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Begun as a Xeroxed newsletter in June 1977, *Powerlifting USA* has grown through the years to become a colorful monthly with approximately 15,500 subscribers. Like most single-sport journals, it covers the major contests each year, publishes biographical pieces and training articles, and, as a free service to meet promoters, it includes a list of upcoming contests that American lifters might like to enter. The September 2003 "Coming Events" column, for example, contained notices for 259 such contests. However, unlike the sport of track and field, or swimming, or even powerlifting's sister sport—weightlifting—those meets are not sanctioned by one national governing body that's directly linked to a single international federation. Rather, the contests represent 27 different national, regional, or international powerlifting organizations. As far as I know, the extent of powerlifting's fragmentation is unique in the world of amateur sport, and it occurred primarily as a result of the struggle for and against meaningful drug testing.

Terry Todd, my husband, and I were deeply involved for a time in that struggle. We were involved because of our careers as lifters and journalists and because we both served in a number of administrative roles in the early days of the sport. This essay is, then, both autobiographical (with all its non-objective pitfalls) and an attempt to analyze the push for drug testing in powerlifting during the first two decades of the sport's existence. The battle for testing didn't end in 1984, but my level of involvement dramatically lessened after that time, and so this article concentrates on the period leading up to the mid-1980s. However, a future issue of *IGH* will carry the story of powerlifting and drug testing from 1984 to the present.

"Chaos can have gentle beginnings . . . it is easy to forget that it may have begun with the best of intentions."

—John Underwood

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sixteen National/Regional Federations</th>
<th>Number of Meets in September 2003 Powerlifting USA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Am. Amateur Powerlifting Fed. (AAPF)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amateur Athletic Union (AAU)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Powerlifting Association (APA)</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Powerlifting Committee (APC)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Powerlifting Federation (APF)</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anti-Drug Athletes United (ADAU)</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana State Powerlifting Federation (ISPA)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Athlete Strength Assoc. (NASA)</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Python Powerlifting League (PPL)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100% Raw Powerlifting Federation (RAW)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Son-Light Power Federation (SLP)</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Powerlifting Federation (SPF)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA Powerlifting (USAPL)</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Amateur Powerlifting Committee (UAPC)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States Bench Federation (USBF)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States Powerlifting Federation (USPF)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Eleven International Federations</th>
<th>Number of Meets in September 2003 Powerlifting USA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amateur World Powerlifting Congress (AWPC)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Powerlifting Association (IPA)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Powerlifting Federation (IPF)</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Strength Association (ISA)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Int'l Natural Strength Athletes (INSA/INSAA)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World Assoc. of Benchers &amp; Deadlifters (WABDL)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World Drug Free Powerlifting Federation (WDFPF)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World Natural Powerlifting Federation (WNPF)</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World Powerlifting Alliance (WPA)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World Powerlifting Committee (WPC)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World Powerlifting Organization (WPO)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
argued in his 1984 classic, *Spoiled Sport*, that sport was once something wonderful that's been "made grotesque" by commercialism, corruption, and the use of performance-enhancing drugs. The overriding problem, he claimed, is the "never ending quest for more." Although all sports that keep records implicitly urge athletes to break those records, Underwood might have had powerlifting in mind, for powerlifting has always been about the quest for "more." More weight, more records, more poundage-boosting gear, and over the past forty years or so, more drugs, and many more federations.

Unlike those sports that can look back to a golden age before anabolic steroids were invented, powerlifting was a littermate of the drug culture and permissive atmosphere of the Sixties. The men who turned to powerlifting in that decade lived in homes with, on average, more than 30 different medicines, vitamins, and assorted nostrums in their medicine chests, making the idea of using drugs to enhance performance almost acceptable. Furthermore, many of these men believed, as most athletes of their generation did, that science was the handmaiden of sport and that new technologies—particularly new pharmacologic inventions—would make their athletic quest easier. As powerlifting evolved, drug use became identified with being part of the inner circle of the sport—what one author referred to as a "hip badge of honor." To quote Ken Kesey, "You were either on the bus or off the bus," in powerlifting as well as on the streets and on college campuses. *Iron Man* magazine publisher Peary Rader was one of the few to decry the use of drugs in the late 1960s. Wrote Rader:

> While at the Senior Nationals, I had a chance to discuss the use of drugs with a number of lifters. They all admitted to using them (some of these men are record holders). They did not think them to be dangerous if taken under a doctor's care and not used excessively. They did not feel they had suffered any bad side effects . . . they felt it was worth the chance. They reported they did not know any top lifter who was not taking pills, usually dianabol. It was their opinion that a man could not reach the top without taking them . . . We know a lot of coaches who encourage their athletes to take the drugs. Any-

thing to win. . . . All of you know our opinion of these drugs. We certainly cannot approve them in any way."

As for the sport of powerlifting, it began as the step-child of weightlifting which, beginning in the 1940s, would occasionally include "odd-lift" contests and exhibitions to hype the gate at their AAU meets. Sometimes these events consisted of squats, curls and deadlifts. At other times the "press on floor" or bench press was included. As the odd-lift events increased in frequency, they became known as "powerlifting" events and grew popular with the lifting audiences, who could see what was happening in the lifts more clearly than was possible with the faster and more complicated "Olympic" lifts. Competitors were also drawn to the new sport because the lifts required less flexibility, less technique training, and less specialized equipment than the intricate weightlifting movements. Weightlifting required rubber bumper plates, platforms, and special spring steel bars, items not found in most commercial gyms. Powerlifting, on the other hand, required only squat racks, benches and a simple barbell—standard equipment in most commercial gyms of the Sixties. Many powerlifters were also drawn to the emerging sport because of the bodies it produced. While weightlifting gave one an athletic, muscular physique, the press, snatch, and clean and jerk performed in weightlifting contests in the Fifties and early Sixties did not produce the thick-chested, big-armed, comic book-type physiques made popular by bodybuilding. This was especially true after 1972, when the International Weightlifting Federation (IWF) dropped the overhead press from competition and the large deltoids and thick triceps developed by the press gradually disappeared, leaving the weightlifters even less physically impressive when compared to powerlifters of the same size. Powerlifting's inclusion of the bench press, perhaps the most popular of all bodybuilding exercises, guaranteed the development of thick chests, large deltoids and big arms. What more could a young man want? Records. That's what. And the final motivation for many American men to shift to powerlifting was because the newness of the sport meant that records were being broken at nearly every meet.

By 1963, interest in powerlifting had grown enough to interest Bob Hoffman, the founder and owner of the York Barbell Company and the leading figure in
AAU weightlifting since the 1930s. Hoffman realized, according to his biographer, John Fair, that Strength & Health's sole focus on weightlifting—a sport in which America continued to decline in both numbers of participants and world ranking in the 1960s—was an economic and editorial blunder. So, Hoffman began Muscular Development (MD) in 1963, and hired powerlifter and Ph.D. candidate Terry Todd in 1964 to help edit both Strength & Health and MD, the latter of which aimed to cover bodybuilding and be the "powerlifter's organ." Fair argues that "Todd's most important impact at York was his instigation of powerlifting." According to Muscletown USA, Todd "had made his mark as an Olympic lifter by winning the heavyweight class in the 1963 junior nationals. Then he won the first national power-lift tournament staged at York in September of 1964. The next year Todd pulled out another victory." Todd, John Fair goes on to say, "helped define powerlifting's image" in its formative period, because of his unusual size (330 pounds with a 60" chest) and the large weights he lifted.

