiler for transcribing the addresses.

Richard W. Pound
President, World Anti-Doping Agency
Montreal, Quebec



Good afternoon ladies and gentlemen. John (Hoberman) and I are going to deal with the first part of the program from a couple of different perspectives. Mine will be from that of the Olympic Movement and what doping means in that context, together with some of the responses that we have made to the phenomenon of doping to date, and what I hope we may be able to do in the future. I will also try to give you some background as to how the World Anti-Doping Agency (WADA) got set up and why it is an agency that may have some reasonable chance of success in this field.

The flood of recent doping cases in sport clearly indicates that the fight against doping has not been won. Even here in Canada we learned, during the summer, of Venoy Clarke's positive test for Stanazolol, at the World Athletic Championships in Edmonton, and there was an ongoing fuss about Olga Yegarova for the use of EPO.

FIFA, the international federation governing the most widely practiced sport in the world, football, or soccer as we call it, seems now ready to acknowledge that even it has a doping problem. I think it was in denial for many, many years on that score. We've followed doping cases in weight lifting for years. Cycling, as you know, is endemic in its use of drugs, and so it goes. In fact, I think it's probably fair to say there there's no sport that is immune to the problem.

I run into a lot of people who say, "You know you're never going to win this. Why don't you give up? Why don't you let athletes take whatever they want to take?" At least that way, they say, "you don't have to worry about who's cheating and you'll have leveled the playing field that you're always talking about, assuming of course that all of the athletes will be able to afford the same drugs." It's not going to come as much of a surprise to anyone here that I am unequivocally opposed to such a solution to the drug problem in sport. Some of you may say, well, it's your job to be

opposed to that, and in that sense it is part of my job description. The order is, however, reversed; it's not my position because I have the role as president of WADA, but because I believe that doping is antithetical to the very ethical foundations of sport. It's my view that any medal won, any result achieved by doping, is an anathema to everything for which sport should stand. The doping tarnishes the achievement, it destroys the accomplishment, it generates shame and the need for clandestine behaviour to hide from those who've competed fairly, the rot that attaches to the drug assisted result. What has begun as an honourable quest and odyssey to see how far your talent and your skills can take you, in accordance with freely agreed-upon rules of play, dissolves into conduct that has to be hidden, that brings public shame if exposed, and frankly, a lifetime of private guilt even if it's not exposed. Something that ought to be a matter of pride and satisfaction becomes akin, for those of you who've read it, to *The Picture of Dorian Gray* written by Oscar Wilde, where the reality of the individual who purports in public to be very pure, has to be concealed from public view.

But there's another reason to be concerned about doping in sport. and that is a justifiable concern about the health of the athletes who either do it voluntarily. or who are subjected to it. And there are all kinds of examples that you can focus on, but if you just take Stanozolol that I've mentioned already this afternoon, you have links between the use of Stanozolol and hypertension, heart disease, and liver damage. Almost every prohibited substance on any list that I've seen, but certainly the IOC list, is either actually or potentially damaging to the health of the athletes involved, and those of you who have some experience with this will know that, in some cases. the athletes are taking industrial quantities of this stuff, not just a pill here and there. Well, this may sound paternalistic, and it's certainly a criticism that I've heard from time to time, and that's fair enough, but paternalistic or not, the athletes do need protection from themselves, or their entourages, or in some cases from their own governments.

Take another step farther along the road. What should we think about the kind of people who counsel athletes to use drugs, or who condone the use of the drugs, or who help make them available to athletes in the full knowledge of the use to which they'll be put? What do we think of medical practitioners who ignore the ethical dictates of a learned profession that has a particular social responsibility? What kind of people are they that would expose young people to the risks of health and moral turpitude that comes from such usage? Where are their personal and professional responsibilities? How can parents - I'm a parent - how can parents in society allow them to have such a formative influence on the youth of their community. I put it to you that there is no coach or team doctor or trainer worthy of the description who cannot be aware if an athlete under his or her charge is using doping methods. And I put it to you that there should be a special onus on these people, on these professionals, to stop any such conduct. And that any doping infraction affecting an athlete under their charge should be equally ascribed to them. As we all know, unfortunately, all too often it's the athlete who may bear only part of the responsibility for the doping infraction who bears the full penalty, while those who are more responsible escape all sanction whatsoever.

