



UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE INTERNATIONAL EXAMINATIONS
General Certificate of Education Advanced Subsidiary Level

GLOBAL PERSPECTIVES

8987/03/PRE

Paper 3 Presentation

October/November 2012

INSTRUCTIONS (Pre-Release Material)

To be given to candidates

READ THESE INSTRUCTIONS FIRST

Guidance for Teachers

This Resource Booklet contains stimulus material to be used by candidates preparing their presentation for 8987/03. One copy should be given to each candidate.

Presentations must be prepared in a four-week period. This may take place at any point before 31 October 2012, by which date all presentations must have been submitted to CIE via the MOVEit website.

The Presentation is marked out of 40.

Instructions to Candidates

- You should use the enclosed stimulus material to help you identify the subject for your presentation.
- Your presentation should attempt to answer a question.
- Your presentation must address alternative perspectives on the question you select and must engage directly with an issue, an assumption, a piece of evidence and/or a line of reasoning (explicit or implicit) in one or more of the documents within this Booklet (i.e. you should not just pick an individual word or phrase which is not central to the reasoning in or the issues covered by the documents).
- Include in your presentation an explanation of how it relates to these pre-release materials.
- Your presentation should be designed for a non-specialist audience.
- Originality in interpretation is welcomed.
- Your presentation may be prepared in a variety of formats (e.g. PowerPoint, weblog or web pages) and your submission must include a verbatim transcript of the presentation.
- The speaking or running time of your presentation should be a maximum of 15 minutes.
- All work must be your own. Any material that is not your own must be acknowledged, and quotations referenced.

This document consists of **14** printed pages and **2** blank pages.



Document 1

Adapted from 'No kind of demonstration or political, religious or racial propaganda is permitted in the Olympic areas.' So says chapter 5 of the Olympic charter. But the modern Olympic movement has had to contend with wars, boycotts, protests, walkouts and even terrorist attack.

***The Guardian*, a British newspaper, 2000**

Anne Mellbye looks back at the most political Olympic Games of the past 100 years.

1936, Berlin

The 1936 Olympic Games were intentionally awarded to Germany so the republic could show that it had regained its status among European countries. With the Nazis in power, however, Adolf Hitler used the event as a platform to prove his theory of racial superiority. His attempt failed as African-American Jesse Owens became the hero of the Games winning four gold medals.

During the long jump competition, Owens' German rival, Luz Long, publicly befriended him in front of the Nazis. Luz Long was killed during World War II, but Owens kept in touch with his family for long after the war.

1948, London

Following World War II, the Olympics took on a greater political significance as participation came to symbolise political recognition and legitimacy. Germany and Japan were not invited to London because of their war-time roles, while the Soviet Union was invited but did not show up. To limit Britain's responsibility to feed the athletes, it was agreed that the participants would bring their own food. No new facilities were built, but Wembley stadium had survived the war and proved adequate. The male athletes were housed in an army camp in Uxbridge and the women housed at Southlands College in dormitories.

The 1948 London Games were the first to be shown on television, although very few people in Great Britain yet owned sets. Though there had been much debate as to whether or not to hold the 1948 Olympic Games, they turned out to be a great popular success. Approximately 4000 athletes participated, representing 59 countries.

1952, Helsinki

The Helsinki Games marked the beginning of Cold War tensions. West Germany participated for the first time, and the USSR returned to the Olympics after a 40-year absence. The USSR initially planned to house its athletes in Leningrad (now St Petersburg) and fly them into Finland each day. In the end, separate housing facilities for Eastern Bloc athletes were set aside.

1956, Melbourne

Three separate protests affected the Melbourne Games. China withdrew after the International Olympic Commission recognised Taiwan, and would not return to the Olympics before 1980. Egypt, Iraq and Lebanon sat out to protest at Israel's invasion of the Sinai Peninsula, while Spain, Switzerland and the Netherlands boycotted over the Soviet invasion of Hungary.

The conflict between USSR and Hungary was brought on-stage when they faced each other for the water-polo semi-final. The game was terminated by the referee after a fierce exchange of kicks and punches. Hungary, who was leading at the time, was credited with a victory.

1960, Rome

The Rome Games marked the end of South African participation in the Olympic Games. Its racist apartheid regime meant the country was excluded until the 1992 Barcelona Games. At the 1960 Olympics, marathon-runner Abebe Bikila, running barefoot, became the first black African Olympic champion. Free of other major political disruptions, the Rome Games became a showcase for Italy, attracting a record 5348 athletes from 83 countries.

