

The Official History of the Olympic Games and the IOC

ATHENS TO LONDON
PART III: THE MODERN ERA (1984–2012)



DAVID MILLER

DAVID MILLER

The Official History of the Olympic Games and the IOC

ATHENS TO LONDON

PART III: THE MODERN ERA 1984–2012



For Michèle and Max, Gavin and Ygraine

Copyright © David Miller, 2003

All rights reserved

The moral right of the author has been asserted

First published in Great Britain in 2003 by
MAINSTREAM PUBLISHING COMPANY (EDINBURGH) LTD
7 Albany Street
Edinburgh EH1 3UG

ISBN 9781780576299

No part of this book may be reproduced or transmitted in
any form or by any
means without written permission from the publisher,
except by a reviewer who
wishes to quote brief passages in connection with a review
written for insertion in
a magazine, newspaper or broadcast

Copyright permissions cleared by the author.
The author has tried to trace all copyright details but
where this has not been possible the publisher will be
pleased to
make necessary arrangements at the earliest opportunity

The views of the author are not necessarily those of the IOC
President and the Executive Board

Cover Image Credits:
Jessica Ennis © IOC/Huet
Mo Farah © IOC/Huet

Usain Bolt © IOC/Evans

A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

This ebook is copyright material and must not be copied, reproduced, transferred, distributed, leased, licenced or publicly performed or used in any way except as specifically permitted in writing by the publishers, as allowed under the terms and conditions under which it was purchased or as strictly permitted by applicable copyright law. Any unauthorised distribution or use of this text may be a direct infringement of the author's and publisher's rights and those responsible may be liable in law accordingly.

This ebook edition, 2012

Epub ISBN: 9781780577760

Version 2.0

www.mainstreampublishing.com

Contents

Title Page

Copyright

Preface

Part III: The Modern Era (1984–2012)

Chapter LIII Revolutionary (*Juan Antonio Samaranch*)

Chapter LIV Sarajevo (XIV) 1984 (*Katarina Witt*)

Chapter LV Los Angeles (XXIII) 1984 (*Carl Lewis*)

Chapter LVI Reality (*Walther Tröger*)

Chapter LVII Calgary (XV) 1988 (*Vreni Schneider*)

Chapter LVIII Seoul (XXIV) 1988 (*Paul Elvstrøm*)

Chapter LIX Excess (*Paul Henderson*)

Chapter LX Albertville (XVI) 1992 (*Alberto Tomba*)

Chapter LXI Barcelona (XXV) 1992 (*Voula Patoulidou*)

Chapter LXII Winter Wonderland (*Mario Vazquez Raña*)

Chapter LXIII Lillehammer (XVII) 1994 (*Johann Olav Koss*)

Chapter LXIV Centenary (*Professor Arne Ljungqvist*)

Chapter LXV Atlanta (XXVI) 1996 (*Josiah Thugwane*)

Chapter LXVI Athens' Reprieve (*Nikos Filaretos*)

Chapter LXVII Nagano (XVIII) 1998 (*Masahiko Harada*)

Chapter LXVIII Laws and Ethics (*Judge Keba M'Baye*)

Chapter LXIX Sydney (XXVII) 2000 (*Sir Steve Redgrave*)

Chapter LXX China-Bound (*Zhen-liang Hé*)

Chapter LXXI Salt Lake City (XIX) 2002 (*Janica Kostelic*)

Chapter LXXII Going Home (*Dr Jacques Rogge*)

Chapter LXXIII Athens (XXVIII) 2004 (*Hicham El Guerrouj*)

Chapter LXXIV London's Late Run (*Ser Miang Ng*)

Chapter LXXV Turin (XX) 2006 (*Evgeni Plushenko*)

Chapter LXXVI Beijing Centre Stage (*Dick Ebersol*)

Chapter LXXVII Beijing (XXIX) 2008 (*Usain Bolt*)

Chapter LXXVIII Next Stop Rio (*Carlos Nuzman*)

Chapter LXXIX Vancouver (XXI) 2010 (*Yu-Na Kim*)

