

SPORT

Contents:

1. Past topics
2. Argument summaries
3. Relevant articles
4. Links

1. Past topics

Junior

- That we should ban parents from the sidelines of children's sports.
- That we should use sport as a diplomatic tool.
- That children who show poor sportsmanship should be suspended for the following weeks match.
- That school sport should be compulsory.
- That commercial television stations should be forced to show more women's sport.
- That women deserve more of the sporting spotlight.
- That those who cheat in professional sports should be banned from competition for life.
- That televising sport reduces participation in it.
- That women playing sport should be paid as much as men
- That there should be more compulsory sport in school.
- That sport is regarded too highly by Australians.
- That today's sporting personalities are paid too much.

Intermediate

- That we should ban the advertisement of alcoholic beverages at sporting events.
- That sports stars make good role models.
- That money has corrupted sport.
- That our sports stars make bad role models.
- That the media should pay more attention to women in sport.
- That we spend too much money on sport.
- That television is undermining sport.
- That our sport stars are put on too high a pedestal
- That women aren't given a fair go in sport.
- That sport is no longer a game.

Senior

- That athletes convicted of drug offences should be banned from the sport for life.
- That cheer leaders should be banned in the National Rugby League.
- That the Beijing Olympics should be the last
- That we should legalise drugs in sport.

- That sport is too prominent in Australian society.
- That commercialisation has ruined sport.
- That our sport stars are put on too high a pedestal

2. Argument summaries

Topic: Is sport really good for us?

Context:

- Sport is a reliable topic for good debates. There is always something in the news to make the issues topical, and even people who don't usually like debate will want to give their opinion. The arguments below look at the general case for and against sport as a worthwhile activity. More specific debates could be also run on particular sporting issues (for example; drugs in sport, physical education in schools, government funding, amateur versus professional sport, and sports violence). It may be helpful to start with a few definitions:
 - A sport could be defined as a physical competition played for pleasure. Those playing amateur (not for pay) sport do so because they enjoy it. Professional sportsmen and women get paid to compete, but do so because other people enjoy watching them play and pay to see them. Sport is not the same as a game, which may be competitive but lacks the physical element. Chess is a good example of a game (perhaps debating is too?).
 - Sport is also not the same as exercise, which might be done for medical reasons rather than for pleasure. Exercise is also not usually competitive. Jogging or aerobics are good examples of this.
 - There are many sports in which two individuals can test their skill, strength and speed against each other (e.g. tennis, squash, sculling, boxing or judo), but most sports are between two teams.

Pros	Cons
Sport is a great way to stay fit and healthy. This is very important today as few people have jobs with physical labour and most of us travel everywhere by car. As a result many people are overweight and suffer poor health. Sport may not be the only way to keep fit, but the competition and teamwork in sport give people a lot of motivation to keep going and to push themselves hard.	It is important to keep fit, but sport is not the only way to do this. Eating well is a big part of a healthy life, and many people prefer to exercise in other ways, for example jogging, working out in a gym, dancing, or even gardening. On the other hand, sport can actually be dangerous. Millions of people are hurt playing sport each year, some of them very seriously. Professional athletes spend much of their time getting over injury. Being hurt by another player is common in contact sports, such as boxing, soccer, football, rugby or hockey. Other injuries often happen because players are pushing their bodies too hard or for too long, in training or competition.
Sport teaches us big lessons for life. Most sports involve teamwork and teach us how to get along with others, how to work together to achieve a common goal, and about trust and responsibility. All sports teach us about dealing with success and	Sport does teach children lessons, but not always good ones. Many children are not naturally talented and only come across failure and embarrassment on the sports field. This hurts their confidence and may put them off any sort of

<p>failure. They also help people learn about coping with pressure and the need to stick with training in order to improve yourself. True, some sports do not suit some people, but there are so many possible choices that everyone can find a sport to enjoy.</p>	<p>exercise for life. Plenty of other activities can teach teamwork and other life skills, for example hiking and camping, playing in a band, or raising money for charity.</p>
<p>Sport is competitive because life is competitive. In the past humans were hunters and fighters and that spirit is still in us. There is nothing wrong with being ambitious and working hard to achieve the aims you set yourself. Nor is there anything wrong with wanting to do better than someone else. By playing sport children learn about competition and adults have a controlled outlet for aggression. But sport teaches us to compete fairly, within the rules. It balances competitiveness with teamwork and the need to respect the other side.</p>	<p>Sport makes people too competitive and encourages the worst sides of human nature. Sport is far from fair - the urge to compete leads many people to go too far to gain an unfair edge. Even amateur sports have plenty of cheats, a lack of respect for referees and drugs problems. These problems are worse in professional sport where the need to make money adds further pressure to win by any means. Too much competition can also be bad for you - doctors find that sports fans often feel stress and depression as a result of following their team.</p>
<p>Sport encourages a sense of belonging and identity, bringing people together in our fragmented society. This is true of playing sport, and also of watching sport and following a team. When cheering your side on, you can forget about your everyday worries and enjoy sharing in a group experience. It also brings people from different classes and backgrounds together - after all, sport is a universal language. At national level, it can bring unity and pride to a whole country and help overcome differences.</p>	<p>Sport also encourages tribalism and an us-against-them attitude. The unity of the group depends on feelings of aggression and hostility towards other groups. This is true for fans of club teams and can be seen in football violence (hooliganism) in England, Holland and Italy. It happens at boxing matches and even in college sports in America. Hooliganism also happens between countries - every time England play Germany it renews memories of the Second World War. Violent fans have also been a problem at the African Cup of Nations and even at cricket matches.</p>
<p>Sport gives us role models to look up to and try to copy. This is very important for young people from poor backgrounds who may have little hope. They can see how sports stars have made it out of bad situations through hard work and their own abilities. For those from minorities, athletes may be the only positive role models from their ethnic group they see on the television.</p>	<p>Sports stars are bad role models for young people to follow. Many behave badly, on the field and off, and so set a bad example to children. But even those who behave well are not good examples to follow. This is because top athletes don't need a good education. Children who hero-worship them could easily come to think that sport is more important than working hard in school. It is also bad that sport is seen as the best way for people from ethnic minorities to become well known. Shouldn't they be celebrated for their work as scientists, doctors, and teachers, or in business?</p>
<p>Sport has lots of social benefits. Sports programmes can give people a positive purpose and something to do. Small amounts of money spent on supporting sports have been shown to reduce crime a lot. In schools periods of activity doing sports send children back to their desks with better focus on their work. On a larger scale, sport can also be at the centre of efforts at urban renewal. Many cities have used a new sports</p>	<p>Sport today is about money rather than taking part. Greed has ruined any good that was once in sport. Success for professional teams now depends upon having a rich owner who can buy up talented players. Players have no loyalty to the club which trained them from childhood, but go wherever the money is. Some athletes have even changed nationality for money. Advertising is everywhere, including on the pitch and the players shirts. Fans</p>

