

Winter-Spring Finalists Named For Today's Top Five Awards

Three track and field athletes, a volleyball player and one swimmer have been selected as the winter-spring finalists for the Today's Top Five Student-Athlete Awards.

UCLA triple jumper William Augustus Banks III, Brigham Young steeplechaser Henry Dinwoodey Marsh and California-Irvine miler Steven N. Scott are the three track and field representatives for the Today's Top Five Awards, which are presented concurrently with the Silver Anniversary Awards each year at the Honors Luncheon of the NCAA Convention. Robert James Yoder, Southern California volleyball player, and Daniel Lee Harrigan, North Carolina State swimmer, are the other finalists.

These five finalists were selected for participation in winter-spring sports during the 1977-78 academic year and will be joined by other finalists at the conclusion of fall competition for selection of the Top Five recipients.

The presentations will be made at the NCAA Honors Luncheon January 8, 1979, in San Francisco.

Each finalist is selected on the basis of his athletic ability and achievement, character, leadership, extracurricular activities and academic achievement. Only seniors from the current calendar year are eligible.

Banks was amazingly consistent in the triple jump and long jump, winning both events in the same meet 15 times during his career. The NCAA Postgraduate Scholarship recipient also won the Pacific-8 triple jump crown twice and was rated second in the world by Track and Field News. His leap of 55-7 earned him a third-place finish in the 1977 World University Games.

Marsh placed 18th in the 3,000-meter steeplechase in the 1976 Olympics. He was a three-time steeplechase all-America and was twice recognized in cross country. Marsh, who maintained a 3.50 grade-point average in

economics and pre-law, also is the current American record-holder in the 3,000 with a time of 8:21.6.

Scott owns the fifth fastest mile ever recorded by an American runner, a 3:53.9 recorded at the California-Irvine Meet of Champions earlier this year. He won the NCAA 1,500-meter championship this year in 3:37.6 after having finished second as a junior. He has been ranked No. 1 in the United States in the one-mile and 1,500-meter runs by Track and Field News and has run the one-mile under four minutes 11 times.

Harrigan won a bronze medal at the 1976 Olympics in the 200-meter backstroke and placed first in the same event in the 1975 Pan American Games. Harrigan swam the world's fastest 200-meter backstroke in 1977 in a dual meet against East Germany and also had two firsts and one third in a dual meet between the United States and the Soviet

Continued on page 6



Finalists

These five student-athletes have been selected as the finalists for the Today's Top Five Award. From the left they are (top row) William Augustus Banks III, UCLA; Daniel Lee Harrigan, North Carolina State; (middle row) Henry Dinwoodey Marsh, Brigham Young; Steven N. Scott, California-Irvine, and (bottom row) Robert James Yoder, Southern California.

NEWS

VOL. 15 • NO. 13

OCTOBER 15, 1978

Wrestling Federation Wins Status as NGB

The United States Wrestling Federation has won a clear-cut decision in its long-term battle to supplant the Amateur Athletic Union as the sport's national governing body and Group A member of the United States Olympic Committee.

A panel of the American Arbitration Association ruled that the USWF has met the requirements under the USOC constitution to act as the national governing body for amateur wrestling and shall replace the AAU Wrestling Division in this capacity.

The decision of the three Chicago attorneys, who had been selected by the opposing parties to hear the case under the rules of the American Arbitration Association and the USOC, was unanimous.

However, at a September 22-24 meeting, the USOC Executive Committee—while recognizing the USWF as the national governing body for wrestling and at the same time terminating the AAU's membership in the USOC for that sport—declined to seat

Continued on page 3

Conference of Conferences Set

The NCAA will sponsor a "conference of conferences" in Chicago or Dallas, primarily to review the Title IX policy statements currently being finalized by an eight-member work group formed by the director of the Office for Civil Rights.

It is anticipated that those documents will be completed by October 22 and will be available at the conference in Dallas, according to NCAA President J. Neils Thompson.

Continued on page 7

Thompson Testifies Before House Subcommittee

EDITOR'S NOTE: NCAA President J. Neils Thompson testified before the House Commerce Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigation September 27. Excerpts of his testimony appear in the following article.