Chapter LXXX Welcome, Youth Games (*Maj-Gen. Muhammed Jibril Rajoub*)

Chapter LXXXI London (XXX) 2012 (*Arthur Zanetti*)

Afterword: Breaking Barriers

Bibliography

PREFACE

The provenance of this publication was an invitation in 1997 from Juan Antonio Samaranch, President of the International Olympic Committee from 1980 to 2001, to write an 'everyman's' history of the IOC. So much of their responsibility remains outside regular news coverage that the President wished for the public to be better informed. During his Presidency, I accompanied Samaranch on a sequence of four tours to twenty-seven outpost nations of the Olympic Movement - twelve National Olympic Committees across central Africa in eleven days; to the Far East including Nepal and Guam; to Pacific islands including Micronesia, just devastated by a hurricane; and to Central Asian nations of the former Soviet Republic. They were often difficult, wearisome journeys, with no tangible reward or prestige for the President other than to bring personal contact from headquarters to distant, sometimes poor, under-funded peoples whose participating spirit nonetheless burns bright through the inspiration of the Olympic flame. At the same time, I felt that a history should include, related in parallel, the events which are the sole reason for the IOC's own creation: the Games and the heroes great and small.

There have been three previous conventional editions of this history, coinciding with the Games of Athens in 2004 and Beijing in 2008, and the build-up to the London Games of 2012. The original intention, a Millennium launch at the time of Sydney 2000, had to be postponed on account of uncertainty following the IOC's crisis of 1999, in the shadow of the Salt Lake City corruption scandal. Each subsequent four years, the text has been updated with four new

chapters, embracing the immediately previous Summer and Winter Games. For the first time, this fourth edition has been updated immediately following the 2012 Games, to reflect the all-round achievements of London's hosting. It is simultaneously published in e-book format in three volumes:

Part I – 1894–1936, covering the first ten Summer Games and four Winter Games, from early near-disasters and including entrenched antipathy towards female competitors under the influence of the first three Presidents, yet steadily growing towards global acclaim.

Part II – 1948–1980, post-Second World War, through the period of financial and Cold War anxieties, and the continuing profound ideological amateur-professional conflict.

Part III – 1984–2012, with a simultaneous expansion of billion-dollar television and sponsorship contracts alongside mounting defamation by drug cheats and the near catastrophic crisis of 1999.

I have been grateful for the continuing enthusiasm for this history of IOC President Jacques Rogge. While my opinions are not necessarily those of the Executive Board, I hope to have reflected accurately the symbiosis of administrators and athletes. I am additionally grateful to The Princess Royal for her Foreword on the occasion of Britain's third hosting of the world's most observed sporting event.

PART III

The Modern Era (1984-2012)

Embracing over nearly 30 years the presidencies of Juan Antonio Samaranch and Jacques Rogge, together with 16 Winter and Summer Games from Sarajevo 1984 to London 2012, Part III is very much a tale of beauty and the beast: ever-expanding global media coverage of sporting glories penetrating a billion homes, in parallel with the evils of drug-enhancement. Or, to paraphrase Wilde, nothing succeeded like excess. If there was little that Samaranch could do to prevent the Soviet Union's boycott of Los Angeles in 1984 – retaliation for 1980, under the smokescreen of alleged anxiety about security – then he was determined to raise IOC status, on many fronts, to provide simultaneous financial protection and social/political prestige.

Alarmed at the prospect of a fourth consecutive boycott at the Seoul Games, he made seventeen journeys to the Far East over four years, to ensure that an emerging Asian industrial power would be safe from political intervention. Simultaneously he wanted to create a level playing field in the arena, which would give equal opportunity to the contrasting social systems of capitalism and communism, supported by burgeoning financial backing from astute development of the sponsorship principle that had enabled Los Angeles to achieve the first Games profit in memory. This involved, besides progressively rising TV rights fees,

inauguration of The Olympic Programme (TOP): a global sponsorship network embracing a handful of multinational million-dollar sponsors and the signature of every NOC – bar a few disgruntled refusniks, including Greece, who later relented.

