

David Triesman  
**POLITICS & SPORT**



Of course sport is political. Given the importance it assumes in the lives of millions of people, it would be astonishing if it were not. Indeed, I suspect that the effort which is made in ruling ideology to suggest that sport and politics are completely autonomous realms is due to the real degree of convergence between them. The relationship obviously emerges most clearly in the international context, in the issues surrounding playing cricket and rugby with South Africa or in relation to the Moscow Olympics in the aftermath of the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan. But it is really present at many other levels.

It is present in all international sport in the run-of-the-mill nationalism of contestants and commentators. It appears within Britain in traditional north-south economic rivalries, in the differential access to sport resources enjoyed by members of different classes, in the fight for resources in the physical culture sector. And, at the deepest level, it is present in the way in which people talk about sport, in the characteristics which are attributed to particular sports, to those who play them and to those who watch. The shabby truisms wheeled out about manliness, individuality, competitiveness, and so on, usually associated with a negative and reactionary concept of

'human nature', are all political expressions about the social world and its inhabitants.

Thus, when we talk of people as fundamentally motivated by competitiveness, or the individual drive to win, or eager to see blood, or disciplined, or team-spirited, we are using everyday words to make fundamental propositions about human psychology, 'nature', and society. They seek to describe human relations in society to justify the basest and most negative view of our potential for change, freezing human psychology into formulae which no social change would eliminate.

While it would be valuable to explore these themes, this article cannot do so. It considers how and why sporting events are used in international power relations, the way in which two nations have focused on sport as an international instrument. And finally, I will make a preliminary consideration of how sporting accomplishment (or lack of it) is said to be associated with the character of the political regime in different countries. Evidently, we see the Olympic years highlight the extent of the overlap between sport and politics, and it is timely to consider the special status of the Olympics. Other years do provide climaxes of interest, in particular the years of planned Springbok tours of the 'Old

Commonwealth'. In reality, sport and politics are continually intertwined, and these are simply the occasions when the images appear in sharp relief.

#### **Politics and the Olympic Movement**

Two 'world' sporting events command infinitely more prestige than any others. At the risk of offending the officionardos of Lancashire Crown Green Bowling or the All Bankok Society of Game Fishermen, or others with a sectional interest in a particular spot, it seems clear to me that the Association Football World Cup and the Olympic Games are in a class of their own.

The World Cup has a special status because it is a single sport (soccer) event watched directly or indirectly by 600 million people each time its final is contested. It is a tournament contested by professionals (although the socialist countries tend to find alternative formulae for describing their professionals), many of whom are week-in, week-out stars in their own right. As a contest, it allows the competing nations to run riot in terms of national chauvinism and xenophobia, and its eliminating rounds have even led to warfare between two Central American nations. International focus on the World Cup occurs because it is the climax of a

sport massively popular in its own right, and a major national institution in many countries.

Because it is competed for by *national teams*, as opposed to individuals, there is little to deflect the patriot from giving full vent to his/her fantasies about nation, destiny and the perfidy of other peoples, the quintessence of which is invariably to be found in the playing methods and standards of sportsmanship of the other side's centre half. With journalists and commentators stoking the atmosphere by adding florid simile to baroque epithet, with every free-kick on the edge of one's penalty area as potentially lethal as the retreat from Dunkirk, every ancient national rivalry rekindled into contemporary drama, it becomes possible to conjure out of a football match a sense of nation usually present only in war.

The more repressive the home regime, the more parlous its economic circumstances, the more this jingoism will flourish. Commentators achieve bellicose rhetoric at new levels: their centre forward, whose violent assaults on our defenders suggest that he must have been fed raw meat prior to having his manacles removed before the match, is now lying in the middle of the pitch with a broken, cheekbone after a firm but fair tackle by our left back. The foreigner (who will have a torrid latin temperament or South American passions, etc) should, when the trainer brings him round with the smelling salts be given an Oscar for his acting ability. Their midfield player (an animal) who has tapped our left winger on the ankle should be arrested for attempted murder. So powerful are these nationalistic institutions, especially during the World Cup, that even countries close to economic collapse can manage to ignore their plight. Italy, for example, under the Christian Democrats, where players and officials are celebrated for the size of the inducements they receive, and where they come to share prison cells with the most eminent of fraudulent bankers, can afford to ignore the fall of yet another government on days boasting World Cup elimination matches.

