

The North South Dialogue in International Sports (II)

by Don W. J. Anthony,

Director of the Centre for International Sports Exchange
and honorary member of the University of Loughborough



Here follows the concluding part of the article by Don W. J. Anthony (GBR) on the theme "Sport and Development": The first part appears in the "Olympic Review" No. 183.

Sport in Development

An infant born in a poor country is roughly ten times more likely to die before his or her first birthday than one born in a rich country. The lifespan will be on average thirty years shorter and the chances of seeing a doctor thirty times slimmer. In 1981 five million children in the developing countries died of diarrhoea. In those countries 3 % of the people owned 80 % of the land. More than 60 % of the members of the United Nations are classified developing countries ; many Commonwealth members among them. I need not labour these facts concerning the North-South dialogue.

Despite all this the people in these countries love sport. The fact that a village boy or girl from a third world country can achieve the ultimate in an Olympic Games is a symbol of hope of achievement, and of modernity that should not be sneered at by the more fortunate. The World Cup in Spain showed how the sports family can indeed provide a platform on which the poor and the rich can compete in equality and with dignity. *"The Cup will be spoilt by the inclusion of these third world teams"* said the European cynics. Spoilt indeed. Even forgetting the incomparable team from developing Brazil ; the Cameroons drew with Peru, with Poland, and with Italy - equalling them all with skill. Honduras drew with Spain and Northern Ireland and lost by one goal to Yugoslavia - meanwhile impressing everyone with their courtesy and sportsmanship. Algeria defeated Germany and

Chile. Kuwait drew with the Czechs and lost by one goal to England. I think this is the first major event to prove conclusively that, once teams are provided with equal opportunities for preparation, coaching, competition, and finance - development status becomes unimportant.

With these sentiments still lingering from the Spanish summer of 1982 It is a fitting moment to reflect on the whole concept of development - and to examine the specialised concept of *"sport in development"*. This could reasonably be considered an area of *"intellectual aid"* in sports planning.

UNESCO's first major conference on sport (*"Sport, Work and Culture"*, Helsinki, 1959) made a specific appeal to developed countries to *"increase their aid to those less developed"*. It called also for the *"establishment of a representative, permanent, body, under the auspices of UNESCO"*. to continue the work started by the conference. It was apt, therefore, that the International Council of Sport and Physical Education (ISJPE), established formally in 1960 at a conference held in Rome prior to the Olympic Games, and with the support of UNESCO, should take up the matter of *"sport in development"* seriously. Their *"Declaration on Sport"* which took early shape at the start of the sixties was ready in its final form for the 1968 Olympic Games. This declaration made a specific reference to developing countries. *"Everything which we have said"*, the statement continues *"concerns both the industrialised and the developing countries"*. *"Sport has its own justifica-*

INDEPENDENT VIEWS

tions" it goes on and "must be included in the development programmes because it can help effectively in improving the health, resistance, and the efficacy of the populations in strengthening national unity, in furthering participation in national life, in diminishing racial tensions, and, to put it shortly, in accelerating the process of development". ICSPE has been active on, at least, an annual basis in refining these thoughts and in creating action. In 1965 the then Secretary of ICSPE, William Jones, went on mission to Brazzaville. In his address he proposed the establishment of "adequate and efficient structures" for sport on that continent. This was the first step in the creation of the Supreme Council for Sport in Africa. ICSPE's next venture was to help Cuba stage the International Seminar on Leisure Time and Recreation, in 1966. A meeting of experts in Tokyo to discuss the role of sports in the social and cultural development of Asia, followed a year later. In 1968 the major conference at the Mexico Olympic Games was 'Sport and Education'. Both FIEP (the International Physical Education Federation) and FISM (International Federation of Sports Medicine) collaborated in this UNESCO sponsored conference ; the main working paper was strongly oriented towards the needs of the developing countries. 1969 saw the publication of a single country study by UNESCO; "Libya - sports affairs" was the result of an intensive working visit by a UNESCO consultant to that country but the recommendations had wider import. In 1969 I presented a full report to the ICSPE Executive Board on "the role of sports in development" and proposed the formation of a Working Group. William Jones wrote out the detailed definitions and terms of reference, for this Working Group, and they were accepted.