One other thing is clear, at least to me, and that is that the fight against doping can not be won by the sports world alone. There are many issues, such as the harmo-

nization of legal penalties against doping, the trafficking of drugs and so forth that can only be resolved by the cooperative intervention of the governments of the world. That is why the World Anti-Doping Agency was created. To bring together the governments and the sporting world, including, and this is absolutely essential to any success that we'll ever have, athletes. We brought them together at the same time, at the same table, and with the same objectives in mind. The creation of WADA. really arises out of the events that occurred during the 1998 Tour de France, when some of you may remember, some of the teams were found to have been using drugs. If you recall the pictures, you saw the French police taking away coaches, team officials, and even athletes, sometimes in the middle of the night, under arrest, to be questioned regarding the use of drugs. It was a very dangerous indication that sport does run the risk of becoming criminalized if it doesn't take charge of its own destiny. Added to this fact was a very unfortunate statement made by the then president of the International Olympic Committee. that basically the list of prohibited substances was too long and that there are too many on it, and as far as he was concerned a lot of these things weren't really doping, which was like pouring gasoline on a fire that was already burning. That led to a response from the International Olympic Committee. In fact, we had to have a special Executive Board meeting to deal with that additional crisis. And from that developed the idea of an independent anti-doping agency, which is to say something that would not be under the control of the International Olympic Committee or any particular sports federation. What was required was a truly independent organization that when it did a test, or performed a test and reported on a test, or recommended a sanction, you simply knew that there wasn't any particular parochial interest involved. It was a model that I had suggested based upon what we had done in sports arbitration, which was to create an independent council composed of IOC members, International Federations, national Olympic committees and athletes, to govern the arbitral process so that everybody would be sure that the results were fair.

We settled on that and we called for a World Conference on Doping in Sport to be held in February of 1999 to which we invited all of the components of the Olympic world, some sponsors, broadcasters, governments and things were going along very well in preparation for that until the Salt Lake City scandal hit. We were right in the middle of that when this Conference occurred. It couldn't have been a worse time for the IOC to be holding a conference on anything, much less an issue like doping that has its ethical as well as scientific components.

But, nevertheless, out of the conference, after we sort of sat in our bunkers being rained upon from great heights by every government and other organization known to God or man, we did have a declaration that resolved that there would be the creation of an independent, international, anti-doping agency, which was created at the end of 1999, the same year. and it was called the World Anti-Doping Agency. We had proposed when we went to the conference that there be equal blocks of control for the IOC, athletes, international federations. national Olympic committees, sponsors, and pharmaceutical companies, because they know what's going on. We also sought representation for organizers and government. During the course of this conference when nothing the IOC did, would do, or ever has done was regarded as anything other than abominable, the governments said that this model was totally unacceptable. We said, well, what model would be acceptable? They said they would have to have

equal control with the Olympic movement. Our president thought that was a disaster. I said, "No, you don't understand. This is far better than we could ever have dared hope." He said, "You go and see if you can arrange it." I went to the government representatives there and said, "You want 50/50." "Absolutely, it's our condition without which we're going to walk out of here furious," they replied. "You got it." They said "What?" "You got it, 50% is wonderful. The only deal is you have to pay 50% of the costs." Ah, well that was different. Anyway, they needed some time to think about it. So we have a structure now that is one-half public authorities. and one-half the Olympic movement including the athletes, and it's showing every sign of being quite effective. We actually have 17 members from each side, governments from all five continents, all of the summer and winter sports and so forth are involved. The only thing governments couldn't do was to get their financial act together for the first two years. They said they needed two years to get their stuff together. I mean, they're talking about half of twenty or twenty-five million dollars a year; amongst 200 governments, this is not rocket science, but it takes them that long. So the IOC agreed to pay all of the costs for the first two years, but starting next January, the governments will be paying their half.

