

Sport – In Praise of Doping on its Usefulness and Necessity

Authors' contribution:

- A) conception and design of the study
- B) acquisition of data
- C) analysis and interpretation of data
- D) manuscript preparation
- E) obtaining funding

Jerzy Kosiewicz

Josef Pilsudski University of Physical Education in Warsaw

ABSTRACT

The author points out that in contemporary competitive, record oriented, professional, spectacular, top-level sport, elite sport, marketability sport or Olympic sport – whose beginnings should be dated to the turn of the 19th and the 20th century – mistaken decisions, which inhibited development of the abovementioned forms of sport, took place.

Primarily it was restricted to circle of financially well-off gentlemen, women's participation was forbidden, participation of professional athletes was also forbidden to a considerable degree (and during the Olympic games – totally). The need of commercialization of sport was negated and definite forms of doping were banned.

When talented persons from the lower social strata – workingmen (as well as women) and athletes earning money by practicing sport – were permitted to participate in sports competition and commercialization of sport was accepted, sport started to develop more rapidly and it became more attractive and spectacular. It contributed to intensification of investment in sport, to enrichment and modernization of its infrastructure, to optimization of research, technologization, production of better equipment and a considerable increase in athletes' and coaches' remuneration.

Another radical qualitative leap in sport can be contributed to by abolition of a ban on doping. It is going to implicate necessary and competent medical and pharmacological care, to facilitate maximization of results, to increase interest in sports spectacles. Skillful application of doping is going to release athletes' considerable capacity, endurance and proficiency potentials which have not been used yet.

KEYWORDS

forbidden sport doping, abolition of a ban of doping, usefulness and necessity of sport doping.

Barriers and exclusions in sport

At the turn of the 19th and the 20th century, various institutions connected with sport created redundant barriers that slowed down the development of modern competitive sport, including its Olympic forms. This refers, among other things, to the restrictions put on participation in the Olympic Games that were introduced by Pierre de Coubertin and restricted the Games to an elite social group who could afford the expensive sports extravagance. In 1899, Thorstein Veblen (1971) called these people the leisure class. This refers to the aristocracy and other persons who have inherited big money. It also concerns individuals and social groups who grew rich in the heyday of the social model of the self-made man – that is, in the heyday of growing and

prospering capitalism. It led to the conclusion, which was also proclaimed by Pierre de Coubertin, that competitive sport should be practiced by those individuals who could afford it and who could unimpededly fulfill their personal hedonistic needs connected with physical effort and specialized movement activity. It referred to a definite sport requiring an appropriately long and costly effort – especially in the time free of earning activity – and extraordinary expenses connected with sport.

The majority of people who were talented in movement activity could not take part in various sports events for several reasons, including the following:

- a) They had to work hard for a dozen or so hours a day, including Saturdays and Sundays, for a low wage that was barely sufficient for living costs.
- b) They could not afford proper sports clothes, sports equipment, a club fee or fee for renting a stadium, sports hall, skating rink, or swimming pool; moreover, they had no free time because work and the recovery of lost strength before another day-long effort filled almost the whole day.

In summary, it can be said that exhausting work, low wages, a chronic lack of free time, and restrictions that were consciously introduced into the axiology of modern Olympism by Pierre de Coubertin were efficient in eliminating young people and adults who worked for wages from sports life and participation in the Games.

Exclusion from sports activity connected with the Olympic Games also refers to women. Pierre de Coubertin refused to allow women to participate in the form of competition in the Olympic Games; he renewed and made Olympic sport accessible only for so-called gentlemen coming from financially well-off social strata. This refers, among others, to the then parasitic aristocracy, as well as to capitalists who were then consumed by an extremely ravenous hunger of surplus value, as well as to the rich bourgeoisie who were consciously increasing and consolidating unjust social differences.

The bankrupted Pierre de Coubertin found out how important and universal women's sport could be among others during the Olympic Games in Berlin in 1936. Then, as John MacAloon writes, he manifested covertly corrupt support for the choice of just that place for the discussed games, supported by fascist German money tainted with blood¹. In this way, he consolidated deliberately, as people in France and Switzerland were fully aware of the social situation in Germany after 1933, when Adolf Hitler's criminal and even felonious internal policy, as well as his prestige and significance, were present on the international stage.

Coubertin's curse and fatal decision to restrict women's participation in sport still weighed heavily on Olympic sport – and hence on global sport – as late as in the 21st century, in spite of the fact that women continued demanding their rights. Only during the Olympic Games in London in 2012 did all teams include not only men, but also women, for the first time. Women had been waiting for this for a very long time – 116 years, in fact. Baron Pierre de Coubertin made a shameful contribution to this fact. He also, as I have already mentioned, exerted a negative influence on the participation of youth and adults from the working class in the Olympic Games because these people did not fit the category of gentlemen.

