Some aspects of DOPING-HISTORY and consequences for DOPING-PREVENTION

Reykjavik, 31st of October 2007 – Play the Game
The problem is:

Anne Gripper (UCI) in Paris last week: „Nous pouvons débarasser le cyclisme du dopage“ (= illusion)

Zabel:
Not only totalitarian states are in the temptation of doping but also democratic states:

The east-west conflict has not been a main reason for doping. The manipulations did not end with the fall of the Berlin wall.
Never forget the conditions in a country:

- The GDR with 17 million of inhabitants was not able to win as many medals in a natural way as the USA or the Soviet Union by normal means.
- Western Germany had in 1976 only half of the births than occurred in 1966, and in the same time the development much more sports (lack of talents)
- Countries without tradition in certain sports (like Greece in athletics)
- Development of pharmacologie and medicalization in a country, sports medicine, sponsoring, increasing importance of sports in the mass media = pushing factors for doping
What can we learn from history?

Stimulants – efficiency in competition -> control
-> reaction: Anabolic steroids – efficiency in training period -> control
-> reaction: Testosterone, Human Growth Hormone, EPO
-> indirect control for Testosterone (Quotient), for EPO
-> reaction: doping up to the allowed limits

Doping -> doping control -> reaction -> other forms of doping

After each scandal assertion of clearing up without any gap: promised consequence eradication of doping
Efficient short time measure

Unannounced training controls mean a stagnation/cutback of performances

(cp. SINGLER/TREUTLEIN 2006, p. 37 & p. 115)
Explosion of performance in endurance sports due to – presumably – the misuse of EPO

- Especially since 1994
- E.g. development of performance considering marathons
- Increase of results under 2:10 in men's marathon since 1979

(SINGLER/TREUTLEIN 2006, p. 71)
Knowbody knew? Impacts on the body

Impacts on the body in a very short period of time
(cp. SINGLER/TREUTLEIN 2006, p. 59)
Possible observations in the past and present times:
- Changes of the body (for ex. muscles, weight, braces for teeth …)
- continues to run after the finishing line
- is able to give an interview instantly after a mountain arrival
- and so on

-No acting: for ex. wait and see, wegschauen, not enough money for the development of doping control laboratories end research, for prevention

-acting: provocation of the dropout of fighters against doping („enemies of sports“), advice for not to be caught in a control, protection of national sports heroes (for ex. Fuentes/Puerto in Spain)

= encouragement of doping
Spread out of knowledge of doping substances

Receivers, motives, beneficiaries of the trading with doping substances

(cp. DONATI 2006, p.22)
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Spread out of information

Enlightenment could be better than controls:

Research of Astrid Offer et al.:
293 young top athletes in the region of the Ruhr

Only 75 received information from:

- Coach of the club (18.8%)
- Coach of the federation (18.8%)
- (Responsibility of the federation for the fight against doping 27.4%)
- Doctor (11.3%)
- Teacher (20%)

= nearly no prevention work
The necessities

- **Research on attitudes towards doping**
  *(Questionnaires, interviews)*

**Hypothesis**: Certain attitudes, information and reflection deficiencies promote doping

- **Preconditions of prevention**
  Development of materials for the education of coaches, teachers and young sportsmen

  Readiness and ability for communication

- **Derived duties for prevention**: Transposition of the materials with the following aims:
  - Information
  - Acquisition of reasoning
  - Qualification for independent decision-making
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Research on attitudes towards doping with coaches who work with Young athlètes (n = 46)

Doping in elite sports is a major problem

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>yes</th>
<th>no</th>
<th>n/a</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If we seriously fight doping in Germany we will fall behind in international sports

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>yes</th>
<th>no</th>
<th>n/a</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Battery of questions about legalization/liberalization of doping if control cannot guarantee cleanliness at extreme stresses like Tour de France

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>yes</th>
<th>no</th>
<th>n/a</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is an answer to the doping problem

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>yes</th>
<th>no</th>
<th>n/a</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Here the **high pressure of the problem** becomes obvious!
### Academic attendance

#### Introduction

Research on attitudes towards doping with coaches who work with teenagers (n = 46)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>n/a</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Germany should be a forerunner in fighting doping</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doping bans limit rights of freedom</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doping prevention is reasonable</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Conclusion:

Although the pressure is so high there is still a great interest in fighting doping through prevention. (partly even for such people who are, under certain circumstances, willing to think about the liberalization of doping)
The grand self-delusion of German and international sports consists of among other things two statements:

All world record performances are possible without doping.

