

Dear Mr Shunk,

I attach five documents pertaining to the business of British Team Manager Maurice Dougan at the 2006 World Masters Indoor at Linz:

1. World Masters Indoor.doc. My formal complaint dated 27 March
2. BMAF Anthony Treacher.doc. Winston Thomas letter dated 11 Sept.
3. BMAFApol.doc. Draft apology from BMAF penned by me, sent 6 Oct.
4. WinstonApol.doc. Draft apology from Winston Thomas penned by me, sent 6 Oct.
5. 20061121Summary.doc. A more precise detailing of the case against Maurice Dougan, in relation to IAAF and WMA rules and praxis. Sent Nov 13.

I was of course out of line to pen those draft BMAF apologies on a black/white version of their own BMAF notepaper. I did it to get the truth out. Also I feared another homily from the BMAF about being friendly to everyone. Winston had forgotten that I had already swallowed my pride and proffered my hand to my antagonist (and had it refused) back in March. My draft apologies are actually very relevant - and much better written than Winston Thomas' letter.

What prompted me to contact you - the last straw - is something I heard from a BMAF committee member on Saturday. I had asked him what Winston meant by my prior "problem" with Maurice Doogan that spilled over to the track at Linz. He replied, in full seriousness, that I was angry with Maurice Dougan because of his e-mail ruling that I could not wear my Swedish club vest at a prior British indoor championships. !?!? Enough said....

You asked me "what satisfaction do you want?" Well all this took place in a ten minute window in the competition area of a prestige WMA event. It may be for the WMA to seek satisfaction from someone.

Personally I want my complaints/statements answered item for item. I want to know whether I was right or wrong to have acted as I did at Linz. If I was right, I want the WMA to recommend that the BMAF Committee discipline Maurice Doogan and rebuke Winston Thomas for his fallacious arguments and for deliberately trying to cover up the matter.

If I did anything wrong at Linz, I want the satisfaction of being told that too.

By the way, my Swedish telephone number is (redacted) which is sometimes coupled to my mobile (redacted). Thank you for your patience,

Anthony Treacher

**From: "Anthony Treacher" <anthony@treacher.se>**  
**To: "Fried. L. Schunk" <Holzschu@t-online.de>**

**Subject: Re: Maurice Dougan and Linz**  
**Date: Thu, 16 Nov 2006 02:12:44 +0100**

Dear Mr. Schunk,

I would like to thank you for responding to my complaint. It makes a pleasant change. The BMAF and Winston Thomas never had the courtesy to contact me for clarification on any point in my complaint.

I understand and welcome your questions. I can best answer all your questions by phone. I believe that the most useful approach would be to take my document 20061121Summary.doc and go through it item by item from the start. You will then have the complete picture. We can only do that on the phone. But we can do it quickly and painlessly. I will call you again tomorrow (or at your convenience) and we can work something out.

There is just one point here. I am not primarily interested in personal satisfaction. I am not a helpless victim. This is an official complaint. I approach the WMA to reveal and file a complaint about a serious incident involving possible violations of the rules and unsportsmanlike conduct at a prestige WMA event at Linz - an incident of which the WMA was not previously aware. Or rather, BMAF Chairman and WMA Secretary Winston Thomas was certainly aware of it but has presumably neglected to inform the WMA Chairman and other WMA officers. I expect a formal decision on the conduct of Maurice Doogan and Winston Thomas (and my conduct for that matter). If that is not what you had in mind, then I think we should start again. No politics and evasions please. I have had enough of that from the BMAF.

Incidentally, if you want to put a face on me: I am 67 years of age. I have served in the Parachute Regiment in Cyprus. I have a B.Sc.(econ.) degree from the London School of Economics. I am married to a Swedish lady since 1961. I have two "children" and two grandchildren. I also boast (and I mean boast) the Swedish high school exam in Russian (1973), Finnish (1975) and Mandarin Chinese (1999) - all now defunct, and I run a reasonable 400m -just a hint that I do not give up easily.

I am looking forward to clarifying the situation for you.