stadium to draw people back to run down areas. Other businesses have followed the sports fans. Over time this investment pays off in higher tax revenues for the city.

are seen as consumers, willing to overpay for any item with the team logo on it. Even the Olympics has become one great marketing exercise, rather than a celebration of sport.

Topic: Should the use of performance-enhancing drugs in sport be legalised?

Background and Context of Debate:

At least as far back as Ben Johnson's steroid scandal at the 1988 Olympics, the use of performance-enhancing drugs in sports had entered the public psyche. Johnson's world record sprint, his win, and then, the stripping of his gold medal made news around the world. However, performance-enhancing drugs in sports do not begin with Johnson. A quick overview of drugs in sports reveals the earlier use of questionable substances; some even argue that drugs in sports date back to the earliest Olympic games.

The 2000 Olympics once again focused the attention of the world upon the use of illegal performance-enhancing drugs within sport. Several Olympic champions were stripped of their medals as a result of positive drugs tests, while the withdrawal of a large number of Chinese competitors on the eve of the games was widely assumed to be linked to failed drugs tests. Although attention is often focused upon athletics, almost all sports have a "drug problem" and devote considerable energy to testing competitors regularly, banning those who fail them. Nonetheless, doubts remain as to the effectiveness of these tests and the fairness of some of the resulting bans, and some argue the whole approach is deeply flawed. Performance-enhancing drugs include steroids, the male hormone testosterone, Human-growth hormone and other drugs taken to build muscle-bulk during training, and stimulants or blood-doping taken to improve performance in competition. Most such drugs have some medical uses and are prescribed legally in certain non-athletic contexts; it is unlikely that a Proposition would also wish to legalise "recreational" drugs such as cocaine, heroin and amphetamines, although all of these could be regarded as performance-enhancing in certain sporting contexts.

Should athletes and/or sports governing bodies allow the choice of using performance-enhancing drugs?

Yes

Freedom of choice. If athletes wish to take drugs in search of improved performances, let them do so. They harm nobody but themselves and should be treated as adults, capable of making rational decisions upon the basis of widely-available information. Even if there are adverse health effects in the long-term, this is also true of both tobacco and boxing, which remain legal.

No

Once some people choose to use drugs to enhance their performance, other athletes have their freedom of choice infringed upon: if they want to succeed they have to take drugs too. Athletes are very driven individuals, who would go to great lengths to achieve their goals. The chance of a gold medal in two years time may out-weigh the risks of serious health problems for the rest of their life. We should protect athletes from themselves and not allow anyone to take

performance-enhancing drugs.

Should a boundary be drawn between legitimate and illegitimate substance?

Yes

Natural/unnatural distinction untenable. Already athletes use all sorts of dietary supplements, exercises, equipment, clothing, training regimes, medical treatments, etc. to enhance their performance. There is nothing 'natural' about taking vitamin pills, wearing whole-body Lycra suits, having surgery on ligaments, spending every day in a gym pumping weights, running in shoes with spikes on the bottom, etc. Diet, medicine, technology, and even just coaching already give an artificial advantage to those athletes who can afford the best of all these aids. Since there is no clear way to distinguish from legitimate and illegitimate artificial aids to performance, they should all be allowed.

No

It is true that it is difficult to decide where to draw the line between legitimate and illegitimate performance enhancement. However we should continue to draw a line nonetheless. First, to protect athletes from harmful drugs. Secondly, to preserve the spirit of fair play and unaided competition between human beings in their peak of natural fitness. Eating a balanced diet and wearing the best shoes are clearly in a different category from taking steroids and growth hormones. We should continue to make this distinction and aim for genuine drug-free athletic competitions.

Is allowing drugs good for sports and athletes?

Yes

Levels the playing field. Currently suspicion over drug use surrounds every sport and every successful athlete, and those competitors who don't take performance-enhancing drugs see themselves as disadvantaged. Some drugs can't be tested for, and in any case, new medical and chemical advances mean that the cheats will always be ahead of the testers. Legalisation would remove this uncertainty and allow everyone to compete openly and fairly.

No

Very bad for athletes. The use of performance-enhancing drugs leads to serious health problems, including "steroid rage", the development of male characteristics in female athletes, heart attacks, and greatly reduced life expectancy. Some drugs are also addictive. With these results in mind, one must seek to eliminate and discourage the use of drugs by most athletes. We cannot condone wrongdoings for balance.