### The Olympics

The World Cup is a vortex of chauvinist politics, although it has seldom been a centre for political dissent. The Olympics, the second 'super' contest, is more interesting having greater scope for political manipulation (for good or ill) for a number of reasons that bear examination.

First, it is an international event from which no nation can, in the general run of events, be disenfranchised. Unlike the World

Cup, every athlete regarded as acceptable to the individual national Olympics Committees may try their luck in competition. It is open to those who want to compete for the rewards of having taken part; only one in twenty-five will stand on the rostrum at the end of an event. Thus, for example, a deservedly unknown Lebanese skier had the right, at Lake Placid, to take over twice as long as A-M Moser Proll in descending the women's downhill, simply because she wanted to have a go at it and the Lebanese Committee said she could. Thus, the Olympics are 'available' and there are consequent opportunities for political demonstration and the exercise of leverage. For example, the African nations took the opportunity in Montreal to hammer home the isolation of South Africa by trying to get New Zealand banned for playing with apartheid, and all African nations were able to engage whether in the front rank of the sporting nations or not. The failure to ban New Zealand removed numerous key athletes from the Olympics. *The Olympics give everyone the opportunity to mount a protest.*

Second, the very fact that almost every nation is present at a Summer Olympics gives the hosting nation unusual opportunities to extol its political and ideological system on a world stage. All nations do so (for good or ill). With the TV and movie cameras of every other nation present, the chance occurs for leaders to portray their state at what they take to be its best. Indeed, before the pervasive presence of TV, the attempt has always been made to demonstrate a connection between excellence across a broad spectrum of physical culture and culture in all other respects by hosting nations. Examples illustrate the point. In Germany in 1936, a sustained effort was made to attach images of sporting success to Aryan 'excellence' in general. Thus, it was no accident that Hitler and Goebbels stormed from the Olympic arena each time the late, magnificent Jesse Owens clinched one of his four gold medals in track and field. Hitler's attempt to recoup the Aryan sporting image exercised him for two years finally to be demolished by Joe Louis (the Brown Bomber) who, in 2:04 minutes of the first round of the world title heavyweight fight, nearly detached the head of the German nazi-sympathising champion, Max Schmeling, from his body.

In 1948, the Olympic parades in Empire Way, Wembley, were carefully orchestrated to demonstrate the extent of Britain's warm, paternal, benevolent rule over the post-war remnants of the colonial world, symbolised in the very name of the avenue through which the athletes paraded. Naturally, to capitalise on the prestige of the Games means that the host nations do not tolerate any untoward

signs of disaffection. A compliant population is needed to underpin the impression of social excellence. It was, again, no accident that the Mexican government thought it necessary to shoot down over 200 of its citizens shortly before the Games in Mexico City (1968) to 'maintain public order'. It is worth noting that the very fact of holding the 1968 Games on the American sub-continent was of more general political significance. 1968 marked the culmination of the work of a black athletic protest movement first proposed by the black political satirist Dick Gregory before the 1960 Olympics. He argued that the Olympics exploited black Americans who were allowed to temporarily emerge from the ghettos of Harlem, the Chicago South Side and Watts for the greater glory of the USA, a glory to which they were otherwise allowed no access.

