Journal of Sport History

VOLUME 38, NUMBER 2 SUMMER 2011

Published by
The North American Society for Sport History

Copyright 2011 by the North American Society for Sport History

Editorial Board

Joseph L. Arbena
Clemson University [U.S.]

Douglas Booth
University of Waikato [New Zealand]

Nancy Bouchier
McMaster University

Mike Cronin
Boston College [Ireland]

Caroline Daley
University of Auckland [New Zealand]

Mark Dyreson
Pennsylvania State University [U.S.]

Henning Eichberg
University of Southern Denmark [Denmark]

Sarah K. Fields
Ohio State University [U.S.]

Allen Guttmann
Amherst College [U.S.]

Stephen Hardy
University of New Hampshire [U.S.]

Roy Hay
Deakin University [Australia]

Susanna Hedenborg
Universities of Malmö [Sweden]

Jeffrey Hill
De Montfort University [England]

Colin Howell
Saint Mary's University [Canada]

Mike Huggins
University of Cumbria [England]

Martin Johnes
University of Swansea [Wales]

Arnd Krüger
University of Gottingen [Germany]

Donald G. Kyle
University of Texas at Arlington [U.S.]

Michael E. Lomax
University of Georgia [U.S.]

Malcolm MacLean
University of Gloucestershire [England]

Daniel A. Nathan
Skidmore College [U.S.]

Michael V. Oriard
Oregon State University [U.S.]

Catriona M. Parratt
University of Iowa [U.S.]

Gertrud Pfister
University of Copenhagen [Denmark]

Murray Phillips
University of Queensland [Australia]

Roland Renson
Catholic University Leuven [Belgium]

Steven A. Riess
Northeastern Illinois University [U.S.]

Dave Russell
Leeds Metropolitan University [England]

Thierry Terret
University of Lyon [France]

Martha H. Verbrugge
Bucknell University [U.S.]

Patricia Vertinsky
University of British Columbia [Canada]

Stephen R. Wenn
Wilfrid Laurier University [Canada]

Belinda Wheaton
University of Brighton [England]

Editor
Wray Vamplew
University of Stirling, Scotland and
University of Central Lancashire, England

Associate Editor
Alison M. Wrynn
California State University, Long Beach

Assistant Editors
Jaime Schultz
Pennsylvania State University
Joyce Kay
University of Stirling, Scotland

Book Review Editors
Gerald R. Gems
North Central College
Annette Hofmann
Ludwigsburg University of Education, Germany

Film, Media, and Museum Reviews Editor
Russell Field
University of Manitoba

Dissertation Survey Editor
Thomas M. Hunt
University of Texas at Austin

Technical Editor and Production Manager
Jodella K. Dyreson
Lemont, Pennsylvania

Cover illustration: "At the start: Lemp—the best swimmer in the pentathlon." Hermann Lemp in the foreground (lane 3) representing Germany in the modern pentathlon of the 1936 Olympics. The gold medal victory of Gotthardt Handrick reinforced the image of the modern pentathlon as dominated by the military and of Germany as the dominating military. "Peaceful competition of the soldiers," *Die Woche*, photograph: Scherl, p. 40.

Library of Congress ISSN: 0094-1700

The *Journal of Sport History* is published three times a year in spring, summer, and fall by the North American Society for Sport History. Members of the Society receive a subscription to the *Journal*, a bound copy of the annual conference *Proceedings*, and periodic *Newsletters*. Membership rates for one year are $70 for institutions, $50 for individuals, and $25 for students. Back issues of the *Proceedings* and *Journal* are available for $15 each. Direct all business correspondence to Ronald A. Smith, NASSH Secretary-Treasurer, P.O. Box 1026, Lemont, PA 16851. Please make all remittances payable to the North American Society for Sport History in U.S. currency or its equivalent. Inquiries concerning permission to quote should be addressed to the Editor. Books for review should be forwarded to Gerald R. Gems, Department of Physical Education, North Central College, P.O. Box 3063, Naperville, IL 60566. Questions concerning advertisements should be directed to the Associate Editor. Memberships and subscriptions are for one calendar year.

The *Journal of Sport History* seeks to promote the study of all aspects of the history of sport. We invite the submission of scholarly articles, research notes, documents, and commentary; interview articles and book reviews are assigned by the Editor. Potential contributors are urged to consult recent issues of the *JSH* for examples of the format of these various contributions. It is the policy of the *JSH* not to review for publication a manuscript that is under consideration elsewhere. Unsolicited book reviews are not accepted.

Authors should follow the submission guidelines available on the JSH website: http://www.journalofsporthistory.org. The North American Society for Sport History disclaims responsibility for statements made by contributors, whether of fact or opinion.

Articles appearing in this journal are abstracted and indexed in *Historical Abtracts* and/or *America: History and Life* and are available on-line at Project Muse: http://muse.jhu.edu.

Back issues of the *Journal of Sport History* are located on the LA84 Foundation website: www.LA84Foundation.org.

Contents

Volume 38, Number 2
Summer 2011

Forum *European Sport and the Challenges of Its Recent Historiography*

181 European Sport Historiography: Challenges and Opportunities
Christopher Young, Anke Hilbrenner, and Alan Tomlinson

189 Austrian Sport and the Challenges of Its Recent Historiography
Matthias Marschik

199 Italian Sport and the Challenges of Its Recent Historiography
Simon Martin

211 Spanish Sport and the Challenges of Its Recent Historiography
Andrew McFarland

223 The Contribution of Sport to the Nordic Third Way
Niels Kayser Nielsen and John Bale

Articles

237 Doped Professional and Clean Amateurs: Amaterism's Influence on the Modern Philosophy of Anti-Doping
John Gleaves

255 "A Blond, Broad-shouldered Athlete with Bright Grey-blue Eyes": German Propaganda and Gotthardt Handrick's Victory in Modern Pentathlon at the Nazis' Olympics in 1936
Sandra Heck

[41]Ossi Viita, *Hymyilevä Hannes* (Helsinki: Kustannusosakeyhtiöö, 2003); Antero Raevuori, *Nurmi* (Porvoo, Finland: Werner Söderström, 1997); Thor Gotaas, *Running: A Global History* (London: Reaktion Books, 2009).

[42]Martti Jukola, *Athletics in Finland* (Porvoo, Finland: Söderström, 1932).

[43]Erkki Vettenniemi, *Joutavan Juoksun Jäljillä* (Helsinki: SKS, 2006); idem, *Pohjolan Helleenit* (Helsinki: SKS, 2007).

[44]Lars Werge, *Wilson Kipketer* (Aarhus, Denmark: Klim, 1998).

[45]Björkman, *Banbrytare*, 39.

[46]Hrefa Róbertsdóttir, "Icelandic Societies in the Nineteenth Century: The Founding of Societies before the Advent of Mass Movements," *Scandinavian Journal of History* 13 (1988): 376.

[47]Henning Eichberg, *People of Democracy: Understanding Self-Determinism on the Basis of Body and Movement* (Aarhus, Denmark: Klim, 2004).

[48]Henrik Stenius, *Frivilligt, jämlikt, samfällt: Föreningsväsendets utveckling i Finland* (Helsinki: Svenska Litteratursällskapet i Finland, 2000).

[49]Mats Hellstenius, *Skjutande borgerliga revolutionärer. Skarpskytterörelsen och 1800-talets liberala moderniseringsprojekt* (Malmö, Sweden: Malmö Högskola, 2008).

[50]Henrik Stenius, "Nordic Associational Life in a European and Inter-Nordic Perspective," in *Nordic Associations in European Perspectives*, eds. Risto Alapuro and Henrik Stenius (Helsinki: NOMOS, 2010).