1964, Tokyo

The first Asian country to host the Olympics, Tokyo spent \$3bn rebuilding the city to show off its post-war success. Yoshinori Sakai was chosen as the final torchbearer, who was born on the day that Hiroshima was destroyed by an atomic bomb.

1968, Mexico City

1968 was a year of universal unrest: Europe was rocked by student protests, the Vietnam war raged on, Martin Luther King and Robert Kennedy were assassinated and the USSR invaded Czechoslovakia. Meanwhile at the Olympics, East Germany competed separately for the first time. Tommie Smith and John Carlos, who finished first and third in the 200 metres, gave the Black Power salute during the national anthem as a protest against racism in the US.

1972, Munich

The largest Games yet staged, the 1972 Olympics were supposed to represent peace. But the Munich Games are most often remembered for the terrorist attack that resulted in the death of 11 Israeli athletes. With five days of the Games to go, eight Palestinian terrorists broke into the Olympic Village, killing two Israelis and taking nine others hostage. The Palestinians demanded the release of 200 prisoners from Israel. In an ensuing battle, all nine Israeli hostages were killed, as were five of the terrorists and one policeman. IOC president Avery Brundage took the decision to continue the Games after a 34-hour suspension.

1976, Montreal

Around 30 African nations staged a last-minute boycott after the IOC allowed New Zealand to compete. New Zealand's rugby team had recently played in the racially segregated South Africa, who had been banned from the Olympics since 1964. Taiwan withdrew when Communist China pressured the host country (and trading partner) to deny the Taiwanese the right to compete.

1980, Moscow

Over 60 nations including West Germany and Japan boycotted the Moscow Games to protest at the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan. The American-led boycott reduced the number of participating nations from 120 to 81, the lowest number since 1956. Countries such as Britain and France supported the boycott, but allowed their Olympic committees to participate if they wished.

1984, Los Angeles

Following the western boycott of the 1980 Games, the USSR led a boycott of the US-staged event by 14 socialist nations. The absentees claimed the Los Angeles Olympic Committee was violating the spirit of the Olympics by using the Games to generate commercial profits.

1988, Seoul

For the first time since the Munich Games, there was no organised boycott of the Summer Olympics. Though North Korea stayed away from the Olympics, joined by Ethiopia, Nicaragua and Cuba. The Seoul Games went on with little interruption, and their success represented a major milestone on the journey from dictatorship to democracy for South Korea.

1992, Barcelona

The 1992 Barcelona Games marked the first Olympic Summer Games since the end of the Cold War. Latvia, Lithuania and Estonia fielded separate teams, while the rest of the former Soviet Union competed as the "Unified Team". Germany competed under one flag for the first time since 1964, while post-apartheid South Africa was invited ending a 32-year ban.

1996, Atlanta

The Atlanta Games were the first to be held without any governmental support. This led to a commercialisation of the Games that disappointed many. In addition, a pipe bomb exploded in Atlanta's Centennial Olympic Park killing two people and injuring a further 110. Although the incident was referred to as a terrorist bomb, the motive or group responsible was never determined. Approximately 10,000 athletes participated in Atlanta, representing 197 countries (including Hong Kong and the Palestinian Authority).

2000, Sydney

The Sydney Games were the largest yet, with 10,651 athletes competing in 300 events. Despite its size, the event was well organised and renewed faith in the Olympic movement after the 1996 Atlanta bombing. The Australians chose Aboriginal athlete and national hero Cathy Freeman to light the Olympic torch.

2004, Athens

The Olympic Games returned to its origins in Athens. Greece was the birthplace of the ancient Olympic Games more than 2000 years ago, and Athens staged the first modern Olympic Games in 1896.

2008, Beijing

The 2008 Games provoked outrage from human rights groups who said allowing China to host the games legitimised its repressive regime. Supporters argued the Olympics accelerated the progress of social liberalisation. The Taiwan government strongly supported the Beijing Games, believing that the event would reduce the risk of China using force against its neighbour.

[<http://politics.guardian.co.uk/politicspast/page/0,9067,892902,00.html>]

Document 2

Adapted from 'It's the Olympics, But Do You Really Care?'

Los Angeles Times, a US newspaper, 12 August 2004
Max Boot

In 1980 the Olympic hockey final between the USA and the Soviet Union was gripping – quite literally a ‘cold war’ between two superpowers. There might be high drama in the Olympics this year if our current enemies chose to compete in sporting events. Unfortunately, Al Qaeda don’t play games. But in their absence, it’s hard to get worked up about the US Olympic medal count versus Russia, China or any other nation. Ironically, the very fact that most countries are engaged in peaceful competition – the Olympic ideal – renders this Olympics uninteresting.