Development of training methods and technologies, professionalization and commercialization of sport

Nor did the French baron foresee that the main factor stimulating the development of competitive, record-oriented, spectacular, Olympic sport, which nowadays is also described as elite sport, top-level sport, or marketability sport, would be its professionalization – with the addition of an aggressive (especially nowadays), highly expansive, modern economy as well as more and more refined training methods (which

¹ By 1914, the realization of the Olympic idea had consumed a great part of Pierre de Coubertin's huge fortune. The First World War, unfortunate investments, and stock manipulations brought the baron to financial ruin, radically lowering his living standards and resulting in the necessity to give up his social work in the International Olympic Committee. Many years later, on the occasion of the 50th anniversary of its activity, there was organized fundraising for "Pierre de Coubertin's Fund." Fifty thousand Swiss Francs were collected during the fundraiser and were used to support his family. Despite this, Coubertin's material situation was very difficult. This is why he contributed – for 14,000 Deutsche Marks – to issuing a recommendation concerning the publishing of the official bulletin of the IOC in Berlin and placing the Olympic Institute there. Unfortunately (from a historical viewpoint), he permanently coupled the universal values of Olympism with the then Nazi ideology. This also exposed his duplicity and moral hypocrisy. He refused athletes the right to remuneration for sporting activity, but he made use of his achievements connected with sport and the Olympic legend to obtain marks for himself. At the end of his life, striving to guarantee the livelihood of his wife and daughter, he, among others, applied for a chair at the University in Lausanne (sic! In spite of the fact that he was only a bachelor) and for the position of the administrative director of the Suez Company (MacAloon 1984; Kosiewicz 1998, pp. 63-64) – in spite of the fact that he was a "professional" aristocrat.

inhumanely exploit and deform the human organism)². Its aftermath – that is, the result of Pierre de Coubertin's nonsensical restrictions – included the decisions of his successors in the position of the International Olympic Committee's chairperson through the times of Avery Brundage. These people eliminated and excluded professional athletes from the Olympic Games³, while professionalization (or covert professionalization, as in the so-called socialist countries)⁴ – as with the increasing commercialization of sport – was a major factor in contributing to a qualitative leap in sport and to heightening the level of sports achievements in general and making spectacular and simultaneously competitive sports more attractive. Nowadays, this refers mainly to

² For example, volleyball players and their care providers are aware of the health hazards connected with competitive sport and, in spite of this, they continue their careers. When talking about volleyball players from Olympic teams, Dr. Robert Śmigieński, a traumatologist and an orthopedist, as well as the director of the medical mission of the Polish Olympic Committee during several Olympic Games, maintains that the "Achilles tendons and ankles are most at risk, then a knee-joint with a quadriceps, a spine, shoulders. 99.9% of the present basketball stars are going to come to a doctor with their injuries" (Iwańczyk 2011, p. 38). He also laments that the most famous athletes are maximally exploited in a way that is too destructive for their organisms, and he doubts whether it is profitable "to be a star for money they earn. It is after all too low price for impaired Achilles tendons, knees and spine after the end of the career" (Iwańczyk 2011, p. 38). He points out that he has "several patients who are in danger that they will have to use a prosthetic knee or who barely get up from a chair and wonder if it was worth it" (Iwańczyk 2011, p. 38).

³ Avery Brundage obstinately and consequently – following baron Pierre de Coubertin's example – defended the idea of amateurism in the Olympic movement. He was the man who divided athletes – permanently, it seemed – into amateur athletes (pure and noble in their intentions, focusing on the non-financial essence of sport) and professional athletes ("gladiators" in pursuit of "dough" who treated the noble, autotelic sports competition in an instrumental way unworthy of an Olympic athlete: as a means of growing wealthy). The latter were treated by him – according to his assumptions – as second-class athletes. He forbade them to participate in the Olympic Games. A famous event connected with that issue had a spectacular and soulless, inhuman, and non-humanistic character: the preclusion of outstanding Austrian Alpine skier, Karl Schranz, from the Winter Olympic Games in Sapporo in 1972. Schranz had, without any sanctions, taken part in other more important competitions for amateurs and professionals (Kosiewicz 2004, pp. 331-332).