[51]Hans Try, *Foreningsliv i Søgne på 1800-talet* (Øvre Ervik, Norway: Alvheim and Eide, 1992), 87; Olle Sirén, "Föreningsmobilisering i lokalsamhället," *Historisk Tidskrift för Finland* 4 (2004): 457-467.

[52]Róbertsdóttir, "Icelandic Societies in the Nineteenth Century," 371-384.

[53]Miroslav Hroch, *Social Preconditions of National Revival in Europe* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985).

[54]Henrik Stenius, "Nordic Associational Life in a European and Inter-Nordic Perspective," in *Nordic Associations in European Perspectives*, eds. Risto Alapuro and Henrik Stenius (Helsinki: NOMOS, 2010).

[55]Jonas Frykman, "I rörelse: Kropp och modernitet i mellankrigstidens Sverige," *Kulturella perspektiv* 1 (1992): 30.

[56]Jonas Frykman, "Nationella ord och handlingar," in *Försvenskningen av Sverige: Det nationellas förvandlingar*, eds. Billy Ehn, Jonas Frykman, and Orvar Löfgren (Stockholm: Natur och kultur, 1993).

[57]Rune Slagstad, *De nasjonale strateger* (Oslo: Pax 1998), 212; idem, *Sporten: En idehistorisk studie* (Oslo: Pax, 2008); Kayser Nielsen, *Bonde, stat og hjem*.

[58]John Bale, *Towards a Geography of International Sport* (Loughborough, U.K.: Loughborough University, Occasional Paper, 8, Loughborough, 1985).

[59]Hans Aldskogius, ed., *Cultural Life, Recreation and Tourism* (Stockholm: The National Atlas of Sweden, 1993).

[60]Sine Agergaard, "Elite Athletes as Migrants in Danish Women's Handball," *International Review for the Society of Sport* 43 (2008): 5-19.

[61]Hans Bonde, *Gymnastics and Politics: Niels Bukh and Male Aesthetics* (Copenhagen: Museum Tusculanum Press, 2006).

[62]David Ley, "Cultural/Humanistic Geography," *Progress in Human Geography* 9 (1985): 415-423.

[63]John Bale, "Deviance, Doping and Denmark in Knud Lundberg's *The Olympic Hope*," *Sport in History* 29 (2009): 190-211; Ask Vest Christiansen, "The Re-enchantment of the World: The Relationship between Sport and Aesthetics Illustrated by Two Classic Cycling Films," *Sport in History* 29 (2009): 49-68.

[64]Martti Silvennoinen, "The Many Levels of Sports Narration," *Historical Social Research* 32 (2006): 230-244.

Doped Professionals and Clean Amateurs: Amateurism's Influence on the Modern Philosophy of Anti-Doping

JOHN GLEAVES†
Department of Kinesiology
The California State University at Fullerton

In the wake of Knud Enemark Jensen's drug-related death in 1960, the sporting world expressed shock that an amateur athlete would dope. For many, such an action directly contradicted amateur ideals. Yet historians heretofore have yet to examine the intellectual development of such anti-doping ideology. Following is an intellectual history of the early development of anti-doping, an ideology that emerged bound to the gospel of amateurism. Indeed, amateurism provided the intellectual soil in which anti-doping attitudes germinated. As the search for performance-enhancing substances increased near the end of the nineteenth century, many amateur athletes showed no moral qualms with doping. Over time, however, advocates of amateurism—consisting of various segments of middle- and upper-class society—used anti-doping to reaffirm middle-class values and

†Correspondence to jgleaves@fullerton.edu. This paper is a revised version of that which won the North American Society for Sport History Graduate Student Essay Award for 2010. The author thanks Mark Dyreson for all of his support and guidance, Matthew Llewellyn for his many constructive conversations and advice, the anonymous reviewers for their constructive criticism, and the editorial team for their assistance.

marginalize the accomplishments of working-class professional athletes. Through amateurism, individuals and sporting communities turned doping from a tacitly tolerated practice to one that contradicted the spirit of sport and constituted a serious threat to sport's moral integrity.

"Many pros are drugged, of course, but we don't drug amateurs."
French Olympic cycling team coach, Robert Oubron, following Knud Jensen's death at the 1960 Rome Olympics.[1]

Many historians of sport consider the response by the International Olympic Committee (IOC) to Knud Jensen's drug-related death at the 1960 Rome Olympic games the starting point for the modern anti-doping movement.[2] They argue that the administration by Jensen's trainer of the vasodilator Roniacol before the tragic race led the IOC to begin formalizing their anti-doping policies and testing athletes.[3] Historian Paul Dimeo has gone so far as to argue that the period from Jensen's death through the 1970s "set the foundation and the basic principles for anti-doping within which anti-doping has continued to operate."[4] According to this narrative, the basic principles that governed the IOC's response to not only amphetamines and the first generation of pharmacological performance enhancers but to subsequent performance enhancers such as steroids, blood doping, and even potential genetic enhancements emerged following Jensen's Olympic demise.

While most historians have concluded that Jensen's death in 1960 initiated the modern anti-doping movement, scholars heretofore have not paid enough attention to the gradual establishment of anti-doping ideology prior to Jensen's demise.[5] For instance, in 1938, the IOC established a rule that prohibited doping by Olympic athletes. Ten years before that, the International Amateur Athletic Federation (IAAF) had written that any athlete who doped faced a potential lifetime ban from track and field.[6] In fact, contemporaneous to the birth of the modern Olympic games in the 1890s, editorials emerged espousing anti-doping attitudes that would resonate with today's doping critics. This nascent anti-doping philosophy, a philosophy that blossomed after Jensen's death and that continues to flourish today, emerged fundamentally bound to the middle- and upper-class gospel of amateurism that suffused the early modern Olympics and much of modern sport. Indeed, the classist ideology of amateurism provided the soil in which the anti-doping attitudes originally germinated.

What follows is not a history of doping or performance enhancement but a history of the development of the anti-doping ideology. Unfortunately, what doping meant to the actual athletes, coaches, officials, sportswriters, fans, and other enthusiasts who participated in sport as the anti-doping ideology emerged is largely obscured. Instead, the rhetoric that emerged from the universe in which these people lived serves to indicate larger social trends. Thus claims about what the doping of athletes meant to the general public—and what influenced these peoples' attitudes—remains tentative. This is complicated even more by the fact that sport was never monolithic, but a diverse—and at times self-contradictory—amalgamation of peoples, geographies, leagues, and cultures. The working-class, Francophone culture of professional cycling differs greatly from the gentlemen cricketers frequenting the oval. Yet all sports in their reactions to doping reveal something about how contemporary anti-doping attitudes emerged. Understanding how and why the often heterogeneous sporting world came to universally prohibit doping reveals much about the intellectual history of anti-doping.

As the anti-doping ideology emerges over the twentieth century, it can appear quite different than today's more established bureaucratic definitions. Although advocates of anti-doping have always believed that performance-enhancing drugs conflict with sport and that athletes should abstain from such substances, prior to the 1960s they had no formalized definition of doping guiding them. For historians of sport, the absences of codified definitions present only one problem. A second problem emerges with the substances athletes initially used to enhance their athletic performance. These "stimulants" included strychnine, alcohol, tobacco, and purified oxygen, substances that today's sport scientists would hardly consider beneficial.[7] Despite their often deleterious effects, athletes took such substances fully intending to perform better. For example, in a 1907 marathon held in Chicago the runner John Lindquist decided with his trainer to use whiskey as a stimulant during the race. A *New York Times* article reported that Lindquist's trainer administered "the drug to him nearly every mile." Amazingly, Lindquist led the twenty-five-mile-race with only a mile to go when he collapsed from "too much whiskey, taken as a stimulant during the race." Even more amazingly, the article quoted an unknown physiological chemist as saying the real value of whiskey comes "in the last mile or so of a race . . . when a man is overtired, a single drink will help him continue his work."[8]

Thus when examining doping generally in the first half century, historians should consider two important cultural dimensions. First, they should examine whether the athlete took a substance intending to improve his performance or whether a coach or scientist intended to improve an athlete's performance by prescribing the substance. In this instance, what matters is the intent to enhance performance. Intent, rather than effect, is important since many substances may not have actually improved performances. Second, historians should consider the general public's perception of the substance's potential ergogenic effects. Unlike idiosyncratic performance enhancers such as a favorite breakfast or a lucky charm, it is important that others around the athlete perceived that using such a substance may have the intended effect of improving performance. These two simple criteria help historians understand the cultural context for defining doping in the periods prior to any organizational or formal definition and in an era when performance-enhancing substances remained young and experimental.

