

From: Hein Verbruggen [REDACTED]
Sent: maandag 10 maart 2014 15:36
To: [REDACTED]
Cc: [REDACTED]; [REDACTED]
Subject: Fwd: Letter to CIRC
Attachments: Letter to CIRC (09-03-14).doc; ATT00019.htm; Sport Accord Book chapters April 2013.docx; ATT00022.htm; Letter to Brian Cookson.docx; ATT00025.htm

Dear Sir/Madam,

Please be so kind to confirm reception of this letter and delivery to the CIRC-Members.

Hein Verbruggen

Dear Mr. President, dear Vice-Presidents of the CIRC,

I do not believe that I need to introduce myself, but for the sake of formality I will do so. I am the person who is continuously presented as a major "suspect" for alleged cover-ups of doping cases and bribery in cycling. In particular Mr. Brian Cookson has in many interviews associated my name to these "wrongdoings" as he likes to call them. His most recent interview with Cycling News was another blatant example: it is for me and Mr. McQuaid to show that the allegations are false. I must say that I also felt some discomfort at reading press articles according to which Mr. Marty stated that he believed that my credibility would be damaged if I would not cooperate with the CIRC. This gives me the feeling that he too is of the opinion that I have to justify myself and that the CIRC has to be convinced by me (!) that I did not do any "wrongdoings": "Mr. Verbruggen: come and prove your innocence or otherwise your credibility is in shatters"! Not exactly the way things are handled in normal juridical procedures, I dare to say.....

Another important fact is that this whole business about "wrongdoings" is solely based upon press articles and (partly) fiction books which have not presented any proof to support specific allegations. It is well known that the media, especially British journalists, have a strong influence on Mr. Cookson's agenda and his actions. This is nothing new. I made that clear to him in 2012. Mr. Cookson did not take this too well, our relationship deteriorated and he has left me with a healthy discomfort about his current intentions.

The British press has also already dictated that Mr. Cookson should take away my Honorary Presidency of the UCI. In his most recent interview with Cycling News Mr. Cookson could not refrain from responding to that call and could not conceal the joyous thought that the outcome of the CIRC's work could be that this sanction is a possibility.

another very important reason to write my November-letter. In fact, Mr. Cookson did exactly the opposite. As we could read in the press, he has consulted extensively with WADA on the CIRC's ToR and in these ToR we can read under V.35 that "the UCI will do its best efforts to assist the CIRC to obtain the cooperation of any NADO as well as WADA's assistance". The latter will not be too difficult since WADA has a keen interest in seeing to it and making sure that the CIRC will NOT investigate WADA's and USADA's roles in the Armstrong-saga and if the latter were to happen that will result into a very incomplete, even biased picture of what has really happened!

I am sure you want me to be more explicit. Therefore and to not allow for any misunderstandings, I herewith ask you officially to investigate the following:

Have WADA and USADA been involved in a smear campaign against the UCI/McQuaid/Verbruggen of which the Armstrong-case was just a part? Is it true that both agencies or either of them:

- Have spoken, even more than once, very negatively about the UCI's AD-efforts while these are recognized by many insiders as "second to none"?
- Have held away from the UCI crucial information from Armstrong's teammates on alleged cover-ups while WADA was already informed in 2010 that Mr. Armstrong had never tested positive?
- Have actively put pressure on Heads of Laboratories to testify against the UCI?
- Have declared to witnesses that the "only thing we are after is the heads of McQuaid and Verbruggen"?
- Has WADA breached the WADA-Code or any other (WADA) rule when WADA was involved in the reanalysis of the '98/'99 Tour de France-samples in 2004/2005? What was the role of WADA in the decision-making process regarding the reanalysis?
-

So is it true that WADA/USADA were not really after Mr. Armstrong but after the UCI/McQuaid and Verbruggen? Isn't it indeed (see my letter) bizarre that if WADA has serious doubts about Mr. Armstrong riding clean, that they had him tested just 3 (three!!!) times in 10 years and that only a slightly better attitude can be found at the level of USADA? Isn't this a clear indication that there was more interest at the level of WADA/USADA in "catching" the UCI and its Presidents than in catching cheating athletes? Will the CIRC investigate into this?

May I ask your attention also for the fact that WADA was NOT involved in the setup of IC-1 and one has to ask the question whether the real reason for WADA's criticism of IC-1 was their fear that WADA's role would be investigated!

Thus as said, instead of following up on my requests, Mr. Cookson has consulted with WADA (and USADA?) on your Terms of Reference and - of course - the investigations will focus on myself and Mr. McQuaid. I might be wrong but I cannot imagine that the CIRC would not have been interested to learn about all that I have just outlined, before having accepted its mission and ToR and I ask your understanding for the fact it is due to the aforementioned attitude, declarations and

omissions of Mr. Cookson that I am forced to have serious doubts whether it is possible for you to exercise your mission in total freedom and independence. I wish to question whether it would not be more constructive, in the first instance, to investigate the alleged “wrongdoings” and proofs of cover-ups by me, or by people under my responsibility, of positives by Armstrong or others before you invite me for a hearing; I will not reiterate my confidence in the result.

There is in my opinion another MAJOR mistake or omission made by the people that have drafted the ToR (from the press, but that is apparently not always a reliable source, I learned that this was the UCI and WADA). Mr. Cookson, in many of his many interviews, has expressed his view that it is the intention "to restore the image of Cycling and the UCI" by knowing the truth about what had happened and about the wrongdoings". That shows an unfortunate lack of understanding about the root cause of where that bad image comes from, and shows once again Mr. Cookson's major passion for the (or my) "wrongdoings" as a major reason for the poor image. Although I certainly do not underestimate the horrible effects of the Armstrong-case in combination with all "Oprah effects", one should never forget to look through these short term storms and clearly keep an eye on the long term trends. If the CIRC will indeed confirm that no cover-ups of positive cases took place, then the Armstrong-case will quickly disappear from the radar screens. But this alone will not have the required long term beneficial effect on cycling's image, since the major reason for the bad image is the misplaced and widespread belief that "Cycling and the UCI have never been serious in their fight against doping". As long as this picture will stick in the minds of the people, the image will remain bad.