In Germany and in the world at the most one percent of the athletes use doping.
The substantial dilemma since the 1970s:

Without asserted effective fight no subsidies from the State or sponsors. (-> hypocrisy)

Classical negative incentive system in Germany: Who effectively takes action against doping (less achievement), will be punished.
Situations of temptation in the course of a top athletes career

- Switching clubs
- Failures
- Severe injuries (« pieces of advice » from doctors, buddies and so on)
- Doping rivals (Equality of chances)
- Fear of « social death » after the end of the career (Bette/Schimank 2000)

Doping becomes a way of coping with difficult situations.
Imagine you are in the final 100m track and field run and your chances of winning and a big advertising contract, fame, acceptance, … are good.

You have never doped yourself your whole life and are now being asked by your coach if you would – just to make sure you win – dope yourself for just this one competition, and never again thereafter.

Would you do it?

☐ yes    ☐ no
What shall I do?

Advantages
- Money and wealth
- Fame and acceptance
- Health

Costs/Risks
- Loss of money from sponsors
- Condemnation by the public
- Physical ruin

In each person (athlete, coach, doctor, researcher) can be an angel (sports without doping) or a devil (cheat)
Prevention

Prevention = repression and prevention

Repression = short time effects
Prevention = long time effects
Double duty
for coaches and functionaries

Encouragement of Performance

Personality: Mature Athlete

In short:
A trainer/functionary is supposed to produce an „all-in-one device suitable for every purpose“!
Ineffective and effective prevention approaches

- Deterrence
- Moralizing instruction
- Allegation of ineffectiveness
- Concealment
- Individualization of the problem
- Enlightenment and information
Deterrence concept

« Doping is health-threatening »
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« Doping is bad – who dopes is mad! »
Allegation of ineffectiveness

« Doping = Placebo! »
Concealment

« Doping – the unsightly, unaudible and unutterable in sports! »
Individualization of the problem
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Präventions ansätze

«Doping-sinner!»
The "passing-the-buck-game" of doping prevention

EU -> Bund

Bund -> Countries (Education)

Countries (Education) -> BzgA

BzgA -> NADA

NADA -> IOC

IOC -> WADA

WADA -> UN
Premises of the Heidelberg approach

1. **Prevention** without finger-wagging

2. **Doping mentality** is no longer only in sports, but within many ranges of the society

3. **Problem awareness** is only present to a small amount likewise the readiness for the execution of measures
The Heidelberg Approach

Reflection – Argumentation – Decision

Two aims:

Doing sports meaningfully and with your body in mind by taking the whole span of life into account.

The mature athlete:
he is informed, can reflect over himself and argue; feels responsible for his decisions
**Multiple layers model**

**Relation-prevention**

1. Layer: Athletes
2. Layer: Club/Environment
3. Layer: Sports unions
4. Layer: State/Society
5. Layer: International Community

**Behavior-prevention**

1. Layer: Athletes

---

Heidelberger Ansatz: Reflektieren Argumentieren Entscheiden
Multiple layers model

- International Network
- Europe-wide congress
- Expert talk 2005
- Congress volume
- DSB/dsj-Project
- ÜL-advanced training
- Material folder
- Doping brochure
- Lectures

**Individual care for athletes**

- „Make kids/athletes mentally strong“

---

1. Layer: Athletes
2. Layer: Club/Environment
3. Layer: Sports unions
4. Layer: State/Society
5. Layer: International Community

---

**Heidelberger Ansatz:**

- Reflektieren
- Argumentieren
- Entscheiden
Prevention can succeed, if ...

... an anti-doping-attitude is being communicated and exemplified through one’s own life in a convincing way

... action is taken on all levels and

... the political will for clean and believable sports is given.
„We have to imagine Sisyphus as a happy man."

Albert Camus

We will never reach the aim of sports without doping, but we have to try it nevertheless
Since 1995/96 research project „Doping im Spitzensport“ at the PH Heidelberg with the focal point „Doping im Westen“ (Andreas Singler/ Gerhard Treutlein)

**Result:**

- **2000/01**: Book publications „Doping im Spitzensport“ and „Doping – von der Analyse zur Prävention“. Interdisciplinary approach: Statistic, historical and sociological analyses were combined into conclusions for the fight against doping out of an educational view.

- Since **2000/01**: various academic publications in anthologies and professional journals; lectures in and out of the country.

- **2004**: „Sport ohne Doping!“ (Arndt/Singler/Treutlein) for the dsj, Austria takes on the brochure.


- **2007**: Media workbook „Sport ohne Doping!“ für die DSJ.

- **Current**: Survey by order of the Deutsche Bundestag regarding „Doping in demokratischen Gesellschaftssystemen“ (Singler/Treutlein).