The Influence of Victorian Values and Amateur Ideals

While defining doping appears quite complex, the concept of amateurism remains even more challenging for historians. This is mostly because no single fixed concept of amateurism ever existed for all sports. Definitions of amateurism varied significantly depending on location, sport, and even time period.[9] Initially, historian Mike Huggins explains, the British first used the term amateur as "a synonym for an upper-class patron or sporting enthusiast (whether or not earning money from sport)."[10] Unsurprisingly, the

aspiring middle classes gradually appropriated this word over the course of the nineteenth century, apparently hoping to enjoy its upper-class glean while also preventing working-class individuals from joining their "social betters."

As amateurism made its way into the sporting rules, different organizations and clubs defined the word differently. Often these organizations would define amateurism according to their needs and situations. For example, the prohibitive "mechanics-clause" from the British Amateur Rowing Association, or ARA, defined an amateur as a rower who had not only never competed for pay but had never been "employed in or about boats for money or wages;" in the nineteenth century this excluded anyone who "had been by trade or employment for wages, a mechanic, artisan or labourer."[11] At the same time, however, the British Amateur Yachting Association permitted professional crews to compete in amateur events as long as the captain remained an amateur.[12] Amateur cricketers accepted nominal employment with their respected clubs, earned the gate receipts from testimonials, and (under the table) received "broken-time payments" as compensation for their play.[13] Such discrepancies make finding one single definition next to impossible.

However, historians have noted some basic "family resemblances" regarding amateurism that make it possible to discuss the term generally. In the British Empire, the ideology of amateurism "accompanied by snobbishness, hypocrisy and double standards," Huggins writes, "became emblematic of class."[14] As the working class gained greater economic mobility thus impinging on previously defined status classes, amateurism served as a legitimating ideology for excluding the lower classes from play and a ploy by the middle classes to maintain their control on sport. Huggins explains that "amateurism became a question of power, of ensuring the middle-class control, a way of keeping working-class players in their place or keeping them out. Working-class players threatened middle-class playing pre-eminence. Professionals, or those working in the mines, factories or other relevant physical jobs, had better strength and skills and outclassed those working in sedentary ways during the week."[15]

While members of the upper class participated in amateur sport, the middle classes comprised the bulk of amateurism's passionate advocates and the source of much of amateurism's ideological values.[16] For those segments of the middle class who adopted amateurism, participation in amateur sport allowed them to emulate the upper classes through their behavior on the sports field.[17] It attached itself neatly to belief in the value of sport as an instrument for character building and instilling British Public School morality.[18]

In terms of social status, those who embraced amateurism linked themselves to the more powerful status groups in society. In nineteenth-century Britain, an aspiring middle-class doctor would never jeopardize his social status by becoming a professional athlete. For example, cricketing legend William Gilbert Grace maintained his amateur status by keeping up the appearance of being a practicing physician despite his professional approach to the game.[19] Had Grace elected to play as a professional, this decision would have relegated him to the social status of the working class, a group that Grace would not have likely wished to join despite any monetary benefit.

Underneath much of amateurism's rejection of payment, however, existed class conflict. The amateur code established by the middle and upper classes served to exclude members of the working class from high-level competition with their social "betters." The

amateur code's rejection of compensation meant that only the upper and middle classes could afford the cost of self-supported leisure activities. As historian Richard Holt points out, the history of rugby illustrates how amateurism centered on class exclusivity since the Rugby Football Union and the Northern Union split not over rules per se, but, as Holt reveals, "over a refusal by the authorities to allow northern working-class players to have the leisure to compete on the same basis as the sons of the liberal professions and the landed."[20] Historian Tony Collins has subsequently further illustrated the degree that class drove rugby's split.[21] The historian Norman Baker reaffirms these specific cases generally in amateurism's rise in Britain arguing that "the gentleman of the professions did not wish to compete with professional athletes from the lower classes, whether from fear of defeat or aversion to physical contact."[22] Anti-doping rules predicated on amateurism's ideals would simply become another tool for excluding or otherwise marginalizing working-class professionals.

Beyond Britain, the elite and middle-class leader of the modern Olympic movement at least tacitly embraced the amateur ideals, if only in order to further the appeal of the games with the British.[23] Eventually the IOC codified their definition of amateurism, defining the amateur athlete as "one who participates and always has participated in sport solely for pleasure and for physical, mental or social benefits he derives there from, and to whom participation in sport is nothing *more* than recreation without material gain of any kind, direct or indirect."[24] Such a definition reified without explicitly stating that the Olympic games remained closed to some segments of society. However, to the dismay of many "apostles of amateurism," the IOC selectively choose to enforce amateur sporting norms and permitted professional-type sports like association football, cycling, and the marathon.

In the less class-oriented United States, amateurism gained support but never widespread public devotion among the middle and upper classes. In the elite Ivy League universities, adopting Oxbridge-style amateurism permitted the schools to associate themselves with the more prestigious British institutions.[25] The amateur ideology never ran deep, however, and the Americans often faced criticism for their professional training techniques and use of professional coaches, something anathema to amateurism's true believers.

While amateurism changed, the concept of professional athletes remained relatively stable. A professional was anyone who *would* play for money. Thus in sports such as association football, pedestrianism, and cycling even those athletes who competed in the Olympic games never were, in the eyes of many apostles of amateurism, truly amateur athletes as they always aspired to enter the professional ranks. For them, a successful amateur career was a means to a lucrative professional contract. A true believer raised with the values of amateurism, on the other hand, ruled out becoming a professional athlete since the significant drop in social status outweighed the amount of money one could make playing professionally. In Victorian Britain, money gained by any trade—whether sport or manual labor—had lower status.[26] Professional athletes—who associated sport with no higher purpose—competed instead for cash prizes or, for the lucky few, a steady income.

The development of the amateur ideal and the character of amateur sport created a culture that differed greatly from professional sport. The attainment of the title "gentleman amateur" was never open to working-class professional athletes, even before they

accepted payment for sport. The moral code of the professionals directly conflicted with the Victorian values that influenced the amateur code and which defined amateurism as the most prized form of athletics. This cultural divide came to define not just how individuals played the sport, but, in the case of doping (historian John Hoberman argues), created "a cultural apartheid" throughout sport that "separated drug-free amateurs from professional athletes, whose right to use drugs was taken for granted."[27] With this division, Hoberman explains, "the professional athletes enjoyed a tacit exemption from the ethical standards that applied to amateurs."[28] The professional athlete who came from the working class and competed to earn a living could acceptably use drugs to do his job more effectively since, for him the social status associated with being an amateur was never available. Doping, as will become apparent, simply became one more way for middle-class groups to limit the status of working-class athletes by marginalizing the accomplishments of those who did not conform to the middle-class amateur ideals.