Another page of the revolution would be the decision – ‘the best of my time in office’ – to separate, post-1992, the Summer and Winter Games into alternate even years, commencing with Lillehammer in 1994 followed by the Centenary Games at Atlanta in 1996: thereby relieving pressure on NOCs in a single year and enhancing the Winter Games’ status.

However, at the heart of Samaranch’s administrative revolution lay an unforeseen flaw. At the time of host bidding for 1984, there had been only one contender, Los Angeles, obliging the IOC to breach the Charter when making a contract that did not include America’s NOC, which had refused to be a guarantor. Yet when LA, under the guidance of travel agent Peter Ueberroth, opened the door to being in the black, suddenly the Olympic Games became an enticing prospect. To heighten the attraction, a wily Samaranch added the additional temptation of televising the voting decision. Cities were now hooked on the prospect of worldwide free advertising. Addressing the Session of 1986, prior to voting on a turbulent campaign for 1992, Samaranch revealed understandable euphoria at a galaxy of thirteen cities contending for the two Games, Summer and Winter. His satisfaction, however, revealed a sheltered viewpoint: disapproval was already rampant about the \$50 million collectively spent on promotion by the candidates. The Games were suddenly a honey pot, but not for the right reasons. The President had furthered the element of show business that over the next decade would become a vehicle of misuse and ultimately abuse. In the hunt for votes from at times gullible and even venal IOC members, cities would offer, and a minority of members would accept, material

benefits that were to generate a crisis which would all but destroy the Games. By the time of the bidding in 1991 for the Winter Games for 1998, Nagano of Japan alone spent an estimated \$66 million in securing victory – and subsequently destroyed most of the records of their expenditure.

Ineffectual attempts were made by the IOC to limit the passage and size of gifts. As administratively lax over the decade would be the pursuit of drug offenders. Together these failures propagated a double whammy that would explode upon the IOC in late 1998, when a Salt Lake City television station exposed elements of corruption in the successful bidding for the Winter Games of 2002, achieved three years earlier in 1995. The fallout from a Niagara of media turmoil and global condemnation, politicians worldwide demanding Samaranch's resignation, was expulsion of six members, resignation of three others and half a dozen warnings.

Samaranch, refusing to resign, orchestrated a second revolution, with the introduction of amended election procedure of host cities, transparency of administration and the creation of an Ethics Commission. With a triumphant Games at Sydney, the IOC and the Games were salvaged, emerging in clean clothes and with restored prestige – even if the drugs malaise would continue to be a haunting shadow.

Part of the 'transparency' for the twenty-first century was that members were now prohibited from visiting bid cities. It was argued that this was naively restrictive: it is possible to bribe a voter at any hotel or airport anywhere in the world and not necessarily at the bidding town or in his own home city. Honest members, on the other hand, were resentful that the restriction presented them as potential criminals. A majority would have preferred a system that permitted group visits of cities on scheduled dates for those who wished to see for themselves, the trip funded directly by the IOC. Instead they would have to be dependent on a report

from an Evaluation Commission. Inevitably such reports tended to lack thorough critical assessment.

Cities now shifted ground, employing small armies of unofficial 'persuaders', many unidentified, who would travel the world to ingratiate the voters. Some persuaders were anything but secret in their persuasion. They included Prime Minister Tony Blair, instrumental in helping London to win the vote for 2012, and Vladimir Putin in assisting Sochi to stage the Winter Games of 2014. Prior to the latter decision at Guatemala City in 2007, Sochi, from Russia's Black Sea coast, and Pyeongchang of South Korea, in a second unavailing successive bid, had each spent enough to build, say, a small town in Albania or Somalia.

The IOC appeared less inclined to take a grip on this excess than on athletes' cheating. Kai Holm, IOC member from Denmark, was adamant about what he believed was a breakdown in accurate assessment of cities' credentials:

Those members on the floor now have no idea what's going on, so how do they gauge the Evaluation Commission's report? They're influenced by outside facts. Let them see what's going on, let them go to bidding cities, if they wish, but in groups. And in my view, you should only have a vote on the Winter Games if your country sent competitors to the previous Games.

