

BOXING SINCE 1966

December 3, 2025

House Education and the Workforce Committee
2101 Rayburn House Office Building
Washington, DC 20515

Re: Muhammad Ali American Boxing Revival Act

Dear Committee Members:

My name is Bob Arum and I am the chairman and founder of Top Rank, Inc., a leading boxing promoter operating since 1966. I am writing to you all regarding the proposed Muhammad Ali American Boxing Revival Act (the "Amendment").

The Professional Boxing Safety Act of 1996 and the subsequent Muhammad Ali Act amendment (collectively the "Ali Act") instituted a series of regulations intended to protect fighters from exploitative and unethical business practices. By way of example, the Ali Act in its current form:

- (1) Prohibits promoters from entering into coercive contracts with fighters (*See* Ali Act Section 10(a)), which serves to prevent a fighter from being forced to sign a long-term contract with a particular promoter as a condition precedent to securing a fight with an opponent under contract to that same promoter;
- (2) Creates strict disclosure rules that compel promoters to disclose to fighters the compensation they have contracted to receive from the fighter's match, which provides fighters with transparency regarding the revenue generated from their bouts and serves as a tool that allows fighters to negotiate fair market value for subsequent bouts (*See* Ali Act Section 13(b)(1) of the Ali Act); and
- (3) Establishes a firewall between promoters and managers, which helps ensure that managers represent the interests of their fighters and do not serve as agents of promoters at their fighters' expense (*See* Ali Act Section 17(b)).

The Amendment strips away these and other protections for fighters set forth in the Ali Act for any fighter that signs with a newly created Unified Boxing Organization ("UBO"). Specifically, the proposed Section 24(a) of the Amendment states that a UBO is "deemed to be in compliance with the requirements of this Act if the UBO meets the conditions of this section with respect to—(1) each boxer under contract with the UBO; and (2) each professional boxing match organized by the UBO."

As presently drafted, the conditions required for an entity to qualify as a UBO do not include the protections for fighters set forth above. A UBO is not prohibited from entering coercive contracts with fighters, is not required to provide financial disclosures



to fighters, and is not subject to the rule establishing a firewall between managers and promoters. It is not subject to any of the protections created for fighters in the Ali Act. Instead, a UBO is deemed in compliance with such provisions simply by virtue of being recognized as a UBO and complying with the requirements for UBOs. This is incredibly problematic and entirely unjustifiable. Put simply, ***there is no reason for Congress to actively remove these protections for those fighters who choose to sign with a UBO, and there is no reason for a UBO to be exempt from complying with these protective measures.***

Proponents of the Amendment have hailed that it will create greater opportunities for fighters outside the current sanctioning body system, enhance health and safety benefits, and improve fighter pay. ***The Amendment can achieve those ends without exempting UBOs from the protections for fighters set forth in the Ali Act.*** Proponents have also stated that the bill does not change the existing provisions of the original Ali Act. This is misleading at best. As stated above, the Amendment exempts UBO's from the existing provisions of the original Ali Act by deeming the UBO in compliance with such provisions so long as it adheres to all UBO requirements. Fighters who benefited from those protective provisions will no longer do so if they participate in the UBO system. That is a fundamental change to the underlying Ali Act and to the many protections granted to fighters therein.

There is likely a version of this bill that achieves the stated aims of its proponents without harming fighters who participate in the alternative UBO system. Indeed, such a change to the presently drafted Amendment could be easily accomplished—UBOs should be forced to comply with those portions of the underlying Ali Act that protect fighters to be deemed in compliance with the overall Act and to maintain their standing as a UBO. ***There is no sound reason to reject such a proposed change, which serves only to ensure that previous protections for fighters carry over into the new alternative system the Amendment seeks to create.***

Please do not hesitate to reach out to me if you have any further questions or if Top Rank can provide any additional information.

Sincerely,

Robert Arum
Chief Executive Officer
Top Rank, Inc.
BobArum@toprank.com