⁴ In the times of the Cold War, before the carnival of Solidarity started in Poland and the Berlin Wall was demolished in 1989, competitive, record-oriented, spectacular sport was treated as a form of amateur sport in socialist countries (cf.: Kobierecki 2017, pp. 74-130). Athletes from those countries did not get monthly remunerations for practicing sport. They were paid for fictitious full-time jobs in the army, the militia, the mining or steelmaking industry, or many other types of production plants. There they received their wages, although they dealt only with sport. In the formal sense, they were amateurs who – after supposedly working for the whole day – came to practice and (on supposed days off) went to sports camps as well as to competitions. In fact, they did nothing but practice sport on the highest national, European, and world levels. During the Olympic Games, world championships, or European championships, they vanquished athletes from Western countries – that is, real amateurs from Western countries who, unlike their counterparts from socialist states, really worked and earned a living in non-sport companies and only started their hard training after a day-long drudgery, when they were really tired. They were basically the only athletes who met the requirements of amateurism demanded by various sports organizations until the times of Avery Brundage. The abovementioned forms of competition did not allow for the participation of professional athletes from Western countries – for example, boxers, hockey players, or basketball players – who achieved a much higher level than their colleagues – real amateurs.

Hypocrisy concerning amateur-professional relations was in a given case universal and especially unjust for professionals from Western countries. They were those who were not admitted to international and global amateur competitions, including the Olympic Games, unlike the covert professionals (in fact, real professionals) from socialist countries. The authorities of the International Olympic Committee were, of course, aware of that real hypocrisy and the resulting social injustice. This means that they favored totalitarianism, an anti-democratic socialist system, and the enslavement of supposed amateurs coming from there. However, it suited them to maintain that only amateurs came from socialist countries to take part in the games. They supported and continued Coubertin's idea of amateurism, but they did it in an Orwellian context in the form of pseudo-amateurism. It was utilized by the totalitarian governments of socialist states, which sent professionals – in the strict sense of the word – to sporting events and paid them for practicing sport as if they were amateurs – that is, a pittance – almost nothing in comparison with the remunerations of Western professionals. Exploitation was in that case absurdly ruthless and soulless (for example, as Jerzy Kulej mentioned, Polish boxers received 20 USD per person for winning a gold medal during the Olympic Games in Tokyo in 1964). This was a downright extreme display of ravenous hunger for surplus value, proof of the peak voracity of the government of one of the socialist countries.

A statement by Artur Pasko is worth adding. He wrote that at the beginning of the 1970s:

Polish athletes won competitions of the highest repute, during the Olympic games, world championships and European championships. They achieved a high level in various sports. Officially they were amateurs, but in fact their status was disputable. In the West they were called "state amateurs" – that is, the state provided them a livelihood. Officially they worked in production plants, in fact they dealt only with sport. On the example of the sport which was the most popular in the country – football – we see that their financial status, if compared with that of their counterparts from Western countries, was low. An excellent player of "Górnik" Zabrze, Jan Banaś, recalls that for a victory over Manchester City in the final of the Cup Winner's Cup Polish players were promised 300 dollars per persons and Englishmen were to get 12 thousand pounds then.

It should be noted that in 1973, when I took part in a two-week student tour to England during which we visited London (for example, the British Museum for several days) and its surroundings (for example, the royal Windsor Castle, Stratford on Avon – including William Shakespeare's house – and Oxford University), and in 1975, when I took part in a month-and-a-half international student work camp on a Guinness hop farm, one British pound equaled 5 USD. The prize for winning the cup was extremely high then. After having paid each British footballer 60 thousand dollars (that is, 12 thousand pounds) – about a million USD in total – the authorities of the British club still had a multiple of that sum at their disposal. Polish authorities simply robbed their athletes. They paid them 300 instead of 60 thousand USD per person (p. 256)! This is a good example reliably illustrating the moral superiority (rzekomą) of socialism over capitalism. Moreover, it is worth pointing out that when it was proposed to sign contracts with athletes, which would include the

competitive sport, record-oriented sport, professional sport, spectacular sport, Olympic sport, top-level sport, elite sport, or marketability sport.

In the times of promoting amateur sports in the Olympic Games, the commercialization of sport used to be commonly condemned. It referred also to the other abovementioned forms of sport. It was emphasized that the discussed commercialization was a shameful and blameworthy fetish of our modern times, which diminished or even compromised the significance of sport, its supposed autotelic values appearing only during the Olympic Games. When the Olympic Games, and other competitions of global importance, became too expensive and donations from the budgets of particular states were insufficient, rich sponsors (and others with sufficient resources), who, thanks to their costly donations, could also increase and broaden the range of advertising and their companies' offer as well as increase their profits, started to be invited for close cooperation. This is one of the reasons why it was possible to significantly intensify investments in the abovementioned forms of sport – that is, to enrich and modernize the infrastructure, optimize research, provide production of better and more expensive equipment, significantly increase athletes' and coaches' remunerations, and invest more money in staff to take care of excellent teams and outstanding athletes. The superior aim has been to make spectacles more attractive, increase viewership of sports events, inspire new advertisers, and encourage longstanding ones to continue their activities, which significantly increase sports budgets and enable the intensification of various investments, qualitatively strengthening various ultramodern athletic infrastructures.