In the first year of operation we negotiated agreements with 26 out of the 27 Olympic sports to do unannounced, out of competition, testing on their behalf. We provided what we called an Independent Observer mission at the Sydney Games, so that we examined every aspect and followed every case of doping at the Sydney Games, and reported on it as to whether we thought it was properly done or not. It's the first time that I can recall in recent years that there's been no question whatsoever about whether the doping control process at the Olympic Games has been properly carried out. That suspicion is gone. We're going to do the same thing in Salt Lake. We've done the same thing at a number of world championships in other events at the request of International Federations. and it's a very good service because it does relieve them from the burden of any suspicion that may attach to their activities.

Now, we understand perfectly well that the fight against doping in sport is not going to be won by simply developing better methods for detecting drugs and imposing sanctions. Clearly that's not going to be enough. In the long run, it's going to be a matter of education, of developing a common understanding that doping is not only ethically wrong, but it is dangerous to the health of the athletes involved. One of our big program activities in WADA is our ethics and education committee, which has a significant budget attached to its activities. It's not unlike the process we went through a few years ago about wearing seatbelts when you drive. It took a long time for people to make the mental adjustment towards wearing seatbelts. Initially, it was a good idea. Then it became such a good idea that it was adopted as a law and there were fines if you didn't do it. But it wasn't the fines for the occasional person who got caught that changed behaviour. It was a common understanding that it is really stupid to be out there without a seatbelt on. That's what must happen as far as doping is concerned.

But there's more that has to be done. We have to do a lot more about identifying the links between badly labeled nutritional products that contain prohibited substances like Nandrolone. There've been all kinds of cases of Nandrolone recently, as you may know. This is not an accident. People are taking this stuff because it works. What they're doing is relying on poor labeling to say, oh I didn't know. The fact that

I and all my team took product X, we didn't know, because there's nothing on the label.

We've got to figure out why it is that such a large proportion of the world's great athletes consume such a large quantity of prescription medicines during competition. And we have to study the reasons why athletes are prepared to risk their health, to risk penalties, and to risk disgrace, to use drugs in sport. I think unless you understand the genesis of the conduct it's going to be very hard to find a cure.

We need to develop more research, and to fund it to develop reliable detection methods. And when I say reliable, I mean you must in the case of doping in sport, have a virtual certainty that there is no other possible explanation for a particular result except doping. A practicing physician can read the literature and say, somebody says substance A is effective in providing therapeutic relief in 85% of the cases tested for condition Z. If you're a practicing physician, of course you prescribe it. You've got 8.5 chances out of ten that your patient will be better off. But if you're imposing a sanction and taking away an Olympic medal, and suspending somebody for two years or more, perhaps life in the case of a second offence, you have to be a lot more certain than that. For those who are law students among you, it's like the burden of proof in a criminal case. You basically have to be in a position to prove beyond all reasonable doubt that there is no other possible explanation for this result except doping.

Now a lot of research hasn't been done in those areas. There haven't been funds available to do it. You know most of the research funds have gone into helping scientists find therapeutic cures for diseases, some of which are then used improperly in sport. But nobody's gone to the other end and reverse engineered the whole process to find out what is a test to determine whether that substance has been used.

We started this year with five million dollars U.S. of research into oxygen carrying agents, such as EPO, growth hormones, steroids, and a variety of other drugs, just so that we can find tests that can then be used. We had hoped, just before the events of September 11th, to have a conference with the leading geneticists and ethicists on the whole question of genetic manipulation. What does that mean for sport? What does it mean for society in general? What are the areas to which we should be giving careful attention now proactively rather than in twenty-five or thirty years when we have a situation that may have gone out of control?