Yours sincerely,  
Anthony Treacher

**Subject: Re: Maurice Dougan and Linz, Call Room etc**  
**From: "Anthony Treacher" <anthony@treacher.se>**  
**To: "Fried. L. Schunk" <Holzschu@t-online.de>**  
**Date: Fri, 17 Nov 2006 10:19:41 +0100**

Dear Mr Schunk,

We cannot communicate if we cannot establish the facts and dismiss the trivia over the telephone. I have already sent you sufficient clear and relevant material to make a ruling on Maurice Doogan's actions in Linz.

Herewith however is a response to your points and questions:  
>"Emotions".

\*\* Please do not trivialise this matter as a question of "emotions". This is a serious complaint against a BMAF official for rules violations and Unsportsmanlike Conduct at a WMA competition.

>And these emotions deal with an incident between an athlete and his team  
>manager and his federation"

\*\*The relevant emotions (those arising at Linz) have nothing to do with any prior internal BMAF incident. That is Winston Thomas' version. It is totally untrue. And I thought I had established that. Any emotions were generated solely by an incident in a ten-minute window on the track at the World Masters Indoors at Linz. Please remember that I did not start this. I upheld your WMA rules and protected my teammates from disqualification. For that I was shouted at. So this very much concerns the WMA. It is not an internal BMAF matter.

> "About the latter (rule violations) we can argue to death and get nowhere"

\*\* As an Athlete I equip myself with a clear concept of the rules before I step onto the track. The WMA expects that of me. In return we athletes expect the WMA Laws and Legislation Committee to have an equally clear concept of its own rules. When rules are violated we expect the WMA to be the first to uphold its rules. If the WMA will "get nowhere" in examining violations of its own rules, then who will?

>"becoming very formal about this case toward WMA, 8 mos after the  
> fact, I will then have to reduce it to that as well."

\*\*I attempted in good faith to be friendly, open and direct with you. I will not ingratiate myself with anyone. Is that a problem for your ego?  
If I today were to refer a doping allegation to the WMA I think you would indeed prefer to be very formal about it indeed. Even 8 mos after the fact. That this matter comes to the notice of the WMA eight months after the fact is not my fault. I tried to solve it immediately on the spot in March. Had I instead contacted the WMA in March you would have referred me to the BMAF anyway. Correct? This is Catch 22.

>"I don't want half the story on the phone and another half in writing"

\*\*I did not want it this way either. But this is what you have yourself engineered. I honestly could not understand everything you had written. As is the case with written communication even between native English speakers, clarification is often required. It is a waste of both your and my time to comment in writing on badly formulated and irrelevant matters - as is the

case now. By refusing to let me explain over the phone at my own expense, you render this process unmanageable.

To date all I have received from you is amateur psychology and impertinent

personal reflections. In this you are rather like Winston Thomas. Why on earth do you people write like this to your athletes?

You have not established the facts relating to Maurice Doogan breaking the rules and and Unsportmanlike Conduct. That may smart and politically correct. But it is not impressive. My serious advice to you the next time around, is to save your personal comments to us master athletes for the phone, or face-to-face (if you dare). Try instead to get the relevant issues down in writing.

However, in some respects I do think you are wise to require everything in writing. I have your personal comments about me in writing for instance.

>The .... Call Room"

\*\*Your Call Room at Linz was very efficient and admirable. Otherwise I really cannot explain all the circumstances of the Call Room because it was not my business as an athlete. Ask the people involved including the Call Room personnel (Percy Hirsch should have a copy of the Final Call Room List for the M65 4x200m relay). I have written what I believe is correct and I stand for that. All the facts you need are in my documentation. It is relatively good documentation and we are both well served by being frank with each other.

But if you insist, I repeat the facts on the Call Room situation. A GBR athlete (Newcombe) did not show up at the Call Room in time. Then another GBR team leader Horwill, who was present at the Call Room with Maurice Doogan to manage the relay team, volunteered to take Newcombe's place. I am not sure where Doogan was at that exact time. Ask Maurice he should know. The WMA should haul him in to explain anyway.

The point is that Eric Howill made the decision to be the substitute and that as a GBR team leader he was empowered to make that decision in the presence/absence of Maurice Doogan. I had nothing to do with it - contrary to what Winston Thomas alleges in his letter. Winston Thomas invents things for his own ends. I cannot know whether or not the other teams consented to our legal substitution. GBR came honourably last. We would certainly have done better with Newcombe instead of heroic 70 year older walker Horwill in a M65 200m relay. We would not have won a medal. But that is all irrelevant to the actions of Maurice Doogan.