"The essence of the operating structure of the NCAA rests upon the work of its committees, of which the Committee on Infractions is only one. Certainly, today, among the most important, difficult and time-consuming of our committee assignments are those to the Committee on Infractions. I feel great resentment at the testimony of various Subcommittee witnesses, the thrust of which was calculated to convey the impression that in some fashion the members of the Committee on Infractions were engaged in the perpetration of a selective, vindictive, or corrupt program of enforcement.

"I say without reservation that I, and members of the NCAA Council, believe the overwhelming majority of the NCAA members hold the individuals serving on the Committee on Infractions in the highest regard. Perhaps I can no more eloquently express this viewpoint than to quote to you directly the remarks of William Ireland, Director of Athletics at the University of Nevada-Las Vegas, made two months ago in a public meeting of college athletic directors, ten days after the appearance of representatives of that institution before this Subcommittee:

'I have the greatest respect for the Infractions Committee. If I was being tried for my life, I would like for the Infractions Committee of the NCAA to be the jury.'

"I hope I am not intemperate when I suggest that the Subcommittee lay this quotation alongside the testimony to this Subcommittee of two representatives of the same institution, Donald Baepfer and Jerry Tarkanian.

"Some witnesses before this Subcommittee have derided the NCAA substantive rules as being so complex as to be incomprehensible. This professed lack of understanding by representatives of higher education is difficult to accept. It may be amusing to the audience, or to members of this Subcommittee, for someone to wave the 266-page NCAA Manual in the air and liken it to the Internal Revenue Code; it would perhaps be more responsible to recognize, as former NCAA President Fuzak pointed out early in these hearings, that the NCAA Constitution and Bylaw substantive rules relating to infractions and eligibility occupy only about 40 pages.

"In gross, the rules are designed with but a single purpose in mind: To implement the fundamental tenet of the NCAA Constitution, that the student-athlete be a student first and an athlete second. If this principle cannot be maintained successfully, then colleges should not be sponsoring varsity athletic teams.

"For better or worse, intercollegiate athletics in many instances are conducted in a highly competitive atmosphere in which some institutions are unfortunately tempted to aggrandize their academic reputations on the basis of instant athletic team prowess, and in which some coaches are equally unfortunately

tempted to gain competitive advantage and develop their coaching reputations by operating outside the rules. NCAA members have found it necessary over the years specifically to legislate on what some casual observers might mistakenly regard as minutiae, e.g., number of campus recruiting visits, types of accommodations for prospects, alumni 'favors' for student-athletes, permissible financial aid and the like. These observers forget, if indeed they ever knew, that since scholarships and grants-in-aid permissible under NCAA legislation are of the same net value to the athlete, recruiting representatives tend to devise different techniques to achieve a 'recruiting edge.' As with any other arena, it is far easier to criticize the rules than it is to create and administer them, and I suggest that no one in touch with the reality of intercollegiate athletics would seriously suggest that equality of opportunity can be maintained by just a 'few simple rules.'

"I remind the Subcommittee that in the normal case, where there is problem with the rendition of a 'small' favor for the student-athlete, he is already receiving the maximum aid permitted by NCAA rules—a maximum which our member institutions have made clear is the limit which should be reasonably imposed for purposes of maintaining the student-athlete as an integral part of the student body. Obviously, that maximum can be increased or decreased, as our member institutions see fit, but I believe that even Coach Tarkanian would agree that there must be some uniform limit. In the past

Continued on page 4

Discussing the Injury Problem

At long last, football injuries are being discussed openly.

The topic has been treated with kid gloves, a subject which has never seemed to attract the attention it deserved. Now, with John Underwood's *Sports Illustrated* series leading the way, people in sports have become more eager to discuss injuries and what can be done to prevent them.

Should helmets be padded? How about one-platoon football? Would it result in fewer injuries than two-platoon? Artificial surfaces—are they the source of a problem? And what about the rules? Improvements have been made, but should there be more?

The answer to the problem of football injury may not pertain to any of those questions. But the athletic community does owe to itself the responsibility of a frank self-examination. Nothing—absolutely nothing—is more important to football than the safety of the participants.

Through the efforts of the NCAA Committee on Competitive Safeguards and Medical Aspects of Sports, the NCAA Football Rules Committee and the National Operating Committee on Standards for Athletic Equipment, various rules changes have been implemented and improvements have

been made on the equipment, specifically the helmet. Head-tackling and blocking now are prohibited both by the rules and by the code of ethics of the American Football Coaches Association. Helmets must meet strict safety standards, and the membership constantly is apprised of developments in sports medicine by the Competitive Safeguards Committee.