I wrote an op-ed piece not too long ago for one of the Toronto papers on this subject and finished it with some words from an address given by Winston Churchill in 1941, I think it was, at Eton or Harrow. The approach we have to have in the battle against the doping in sport is, "never give in, never give in, never. never, never. Never give in except to convictions of honour and good sense." That's where we are in doping.

John Hoberman
Professor of Germanic Languages
University of Texas at Austin



We are fortunate to have just heard from the most important anti-doping official in the world. Before I make my remarks I would endorse what I would call his two most important points. Number one, after many years of thinking about this, I don't think we should give up the anti-doping position; and number two, I do not think it is hopeless. To explain why I say that would take the rest of the afternoon, and we don't have that much time. But, in any case I wanted to make that clear because what I'm going to do is raise a number of the difficulties that confront the anti-doping effort. The doping problem, as I'm sure you know, is commonly thought of as detecting banned drugs in athletes. This is WADA's primary job and when Dick Pound refers to education that opens up a very wide window that is worth discussing for a long time. My point is that doping is a very complex social phenomenon that includes far more than the familiar ethical dilemma that confronts many elite athletes, which is to dope or not to dope. This has become extremely important in a world of commercialized sport including commercialized Olympic sport. Doping is an economic issue. You cannot begin to understand the Tour de France situation without understanding that.

We are in an age in which the athlete at the elite level in many cases, is a worker, thinks of himself or herself as a worker, and sport becomes to a significant degree, labour. The whole history of the Tour de France is a prime example of that. Given this reality, in fact two of Dick Pound's colleagues on WADA have already commented on the labour dimension of the doping issue. The Prince de Merode, the long time head of the IOC Medical Commission, in '96 and '99, addressed very bluntly the notion that doping penalties would have to be reduced because after all these people were making a living. Hein Verbruggen, also of the IOC and WADA, has talked in

similar terms as the president of the International Cycling Federation. I think it's important too, to understand that one of the things we have to keep track of is the idea that high performance athletes in some branches are entitled to drugs because this is a professional necessity. You have to keep track of that sort of thinking.

Having pointed to this problem, which is a large one, I'd like to point to several more that I don't think get enough attention. First, how the pharmaceutical industry has responded to the doping issue in the past. This is after all the source of most of the illicit doping drugs. They start out of course as legitimate therapeutic drugs that are diverted in ways that, after fifteen years of studying this field, remain largely mysterious to me. I ask others. They don't know either. And sports officials, for this reason, should be in contact with drug company executives. This is a story with which Dick Pound is familiar and I'll address that in a minute.

The second point is how a new type of pharmaceutical advertising is undermining the campaign against doping, as certain doping drugs like testosterone and growth hormone, are being converted by entrepreneurial physicians into lifestyle drugs for the boomer generation, and even older people than that.

Third, what might be done about the suspicious record performances of the 1980s in particular, and also of the 1990s? Why have the international sports federations, and national sports federations, been so recalcitrant about, shall we say, amending the record book when there is good reason, or even certifiable proof that a record was a doped record? And finally, what does the so-called public really think about doped athletes? This a very tricky issue that I'll address briefly in the next twenty minutes.

So let's start with the first question regarding the pharmaceutical industry. To what extent do they even care about the effects of their products in the sports world, for which they do not bear unlimited responsibility? One could seriously argue that it is up to sports officials to regulate drugs, not the companies that are producing therapeutic drugs. But let's take a look at the issue. It's August of 1998, we're right in the middle of the Tour de France scandal of that year, and a member of the IOC Executive Board, Kevan Gosper of Australia, makes the following statement, "It's time we made it clear to major drug manufacturers of steroids, EPOs, human growth hormones, that if they're not careful and don't apply more stringent controls, and the public perceives that drugs are bringing down the character of sport, their reputation is at stake." Kevan Gosper issuing a threat to the mighty pharmaceutical industry. Frankly, he was not in a very strong position. According to this report, the IOC was going to invite pharmaceutical companies to participate in the February 1999 Anti-Doping Conference in Lausanne, to which Dick Pound just referred, and Dick confirmed earlier that the pharmaceutical industry was in fact unresponsive to this invitation.