It will be recalled that the protest, finally masterminded and orchestrated by Harry Edwards, the San Jose State College basketball coach, culminated on the victory rostrum in the clenched-fist black power salutes of Tommie Smith (who held 11 world sprint records), Lee Evans (who with the Cuban Juantorena was among the world's greatest modern quarter-milers), and John Carlos (one-time 200 meter sprint record holder and Olympic bronze medalist). These were the athletes who chose the American sub-continental venue to turn their backs on

it becomes possible to  
conjure out of a football  
match a sense of nation  
usually present only in war

their national flag before world-wide television audiences.

The world stage is again set at the Moscow Summer Games for massive demonstrations of prestige on the part of the host and by equally massive demonstrations of hostility by the nations seeking opportunities to attack that prestige. It is no real inconsistency that leads the Tories, after muted Ministerial protest, to allow a British Lions rugby tour to go ahead in South Africa at the same time as harrasing every sportsperson who wants to go to Moscow. As with the USA, each measure taken in the international sport world is an extension of diplomatic and political policy. While the invasion of Afghanistan may have provided a reason, the original choice of Moscow for the 19th Summer Games raised the voices of the demagogues of the Cold War, long before most of them had learned to spell Kabul, and those who could thought it was a brand of cigarettes. The message is simple. *So long as so much international prestige is available to*

either side, it is a 'natural' sphere of political manoeuvre. Britain and the USA will, under their current political leaderships, contend that politics should be kept out of sport, at the same time that they cooperate with other right wing regimes in sporting links.

### Its growth

Third, the simple statement that the Olympic competition is very large is really to understate its unique character. Indeed, its very size has been the subject of political and philosophical controversy. Unlike all World Championships, it involves simultaneous competition in an unparalleled number of sports, each involving many events. The Olympic movement has a tendency to all-inclusiveness and the pattern of growth is significant in making the Games a prime political target. The figures in the table below refer to the Summer Games, although the Winter Games have the same characteristics but on a smaller scale.

Development of Sports and Events in the Olympic Games reflected in figures

|      | Number of |        | Number of |        |     |
|------|-----------|--------|-----------|--------|-----|
|      | Sports    | Events | Sports    | Events |     |
| 1896 | 8         | 43     | 1948      | 19     | 150 |
| 1900 | 9         | 56     | 1952      | 19     | 149 |
| 1904 | 9         | 73     | 1956      | 19     | 151 |
| 1908 | 23        | 109    | 1960      | 19     | 150 |
| 1912 | 16        | 107    | 1964      | 21     | 163 |
| 1920 | 22        | 158    | 1968      | 20     | 172 |
| 1924 | 19        | 131    | 1972      | 21     | 195 |
| 1928 | 16        | 122    | 1976      | 21     | 198 |
| 1932 | 17        | 126    | 1980      | 21     | 203 |
| 1936 | 21        | 144    |           |        |     |

The growth in volume of events, especially since 1972 has been due in no small measure to the general international development of womens' sports, though even the growth pattern shown understates the number of sports that have been played at the Olympics. Of the original programme of eight, only four appear in the 1980 programme — athletics, gymnastics, fencing and swimming/waterpolo. Others have come and gone having been contested only a few times — lawn tennis (6), equestrian polo (3), tug-of-war (3), rugby (2), jeu de palme (1), lacrosse (1), alpinism (1), racquets (1) and motorboat racing (1).

In fact, the panel which decides which sports should be included has, since the Varna Congress in 1973, been the location of several political and technical battles. It has sought to restrict new sports to those where the results can be determined by the stopwatch or equally objective measure, excluding those new sports requiring judges to mark

performance. But of more significance, there have been long arguments about restricting the enormity of the Olympics so that either smaller countries could stage it, or so that it could be divided between a number of sites in one country, thus reducing the accumulated prestige manifest at one site. At a more philosophical level, Olympic Committees have long argued that team events should be eliminated, leaving only competitions between *individual* athletes. The virtue of the individual against his/her peers and the clock rather than the 'adulteration' of cooperation

## it involves simultaneous competition in an unparalleled number of sports

between team members carried with it political connotations about the desirability of rugged individualism as a measure of human excellence.