The new changed team had been formally written in stone on the Final Call Room List and escorted onto the closed competition area. Maurice Doogan then invaded the track with the original athlete Newcombe and tried to switch back Newcombe into the team, contrary to the Final Call Room List. None of this is in Winston Thomas' version, which you say you respect. But I swear my version is the correct version. And the other relay team members will confirm it.

Maurice Doogan broke the rules. He wanted us to break the rules. Formally it

was cheating and would have exposed us to disqualification, irrespective of medal chances. Are you now formally condoning this? May we in the future "stretch the rules a bit" as you the Chairman of the WMA Laws and Legislation Committee say. In future may we athletes ignore what is on the Final Call Room List? Perhaps we athletes can bypass the Call Room completely?

Or does interpretation of the rules subjectively depend on the persons involved - one application for the athletes and another for Maurice Doogan, Winston Thomas and Friedel Schunk? Or are the rules only to be applied against us athletes and not on our behalf?

>And those issues are water under the bridge, at this stage.

\*\* Yes. Just like rape and murder. Why bother to investigate them eight months later?

The point is that addressing rule violations is highly relevant to future WMA events. We masters athletes must know what is required of us the next time we step onto the track. If our role figures - our Team Managers - break the rules against us, then we reasonably expect the WMA to uphold the rules. Otherwise we athletes in future will have no confidence in the system - your WMA system. Why should we bother about the rules if the WMA does not? "Don't bother. The Chairman of the WMA Laws and Legislation Committee says it's OK to "stretch the rules a bit"".

A lot of water has run under the bridge after I directly initiated my complaint in March but that is the fault of the BMAF. I had no choice but to go to the BMAF first. Do you mean that if a national federation ignores a complaint about a WMA event, we masters athletes cannot complain about it to the WMA? Are we masters athletes completely without rights and protection? Or does the WMA mean that I should have formally complained to the WMA officials at Linz? Does the WMA seriously mean that I should have immediately reported my own BMAF team manager to the WMA for rules violations, and the WMA track officials for rule violations in allowing Maurice Doogan on the track to break the rules and harass me? I am the one who upheld the integrity of your own WMA rules. How can that be wrong?

>Even if you get a statement from WMA that there may have been rule  
>violations that does not automatically resolve your dispute with your  
>federation and its team manager...

\*\*Actually, a written statement from the WMA criticising Maurice Doogan for violating the rules and Unsportsmanlike Conduct would resolve this dispute. An equivalent statement from the BMAF would have the same effect eight (8) months ago. That has always been the case.

I care not one iota about the BMAF. By ignoring my allegations about Maurice Doogan the BMAF was totally out of line. Living abroad I do expect better from the British - fairplay and all that. But now the prospect of wearing

the BMAF vest again makes me feel sick. But can we not once and for all separate my disgust with the BMAF from your WMA case against Maurice Doogan for violating the rules and Unsportsmanlike Conduct at Linz?

There are today expectations in the masters athletes world that the WMA will still handle this honourably. There remains a slight hope that you - in the interests of the masters athletes - will concentrate on the alleged rule violations and Unsportsmanlike Conduct. Other equally "proud" masters athletes share my anger at this. They do not want to end up in the same situation. Maybe the WMA should consider a long hard talk with Maurice Doogan and the BMAF Chairman Winston Thomas. They caused this situation. Not me. This is very much a WMA concern.

>"With all due respect for your opinion, there are obviously additional >facts that you have not communicated to me."

\*\*In life there are always additional facts, documents etc. I had to draw a line somewhere. I had to make it manageable for you and me. I assure you that I am an honest man, acting in good faith.

Let me put things in perspective here. I made a complaint to the BMAF about Maurice Doogan. It is not the other way around. Unless I am misinformed there is no complaint about my conduct at Linz. I presume that with "obviously additional facts" you are referring to Winston Thomas letter to me. I can only answer to my complaint about Maurice Doogan. You will have to ask Winston Thomas to explain his letter if anything he says contradicts my version of the facts. Then you should talk to me about it. It is not correct to accept Winston Thomas' allegations about my conduct without me being able to refute them or defend myself - a fundamental Western legal principle I believe. Although not practiced by the BMAF in my case. I attach the correspondence with BMAF President Paul Dickenson that I can find. It only confirms what I already said - that I tried to solve this matter informally with the BMAF in a quiet civilized manner back in March. Paul Dickenson unfortunately did not come back to me as promised. This is really his fault.