In 1971 preparations began for the 1st Andean regional seminar on "physical education and recreation as factors of change": this took place a year later and was supported by Chile, Venezuela, Ecuador, Peru, and Colombia, with Panama and Bolivia also attending. In 1971 also there was a major seminar in Morocco which brought out what became known as the "Rabat Declaration" on the "contribution of sport to the construction of modern Africa". This ICSPE organized seminar, supported by the Supreme Council

of Sport in Africa, and sponsored by UNESCO, set the stage for a bigger seminar held at the time of the second All Africa Games in Lagos two years later. It was here that the Director General of UNESCO and the President of the International Olympic Committee first met to discuss the question of possible collaboration.

In 1972 however, prior to the Munich Olympic Games, a significant scientific congress had been held. One section of this was devoted to sports in developing countries. Arising from contacts made at this time a "Meeting on sports technical assistance" was hosted by the President of the Belgian Olympic Committee, Raoul Mallet, later-in that year. Representatives from UNESCO, ICSPE, the international sport federations, and the "Sport for All" clearing house in Belgium, took part.

1973 was an extremely fertile year for developments in this area. In addition to the Lagos meetings, UNESCO published a document advising-on sports facilities for schools in developing countries, and the International Olympic Committee established its "Olympic Solidarity" scheme.

The IOC was preoccupied with building up this scheme and implementing a programme from 1973 onwards. UNESCO became engrossed in establishing an Intergovernmental Committee for Physical Education and Sport, together with an International Fund - a project which reached fruition in 1976.

Since that period several important sports aid initiatives have taken place, many in the publishing field. The IOC has issued several excellent texts to guide sports planners and managers in developing countries. UNESCO has been responsible for such publications as the "Assessment of needs in Physical Education and Sport in Africa and proposals for their implementation", and "Sport for All Programmes Throughout the World" : both these were conducted under the aegis of ICSPE and the latest "Review" of this body has devoted its whole edition to the discussion of sport and development. The other leading international physical education organizations - ICHPER (International Council for Health, Physical Education and Recreation) and FIEP, have often collaborated with ICSPE in matters of sport and

INDEPENDENT VIEWS

development, and in the early stages a regular "tripartite" committee coordinated opinion from the three bodies. ICHPER and FIEP have also conducted seminars, and published, separately in this field. The 1981 Olympic Congress saw more than 14 interventions on the question of sports aid. The President of the IOC, his Vice President, the main organizer of the Moscow Olympics and the Director of UNESCO - all spoke in favour of "Olympic Solidarity" Lord Philip Noel-Baker, doyen of the Olympic movement promised the IOC his recommendation for the Nobel Peace Prize if indeed they could bring sport to *all* - both in developed and developing countries.

On the one hand therefore we have the world sports organizations - and national sports bodies in many countries - engaged actively in *technical sports aid* programmes. On the

other we have several international and national institutions engaged in intellectual aid ; in the thinking and planning which should accompany such action. Unless the latter group can help rapidly developing countries to elaborate good arguments for the inclusion of sport in national development strategies - budgets will either not cater for, or will cater for only inadequately, sport and physical education.

For 15 years I played a major part in building up the UNESCO/ICSPE programme. For the last 6 I have been involved with Olympic Solidarity courses. These responsibilities have moderated my viewpoint. I am aware of the difficulties, the rivalries, the conflict of interests, which anything "international" can promote. But I do feel able to make 5 definite proposals for improved action and collaboration.



13th African Nations' Cup : a stage in the final between Ghana and Lybia before an exited crowd.