Given the dearth of geopolitical competition, we are left to contemplate the actual competition on the field. Unfortunately, it’s impossible for this couch potato – I can’t speak for any other spud – to care who wins the 400-meter hurdles, the long jump or the hammer throw. Imagine shouting yourself hoarse over the outcome of table tennis or epee fencing.

I have nothing but admiration for the fortitude and grit of all Olympic competitors, especially in the more obscure events where there is no financial reward. I also have nothing but respect for what scientists and doctors do. But that doesn’t mean I want to watch them in action.

Sports like football, baseball and basketball have intrinsic appeal to millions of people because their fans follow them all the time and know the players. We see most Olympic events only once every four years. It’s like meeting some long-lost cousin. Are you going to gush over her? It’s true that all the Olympic sports are contested year in, year out, but few receive any coverage, at least in this country. Yet every four years we’re supposed to get worked up over who does and who does not snare a gold medal.

During Olympic TV coverage, snippets of actual competition will be sandwiched by long, weepy infomercials that seek to humanize the athletes. No hint of adversity will go unexploited. We will learn that as a baby, American boxer Ron Siler “slept in a dresser drawer near his father’s bed,” that Jamaican runner Asafa Powell has lost two brothers (“one was shot and the other passed away of natural causes”) and that Sada Jacobson, “America’s fencing darling,” considers her sister her toughest competitor. Fascinating. But I’d still rather see what quarterbacks Peyton Manning and Michael Vick are up to and all I want to know about them is how many plays they make.

Please note that my complaint about the Games is not the usual whining about excessive commercialism and professionalism. As a thoroughgoing capitalist, I have nothing against athletes being paid to play.

My favorite sport – professional football – is far more guilty of crass exploitation than the Olympics. But at least the National Football League is honest about what it’s up to: entertainment. Olympic abuses, ranging from steroid use to bribery, are harder to swallow because they come coated with insufferable malarkey about bettering humanity.

The International Olympic Committee may be the most scandal-ridden organization this side of the United Nations’ oil-for-food program, but it continues to justify its existence with the need to spread the “Olympic spirit.” Which is what, exactly? That you should pass up no opportunity for a payoff?

Ultimately, I would be willing to overlook the Olympics’ moral failings, as I do with sports that I like, if I were interested in the outcome. But I’m not.

[http://www.cfr.org/publication/7244/its_the_olympics_but_do_you_really_care.html]

Document 3

‘No nation which abuses human rights has the right to host the Olympics.’

Letter to the International Olympic Committee Regarding the Sochi Games and Murders of Russia’s Rights Defenders, 28 August 2009

Subject: Sochi Winter Games 2014 and Murders of Russia’s Rights Defenders

Dear Mr. De Kepper,

We are writing today to call your attention to recent developments of serious concern in Russia, including the abduction and killing of three civil society activists and a journalist in recent weeks. We would also like to take this opportunity to share with you an opinion piece by Manfred von Richthofen, Honorary President of the German Olympic Sports Confederation (DOSB) regarding the need for the IOC to “insist that human rights relevant to the staging of the Games be enforced.”

As we have repeatedly asserted in meetings and correspondence, we believe successful Olympic Games cannot be staged in an environment where serious human rights abuses are occurring. When we met in March, we discussed the murder of leading human rights lawyer Stanislav Markelov, who represented numerous victims of rights abuses in Chechnya, and was shot dead on the street after leaving a Moscow news conference. Anastasiya Baburova, a journalist who was with him, was also killed.

Since that time there has been a marked deterioration in conditions in Russia for the human rights and journalist community, and we are asking the IOC to take action.

Kidnappings and Killings of Rights Advocates and Journalists

On July 15, unidentified men forced Natalia Estemirova, a leading human rights activist and researcher in Chechnya for the Russian human rights organization Memorial, into a car as she left her apartment to go to work. Estemirova’s body was found hours later bearing gunshot wounds to the head and chest. Estemirova had been at the forefront of efforts to investigate human rights violations and work for accountability in Chechnya for more than 10 years. Her efforts brought criticism from the Chechen authorities, including the republic’s president, Ramzan Kadyrov. Forces under his command have been implicated in multiple human rights abuses, including killings, torture, and enforced disappearances, yet only a handful of perpetrators have been held to account.

Less than a month after Estemirova’s killing, on August 10, two civil society activists, Zarema Sadulayeva and her husband Alik Dzhabrailov were abducted from their office in Chechnya at gunpoint by men claiming to be from “security services.” Their bodies with bullet wounds were found several hours later in the trunk of Dzhabrailov’s car. Sadulayeva was the head of the humanitarian organization Save the Generation, which helped children with disabilities in Chechnya.