Hoffman's commitment to powerlifting deepened over the next several years. He sponsored the first official AAU Senior National Championships in 1965 and hosted the subsequent national meets held in 1966, 1967, and 1968. During these years, powerlifting sanctions remained under the control of the AAU Weightlifting Committee. However, the fact that more powerlifting meet sanctions were being issued than weightlifting sanctions by the end of the Sixties created ambivalence among many weightlifting officials. At this time, the AAU operated as a clearinghouse for most amateur sports in the United States, and each sport under the AAU's national umbrella had its own organizing committee to sanction contests, keep records, and create rules. Powerlifting, however, had no direct AAU affiliation, but it still grew exponentially. As Peary Rader put it in his "Grunt and Groan" column in 1969, "POWER lifting is sweeping the country by storm. For a while we thought that Olympic lifting was holding its own. Now it would appear that while Olympic lifting has about as many competitors as ever, it is not growing, but powerlifting is moving like wildfire. All you have to do is announce a powerlifting contest anywhere and any time and you soon have a lot of competitors."19

In 1968, the AAU Weightlifting Committee's control of powerlifting was threatened by Olympic hammer thrower, George Frenn—who'd begun competing in powerlifting—when he asked for an AAU sanction to host an international powerlifting meet with sponsorship from California magazine magnate Joe Weider. Weider, like Hoffman, had also begun publicizing the new sport and hired Frenn to serve as his powerlifting editor for Muscle Builder in 1969. Hoffman and his weightlifting colleagues feared that Frenn, with support from Weider, might be trying to get permission from the AAU to start an independent powerlifting committee. Although the AAU turned down the request for the new organization, Frenn's continued interest in seeing the sport become autonomous served to galvanize Hoffman and his primary assistant, John Terpak, to request permission to set up powerlifting as an official sub-committee of the AAU Weightlifting Committee so they could maintain control of the growing sport.22

Frenn and Weider did, finally, hold a meet in Los Angeles—nine Americans faced eight British lifters—on 19 September 1970.23 Although it was not declared such by any sanctioning body, the meet appears to have been the first international contest ever held in powerlifting.24 Over the next several years, Bob Crist, the weightlifting official put in charge of powerlifting, worked to hold off Frenn, Weider, and any other potential challengers to AAU authority by building a more meaningful powerlifting organization. Crist drew up minimal by-laws, set up regional chairmen, began keeping national records, and lobbied Hoffman to host an international meet. In 1971 Hoffman agreed, sponsoring a joint Mr. World Bodybuilding Contest and the World Powerlifting Championships at York. Although this first "world" meet was made up largely of Americans, international involvement continued to grow and in 1973, with the blessing of the AAU old-guard, the Internation-
al Powerlifting Federation was formed. Bob Crist credits Hoffman for the rapid growth of the international scene: "it was he who bankrolled the IPF and really got powerlifting moving" in the 1970s.  

If American powerlifting had a golden era, the Seventies was surely it. The sport grew steadily in numbers and Americans dominated powerlifting’s politics as well as the world record lists. In 1973, when the IPF formed, Bob Crist was chosen President, Clay Patterson was named General Secretary, and Rudy Sablo was named Records Chairman. All were Americans and all were well-entrenched members of the AAU fraternity. In 1975, the year the IPF published its first rule book, Americans held 30 of the 40 world records in men’s powerlifting. That same year, in Birmingham, England, America won eight of the ten weight classes at the first world championships held outside the United States. By 1977, powerlifting even began to attract big-time TV contracts. However, the "gremlins of modern sport" as Terry Todd later called anabolic steroids, were preparing to throw an ethical monkey wrench into this smoothly-running machine.

In the early 1970s, the Olympic movement wrestled with a variety of drug-related incidents that caused drug testing to become part of the mainstream discourse surrounding sport. There was, for instance, American weightlifter Ken Patera’s 1971 public pronouncement that he hoped to find out at the Munich Olympics whose steroids were better—the Russian superheavyweight Alexeyev’s or his own. Then, the following year, track and field team member Jay Sylvester’s unofficial poll indicated that 68% of the US men’s track and field athletes at Munich had used some form of anabolic agent to prepare for the Games. During that same era, however, the non-Olympic sport of powerlifting largely avoided any real discussion of the drug problem. In fact, it was only when the IOC announced that the drug testing at the Montreal Olympic Games had caught eight athletes, that drug testing became a topic of conversation in powerlifting circles, as it did elsewhere in the world of sports. 

Anabolic steroid use had become increasingly open in powerlifting by the mid-1970s and, since there were no rules banning the use of ergogenic aids in any of the hastily written powerlifting rule books, few users felt any moral or ethical conflict over their use. Some people, like Iron Man editor Peary Rader, had continued to express concerns about the use of drugs but, for the most, the men lifting during this era felt little concern for their mortality or morality because of their use of drugs. Terry Todd, for example, in the first book written about the sport, Inside Powerlifting (1977), openly discussed his own steroid use and suggested that many—if not most—of the nine elite lifters he profiled probably used ergogenic drugs. During that general period, Terry and I both observed lifters with steroids in their gym bags at contests; saw men inject themselves with adrenaline, steroids, and other stimulants; and saw men openly taking drugs backstage at meets. In fact, the atmosphere was such that when Terry called meet promoter Jim Taylor in 1975 to ask if I could attempt to break a 48-year-old women’s record at the upcoming Chattanooga Open, Taylor advised Terry to put me on Decadurabolin to make sure I’d succeed. Terry and I had a good laugh over the suggestion, but I decided to pass on the Deca and try to make my Guinness world record anyway. However, this casual suggestion from someone I’d never met, and Terry knew only casually, is indicative of the climate of the times. Anabolic steroids were deeply embedded in powerlifting by then, and as Rader had observed in 1969, most of the male champions used them. Powerlifter Joe Nickele spoke for many male powerlifters in 1977 when he wrote an "Open Letter to All Officials of the IPF" for inclusion in Powerlifting USA. "Eventually," Nickele wrote, "the IPF will have to decide whether or not to test for steroids at national and international championships." However, rather than recommend testing for the sport, Nickele asked the IPF to take a stand against testing. If the IPF decides not to test, he wrote, "Criticism will come from all directions, of course. . . However, the IPF should be responsive to the desire of the majority of the lifters." And those lifters, Nickele explained, didn’t want testing. "If you ask around, you
will probably find that the majority of lifters agree that what really counts in powerlifting is the lifter's strength, not HOW he got strong.”