Do contemporary sports need performance-enhancing substances?

Yes

Better spectacle for spectators. Sport has become a branch of the entertainment business and the public demands "higher, faster, stronger" from athletes. If drug-use allows world records to be continually broken, and makes American Football

No

Spectators enjoy the competition between athletes rather than individual performances; a close race is better than a no-contest in a world record time. Similarly, they enjoy displays of skill, e.g. in football and other team sports and in

players bigger and more exciting to watch, why deny the public what they want, especially if the athletes want to give it to them?

gymnastics, more than simply raw power. In any case, why should we sacrifice the health of athletes for the sake of public enjoyment? Furthermore, the question arises, that if the government allows the partaking of drugs to enhance performances of athletes, why not allow other professional (physically laboring) individuals such as construction workers, to also use the steroids to enhance performance? The fact of the matter remains, that societal entertainment does not override the importance of health for individuals.

Simple analogy: If a person were to kill himself for the sake of entertaining the crowd--this act would still be considered illegal by the government and efforts to hinder/discourage will be put forth. A steroid induced athlete is on his way to serious death and/or danger of injuring other individuals around him (based on increases in testosterone levels that aggregate resulting in high levels of blood pressure and high probability of rash behavior). This should be seen as an equally detrimental act and thus illegal.

Should the use of performance-enhancing drugs be allowed for adults?

Yes

Current rules are very arbitrary and unfair:e.g. cold remedies denied to athletes, even in sports where any stimulating effect these might have is minimal (e.g. Gymnastics in the Sydney Olympics)e.g. the possibility that some positive tests are simply the result of using a combination of legal food supplements (e.g. nandrolone) e.g. creatine is legal despite health riskse.g. cyclists legally having heart operations to allow increased circulation and thus improve performance.

No

What about the children? Even if performance-enhancing drugs were only legalised for adults, the definition of this varies from country to country. Teenage athletes train alongside adult ones and share the same coaches, so many would succumb to the temptation and pressure to use drugs if these were widely available and effectively endorsed by legalisation. Not only are such young athletes unable to make a fully rational, informed choice about drug-taking, the health impacts upon growing bodies would be even worse than for adult users. It would also send a positive message about drug culture in general, making the use of "recreational drugs" with all their accompanying evils more widespread.

Is legalization feasible?

<p>Yes</p> <p>Bans increasingly fail to stand up in court. The whole legal basis for drugs-testing and the subsequent banning of transgressors is open to challenge, both as restraint of trade and invasion of privacy, and on scientific and methodological grounds. Sports' governing bodies fighting, and often losing, such court cases wastes vast sums of money.</p>	<p>No</p> <p>Disadvantages poor nations. Far from creating a level playing field, legalisation would tilt it in favour of those athletes from wealthy countries with advanced medical provision and pharmaceutical industries. Athletes from poorer nations would no longer be able to compete on talent alone. Talent, skill, hardwork--at the root of all sports, these are the points on which one must solely base the winner. Not on his financial ability to afford medicines that enhance his natural performance. The act of encouraging drugs in the sporting business contradicts the values of sportsmanship.</p>
--	---

Will legalization make the situation safer?

<p>Yes</p> <p>If legal then drugs can be controlled and monitored by doctors, making them much safer. Athletes on drugs today often take far more than is needed for performance-enhancement, running needless health risks as a result, simply because of ignorance and the need for secrecy. Legalisation allows more information to become available and open medical supervision will avoid many of the health problems currently associated with performance-enhancing drugs.</p>	<p>[No]</p> <p>Reform is preferable to surrender. The current testing regime is not perfect but better research, testing and funding, plus sanctions against uncooperative countries and sports could greatly improve the fight against drugs in sport</p>
---	---

Topic: *Should Physical Education in schools be compulsory?*

Arguments:

Pros	Cons
<p>Participation in sport promotes health. Government is, or should be, concerned with the health of its citizens. Encouraging physical activity in the young through compulsory PE fights child obesity and contributes to forming lifelong habits of exercise. This doesn't have to be through traditional team sports; increasingly schools are able to offer exercise in the form of swimming, gymnastics, dance, weight training, use of a multigym, aerobics, etc.</p>	<p>Students should be allowed a choice. Lots of children don't want to do this. If their parents agree, why should they be forced to (or forced to lie in producing a sick note)? It is different from any other lesson - it is about what one does with one's body. In any case, it is a red herring to say that PE makes any serious difference to people's health. There are plenty of more effective ways of ensuring a healthy population than pushing children round a freezing sports pitch once a week; not least would be addressing the disgusting diets our young have today, and</p>