The keypoint about the gigantism of the Game is that the burgeoning size focuses so much attention on the Games that they become more of a political target as time goes by. Equally, it gives them a political status expressed in the Charter of the Games itself. As IOC Rule 1 states

'The aims of the Olympic movement are to promote the development of those fine physical and moral qualities which are the basis of sport and to bring together the athletes of the world in a great quadrennial festival of sports thereby creating international respect and goodwill and thus helping to construct a *better and more peaceful world*', (my emphasis — DT).

### Nationalism and Sport

Nothing said so far argues for or against the Olympic movement being political. Rather, I simply say that it is, as a matter of fact. The question remains: is this an unavoidable state of affairs? My own view is that it is entirely unavoidable, quite irrespective of whether it is desirable to try to avoid it.

Nations compete in many forms. They compete in all spheres of international economic life in the capitalist world. They compete for scarce resources. They compete for military supremacy whether exercising that supremacy or not. And it is also true that the newspapers of the world carry the evidence of those competitions whether as the statements on balance of trade deficits or in publicity puffs for swing-wing vertical take-off submarines. But there is a level to which such 'news' does not penetrate as it attempts to mask the nature of the competition involved. West German newspapers do

not, when reporting a favourable balance of payments use headlines like 'West Germany gives French Trade a Thrashing'.

Sporting events have a different quality. They provide a limited, or a 'managed' occasion when press and state organs can openly stimulate national rivalry, and thus, nationalism. Every moment of a major sporting event is open to ritual xenophobia and to appeals for what amounts to national cohesion. The particular scope of the opportunities provided lies in the fact that the sporting event does not appear so important that using it for chauvinistic reasons seems particularly dreadful. One can wallow in nationalism and then excuse one's behaviour by saying 'well, its only a game'. Thus, sporting events allow for the inculcation of values which are useful to governments and yet appear not to be of real significance.

To successfully capitalise on such emotions, it has traditionally been said in Britain that it makes little difference whether you win or lose. When winning, the natural superiority of the British appears confirmed; when losing, strong character traits of fortitude, being a 'good loser', of having the right measure of things — since after all, its only a game, and so on, can be paraded with almost as much conviction as winning is celebrated. A British athlete winning seems to do so by effortless ability, not deigning to put in more effort even at the risk of losing. Foreigners seek victory with a kind of relentlessness which makes the whole conquest a display of cheap vanity. What is to be made then of those nations which produce strings of winners in wide varieties of sports, countries like the GDR which routinely produces winners in athletics, swimming, rowing, bobbing, lifting and so on. This brings us to the second major political question to be explored in this article.

### Sporting Accomplishment and National Character

The British media are particularly strong when it comes to 'well known facts'. The fact that the Queen Mother is universally adored, or that Prince Charles has international renown for his sense of humour are matters upon which no rational person could express a contrary opinion. It is equally 'true' that the socialist countries, and the Soviet Union, GDR and Romania in particular, seize children almost at birth, force-feed them with drugs and train them in all manner of sports before they can walk. Obviously, any nation which does that will produce an abnormally high number of champions, but it is equally evident that it is accomplished only at a human cost of such proportions that GDR women swimmers, we were told in 1976



were trained to the point of sterility. Source of information: an American women silver medalist who lost to Kornelia Ender and thought that East German women were unattractive, 'unfeminine', obsessed with their sport, and therefore, unlikely to win the ultimate of all competitions, finding a man. This year, the same hoary stories are back again. In a new book *The Miracle Machine*, Doug Gilbert rediscovers the truth about GDR Olympic success. In order to attain a *per capita* chance 14 times as great as an American of striking gold, the GDR planned to reconstruct its sport which is geared ruthlessly to winning. Huge sporting meetings are held where 10,000 children at a time compete before coaches who select from their number an elite. It requires 8000 full-time athletics coaches to accomplish this.