Although a few women occasionally entered men's powerlifting contests after the passage of Title IX in 1972, and there was a small eight-woman "contest" held in California in 1975, it wasn't until 1976, at the Men's World Powerlifting Championships, that Cindy Wyatt Reinhoudt (wife of men's superheavyweight champion Don Reinhoudt), meet promoter Joe Zarella, and I first discussed the possibility of an AAU-sanctioned national championships for women. After we talked, Zarella agreed to request AAU permission to hold the "All-American Women's Open." Permission was given, and the following May, 25 women participated at this historic meet in Nashua, New Hampshire. After the contest, Cindy and Joe Zarella held an open meeting to discuss the future of women's powerlifting. The consensus of those there was that, for the time being, women's powerlifting should stay within the political structure of the AAU Powerlifting Committee as there were not enough women lifters or women officials for us to be independent.” Zarella put in a bid to host an official national championships for women the next year, and this time 74 women showed up in Nashua to compete. After the 1978 Women's Nationals another open meeting was held and the subject of drug testing was discussed for the first time by women powerlifters. At issue was the fact that the previous fall, in October of 1977, at the AAU National Committee meeting held in conjunction with the 1977 Men's Nationals, Oklahoma referee Dick Burke had introduced legislation requiring powerlifting to adopt the same testing protocols used by the International Olympic Committee (IOC). Burke's proposal met with considerable resistance, as the members of the all-male national committee, most of whom were active competitors, argued that there was no need to test since the IPF had no testing policy. As Powerlifting USA publisher Mike Lambert put it, "no other countries seem to have much concern about the use/abuse of these substances." When it was clear that there was little support for steroid testing within the group, Burke's motion was amended to require only a test for amphetamines at the following year's championships. This passed but the National Committee did not take the next step and allocate money to pay for the testing. In May, however, when the women lifters met after the 1978 Nationals, many of us were optimistic that the AAU would soon implement a testing program because of the passage of the Burke motion. Although the women's group took no formal stand on steroids at our meeting in Nashua in 1978, many expressed concern about the potentially negative impact of steroid use on television contracts and spectatorship for women's powerlifting. However, Burke's amphetamine test was not implemented at the 1979 Men's Nationals Championships or at any American contest thereafter. The year 1979 marked a transitional time for powerlifting. Following the passage of the 1978 Amateur Sports Act, which lessened the AAU’s power in favor of the United States Olympic Committee (USOC) and mandated that all sports should have their own autonomous governing bodies, the powerlifting committee began working to form an independent organization that would be known as the United States Powerlifting Federation (USPF). The new bylaws called for an annual meeting of the National Committee (composed of
state chairmen and various committee heads) and it created a ten-member Executive Committee (eight elected members, president and appointed secretary) which was given full authority to make policy decisions for the USPF between National Committee meetings. Terry and I moved back to the United States from Canada that summer, and Joe Zarella, by now the USPF president, asked me to take over as chair of the women's subcommittee (USPFWC).

That same year, the International Powerlifting Federation voted to amend its by-laws to include regulation 5.02, which read: "The IPF shall maintain testing procedures for Anabolic Steroids and Amphetamine Supplements for all International Championships beginning in 1979. Testing will begin in all National Championships beginning in 1980." Although passed by the IPF, the new rule had little immediate impact. No testing occurred at the World Championships in 1979 or 1980, although Canadian world champion powerlifter and physician Mauro DiPasquale, head of the IPF Medical Committee, recommended at that Congress that the IPF begin at once to test for the full IOC list of banned substances. However, as so often happens in powerlifting—and indeed in many amateur sport meetings—the group felt it necessary to revisit the entire decision they’d made the previous year and so, after lengthy discussion about the expense, the potential for legal consequences, and other speculative matters, the IPF Congress agreed by a 12-0 vote to allocate funds only for the testing of amphetamines at the World Championships scheduled for Calcutta, India, in 1981. Testing for steroids was put on hold. (It should be remembered that the IOC began such testing in 1976.)

Meanwhile, as chair of the USPF women’s committee, I began lobbying both the national and international federation to begin upholding IPF Rule 5.02. In May of 1980, Zarella played host to the first Women’s World Championships in Lowell, Massachusetts. Following the contest, at a meeting for women lifters and interested officials, IPF President Vic Mercer of Great Britain explained that he was appointing a women’s subcommittee to advise the IPF leadership on matters concerning women. Roz Basile, a gym-owner in Sydney, Australia and coach of the Australian team, became the first chairperson. Basile held the post for slightly more than a year before deciding that she would step down in 1981. Since I had written a "constitutional framework" for the IPF Women’s Committee and been intimately involved in the IPF Women’s Committee (IPFWC) from the beginning, I was unanimously elected as the new chairperson at the 1981 Women’s Worlds in Honolulu. Immediately following my election, I asked the IPFWC delegates for their support on a resolution to request a full drug testing program at the 1982 Women's Worlds.

Things on the national scene also heated up in 1981. At the USPFWC meeting held in conjunction with the 1981 Women's Nationals in Los Angeles, the women's committee voted unanimously to request drug testing at
the 1982 Nationals. Since the USPFWC was only an advisory committee, however, the vote carried no weight without the approval of the full USPF National Committee, which would have to allocate funds to pay for the tests. At the Men's Nationals in Corpus Christi, the USPF National Committee supported our request and voted to allocate $2000 for the testing of women at the next nationals. The National Committee also approved a resolution to adopt testing for men if the IPF voted to do testing at the 1982 World Championships. Finally, it seemed, we were making headway. In fact, after the 1981 meeting Zarella appointed me to serve as the head of a newly formed USPF Medical Committee and asked me to investigate the best testing protocol for 1982. 

Later that year, I attended the IPF Men's World Championships in Calcutta, India, where as a delegate in the IPF Congress, I presented my IPF Women's Committee request for drug testing. The IPF approved the request for a full drug test at the 1982 Women's World Championships, and also approved IPF President Vic Mercer's recommendation that all women competing in the World's would have to submit to a chromosome-based gender test. This was not something that the IPF's committee had supported, but Mercer was adamant that the test was necessary and argued that since it could be done by a simple scraping of the inside of the cheek there was no reason for the women to object. 

The other surprise of the Congress was the decision to support both amphetamine and steroid testing at the 1982 Men's World Championships and to send word to the member nations of the IPF that they should, therefore, drug test at their own national championships.

Besides attending the IPF Congress, however, I had other duties in Calcutta. After a meeting of the athletes on the 1981 men's team, I'd been asked to serve as that year's manager/coach at the World Championships. This meant I was responsible for all aspects of the US team's performance in Calcutta, including their drug testing. Since this marked the first time that a woman had served as a coach at the Men's World's I took my duties very seriously and was concerned when I learned that the IPF planned to run the amphetamine tests at a hospital in Calcutta, rather than in an IOC lab. Even though I'd heard Dr. Mahabir Singh, the Calcutta physician in charge of the doping protocol, assure the IPF delegates that the tests would be IOC-type tests, I knew as soon as I entered the "collection center" with one of my athletes that things were not what they should have been. However, since the athletes had been informed well in advance of the procedure, and since the only substances the IPF was testing for were amphetamines, I wasn't really worried about the results because I knew that the test for amphetamines did not go back in time and that there was no way my men would be foolish enough to use an amphetamine when they knew they would be tested right after the championships.