In November of last year at a press conference Dick did report that the industry had demonstrated at least some sort of interest in collaborating with Olympic officials in the matter of gene doping, to which he just referred. But in the meantime, more immediate problems, such as the diversion of therapeutic hormones onto the black market, and the willingness of sports physicians to prescribe them, remain unaddressed.

Now, are the drug companies interested in this issue at all? About a year ago, a so-called major drug firm that was not disclosed to me, engaged a public relations agency in Paris to investigate the possibility of sponsoring WADA. As the public

relations firm put it in a communication to one journalist, "We have been mandated by one of the world leaders of the pharmaceutical industry to seek new opportunities for this group regarding a specific action in the fight against doping in sports." I mentioned this at a conference last May, and Dr. Arne Lundquist of the IOC and WADA, said that he was aware of this approach, but that WADA was not for sale. So that's the good news. WADA, and I'll bet Dick will confirm this, is not for sale to the pharmaceutical industry.

The more interesting question is why they were interested in the first place. I would assume that this was a kind of preemptive foray into the whole realm of ethics and public relations, trying to get an inoculation against bad publicity, because to some extent the drug manufacturer is at least episodically interested. A year ago, for example, the *Boston Globe* reported that as rumours and reports circulated, the companies found themselves in the spotlight; they are exposed to the negative fallout of doping scandals, defending their public images, and fielding complaints about a lack of controls in balancing social and corporate responsibilities. In fact over the past twenty years, the drug companies have demonstrated a keen interest in the public relations aspects of steroids and commercially valuable hormones that lead double lives. They're legitimate drugs in clinical medicine, while they're illicit drugs in the sports world. In 1982 for example, Ciba Geigy stopped the production of Dianabol because it didn't want to be seen as promoting doping. In 1988 Searle took the anabolic steroid, Anovar, off the market on account of its misuse in sport. As of 1992, the German drug firm, Schering, was concerned about the public image of testosterone as a doping drug because it was investigating the potential for a testosterone-based contraceptive, research which was published by the World Health Organization as far back as 1990. When the controversial German sprinter, Katrine Krabbe was disciplined for Clenbuterol doping in 1992, the drug's manufacturer hired prominent scientific experts in a campaign to exonerate Krabbe, and thus protect the image of a drug worth billions of dollars in annual sales. It is marketed under the rubric of Spiropent as an asthma drug.

So what, given this situation, can the IOC and WADA, perhaps do? One would think that such concerns about stigmatizing commercially valuable drugs ought to make it easier for sports officials to persuade drug companies that it is in their interest to contribute to anti-doping initiatives for at least three reasons. Number one, they should not overproduce drugs. I'm told that overproduction of drugs is common in the pharmaceutical industry. Number two, what about more rigorous tracking of drug shipments to hospitals, physicians, and veterinarians? Veterinarians turn out to be an important source of illicit hormone drugs to athletes. Number three, what about the idea of adding chemical markers that would aid in detecting the presence of these drugs in the body?

Well, we have no reason to believe that there is going to be immediate action on any of these issues. For example, Amgen, which produces Epopoetin, a therapeutic form of erythropoietin, has rejected a proposal to put a marker on the drug, to add a little something to the molecule to make it detectable on the grounds it would be too costly. And here's the important point, it might require sending this drug back through the very complicated Food and Drug Administration (FDA) regulatory process for a second time. This is a very expensive proposition. But that is an argument that comes from the drug company and needs to be scrutinized. Nor is it easier, or

perhaps possible to regulate the behaviour of a lot of physicians who misbehave in this matter. Dick asked, I think rhetorically, a few minutes ago, "What kind of physician would counsel a young person to take drugs?" One of the things that really shocked me when I started this research many years ago, was the discovery that there is in fact a pro-steroid lobby among sports physicians. One of the things that needs to be investigated is why physicians get into sports medicine in the first place. There are some unwholesome motives involved in that. And these are people who rarely attract attention in the context of the doping problem.