Many consider it irrational that some 50 per cent of members attend only the Session prior to a Winter Games, and then go home because they have little if any connection or interest on the outcome of events, having no winter facilities in their own country.

It can be said that the last two host election occasions, in 2009 for the Summer Games of 2016 and in 2011 for the Winter Games of 2018, were the least contentious of recent times, being respectively won by Rio de Janeiro and Pyeongchang. Rio deservedly became the first South American city to be granted the privilege, against a background of accelerating national economic growth, notwithstanding that there was dismay in America at a

second consecutive rejection, Chicago's following that of New York. Few could argue against the success of Pyeongchang at a third attempt, having fulfilled every recommendation from the IOC and offering a resplendent new Asian venue for expansion of winter sports. The rival bid from Munich was excellent but unoriginal.

If there was cause for satisfaction within the IOC at these two outcomes, there was also evidence that control on the drugs front was achieving success: a marked fall in positive tests at successive Games in Beijing and Vancouver. Not before time. For 20 years, Olympic credibility had reeled under the impact of disgrace: for Ben Johnson, Canadian 100m champion of 1988, followed by exposure of a succession of other frontline sprinters, and the equally dramatic retrospective defamation of the Games by American multi-medal winner Marion Jones, perverted heroine of Sydney and Athens.

A prison sentence for Jones was the ultimate shock, the truth emerging because she had lied to a federal investigation in 2003 into BALCO, a San Francisco-based laboratory in the drug-trafficking trade, of whom she had been a well-documented client. Aged 31, she admitted taking steroids, and though disingenuously claiming innocence acknowledged that the drug - tetrahydrogestrinone, known as THG or 'the clear' - had raised her performance standards. In tears outside the court, she was contrite. 'I have been dishonest, I've let down my family, my country and myself ... I lied because I panicked, to protect my coach at the time. It was an incredibly stupid thing to do, to break the law, and I have to take full responsibility.' So consistent had been her lying during seven years that there was little justification for grief among even her closest admirers. In a formal statement as president of IAAF, Lamine Diack was unrestrained in his condemnation:

I am deeply disappointed that an athlete with Marion Jones' immense natural ability gave in to the corrupt, get-rich-quick spin of a dope dealer ... If she had trusted her own natural gifts and allied them to self-sacrifice and hard work, I sincerely believe she could have been an honest champion. Now, instead, she will be remembered as one of the biggest frauds in sporting history. It is a tragedy, and I'm glad that Marion Jones is aware not only of the damage that her action caused herself and her loved ones, but also her fans, her country and her sport of athletics all over the world.

Rogge, who from his election as successor to Samaranch in 2001 had been persistent in a policy of zero tolerance, was approving both of the drugs-bust of twenty-six positive tests in the Athens Games and the break-in by police at the Austrian Nordic teams' residential quarters at the Turin Winter Games, leading to six life suspensions: proof of WADA's growing effectiveness. He stated:

There are two sides of the coin. Being a strong proponent of credibility, I also believe in revealing the facts without window dressing. Between the first Winter Games at Chamonix in 1924 and Nagano '98, the IOC found only five cases of doping. What we did following Nagano was drastically to step up the number of tests at Salt Lake City, which led to seven positives, together with disciplinary action against the Austrian team coach, Mayer. At Sydney we had twelve positives and I decided we should double the tests for Athens, the positives rising from twelve to twenty-six. The increase in testing between Nagano and Turin [catching the Austrian Nordic team] was almost double, and it was almost the same between Sydney and Beijing, an increase in testing of over 90 per cent. By now we are far more effective, though the situation is by no means ideal.

Testing at Vancouver's Winter Games, in conjunction with random testing now extensively in global operation between each Games, suggested that cheats are on the retreat. It is an unrelenting contest between chemists, those willing with the assistance of doctors and coaches to be a party to perversion, and those attempting to maintain an Olympic profile that can still be smiled upon by the ancient gods. Reassuringly, London maintained the trend.