INDEPENDENT VIEWS

1. One way to improve collaboration is joint *work* on agreed projects. When organizations share a common aim, the administrative procedures for reaching this aim can fall into place naturally. IOC's "Olympic Solidarity" and UNESCO's "Fund" might search for some model shared projects of this kind. Ideally the two factor bodies should identify the "maximum multipliers".
2. The different organizations and countries involved in sports aid can and do overlap unnecessarily. An improved data bank and better forms of inter-organisational communication are needed.
3. The drive to make the sports family more aware of the need to commit energy to North-South collaboration, needs to be deeper and wider. The network should encompass the area of "general voluntary aid"; I envisage a corps of "youth, sports volunteers" who live in a community, training with the local people, and offering both their sports knowledge and any professional expertise they might have. The same spirit could exist at "retired" level ; sports administrators with long experience could play a valuable part by lending their expertise on a "expenses on/y" basis. Currently steps are being taken to interest the international schools sport movement more acutely in the development question. Concurrently, we have to study how sport might also be a job creating area in countries with high unemployment.
4. Work done so far has not been evaluated objectively. Two important events are planned in 1983 which might help to remedy this situation. At the Inter-University Post Graduate Centre in Dubrovnik, in April, a "Sports North/South Dialogue" is planned. In July, at Edmonton, a section of the conference preceding the World Student Games, is concerned with sport in development. 1983 might thus herald a more intensive and long term academic preoccupation with the subject. Ideally the United Nations University - a network structure with headquarters in Tokyo - should be persuaded to take some action in this area. Such action might be in collaboration with the International Olympic Academy, or an "Olympic University" which was called for by the "coaching and technical" group at Baden Baden.
5. The Olympic Games planned for Seoul in 1988, set us an excellent target. In Seoul we have again a developing country utilising the Olympic Games as a target for its overall strategy to "breakthrough" into the "developed nation" category; just as Tokyo successfully employed this strategy in 1964. The period up to 1988, which also includes the organization of the World Cup (soccer) in Colombia could therefore be an exciting one for great new strides in both practical North-South collaboration and in understanding. May I close this particular section of my paper by reminding everyone that studies and work in this area of development are not only of value to the "recipient" nations. "Donor" nations too can learn very much about their own problems, priorities, and attitudes, when the area is brought into high relief - as it is in the development context. Decision making cannot be dodged in an economy of scarcity. "North-South" can now be supercharged by "South-South". India can offer hockey expertise ; Malaysia, badminton ; Jamaica, sprinting ; urban recreation in Hong Kong; stadium usage in Singapore ; the University physical education developments in Nigeria. This brings me then to the particular problems of *Commonwealth sport and physical education*.

Here we all are - members of a unique family - the Commonwealth. Those of us who have taken part in the Commonwealth Games know its worths - its friendliness - and its charisma. The Commonwealth Games remind us that top class competition can also be good fun. So far however we have managed to preserve the structure by luck and goodwill. Can we go on, tottering from crisis to crisis ? Is there nothing more we can do? Have we the capacity to change? What changes are necessary ?

The Commonwealth group are truly international ; we are of all colours; from all continents ; from countries with widely differing political structures; of all religions. We have a common language, a rather genera-

INDEPENDENT VIEWS

lized view that its nice to stick together, and a common love of sport. Not only a shared love for sport - but a shared group of problems.

Many Commonwealth countries inherit the basic British problems in sport organization and physical education teaching. Happily the solutions to these problems are now being found in more diverse ways - and the old mother country has as much to learn, as it has to teach.

Commonwealth countries take part in the full international range of sports projects which I have outlined earlier in my paper. They will continue to do so. In addition to their Commonwealth loyalties they have other regional and international alliances they wish to honour. All this is right and proper. It is my view however that we have neglected ourselves as a collective unit. I submit that the time is ripe for us to look within our sports family and streamline our own capacities for mutual sports aid.

If we can design new structures for ongoing sports aid the whole family will be strengthened. In evolving new strategies within our own group we might also help to establish models for other international groupings. We have the chance to create a fascinating new programme of Commonwealth cooperation in sport.