I was, therefore, shocked when, on the evening of the second day of the contest, IPF President Mercer announced that six lifters had been found positive for amphetamines in the first day's tests. By the end of the contest, a total of 16 men (including four Americans) had been found positive, one failed to show for testing, and another man was listed as being under "further investigation." As the word spread about high number of positives, several of the coaches and I met to discuss the matter with IPF President Vic Mercer. Mercer refused to investigate our concerns, claiming that the tests were good tests. Furthermore, he refused to allow any of the coaches to attend the "second test" of the samples, which is normal IOC procedure. In fact, when I asked if I could attend, since four American gold medalists were supposedly positive—Joe Bradley, Mike Bridges, Jim Cash, and Dan Wohleber—I was told by IPF President Mercer that the second tests had already been run and so the results were final. After the contest, Finnish coach Bror Holm, Glenn Hogue of Australia, and I called the rest of the coaches together to discuss the methodology of the testing procedure and we decided, as a group, to request a meeting with Dr. Singh. Although Singh promised to meet with us at the final banquet the next evening, he failed to show. He also missed a second appointment—set up by his colleagues in the Indian Federation—for the following morning. Finally, as time was running out and teams and coaches had to leave Calcutta to return home, Glenn Hogue and I decided to take matters into our own hands. I called the hospital where the tests were done and set up a meeting with Dr. K.L. Mukherjee, the biochemistry professor who actually ran the testing procedures in the lab at the main hospital in Calcutta.

After I returned to the United States, I wrote an eight-page, single-spaced "official protest" to IPF Secretary Arnold Bostrom. In the letter, I detailed how the testing done by Dr. Singh and his colleagues broke nearly every tenet of the IOC's suggestions for proper testing. The facility used for collection was a public wash-
room, which had been used throughout the day by lifters and officials alike. No one watched the men as they gave their samples, they were fully clothed, and the same beakers were used over and over to collect urine and then simply washed out in the sink between tests. No one was asked for a passport or photo ID. Although I'd been forewarned by the unhygienic conditions of the "collection facility" at the stadium, the trip to the Calcutta hospital was a revelation on almost every level. The dilapidated condition of the building, the omnipresent heat, the people and goats camped out in the interior courtyard, and the drying laundry hung on clotheslines throughout the building, were in stark contrast to the cleanliness and antiseptic atmosphere of an American facility.

When Glenn and I met Dr. Mukherjee in his lab, however, even more surprises were in store for us. I asked Dr. Mukherjee to explain his procedures, and he stated that the tests were gas chromatograph tests. As I wrote in my report, "Simply speaking, this is a test which gives a graph-like reading indicating the presence or non-presence of a drug. To find this out the urine sample is placed in a gas chromatograph machine...and the urine sample [is] broken down into its component parts. Different substances in the urine then show up at different places on the graph and it is on the basis of these 'peaks' or marks on the graph that the trained scientist is able to tell what sort of drug . . . has appeared. . . . Gas chromatography, however, cannot tell you exactly what drug a person has taken. . . . there are some substances which show up in the amphetamine range which are not amphetamines. That is why the IOC always then carries out a second test on each sample that involves the use of mass spectrometry." When I asked to see some of the graphs I noticed that on the graphs for two of the men (Joe Bradley of the USA and Hiro Isagawa of Japan) their spikes were not in the same range on the graph even though they were supposedly positive for the same substance. When questioned, Dr. Mukherjee agreed that they were "slightly different" in appearance. When I asked what the drug was, Mukherjee could not tell me as "no mass spectrometry was ever done on the test," and furthermore, that they had no mass spectrometer in the hospital and had made no arrangements anywhere else to have the required mass-spectrometry done. By far the most damning bit of evidence I discovered, however, was when Dr. Mukherjee, trying to be helpful, showed me the composite printout he had made on which all the tests were laid side by side for comparison.

As I wrote in my official report following the championships:

. . . it appeared to me that there were two other men who also had "peaks," though smaller "peaks," in the same amphetamine range. I asked Dr. Mukherjee about these two other tests and he said that, yes, there were two other men who had shown up in the positive range, but to a lesser level. I then asked him what scale he had used to determine a "positive test" from a "negative test" for the IPF, and he said that according to IOC rules any drug test over one part per million per cc was considered by the IOC to be "positive." In answer to my next question, he then admitted that the two other tests (whose names were never disclosed to me) would also have been over the one part per million per cc allowable limit defined by the IOC. Then I asked why he had not included these other two men in his 'positive' test results, and when he didn't answer immediately, I asked him a second question—"Did you make a subjective judgment as to what was considered high or low on the test?"—and to this question he answered, 'Yes, I decided.'

And so, despite my identification as one of the most outspoken advocates of drug testing, I found myself in the unhappy position of trying to get the IPF to rescind the 1981 drug tests. I began writing letters urging the other national coaches who'd been in Calcutta to ask their home federations to protest the results and telling them what Glenn and I had learned from Dr. Mukherjee. Since the four American positives would mean that the US team finished third in the world, rather than first, the USPF fully supported my efforts, and we soon also had support from Sweden, Japan, Australia, England, Finland, Norway, New Zealand, Canada, and France as well. In January, a ballot circulated to IPF member nations asking them to vote whether to let the tests stand or reinstate the 16 lifters. IPF President Mercer reported back to the member nations that the vote was overwhelmingly in favor of disregarding the drug test and observed, "The way of the pioneer is often hard and it is regrettable that we got off to a bad start with the drug testing programme. But it must be clearly stated for the future that every possible precaution will be taken to ensure that the tests will be carried out impeccably under the IOC approved testing clinics." However, Mercer continued, the IPF Congress has
decreed that "the sport of powerlifting shall be seen to be free from the use and abuse of drugs. This attitude will give the IPF great respect and esteem from other international federations, the General Assembly of International Sports Federations and the International Olympic Committee."

The story of the first IPF tests in Calcutta are a good example of what can go wrong when amateurs—even well-intentioned amateurs—are in charge of drug testing for sport. Mercer’s unwillingness to heed the coaches’ protests in Calcutta was probably due more to his fear that he and the IPF could be seen as incompetent, I believe, than from any belief that that many lifters were stupid enough to have actually used amphetamines in such a tested competition.

To his credit, however, Mercer and the IPF Executive Committee stuck to their plan to initiate full IOC testing at both the men’s and women’s world championships in 1982. In the United States, however, the testing program rapidly derailed. The first problem came in January of 1982 when, after repeated attempts to get USPF President Joe Zarella to disclose the federation’s economic records, the USPF Executive Committee sent Zarella notice that he would either have to turn over the records or face possible impeachment. A hearing before the USPF Executive was set for February 19th at the 1982 Women’s Nationals which Terry and I organized that year at Auburn University. When Zarella failed to appear he was unanimously impeached and USPF secretary Conrad Cotter, a professor at Pensacola Junior College and an active master’s lifter, assumed the presidency. With Cotter as president, the anti-testing faction of the USPF suddenly had a new and very savvy ally. Cotter’s first act was to appoint Ramona Kenady, wife of superheavyweight champion Doyle Kenady (who was later convicted and jailed for trafficking in steroids), as the new secretary for the federation, a position that also gave her a vote on the Executive Committee.