A negative attitude towards the commercialization of sport, which was supposed to be its shameful malady, and a negative evaluation of its professionalization, which was to lead to its degeneration, changing competition into its own caricature and athletes into regrettable clowns, considerably slowed down the development of competitive sport, record-oriented sport, professional sport, spectacular sport, Olympic sport, top-level sport, elite sport, and marketability sport. Hosting cities and governments of particular states have been – according to the IOC – the only subjects to bear the costs of holding the Games. That view was radically changed thanks to Antonio Samaranch during his presidency. He formed and directed a committee – which was also a company in the business sense, too. He strove for the highest possible and all-embracing income of his institution. The optimization of income, besides sports competition, became – and still is – the main aim of the IOC's activity.

Factors facilitating the development of sport

Nowadays, we may witness an unprecedented period of fantastic development and full bloom of the abovementioned forms of sports – as well as of the broadening and increasing of sport's reception and attractiveness. The view about sport's deepening crisis is outmoded and archaic, with an exaggerated attachment to the following:

- a) Coubertin and Brundage's idea of the supposedly autotelic character of competitive sport, record-oriented sport, professional sport, spectacular sport, Olympic sport, top-level sport, elite sport, and marketable sport. As is only too obvious, the abovementioned forms of activity do not include and do not support such a value as the highest one. Sports activity, which is required in their field, is not an aim in itself at all – it is an instrumental value making it possible to achieve a variously understood sports success of praxeological (effectivity-oriented, after Tadeusz Kotarbiński 1982) and pragmatic character (bringing a relativistically conceived benefit and utility, after William James 1911).
- b) Assumptions of Marxism (Engels 1949, pp. 302-306; Lenin 1955, pp. 135-138) or Marxism-leaning Catholic personalism, especially according to Emmanuel Mounier's (and partly Jacques Maritain's) interpretation, pointing out that intense professional activity reifies, depersonalizes – that is, deforms a human individual's personality – and, as a consequence, alienates and dehumanizes (Mounier 1960a, pp. 200-209; Mounier 1960b, pp. 248-252), making a human being an individual involved only in

regulation of duties of each party in a form close to the Western model of professionalism, they were described as “a synonym of exploitation of man” (Pasko 2012, p. 257).

horizontal (that is, social and material) relations and not in spiritual relations: vertical ones, oriented towards God and the development of a person (Maritain 1965, pp. 78-84).

The abovementioned contemporary forms of professional sport – like with other manifestations of professional activity – are saturated with the subject's reified dependency on an employer who appoints tasks and expects demanded and relevant (to the proposed remuneration) effects of activity (the subject undergoes obvious reification in that case). This is a normal and common dependency because it concerns all people undertaking work: doctors, nurses, paramedics, politicians, firemen, guards, teachers, clerks, policemen, coaches, and masseurs. These types of relations are not proof of any dehumanization or alienation. In spite of this, some individual deviations or pathologies are possible in these forms of professional activity – just as, for example, in family relations or among priests. However, these are not binding norms as they were in the case of the optimal and common exploitation of the employee in the times of 19th-century capitalism.

Of course, in the abovementioned forms of sport there are various deformations, aberrations, deviations, and social pathologies. However, they do not reflect the magnitude of the manifestations of social pathologies, deviations, and deformations that appear out of sport proportionally. The breaking of regulations of the Penal Code, the Civil Code, and the Administrative Procedure Code among persons connected with sport is significantly less frequent than in society as such. For example, drug addiction or other criminogenic behaviors are present to a much smaller degree. Murders, kidnappings, or theft are rather absent. Athletes and the connected milieu focus on striving for a broadly understood sporting success. A big problem is constituted by gambling, which is, however, imposed by a non-sport mafia milieu and brings criminals from outside sport enormous profits.

Some of the abovementioned restrictions that have appeared in sport have detracted from its development in the past. Nowadays, it is slowed down first of all by a negative attitude towards various forms of doping – such as pharmacological doping (Houlihan 2008, p. 375-394), genetic doping (Miah 2004; Tamburini and Tonsjorn 2005; Tamburini 2007a, pp. 285-297; Muthe 2010, pp. 194-205), or doping connected with blood transfusions (Browne 2001, pp. 196-204).

