

The divine strains that bring back to us, as it were, the melodious presence of the soul of antiquity, do not receive nowadays the honour due to them. The numerous admirers of Gluck have often expressed the wish that a cycle of his great works should be performed; as far as I am concerned, the proposal was not a new one. But where could one find a more perfectly appropriated frame, a more favourable atmosphere, surroundings better adapted?

The athletic contests will not last more than two or three days at most, for they will be strictly limited to the ancient trials of strength and skill: races on classical distances, jumping, throwing of weights and wrestling, - all according to the ancient methods which differ widely from ours. They differ chiefly on a point of capital importance. For the present-day athlete, every thing is made smooth and easy. Highly perfected, elastic tracks are set for him, every detail being calculated in order to help his effort and enable him to increase his records. But such are not the «courses of life». So that good care was taken in ancient times to make things as difficult as possible to him so as to increase his merit in victory and his endurance in the trial. Here are two philosophies of sport opposed to one another and almost contradictory. Each has its own adepts, but those of the latter discuss the former only in theory. Henceforth they will have living arguments before them and it will be possible to make interesting comparisons. Of course, the majority will remain staunch followers of the modernist point of view, but there are already some countries where the ancient conception has been taken up again and a legion of athletes will be formed whose performances will be followed with no little interest.

It is the duty of all to hail with good-will the homage thus rendered to ancient athleticism and immortal Hellad. Besides, the Olympic unity will be hereby strengthened. It has been sought in vain to destroy or at least to weaken it. It answers a deep feeling based on powerful realities. That is why it has always emerged from the subtle attacks levelled against it. It will never be beaten.

Pierre de Coubertin.

---:§:---

#### **4.— Subsidies by the German Government for the preparation in Germany for the Games of the IXth Olympiade**

Dr. Lewald, President of the German Olympic Committee and member of the International Olympic Committee, draws our attention to fact that the publication No. 4308 of the French Chambre des Deputes, when claiming a subsidy of 2.000.000 francs to enable France to participate in the Olympic Games of 1928, contained the following remark:

«The Countries which are going to take part in the Olympic Games of 1928 are already very busy training their athletes. The German Government has allowed 8.000.000 marks for this preparation.»

This information is absolutely wrong. The German

Government has granted in the budget for this year, the sum of 150,000 marks for the preparation of the Games and promised 300.000 marks for 1928, making a total of 450.000 marks or 1/18 th of the sum mentioned in the statement of the French. The German subsidy calculated by so much per head of the population, is far less than that granted by the French Government. If the calculation is made on the same basis as the French, the German Government must grant the sum of 522,000 marks which is 72.000 marks more than they had intended.

---:§:---

#### **5.— Speech delivered at the opening of the session of the E. C. Meeting in Paris in August 1927 by Count Baillet-Latour, President of the I. O. C.**

Gentlemen.

Before referring to the important question that we have to consider, and for which we have met to-day, I think it is absolutely necessary to recall previous discussions on the question of amateurism in order to define the responsibility of each in the decisions taken and in the same way to consider the powers of the I. O. C. relative to the application of these decisions.

At the end of the Games in Paris in 1924, a preparatory Congress was held in Paris composed, as all the Olympic Congresses are composed, of delegates of the International Federations, National Olympic Committees and members of the I. O. C. Its object was to prepare the work of the Congress of Prague and also to get a general idea on the question of amateurism.

Two questions which arose during this discussion have a particular importance; the first came from M. Rimet who asked whether the definition of an amateur which would be promulgated at Prague would be compulsory for the International Federations, or whether the «status quo» should be maintained which would allow each Federation to determine for itself, the definition of an amateur.

The reply to this was that the Congress of Prague would give a definition, the main idea of which would have to be agreed upon by the International Federations. It was then understood that the Congress of Prague would have to establish some main principles which would be agreeable to the majority of the International Sporting Federations. The second proposition was put by Mr. Hirschy (Switzerland) who suggested that the Executive Committee of the I. O. C. should make an enquiry as to the opinion of the International Federations and present a report to the Congress of Prague, based on the replies received from the International Federations and from the National Olympic Committee and from them get a general definition of an amateur applicable to all the International Federations. In concluding this debate M. Seeldrayers made the following proposition:

That the following three points be put on the Agenda.

1. Should there be one definition of an amateur agreeable to all the International Federations.

2. Is it desirable that there should be one definition

for the Olympic Games and another for all other sporting events.

3. That a report be made on the replies received from the International Federations.

This proposition was carried unanimously.