Chapter LIII

Revolutionary

*Juan Antonio Samaranch of Spain, IOC President,
1980-2001*



'Barely one year ago, [1998] the International Olympic Committee was confronted with one of the most serious crises in its existence. You know all the details. This crisis revealed that our institution was faced with serious problems regarding its composition, organisation and role, as well as some of its procedures, in particular the selection of host cities for the Olympic Games. The errors committed by some members of the IOC and other people alerted world public opinion to this crisis. We were severely criticised and our credibility, even in some cases our integrity, was questioned.

The crisis we are resolving stems from the fact that, since the success of the Olympic Games in Los Angeles in 1984, the organising of the Games has become a source of substantial benefits for host cities not only in public relations but also on an economic level. The amounts we pay to them have been growing increasingly higher, reaching hundreds of millions of dollars.

The IOC is privately funded. It is a fact that bidding for the Olympic Games has become, in many countries, a paramount objective for entire communities – not only the sports community but also the business and civic communities, including the public authorities. In such an environment, the candidate cities have become increasingly aggressive in their quest to host the Games. Each time, the financial stakes are higher. A consequence of these developments is that individuals tend to become more vulnerable. This is no excuse, but a fact. In our society, whenever and wherever money plays a conspicuous role, there is a serious potential risk of human vulnerability.

Our institution was conceived 105 years ago, at a time when such problems and risks did not exist. For many years, the IOC operated without serious flaw. However, we were wrong not to see that our organisation had to adjust itself to a new world, a new environment, a new society, in which money penetrated all aspects of human activities, including sport.

Never has the IOC undertaken so many projects and carried out so much work as during this last year. This would have been impossible without the support, understanding and active participation of the IOC members, the international federations and the national Olympic committees. The crisis has affected each of us not only as leaders but also in our professional and private lives.

We have all been facing harsh criticism, much of which has been unfair. Yet unity has generated the necessary strength to move forward, so that, with the dawn of the new millennium, the credibility and prestige of our Movement can be restored. Any crisis has a positive side. Without the present crisis, the IOC would never have undertaken the fundamental reform programme which has been approved during this historic Session. Thanks to these reforms, the IOC will enter the new millennium stronger, more modern, more democratic, more transparent, more accountable and more responsible.’ (Address to the Session, 1999, following constitutional reforms introduced in the wake of the Salt Lake City bidding scandal)
(Photograph © IOC/Strahm)

The presidency of Juan Antonio Samaranch was to encompass a period of development that many of his contemporaries regarded as revolutionary. In the first decade of his administration, Samaranch transformed an elderly, reactionary private club into a progressive, radical sports body: lifting it finally from its long-standing, troubled state of ambivalent amateurism into a professional structure, administratively and competitively, that was simultaneously envied and derided, welcomed and

condemned. Here was a President who dealt in the realities of contemporary society. In doing so, he not only made the IOC and the encircling Olympic environment enormously wealthy but, through absence of internal surveillance, also witnessed the organisation plunge into near catastrophe in 1998-9.

With a ringmaster's nerve, and with critics worldwide, even governments, calling for his resignation, Samaranch steered the IOC back to health prior to his ultimate, twice-deferred retirement, departing in 2001 not long after the staging by Sydney, guided by the IOC's template, of one of the most outstanding of all Games.

During 30 years, Samaranch had stealthily ascended the steps of the Olympic pyramid: beginning as president of roller-hockey in Spain; marshalling the second Mediterranean Games in 1955; becoming an initially inconspicuous figure within the Spanish NOC; favoured by Brundage for election into the IOC in 1966 after heading the Spanish delegation for the Olympic Games of 1960 and 1964. Within two years of his election, he was running, though narrowly defeated, for the Executive Board; was appointed by Brundage as head of protocol; and became Vice-President, 1974-8, by which time he had also become Spanish ambassador to Moscow, diplomatic relations with Russia/USSR having been re-opened for the first time since 1917.