It is possible to distinguish several main factors that are advantageous for the development of sport:

- a) the proper individual or team qualities of an athlete or athletes: physical, mental, and relational ones;
- b) sports training that is more and more often enriched with new technical solutions and methods, requiring huge sacrifices;
- c) highly developed technology that is applied for the production of sport suits, facilities, and equipment, among other things – for example, bicycles, motorcycles, and cars – and of modern sports infrastructure, which requires almost billion-dollar expenditures;
- d) the highly effective – and attractive – commercialization of sport.

Sport doping as a necessary stimulator of sport development

It is likely that one of the last attempts at accelerating the development of sport – besides professionalization and the abovementioned commercialization and technologization – will be the abolition of the ban on sport doping by sports authorities and penal codes in several countries. Its negation has mainly irrational, baseless, and mythologized – that is, mythical – foundations of a secular character. It has inevitably led to the occurrence of a “grey area” of doping, which has already resulted in the tragic deaths of young cyclists (for example, Joachima Halupczok), and shortened lives of, among others, former Bulgarian, Turkish, and Soviet weightlifters, as well as painful lasting medical complications – e.g., of a hormonal character or concerning the liver – at an advanced age.

It is said that the inevitable harmfulness of forbidden doping or undermining the principle of equal chances, which are supposedly valid in sport, resulting from doping are also myths (but myths of a secular character). The aim of activity in competitive sport, record-oriented sport, professional sport, spectacular sport, Olympic sport, top-level sport, elite sport, and marketable sport – especially during the time of preparation – is to increase the athlete's chances against his or her rivals as much as possible. This is achieved through, among other things, innovatory coaching methods that have not yet been disclosed, purchasing the best athletes, employing the most excellent coaches, and introducing the newest and the most expensive

technological solutions, which are unaffordable for other teams. Doping in sports, which is forbidden nowadays, but which will probably be permitted in the future, will contribute not only to radically increasing the chances of competing athletes and teams, but also to the development of particular sports.

Statements about the high harmfulness of doping (e.g., of pharmacological doping) that are presented in papers and during conferences are also myths. There is no certainty regarding that issue. In this case, we have, at most, a working hypothesis because there has not been any empirical research concerning doping in children (and this will probably never happen), which could affirm or reject that myth, and thus we must do with a metaphysical supposition.

The abolition of the ban on doping also implies necessary and competent medical care – pharmacological care, as well as the care provided by doctors – to foster the optimization of sports results and simultaneously neutralize any harmful influence. This type of doping will not only significantly contribute to further substantial progress in sports results, but also to a significant increase in interest in and the attractiveness of sports spectacles, as well as to considerable intensification of financial investment. This means that the skilled use of doping will release considerable capacity, endurance, and proficiency potentials that have not yet been taken advantage of. They will be objectivized without any harm to health – that is, without the physical injuries that are now caused by excessively exploitative modern sports training. Nowadays, doping done correctly has the greatest potential for sports development, which is not only possible, but also necessary. The ban on doping must be abolished and it certainly will be. The sooner it happens, the better it is for sport. Presently, that ban is an anachronistic relict, much like the fair play principle, which is sometimes still conceived – in a strange and mistaken way – as the highest value in contemporary and Olympic sport (Kosiewicz 2014, pp. 48-63; Kosiewicz 2016b, pp. 108-162). In the forms of sport that are considered in this paper, all normative ethical systems are, at most, of secondary or tertiary importance in relation to the rules of a particular discipline. Those rules – and not variously (pluralistically, subjectivistically, relationally, relativistically, discretionarily, or panthareistically – as fluent and changeable) conceived demands of normative ethics (including fair play values) – determine the principles of conduct during sports competitions, including the Olympic agon (Kosiewicz 2015, pp. 48-63; Kosiewicz 2016b, pp. 108-162). Each institutionalized sport must be legally approved (along with its regulations). In other words, it must be registered with the particular institutions connected with it and professions planned by it – by proper National Court Registers.

Pharmacological institutions will optimize doping – in the qualitative sense – and, taking into account their own reputation and possible enormous profits, they will also compete in creating and providing proper (that is, tested) doping substances, much like they do in the case of drugs that are necessary for pharmacological therapies applied by doctors. The supply of defective or simply harmful substances on the market will – much like in other past and possible pharmacological cases – result in serious legal sanctions, which could even ruin pharmacological producers, provided for by the regulations of the Penal Code, the Civil Code, and the Administrative Procedure Code of the country that has registered that substance, the country where harm has been done, or the country that a harmed athlete comes from. A similar responsibility will rest with the hospitals and surgeons who vouch for operations connected with genetically engineering doping (Tamburini 2007a, pp. 285-297), as well as with those hospitals and doctors who perform, for example, unfortunate blood transfusions (Browne 2001, pp. 196-204). The abovementioned cases will suffer the same legal consequences as a defective plastic surgery.