On what have we to build ?

We have the *Commonwealth Games*. This four yearly festival, conceived originally by J. Astley Cooper in 1891 as the Pan-Britannic Games starting officially with the first Games at Ontario in 1930, is concerned mainly with individual sports. It is a major multisport event, and will continue to be so ; it is the hub of our own network.

In the past ten years - perhaps even less - a number of *Commonwealth Sports Championships* have developed. In table tennis, in basketball, in weightlifting, in gymnastics, in fencing and netball if I remember rightly, and, in 1981, the first Commonwealth Volleyball Tournament. Cricket and rugby are ubiquitous commonwealth sports but do not yet have a closed commonwealth event. Steps are underway at this moment to organize the first Commonwealth soccer event.

This *Commonwealth Physical Education Conference* is something that has grown in importance over the years, and is an event which needs our deep consideration as to how it might be even more effective.

There are other new growth points ; *sports writers* in the Commonwealth are anxious to establish a regular meeting point; the need for a Commonwealth *sports films and television* festival has been expressed.

This is not the first time that these questions have been raised. At the meeting of the Commonwealth Games Federation in Edmonton, August 1978, the "*emerging countries*" group asked the Federation to request financial assistance for sport through :

- the Commonwealth Secretariat
- the Commonwealth Foundation
- the Commonwealth Fund for Technical Assistance.

One month later at the Olympic Administrators course held at the University of Sussex under Olympic Solidarity auspices, 14 of the 31 delegates were from Commonwealth countries viz - Papua/New Gumea, Antigua, Jamaica, Fiji, Malta, Nigeria, Guyana, Singapore, Bahamas, Great Britain, Kenya, Malaysia, and Hong Kong. A representative of the Commonwealth Secretariat attended as did a representative from the Commonwealth Youth Programme. A questionnaire issued at this meeting revealed that 6 of the commonwealth countries had no office ; 4 had offices on loan; 4 had to rent. Without a basic administrative base the required aid in coaching, sports medicine, competition, fund raising, and other matters, could be neither formulated nor organized. Eleven of the countries had only honorary officers. Of the 17 non-Commonwealth countries present 8 owned their own offices and 14 had full time paid staff.

Subsequently we followed up these positive meetings. A meeting of Young Leaders recommended to the Commonwealth Youth Affairs Council that "*a programme of cooperation in the development of physical education and sport should be established within the*

INDEPENDENT VIEWS

Commonwealth Youth Programme". A spokesman for the Commonwealth Foundation said that "there is now some possibility that our terms of reference might later be expanded to cover operations of the kind (you mention)".

We hoped for sports programmes at the Commonwealth Youth Centres in Zambia, Guyana, India, and the South Pacific.

There were other pressures on the Secretariat. Thomas Bedeck, then holder of the Tait McKenzie Chair for Sport in Canada, wrote to Shridath Ramphal, Secretary General of the Commonwealth Secretariat in 1979. He suggested a study/seminar on cooperative sport technology within the Commonwealth and the elaboration of a five year plan to facilitate this "transfer of sport technology". A Zambian friend, the late Musa Kasonka, endeavoured to put our views forward at the Lusaka meeting of Heads of Government in 1979.

The Commonwealth Institute was also asked for its views. The Director wrote to me in March 1979 saying that "the Institute has developed a close relationship with the Commonwealth Games Federation at Edmonton".

Another project was to relate "to the Commonwealth Games in Brisbane". He wrote also of his wish to see "a much wider development of Commonwealth sport through team games".

The Institute, he said, "would certainly be happy to be associated and to give maximum support and coverage" within its limited resources. He expressed the hope that golf would be one of the sports considered.

The Secretary General of the Commonwealth Secretariat, Shridath Ramphal and Christopher Laidlaw, of the Commonwealth Secretariat, have always given support to these initiatives and with their guidance we at the Centre for International Sports Exchange (then the Centre for International Sports Studies) put forward in 1979 some tentative proposals for the establishment of a Commonwealth Sports Foundation.