The Early Days of Performance Enhancement: 1860-1903

While a "cultural apartheid" eventually separated professionals and amateurs, when stimulants first entered into modern sports both professional and amateur athletes experimented with various substances. In the world of professional sports, many athletes experimented with doping substances. In the 1880s and 1890s, professional cycling trainer James "Choppy" Warburton openly doped his riders, although some have questioned whether the substance used actually amounted to more than sugar water.[29] Reports also indicated professional pedestrians and prize fighters doping during competition.[30] By 1903 the public's expectation that professional athletes put on a good show increased to the point that, in one case, a reporter openly lamented the lack of doping when fatigue slowed the riders at a six-day cycling race at New York City's Madison Square Garden. The author admitted that, although the riders did drink champagne, none of the athletes used drugs "although some of them seemed sadly in need of stimulants."[31] In fact, most often professional athletes used stimulants not just as a means to victory but as a way to overcome the grinding fatigue of a pay-for-play profession. According to some news reports, for six-day cyclists "the use of stimulating drugs was only resorted to in the final stages of the struggle."[32] In the era of smaller contracts, athletes needed to perform more often to eke out even modest incomes, and the physical toll of such racing often meant the athletes used drugs to combat fatigue rather than gain an edge.

In the world of amateur sport, evidence indicates that a universal rejection of stimulants did not exist in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. An editorial column in *The Times* describes an 1860 resolution from the Oxford rowing team stating that it would pay for the champagne it deemed necessary for the athletes' training, standard practice in an area that considered alcohol an athletic stimulant.[33] In 1895, physicians studying the benefits of the African kola nut recorded positive accounts from mountain climbers who used the stimulant when overtaxed on their climbs.[34] The Cambridge University graduate and amateur tennis champion Eustace White explained in 1901 that "alcohol does have certain advantages for modern athletic conditions." White believed that when a player felt tired near the end of a tennis match and needed ten more minutes of good play, "he takes a glass of brandy; he keeps up for ten minutes longer; he wins."[35] A person considered at that time to be a clear amateur, White's attitude towards stimulants and winning

indicated that he did not see stimulants conflicting with the values of amateur sport. Moreover, White reveals other amateur athletes used alcohol for training purposes. To ward off "staleness," White explains, the Cambridge crew would take a glass of port following training and a beer at midday.[36]

Although amateur and professional distinctions clearly existed, in neither did participants or organizations show clear moral disapproval. Yet that does not mean everyone approved of that practice. An 1895 *New York Times* article fretted over the "extraordinary interest and widespread indulgence" in doping. The article argued that no "true athletes" would use "any such injurious and adventitious aids," despite the fact that professional athletes could use such drugs "in order to help them prepare for their work."[37] For this author, a professional athlete was quite different from a "true" athlete, and a "true" athlete never doped so as to perform better. Although professionals turned towards stimulants, those who played sport for the "right" reasons should not dope according to defenders of the amateur code. Such a sentiment emerged again in an 1899 article entitled "The Greatest Athlete That Ever Lived." The author praised "the foremost of American athletes" and "a model amateur," William B. Curtis, for abstaining from stimulants and maintaining the pure lifestyle of an amateur athlete.[38] The article portrays Curtis as an athlete who earned his athletic success the right way, by avoiding stimulants and the professional lifestyle. At collegiate level, both the Harvard and Yale crew officials made a similar point in 1900 by forbidding their athletes from using stimulants during the season.[39]

However, not all of the voices in amateur circles opposed stimulants in sports. In an extended article on the African kola nut for *Medical and Surgical Reporter*, Dr. William Pierce "highly recommended" the stimulant for athletic training. Pierce explains that the kola nut's ergogenic effect "was notably demonstrated last autumn in several prominent foot-ball contests, and in the recent athletic games between our representative athletes and those of England" and resulted in "a long line of world-record breaking victories for our boys."[40] Using the kola nut to improve sporting performances appeared to present no moral objections and no effort existed to hide its use. This indicates that the later universal opposition to doping in amateur circles did not yet exist. At this point, however, for athletes of this era—both professional and amateur—the ethics of using performance-enhancing substances remained murky. Some objected to stimulants, arguing that "true" athletes abstained from such substances. However, it appears that some athletes hoped—even those in the amateur ranks—for a performance benefit from such substances and thus turned to an increasing array of stimulants. The number of athletes using them appears to have increased during this period, which indicates only a limited initial aversion to stimulants.[41] Users came from various social classes and backgrounds while stimulants appeared in a variety of sports.[42] Significantly, through the end of the nineteenth century, the objections to these substances appealed to images of the "true" athlete, an idealized notion based upon archetypal characteristics of the "gentleman amateur," laying a foundation for the anti-doping ideology.

Amateurism Slowly Takes Hold: 1904-1924

Over the course of two decades, anti-doping views solidified around the ideology of amateurism and rapidly took the form that they would keep well into the modern era of

anti-doping. While the image of the "gentleman amateur" occasionally did appear in the nineteenth-century doping debates, over the first quarter of the twentieth century this notion would influence the amateur world to a much greater degree as it gradually concluded that stimulants and other artificial forms of enhancement contradicted the spirit of amateur sport. In this period, those opposed to doping would first use rhetoric derived from amateurism to argue that stimulants were "unsporting" and not part of the "spirit of sport" while at the same time stimulants became even more acceptable for athletes participating in professional sports such as six-day track-cycling, pedestrianism, and association football.

Illustrating this point, the stories of the 1904 and 1908 Olympic marathons reveal much about cultural attitudes towards doping at the start of the twentieth century. In both of these cases, prominent athletes openly used stimulants throughout the race without significant protest. During the dusty 1904 St. Louis marathon, Thomas Hicks used a combination of strychnine, egg whites, and brandy without anyone voicing concern over Hick's immoral or deviant behavior. Four years later while leading the 1908 Olympic marathon, the Italian marathoner, Dorando Pietri stumbled and struggled towards the finish line.[43] Newspaper reports document how, in order to assist the brave runner, doctors administered stimulants three times.[44] Moreover, written testimony from one of the track officials who assisted Pietri, Maxwell Andrews, reported that a Dr. Bulger had witnessed Pietri take "a dope of strychnine and atropia" during the race.[45] Although later disqualified because of the track officials' assistance, no one cried foul over Pietri's very public use of stimulants during the race while modern Olympic games founder, Baron Pierre de Coubertin, praised the dope-using Pietri as the "moral winner of the competition."[46]

At first glance, Hicks's and Pietri's stories may appear similar to other instances of amateur athletes experimenting with drugs. However, a complex web of cultural and class distinctions affected the public's perception of the two athletes and their doping. For the most part, members of the IOC viewed the marathon, as well as cycling and association football, as professional sports. Although Coubertin, as IOC president, introduced the marathon into the games, neither he nor his successor Count Henri de Baillet Latour ever became "true believers" in the gospel of amateurism—unlike future IOC president Avery Brundage—and thus, unlike the British, remained largely untroubled by the professional nature of certain events like the marathon or association football.[47] Most likely, the use of stimulants by Hicks and Pietri in the marathon raised little concern for the anti-doping advocates since neither of these athletes qualified as true "gentleman amateurs" and fell outside the moral code of amateur sport. Moreover, given the strenuous and time-consuming nature of the marathon, the event itself always carried professional overtones for some of the more ardent amateur ideologues. While prior to their Olympic races neither Hicks nor Pietri had competed for pay or raced against professionals, most of the general public understood that these types of athletes intended to turn professional if the opportunity arose and that the values of amateurism never truly applied to the two runners.[48]