On August 11, in neighboring Dagestan, a journalist known for his criticism of government authorities, Abdulmalik Akhmedilov, was shot by an unidentified gunman shortly after leaving his apartment on an errand. Akhmedilov was the deputy editor of a daily newspaper and a political monthly, and had sharply criticized federal forces and local law enforcement for suppressing religious and political dissent.

These targeted attacks on outspoken critics of the Russian government all point to a disturbing climate of violence and impunity in the Caucasus region, where the Sochi Games will take place. Some cases show signs of possible government involvement. The attacks have a profound chilling effect on human rights activists, journalists, and others who might be in a position to expose government misconduct or violations of the law, including those outside of Chechnya or Dagestan. Recent examples include the killing of rights activist Andrei Kulagin in the republic of Karelia in northern Russia and the arbitrary detention of another activist, Alexei Sokolov, in Ekaterinburg.

“Persecuted on a Systematic Basis”

These killings were widely denounced by foreign governments and international human rights and other organizations. In condemning the three recent murders in Chechnya, French Foreign Minister Bernard Kouchner noted France’s “deep preoccupation in the face of these particularly odious and cowardly crimes against human rights defenders in Chechnya, who appear to be persecuted on a systematic basis” and stressed the importance for Russia to protect human rights defenders.

The IOC has been silent on these killings, some of which have occurred within a few hundred miles of Sochi.

The International Olympic Committee is uniquely positioned to send a strong message to the Russian authorities condemning these killings and should call on President Dmitry Medvedev to publicly state that there will be zero tolerance for such crimes. Zero tolerance needs to include independent, effective, and timely investigations leading to the identification and prosecution of the perpetrators, and suitable punishment for those convicted. Without justice and a strong signal that the government will no longer permit such heinous crimes, the prevailing climate of impunity will persist and enable similar attacks in the future. It is hard to imagine the Sochi 2014 Olympics taking place as a festive sporting event in a climate of the most brutal violence and fear for civil society actors, and journalists.

The IOC’s Chance to Implement Human Rights Reforms

Given the serious ongoing human rights concerns in Russia, we respectfully reiterate our call for the IOC to establish a standing human rights committee or similar mechanism to monitor the adherence by Olympic host countries to basic human rights standards – it is literally becoming a matter of life or death for Russia’s journalists and civil society.

Human Rights Watch strongly urges the IOC to seize this moment to adopt simple reforms that could protect the reputation of the Olympic movement going forward.

Sincerely,

Allison Gill
Director, Russia Office

Minky Worden
Media Director

[<http://www.hrw.org/en/news/2009/08/28/letter-international-olympic-committee-regarding-sochi-games-and-murders-russia-s-ri>]

Document 4

'Politics and Patriotism Encumber Sports.'

An article from a US sports website, 9 May 2010

Tim Joyce

Two incidents in the last week – one direct and the other indirect – acted as reminders that the connection between sports and political expression and nationalism is ever-present and is articulated in ways trivial, misguided, reasoned and passionate.

The uproar over the Arizona immigration law reached into the sports world with members of the Phoenix Suns proudly speaking up about its intrinsically un-American elements and what the law could lead to. Steve Nash said the measure would amount to racial profiling. Suns General Manager Steve Kerr said it conjured up images of “Nazi Germany.” Amare Stoudemire said, “It’s going to be great to wear Los Suns to let the Latin community know we’re behind them 100 percent.”

For the record, I am also against this law. I believe it does go too far in the latitude it gives police in rooting out illegal immigrants. And I firmly believe that compassion for the human condition and those huddled masses who seek comfort in our brilliantly conceived nation should always remain an overriding aspect of our collective character.

However, to overreach so far as to compare this law with Nazi Germany is insulting, ridiculous and nonsensical. We are talking about illegal immigration, not the rounding up of legal Japanese-Americans during World War II or the violent repression of black Americans for so long. And for Stoudemire to say that by donning jerseys the team is supporting the Latin community – what does this mean? Did Stoudemire imply that illegal immigration is not a serious problem that has been ignored too long?

Of course, none of these statements was pursued with significant follow-up questions from the media. This is a hot-button, PC affair in which thoughtful, rational contemplation is sacrificed for the sake of supposed righteousness.

It’s good to see these athletes speaking up about current events. But let’s say a member of the Suns had said he agreed with the law in some measure because he thought illegal immigration was such a pressing issue that it needed to be addressed. Would this player have been ridden out of town and scorned throughout the league? I think so.

