

**14 Edward Grove  
New Barnet  
Herts EN4 8BA  
United Kingdom  
Tel: 020 8441 6908  
Email: [zac@british-athletics.co.uk](mailto:zac@british-athletics.co.uk)**

---

**For the attention of  
The National Olympic Associations of the World, and others:**

3rd January 2012

Dear Sirs,

**AN APOLOGY TO THE SPORTING WORLD**

Enclosed please find a copy of a letter sent to Mr Peter Keen who is the Performance Director at UK Sport in the United Kingdom. UK Sport have responsibility for distributing funds to British sports federations on behalf of government, and setting targets for the honours to be achieved in return for the money.

The following web page displays the enclosed letter with links to the sources of the information:

[http://www.british-athletics.co.uk/foster/uk\\_sport.htm](http://www.british-athletics.co.uk/foster/uk_sport.htm)

This web page also gives access to the freedom of information documents referred to. These documents reveal that UK Sport and UK Athletics believe that competitor nations are trying to steal the performance secrets of the United Kingdom. This is why, they say, confidentiality is so important when discussing how government money is being spent on elite athletics in the United Kingdom.

The sport of athletics in the United Kingdom has been stolen by government. UK Athletics were created by UK Sport and imposed on the athletics community who have no influence over their activities. Together UK Sport and UK Athletics have evolved into a secretive organisation whose primary objective is to win Olympic medals.

The Amateur Athletics Association of England (AAA's) who were the guardian of the sport's values, have effectively been forced into closure.

The enclosed letter is being copied to you to give an insight to the path that UK Sport and UK Athletics have chosen. This letter is intended as an apology to the sporting world because the athletics community in the United Kingdom no longer have confidence in the values of the two government agencies.

Please be assured that the community clubs within British Athletics remain true to the Olympic Charter and these values will be reestablished when UK Sport and UK Athletics have been either cleaned up or closed down.

Yours faithfully

**C.Zacharides**

**Webmaster:** <http://www.british-athletics.co.uk>

**14 Edward Grove  
New Barnet  
Herts EN4 8BA  
United Kingdom  
Tel: 020 8441 6908  
Email: [zac@british-athletics.co.uk](mailto:zac@british-athletics.co.uk)**

---

**Mr Peter Keen  
Director of Performance at UK Sport  
UK Sport  
40 Bernard Street  
London  
WC1N 1ST**

3rd January 2012

Dear Peter,

I am writing to bring closure to my failed attempt in using the freedom of information act, to reveal the training methods of UK Athletics (UKA). As the sport's governing body, UKA have a responsibility to put in place a coach education programme. How is it possible to have a coach education programme when the most effective coaching methods are a secret?

During the two day freedom of information tribunal hearing on Wednesday 23rd March 2011, you dismissed as wrong, the conclusions of the world's largest ever investigation into drugs cheating in sport, Canada's Dubin Enquiry.

The Dubin Enquiry followed the Ben Johnson drugs scandal, when he was stripped of the 1988 Olympic title and world record for the 100 metres. The Dubin Enquiry concluded that setting Olympic medal targets by government in return for funding had encouraged a culture of drugs cheating. For you to reject the conclusions of the Dubin Enquiry is understandable because UK Sport operate the same system which allocates funding based on medal targets.

During the Dubin Enquiry, in Toronto on 1st March 1989, it was reported by the New York Times that Charlie Francis named Kevin Tyler as someone who started to use drugs after the 1984 Los Angeles Olympics. Kevin Tyler is currently head of coach education at UK Athletics. It is known that UKA has had, and possibly still has, a coaching relationship with Dr Ekkart Arbeit who has been identified as the architect behind the East German systematic drugs cheating programme of the 1970's and 1980's. Such details do not inspire confidence in the values of UKA and UK Sport.