The prevention of serious injuries will not be accomplished, however, simply by issuing position statements or by the use of protective equipment. More important factors are the manner in which coaches teach the fundamentals of blocking and tackling, the way in which student-athletes play the game and the techniques officials utilize enforcing the rules.

On page five of this issue, the Competitive Safeguards Committee asks that athletes and those conducting athletic programs work together to eliminate injuries. An example of how this can be done is provided on the subject of head and neck injuries.

The four points contained in that statement should be required reading for all football players and coaches. Perhaps a player, more familiar with the reasons behind the rules, will be less tempted to "spear" an opponent when he knows that it is his own neck he's risking.

Columnary Craft

Reprinted below is an excerpt from the writing of a news columnist commenting pertinently about intercollegiate athletics. It is selected because the NCAA News feels it makes a point and discusses a topic which will interest readers. Publication herein, however, does not imply NCAA News endorsement of the views expressed by the author.

Significant Development

By J. CARL GUYMON
The Daily Oklahoman

The long-range ramifications in wrestling and at least two other sports remain uncertain, and both the Amateur Athletic Union and the United States Wrestling Federation have yet to fully recover from the shock.

But for now, the fact remains that the USWF has officially supplanted the AAU as amateur wrestling's national governing body and Group A member of the United States Olympic Committee.

A three-man panel of the American Arbitration Association recently ruled in favor of the Stillwater-based USWF, deciding the organization meets the requirements under the U.S. Olympic Committee Constitution to act as the governing body.

The ruling ended, at least temporarily, an eight-year battle between the AAU and USWF. The binding arbitration concluded proceedings which started more than a year ago when the USWF called upon a 1976 rule change in the USOC constitution, permitting an organization to "challenge" an incumbent for recognition by the USOC as the national governing body for a particular sport. Such recognition includes Group A (first class, if you will) membership in the USOC.

So what does it mean? It means the USWF assumes the role of American wrestling leader, a role it probably has deserved for at least a half-dozen years. More importantly, it awards sanctioning authority for all international competition in the sports, along with selection and training of United States teams entered in World, Pan American and Olympic competition.

Door Open

The decision might open the door for similar challenges to the AAU in track and field and swimming. The AAU does have the right, within one year of the 1980 Olympic Games' closing ceremonies, to re-challenge the new incumbent—the USWF.

"The only flaw in the decision could be in our relationship to FILA (the International Wrestling Federation)," says USWF executive Bob Dellinger.

"We expect to be endorsed by the USOC for membership in FILA, which conducts virtually all international competition. The FILA can pick another organization. It doesn't have to accept who our highest sports authority designates as sole representative body for this country.

"But if FILA does side with the AAU, it would be the only sport in the only nation where FILA hasn't accepted that nation's highest sports authority's representative.

"So we don't expect that to happen. But it is a remote possibility."

Steve Combs, USWF executive director, was ecstatic after the decision:

"The USWF was founded 10 years ago by individuals and organizations who were extremely concerned about the lack of any coordinated and consistent programs for the improvement, development and promotion of the international styles of wrestling in the United States.

Since that beginning, the USWF has grown into the largest single-purpose wrestling organization in the country. This growth is based on the strong USWF organizations developed at the state level and the representation afforded the many national organizations actively involved in the sport.

"It is a tremendous honor to be designated the national governing body, but we readily acknowledge that it is an even greater responsibility, one which the USWF is committed to fulfill."

Eight-Year Battle

The battle officially began in 1970 when FILA passed a rule commanding all member nations to be represented in various sports by single sports bodies. The USWF asserted that the AAU was an "umbrella organization," concerned with swimming, track and field, etc.

In 1972, the USOC (heavily laden with AAU sympathizers) rejected the USWF. But in 1976, the USOC (under pressure from Congress) revised its constitution to include the right to challenge an incumbent governing body.

Thus, the USWF gained its first significant wedge into the door.

In July of 1977, the USWF presented its case to the USOC executive board, which ruled in favor of the AAU, 70-3. But the lopsided defeat was a victory of sorts, as it represented the first step toward binding arbitration. USOC rules provided this avenue for organizations spurned by the executive board.