Major League Baseball (MLB) is also exhibiting fear by worrying about a backlash against its brand, which is more than 30 percent Latino. Yet this smacks of hypocrisy because if MLB were as concerned with the integrity of the sport (as per postseason scheduling, a topic this columnist will continue to hammer in the coming months) as it was with knee-jerk, economically based pandering to interest groups, then perhaps its seeming compassion to the Latino community would appear more sincere.

And here in Gotham last weekend there was the failed terror attempt. All of us in New York were quickly transported back almost 10 years ago to that hellish September day that we all hope will never be replicated. So since 9/11 came to mind, I thought of the connection between sports and patriotism that resurfaced back then and continues somewhat today.

Baseball was the sport that supplied the inspiration back then, and it’s in baseball where the 9/11 themes seem to linger, especially here in New York – specifically, the Yankees organization’s continued playing of “God Bless America” in the seventh inning.

Played in all major league ballparks during the patriotic days immediately after 9/11, the song is now heard in only two venues on a regular basis – Yankee Stadium and Dodger Stadium in Los Angeles.

It’s time the Yankees joined the other 28 franchises and unburdened their fans by letting go of this unneeded in-game distraction.

It is thoroughly understandable how “God Bless America” became so popular in September 2001. No matter what one’s political allegiances were at the time, there was a genuine, unified American populace and a desire to exhibit patriotism in all places. And what better place to display one’s patriotic instincts than baseball? If not the most popular sport in our country, it is without question the most American of all games.

As a resident of New York, I felt that just seeing baseball again during those terrible days in our city roused my patriotic impulses and was proof enough of our nation’s greatness. It didn’t need any augmentation. But as I said, I appreciated why so many felt compelled to sing Kate Smith’s signature song during that period.

But why the need to make it a permanent fixture? Where fans used to hear the summery, childhood anthem of “Take Me Out to the Ball Game,” they are now compelled to pay respect to words that have nothing to do with the reason they purchased their high-priced tickets, which is to watch a baseball game.

Isn’t it enough that “The Star-Spangled Banner” is played before every sporting event? When Francis Scott Key’s poem, penned amid the Battle of Baltimore during the War of 1812, finally emerged as our national anthem by decree of President Woodrow Wilson, I doubt many immediately thought to use the song before every sporting contest.

After being played only occasionally during special games – such as Opening Day and the World Series – “The Star-Spangled Banner” didn’t become de rigueur at baseball games until World War II, when this nation was united like never before and national pride was at an all-time high. Every ounce of patriotism was needed and appreciated. And the anthem has been a mainstay ever since.

And so, like everyone else, I grew up with “The Star-Spangled Banner” before games and have become so accustomed to it that it doesn’t register on most occasions. I am neither irritated by its presence nor especially mindful of its meaning. For those who grew up around New York, fans at Yankee Stadium used to routinely start cheering halfway through as if to say, “OK, OK, great ... now get on with the game.” I find the song far more inspiring and relevant when I hear it within the context of a governmental or military occasion.

What makes sports so different from other forms of entertainment? After all, we’re seldom subjected to the national anthem before the start of a movie or a concert. Where is the rationale that sports must be intertwined with politics and hints of nationalism?

Let baseball’s cherished seventh-inning stretch unfold as it should, with a pause to recharge one’s energy while lost in thought at the ballpark on a summer’s day. And in a way, the playing of “God Bless America” during the seventh-inning stretch infringes on New York’s celebrated baseball heritage, as many claim the stretch tradition started in New York at Manhattan College in the late 1800s.

And let heightened and enlightened awareness of pressing matters of the day override the easy-to-access and narrow PC dialogue that is too often mistaken for compassion and benevolence.

[http://www.realclearsports.com/articles/2010/05/09/politics_patriotism_encumber_sports_96955.html]

Document 5

'Boycott, not ban.'

A blog on the website of *The Times of India*, 20 April 2010

Jug Suraiya

Who's going to clean-up the Indian Premier League (IPL) mess? That's the 64 million (or should that be 640 million?) dollar question. Just how monied and, messy, it is can be gauged by the fact that, over the past week or so, the cricket scandal known as 'Wicketgate' has hogged centre stage in the national media and nudged into the wings such incidentals as the Iceland volcano that has severely disrupted global air traffic, reports of starvation deaths in Orissa, and the Supreme Court's confirmation of Manu Sharma's life sentence for the murder of Jessica Lall. Compared with the IPL scandal these have become footnotes to the main news of the day.

The increasing commercialisation of cricket has long been lamented by lovers of the game; what we're seeing now is the criminalisation of the sport.