Now, my second point about the pharmaceutical industry is the following: I referred to the impact of advertising so-called lifestyle drugs that now include testosterone and human growth hormone. These doping drugs are being promoted by a growing number of physicians, including plastic surgeons, who practice anti-aging medicine as a way to make up for the shrinking fee structure that is imposed upon physicians by HMOs in the United States. Not only is this a dynamic driving lifestyle hormone consumption in the United States. I picked up a German newsweekly a couple of weeks ago. It's come to Germany. When a significant number of physicians feel a financial pinch, some of them will go into the anti-aging business. In the United States, if you are a physician with a prescription pad, you can get away with prescribing hormones to all sorts of people. You are going to risk losing your license if you prescribe hormones to a healthy twenty-five year old who wants to throw the javelin. To some extent the 1990 Anabolic Steroids Control Act has put a good deal of fear into American physicians. One of the things I do not have time to describe to you adequately is the process whereby testosterone and human growth hormone circumvent the restrictions of the Anabolic Steroids Control Act. This is happening. It's happening now, it happens slowly, and it's happening in a number of ways. It is happening in the context of a baby boomer demand for a whole variety of anti-aging therapies, and it is really changing the whole idea of what drugs are for.

It's all very well to run, and it's certainly advantageous to run an anti-doping campaign in the context of what we'll call a traditional relationship between the pharmaceutical industry and society. The pharmaceutical industry creates prescription drugs that promote and maintain health, but have you been paying attention to drug company advertising lately, including that incredible NASCAR ad that Pfizer has out for Viagra?; it just rocked me back in my chair. You are no longer an impotent weak male if you take Viagra. You're a strong athlete and they have a tough guy auto racer taking off his helmet and plugging Viagra. Viagra is what I call an honorary hormone. Chemically it's not a hormone, but because it is a promotor of sexual function, I think it deserves credit as being an honorary hormone.

The whole concept of ethical drug advertising is changing. In 1997 it became possible for the drug companies to advertise directly to consumers who go to their doctors and they hold up the advertisement and say, why don't you give me this? And a doctor who is worried about losing patients is going to think twice before he says to Mr. or Mrs. Smith, I'm sorry, I don't think it is medically indicated. You are asking not for a therapy, but for an enhancement. The key point here is that the line that separates therapy from enhancement is eroding as we speak. The pharmaceutical industry is going to be taking advantage of that. They tried sixty years ago to make testosterone a mass therapy drug for aging males. They failed for certain reasons. They've been doing better in the 1990s.

The bottom line here is that the idea that normal human performances are drug-free performances is becoming increasingly difficult to sustain. And so, on what ethical medical ground do we stand in this new age of pharmaceutical advertising, to tell athletes, young and old, you should be drug-free. Athletes are going to be able to point to an increasing number of cases where people they know, perhaps members of their family, are taking hormones for enhancement purposes that they will rationalize or experience as therapy. All right. So much for the pharmaceutical industry.