Approximately three weeks before the Women’s Nationals, a conference call had been organized for the USPF Executive Committee to hear the medical committee’s proposals for testing at the 1982 women’s meet. Despite the unanimous vote taken the previous July to test for all substances, the problems in Calcutta dampened the enthusiasm of several members of the Executive Committee and so the matter of whether to test at all became the main focus of the call. As an Executive Committee member and the head of the drug testing committee, I argued against any change in the announced plan. However, with Cotter leading the discussion, my arguments failed to persuade a majority of the Executive Committee, although the Committee finally agreed to take up the matter again when we all met in Auburn for Zarella’s hearing and the 1982 Women’s National Championships. When the Executive Committee convened, the room was filled with a number of the top male lifters who’d made the trip to Auburn to be present for the drug discussion. I explained to the Executive Committee that I’d made arrangements with the Chelsea Lab in London (an officially-designated IOC lab) to test the top two women in each class and one other at random in each class for approximately $1,750—well within the $2,000 allocated by the National Committee the previous year. Resisting my suggestion that we move forward, Cotter suggested that the funds be used, instead, to pay the various state chairmen the 50 cents per lifter fee they were supposed to be given each time they sold a registration card. This, he argued, was more important than the USPF starting a drug testing
program. In the frequently hostile debate that followed, a number of objections were raised by the men present—that the women had not had proper notice—that the list of drugs was too long—that the tests went too far back in time—that the federation was now short on funds because of Zarella’s mismanagement, and so on. Several Executive Committee members also openly supported not going forward with the testing at that juncture and so no testing was done in Auburn that weekend.

Following that vote, I asked the Executive for permission to go forward with full IOC-type testing at the 1982 Men’s Nationals. Since it was February, I argued, there was plenty of time to officially notify the men and the federation would have the funds because of the TV revenues from the airing of the Men’s and Women’s Nationals on CBS. I reminded those in the room that the decision of the USPF National Committee had been unanimous the previous July—that if the IPF tested at the Worlds in 1982, then the USPF would test at the preceding Nationals. For more than an hour, frequently acrimonious debate filled the small meeting room. In the end, however, only the eight members of the Executive Committee present and Cotter could vote. As Cotter finally asked for a show of hands, the Executive Committee split—four in favor and four against the motion. That meant that Cotter, the new president, would have to break the tie. It was a particularly revealing moment as Cotter had tried hard in the past to appear neutral on the drug question. Forced to reveal his position, he voted with those opposed to testing at the 1982 Men’s Nationals and thus ignored the mandate of the entire USPF National Committee from the previous summer. Cotter would later write in Powerlifting USA that his vote in Auburn was not against testing—but only about the particular method of testing that I recommended in my report. Since what I recommended was IOC-type testing done by the Chelsea lab in London, however, his protest made little sense, unless he wanted tests that wouldn’t catch anyone. Those close to Cotter knew that he used steroids himself and, seen in that light, his vote was understandable.

Many of the women lifters who competed in the Nationals that weekend took the news hard. As Powerlifting USA editor Mike Lambert later described the scene, “Testing for drugs dominated much of the conversation at the meet . . . Many women came into the meet expecting and hoping for testing and left disappointed. Others pointed out unfair aspects of the proposed tests and were relieved when they did not take place. Emotion was at a high level.” It was indeed high. Some of the lifters made their anti-drug stance very public. Mary Barreira wore a t-shirt all weekend with “100% Natural” written on the back. Terri Ptomey, a drug free lifter who won the 165 pound class that year, pulled on one that said “Look Ma, No Roids,” to accept her trophy.

Ptomey’s main opponent was Jennifer Weyland, an outspoken opponent of drug testing. When Ptomey made her winning lift, Ptomey’s teammate, perennial World Champion Lamar Gant, rushed onto the stage yelling, “Don’t need no drugs to be a champion!” The next morning, as we were cleaning up the hotel where the contest was held, we found Weyland’s broken second-place trophy at the bottom of the swimming pool. Feelings ran high on both sides.

At the USPFWC meeting after the contest, most of the women complained bitterly about the Executive Committee’s decision and about their inability to control their own sport. Sue Elwyn, of Boston, argued that the women should break away and form their own independent organization, but I sadly reminded the group that very few of them had taken the time to become referees or promote meets and so the infrastructure wasn’t there yet to support a national organization just for women. However, as a step in the direction of self-governance, the USPFWC ratified a new constitution that would mean that the Women’s Committee would have the right to directly elect their own chairperson, rather
than have the USPF President appoint someone. However, like all USPFWC decisions, it would have to be approved by the USPF National Committee before it became official.72

Unfortunately, emotions were no less high in July of 1982, when I presented another Medical Committee Report at the National Convention in Dayton, Ohio, and this time recommended that testing be done for both men and women in 1983. Kathy Sansocie, the secretary of the USPFWC, moved that the vote be separated so that testing for men and testing for women would be considered separately. By a vote of 25-21, the Sansocie amendment failed, as did the vote on testing at both championships—27 to 21.1 and the other members of the USPF Women’s Committee who’d traveled to Dayton to fight for testing and our right to elect our own leadership were angered and depressed by the USPF’s unwillingness to go along with the IPF’s new mandate on testing and by the fact that the USPF turned down the women’s request to elect their own chairperson of the USPFWC.73 When elections were held in Dayton, the new Executive Committee members were largely opposed to testing, with the exception of perennial Executive Committee members Lyle Schwartz and Nate Foster. Doyle Kenady, the superheavyweight world champion was elected that year as was Fred Hatfield, author of Anabolic Steroids, What Kind, and How Many.74 Hatfield had made no secret of his pro-drug stance either in his books or in USPF meetings. In one heated debate among USPF officials in Austin, Texas, in 1983, in fact, Hatfield even declared that anabolic steroids would one day be viewed as “the salvation of mankind.”75 Filling out the Executive Committee roster was Larry Kidney, national champion in the 275 pound class, John Pettit of Texas, and George Zangas and Bob Packer of California.76

Following the National Committee meeting, Larry Pacifico hosted the most successful contest ever seen in the history of powerlifting. The large audience in the Dayton Convention Center watched dozens of records broken while CBS filmed the contest for “Sports Spectacular.”77 There was only one hitch. The men winning the trophies and setting the records were not tested and so when the American team was chosen for that year’s World Championships, there was no way to predict what they would lift in a tested meet.