The British Olympic Association (BOA) eligibility bye-law is a rule which prevents drugs cheats from ever representing Great Britain at an Olympic Games. The International Olympic Committee Rule 45 has a similar purpose to prevent drugs cheats from competing at the next Olympic Games following their return from suspension. These rules are becoming overwhelmed by a flood of calls for their removal, causing them to look like isolated beacons of integrity on the landscape of British sport. It does appear that the calls challenging the legality of these important rules, originate from UK Sport. Many decent sports people think your energy would be better spent persuading the courts that the "restraint of trade" argument against these rules is ludicrous. Drugs cheats are being encouraged to demand access to the very competitions they have proven themselves unfit to grace. It is as ridiculous as a child molester demanding he be allowed to return to work with children after having served his sentence. The idea that an honest athlete can be denied the opportunity to represent Great Britain at an Olympic Games, in favour of a "former" drugs cheat is offensive to any right minded individual.

In August 2009 Andy Parkinson, the head of UK Sport's anti doping unit was approved to lead the new UK Anti Doping agency. It did not take him long to attack the BOA eligibility bye-law. On 14th December 2010, Andy Parkinson wrote: "If, as is the case with the eligibility rules of the International Olympic Committee and here in the UK the British Olympic Association, we remove all incentives for athletes to share their stories and information with us, then we will continue to struggle to catch those who are supplying performance enhancing substances". He also wrote in the same article: "We will continue to push to ensure our views are heard both through our European forums and directly to WADA."

It is ridiculous that someone in the position of Andy Parkinson cannot see the difference between a pusher of recreational drugs, and someone who is providing a service to individuals who choose to cheat at sport. For recreational drugs, the pusher is the villain, but for performance enhancing drugs, the cheating athlete is clearly the villain. You can take the man out of UK Sport, but you can't take UK Sport out of the man.

I understand that UK Sport have a policy of training up "high flying administrators" to occupy places on international sports federations. Your literature indicates that 15 such individuals are dispatched around the world annually to promote the interests of UK Sport. Thanks to the patronage of UK Sport, David Millar, the cyclist and convicted drugs cheat, who it was reported you once coached, is currently a member of the World Anti-Doping Agency (WADA) athlete committee.

Surely UK Sport could have found someone in Great Britain who had not been caught with two syringes containing the banned blood booster erythropoietin (EPO) in his bedroom!

Incredibly, WADA has written to the BOA asking if they would consider testing the legality of their eligibility bye-law. I hope the BOA treat that request with the contempt it deserves.

Under the circumstances, it should not have come as a big surprise to me that UK Sport were prepared to spend 2 days at a freedom of information tribunal hearing on 22nd and 23rd March 2011 ensuring that the coaching methods of UKA remain a secret.

UK Sport wrote in a letter to the Information Commissioner on 31st March 2010 "It is accepted in the world of high performance sport that competitor nations will attempt to find out the sporting performance 'secrets' of other nations who are seen to be successful on the world stage". The Information Commissioner also revealed that UKA wrote a letter to UK Sport, dated 23rd March 2010, in which they stated categorically that releasing the withheld information would be detrimental to their aim to create a competitive sporting advantage over other nations.

On the 18th July 2006, Parliament's Public Accounts Committee produced a report implying that UK Sport were serial liars when it came to exaggerating their own successes. I was amazed to receive a letter dated 19th November 2010 from the Legal Services Office of the House of Commons threatening me with a 1689 act of Parliament if I were to bring this fact to the attention of the Freedom of Information Tribunal Hearing.

The legacy of UK Sport and UKA can be summarised in three simple words.  
**Standards have slipped.**

Having now spent 7 years scrutinising the quangos UK Sport and Sport England, and the corrosive impact that they have had on British Athletics, it is with great sadness I must say I am alarmed at the possibility that British Sport is embroiled in systematic state sponsored cheating. As you determinedly pursue the objective of winning medals at the 2012 Olympic Games under your banner of "no compromise", I consider it important to bring my concerns to the attention of the "competitor nations", who you say wish to steal our secrets.

For this reason I am copying this letter to every National Olympic Association in the world, and asking them to understand that the government funded quangos UK Sport and UK Athletics do not represent the values of British Athletics. We wish our competitors well at the 2012 London Olympiad.

When our guests start competing on Saturday 27th July 2012, subject to the accepted standards of sporting behaviour, may the best man win.

Yours Faithfully

**C.Zacharides**

**Webmaster:** [www.british-athletics.co.uk](http://www.british-athletics.co.uk)