And even if Mr. Cookson gets some lauding comments now about his intentions in the fight against doping, soon people will see that in fact he will not be able to do much more than his predecessors did. As you have seen, by the way, I asked to investigate into WADA's (read Mr. Dick Pound's) role in creating this misplaced perception of the UCI's AD-efforts.

As I wrote in my November-letter, the CIRC presents a golden opportunity for the UCI to prove to the world that its work in anti-doping has existed since the 1960's and that it is second to none. Your Commission should undertake an extensive investigation into UCI's historical AD-fight and compare this with all other AD-bodies and instances. And your Commission should take the opportunity to confirm and give more weight to the judgment of the Court of Appeal of Douai/France (2002) in the wake of the Festina affair and its conclusion, after thorough investigation, that “the UCI had done everything possible in the fight against doping”.

This is the kind of analysis that is required to deliver far reaching and long-term benefits for the worldwide image of cycling. I will not hesitate for one second to say that it would be a catastrophic mistake not to ask you to undertake such analysis. Needless to say of course that I am totally convinced that the CIRC would come to a positive conclusion on UCI's efforts; of course things can always be better, especially with the benefit of hindsight, but insiders in global AD-circles know all too well that the UCI has always been serious and that it has led the way in its AD-efforts. Confirmation of that fact by the CIRC would certainly help to change the current perception of the sport and the undeserving image from which it suffers. Let me add in this respect that I make this plea not for myself, but in particular for the great people who, on a day-to-day basis, were at the forefront of UCI's fight against doping,

such as the late Messrs. Goehner and Donicke, as well as Dr. Schattenberg and Dr. Calvez, not forgetting the highly capable and efficient AD-staff of the UCI.

Let me, by the way, mention here that this recognition of the UCI as a leader in the fight against doping has gained increasing recognition. Serious observers and authors with knowledge about AD (I am not referring to writers such as Mr. David Walsh who did not have the courage to present his allegations to the UCI for fear that the response would undermine his presentation of a juicy story.) have expressed and written fact based articles about this and it was a French expert, Prof. Laure, who wrote almost 20 years ago that one should be honest about the fact, that "if there is a culture of doping in cycling, there exists also a real culture of anti-doping". I send as an attachment the English translation of two chapters from a book that came out in 2013 of the Belgian expert/journalist Hans VandeWeghe; it will give you an objective and true picture of the UCI's AD-fight.

This brings me to my last remarks about the ToR, in particular where the CIRC is asked to answer the question about "how could it get this far?" Once again, this demonstrates a lack of real understanding. An answer to the question "how could it get this far" cannot be given if one does not thoroughly understand what is meant by "the culture of doping" and for that one has to go back to the first days of professional cycling. One has to grasp and understand how the character and mentality of riders was shaped in the old days. One will have to identify what factors have led to a widespread use of performance enhancing products in cycling; factors that still exist till today! The situation was not that different in the sixties or seventies or eighties; it was the doping products that were different. Do not conclude from this that I say that doping was as widespread during all those years as it was in the period 1990 through 2005 (when indeed a change started because the mentality changed). I will not say that since we don't know and we will never know. If I say that the situation was not that different, I refer to the mentality of the riders and the environment in which they had to practice their profession. And I am of the simple opinion that it will not be possible for the CIRC to make thorough recommendations for the future if it cannot acquire a very good understanding of the past when professional road cycling's characteristics were shaped. Hearing some riders talk about their and their colleague's doping methods and about how to stay under the radar will just give a picture. What is needed is a film!

To conclude, this is what I meant when I wrote to Mr. Cookson last November urging him to make this investigation as broad as possible. I assured him that he could count upon my full co-operation if that were the case. Mr. Cookson has decided not to do so. Yet, when asked in interviews he says that the CIRC can do whatever it wishes to do but I am sure that you will understand that I have to refer to the official ToR and that is not reassuring as to whether it allows for what I believe is required in the best interests of cycling and the UCI.

It is far too concentrated on the witch-hunt around the Armstrong-issues and then almost exclusively restricted to the UCI, leaving WADA's and USADA's potential "wrongdoings" out of the picture. That unfortunately results in not enough space and scope for what I believe to be necessary to have real long term beneficial effects of the CIRC's work and I say that to my great regret.

As I wrote in my letter of January 31 last and sent to the CIRC via Mr. Haas, I have confidence in all three CIRC-Members personally and I wish to repeat that, notwithstanding my fears as to whether it is possible for you to exercise your mission in total freedom and independence because of the frame that was created in the ToR, as expressed above. My problem lies in the way I have been treated and (already) judged by Mr. Cookson. He withheld my letters from you and I can clearly see the result in the ToR as well as in the statement of Mr. Marty about my (to be restored) credibility. That puts me in a difficult situation for which I ask your understanding.

You will appreciate that before deciding on the appropriate follow-up, I would like to read the CIRC's reactions on my remarks and observations. I apologize for this long letter.

Sincerely,

Hein Verbruggen

Attachments:

- Letter of November 13th from myself to Brian Cookson
- Excerpts of the book written by Mr Hans Vande Weghe

CC:

- IOC Ethics Commission
- Mr Brian Cookson