The 1982 Men’s World Championships in Munich, Germany, marked the first time that powerlifting tested for anabolic steroids, and the difference in performance was dramatic. On average, the American team lifted 122.2 pounds (55.5 kilos) less than they had just four months earlier at the Nationals. Normally, of course, four additional months of training should mean that the men were a bit stronger. In a letter to IPF secretary Arnold Bostrom, written after the contest, I observed, "I think almost everyone was surprised by the fact that the testing seemed to cause such a huge drop in the amount of weight lifted. Everyone expected some drop, but few expected that the drop would be so great. As you remember, there have been many world records made in the past world championships, usually between 10 and 20 per championships. This year there was only one.”78

In that same letter, I asked the IPF to abolish the

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1982 U.S. Men's Team Performances</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name &amp; Weight Class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chuck Dunbar (114)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lamar Gant (123)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jay Rosciglione (148)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ricky Crain (165)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike Bridges (181)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walter Thomas (198)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim Cash (220)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dave Schneider (242)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wayne Bouvier (SHW)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*On a fourth attempt, Lamar Gant squatted 518 pounds for a new world record. It was the only world record set in the 1982 Men's World Championships.
existing list of world records and to start the keeping of records with the drug-tested 1982 Worlds. The IPF had done this in 1973 when it initiated rules about excessive elbow and knee wraps. Writing at the request of my IPF Women's Committee, I told Bostrom, "Our feeling is that unless we remove the current world records, many of our lifters will become depressed, thinking they will have no chance to ever create a new world record." In closing, I added a personal note, "As you know, I now hold three world records—the squat (545 lbs./247.5 kg.) and the total (1229 lbs./557.5 kg.) in the unlimited class, and the deadlift (446.5 lbs./202.5 kg.) in the 67.5 kg class, and if the IPF accepts our recommendation, I realize I will lose all three of these world records . . . losing my three world records is not nearly as important as helping to make powerlifting a fairer sport in which the health of our lifters is protected and in which all the world records represent lifts made in competitions with IOC testing."  

The IPF chose not to start their record list over, however, and discussion on both sides of the drug issue swelled again in the United States. By this time, many lifters, coaches and former lifters had begun to realize that anabolic steroids were a bane to the sport. As physical and psychological problems associated with drug use began to emerge, many people began moving away from the pro-drug or laissez faire attitude so common in the mid-seventies. Terry Todd, in fact, in a long article in Sports Illustrated, discussed his own steroid use and detailed the history of drug use in sports and how steroids had been particularly harmful to powerlifting. As frustration rose among those who wanted testing, Edmund Martin Bishop, whose name within the Catholic order of the Brothers of the Sacred Heart was Brother Bennet, decided to start a new federation in which testing would be done at every sanctioned meet. Brother Bennet, who taught at St. Stanislaus College in Bay St. Louis, Mississippi, had worked as a powerlifting official for many years but as he watched the increase in both steroid use and the USPF's foot-dragging on the testing issue, Bennet decided to give lifters another venue in which to compete. The idea was not totally new. Mike Lambert, editor of Powerlifting USA, had suggested a similar sort of organization in 1980 when he wrote in an editorial, "As far as I can discern, there is only lip service paid toward drug testing in Powerlifting by national and international levels of administration. . . While some administrators in PL do push for drug testing, most nod their heads in agreement with such statements as . . . 'It's too expensive' . . . 'what if the test is inaccurate and we get sued.'" Lambert claimed that ever since he started Powerlifting USA in 1977 he'd felt there should be two organizations. How does this sound? Let's form an organization . . . open only to powerlifters who will sign their name to a document stating that they will not take drugs as long as they hold membership. And let's keep track of the performances of the members of this organization . . . keep records of their clean lifts, perhaps even run local, regional and national contests for the members of the organization. With enough members and proper preparation, such an organization could exert significant political and even ethical influence on the sport eventually.

In November of 1981, at a meeting in Arlington, Virginia, Bennet and a group of like-minded friends adopted by-laws, elected an executive committee, drafted an oath that all members would have to sign, and set up testing policies for the American Drug Free Powerlifting Association (ADFPA). Several months later, at the tumultuous 1982 USPFWC meeting in Auburn, Bennet spoke eloquently about the group's goals and urged the women lifters to join him. "What we do reflects who we are," Bennet told the group in Auburn, adding that "Drugs offend the concept of fairness. . . Athletic competitions are becoming more and more chemical competitions. Does this sound right?? Moral?? Ethical?? . . . If we are to have respect for others, we must first have respect for ourselves. A different world cannot be made by indifferent people." Bennet's hope that many of the disgruntled
women lifters would leave the USPF and join his organization proved true. Many time world and national champion Judy Gedney was one of the first women lifters to answer Bennet's call to join the ADFPA. Said Gedney, who is still actively competing at age 63:

If it wasn't for the development of the ADFPA, I'm sure that the frustration of dealing with drug use within the USPF and the IPF would have discouraged me from continuing to participate in this sport. As a committed Christian and an educator, I'm a firm believer that using chemicals and drugs to enhance strength or to adjust body weight is unethical. Athletes who use drugs to enhance performance usually provide a rationale to justify their decisions; I simply consider, would taking drugs be a pleasing decision to my Creator? Drug use is morally wrong because it is contrary to sporting rules.

When I started competing in 1979, drug use was becoming popular among the male lifters; it soon spread to the female lifters. It was shocking to go to National Championships and see the physical changes that took place within a year's time among some of the women lifters who used anabolic steroids. By afternoon, the Women's Nationals taking place in Boston looked like a Bic razor commercial. Drug testing motions were placed on the annual agendas regularly; sadly the sporting administrators had no interest in allowing drug testing within the sport of powerlifting. The organization of the USPF Women's Committee helped to promote drug testing within the sport. Still with the exception of select leaders with character, the USPF as a body did not want to establish a drug testing program.  

The ADFPA grew considerably in 1982 and 1983 as large numbers of women and men began to view its contests as a viable alternative to the USPF. They held national championships for both men and women in 1983, and the first Men's Nationals attracted 120 lifters. There were, however, two big problems. The first was that the USPF remained the officially recognized member of the IPF and so it was the only federation that could send athletes to the World Championships. So, Gedney and others couldn't lift only in the ADFPA if they wanted a chance to be IPF world champion. The second problem, and a significant one it was, was that in order to live up to its mandate that it would test 10% of the lifters in every meet it sanctioned, the ADFPA generally used polygraph exams to determine if someone was "clean." Fears of registering a false positive on a polygraph test made many lifters reluctant to lift in ADFPA meets, however, even though they were drug-free lifters.

Although many people recognized that the
ADFPA posed a threat to the growth and expansion of the USPF. Cotter and a few others began to view it as a way to maintain the status quo for the USPF. An interesting editorial published in the September 1982 issue of Powerlifting USA, Cotter even argued that the USPF should begin co-sanctioning meets with the ADFPA rather than following the IPF guidelines for testing. Although the ADFPA and the USPF did co-sanction a few meets in that first year, Bennet soon realized that most of his lifters and administrative supporters wanted nothing to do with the USPF. Long time powerlifting officials Peary and Mabel Rader, for instance, resigned from the USPF in 1982, as did Executive Committee member Nate Foster. In a letter to Rader, on 11 September 1982, Brother Bennet wrote, "It was a sad day indeed when you resigned from the USPF. I can fully understand your disgust. So did Nate Foster. Then, perhaps, on the other hand, these are good signs since the people of integrity are beginning to show a greater interest in the ADFPA." While many people transferred their allegiance to the ADFPA, some top lifters could not fully commit because they hoped to still be able to attend the IPF world championships. So, Bennet began lobbying the IPF to recognize the ADFPA as the official federation for the United States.