Chosen at the age of 10, Gilbert would have us believe they are inducted into special schools where coaches, scientists and doctors measure just about everything that can be measured, and they are subjected to electrical stimulation of the muscles which increases muscle strength by 50% in two weeks. It goes without saying that the inventor of this demonic apparatus is a Soviet scientist, Yakou Kots. Moreover, to the dismay of Western coaches, GDR athletes are said to use muscle-building anabolic steroids, and to justify doing so by saying that they cannot be detected in dope tests. It is a matter of record that the GDR coaches discovered the use of steroids by taking long-distance photographs of American shot-putters eating them for lunch.

It is, of course, a perfectly proper question to ask how a particular country produces a disproportionately large number of world-class athletes, and whether this reflects unacceptable practices rather than a social system geared to more wide-spread physical culture. Before one can answer such a question, it is instructive to look at the facts

about international athletic performances. How much is truth, how much is myth?

#### Recent findings

In recent research, John Bale of Avery Hill College has considered the success of different national coaching schemes in producing world class athletes. All nations have a *per capita* output of athletes, and the names of all athletes who record world class times or measures in events are recorded each year in the *Report of the Association of Track and Field Statisticians*. Bale recorded the top 50 measured athletes in 18 track and field events and built an index of the *per capita* production of such athletes by the European nations. He also developed a method of measuring the degree of diversity in the events in which a nation's athletes were successful.

The results of the research are fascinating for they immediately destroy many of the myths. Two countries emerge as spectacular — Finland and the GDR, with Finland having the highest place in the index and the GDR, having the next highest and the greatest diversity. Placed respectively 15th and 16th among the European nations come the USSR and UK, both being, in a *per capita* sense about a thirteenth as successful as Finland. Both rank below average in this respect. Thus, while the total number of

### Two countries emerge as spectacular — Finland and the GDR

Olympic golds won by the Soviet Union was greater in 1976 than any other country, when considered in terms of overall performance and population size, many of the characterisations of Soviet sport are mythical.

But there is little doubt that the GDR has an entirely different status. One in every six of the entire population is in a well-funded

sports club, organised by a third of a million popularly elected officials. Anyone, whether a potential Olympic champion or weekend enthusiast can take part in almost any sport. It is difficult under such circumstances to miss talented sportspersons or to neglect to develop their capability. It is interesting that where individuals become champions, considerable effort is put into reintegrating them into more mundane roles when their days as top competitors are over.

It will be seen from the brief description given of European rankings and of the GDR's method of encouraging physical culture that a crude distinction between what happens in the east and west European nations is unwarranted. Countries including Finland, East Germany, Switzerland, Norway and Sweden have high outputs of athletes, while the USSR, UK, Netherlands, Yugoslavia, Spain and Denmark have a relatively low output. Additionally, since there does not appear to be any direct correlation between political system and athletic attainment, it is simply not possible to make out the kind of case so well loved by Western media about the forced factories of athletics production. No one claims, to my knowledge, that the Finns are culpable in this respect, although they might well be said to be the best qualified to be the butt of such absurd claims.

I am not familiar with the selection and coaching methods adopted in Finland, nor with the proportions of its population actively engaged in physical culture. But the case which I have briefly reviewed does appear to show evidence that a decision to make widespread and extensive provision for all sections of the population is closely associated with international success, as well as transforming some of the bastions of male sport into arenas in which women also compete. As is well known, men and women do not yet compete with each other, but it is a matter of note that the rate of progress among

women in bringing down records on the track could lead to parity within a generation.

## Once the invasion occurred, she threw all gears into reverse

### Britain and the current Olympics

The first shots at the Moscow Games were fired long before the International Olympics Committee had fixed the venue. British Tories were to be found quoting Alexander Solzhenitsyn and Victor Korchnoi with a fervour normally reserved for repeating the wisdoms of Peregrine Worsthorne. It was, however, a forlorn opposition and the venue was fixed and agreed without much difficulty.