	encouraging walking or cycling to school rather than total reliance on the car.
Physical Education is an important part of holistic schooling. PE is an aspect of school being about more than just book learning – it is about educating the whole person, a holistic education that betters us in an all-round sense, rather than a merely academic experience. Some aspects of physical education are vital for future wellbeing, e.g. being able to swim, learning to lift heavy weights safely.	Sport is a waste of school time and resources. It creates a whole extra department in schools, wasting a great deal of money and time that could be better spent on academic lessons. It also requires schools buildings to be surrounded by a large amount of land for playing fields, making it prohibitively expensive to build new schools in urban areas
The quest for national sporting achievement begins in schools. If we don't have compulsory PE, it is much harder to pick out athletes to represent our country on a wider stage. Even with a 'sports academy' model run along Australian lines, it's much easier to find suitable individuals with a full sports program in every school.	Schools aren't supposed to be about fostering achievers for the state - that smacks of Stalinism. Schools should be tailored to the individual - if the individual student doesn't want to participate in sports, they shouldn't have to.
Without school support, sports will collapse. If full classes aren't made up, then team activities will end by sheer lack of numbers, no matter if several very talented individuals are at the school (or even potentially talented - they'll never know without the program). If voluntary take-up of sport in schools is too low, then schools will shut down PE programmes so that there is no choice at all. Not everyone is academic: why deprive those talented sports students of their one chance to shine?	Forcing children that don't want to play to make up teams in order to allow others to shine smacks of rigid education from a bygone era. In any case, in an increasingly litigious age, a compulsory rather than voluntary sports program is a liability.
Sport is different to, say Latin - it encompasses life choices (most importantly, a concern for physical fitness, but also working in a team etc) that ought to be encouraged in all students. Extra classes for interested students can take place separately, and often do in the form of fixtures with other schools, championships etc. Sport shouldn't be seen as an alternative to academia, an either/or – it should be a part of every student's life in addition to their other studies.	Successful sporting nations like Australia realise that sports, like any other specialised subjects, are best taught to selected groups that display both talent and interest in the field - forcing all to compete holds back the able and punishes the less able. The right way to go is to liberate those that don't want to participate, and allow those that are extremely keen to go to academies that focus their talents more efficiently than a regular school ever could.
Sport helps to forge character. Playing team sports builds character and encourages students to work with others. It teaches children how to win and lose with good grace and builds a strong school spirit through competition with other institutions. It is often the experience of playing	Many say the same benefits derive from the common endurance of prison. In particular, injuries sustained through school sport and the psychological trauma of being bullied for sporting ineptitude can mark people for years after they have left school. Teamwork can be

on a team together which builds the strongest friendships at school, which endure for years afterwards.

better developed through music, drama, community projects, etc. without the need to encourage an ultra-competitive ethos.

Topic: *Should Wimbledon and other sports competitions offer equal prize money for men and women?*

Background and Context of Debate:

The organising bodies of tournaments in several sports currently offer 'uneven' prize funds, paying the champion of the men's competition more than the women's. The most obvious and high profile example is the Wimbledon Championship hosted by the All-England Tennis and Croquet Club, but also other events such as bodybuilding or cycling offer more money for men [Purses for men's chess championships are always higher than those for women, but top tournaments are run by different organisations thus making proper comparison impossible, and chess's status as a 'sport' is doubted]. In tennis, the US Open has paid equal prize money for three decades, and was followed by the Australian Open in 2000. Should others do the same? [The following case is presented with reference to the principles involved – should they? Debates may or may not involve a mechanism, too – should we somehow make them?]

Work and effort: Are female athletes performing the same amount of work in sports relative to men, warranting equal pay?

Yes

It is outrageous that in the modern world women can be paid less than men for doing the same job. Sport or not, the widely accepted principle of equal pay in the workplace ought to be applied – after all, these are professionals with jobs that should be treated like any other. Talk about longer play and other differences is irrelevant. The champion is the champion – they've beaten everyone in their field – and deserve full recognition. For this isn't really about the money – it's about the message of comparative inferiority lower prize funds send about women's sports. Furthermore, elite sports are extremely high profile, and in their organisation and rewards they contain messages that the whole of society looks to. Thus, in having unequal prize funds, the organisers of some of our most popular events don't just look down

No

Men's higher inherent ability to perform in sports has a higher market value: Of course women should be paid equal pay – for equal work. The work being done isn't equal, so there's no discrimination. Sports fans are interested in the highest levels of performance, so the highest athletic prizes should go to the competitors who are strongest, fastest, most powerful or who have the greatest endurance. It is coincidental that for biological reasons such competitors are almost always men. Firstly, in tennis men play 'best of five sets' matches; women play only three. In weightlifting, they lift more weight. It's therefore perfectly reasonable for the men to be paid more as the men are doing more work. Since records began, the average men's tennis game at Wimbledon has taken on 30 minutes longer to play than the average women's game. Thus, on average the men's champion will have played 3?

on women's sports – they look down on women. The message this sends must be corrected. Proof, if it's needed, that the 'longer play' line is bogus is found in the fact that in non-grand slam events men receive higher prize funds, even though they only play best of 3 sets matches, like the women (except in some finals). Even if it's justifiable for Wimbledon to differentiate on this ground (and it's not, given the message it sends as outlined above), the vast majority of tournaments should change their policy to equality if you accept the 'work rate' logic of the opposition.

hours more tennis than the women's. If women want the same prize money, they should be prepared to play the same number of sets (thus providing more advertising time for networks, from which much of Wimbledon's revenue – and thus the prize fund – comes), or in the weightlifting example, lift more weights. The men's game is also more contested at the top. 52% of men's games went into at least the 4th set at Wimbledon 2002, whilst only 24% of women's matches made it to the 3rd set. This suggests a greater, and thus more exciting, contest, which feeds into popularity (see argument 2). But it also points to the fact that men at the height of their game have to perform and train harder, and for longer than the women do, enduring more pain, risking more injuries, and delivering higher levels of performance. Again – the work isn't equal, so neither is the pay.

Market value: Is the higher pay of men just a fair representation of their market value?

Yes

Male athletes have received unrepresentative support from male sport administrators and media executives: How can this fairly be decided, when men's sports dominate media coverage so thoroughly? The market has been conditioned historically by the preferences of biased male sports administrators and media executives. Do we really know that sports fans prefer men's sports, or do we only know that they watch them? In fact, many viewers say that they prefer women's tennis, as it relies more on skill and less on power than the men's game, especially in fast grass services such as that at Wimbledon.