The existing anti-doping institutions, such as the World Anti-Doping Agency, the American Anti-Doping Agency, and other anti-doping commissions and their related ultramodern laboratories will radically change their professional profiles. They will no longer prosecute athletes who take advantage of doping. They will hunt down unfair producers and distributors, as well as other bidders of various forms of doping, because they will examine the content of doping substances placed on the market and, if possible, issue permissions for selling and distributing them. They will also examine, certainly more thoroughly, the athletes themselves (that is, their organisms) in order to find possibly harmful elements and aspects of the applied doping. Legal and financial penalization will, first of all, concern unfair producers and other bidders of doping that prove dangerous for health. Financial penalization will especially take the form of compensations paid to athletes

whose health has been put at risk. Hence, potential wrongdoers will be hunted down not only by public and transnational institutions examining the content of the offered doping substances, but also by the athletes themselves and their employers, as they will more than anyone else be interested in the highest possible quality of offers and services from the field of doping and – if necessary – in the highest possible restitution.

Such a solution can lead not only to the optimal eradication of the harmful effects of doping, but also to further progress in sporting results and to making sports spectacles more attractive and profitable. It requires the introduction of proper legal regulations, which will indubitably be made sooner or later. The initiation of such changes will result in an avalanche (concerning all possible legal subjects) and the universal legalization of doping.

Doping is the future of sport and the presented text is also a form of encouragement for its development, including properly controlling its quality and supporting pro-doping attitudes.

Nowadays, doping can be divided into the following forms:

- a) when it is incompetently prepared, badly chosen, and incorrectly applied, it is irreparably harmful for the organism;
- b) when it is correctly chosen, prepared, and applied, it stimulates the human organism – without causing present or future dysfunctions – for challenges connected with breaking new records.

An example of the second situation is provided by doping used by the remarkable cyclist Lance Armstrong, who led his ailing organism, exhausted from fighting cancer, to the greatest successes in the history of contemporary cycling without any further damage to his health. It refers also to covert doping in the form of anti-asthmatic drugs, which were successfully tested during at least the last two Winter Olympic Games in 2010 and 2014, and in the winter season 2016/2017 it was overdosed by Norwegian female and male ski runners (overdosed meaning unlawfully applied).

Verner Moller points out that the most common argument against doping substances are their supposed anti-health qualities, whereas, as he writes, the sugar, salt, vitamins, and minerals that are included in them have a positive effect on the human organism (Moller 2010, p. 107). This obviously undermines the legitimacy of an orthodoxly negative (mythical) attitude towards doping. It has also turned out that (the abovementioned) supposed doping or covert doping based on anti-asthmatic drugs does not have a negative effect on the human organism (much like the doping substances used by Lance Armstrong).

Moller also emphasized that the final definition of what is doping and what is not doping has not been formulated yet. In my opinion, such a definition will never be properly formed. He also points out that institutions that have been founded for this purpose cannot conduct a coherent, consistent, logical campaign and provide it with suitable justification (Moller 2010, p. 107).

Note that doping has the same meaning, assumption, and aim as sports coaching – that is, using the abilities or reserves of the human organism to the maximal degree. It can contribute to sporting successes differently than an excessive increase in training load.

Considerations of the harmfulness of forbidden doping in the context of the intense and devastating training and sporting exploitation of the young organisms of athletes practicing competitive, record-oriented, spectacular, or Olympic sport have an undercurrent of false altruism and hypocritical care⁵.

⁵ The main aim of such a type of activity – as it is pointed out in the main text – certainly is not the cultivation of any autotelic values, but variously conceived sporting success. Physical and mental capacities and multiperspectively understood health are only instrumental values in the discussed form of sport. Moral, religious, political, and ideological convictions can at most play an additional and secondary role, but only on the condition that they are useful in the course of competition and the realization of its main aim. The legalization of doping will make it possible to avoid such situations as in Norwegian cross-country skiing, where there is presently covert pharmacological doping officially sanctioned by international sports unions and anti-doping institutions and supported by legislation and Norwegian authorities (cf.: Holm 2010, pp. 186-193).