How is cricket to be restored to its pristine status as a game to be played on a field by sportspeople, and not a megabuck scam to be conducted by conspirators behind locked doors? Who's going to clean-up cricket?

True to type, some politicians have already suggested that the best way to deal with the situation is to ban IPL, and stick to traditional Tests. This is patently preposterous, and akin to saying that as every now and then governments get themselves – and consequently their electorates – into a mess, all governments should be banned, and democracy along with it.

Bans, in any context, are not part of the solution but only a compounding part of the problem. So who's to solve this problem? Greed is the key both to the problem and the solution. The IPL scam took place because of the humungous money involved. Who generates all that boodle? No, not the players, superb performers though they are. It's the Indian fans, more than willing to put their purse where their passion is, who've made cricket, particularly Twenty20 and IPL, the money-spinner that it is. What would happen if these fans – if you – as a mark of protest to what is being done to the game were to switch off their TV sets, or switch channels to the news, or a soap, when a match was being played? Ratings would drop, the money would dry up. Greed would meet its comeuppance.

Boycott as an instrument of protest and correction was used by no less a person than Mohandas Gandhi against the British Raj when he urged Indians to stop using British goods. In what was then Calcutta, citizens have periodically brought down the manipulated prices of hilsa by refusing to buy the fish. The temporary boycott of goods and services re-establishes the consumer as king.

The Indian cricket fan is – or ought to be – the king of cricket. How is this kingship to be taken away from scamsters and restored to its rightful claimant, which is you? It's up to you. Boycott Twenty20, just for one season. Switch channels, don't go to the stadium. You won't do either, of course. But, just for a moment, think of what might happen if you – if all of us – did.

[<http://blogs.timesofindia.indiatimes.com/jugglebandhi/entry/boycott-not-ban>]

Document 6

‘Drugs & Sport: The Ongoing Struggle.’

Speech by John Fahey, President of the World Anti-Doping Agency, to the 33rd Asian Racing Conference, Sydney, 14 April 2010

Thank you for your very kind invitation to participate in this Conference.

I am conscious today that doping in your sport generally relates to thoroughbreds although it is not inconsequential that the riders of those thoroughbreds must also be considered, but before specifically making some comments on doping in the racing industry, I would like to deal with the subject of doping in sport more generally and the evolution and role of the World Anti-Doping Agency over the past decade.

Some of you may ask – why is it important to fight against doping in sport?

The answer is because sport is a humanistic exercise that is based on certain ethical principles, as well as the health of those who practise it, and which centers around the joy and results of effort. The ethical principles include respect for the rules of the game, respect for one’s fellow competitors, respect for the impartial officials who apply the rules, fair play, renunciation of violence, self-discipline, teamwork and, ultimately, self-respect.

Achievement in sport, no matter what the level, whether at school or in the Olympic Games, should be a matter of intense personal pride and accomplishment, not something that has been accomplished by cheating.

One of the rules of sport now is that the participants will not use certain substances and methods for performance-enhancing purposes. The genesis of the original rule was a medical concern for the health of those who were using the particular substances or methods.

They increased the risks of major damage to health and even death. Over time, the rules have expanded to include preservation of the ethical aspects of sport as well as the health of athletes. There is now a well recognized list of such substances and procedures that are prohibited. These rules are just like any other rule of sport, such as the number of players, equipment, scoring and so forth. There are often discussions regarding what should or should not be on the List and, as a result of its annual review, there are changes made to the List from time to time. That is a useful process and allows sport to take advantage of the increasing scientific knowledge that is improving each year.

But the most important factor is that, whatever the List may be at a particular time, it represents the agreement among participants in sport regarding the rules that apply to our common activity. That is our contract with each other: we agree that we will not use those substances and methods. If you and I are competing, I am entitled to expect, and to insist, that you will follow our rules. You are entitled to the same expectation of me. That is our deal.

You have the full freedom to choose, if you do not like or do not agree with the rules, not to participate. But, if you decide to participate, you must accept them. If you reject our mutual agreement, you should lose your result and be removed from the competition that you have tainted by your behavior.

It seems to be part of human nature that there will always be people who refuse to respect the rules, whether in society in general or in sport. That is why, in society, we have a system of police, courts and prisons. That is why, in sport, we have officials who enforce the rules, a system of sanctions for those who cheat by doping, and a system for resolving any disputes regarding application of those rules.

Doping in sport is not limited to specific sports, nor to specific countries. It is an international problem. No sport and no country is immune from the risks of doping. Equestrian sport has had its own share of doping cases. I think in particular of the cases uncovered by the International Equestrian Federation at the 2008 Beijing Olympic Games, which involved the administration to horses of substances prohibited by the Federation.