With both sides agreeing upon the three attorneys furnished by American Arbitration Association, hearings began in May and continued, intermittently, through August.

Then came the decision the first part of September.

A new era in amateur wrestling had begun. Only time will tell how well the pre-pubescent USWF (10 years old) handles the responsibility.

But the organization has overcome the normal organizational difficulties plus the embarrassment of having several international trips blocked by the AAU's membership in FILA.

Opinions Out Loud

—Bo Schembechler, football coach
University of Michigan
Chicago Tribune

"My policy is never make any wild promises to a kid—which may scare off some prospects because other recruiters give them such an inflated opinion of their talent, you got it? Michigan's never been on probation. I know cheating goes on elsewhere because I've run into it. I think if we cheated, we could probably get half a dozen more blue-chippers and maybe win the national title. But that's too big a price to pay.

"I think some schools just defy the NCAA. They think they absolutely have to do it in order to survive, and that's very, very unfortunate. When you consider the complexities, the NCAA has done a good job in its investigation and prosecution. You'll notice the only people who really find fault are those who've gotten caught. You don't hear anybody else bitchin' about it. It's an exasperating thing when you know it's being done. But I really feel if we've lost a kid for that reason, we're probably better off we didn't get him."

—National Federation Press Service

"When HEW's tests to discover discrimination are applied to HEW itself, the Department flunks, according to George J. Borjas, who has published his findings in 'Discrimination in HEW: Is the Doctor Sick or Is the Patient Healthy?' The report has been distributed by the Center for the Study of the Economy and the State at the University of Chicago.

"The report shows discrepancies in pay to men and women and to blacks and whites. According to Borjas, at least 39.8 per cent of the wage gap between white males and white females and 35 per cent of the wage gap between blacks and whites can be explained by no other cause but discrimination.

"These results raise important questions concerning HEW's handling of wage discrimination complaints in the schools and colleges. If HEW argues it does not discriminate against women, despite evidence to the contrary, then cannot schools and colleges make the same argument? HEW argues that the wage gap accurately reflects productivity differences between men and women and blacks and whites. Can HEW then turn a deaf ear to the same argument by schools and colleges?

"Borjas does not accuse HEW of discrimination. His purpose is to point out the difficulty, if not impossibility, of proving discrimination with the use of HEW's statistical techniques."

—Eddie Lee Ivery, football player
Georgia Tech
The Atlanta Journal

"Everything has centered around football, but I want my education. I want my degree. I want something to go to when football is done."

—Jack Dahany, director of security
National Football League
The Atlanta Journal

"Only God knows for sure, but what estimates we have from the legal betting, from the commissions and congressional committees who look into these things, I feel comfortable saying that all sports betting, not just pro football, is more than \$20 billion a year. It could go as high as \$60 billion."

—Paul "Bear" Bryant, football coach
University of Alabama

"I've always been for open bowls. The Sugar Bowl is good for the SEC, and I'm grateful we'll be sharing that \$1 million every year, but the fact is it costs the conference team that goes to the game more in expenses than it makes, so I'd just as soon go other places, too.

"I think it'd be better for college football if they opened everything up. Give every team a chance to go to any bowl. There've been years when we'd had a good chance for the Rose Bowl under those conditions."

—Dr. William Clancy, team physician
University of Wisconsin
Wisconsin State Journal

"... People want to play football. Let them play. Try to do the best you can to protect them. Do the best coaching you can, do the best you can with the rules, get everybody involved who should have a say in rules.

"Progress means bringing in more and more experts. I believe then the game can become a little safer, but not a heck of a lot safer. You can only do so much. Maybe if we played the game at five miles an hour like we dropped the speed limit down from 65 to 55.

"You can do certain things, but there still are going to be injuries. There still are going to be mountain climbers who are going to fall off the rocks.

"I think certain things that (John) Underwood says are true, but I think a lot is overplayed. There is a time for crisis. In other words, the time is ripe for rules changes. The time is ripe to point out certain inadequacies.

"The public is aware of these problems. Let's do something about it. Let's get everybody together, pool our heads."

NCAA
NEWS

Executive Editor
David E. Cawood
Editor David Pickle

Published by the National Collegiate Athletic Association, U. S. Highway 50 and Nall Avenue, P.O. Box 1906, Shawnee Mission, Kansas 66222. Phone (AC 913) 384-3220. Subscription Rate: \$9 annually.