Women's sports are played at a lower level precisely because there is less money in them. This cycle has to be broken at some point.

No

The market decides the ratio of reward – and there isn't a fairer method of deciding than that: The male game is more popular. It's more powerful and many find it more exciting. If that were different, the pay scale would be too. Rewards come from consumers: if women's tennis or weightlifting or cycling were more popular than men's, they'd be paid more than men. For the same reasons, heavyweight (male) boxers get much greater rewards than boxers in lighter weight categories.

Feasibility: Is it feasible to equalise pay between men and women?

Yes

A complete change toward pay equality is a feasible long-term goal:

One quick fix could be to equalize pay first in tournaments with joint men's and women's events: It also makes sense symbolically to begin with something like Wimbledon, where both men's and women's games are played at a very high level and both are very popular.

No

Equal-pay campaigns are selectively discriminatory and risk causing a backlash against joint tournaments that will harm female pay: It is not really fair that tournaments in which both sexes (separately) compete, such as Wimbledon, are singled out for campaigns for equality, as different levels of popularity and physical ability has resulted in this differentiation across all major sports – such as soccer, rugby, cricket, basketball, baseball. There is a danger that sports administrators will decide the best way to avoid forced equality is to scrap joint tournaments in which men and women compete at the same time in parallel competitions. This could have the unintended consequence of reducing the opportunities for women to compete at the top level and so to earn the highest financial rewards.

Exceptionality: Are unequal pay events the exception rather than the norm, and does this matter?

Yes

Wimbledon stands out as discriminatory given that two other 'Grand Slam' tournaments (the US and Australian Opens) pay equal prize money. The Wimbledon tournament trades party upon a sense of history and tradition, but upholding discrimination makes it look outdated. Over time, this will reduce its status as the leading international tennis tournament and make it less attractive to sponsors and media partners.

No

Equal prize money in tournaments is the exception rather than the norm: Wimbledon and the French Open both have larger men's prizes. Only very recently have half of the Grand Slams paid equal money, and in the wider tennis world an imbalance is still normal. In other sports, such as weightlifting, very few joint events pay equal prize money.

Public image: Does the public reject unequal pay and punish those events that uphold it?

Yes

Wimbledon is losing face by maintaining that women should not receive equal pay: It is not in the tournament's interests to do this: it makes Wimbledon and similar events look bad, and over time it will only become more of an issue. Martina Hingis has suggested that

No

On the contrary, this is an accepted principle in world sports and anyone trying to blackmail a tournament would lose public sympathy themselves: They also wouldn't change anything except denying themselves the chance to compete, as winning is so prestigious that plenty

women should boycott tournaments with unequal prize funds. The same applies to weightlifting, cycling etc. The quality of the competition will be lower, and the publicity will be terrible

of other women will still enter and protestors will just get forgotten as the tournament progresses.

3. Relevant articles

Tuesday, September 30

Equal prize money unrealistic

By Jeff Hollobaugh

Special to ESPN.com

A point of debate that used to come up when I worked in the track magazine business was whether all events were created equal. After long and tangled deliberations involving the use of e-mail rather than walking 10 feet to the next office to have an actual conversation, we would usually decide no. That is, while events might be equal in some idealistic, space-organizing sort of way, they don't end up that way in the marketplace.

That bothers some people.

It's kind of hard to say that all events are equal when you see Justin Gatlin winning \$500,000 for running 100 meters in a 10.05 in Moscow and Paul Tergat winning \$92,000 (not counting appearance money) for running a world record marathon in Berlin. You do the math.

Okay, so you won't do the math. You probably think that's what I get paid for.

Fine. So I'll do the math. Tergat, in his two-hours-plus worth of work on Sunday, earned something like \$44,191 an hour. Gatlin, at least for those few moments, was earning \$1.79 billion an hour. And you can't tell me that Gatlin deserves it because he works harder in training. A sprinter may work faster, but a sprinter most definitely does not work longer or harder in training than the world's fastest marathoner.

This might not be a fair example. There are not many (any) track meets that pay out what the Moscow extravaganza did. I'm still not sure where all the money came from and will be watching to see whether the checks clear the bank.

Still, you get the point. Track and field pays a lot more for top sprinters than it does for top distance runners. That's not the injustice, though. If the top distance runners start griping about money, I suspect the women's throwers would consider killing them and burying them in shallow graves near minor European villages.

And if the women's throwers start griping, I think the racewalkers would have a

legitimate grudge. (But they wouldn't be able to hurt the throwers, not in a fair fight.)

As my cohorts and I decided long ago, all events are not equal. The mass of men who lead lives of quiet desperation simply do not care as much about some events as others. And it's ridiculous for athletes in those events to expect reporters and muckrakers such as myself to try to rectify the situation for them by granting them equal time in the media.

If the exciting, world-record racewalking we saw at the recent World Championships didn't drive fans in droves out to watch the walks, could articles in magazines and on the Web do such a thing? Heck, the racewalking world should chip in and buy a fabulous gift for whoever it was who measured the World Championships race courses, but they shouldn't expect us to trumpet their glories.

Nasty about the walks, perhaps I am. But I'm pretty sure my last walker readers lost their patience with me long ago. They haven't flamed me in a while.

Beating up on walkers isn't my point here. I'll leave such pleasures to the women's throwers. No, my point is that we have a plethora of events in track and field, up to 48 counting women's events separately and depending on which championship you are looking at. If you try to do everything equally, things just don't work because that's not what the fans want. And sometimes, it's not what the athletes seemingly want. I remember the joy of trying to do 50-deep performer lists for Track & Field News years ago. We couldn't even find 50 people in the country in a given year who tried certain events!