>I am personally very sympathetic about your anger toward Mr. Doogan.  
>However, I also respect Winston Thomas' point of view to look at both >sides of the coin."

\*\*Thank you Mr Schunk. Please try to continue to be sympathetic. But please be wary of Winston Thomas' point of view. If you can prove he is right, then please inform me. I am very interested.

>"It is a pity, for a long time, the matter has not been resolved.....Also >accept the fact, that not everybody may be perfect, or as perfect as you >think you are."

\*\*Oh dear. Why do you officials so despise your athletes?

OK. Let us both agree that we are not hitting it off. I will call you later today so that we may part amicably.

Sincerely,  
Anthony Treacher

**From: "Anthony Treacher" <anthony@treacher.se>**  
**To: "Fried. L. Schunk" <Holzschu@t-online.de>**  
**Subject: Re: Maurice Dougan and Linz, Call Room etc**  
**Date: Fri, 17 Nov 2006 18:26:45 +0100**

Dear Mr Schunk,

You are losing control. Calm down. The trouble is the clearer and more specific I get, the angrier you become. If I can forget my enormous ego, then you can forget yours. Where you got the idea you can communicate with me in this tone, I cannot fathom. You do realise that we are equal in the eyes of the Lord? You are not my superior.

I am sorry but I do not know the status of my approach to you, or what you are doing. I just cannot fathom it. But I do know it your duty to handle the topic. You are not doing me a favour. Why cannot we work sensibly together on this, I do not know. I am not a nasty person And I do not go and tell tales. But you have provoked me to the utmost. More on that at the end....

As I stated, I have responded to all your queries about the Call Room. The documentation I already sent you does answer all your questions as far as I could reasonably be expected to know. I repeat:

A." The substitute runner also being another team manager" - this is not the first time you have this information. It was contained in my WinstonApol.doc:

1.. Contrary to my assertion, BMAF Team Manager Maurice Dougan was notified of the change to the relay team. I now understand that he was present when that change was initiated by another team manager Eric Horwill, who in fact was the person who volunteered to replace John Newcombe.

C. "You say in one breath Doogan was in the Call Room, and he was not."

The movements of Maurice Doogan in or outside the Call Room at Linz were not my responsibility. I honestly thought he was present. But I equally honestly do not remember exactly. So I am honestly saying that. As an athlete I specifically have no obligation to remember, no more than did Eric Horwill (ask him maybe?), Arthur Kimber (ask him?), or John Seymour (ask him?) or better still Maurice Doogan (?). It had nothing to do with me.

Furthermore, I would venture that it is essentially irrelevant to the central issue of whether or not the British Team made a legal change because the substitute Eric Horwill was in fact also another GBR team manager. All of which was outside my mandate and which I made no attempt to influence. Is everyone clear on this now? Particularly Winston Thomas? Please call me if you are not. Again, a telephone call would have clarified this immediately.

C. That the Call Room was very "accomodating" means that I felt that the nice young Call Room officials performed their job flexibly and well. They inserted the new runner Eric Horwill in the Final Call Room List at the last minute according to the rules (I suppose), enabling us to run with a full team. I apologise for using a long word to a foreigner. I know what it is like.

D. "But it still would interest me, who was listed on the original team sheet, just the original four runners, or any (and which) substitute".

Again I just do not know. Why should I know? I never really saw the original team sheet as submitted to the Call Room. It was none of my business. I therefore also do not know whether there was a substitute listed. I doubt it. But I just do not know. Again please ask someone else. And I still do not understand the relevance of your question to the Doogan problem on the track at Linz. We arrived on the track legitimately according to the approved Final Call Room List. If this is an attempt to find fault with your admirable Linz Call Room staff, then I will not help you either.

E. "By your representations you seem to be firm on rules".

I am not firm on the rules at all. I am a humble athlete. I do not know the rules on substitutions because it is not my job. But what I knew and what has subsequently been verified to 100% by all the experts I have contacted in Sweden and abroad, is that a team leader cannot change a team listed on the Final Call Room List once that team has passed the Call Room and is on the competition area. But then they may all be wrong. How should I know?