This is further evidenced by the debate over the acceptability of an unsuspecting stimulant—the use of purified oxygen. In 1908, the same year as Pietri's marathon, advocates of amateurism began questioning both the benefits and the ethics of using oxygen in sport. A pioneering researcher on the use of oxygen in sport and a professor of physiology at the London Hospital, Leonard Hill, argued that with "the use of oxygen it will be possible to break the world's athletic records and to improve sports in general," and that "its use can only do good to the athlete."[49] In 1908, Hill administered oxygen to runners prior to both a three-mile race and a quarter-mile race while announcing that he sought to reproduce the experiment next with world record holders.[50] Others tried doping with oxygen as well. In a letter to the editor of *The Times* entitled "'Doping' of Athletes," J.D. Casswell describes the amateur Oxford University crew experimenting with oxygen in 1908, eventually concluding that it helped their rowers perform better.[51]

That same year, the *New York Times* reported that the University of Chicago's American football team intended to use oxygen during their matches.[52] The article reports that the university's famed football coach, Dr. Amos Alonzo Stagg, had traveled to London over the summer to observe Hill's experiments with oxygen and intended to use the stimulant "to aid Chicago's football men in making touchdowns this [f]all." Stagg's plan was controversial, however, and the article addressed the ethical issues surrounding what it called "oxygen doping." The author responded to critics, pointing out that "it is unfair to call it 'dope,'" given oxygen's "harmlessness as a stimulant." The article portrayed oxygen as only "a supply of pure air." Moreover, just because of the simple fact that oxygen enhanced the athlete's prowess, the article contended, "its use cannot be barred from the track and football field." The author suspected that soon "the public or secret administration of oxygen to athletes may become the rule hereafter in all intercollegiate and professional contests."[53]

The next year, an even more contentious debate over oxygen consumed the sport of long distance swimming. Jabez Wolffe, a British swimmer who took part in the highly competitive quest to swim the English Channel received doses of extra oxygen during one of his attempts. Wolffe's rival, Montague Holbein, denounced Wolffe's use of oxygen as "unsportsmanlike." The British aristocrat and amateur sportsman Lord Lonsdale supported Holbein's objection and argued that "the use of oxygen is unsportsmanlike and un-English."[54] Others agreed with Lonsdale's assessment that using oxygen to enhance athletic performance violated the amateur code. A 1909 article in the *Duluth Times* called oxygen an artificial stimulant and asserted that its use in running and swimming would be unnatural and thus ought not to be part of sport.[55]

Not everyone viewed oxygen doping negatively. In the realm of professional sports, an article in the *New York Times* called a prize fighter's use of oxygen "the very latest scientific aid" and praised the boxer's ability to rise to the occasion by breathing oxygen in between rounds of the fight.[56] In a 1910 article exploring the effects of exercise on the human body, New York Polyclinic professor Dr. Woods Hutchinson praised oxygen's benefits. After witnessing runners using oxygen, Woods explained that "the results were most gratifying; the exhausted and gasping runner, inhaling pure oxygen gas for two or three minutes, would rise and bound forward again, apparently almost as fresh as when he started." So great was the use of oxygen in sport that Woods believed "in the future the exhausted and perspiring athlete may walk into the club house to call for an oxygen fizz instead of a Scotch highball."[57]

The fact that in the 1910s and 1920s professional athletes could acceptably dope illustrates that amateurism remained the driving force behind the early anti-doping movement. Among members of the working class, few appear to have objected to athletes taking stimulants to enhance their performance. In the professional sport of cycling, athletes openly used drugs in both the grueling one-day races and the grand tour races such as the Tour de France. Throughout the six-day track racing's heyday, newspaper reports frequently discussed the cyclists using stimulants.[58] These were professional athletes and, with great sums of money on the line, they were expected to take stimulants when, as one newspaper explained, they "had not come up to expectations."[59]

Reflected in such sentiments, the general public's standards for turn-of-the-century professional athletes, then, was different than the middle-class standards applied to amateur sport since generally the public viewed professional sport as an acceptable livelihood for the working-class professional athletes to whom amateur sport was never open. Doping simply reflected this class divide since stimulants, for professional athletes, became another tool to aid in plying their journeyman trade and, for middle- and upper-class supporters of amateurism, a reaffirmation of their class superiority over their athletic betters.

Despite amateurism's growing aversion to doping, some amateurs continued to use stimulants. In 1910, an editorial for the *New York Times* warned young athletes against over-indulging in alcohol or tobacco, although the editor conceded that "a man under severe training needs a little stimulant now and then, especially during a severe bout of training."[60] In 1911, the Cornell rowing coach showed his aversion to doping when he denied doping the Cornell rowers. He admitted, however, that he believed the "football men and track men were drugged before important contests."[61] Thus even though some athletes could dope, the view existed that doping was not acceptable.

Sport Organizations Get Serious: 1925-1938

Over the course of the 1920s, the belief among advocates of amateurism that such practices contradicted the spirit of sport had solidified enough that, in 1928, the leading governing body of amateur track and field, the IAAF, became the first international sporting federation to formally ban their athletes from doping in competition. That year the IAAF included in their *Handbook* the following declaration:

> Doping is the use of any stimulant not normally employed to increase the power of action in athletic competition above the average. Any person knowingly acting or assisting as explained above shall be excluded from any place where these rules are in force or, if he is a competitor, be suspended for a time or otherwise from further participation in amateur athletics under the jurisdiction of this Federation.[62]

While it remains unclear how the IAAF would have enforced such a rule—or even how they would determine what substances count as normal—the IAAF's choice to prohibit doping indicates a growing acceptance of anti-doping ideology among amateur organizations. The IAAF had translated tacit ideology into bureaucracy. This formalization marks the increase in anti-doping hegemony and its institutionalized support that existed first in amateur sporting organizations.

Others began trumpeting the call against doping in amateur sport as well. In an effort to critique what he believed to be widespread use of strychnine in amateur sports, in 1929

the director of health education for the State of New York, Dr. Frederic Rand Rogers, argued that using stimulants conflicted with the value of "play for play's sake."[63] While it is unclear if Rogers is directly addressing a growing problem or simply playing to growing societal concerns over doping, his appeal to middle-class amateur values indicates where the lines are drawn.

Amateurism's hold as a middle-class sporting ideal began to be one of the primary reasons for rejecting. One of the most telling debates over doping in this period arose following the use of oxygen at the 1932 Los Angeles summer Olympics. At the 1932 games, the Japanese men surprisingly trounced their American counterparts in the swimming events, winning gold in five of the six races. No one from the United States anticipated the talent of the Japanese swimmers. Following the games, two swim coaches from the United States, Matt Mann and Robert Kiphuth, formed a National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA) subcommittee to investigate the Japanese swimmers using oxygen prior to their events. Despite claims from physiologists contradicting the belief that oxygen consumption before a swimming event would have had any performance-enhancing effect, Mann adamantly denounced the actions of the Japanese men as doping and thus not something that should take place at an Olympic games with amateur athletes. Mann declared a "'war against doping' of amateur swimmers, 'such as was done by the Japanese in the 1932 Olympic Games.'" Moreover, Mann announced that he sought rules "to forestall the danger of the practice spreading in this country." Although, like others, Mann acknowledged the practice's safety, he concluded that it "was unethical, regardless of harmful effects."[64]

Mann's accusations of doping and his claim that doping amateur swimmers with oxygen was unethical, regardless of health effects, was rooted not in any spirit of sport argument or sense of fairness but a desire to delegitimize the performance of the Japanese. Mann's nationalist criticism would not have resonated with newspaper reporters nor the general public, nor would Mann have even offered it as criticism unless he believed others would be persuaded by the claim that doping contradicted amateur values. The fact that Mann did use the accusation as a criticism of the Japanese indicates that he believed such criticism would resonate with a broader audience—an audience who also perceived doping as un-amateur. More important than its rational basis, Mann's accusations indicate that at least he believed in the general existence of a climate that viewed doping as un-amateur and that advocates of amateurism may have already tacitly internalized anti-doping attitudes as early as 1933.