Heck, even track and field are not equal components. No yin and yang here. If you don't agree, try telling people you're going to a field meet next time. You will find yourself in an explanation, and possibly, an actual conversation.

People pay for what they want to see. That's harsh, but it's life. Merit doesn't matter. Look at the entertainment scene for proof (Britney fans, take umbrage), and to remind yourself what planet you live on. Paul Tergat should be glad he got the money he got; he's beating most of us.

Jeff Hollobaugh, former managing editor of Track and Field News, is a regular contributor to ESPN.com. He can be reached by e-mail at michtrack@aol.com.

Unbelievable ... 30 per cent believe they won't get caught. *Bob Barker*

We won't get caught, say athletes

By Sean Parnell

March 13, 2008

UP to 30 per cent of Australia's top athletes believe they could get away with using performance-enhancing drugs if they wanted to, according to an explosive survey commissioned by the

nation's anti-doping agency.

As the Beijing Olympics approaches, a report on the confidential survey also warns that Olympic-level athletes are more confident they could escape detection than lower-level competitors, and are also more pessimistic about the prospects of winning without drugs.

The Curtin University survey was completed in the middle of last year and warranted a brief mention in the Australian Sports Anti-Doping Authority annual report, where the only finding mentioned was that the proportion of athletes who might consider doping had dropped from 16 to 8 per cent in three years.

But the other findings, uncovered by *The Australian* after a Freedom of Information search, raise serious questions over the perception of anti-doping efforts worldwide and athletes' concerns over the extent of the drug problem. The report also helps explain the rationale for ASADA's tough stance on drugs, including its work with customs, targeted testing, and long-term storage of samples.

"It is perhaps of some concern that a substantial proportion of 'Olympic/world' athletes (30 per cent) consider that they are unlikely to be caught if using doping out of competition, and even 7 per cent consider that they are unlikely to be caught if using doping during competition," the report said.

The report linked that response to a finding that a slightly lower proportion of Olympic and world championship level athletes would reject or immediately report receiving an offer of performance-enhancing drugs, and were more likely than lower-level competitors to consider such an offer.

While at all levels, more than 90 per cent of athletes felt using performance-enhancing drugs was morally and ethically wrong, Olympic- and world championship-level athletes were more pessimistic when asked if natural ability would always win out.

Among higher-level athletes, as many agreed as disagreed - 44 per cent and 44 per cent respectively - that using performance-enhancing drugs and technologies was unnecessary.

"These indirect measures suggest that many athletes are more vulnerable to doping than their responses (to earlier questions about their consideration of any offer) would suggest," the report said.

Olympic- and world championship-level athletes were also more likely to believe that "there are a lot of technological ways to improve performance that are allowed that are unfair to athletes who can't afford them".

But higher-level athletes endorsed tougher penalties for doping, with 72 per cent of Olympic and world championship athletes advocating a life ban for a second offence, a stronger response than from lower-level athletes.

Knowledge and concern about lesser substances was mixed. About two in three athletes believed regular use of nutritional and energy supplements would result in little or no harm to their health, and very few believed it could result in a positive drug test.

"These data suggest that some athletes could require little persuasion or evidence to convince

them that the likelihood is greater than they thought," the report said.

There was also a more relaxed view about marijuana and amphetamines use.

ASADA chairman Richard Ings was unavailable for comment, and his spokesman offered no comment on the report. But Australian Olympic Committee boss John Coates said the survey results came as no surprise to him, and reflected widespread pessimism about authorities' ability to detect and punish athletes for use of human growth hormones.

"I can understand some athletes responding in the way they have," Coates said.

Coates said he supported ASADA's recent enhanced testing regime, and its commitment to store samples for future testing once technology is available.

"I think the message that's coming from ASADA is, 'if we don't get you now, we'll get you later'," he said. "Once there's a realisation of that I think those percentages that you've referred to might come down."

Swimmer Elka Graham came under fire last year when she claimed she had been offered performance-enhancing drugs but declined to publicly reveal who made the offer. The survey, however, avoided asking athletes if they had received such an offer.

Curtin University randomly sent 1300 surveys to athletes registered with ASADA and had a 30 per cent response rate. The report noted that, unlike the 2004 survey, ASADA's involvement was detailed, and some results could therefore have been skewed.

Why Cousins must be banned

COMMENT

Patrick Smith

April 28, 2007

AUSTRALIAN Football League boss Andrew Demetriou made an emotional speech when the league launched its season last month.

Demetriou embraced the troubled Ben Cousins and said that the grand football family would always support him. That the family has done.

West Coast has paid some \$75,000 for Cousins to beat his drug addiction at a fancy facility in Malibu, California. Cousins' salary package would be around \$750,000.

The AFL has granted West Coast's request that the money spent on its star's rehabilitation be considered outside the club's salary cap. The Brownlow medallist is expected back in Australia any time soon and everyone wishes him well.

Enough of feeling warm and fuzzy. The AFL must suspend Cousins immediately and for an indefinite period. And the perfect time to announce the penalty is after the AFL commission and

West Coast crisis meeting tomorrow morning.

That Cousins has brought the game into disrepute under rule 1.6 cannot be contested and thus the AFL has the power to do all manner of things to the champion.

A fine, a rebuke or suspended sentence would not be appropriate. Cousins must officially be judged a banned player for his use of drugs and the damage that has done to football.

If the AFL does not act now, when Cousins' return to Perth is imminent, then the perception that football is soft on those players who use illicit drugs will toughen into reality.