The I. O. C. instituted the desired enquiry. The Federations replied to the questionnaire which was addressed to them, these replies were tabulated and addressed to the Congress of Prague.

It was working on this idea that the General Secretary made his report and laid down the status of an amateur.

The future will prove that the opinions expressed at this time by the International Federations have not changed.

If the Federations do not recognise either to the I. O. C. or the Congress, the right to lay down the general principles of the definition of an amateur, they approve them and apply them themselves.

It is by their wish that these have been introduced into the Rules applicable to the celebration of the Olympic Games.

At the Congress of Prague the General Secretary presented his report on the question of amateurism and also on the amateur status proposed by the I. O. C. A special committee was formed to study this.

The Congress then proceeded to examine the first two points of the proposition made by Mr. Seeldrayers at the Congress at Paris.

After having given its opinion that it had neither the right nor the power to lay down rules concerning amateurism, the Congress considered whether it had the right to decide the question of the qualification of athletes for the Olympic Games and, after weighing the consequences which would arise with those Federations who refused to adopt this principle, voted by 83 for, 10 against and 4 abstentions: «The Congress can decide the question of qualification of athletes for the Olympic Games.»

Those voting against were: Messrs. Brull and Csillag (Boxing Federation), Hearne (Swimming Federation), Sander. (Dutch Olympic Committee), Hunter and Low (British Olympic Committee) Hulbert (American Olympic Committee), Falchenberg (Norwegian Olympic Committee). Those not voting were: Messrs. de Borman and Robetin (Lawn Tennis Federation) Hirschmann and Pelikan (Football Federation).

Thus was abandoned the project discussed at Paris and it was replaced by a rule which was approved by an enormous majority.

This being done, M. Paul Rousseau after suggesting that, nevertheless, the status of an amateur as proposed by the I. O. C. should be sent to the International Federations as a guide which they could not fail to act upon then moved the following proposition:

The amateur status as laid down by the International Sporting Federations will apply to all athletes taking part in the Olympic Games. At the same time all athletes taking part in the Olympic Games must at least comply with the following rules, namely:

The following will not be eligible to take part in the Games.—

1. Those who are or have been professionals in their sport or in any other sport.

2. Those who have received compensation for lost salaries.

The vote was then taken by the Congress on this proposition.

1. He who is a professional in his sport or in any other sport is not qualified to take part in the Games.

Passed unanimously, after adding to it the word «Knowingly».

With regard to the second part, namely, he who has been a professional, this has been added by a nominal vote 80 for, 1 against 5 abstentions.

With regard to those who have received reimbursements for loss of salary, this was agreed by 66 votes in favour, 12 against and 5 abstentions.

Those against were: Messrs. Sander (Dutch Olympic Committee), Vander Heyden (Belgian Olympic Committee) Hirschy and Messerli (Swiss Olympic Committee), Falchenberg (Norwegian Olympic Committee), Diem and Hefner (German Olympic Committee), Pelikan (Football Federation), Linden (Shooting Federation). Those not voting were: Messrs. Thompson (American Olympic Committee), Osmolski (Polish Olympic Committee), de Borman (Lawn Tennis Federation) and Hirschmann (Football Federation).

M. Vidal, who had attacked this principle of loss of salary with great energy at the first sitting, was absent on the day of the vote. The conclusion to be drawn from the statement which I have just made to you is that the project, previously recognised by the I. O. C. was not adopted but that a formal expression of the desire of the Congress was expressed, in perfect understanding of the motive, and after having weighed the advantages and disadvantages. A detail to note, which has its significance is, how few delegates of the International Federations are among the negative voters. Does not the I. O. C. note this? To put the question—it is the problem. Will not the Federations themselves lose badly? We have no longer got to discuss the qualification of an amateur belonging to the Federations, nor to create Olympic amateurs as apart from ordinary amateurs conforming to the definition laid down by their Federation; briefly, we have to apply M. Rousseau's proposition, passed at the Olympic Congress of Prague, and to assure ourselves that the amateurs of the different Federations who will appear at the Games will comply with the conditions of qualification required.

If it appears that the definition of amateurism of one Federation, or the method of application laid down by the Committee of this Federation, are absolutely inconsistent with the aforementioned Rules of qualification, then it is the duty of the Executive Committee with the concurrence of the heads of this Federation, to investigate the possibility of combining the two ideas and formulating a rule which would not be contrary to the rules laid down.

This is the end of our meeting today.

The heartiness which has been evident in our deliberations, in the course of particularly difficult and delicate negotiations during these last weeks, proves that we are all urged by a mutual desire to end the discussion. Whatever may be the result of our negotiations, the

