

## REFLECTIONS ON AN IOC SESSION

---

by Alexandru SIPERCO.

M. Alexandru SIPERCO, I.O.C.Meber for Rumania, publishes his "Reflections on an IOC Session" in No 41 of the Rumanian Olympic Committee's Bulletin. Herewith we give an extract to our readers.

\* \* \*

". . . The Olympic Movement continues to make a great headway on the world scale and its promoters throughout the world are the 126 National Olympic Committees acknowledged by the I.O.C. which do the selection and training and ensure the participation of the national representative teams. Until a short time ago this was their main mission within an activity whose intensity was that of the Olympic cycle.

In recent years, and to a larger extent, the tasks of the Olympic Committees tended to go beyond their initial spheres of interest and became permanent. The National Olympic Committees have incessantly fought against the pressure the idea of amateurism was subjected to by the mercantile spirits trying to transform sports in a source of profits of all kinds.

In this fight the Olympic Committees have grown and expanded, and have extended their influence over the country's sporting life in general, and over the domain of the education of youth. In their activity they expect a more substantial help from the I.O.C. and are ready to support it in return. There is no need for an intermediary body between them, but relations should be established, which to make for a two-way circulation of ideas, while the final decisions of the I.O.C. should be adopted following ample and deep-going debates within its meeting with the National Olympic Committees. The problems to be debated are those encompassing the sporting and Olympic Movement: The Olympic rules, the contents and programmed of games, the organization and organizers of competitions, the defence against amateurism, and the fight against discrimination.

The I.O.C. has taken many just decisions and only few of them, insufficiently matured, required returns. Had a larger and more thorough consultation with the National Olympic Committee occurred they could have been avoided altogether. Unfortunately the very session in Grenoble served as an example of decisions that caused unrest with the sporting public opinion. . .

. . . I.O.C's getting back on the decision taken far from weakening its authority, as some people could think, was one more proof of its maturity and sense of responsibility, which made its consider, above all, the great and far-reaching interests of the sporting and Olympic Movement and not such unimportant matters as prestige.

Expressing these few ideas shared in by many of those that spend their time and yield their energy for the promotion of the Olympic ideals in our country, we end the Grenoble chapter to open that of Mexico City, looking forward to its marking a new step towards the furthering of our one common cause".

\* \* \*

## PROSPERITY AND IMMENSITY

---

By Monique BERLIOUX

Whenever anyone speaks of the Olympic Games there is one remark that is always repeated : The immensity of the Games. We would like to weigh up this remark. The immensity assumes two aspects in public opinions:

- The increasing number of athletes
- The increase in events, hence more medals

First let us look at the participants. The number of accepted athletes at Athens was 285, at Stockholm there were 3541 (including 57 women) then 4169 at Berlin (328 women) and at Rome 5337 (537 women), at Tokyo the number reached was 5558 (732 women) We are quoting and we will speak only of the summer Games.

On the one hand, here is the proof that the whole world has become aware of the interest in the Olympic Games, and that, on the other hand, youth has accomplished considerable progress in the field of sports, thanks to the confrontation between the best.

Let us take another example. In the first Olympic Games in 1896, only 10 countries took part. Forty years later in Berlin there were 49, and in Tokyo 117.

However, it is not only in this field, nor in connection with that of the participants, that the immensity is feared. Quite the opposite. To see the Olympic Family increasing and prospering is a cause for rejoicing. The real anxieties are other than these.

Let us consider the sports competitions.

At first sight, the criticism of increase on this side seems to be the most real - nevertheless, not only the numbers of the sports or disciplines (athletics, swimming, gymnastics etc...) must be confronted and examined, but the events figuring in the programme for each sport (for example - athletics/ 100 m. 200 m. 400 m. etc...)

Thus 19 sporting events are figured on the programme for Mexico against 20 at Tokyo. In London in 1908 there were 21 and at Berlin in 1936, 22. Here then is a decrease.

In every discipline practised in the various Games, some events have been successively added to or withdrawn. At