What about this whole matter of the record lists, and Olympic or World Championship medals that either certainly or probably were due to doping? What am I talking about? What about the men's shot put record, 75 feet 10 inches, by Randy Barnes of Texas, who has two steroid convictions? There's a tiny handful of men in the world today who can even throw over 70 feet, let alone 76 feet. Here is a way for us to document what progress has been made in what is sometimes called the post Ben Johnson era. You can pick up *Track and Field News* and, in effect, draw a graph of performance levels. The fact that there's only a handful throwing over 70 feet is good news from an anti-doping standpoint, as is the fact that you do not have women throwing the 12 pound shot, 73, 74 feet the way the eastern European women used to. These days 67, 68, is going to do you very well. That's how to document progress. I don't think Ben Plucknett's steroid-tainted 237 feet for the discus is being approached very often these days. My favourite example of a tainted record is Marita Koch's 47.6 seconds for the Women's 400 meter run. She ran that in 1985. You can look for her steroid doses in Brigitte Berendonk's book from 1992. Why do I recommend that book to you? How about because it has already survived 20 court cases in Germany? She was sued over and over again by the people she named in that book. This is a book that came out in 1991. You turn on the World Championships from Edmonton or anywhere else, and you see WR, world record, 47.6. What a joke. It shouldn't be there. At the very least there should be a public discussion about the merits and demerits of keeping these sorts of records on the books. Of course this involves all sorts of complications and complicated questions. How do you prove that the person in second place was clean, etc? But I really don't think that putting our heads in the sand about steroid suspect records is a very good idea, or that it sends a wholesome message to a generation of athletes that doesn't have a prayer of getting even close to Florence Griffith Joyner's times. Not to mention the mysterious Chinese performances of 1993, all of which were set in Beijing and none of which to the best of my knowledge involved the participation of any supervising official other than Chinese officials. If that's too suspicious, too bad.

I think there should be international representation to verify world records. One of the most curious aspects of this question is the IOC's record with regard to the whole idea of investigating past history. In fact the IOC has not been interested in new information about the possibility of doping-compromised records. I was surprised to find out, for example, that as early as the Calgary Games in 1988, both Mr. Samaranch and the Prince de Merode, who was supposed to be supervising IOC anti-doping efforts, pointedly rejected the idea of using information about doping to revise the results of tainted competitions. The Prince said some things belong to history; we are not going to apply sanctions for an event that happened four years ago. We will never have retroactive sanctions. This is the head of the IOC medical commission only months before the Ben Johnson scandal later that year. Mr. Samaranch took the

same position. When he was asked in December 1990, whether an Olympic champion who later confessed to doping would be disqualified, the IOC president deflected the question by saying those are only hypotheses. "We proceed on the basis of facts." Seven years later those facts are arriving in an avalanche, and Samaranch declares that they are irrelevant. When he's asked about doped East German athletes, this is documented, there is not a shred of doubt as to whether the vast majority of East German high performance athletes who competed at the Olympics for example during the 1980s were doped. Mr. Samaranch says there are time limits, one cannot go back that far. The International Amateur Athletic Federation that runs world track and field, the IAAF, took the same position; we've got a six-year statute of limitations. That's all they wanted to do with this issue, we have a six-year statute of limitations. Who is the IAAF? It's a world federation. What about their anti-doping record? Take for example the World Championships in Rome in 1987. World Championships. How many positives? One. Who was it? It was Sandra Gossler, a rather obscure female Swiss runner. Who was not caught? A minimum of five doped East Germans and Ben Johnson. That was the level of competence and care with which the IAAF was practicing doping control at its own world championships in 1987. This is the group that tells us that history is not going to be rewritten. I suggest otherwise.

Finally what about, what I call public response to doping? This in a way is the most complicated issue of all. If the IOC and WADA and other federations are going to practice what everybody calls education, hard questions have to be asked about what is going to be said and how much we know about the target audience or audiences. It is widely believed, I think, that the doped athlete is a notorious and rejected figure in modern societies. The public, according to this argument, would abandon an elite sport if they were to become convinced that institutionalized doping was the norm. If the American public ever thought the country's athletes all used drugs to compete, the Olympic movement would die overnight -- this from the Executive Director of the United States Olympic Committee in 1999. Similarly, dire warnings about how doping threatened the very future of sport became common after the Ben Johnson scandal. Manfred Donike, a scientist whose detection instruments had found traces of an anabolic steroid in Johnson's urine, declared in 1990 that nothing less than the credibility of sport, as he put it, was at stake. The same year a German sports official observed that doping raised the question of whether sport was going to be accepted in this society. On and on this litany of dark predictions goes.