I should mention here that since March I have endured much soul-searching in querying the legal basis of the actions of myself and Maurice Doogan. I had hoped that a bye-product of a correct examination of my complaint would be the truth on my position. I have longed for it. But because nobody has ever examined the essence of my complaint from late-March to mid-September (and noit even then), I was none the wiser as to the rights or the wrongs. Now in mid-November I am talking to the WMA legal expert and I am still none the wiser. Still the politics and evasions. I appear to be still involved with the same people who are more intent on questioning my motives, dissecting my personality and preaching at me.

That is the impression you give me Friedel. It is my honest opinion and you should be grateful for it and thank me for having the guts to tell you. You may think that this is trouble for you. Well, it has given me sleepless nights since March. If you had been subjected to such treatment, you would have had sleepless nights too.

Just one last thing. I stand by what I write. So I give you full permission to quote anything I write. As to me giving you confidentiality for what you have written, I must confess we are on the verge here.

I have a very serious issue with you. It is the last paragraph in your penultimate e-mail:

>>> It is a pity, for a long time, the matter has not been resolved. While  
>>> organisations try to cater to hundreds or thousand of "clientele", an  
>>> individual may sometimes have the tendency to think that the whole world  
>>> revolves around his own pet project. The championships are supposed to >>> be

>>> fun for all involved, including those who organise them - without pay.

>>> Please, put things into perspective. Also accept the fact, that not  
>>> everybody may be perfect, or as perfect as you think you are.

I have neither said nor written anything to you to deserve that. It was a deliberate insult.

I request that you give me an immediate and unreserved apology for that entire paragraph. Otherwise I will indeed send this to the international masters athletics community and I promise you that I will fling it as widely as I possibly can. You deserve it. Question is whether you should have this last chance.

This is my last warning to you. You have provoked me to the limit. From now on take great care on what you write. I just do not know whether you mean well or what but it reads very badly. For your own sake, just use the phone. Write nothing. From now on.  
For your information my pet project just now is actually the 2007 Helsinki Indoor Championships. The project has two interrelated modules. The first module is to brush up my dormant Finnish. For that purpose I have been taking an advanced Finnish conversation course at the Stockholm Finnish Institute - I am terrible. It is all way above my head. But I try. The second module comprises sensible training to take medals in the 60m, 200m, 400m and perhaps the long jump. I really look forward to meeting your many outstanding German M65 athletes again - Guido, Willi, Gerhard, Arno, Hans-Joachim and the others. I hope at least this my pet project meets with WMA approval.

Please don't forget the immediate and unreserved apology.

Sincerely,  
Anthony Treacher

**From: "Anthony Treacher" <anthony@treacher.se>**  
**To: "Fried. L. Schunk" <Holzschu@t-online.de>**  
**Subject: The Call Room and the presence of Maurice Doogan**  
**Date: Sat, 18 Nov 2006 07:29:39 +0100**

Dear Mr. Schunk,

I see now that there is one area where you may still be uncertain of the Call Room facts. Maurice Doogan was of course initially at the Call Room with us. He and Eric Horwill, in their capacities as team leaders. I have not specified that explicitly because it was of course known to us British. In normal circumstances it would not need to be clarified. There arose a discussion about finding a substitute and Eric Horwill volunteered. At some time Maurice Doogan left the Call Room to look for original relay team member John Newcombe. My strongest recollection is that he was present when Eric Horwill volunteered and thus knew of the substitution made by his co-team leader at the time it was made. Maurice Doogan of course knew of the substitution by the time he took Newcombe to the track. And he later should have informed Winston Thomas of that fact.

Sincerely,  
Anthony Treacher

**From: "Anthony Treacher" <anthony@treacher.se>**  
**To: "Fried. L. Schunk" <Holzschu@t-online.de>**

**Subject: Maurice Doogan - towards the final solution**

**Date: Sat, 18 Nov 2006 19:44:58 +0100**

Dear Mr Schunk,

It is good that we are acting in a more friendly manner towards each other, as adult equals. But...

And I thank you for your confirmation that Maurice Doogan broke the WMA rules and that Anthony Treacher was correct in upholding the WMA rules. I assume you also mean that Anthony Treacher in his role as an athlete did not offend the WMA rules in any way at Linz. After eight months of BMAF evasion, this is gratifying.