Indeed, the IOC's actions just five years later indicate that anti-doping sentiment had begun solidifying within their ranks. Although Mann's crusade against doping produced no tangible results, in 1938, the IOC formally declared that "the use of drugs or artificial stimulants of any kind must be condemned most strongly, and everyone who accepts or offers dope, no matter in what form, should not be allowed to participate in amateur meetings or in the Olympic games."[65] Although foreshadowed by Mann's accusations, this statement reveals that enough agreement existed among the members of the IOC that doping conflicted with amateurism that they would formally threaten any athlete who doped with suspension from the Olympic games.[66] However, as Dimeo has asserted, this statement by the IOC carried little weight and likely did not indicate a serious effort on

the part of the IOC to prevent doping. Dimeo explains:

> The IOC must have been aware of drug taking but failed to offer a discussion, definition, set of penalties, or any indication of how this ruling might be policed. Moreover, the idea that all amateur meetings came under the remit of the IOC was clearly not going to sit easily with the national governing bodies in specific countries who felt they were in charge. Without a process of consultation, this statement was never going to be taken seriously.[67]

Dimeo, however, ignores the IOC's central point. Clearly, by 1938, the IOC believed that doping did not belong in either the Olympics or any amateur sport. That the IOC formalized this belief in writing shows some degree of consensus. Moreover, since the next Olympics would not occur for another decade, it becomes difficult to conclude what effects the IOC's anti-doping rule would have had. Nonetheless, that the IOC specifically introduced formal language prohibiting doping in Olympic and amateur competition indicates that anti-doping attitudes had begun solidifying in amateur sport.

Creating the Modern Discourse of Doping: 1939-1959

By the close of the 1930s, many now accepted the idea that stimulants could improve performance and that such enhancement could present ethical problems at least for amateurs. Spurred on by the Second World War and advances in pharmacology, athletes witnessed the mass production of a new generation of drugs—drugs that actually worked much better than the doping substances used by earlier generations of athletes. These drugs included the amphetamine Benzedrine along with synthesized testosterone and eventually anabolic steroids. Not only could these drugs far more drastically improve performance than previous stimulants, they appeared far more dangerous.[68]

The 1948 games possibly witnessed the first modern doping scandal, if on a rather modest scale. Given the interruption of World War II, the 1948 London Olympic games would be the first to take place under the IOC's new anti-doping statement. Although the IOC caught no athletes doping during the 1948 games, this did not stop the rumors and allegations that some athletes had cheated by taking dope—not unlike future Olympic games. The chief source of the allegations, Dr. Christopher Woodard, was a thirty-four-year-old physician and an official medical adviser to the British Olympic team at the games. According to Woodard, he "became suspicious that some competitors were receiving artificial stimulants at the Olympic games." While Woodard "exonerated all British and American athletes," he explained that "some continental European athletes during the summer Olympic games were stimulated by drugs, much in the manner of race horses." When asked why an athlete should not take drugs, Woodard responded that "nothing whatever justifies it." For Woodard, *how* an athlete won mattered more than *that* an athlete won, and doping was not how an athlete should win.[69]

When, four years after Woodard's allegations of doping, Dr. Karl Evang, Norway's director general of public health, stood before the first session of the international conference on sports and health in 1952 and explained that "the use of dope . . . in the amateur sports world, needs very strong and united counter-action," he was playing on the fear that the amateur sports world was not maintaining one of the key distinctions between it and the realm/world of professional athletes.[70] When allegations of amateur doping emerged later that year following the many record-breaking performances at the Helsinki Olympic games, American physiologist Dr. Arthur Steinhaus argued that "medical study, not 'doping,' has helped athletes." Concerning doping, Steinhaus expressed the belief that "there's no place for that kind of stuff in athletics."[71]

However, a handful of voices in the postwar era publicly rejected the idea that doping inherently contradicted the principles of amateur sport. For example, Professor Peter Karpovich, one of the founding members of the American College of Sports Medicine and an expert on the subject of drugs in sports, rejected the anti-doping criticism and argued that "any substance that improves performance without risking health cannot be considered unethical."[72] Across the Atlantic, Adolphe Abrahams, the founding president of the British Association of Sport and Medicine, a former amateur athlete at Cambridge, and the brother of *Chariots of Fire* legend and 1924 British gold medalist Harold Abrahams, repeated Karpovich's sentiments and scoffed at the idea that that using stimulants somehow represented unsporting behavior.[73]

In professional sports, a liberal view of doping remained throughout the 1950s. The general attitude towards doping that existed among professional athletes remained rooted in their perception of sport as a profession and of themselves as journeymen or artisan workers plying their trade. These men continued to reject the notion of participating in sport for some higher purpose. In 1954, the secretary of the British professional "Football League," Fred Howarth, explained that "there is nothing illegal in the use of oxygen as a distributor of energy. Stimulants are not forbidden; commonsense condemns all excesses just as it has maintained within reasonable limits the glandular treatments given to footballers."[74] In professional association football, stimulants in general posed little concern since professional athletes were assumed to have enough experience with the drugs to limit their harm. Falling outside the umbrella of amateurism, professional athletes appeared more willing to use stimulants during athletic competition and the supporters of professional sports—mostly working classes—did not raise serious objections.

Amateur sporting organizations throughout the 1950s continued to internalize middle-class values, values that disdained professional sport and its use of stimulants. The case of the quest to break the four-minute barrier in the mile exemplifies this point. At the American Medical Association's annual meeting in 1957, three years after Britain's Roger Bannister had first broken the barrier, Dr. Herbert Berger suggested that some of the twelve runners who had run sub-four-minute miles had done so by using amphetamines.[75] Berger included the highly praised amateur Bannister in his accusations. Responding to Berger's allegations, Bannister claimed "to have heard nothing about the use of stimulants," a dubious assertion historian John Hoberman points out considering Bannister's medical training and the prevalence of amphetamines in British society.[76] Although Bannister's claim of ignorance over amphetamines remains slightly suspect, he clearly understood that accusations of amphetamine use in his record-breaking run diminished the status of his accomplishments. The other accused runners quickly joined Banister in denying Berger's allegations. Australian milers Merv Lincoln and John Landy went so far as to claim that they "had not taken so much as an aspirin."[77] For all of these men, accusations of doping essentially meant that they had not achieved their success in any significant manner. Their status as amateur athletes rested on the perception that they had achieved their success "clean" and without the use of any artificial aids.

Thus in the 1950s, middle-class attitudes towards stimulants in particular and drugs in general dominated the sporting scene. The professional athletes—increasingly rising in social prestige—found that their own sporting organizations and fans tolerated doping. Yet changing social forces in sport and changing societal views of drugs would not allow this détente to persist. Indeed, the amateur belief embodied by Bannister that any record or sporting accomplishment achieved through use of an artificial aid or stimulant somehow "did not count" became a cornerstone of the anti-doping movement, an anti-doping movement that would expand beyond amateur sport as middle-class values came to dominate elite sport.

Epilogue: Jensen and the Emergence of the Modern Anti-Doping Philosophy: 1960-1970

With Jensen's death, a wave of information regarding drug use in elite sport emerged.[78] Yet by that point, an ideology existed that allowed the IOC to marginalize Jensen. By asserting that doping did not belong in amateur sport, the sporting world reassured itself and the middle-class consumers of Olympic sport that Jensen's death was not a natural consequence of elite sport but a deviance from amateur values.[79] Thus the day following Jensen's demise, newspapers recorded the French Olympic cycling team coach, Robert Oubron, expressing his surprise that someone had violated the established code, explaining that in France, "many pros are drugged, of course, but we don't drug amateurs."[80] In a *New York Times* article published at the same time, Dr. Albert Hyman, the past president of the American College of Sports Medicine, expressed the belief that doping perverted pure, amateur sport but that for the professional athlete, who "has a job to do which may be his sole livelihood; under such conditions it is an accepted fact that he may employ any means which will permit him to achieve his best performance."[81] These sentiments—and the assumption that such sentiments would resonate with the general public—were the product of the gradual rejection of doping in amateur sport. Thus the response to Jensen's death had been set in motion long before Jensen ever climbed on a bicycle.