All right, let's visit a couple of venues. It's April 22, 2001, a spring Sunday in Rome, and the final whistle of the soccer match between Lazio Rome and Vicenza Casio has just been sounded. The home team has been victorious and at this moment Lazio's Portuguese star, Fernando Couto, runs to the northern end of the stadium, tears off his shirt and flings it into the stands. The crowd erupts into an ovation and everyone present understands the significance of this affectionate exchange between the player and his fans. Couto has recently tested positive for the anabolic steroid, Nandrolone, and he's facing a sixteen-month exile that could mean the end of his career. I was really moved by the public, Couto says later, this is a delicate moment for me. In the meantime, his club Lazio Rome is making strenuous efforts to present Couto as a victim of incompetent laboratory technicians and unscrupulous pharmaceutical companies that contaminate their dietary supplements with Nandrolone. The

steroid for which Couto had tested positive. He gets a sixteen-month sentence. I picked up the paper the other day and guess what? Couto's got a four-month ban.

The more famous Dutch soccer star, Edgar Davids, who tested positive not too long ago, will also serve four months. File this one under the rubric of doping exonerations, because one of the spectacles that WADA has confronted in the almost two years of its official existence now is one exoneration after the next, one penalty being reduced or dismissed, thrown out of court after the next. This is a demoralizing prospect for anti-doping administrators and something has to be done about it.

Merlene Ottey tests positive and Jamaica's acting Prime Minister goes on the air to defend her. The Touretski scandal erupts in Australia and the Prime Minister, John Howard, goes on the air to congratulate Australia's athletes on being so clean, despite the fact that this coach had been found to have steroids in his private safe.

The political influence of what we can call the sportive nationalism is one of the things that is driving all of this. I could repeat all sorts of evidence to the effect that what we call the public, is less interested in doping control than we are and, not only that, one has to be careful about subdividing the so-called public in a number of different ways. We don't have the time to parse the public as we should this afternoon, but believe me it needs to be done to get a handle on what people really think, and how they really respond to doping scandals. And given enough time we could analyze the Ben Johnson scandal in that context.

The Tour de France has offered many examples of public indifference to doping. Even as the catastrophic scandal was overwhelming the 1998 tour, its director Jean Marie LeBlanc remained confident that the event would retain public support and there is lots of evidence that he is correct. He said when the riders get to the Pyrennes they're going to be lining the streets the way they always did. There is lots of evidence that he was more accurate than any dissenting interlocutor would have been in that particular argument.

And then finally in that vein, what about the effect of the doping scandal on the sponsor? Well, we know that the first team that was caught in the summer of 1998 was the Festina Team sponsored by a Spanish watch manufacturer. How did the buying public treat the corporate sponsor of these people who were caught red handed with hundreds of doses of testosterone, EPO, etc. Within a few months of the scandal, Festina actually reported that the scandal had positive effects on sales of its watches and that it would be paying the team's five million dollar annual expenses the next year. Even three years later, which is to say this year, it was still being reported that the company had experienced a significant rise in name recognition and sales. Despite the notoriety of the athletes it had sponsored, the public was buying more of its watches, not less. Sobering news.

Finally, in May 1996, German television ran a non-representative survey of twenty thousand viewers. It found that 48% of these people who were asked said they would rather see "doped medal winners than clean losers" at the 1996 Atlanta Olympic Games. This disquieting response shows how the sportive nationalism can subvert the anti-doping campaign. Five months later the German anti-doping official, Hans Evers, an important man at that time stated, "if you were to do an opinion survey, do you want clean sport or medals, I am sure that most would want the medals, and I believe that is how the federations think as well." Sobering news, but I still think that things can be done.

I will conclude by going back to the point about the changing nature of the pharmaceutical market for legal hormones, the shift from therapy to lifestyle enhancement, and pose the following question that addresses the future and how what we call the public will receive the anti-doping message that a number of us represent. Will a general population that medicates itself for the purpose of boosting its own human capacities oppose the medicalizing of elite athletes?