The AFL's three-strike policy is becoming harder for Demetriou's administration to defend, and revelations that Port Adelaide had a two-day warning drug testers were on their way to Alberton makes it look amateurish and compromised.

Cousins has already been suspended by West Coast but this is hardly a club issue. The commission must show emphatic leadership on drug abuse.

The defence by West Coast coach John Worsfold, that Cousins has broken no rules because he has not returned a test positive to illegal drugs, is absurd.

Cousins is an addict. That the AFL does not have a positive result is evidence only of the shambolic nature of the football drug-testing protocols. That Cousins might have played football for West Coast while affected by drugs cannot be dismissed. His addiction has soiled the standing of the AFL.

It would be a most unhelpful image for football if a player can admit to drug addiction, repeatedly flouting the AFL's illicit drug policy, then simply return to the competition when he is feeling chipper enough to last four quarters.

The AFL's suspension should only be lifted when it believes Cousins is a clean athlete and his time spent out of the game is commensurate to his misbehaviour. A footballer who tests positive three times faces a suspension of up to 12 matches.

That is not a bad figure for the AFL to factor in when it considers Cousins' punishment under rule 1.6.

The AFL may well have all this planned and plotted. It may argue that until it can confront Cousins personally it does not know the exact details of his addiction. That information is not necessary if the league acts on the rule governing bringing the game into disrepute.

Until the commission takes a strong public position the unsettling feeling that the league does not have control over the issue of drugs in football will fester among the community. It will be regarded as insipid and indecisive on illicit substances.

Unfortunately for West Coast, Cousins' addiction is just one of many incidents involving the club's players that the commission will review. Worsfold will be asked to explain his comments this week that the AFL needed to clean up its own act.

On Wednesday, Worsfold said: "I was very surprised to have heard (about the Port Adelaide

tests) but when I say I'm surprised, we heard about the leaks of players who had positive tests last year, and that was always going to be confidential.

"But anything can be leaked out and the AFL seem to have some pretty massive holes in some of their systems at the moment."

The coach's defence will need to be extraordinary. It is not just the recent behaviour of Michael Braun (swearing at the Ross Glendinning Medal presentation), Daniel Chick (contemptuous behaviour at the tribunal) and Adam Selwood (demeaning language regarding women) that will be examined. The AFL will conduct a history lesson. It is a grim read.

It is believed that West Coast will admit it might have acted more strongly over Braun and Chick, but will defend the reputation of Selwood vigorously and argue that he should not be punished. However, it is unlikely "a good bloke" defence will draw sympathy from the commission.

West Coast players will not be the only casualties from the club's months of behaving badly.

Chairman Dalton Gooding - summoned to the meeting along with his chief executive Trevor Nisbett, football manager Steve Woodhouse, Worsfold, skipper Chris Judd and other members of the playing leadership group - has lost a chance to join the AFL commission.

The AFL has begun the process of finding a replacement for the late Ron Evans, the former commission chairman who died last month. Gooding was widely regarded as a good choice to represent WA at the commission table. He isn't any more.

Violence to be tackled on pitch

From correspondents in Brussels, Belgium

March 17, 2008

THE European Union's top sports regulator said dangerous tackles should be dealt with on the football pitch, dismissing FIFA president Sepp Blatter's view that the matter should be handed to the civil courts.

The head of soccer's world governing body believes players who commit dangerous tackles should be banned for life and such incidents treated as criminal acts.

But EU Sports Commissioner Jan Figel said FIFA should avoid advocating court cases and instead concentrate on educating coaches and players about the dangers of such actions. He also said the rules needed to be tougher and clearer for referees.

"I like the preventive rather than the reactive approach. It is better to educate, to advocate tolerance, an observance of the rules and team spirit," Figel said.

"It's important that we try to develop steps and policies which are compatible and realistic from an implementation point of view. We shouldn't give too much work to the courts."

Michel Platini, president of UEFA, the game's governing body in Europe, has also slammed Blatter's reaction following a recent tackle on Arsenal's Eduardo da Silva in which the Croatia striker suffered a broken leg and ankle dislocation.

Platini played down the significance of the incident and said the game was "a lot more dangerous" when he played.

"We shouldn't have foggy rules or ideas flying about it. FIFA has its own responsibility here in setting clear rules and the importance of self-regulation," Figel said.

"Coaches also have the major responsibility in this. I work on the golden rule that you don't do to others what you don't want done to yourself."

Figel was speaking ahead of a meeting of EU sports ministers in Slovenia which is set to send a positive political signal to UEFA over its rules on home-groomed players, but is again due to rubbish Blatter's proposals to limit the number of foreign players available to clubs.

Under Blatter's so-called "6 plus 5" system - backed by FIFA's executive committee last week - a team must field a minimum of six players eligible to represent the club's home international side, contrary to the EU's rules on free movement of labour.

UEFA's "home-grown player rule" sets a quota of locally trained players at clubs, but without any discrimination on nationality.

EU plans for 'football police'

By Darren Ennis

November 30, 2007

THE European Union's top justice official wants to demilitarise football crowd control as part of his bid to combat a rising tide of violence which has gripped the game over the past year.

EU Justice Commissioner Franco Frattini told Reuters Television in an interview that he wants a "less military-style presence" around football matches by replacing high numbers of police inside the stadium with specially trained stewards.

"I want to see an end to this heavy-handed approach around some matches. We will take a less military-style approach, a demilitarisation of football if you like," Frattini said.

"The more we will be able to improve training of police outside the stadium, the more we would be promoting stewards, for example, inside.