It was evidently not until the invasion of Afghanistan that the hawks found a tactical breach through which they could again advance their cause. Margaret Thatcher's response was, from the day of the invasion entirely predictable, though it should not be thought that she had been among the early hawks. Indeed, she had supported a Moscow Games and had been patron of the Olympic Appeals Committee. Once the invasion had occurred, she threw all gears into reverse and acted with a determinedness bereft of either

tactical thought or essential knowledge.

Her first response was to stand down from the Appeals Committee, and her second was to threaten to prevent athletes from attending Moscow by methods which embarrassed civil servants rapidly indicated were impossible, ineffective or illegal. Her first instinct was to sequester competitors' passports. She graduated to trying to prevent people from taking their summer vacations and to threatening their job security if in government employment. She could scarcely have chosen less appropriate threats, and has, at most, produced a set of embarrassing resignations as athletes left the civil service and police force rather than comply. The latest defector is shot-putter Geoff Capes.

In each of these excursions, she has clearly been slavishly loyal to requests from Jimmy Carter, and, indeed, she shows all the finesse of a Southern Democrat. He, at least, can comfort himself with the knowledge that bellicose tactics appear to have paid off despite efforts to reach the Games by American athletes who have considered ways of more or less smuggling themselves out of the USA. Thatcher is compelled to persist in a line which, if finally unsuccessful, will show a significant lack of control on her part of a set of events which she set in train.

Three things strike me as particularly

interesting about the Tory strategy. The first is that they are prepared to openly acknowledge that sporting events must be conceived of as political and therefore are entirely proper means to furthering foreign policy. And in the same vein, they see this particular response as giving them significant opportunities of achieving a wider political goal, namely of showing the Americans that they have more concern for the Atlantic axis than do other European powers by leading the anti-Moscow campaign in Europe.

The second is that they have, as British Olympic Committee chairman, Sir Dennis Follows, has indicated been prepared to act without regard to all advice from the international sports administrators and specialists, 'from a position of amazing ignorance and without expert consultation'. In short, this policy has been conceived with the same attention to detail that it is understood has characterised several of the key Tory strategies. Like the planned reorganisation of the health service, and of London education, the decisions are taken irrespective of all consultative advice in an atmosphere of unadulterated ignorance.

Third, they have clearly adopted what I would call a 'Staff College mentality'. Like the nuclear war game constructors who 'game

The first popular book on sport in the USSR

# Soviet Sport

Background to the Olympics

by James Riordan

hardback £9.95  
paperback £3.50

Basil Blackwell Publisher  
Oxford

**STRIKE WHILE  
THE IRON  
IS HOT**

## LENINGRAD £155

Aug 2-13 and Aug 16-27  
via Rostock (GDR), Stockholm,  
Helsinki

*Price includes:* Full board in hotel in city centre, superb sight-seeing programme, meeting with English-speaking Soviet citizens, and free theatre evening.

Full day in Moscow only £35 extra

## BERLIN, DRESDEN, LEIPZIG £135

Aug 16-24 and Aug 23-31  
Full board in five-star hotel

*The sight-seeing programme includes:* Meissen porcelain production, Zwinger Galleries, ISKRA printing press, and discussion with the Friendship Society, a visit to a kindergarten & Dimitrov Court House.

Phone or write

## YORKSHIRE TOURS

49 Thornton Lodge Road, Huddersfield HD1 3JQ  
Telephone: 0484 24269

out' the obscene calculus of megadeaths and the loss of Baltimore for Leningrad in the inner sanctums of Camberley, they work on a 'how far can we go and what will each step cost' basis. Thus, economic sanctions are too expensive, but sports intervention is not; diplomatic absence on May Day is 'cost-effective', but withdrawal of diplomatic links is not.