Although Brother Bennet's lobby failed, the IPF did make life more difficult for the drug users by passing a new regulation in 1982 that required all world record applications to include a negative drug test report from an official IOC lab. Furthermore, the IPF required that one of its own drug control officers had to be present at the test, and since there were only two IPF medical officers—George Bostrom in Sweden and Bill Jamieson in Canada—this meant that very few world records would be set in America any time soon. Rather than seizing upon the IPF decision as a tool it could use to hammer home the need for an American testing program, however, Cotter and the USPF Executive responded by announcing new regulations for the setting of American records. "All IPF rules currently in force . . . shall apply also to the setting of American records, with the proviso that drug testing will not be required." Cotter admitted that this would soon mean that many USPF records would probably exceed the IPF world records. However, he and many of the other American leaders, viewed the new IPF regulation as specifically anti-American as well as anti-drug, and so felt it was fair to defy the IPF.

Because there were women who wanted to set official world records (including myself), I requested, on behalf of the USPF women's committee, that there be a testing program at the upcoming 1983 Women's Nationals so that IPF world records could be set. When the USPF denied my request, I asked to implement "voluntary testing" at the meet scheduled for Chicago. As Ruthie Shafer, an open opponent of drug testing explained it in Powerlifting USA, "Although the measure was voted down by the Executive Committee twice, with heavy lobbying Jan Todd managed to push it through as long as she could arrange outside funding." I was able to do that, and so sent word to the IPF asking Bill Jamieson, the Canadian drug officer, to attend the meet. However, things became complicated. As Mike Lambert wrote in his report of the contest:

Somewhat like last year's competition, the possibility of drug testing at this competition (albeit of the voluntary type) wavered between yes and no almost up until meet.
Fifteen women broke world records at that meet, but only four agreed to be tested. I was one of them, deadlifting 473.75 pounds in the 148 pound class, and it was my last meet with the USPF as a lifter. At the USPFWC meeting following the Chicago Nationals, I was again elected to serve as head of the USPFWC. However, I was coming to the realization that my effectiveness as an advocate for testing on the national scene was diminishing as the pro-drug faction, which now included a number of the top anti-testing women lifters, was gaining in strength under Cotter’s leadership.

At the National Committee meeting that summer, sensitive to the polarization I now created on the national scene, I asked Judy Gedney to present the resolution requesting that IOC-type drug testing be done in all National Championships beginning in 1984. I then moved to separate the men’s and women’s votes in the hopes that perhaps we could get the women’s testing passed. This time the strategy worked and after a heated debate it was agreed that the USPF would pay for full (required) IPF testing at the women’s nationals in 1984—but not at the men’s. However, the USPF National Committee did pass my request for voluntary testing at the 1984 Men’s Nationals for those men who wished to set official world records.

In November, at the 1983 World Powerlifting Championships in Gothenburg, Sweden, the IPF Congress was clearly angry that the USPF had still not agreed to test their men. And so, to force the issue, they passed a new rule requiring all federations who sent lifters to the IPF World Championships to have an IOC-type testing program at their national championships.

The decision infuriated many of the top USPF lifters, and Cotter agreed that it was an attempt by the IPF to “dictate” to the United States. While Cotter and his inner circle tried to figure out how to finesse the new requirement, master lifter Ernie Frantz and nine time world powerlifting champion Larry Pacifico used it to attract lifters to yet another new federation—the American Powerlifting Federation. The APF had been announced with a full page ad in the January 1983 issue of Powerlifting USA, following the IPF’s decision about the testing of world records. “Don’t be dictated to—Lift the way you want to lift,” read the ad. “Don’t want testing? We won’t have any.” As Ernie Frantz then went on to explain in the ad, “We want to run our own organization the way we, the lifters see fit. There are more powerlifters in the US than any other country in the world, yet we are dictated to by a small minority of foreign lifters. The AMPF/APF will bring the power back where it belongs—to you, the American lifter.” Powerlifting USA columnist Ken Leistner claimed that “almost every top lifter [is] ready to abandon the IPF if this ruling stands.”

The APF held its first organizational meeting on 28 January 1983 on the same weekend as the USPF Women’s National Championships. From the beginning, Frantz wanted there to be no confusion about the drug stance of his group. In the promotional materials he circulated that weekend trying to get members to join with him, Item One on Frantz’s “Proposal for APF/AMPF Meeting” read: “I don’t believe in any testing whatsoever at any time.” However, Frantz’s reason for starting the new federation was more complicated than simply a desire to use drugs and lift big weights. He was not happy, he told me back in 1983, about being a rule breaker. In a conversation we had that weekend, Frantz explained that he was tired of the hypocrisy of the USPF’s position on drug testing and didn’t like the idea that he was using drugs in a federation that supposedly banned them. He felt that the more ethical thing would be to have a federation in which everyone knew that drug use was a permitted option and in which he or she wasn’t taking a trophy from some clean lifter who hadn’t used drugs. I can’t fault that logic.

Although Frantz and Pacifico had hoped that most of the top men and women would jump ship and join them, the majority chose to stay with the USPF, especially after the IPF let it be known that any lifter participating in an APF meet would face a two year suspension from the IPF. As things stood, however, America’s anti-testing lifters had little reason to leave the USPF with Cotter and his anti-testing Executive Committee at the helm. At the 1984 Women’s Nationals held in Austin, Cotter’s new drug control officer, Dr. Richard Herrick of Opelika, Alabama, collected urine samples from the winners, record breakers, and other lifters at...
random, to be sent to the new IOC testing lab at UCLA in Los Angeles. What none of the lifters realized until after the championships, however, was that Cotter—using a loophole in the enabling legislation—did not plan to impose any sanctions against those women who might turn up positive. Nor did he plan to reveal who they were.\textsuperscript{107} This was the final straw for many women lifters, including me. I was up for re-election that year for the USPFWC chair and decided not to run, as I saw drug testing as a battle we would never win.\textsuperscript{108} Judy Gedney, my staunch ally since her introduction to the national scene, agreed to run instead, and did her best to continue to work with the USPF for the next several years following her election.\textsuperscript{109} She did not have an easy job.\textsuperscript{110} Although the USPFWC immediately asked that sanctions be put in place for the women found positive at the 1984 Women's Nationals, Cotter and the Executive Committee refused to act retroactively. Writing in \textit{Powerlifting USA}, in June, prior to the National Committee meeting, Cotter contended:

It will, of course, be argued that the pro-testing people, especially members of the Women's Committee, feel very strongly that sanctions must be applied, however, belatedly in order to preserve the integrity of the US team and the sport. It will be argued that failure to impose sanctions will make a mockery of drug testing and will unfairly nullify the victory of those who fought so hard for testing at Austin last July. It will be argued that sanctions may legitimately be implied from this contract.