NCAA enforcement staff and the institution under investigation.

"I suggest this issue is far more complex than any witness before this Subcommittee has been willing to admit. When undertaking an investigation, the NCAA investigative staff simply does not know what will be the attitude toward the investigation by the member institution, or more particularly, by the chief executive officer of that institution. That attitude can run the full spectrum from the one evidenced by President Magrath of the University of Minnesota, who caused there to be undertaken an aggressive program of self-investigation and self-disclosure by university personnel, to the attitude of President Baepler of the University of Nevada, Las Vegas, who has been characterized by his own faculty committee as appearing less interested in developing the facts than in attempting to disprove the NCAA's case.

"If a university chooses to demand 'cooperation' from the NCAA staff, but by the same token, chooses not itself to cooperate in the development of a full and fair disclosure of the facts wherever the chips may fall, the investigation in fact becomes an exercise in futility—particularly when the NCAA staff does not enjoy the power of subpoena nor the power to place witnesses under oath. It is essential that the NCAA make the determination as to whether cooperation is possible and to what extent.

"The state of affairs which necessitates the very existence of the NCAA enforcement program—that is, the highly competitive atmosphere in which the intercollegiate athletics are today conducted—does not stop at the front door of a university athletic department. It can, and unfortunately sometimes does, invade the office of the president or board of trustees as well. Thus, many of the recommendations involving cooperative or joint investigations are simply unwise from the point of view of effective enforcement of the rules.

"Quite frankly, I believe that the only practical solution to this complex question can be an *ad hoc* one, in which the enforcement staff 'cooperates' with institutional representatives during an investigation, to the extent that the cooperation appears justified by the seriousness and nature of the allegations, the attitude toward investigation evidenced by university personnel (and particularly the university's president) and the nature and character of the evidence upon which the investigation is developed. This is in fact what occurs today, and in my judgment, those who complain most stridently of a lack of cooperation on the part of the NCAA enforcement staff are those who have evidenced their own unwillingness seriously to investigate the facts in an objective, as distinct from a defensive, manner.

"Much has been said at these hearings about the 'rights' of the member institutions under investigation, and the rights of student-athletes enrolled therein. I point out that as the NCAA is structured, these are not the only 'rights,' or perhaps sometimes even the paramount rights, with which the NCAA enforcement staff and Committee on Infractions must be concerned. Also involved are the interests of all the other members of the NCAA, and particularly those institutions against whom the institution under investigation competes, or recruits, on a regular basis.

"It is a fundamental requirement of NCAA policy that each institution take primary responsibility for enforcing the NCAA's rules, and when the compliance with this tenet by one particular institution is called into question on the basis of what appears to be credible evidence, the NCAA enforcement staff should conscientiously seek to develop the facts. If it did not do so, it would fail to fulfill its responsibility to all other NCAA members and the student-athletes who participate on their athletic teams.

"This brings me to what I regard as an equally complex issue, the issue involving determination of student athletes' ineligibility.

"It is certainly clear that under current NCAA rules and procedures, the responsibility for a declaration of ineligibility rests with the member institution, and it is equally clear that this responsibility is simply one facet of the fundamental commitment of NCAA membership namely that each member institution has primary responsibility for carrying out the NCAA substantive rules.

"Some witnesses have argued to the Subcommittee that once the Committee on Infractions has determined facts, even if the interests of the particular student-athlete have been fully represented in that hearing, that a subsequent hearing of an institutional body on the matter of ineligibility becomes a sham. This of course is a rank misrepresentation; it is perfectly possible that during such an institutional hearing—unlike, I might add, the situation in the Minnesota case—the institutional panel might develop facts which were not brought to the attention of the Committee on Infractions, thereby providing grounds for a request, based upon newly-discovered evidence, for a further hearing

Continued on page 7



Throwin' Samoan

Washington State quarterback Jack Thompson (left) talks with reporters Virgil Parker of the Lincoln Journal (center), Tom Ash of the Omaha World Herald (near right) and Marvin West of the Knoxville News-Sentinel (far right) at one of the stops on the 1978 NCAA/ABC Football Promotional Tour.