Although initially the sporting world tolerated doping as amateur athletes experimented with new substances, over time the apostles of amateurism used anti-doping ideology to marginalize working-class professionals. This anti-doping ideology tied into developing middle-class values and found support in organizations such as the IOC and the NCAA. Today such values continue in the IOC-funded World Anti-Doping Agency, or WADA, which still reflects amateurism's influence on current anti-doping policies by arguing that doping contradicts "the spirit of sport."[82]

The ideological underpinnings of today's anti-doping rhetoric point to a fundamental tension that exists in contemporary sport today. At the very same time that amateurism is for all intents and purposes extinct in the twenty-first century, anti-doping attitudes appear more entrenched than ever. Openly professional athletes now reign yet must compete under a strict anti-doping code rooted in an unfamiliar set of sporting values. Perhaps this partially reveals why, despite strict testing and severe punishments, the sporting world has not won its war on doping as professional athletes push to exceed the boundaries of human performance. Although the ideology of amateurism may have died out, it continues to shape how the sporting world views doping and the use of drugs in sport.

Keywords: Doping, Amateurism

[1]Robert Daley, "Danish Cyclists Are Recovering," *New York Times*, 30 August 1960, p. 33.

[2]Authors who mark Jensen as the start of the modern anti-doping movement are Thomas Hunt, "Drug Games: The International Politics of Doping and the Olympic Movement, 1960-2007" (Ph.D. diss., University of Texas, 2007); Barrie Houlihan, *Dying to Win: Doping in Sport and the Development of Anti-Doping Policy* (Strasbourg, Ger.: Council of Europe Publishing, 1999), 36; and Paul Dimeo, *A History of Drug Use in Sport 1876-1976: Beyond Good and Evil* (New York: Routledge, 2007).

[3]For more on the death of Knud Jensen, see Verner Møller, "Knud Enemark Jensen's Death during the 1960 Rome Olympics: A Search for Truth?" in *Drugs, Alcohol and Sport*, ed. Paul Dimeo (New York: Routledge, 2006).

[4]Dimeo, *A History of Drug Use*, 119.

[5]Many historians have explored the history of performance-enhancing drugs and drug use in sports such as Daniel Rosen, *Dope: A History of Performance Enhancement in Sports from the Nineteenth Century to Today* (Westport, Conn.: Praeger, 2008); John Hoberman, *Mortal Engines: The Science of Performance and the Dehumanization of Sport* (New York: The Free Press, 1992); idem, *Testosterone Dreams: Rejuvenation, Aphrodisia, Doping* (Los Angeles: University of California Press, 2005); Dimeo, *A History of Drug Use*; and Houlihan, *Dying to Win*. However, none have yet fully explored the history of the debate over the ethics of using such drugs.

[6]The IAAF's rule read in their 1928 *Handbook* that "doping is the use of any stimulant not normally employed to increase the power of action in athletic competition above the average. Any person knowingly acting or assisting as explained above shall be excluded from any place where these rules are in force or, if he is a competitor, be suspended for a time or otherwise from further participation in amateur athletics under the jurisdiction of this Federation." Cited from *IAAF Medical Manual* (Monaco: The International Amateur Athletic Federation, 2008), <http://www.iaaf.org/mm/Document/imported/42026.pdf> [1 August 2011].

[7]Although philosophical objections exist to the term "artificial forms of enhancement" and the pharmacology of performance enhancement has expanded significantly, historically, the term doping was defined as "stimulants and artificial forms of enhancement."

[8]"Why He Lost the Race," *New York Times*, 20 October 1907, Sunday magazine, p. 10.

[9]For more on amateurism as it relates to specific location, sport, and time period, see Ronald A. Smith, *Sports and Freedom: The Rise of Big-Time College Athletics*, Sports and History Series (New York: Oxford University Press, 1988); Matthew Llewellyn, "Lighting the Olympic Flame," *The International Journal of the History of Sport* 27 (2011), 648-668; Tony Collins, *Rugby's Great Split: Class, Culture, and the Origins of Rugby League Football* (London: Frank Cass, 1998); idem, *Rugby League in Twentieth Century Britain: A Social and Cultural History* (London: Routledge, 2006); Mike Huggins and Jack Williams, *Sport and the English, 1918-1939* (London: Routledge, 2006); Mike Huggins, *The Victorians and Sport* (London: Hambledon and London, 2004); and Richard Holt, *Sport and the British: A Modern History* (New York: Clarendon Press, 1989).

[10]Huggins, *The Victorians and Sport*, 52.

[11]Theodore Andrea Cook, *The Fourth Olympiad: Being the Official Report of the Olympic Games of 1908 Celebrated in London under the Patronage of His Most Gracious King Edward VII* (London: International Olympic Committee, 1909), 624.

[12]Ibid.

[13]Holt, *Sport and the British*, 290.

[14]Huggins, *The Victorians and Sport*, 54.

[15]Ibid., 56.

[16]Norman Baker, "Whose Hegemony? The Origins of the Amateur Ethos in Nineteenth Century English Society," *Sport in History* 24 (2004):1-16.

[17]For a flavor of how the British public schools imbued sport with morality see "Introduction" in J. A. Mangan, *Athleticism in the Victorian and Edwardian Public School: The Emergence and Consolidation of an Educational Ideology* (New York: Falmer Press, 1986).

[18]Mike Huggins, "Second-Class Citizens? English Middle-Class Culture and Sport, 1850-1910: A Reconsideration," *International Journal of the History of Sport* 17 (2000):1-35, 5.

[19]Some debate exists as to whether Grace made more money competing as an amateur than he would have as a professional. A loss of social status would have inevitably followed Grace's move had he chosen to work as an outright professional.

[20]Holt, *Sport and the British*, 104-105.

[21]See both Collins, *Rugby League in Twentieth Century Britain*; and idem, *Rugby's Great Split.*

[22]Baker, "Whose Hegemony?" 7.

[23]Llewellyn, "Lighting the Olympic Flame," 648-668.

[24]G.M. Oza, "Athletes, Doping and Olympism," *Olympic Review* 19 (1969): 2, 210 [QUOTATION].

[25]Smith, *Sports and Freedom.*

[26]Huggins, *The Victorians and Sport*, 54.

[27]Hoberman, *Testosterone Dreams*, 183.

[28]Ibid. Other authors who have expressed this same sentiment are: Dimeo, *A History of Drug Use*; Rosen, *Dope*, vii; and Ivan Waddington and Andy Smith, *An Introduction to Drugs in Sport: Addicted to Winning?* (New York: Routledge, 2009).

[29]Dimeo, *A History of Drug Use.*

[30]"Brooklyn Prize Fighting," *New York Times*, 28 August 1894, p. 2; "The Use of Stimulants by Athletes," *New York Times*, 1 December 1895, p. 16.

[31]"Cyclist behind Record," *New York Times*, 9 December 1903, p. 10.

[32]"Cyclists End Long Ride," *New York Times*, 14 December 1902, p. 8.

[33]O.D.H. Clauson, "'Doping'of Athletes," *Times* (London), 18 July 1953, p. 7.

[34]"That Nut from Africa," *New York Times*, 3 November 1895, p. 11.

[35]Eustace H. White, "Athletes and the Effect of Alcohol," *The State*, 28 June 1901, p. 6.

[36]Ibid.

[37]"The Use of Stimulants by Athletes."

[38]"Greatest All Around Athlete That Ever Lived," *Fort Worth (Texas) Morning Register*, 16 July 1899, p. 14.