"Because I do prefer to have sport infrastructures not militarised with the presence of police, armed police inside the stadium. It's much better to leave police outside,

well protected and well prepared to prevent and to intervene," Frattini said.

The Italian official was speaking on the day he announced his proposal for a special pan-European police force to tackle football-related violence.

The decision followed Thursday's first high-level meeting of EU government officials, the European Commission, police chiefs, supporters and sports bodies which agreed a blueprint for combating violence in sport.

The meeting was organised in response to the recent rise in incidents which culminated in two fatal shootings in Italy this year.

"This is about training and educating police officers how to deal with incidents in a proper manner. This new force will not be wearing any special combat uniform or badge of honour," Frattini said.

"That's why I do believe that just having reactions or just militarising sport events doesn't work, it's much better to have a prevention, to better prepare our police forces and young people going to sport events to abstain from violence, riots, etc."

The justice chief backs the principle of an EU-wide ban on troublemakers, but said this was not a "one-off, simple solution" to the problem. He also wants to see tougher sanctions being taken against offenders.

"Why not entrust Europol (European police force) to monitor suspects and violent hooligans which they can control, to track down them all across Europe instead of saying, well, there is a ban across Europe," Frattini said.

"Because if they want to exploit freedom of movement, which is a fundamental liberty for citizens, to commit violence, they should stay at home. That is sufficient to give Europol a better coordinated role in prevention."

"So prevention, training of police, cooperation with football clubs and supporters, cooperation with sports federation. That's my recipe," he added.

Reuters

Players must take responsibility

Comment by Richard Freedman

March 25, 2007

WHO appointed footy players as role models for my children? I didn't, they didn't, so who did?

Maybe it's like the Millennium Bug, another myth that gathered momentum until everyone was conned.

No one can be a role model 100 per cent of the time, and be assured - those young men, with little life experience and sometimes even less education, would be low on my list of mentors.

Meanwhile, the footy club has been elevated to occupy a position in society it doesn't deserve. Why has an association of people who want to play football games been elevated to the role of custodian of young men's souls? Why is everything that goes wrong in a player's life somehow the responsibility or the fault of the footy club?

It beats me. The footy club should only be responsible for a player's behaviour when he is representing that club or sport. According to some, that's a 24-hour, seven-day commitment, every week of the year.

That's an unreasonable expectation.

Likewise, the player cannot be held constantly responsible for the club's good name either. Was Ben Cousins representing West Coast when he was buying illegal drugs?

Yes, if he was in his team kit or on club premises. No, if he was in an alley outside a Perth nightclub at 3am on a Sunday.

And there are 500 shades of grey between those extremes.

Why should the West Coast be held responsible for all the stupid actions of a grown man?

The footy club exists to provide young men with the opportunity to play football. The club is entitled to demand a certain level of behaviour when a player is truly representing it.

Put that expectation in the player's contract with set penalties for a breach; that's fine, too. However, clear boundaries must be defined regarding when players represent the club and when they represent themselves, because they can't be doing both all the time.

Speeches by club chairmen and chief executives extolling their club's intention to mould the characters of their players, for the betterment of society, make me laugh. Get a grip, you're a footy club, you're not that important, and it's not your place. Offer guidance if asked, but generally leave that to the player or his parents.

All these players have managers, too. What are they doing? Players, like the rest of us, must take responsibility for their own actions and stop blaming someone else.

And as for players being role models - my laughter gets louder. I hear you say, "What about the kids? They copy their heroes". But which heroes are flawless?

Every person has the capacity to be a role model or a creep. Why do we expect more from football players than we expect from ourselves?

Really, players are just like your next-door neighbour, only better at sport, that's all. It's a parent's duty to teach their kids right from wrong; it's not the role of any sportsperson.

Parents of players who blame the football club for the misconduct of their sons are copping out

on their own culpability.

We're selling our children short by assuming that they can't tell the difference between a player behaving well or being a goose.

If kids are struggling with the grey wasteland in between conduct that is clearly good and clearly bad, then parents or guardians must interpret that for them and explain it to them.

Primarily, each player represents himself first, and then perhaps his employer.

Drop the words "role model" from the sporting vernacular because they just don't apply. Everyone can be a role model at times and everyone can be an anti-social boor at times.

The clergy, the Prime Minister and parents - they're about the only people you can expect to be role models. The rest are just people.

4. Links:

- **Australian Sports Anti-Doping Authoring**
 - <http://www.asada.gov.au/>
- **About Anabolic Steroid (ESPN)**
 - <http://espn.go.com/special/s/drugsandsports/steroids.html>
- **Is the Olympic dream dead?**
 - http://www.idebate.org/debatabase/topic_details.php?topicID=75
- **Australian Institute of Sport**
 - <http://www.ausport.gov.au/ais/>
- **Working together for a healthy active Australia (government)**
 - <http://www.healthactive.gov.au/>
- **Australia Government – Australian Sports Commission**
 - <http://www.ausport.gov.au/>
- **Should Wimbledon and other sports competitions offer equal prize money for men and women?**
 - http://www.idebate.org/debatabase/topic_details.php?topicID=300
- **Should the state financially support elite athletes or should it leave them to compete for a limited pot of funding from charities and sponsorship?**
 - http://www.idebate.org/debatabase/topic_details.php?topicID=522
- **Should we refuse to send a team to the Beijing Olympics in 2008?**
 - Should we refuse to send a team to the Beijing Olympics in 2008?
- **Women's Sport Foundation**
 - <http://www.womenssportsfoundation.org/>
- **FOX Sports**
 - www.foxsports.com