Moreover, it is a fact that there is a deficit of knowledge about the properties of doping, and this situation will probably last for a long time (maybe forever). This refers to its differentiated, positive and negative, influence on the human individual. The latter manifests itself when homemade doping is badly prepared: hastily, without proper laboratory facilities and without adequate testing (which happens often nowadays). It is also more and more often noticed that doping can beneficially influence human health or influence health in a way that in the end turns out not to be significant if we compare it with the harmfulness of super-intense training and increased exploitative fights, matches, races, and other forms of competition during a sport season. They cause and fix the mental, social, and physical destruction of an athlete. They permanently devastate his organism, too often changing it into a wreck. I strongly disagree with the ban on doping – and especially with justifying it by referring to moral arguments. The issues of using doping, in my

REFERENCES:

- Browne, A. (2001). The Ethics of Blood Testing As an Element of Doping Control in Sport. In W.J. Morgan, K.V. Meier, and A.J. Schneider (Eds.), *Ethics in Sport* (pp. 196-204). Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.
- Holm, S. (2010). Doping under Medical Control Conceptually Possible but Impossible in the World of Professional Sport. In M. McNamee (Ed.), *The Ethics of Sport. A Reader* (pp. 186-194). London and New York: Routledge Taylor & Francis Group.
- Houlihan, B. (2008). Sport and Doping. In *Sport and Society* (pp. 375-394). London: Sage Publication
- Iwańczyk, R. (2011). Śmigiełski: Siatkarze jadą po bandzie [Śmigiełski: Volleyball Players Test the Limits]. *Gazeta Wyborcza*, no. 242, p. 38
- James, W. (1911). *Pragmatyzm. Dylematy determinizmu* [Pragmatism. The Dilemma of Determinism]. Warszawa.
- Kobierecki, M. (2017). Walka o prestiż polityczny w zimnowojennym współzawodnictwie sportowym [Struggle for Political Prestige in Cold War Sports Competition]. In *Sportowa wojna światów* [Sports War of the Worlds] (pp. 74-130). Łódź: Wydawnictwo *Ibidem*.
- Kosiewicz, J. (1988). Pierre de Coubertin – w kręgu Olimpii i Laokoon [Pierre de Coubertin: In the Circle of Olympia and Laokoon]. In *Sport Wyczynowy*, 7-8, 54-64.
- Kosiewicz, J. (2004). Dylematy sportu olimpijskiego [Dilemmas of Olympic Sport]. In *Filozoficzne aspekty sportu wyczynowego* [Philosophical Aspects of Competitive Sport] (pp. 323-340). Warszawa: Wydawnictwo BK.
- Kosiewicz, J. (2014). The Ethical and Legal Context of Justifying Anti-Doping Attitudes. *Physical Culture and Sport. Studies and Research*, 66, 75-87. DOI: 10.1515/pcssr-2015-0015
- Kosiewicz, J. (2015). Why Pluralism, Relativism, and Panthareism: An Ethical Landscape with Sport in the Background. *Physical Culture and Sport. Studies and Research*, 62, 48-63. DOI: 10.2478/pcssr-2014-0011.
- Kosiewicz, J. (2016a). Universalizm a pluralizm, relatywizm i pantareizm moralny [Moral Universalism and Pluralism, Relativism, and Panthareism]. In *Pejzaż etyczny ze sportem w tle* [Ethical Landscape with Doping in the Background]. In J. Kosiewicz, *Moralność i sport* [Morality and Sport] (pp. 5-49). Warszawa: Międzynarodowe Towarzystwo Nauk Społecznych o Sportcie.
- Kosiewicz, J. (2016b). Etyczny i prawny kontekst uzasadnienia postawy antydopingowej w sporcie [Ethical and Legal Context of Justification of the Anti-Doping Attitude]. In J. Kosiewicz, *Moralność i sport* [Morality and Sport] (pp. 108-163). Warszawa: Międzynarodowe Towarzystwo Nauk Społecznych o Sportcie.
- MacAloon, J.J. (1984). *The Great Symbol. Pierre de Coubertin and the Origins of the Modern Olympic Games*. Chicago-London: University of Chicago Press.

opinion, should be settled clearly and unequivocally solely by legal norms in particular communities and, in the second place, by the regulations of particular sports organizations and the rules of particular sports. The transparency of legal regulations is indispensable and necessary because what is not forbidden is permitted.

If doping (or covert doping) is openly banned by law, then it is possible – without any controversies of a relativistic character – to proclaim that an athlete using covert doping or forbidden doping is breaking the law and should be subjected to suitable legal procedures, regardless of the content of sports directives, regulations, and rules. If doping is forbidden only by principles referring to a particular sport, the type and extent of punishment can be determined by a proper commission of the interested sports club, union, organization, or federation. These types of sanctions also have a legal character regarding the fact that activity in the field of a definite discipline of competitive sport, record-oriented sport, professional sport, spectacular sport, Olympic sport, top-level sport, elite sport, or marketable sport (and of the connected rules of procedure) must be institutionalized and accepted by a proper court register on the basis of the Administrative Procedure Code that is in force in a given country.