The solution to doping in sport therefore requires an international response. The same rules must apply to all in a sport, no matter where they come from. It is no solution to the problem if athletes from country “A” who compete fairly compete with doped athletes from country “B.” Nor is it an answer if an athlete is banned in one country but allowed to compete in another.

[http://www.wada-ama.org/Documents/News_Center/Speeches_Presentations/WADA_Address_JohnFahey_ARC_Sydney_April2010.pdf]

Document 7

Adapted from ‘There is no evidence that the London 2012 Olympics will leave a financial legacy for the local population or improve their health, according to new research.’

***The Daily Telegraph*, a British newspaper, 20 May 2010**

Countries often bid for big global shows on the grounds they will bring lasting improvements in employment, skills, the economy, housing, pride, the environment and physical activity.

But public health expert Dr Gerry McCartney and colleagues, whose findings are published online in the *British Medical Journal*, question whether the 2012 Olympics in London – already grossly over budget – will help ordinary people.

They reviewed 54 studies that assessed the health and socioeconomic impacts of major multi-sport events since 1978 and found the quality of most were poor and at risk of bias. There were also large gaps in a number of outcomes evaluated, especially health.

The researchers are now calling on decision makers to ensure that robust evaluations are in place for the London 2012 Olympics and Paralympics and the Glasgow 2014 Commonwealth Games so it is clear costs “can be justified in terms of benefits to the host population.”

Dr McCartney, of the University of Glasgow, and colleagues, said: “The cost of hosting a major multi-sport event such as the Olympic Games or the Commonwealth Games has increased over the past two decades, to the extent that it has become difficult to justify the expenditure on the basis of entertainment or national showcasing alone.

“Cities competing to host events are now judged on the prospect of a long term positive legacy being generated for the host population, among other factors.

“Our review found insufficient evidence to confirm or refute expectations about the health or socioeconomic benefits for the host population of previous major multi-sport events.

“Benefits from future events such as the 2012 Olympic Games and Paralympic Games in London or the 2014 Commonwealth Games in Glasgow cannot be expected to occur automatically.

“There is a lack of evidence on the impacts of major multi-sport events on the host population, and until decision makers include robust, long term evaluations as part of their design and implementation of events, it is unclear how the costs can be justified in terms of host population benefits.”

Professor Mike Weed, of Canterbury Christ Church University, Kent, who reviewed the study for the journal, said the London 2012 Olympic and Paralympic Games will cost over £9 billion – £150 for every man, woman and child in the UK.

He said: “For this investment, we have been promised legacy outcomes for sport and physical activity, regeneration, culture, sustainability, the economy and disability. Each of these areas has implications for health or relates to socioeconomic determinants of health.”

Prof Weed said the findings suggest £150 a head towards staging London 2012 “is a poor investment made by the treasury on our behalf.”

[<http://www.telegraph.co.uk/health/healthnews/7745184/No-evidence-that-2012-Olympics-will-improve-health-or-wealth.html>]

Document 8

‘How much is too much?’

An article on a British youth football website Dr Lyle Micheli

In kids’ sports programs, fitness and skill development have to be balanced with the need to avoid overtraining. Overtraining is when the athlete is required to do too much – either physically or mentally, or both.

Parents need to be sensitive to changes in performance and attitude that suggest their kids are being pushed too hard. Such changes may be precursors of physical injury.

Signs of overtraining

- Slower times in distance sports such as running, cycling, and swimming
- Deterioration in execution of sports plays or routines such as those performed in figure skating and gymnastics
- Decreased ability to achieve training goals
- Lack of motivation to practise
- Getting tired easily
- Irritability and unwillingness to cooperate with teammates.

Unfortunately, the tendency when a parent or coach is confronted with signs of overtraining is to push the child harder. But if overtraining is the culprit, any increase in training will only worsen the situation.

And as I have suggested, training too much may eventually lead to overuse injuries in which actual damage to the bones and soft tissues occurs because the body can’t recover from the repetitive physical demands placed on it by sport activity.

This raises an important question: How much is too much? Not a great deal of hard data is available on this subject. That’s because to find out exactly how much training is safe, we’d have to take large groups of kids and put them through grueling sports drills and wait there with our clipboards for them to collapse in pain. I don’t think we could find too many parents who’d be willing to turn over their kids for such tests! In the absence of data obtained from clinical studies, we need to formulate our guidelines based on observations made over the years by coaches and sports scientists.

How long can kids train?