## economic sanctions are too expensive, but sports intervention is not

### Conclusion

I have argued that various aspects of sport are intrinsically connected to political processes, and that they cannot be sensibly disentangled. I have tried to indicate that judgement about the politics involved calls for the same general criteria of judgement that would be applied to other political arenas.

Indeed, some states explicitly recognise this in describing the norms of sporting life. In the Soviet Union, for example, the Committee for Physical Culture and Sport, attached to the Council of Ministers, has listed in its objectives:

'iv) To plan the rules and norms for the competition "Ready for labour and defence of the Soviet Union". . .

x) Along with the Trade Unions, Komsomol and other organisations, to conduct educational work among sportsmen and PE specialists'.

Other states do not.

Next, I have tried to indicate the essential triviality of the characterisation of sportspersons from other countries in an attempt to demean their success as due to alien and oppressive cradle-snatching activities which would be abhorrent to a civilised sporting nation. The evidence for this does not bear examination. Just as one would expect in health, education or housing, countries appear to get out of sport what they put in. These and other arguments cannot account for the British response to the Olympics for that response is simply a matter of political calculation and expediency.

In short, the political stratagems are fairly standard ones in the conduct of international relations. And, equally, it is necessary to form a judgement on the basis of the real political conjuncture rather than on the basis of an entirely abstract set of principles. The questions seem to me to occur in this order: First, is it wrong in principle, as some people have suggested, for politicians to interfere in the operation of 'autonomous' sporting organisations? Second, what judgement can



one make of the current Olympics?

In response to the first question, I cannot accept that it is always wrong in principle for governments to intervene. It is easy enough to recall those occasions when many of us have campaigned for governmental intervention with the Rugby Union, the Davis Cup, or the Test and County Cricket Board. The fact is that anyone on the Left will want to hold in reserve the possibility of preventing sport with apartheid, or of an Olympics staged under the circumstances of, for example, the Berlin Olympics of 1936. Complete autonomy is too costly, too indiscriminate a dispensation for any social organisation, whether they are involved in sport or any other activity.

The second question is more complex because it necessarily involves more pragmatic considerations. It is my view that the Moscow Olympics should be supported unequivocally. It is not being conducted under circumstances remotely analogous to the 1936 Olympics, and every step in its preparation has been directed toward accommodating different visiting teams from countries with widely different regimes. The detente character of the preparations have been cemented by allowing the International Olympics Committee to deal with all matters of invitation and related organisation, thereby accepting precisely the same requirements made of any recent host nation. In addition, in a climate where any addition to world cooperation is a bonus, these Olympics have the potential that all Olympics should have — to foster international cooperation, friendly competition, and engagement in physical culture with peoples of all kinds, creeds, colours and persuasions — in large measure. The Olympics achieve this potential for cooperation on a unique scale, symbolised at the end of each Games in the promise to meet again in peace four years hence to renew the spirit of cooperation and friendship between 'non-political' people. In this sense, the Games have a powerful ingredient, not to be underestimated: cohesion. The Moscow Olympics has this potential; the Berlin Olympics did not.

I have heard it said of all sports, the Olympics included, that because they are competitions, with people winning or losing, beating each other along a track or over a bar or into submission in a ring, vitiate something intrinsic to a 'socialist way of life'. It would follow, on this line of argument, that we should be indifferent or hostile to international and local sport. I utterly reject this view. Relationships between people are made up of many qualities which have the potential for either constructive or destructive options. In sport, in order to play with or against people, cooperation is essential for it is necessary to cooperate with opponents in order to play at all. In the right circumstances, it can weald relationships as politically and socially viable as any others. Indeed, it has more potential than many others because the preconditions for cooperation, the potentiation of friendship, is well established in advance, and it takes an open decision to make an event like the Olympics a stage for explicit racism, to vitiate that potential.

In reaching such a conclusion, there need be no implication that it approves or sanctions the invasion of another country or the movement of domestic dissidents away from Moscow.