But as I said, I will never give up on this. I require formal satisfaction. It is no use asking me to forget it all, come to my senses, swallow my pride, be a man, stop being a child, or whatever. Does anyone forget a rape?

This is definitely not an internal matter between an athlete, his team manager and his federation. It is demonstrably a WMA matter and it always was. So unfortunately I must take of your time again.

In his formal 11 September letter to me BMAF chairman Winston Thomas, at length, argued the exact opposite of your WMA findings. He found that Maurice Doogan was formally correct and that Anthony Treacher had acted incorrectly. Winston Thomas also added unsubstantiated derogatory personal comment that the Linz incident was the fault of Anthony Treacher, in that Anthony had carried a private difference with Maurice Doogan onto the track at Linz. Winston Thomas also stated in this formal BMAF record that the WMA rules are such as to permit the on-track substitution back to John Newcombe. This is also in direct contrast to your findings and particularly regrettable as Winston Thomas is also BMA Secretary. The BMA should not countenance the BMA secretary making statements counter to the official BMA rules.

Winston Thomas' 11 September letter to me is the only formal record of the BMAF findings in my complaint against Maurice Doogan. Your WMA findings contradict those of BMAF chairman Winston Thomas. The BMAF formal record of the incident at Linz should be corrected.

I cannot go to the BMAF and talk to them. From March 2006 the BMAF deliberately ignored my complaint. I have asked Winston Thomas for redress. He has refused, in no uncertain terms. I will not ask him again and risk a repeat of the same unpleasant treatment. I will not humble myself yet again to Maurice Doogan and proffer him my hand. It is unreasonable to require me to do so. It is clear I have no recourse with the BMAF.

The BMAF is a WMA-affiliated body. I request you to communicate - informally or formally - your own professional WMA findings in the matter of Maurice Doogan and the WMA rules at Linz to BMAF chairman Winston Thomas. I request that you ask Winston Thomas to send me a new letter that corrects the BMAF formal 11 September 2006 record of the conduct of Maurice Doogan at Linz, which is now found wanting by your findings. You may inform BMAF chairman Winston Thomas that he would be unwise to blemish any new formal record with unsubstantiated personal comments about Anthony Treacher that are unrelated to Anthony Treacher's complaint concerning the conduct of British Team Manager Maurice Doogan at Linz.

Failing that, I intend to file a formal complaint to the WMA, citing Maurice Dougan's WMA rules violations and UC within a ten-minute window in the competition area at the WMA-sponsored Indoor Masters Championships. That is a one hundred per cent WMA concern. I will also file a further request that the WMA ask the WMA-affiliated BMAF to erase from the record Winston Thomas' formal 11 September letter to Anthony Treacher concerning the above WMA championship. I will request that letter be replaced with a true record that outlines Maurice Doogan's WMA rules violations and Unsportsmanlike Conduct on the track at Linz. Formally, complaints to the WMA must be addressed to WMA Secretary Winston Thomas who, in a unfortunate conflict of interest, is also the BMAF Chairman. WMA Secretary Winston Thomas is a part in this case, a case in which he has already demonstrated prejudice and a lack of understanding of applicable WMA rules and regulations. Pursuant to normal practice in such conflict of interest cases, I therefore require the name and address of an alternative WMA officer other than Winston Thomas, to whom I should address my complaint. Hopefully, it will never come to this but I request that you now give me an alternative WMA name for that eventuality. I really apologise to you for the additional work. And I do mean that. But let us get this processed correctly and people like Maurice Doogan and Winston Thomas finally out of our hair.

Sincerely and forgive me for sending you this now on your weekend.

Anthony

**From: "Anthony Treacher" <anthony@treacher.se>**

**To: "Fried. L. Schunk" <Holzschu@t-online.de>**

**Subject: Thank you**

**Date: Mon, 20 Nov 2006 08:40:44 +0100**

Dear Mr. Shunk,

Thank you. You are most gracious.

Membership of the WMA-affiliated BMAF has not proved to be a privilege for me. I have therefore scant interest in safeguarding it.

You are unilaterally releasing a selection of our internal e-mail correspondence ad verbum to Winston Thomas. I assume that you thereby release me from any obligation to hold our e-mail correspondence confidential.

Thank you again,  
Anthony Treacher.