Hence, in a sense, we must deal with the following:

- a) Indirect penalization resulting from the rules of a definite sports organization, sanctioned by the law in force in a given country – that is, by administrative law;
- b) A direct sanction – that is, punishment resulting, first of all, from regulations of the penal code – as, for example, in Italy or the United States of America. Athletes using doping and persons connected with those operations are treated as criminals on the strength of the penal law.

A possible moral sanction has no significance in that case because:

- a) it is secondary and ancillary in its relation to legal provisions,
- b) it results from assumptions of normative ethics, whose character is pluralistic, relativistic, changeable, and fluent (that is, panthareistic: Kosiewicz 2015, pp. 75-87; Kosiewicz 2016a, pp. 7-12), as well as discretionary (that is, ambiguous), which undermines and neutralizes possible purposefulness and the efficiency of its influence (compare the above argument with the content of all parts of the joint publication *Sport in the Global Society*, edited by A.J. Schneider and F. Hong, and especially with the statement by C. Tamburini entitled *Are Doping Sanctions Justified? A Moral Relativistic View* [2007b, pp. 23-35]).

An interesting, albeit surprising, conception has also appeared that puts into doubt the necessity of regulating sports activity by law – and of using the connected penalization – as such. This refers to the abovementioned Claudio Tamburini, who points out (and even “believes”) that various forms of social activity, including sport, “have a life of their own and often develop in ways we cannot always judge, at least on first sight, as desirable” (Tamburini 2007b, p. 33).

However, I am not of the opinion that Tamburini’s rudimentary statement deserves any application, especially in the fields of competitive sport, record-oriented sport, professional sport, spectacular sport, and Olympic sport. National and international sports institutions – and various connected athletic competitions – should be founded and organized on the basis of the existing legislation.

- Maritain, J. (1965). Jednostka a osoba [Individual and Person]. In *Filozofia i socjologia XX wieku* [Philosophy and Sociology of the 20th Century], Part II (pp. 78-84). Warszawa: Wiedza Powszechna.
- Miah, A. (2005). *Genetically Modified Athletes. Biomedical Ethics, Gene Doping and Sport*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Moller, V. (2010). Legislation of Doping. In *The Ethics of Doping and Anti-Doping* (pp. 107-122). London and New York: Routledge Taylor & Francis Group.
- Mounier, E. (1960). Dwie alienacje [Two Alienations]. In *Co to jest personalizm?* [What Is Personalism?] (pp. 200-209). Kraków: Społeczny Instytut Wydawniczy "Znak".
- Mounier, E. (1960). Perspektywa – metoda – zobowiązanie [Perspective, Method, Obligation]. In *Co to jest personalizm?* [What Is Personalism?] (pp. 248-252). Kraków: Społeczny Instytut Wydawniczy "Znak".
- Munthe, C. (2010). Ethical Aspects of Controlling Genetic Doping. In M. McNamee (Ed.), *The Ethics of Sport. A Reader* (pp. 194-205). London and New York: Routledge Taylor & Francis Group.
- Pasko, A. (2012). *Sport wyczynowy w polityce państwa 1944-1989* [Competitive Sport in State Politics]. Kraków: Wydawnictwo AVALON.
- Schneider, A.J. & Hong, F. (2007). *Sport in the Global Society*. London and New York: Routledge Taylor & Francis Group.
- Tamburini, C. & Tonsjorn, T. (2005). *Genetic Technology and Sport. Ethical Questions*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Tamburini, C. (2007a). After Doping. What? The Morality of the Genetic Engineering of Athletes. In W.J. Morgan (Ed.), *Ethics in Sport* (pp. 285-297). Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.
- Tamburini, C. (2007b). *Are Doping Sanctions Justified? A Moral Relativistic View* (pp. 23-35). London and New York: Routledge Taylor & Francis Group.
- Veblen, T. (1971). *Teoria klasy próżniaczej* [The Theory of the Leisure Class]. Warszawa: PWN

AUTHOR'S ADDRESS:

Jerzy Kosiewicz
 Josef Pilsudski University of Physical Education in Warsaw
 Department of Philosophy and Sociology
 00-968 Warsaw
 34 Marymoncka str.
 Poland
 E-mail: jerzy.kosiewicz@awf.edu.pl

Received: 16 October 2017; Accepted: 24 November 2017