At this time the Commonwealth sports movement had other things to absorb it; principally, Gleneagles, and its aftermath. This week however a new committee will take over

in the Commonwealth Games Federation and the time is again ripe for substantial collaboration - during the period between Games - and over the whole range of Commonwealth sports and physical education. It is time to gird our loins for new efforts, using imaginative strategies. I have a thought about the next Olympic Congress - due for 1990 but with the site yet to be determined.

After a gap of forty years the 1973 Congress was held in Sofia. In 1981 it was Baden Baden. To hold the next Congress in a developing country would be a challenge - and it would be right. Would it be too much to hope that one of our family, a Commonwealth developing country, will offer to host the 1990 Olympic Congress - but be assured, should it need it, of the material and human support from all of us, that will make the whole project both successful - and a joy to create ?

The atmosphere is also good at Heads of Government level. After their meeting in Melbourne in 1981 the "Melbourne Declaration" was issued. This spoke of the need to :

Assert that the gross inequality of wealth and opportunity in the world, and the unbroken circle of poverty in which the lives of millions in developing countries are confined, are fundamental sources of tension and instability in the world.

Assert our unanimous conviction that there must be determined and dedicated action at national and international levels to reduce that inequality and to break that circle.

Note that, as well as technical economic considerations, it is imperative that states keep in the forefront of their attention the larger moral, political, and strategic dimensions of what is at stake.

This declaration called, finally for a personal commitment to advance the dialogue between developed and developing countries

It is in the same spirit therefore that I call for a personal commitment from you all towards the design and implementation of a *Commonwealth Sports Development Programme*.

INDEPENDENT VIEWS



The new Ouagadougou stadium (VOL).

We do need urgently - this week - during these Games - a *Brisbane Commitment to Commonwealth Sports Cooperation*, which can be the starting point of this programme.

My task today is to excite you at the prospects and to call for your individual, institutional, and collective commitment.

Such action could become a powerful factor in persuading both the Commonwealth *sports* family and the Governments, aid agencies, companies, and trusts, that our proposed action plan is worth supporting.

(Concluded.)

D. A.



References

1. Anthony D. Analysis of Sports and Physical Education in Developing Countries. Chapter 6 pp 120-135 in *Methodology in Comparative Physical Education and Sport* Howell and Tooney, Stipes 1979.
2. Anthony D : Libya, sports affairs. Consultant Report, distribution limited, UNESCO 1969.
3. Antony D (Ed) Seminar Report, The contribution of sport to the construction of modern Africa Rabat. ICSP/UNESCO 1971
4. Anthony D (Ed) Seminar Report African Sport and Physical Education" Lagos 1973 ICSP/UNESCO
5. Colombian Institute of Youth and Sports Final Report 1st Andean Regional Seminar on physical education and recreation as factors of change Coldportes Bogota. 1972
6. ICSP Declaration on Sport 1966 ICSP/UNESCO
7. ICSP Review 1982 Edltion on sport and development ICSP/UNESCO
6. Lillis K Consultant Report Assessment of needs in physical education and sport in Africa and proposals for Implementation 1977 ICSP/UNESCO
9. McIntosh P: Consultant Report Sport for all Programmes Throughout the World ICSP/UNESCO 1960
10. Ordia A: History of the All Africa Games 1973 Supreme Council of Sporl in Africa
11. Olympic Congress 1961 Report International Olympic Committee
12. Olympic Scientific Congress Report Sport in the Modern World - chances and problems. Sport and PE chapter pp 575-565 Springer-Verlag Berlin 1973.
13. Olympic Solidarity Explanatory Notes, International Olympic Committee
14. Scriven B Sports Facilities for Schools in Developing Countries Educational Studies and Document No 8. UNESCO 1973
15. UNESCO Report : Second Session Intergovernmental Committee on Physical Education and Sport December 1961. UNESCO.