On the other side, it will be argued that strong feelings confer no legal right, that injustice also may make a mockery of drug testing, and that sanctions for testing positive for drugs in a private contract should be included by express action, and not by implication.\textsuperscript{111}

Responding to Cotter's explanation, USPFWC Chairperson Judy Gedney replied:

I assure you that there was no intent on the part of the Women's Committee during the July/Austin National Meeting to purposely avoid the inclusion of sanctions in the drug testing motion. I do not believe that a logical case can be developed to support that particular view. I believe the rationale for testing was so obviously to negate the necessity of considering whether or not there would be sanctions. It should be obvious, even to those who are most opposed to drug evaluation, that this testing procedure was not implemented as a pilot study for some future event, but that it was meant to be "for real" and passage of the test would be necessary to participate on the USA team for the World Championships. The problem that has now arisen about the sanctions must seem to everyone to be just what it is: a loophole. It appears inconceivable that it could be anything else in light of the time, energy and vast expense (taken from the registered powerlifter's [sic] fees) that went into the implementation of the entire process.\textsuperscript{112}

As it turned out, the loophole was sufficiently large to allow the pro-drug faction to continue to have its way. In May, when the 1984 Women's World Championships were held in Los Angeles, no official word about the results of the drug tests from the Nationals had been announced by Cotter, who claimed that the IOC drug labs were taking too much time to run the second, confirming test. So, all the class winners were automatically sent forward as US team members and no sanctions were ever imposed.\textsuperscript{113} Furthermore, in July of 1984 when the National Committee had its annual meeting in Dayton, the group voted down testing at the 1985 Women's Nationals.\textsuperscript{114} They did, however, agree to optional testing for world records at the 1984 Men's National Championships as had been decided the previous year.\textsuperscript{115}

And so, by the end of 1984, American powerlifting had three distinct federations with three distinct sets of records and three different philosophies on the drug question. Although Cotter and others called for reconciliation of the disparate groups, the level of mistrust on all sides was great, and as Cotter rightly pointed out, the leaders of the new organizations undoubtedly found "it more exciting to be a top leader in a splinter group than to be a soldier in a larger organization."\textsuperscript{116}

Over the next two decades, dozens of additional federations have cluttered the powerlifting landscape. Many of these federations have been short-lived. Many are strictly regional or age-group affairs. One can only
wonder where powerlifting might be these days if instead of fighting the IPF over testing, the USPF had acted honorably and led the fight to implement reliable testing methods. Would powerlifting still have the TV contracts which were once so lucrative? Probably. Would it perhaps now be an Olympic sport? Probably not. Would it have grown in numbers and reputation? Undoubtedly.

Instead, the USPF spent most of its time, energy, and money in the latter part of the 1980s fighting off a series of lawsuits from Ernie Frantz and the APF, while the ADFPA, frustrated at the IPF’s unwillingness to recognize them, eventually formed its own international association—the World Drug Free Powerlifting Federation. The ADFPA gradually overtook the USPF and some members of the USPF did eventually join them, forming USAPowerlifting, which became the designated IPF affiliate in 1996. However, USAPowerlifting still has only about half as many members as the USPF did in the early 1980s, and the US is no longer the dominant force it once was in international powerlifting competitions.

And so the fragmentation of powerlifting that began in the early 1980s continues, as does the quest for more records, more championships, and more individual glory. In addition to the IPF, lifters can now compete internationally in federations such as the World Drug Free Powerlifting Federation (WDFPF); the World Powerlifting Congress (WPC); the Amateur World Powerlifting Congress (AWPC), the amateur wing of the WPC; the World Association of Benchers and Dead Lifters (WABDL), which sanctions single-lift competitions; the World Powerlifting Alliance (WPA); the Natural Athlete Strength Association (NASA); the World Powerlifting League (WPL); the World Powerlifting Organization (WPO); and the World Natural Powerlifting Federation (WNPF). One of the problems of such diversity is that in addition to different rules on drug testing, the various federations also vary dramatically on what kind of supportive gear a lifter can use and even how the individual lifts are performed. Some of the supportive, multi-layered shirts permitted in the APF and WPO, for instance, supposedly allow a man to lift as much as 300 pounds more than he can in a simple t-shirt.

Master's powerlifter Bob Strauss, who's been involved with the sport since 1971, satirized the current situation on his website when he "announced" the formation of a fictional federation—The Committee Representing Advanced Powerlifting (CRAP). CRAP had been formed, Strauss explained, to "limit the intrusion of rules" in powerlifting and to take advantage of the technological and pharmaceutical advances of the 21st century. The rules he lists for this mock-federation are all geared to maximize record breaking. There are no limits on uniforms or supportive gear; there is absolutely no drug testing or even talk of drug testing allowed. CRAP's goal, he explains, is simple—lift bigger and bigger weights and "popularize powerlifting like the WWF has done to wrestling." Switching to a serious tone, Strauss concluded his satirical web announcement by noting that the state of powerlifting in 2004 was simply ridiculous. "If you thought I was just kidding or frantically inventing," he wrote, "just look at what's going on in powerlifting now. Record crazy federations, backed by greedy suppliers are ruining our sport. Look at the recent PL-USA! Look at the federations in which you don't even have to back out with a squat and don't have
to go anywhere low enough in a triple ply canvas suit!" Look at the federations, he continued, where spotters not only help a man lift the bar into position but actually have to help him get the bar down to his chest because the bench shirt he's wearing is so strong that it won't allow the bar to touch his chest without spotter help. Strauss has reason to be concerned. When a sport has no consistent set of rules, it ceases to be a sport.

The struggle over drug-testing is not the sole cause of the proliferation of federations we see today, but it made them possible. The success of the ADFPA and the APF demonstrated just how easy it was to begin a new organization that suited an individual's personal tastes. Ironically, if I had started a separate women's organization as soon as the National Committee turned down the USPFWC's first request to test at the Women's Nationals, powerlifting might have evolved on a more traditional model for sport—like men's and women's tennis or men's and women's golf. However, with less than a thousand American women involved in the sport in the early 1980s, I did not see how we could go it alone and so I recommended, on more than one occasion, that women's lifting should try to stay within the USPF.

Anabolic steroids are addictive drugs and once an obsessive lifter has seen his body swell and strengthen, he will fight for his right to keep using these substances even in the face of laws, commonsense, and friendship. Because we were not autonomous, women powerlifters could not control their own destiny on the drug issue. And, as the USPFWC became more vocal in its requests to test women lifters, the top male lifters realized that we had to be stopped. They rightfully feared that if they allowed us to test the women, the IPF would force the men to be tested, too.

I deeply believe that had the USPF Women's Committee been "allowed" to create its own testing procedures, we could have gradually added to our numbers and kept our side of the sport basically clean. I say this because in meeting after meeting held during the years I led the USPFWC, almost all of the women lifters I spoke with at the national and local level wanted testing. We lacked the male hunger for heavy muscling, and we feared the baldness, acne, amenorrhea, beards, and deepened voices of the women who first took steroids at the urging of some boyfriend, husband or training partner. Beyond these physiological fears, however, most of the women also felt as Judy Gedney and I did, that the winners of a contest should be determined by genetic gifts and hard training—not by how many drugs they were willing to take.
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