As a general rule, children shouldn’t train for more than 18–20 hours a week. If a child is engaged in elite competition there may be pressures to train for longer – especially in the lead-up to a major event. Anytime a child trains for longer than this recommended length of time she must be monitored by a qualified sports doctor with expertise in young athletes. This is to make sure abnormalities in growth or maturation do not occur. Any joint pain lasting more than two weeks is justification for a visit to the sports doctor.

It’s also important to ensure restrictions against excessive sports activity are not exceeded. For instance, young baseball pitchers in America are not allowed to pitch more than seven innings a week. While this restriction is mostly adhered to in the game setting, it is pointless if kids are pressured by their coaches to throw excessively during practices (parents, too, need to remember that going to the park with their kid to “throw a few” needs to be counted as part of the number of pitches he makes).

In general, young baseball players shouldn’t perform more than 300 “skilled throws” a week; any more than this and the risk of injury dramatically increases.

How much of an increase in training is safe?

Increasing the frequency, duration, or intensity of training too quickly is one of the main causes of injury. To prevent injuries caused by too-rapid increases in training, I am a strong believer in athletes following the “ten-percent rule.” The rule refers to the amount a young athlete’s training can be increased every week without risking injury. In other words, a child running 20 minutes at a time four times a week can probably safely run 22 minutes four times a week the week after, an increase of ten percent.

Most of the injuries I see in my clinic are the product of violations of the ten percent rule, when young athletes have their training regimen increased “too much, too soon.”

“Too much too soon” scenarios

The football player, who, after a summer of inactivity, goes straight into a fall pre-season training camp.

The swimmer who normally trains at 5000 yards per day but then is asked to swim 8000 yards a day for three consecutive days.

The dancer who does 12 hours of classes per week and then suddenly is training six hours per day, six days a week at a summer dance program.

The gymnast, who, in the weeks before a major event, doubles her training time.

How hard should kids train?

When young athletes are growing the emphasis should be on developing athletic technique. Although power or speed are important qualities in sports, stressing them to children at the expense of technique can lead to injuries. Once good technique is mastered, power and speed can be introduced.

It is important for you to safeguard your children against being overtrained. The danger of this happening is especially acute if your child is an elite athlete or one engaged in a very competitive sports environment. Perhaps the most effective measure any parent can take is to make sure his child’s coach is certified. Another is to look out for the signs of overtraining, as described above, as well as the early signs of injuries themselves. A strength training program is an important component of any injury prevention program for athletes – kids included.

In many cases, I believe, kids drop out of sports because of low-grade pain that is actually the early stage of an overuse injury. The pain is never diagnosed as an early-stage overuse injury because the child simply quits the program. What this may do is prejudice a child against physical activity and exercise for life. The same is true for mental stress in sports.

Given the state of fitness in this country, overtraining children has the opposite effect of what we want, which is to instill in our young people a love of exercise that will stay with them through life, and inspire them to stay fit and healthy long after their youth sports days are done.

[http://www.footy4kids.co.uk/sports_training_howmuchistoomuch.htm]

BLANK PAGE

Copyright Acknowledgements:

- Document 1 © <http://politics.guardian.co.uk/politicspast/page/0,9067,892902,00.html>.
Document 2 © http://www.cfr.org/publication/7244/its_the_olympics_but_do_you_really_care.html.
Document 3 © <http://www.hrw.org/en/news/2009/08/28/letter-international-olympic-committee-regarding-sochi-games-and-murders-russia-s-ri>.
Document 4 © http://www.realclearsports.com/articles/2010/05/09/politics_patriotism_encumber_sports_96955.html.
Document 5 © <http://blogs.timesofindia.indiatimes.com/jugglebandhi/entry/boycott-not-ban>; The Times of India.
Document 6 © http://www.wada-ama.org/Documents/News_Center/Speeches_Presentations/WADA_Address_JohnFahey_ARC_Sydney_April2010.pdf.
Document 7 © <http://www.telegraph.co.uk/health/healthnews/7745184/No-evidence-that-2012-Olympics-will-improve-health-or-wealth.html>.
Document 8 © http://www.footy4kids.co.uk/sports_training_howmuchistoomuch.htm.

Permission to reproduce items where third-party owned material protected by copyright is included has been sought and cleared where possible. Every reasonable effort has been made by the publisher (UCLES) to trace copyright holders, but if any items requiring clearance have unwittingly been included, the publisher will be pleased to make amends at the earliest possible opportunity.

University of Cambridge International Examinations is part of the Cambridge Assessment Group. Cambridge Assessment is the brand name of University of Cambridge Local Examinations Syndicate (UCLES), which is itself a department of the University of Cambridge.