[39]"College Muscle. Uncle Sam Seeks Suitable Diet and Analyzes Foods Consumed by Harvard and Yale Crews," *The Biloxi (Mississippi) Daily Herald*, 18 April 1900, p. 3.

[40]William Pierce, "Kola," *Medical and Surgical Reporter*, 25 April 1896, p. 513.

[41]"The Use of Stimulants by Athletes."

[42]Ibid.

[43]Matthew Llewellyn, "'Viva L'Italia! Viva L'Italia!' Dorando Pietri and the North American Professional Marathon Craze, 1908-1910," *International Journal of the History of Sport* 25 (2008): 710-736.

[44]"Hayes, American, Marathon Winner,"*New York Times*, 25 July 1908, p. 1.

[45]Maxwell Andrews, n.d., cited from Dimeo, *A History of Drug Use*, 28.

[46]Norbert Muller, ed., *Pierre De Coubertin, 1863-1937* (Lausanne, Switz.: International Olympic Committee, 2000), 72.

[47]Balliet Latour would go on to grant broken time payments to amateur association football players in 1928, a grave breach of the amateur ethos.

[48]Both Hicks and Pietri would capitalize on the pedestrian craze and go on to successful professional running careers.

[49]"To Oxygenize Athletes," *New York Times*, 23 August 1908, p. 9.

[50]Ibid.

[51]J.D. Casswell, "'Doping' of Athletes," *Times* (London), 15 July 1953, p. 9.

[52]"Oxygenated Football," *New York Times*, 6 September 1908, p. 8.

[53]Ibid.

[54]"Oxygen's Use in Athletics," *New York Times*, 4 October 1908, sec. C, p. 3.

[55]"To Prohibit the Use of Oxygen? Artificial Stimulant May Injure Athletics Competition Would Be Unnatural," *The Duluth (Minnesota) News Tribune*, 21 March 1909, p. 3.

[56]"Corbett's Oxygen Tank Saves Him," *New York Times*, 3 March 1909, p. 7.

[57]Woods Hutchinson, "Athletics and the Heart," *Outing Magazine*, 4 July 1910, p. 428.

[58]For more on six-day track cycling and stimulants, see Hoberman, *Mortal Engines*; Dimeo, *A History of Drug Use*; and Rosen, *Dope.*

[59]"Six-Day Race Won by Egg and Dupuy," *New York Times*, 24 December 1916, p. 14.

[60]Harry Hillman, "Athletics Helpful to American Youth," *New York Times*, 17 September 1910, p. 14.

[61]"Brains Preferred to Brawn for Oarsmen," *The Anaconda (Montana) Standard*, 14 May 1911, p. 2.

[62]*I.A.A.F. Medical Manual.*

[63]"Sport Study Urges Minimizing Glory," *New York Times*, 6 December 1929, p. 28.

[64]"Charges Japanese 'Doped' Swimmers," *New York Times*, 14 January 1933, p. 16.

[65]International Olympic Committee, "Bulletin Officiel Du Comite International Olympique," no. 37, July 1938, p. 39, <http://www.la84foundation.org/OlympicInformationCenter/RevueOlympique/1938/BODF37/BODF37c.pdf> [1 August 2011].

[66]Dimeo, *A History of Drug Use.*

[67]Ibid., 50.

[68]In this period, amphetamines finally became widely available: Nicolas Rasmussen, "Making the First Anti-Depressant: Amphetamine in American Medicine, 1929-1950," *Journal of the History of Medicine and Allied Sciences* 61 (2006): 288-323. Additionally, scientists first synthesized testosterone in 1935 and, by 1939, historian John Hoberman explains that people widely accepted "the idea that testosterone was a performance-enhancing drug." Hoberman, *Testosterone Dreams*, 8.

[69]"Alleges Stimulation of Olympic Athletes," *New York Times*, 1 October 1948, p. 36.

[70]"Fight against Doping of Amateur Athletes Asked as Health-Sports Conference Starts," *New York Times*, 26 February 1952, p. 30.

[71]"Science Takes Bow for Many Records," *New York Times*, 2 August 1952, p. 8.

[72]Dimeo, *A History of Drug Use*, 36-37.

[73]In a letter to the editor of *The Times*, Abraham writes:

> Suppose, for the sake of argument, the discovery of a substance which by its stimulating or inhibitory action was capable of conferring enhanced athletic efficiency. . . . The substance to be guaranteed to be free from any harm, temporary or remote. As a *sine qua non* all element of secrecy must be eliminated, it would have to be universally available. What objection could be raised against its use? Only that—to use the question-begging term—it would be unsporting to enable athletes to surpass records achieved by the giants of the past, who lacked that advantage. I do not think the conscience of the sporting world would or need be disturbed (Adolphe Abrahams, "'Doping' of Athletes," *Times* (London), 10 July 1953, p. 7).

[74]"Is the Oxygenation of Athletes a Form of Doping?"*Bulletin do Comite International Olympique (Olympic Review)*, 1954, pp. 24-25.

[75]Robert Plumb, "A.M.A. to Study Drugs in Sports; Use in Four-Minute Mile Hinted," *New York Times*, 6 June 1957, p. 1.

[76]John Hoberman, "Amphetamine and the Four-Minute Mile," *Sport in History* 26 (2006): 289-304.

[77]"Drug-Use Charge Denied by Milers," *New York Times*, 7 June 1957, p. 24.

[78]In-depth research into Jensen's death can be found in Dimeo, *A History of Drug Use*; and Møller, "Knud Enemark Jensen's Death."

[79]Following Jensen's death, the substances that concerned the IOC were "drugs designed to stimulate living creatures . . . depressive drugs and tranquilizers." J. Ferreira Santos and Mario de Carvalho Pini, "Doping," Moscow International Olympic Committee Session: International Olympic Committee, *Olympic Review* 81 (1963): 51. Even as late as 1970, Dr. G.M. Oza makes no mention of steroids in his article in the *Olympic Bulletin* and describes that anti-doping efforts primarily focused on: a) amphetamine, ephedrine and similar products; b) stimulants affecting the central nervous system such as strychnine, as well as analeptics and similar substances; and c) analgesic narcotics such as morphine, methadine and similar substances. G.M. Oza, "Anti-Doping Measures in India," *Olympic Review* 28 (1970): 20-22.

[80]Daley, "Danish Cyclists Are Recovering."

[81]Albert Hyman, "Use of Drugs in Sports," *New York Times*, 12 September 1960, p. 28.

[82]*The World Anti-Doping Code 2009* (Montreal: The World Anti-Doping Agency, 2009), <http://www.wada-ama.org/rtecontent/document/code_v2009_En.pdf> [1 August 2011].

"A Blond, Broad-shouldered Athlete with Bright Grey-blue Eyes": German Propaganda and Gotthardt Handrick's Victory in Modern Pentathlon at the Nazis' Olympics in 1936

SANDRA HECK†
Faculty of Sports Science
Ruhr-University Bochum

Modern pentathlon requires mainly military skills and historically attracted the attention of officers only. Appropriately, the country that provided the best modern pentathletes simultaneously demonstrated its military strength. Gotthardt Handrick who interrupted a long-lasting Swedish hegemony over the modern pentathlon developed into Germany's national pride. Surprisingly, his victory in

†Correspondence to sandra.heck@rub.de. The quotation in the title comes from Carl Graf Norman, "Der Fünfkämpfer muß sich selbst besiegen," *Berliner Lokal-Anzeiger*, 7 August 1936, ID 017/3.2.6, Carl und Liselott Diem-Archive, Cologne, Germany. The author would like to thank Chad Seifried, Assistant Professor at the Department of Kinesiology of Louisiana State University, for checking the English of her text.