



»The IOC is still not taking doping seriously,« says *Sunday Times* sports journalist David Walsh

LIES AND LATIN

In his comment to the Play the Game conference, 46-year-old David Walsh did not mince his words.

»It was a load of nonsense,« he said of Patrick Schamasch's earlier address on doping. »Schamasch only gave the political version - the version in which the IOC is leading the fight. But they have never taken doping seriously enough. Instead, they have attempted to hide it from public view. They have never tried to get to the heart of the problem.«

Walsh, who has been plying his trade since 1976, has had a special interest in doping since the full extent of the problem was realised in the mid 1990's.

He admits that things improved in Sydney, mainly because more tests were carried out - but he accuses both the IOC and the Sydney officials of wrongly giving the impression that the problem is under control.

»The IOC wants to protect its image,« he continued. »Therefore, it needs to show that it is carrying out lots of tests - but it does not welcome positive ones. There is still no definitive test for EPO or growth hormone. In fact, there are drugs that we don't even know about yet. We simply cannot tell whether our champions have been using drugs.«

Walsh's own opinion is clear. He abhors the fact that in some areas of sport, "clean" competitors stand little chance of success. »I often try to remind myself that we all have the right to play fair,« he said. »It is a fundamental right that everyone has. The right to play according to the rules. As journalists we should defend the person who plays fair - and that person is not necessarily the champion.«

KL

According to German journalists, corruption in FIFA is widespread

Votes for sale in the night

By Jonna Toft

How did the Swedish favourite for the FIFA president's position, UEFA Chairman Lennart Johansson, end up losing the vote to Switzerland's Joseph Blatter? What caused the delegates - especially the Africans - to change their minds and vote for former president Havelange's right-hand man, when a short time previously they had committed themselves to Johansson?

And how did South Africa lose the fight to host the 2006 World Cup after Joseph Blatter had promised the tournament to Africa if he was elected? What accounts for Germany's victory?

The answer is money.

According to two German journalists who addressed the Play the Game conference, money means everything in international football. Thomas Kistner of *Süddeutsche Zeitung*, and Jens Weinreich of *Berliner Zeitung* have written a series of articles and a book entitled "Das Milliardenpiel" (The Game of Billions).

When Joseph Blatter put himself up as FIFA presidential candidate in April 1998, it was the less-influential nations such as Algeria, Libya, Lebanon and Guinea that supported his candidature. Few of the nations from football's central power blocs of Europe or South America were in favour of his nomination. However, two months later, Blatter was elected president with a total of 111 votes against the 80 of Lennart Johansson.

The following day, Kistner and Weinreich spoke to Issa Hayatou, Vice President of FIFA and representative of FIFA's African offshoot, the CAF. Hayatou revealed that shortly before the vote was to take place, most of the African delegates had confirmed their intention to vote for Johansson.

Said Jens Weinreich: »Hayatou said that at around midnight he was called over to the hotel used by the African delegation. When he arrived, many of the delegates asked him how much money he could get from the CAF to ensure they voted for Johansson. It seemed that they had already been offered large incentives by the Blatter camp. Hayatou confirmed what other observers had also alleged: that the voting process was nothing more than a bidding business akin to a bazaar.«

In his campaign for their votes, Blatter allegedly gave a pledge to the African delegates: if he were elected, the 2006 World Cup would be held on their continent. However, this proved to be a hollow promise.

Did Germany buy the World Cup?

In July last year, FIFA's executive committee was charging with choosing the country best suited to host of the 2006 World Cup: With all other nations eliminated, the final choice was between South Africa or Germany, and the vote ended up 12-11 in favour of Germany. The deciding factor was widely reported as the abstention of New Zealand delegate Charles Dempsey. Had he voted for South Africa, Blatter's deciding presidential vote would have handed the tournament to the African continent. So what prevented the New Zealand delegate casting his vote in favour of South Africa? »Dempsey would not vote because he had been subjected to intense pressure - including attempted bribes from both sides,« said Weinreich.

The two journalists point out that Germany won the vote because of support from Asian nations that had previously pledged their support to South Africa.





Jens Weinreich: »We are not saying that German firms and the government conspired to buy the World Cup 2006. But they displayed astonishingly good timing«

**»Brazilian football is full of corruption,« says Thomas Kistner.
»It is impossible to become a powerful football administrator in South America without counting former FIFA Chairman Joao Havelange among your list of friends«**



PHOTO: JENS NØRGAARD LARSEN/NORDFOTO

»All eight European countries on the executive committee voted in a bloc - this was the first time in many years they had done this. After Johansson's loss in Paris they dared not risk another catastrophe so they decided to stick together. There were 24 members on the executive committee, so they needed five more votes to win. In the end, they got just four,« continued Weinreich.

South Africa's supporters knew they needed to secure at least one of the Asian votes to take their total to 12 and force a deciding vote by Blatter. But their optimism drained away when it emerged that the Asians were voting en bloc for Germany. But why was this?

»We must look at some of the big German businesses that were active behind the scenes,« continues Weinreich. »DaimlerChrysler, Bayer, BASF and Siemens proclaimed new investments and joint ventures in Thailand and South Korea worth two billion dollars. This took place in the final ten days before the FIFA vote. And eight days before, the German Federal Parliament - in a secret meeting - agreed to sell weapons to Saudi Arabia.

We are not saying that these firms and the government conspired to buy the World Cup. But we think that they displayed astonishingly good timing. It was precisely these nations that ended up voting for Germany. In our opinion,

this was decisive to the final outcome of the vote.«

The reaction in South Africa was anger and frustration. As journalist Julia Beffon from the Mail & Guardian related: "Initially the anger was directed at Charles Dempsey. But gradually it turned into bitterness towards at Europe and the rest of the industrialised world. People felt that no matter what happened, the European countries would always get what they wanted. They have the power, the money and the best footballers.

»In my opinion, the entire African football world saw the vote as yet another example of money controlling sporting interests.«

After Kistner and Weinreich's address, a Swedish journalist asked whether - given Lennart Johansson's stated commitment to openness, especially in economic matters - the situation within FIFA would now be different if Johansson had become president

»Yes, I think he would have done better than Blatter,« said Thomas Kistner. »Blatter is at the time involved in a corruption scandal in Brazil which has now turned into an investigation into his predecessor and good friend Joao Havelange and his former son-in-law Ricardo Teixeira, who is also a member of FIFA's Executive Committee.

It is extremely bad news for football if their top leaders talk more about money than sport,« he added. »But things will only change if society takes the initiative to alter the rules, politics and referees. Some of this has happened: when Andrew Jennings first began writing about corruption in sport in 1992, he was sentenced to five days in jail. Now, however, many people are writing about it.« ♦