Safeguards Committee Asks For Sharing of Responsibility

The NCAA Committee on Competitive Safeguards and Medical Aspects of Sports has adopted a statement advocating that athletic programs and athletes share responsibility for the prevention of sports-related injuries.

The statement follows:

"Participation in sport requires an acceptance of risk of injury. Athletes rightfully assume that those who are responsible for the conduct of sport have taken reasonable precautions to minimize the risk of significant injury. Periodic analysis of injury patterns continuously lead to refinements in the rules and/or other safety guidelines.

"However, to legislate safety via the rule book and equipment standards, while often necessary, is seldom effective by itself. To rely on officials to enforce compliance with the rule book is as insufficient as to rely on warning labels to produce behavioral compliance with safety guidelines. Compliance means respect on everyone's part for the intent and purpose of a rule or guideline, not merely technical satisfaction by some of its phrasing.

"Some sport safety problems lend themselves readily to identification and solution (e.g., heat stroke and the administration of liquid freely during early football practice). Some safety problems may be less clearly identified (e.g., head injuries), and solutions may be developed on selected assumptions and the premise that measurable standards are better understood than qualitative rhetoric (e.g., purchase a helmet manufactured in accordance with NOCSAE standards instead of purchase the "best helmet possible"). Some safety problems remain problems because of questionable compliance with the legislated solutions (e.g., dental mouthguards).

"Using football head/neck injury prevention as an illustration with current significance, it is impossible and should be unnecessary to expect the game officials to examine each helmet of the squad before the game to ensure that each helmet has met the NOCSAE standard. Respect for the approved safety standard alone should ensure that nothing but NOCSAE helmets are available to be worn.

"Optimal effectiveness, moreover, will come only from the athletes' informed compliance with all basic principles of head/neck injury prevention. The committee therefore encourages football coaches to discuss the following information with their squads, put it on each player's locker for emphasis, and then remind them of the essentials periodically during the season:

1. Serious head and neck injuries, leading to death, permanent brain damage, or quadriplegia (extensive paralysis from injury to the spinal cord at the neck level), occur each year in football. The toll is relatively small (less than one fatality for every 100,000 players and an estimated two to three non-fatal severe brain and spinal cord injuries for every 100,000 players), but persistent. They cannot be completely prevented due to the tremen-

dous forces occasionally encountered in football collisions, but they can be minimized by manufacturer, coach and player compliance with accepted safety standards.

2. The NOCSAE seal on a helmet indicates that a manufacturer has complied with the best available engineering standards for head protection. By keeping a proper fit, by not modifying its design and by reporting to the coach or equipment manager any need for its maintenance, the athlete is also complying with the purpose of the NOCSAE standard.
3. The rules against intentional butting, ramming, or spearing the opponent with the helmeted head are there to protect the helmeted person much more than the opponent being hit. No player shall intentionally strike a runner with the crown or the top of his helmet. The athlete who does not comply with these rules is the candidate for catastrophic injury. For example, no helmet can offer protection to the neck, and quadriplegia now occurs more frequently than brain damage. The typical scenario of this catastrophic injury in football is the lowering of one's head while making a tackle. The momentum of the body tries to bend the neck after the helmeted head is stopped by the impact, and the cervical spine cannot be "splinted" as well by the neck's muscles with the head lowered as it can with the preferred "face up, eyes forward, neck bulled" position. When the force at impact is sufficient, the vertebrae in the neck can dislocate or break, cause damage to the spinal cord they had been protecting and thereby produce permanent loss of motor and sensory function below the level of injury.
4. Because of the impact forces in football, even the "face up" position is no guarantee against head or neck injury. Further, the intent to make contact "face up" is no guarantee that that position can be maintained at the moment of impact. Consequently, the teaching of blocking/tackling techniques which keep the helmeted head from receiving the brunt of the impact are now required by rule and coaching ethics, and coaching techniques which help athletes maintain or regain the "face up" position during the milieu of a play must be respected by the athletes.

"This illustration covers only one significant safety problem in one sport. Other sports and other concerns within football can be similarly approached. The Committee on Competitive Safeguards and Medical Aspects of Sports recommends that coaches acquaint athletes with the risks of injury and the rules and practices that are being employed to minimize his/her risk of significant injury while pursuing the many benefits of sport. The athlete and the athletic program have a mutual need for an informed awareness of the risks being accepted and for sharing the responsibility for controlling those risks."