Against the expectation of many, after assuming the presidency the quiet Spaniard rapidly emerged as a man of foresight, will-power, subtle negotiating technique and a vision of IOC influence that was inaccurately judged by many to be driven exclusively by personal ambition. Having been assigned, under the dictatorship of General Franco, to assist discreetly in the schooling of Prince Juan Carlos - decreed by Franco to be his successor - Samaranch had worked, like everyone in Spanish public life, within the influence of Franco's regime: a source of regular, often

intense foreign criticism when Samaranch came to sporting power. Samaranch responded:

Spain had evolved under Franco, who in my opinion did three sensible things: to stay out of the Second World War, resisting Hitler, which was not easy; to place the economy in the 1960s under the control of the educated middle class, so that the social evolution in Spain was not the problem it had been in eastern Europe and Latin America, democratic employment laws ensuring we no longer had the rich-and-poor situation that existed prior to the Civil War; and to choose Juan Carlos as his successor. The King represented the unity of Spain, even for the left wing.

His first important decision was the seminal one to base himself in Lausanne. He was offered an office by the Sports University of Madrid, but sensed that to have the control he needed to initiate the revolution, he had to be on hand day by day; not least because of Monique Berlioux, the existing Director-General, who was behaving as though she were the President; and the head of an international federation, Thomas Keller in rowing, who was attempting to prove the IOC was insignificant alongside the continuous activity of the major IFs. Privately, Samaranch had told colleagues he was ready to dispose of Berlioux, but was talked out of it by Alexandru Siperco, IOC member in Romania, who advised him it might be destabilising when facing a difficult Games in LA. 'Living in Lausanne was the best decision I ever took,' Samaranch said. Distant critics might run fantasy stories of the President flying to work daily by helicopter from Geneva; the reality was a relatively frugal hotel existence costing the IOC less than the rental of a small apartment with essential domestic services.

Devoting an hour or more a day to improving his French and English with a tutor, an unpaid President set himself from the outset a string of objectives far broader than any cosmetic surgery. The three fundamentals were unity of the three arms of the Movement, IOC/NOCs/IFs; a secure financial basis; and global universality of Games participants. Intertwined were these subsidiary changes:

- The establishment of continental Olympic associations
- The completion of Killanin's unfulfilled solution to joint IOC membership of China and Taiwan (Killanin's priority had been inclusion of the People's Republic of China – 'the greatest good for the greatest number')
- Relaxation of the eligibility code to admit professionals, in order to counter-balance the superiority of totalitarian state-sponsored amateurs
- Development of commercialisation and marketing to place the IOC, and the Olympic Movement, on a more secure base
- Tighter negotiation, and exploitation, of the potential of television rights fees in order to resist government interference
- The formation, at the Congress in Baden-Baden in 1981, of a Commission for the Olympic Movement, replacing and bringing directly under the Olympic umbrella the former Tripartite Commission
- First-hand acquaintance with 172 NOCs by journeying to visit as many of them as possible
- Broadening of IOC membership, so as to include more athletes, more presidents of IFs and NOCs and, belatedly, women members
- Acceptance by Swiss authorities of IOC opportunity at Vidy having international, independent, untaxed status
- Creation, through donations, of an Olympic Museum in Lausanne on the shore of Lake Geneva
- Resolution of the IOC's 20-year-old cancer involving South Africa
- Transformation of administration in Lausanne, including revision of the authority of the Director



Righting a wrong. The seventh IOC President restores, after an interval of 67 years, the gold medal of Jim Thorpe from 1912, in a presentation to Thorpe's daughter. (© IOC/Pi)

'During Killanin's time, the IOC was sailing gently along, marking time,' Lord Luke, former director of Lloyds Bank International and of Bovril, IOC member in Britain, recalled:

The Olympic Movement was moving a bit, but not developing. Killanin had a lot of unreasonable problems to distract him. De Beaumont and I had initiated the Finance Commission, realising this was necessary with the arrival of television money. Samaranch proliferated commissions, a big improvement compared with Brundage, who thought he was God, and Killanin, who wasn't awfully good. I liked Samaranch because he was so accessible. I know people will go on about the IOC still being privileged, but I think you want some people who are not necessarily locked in sport, people who live with dignity and have no political ambition.

Keba M'Baye of Senegal, former judge of the international court at The Hague and sometime Vice-President, was equally impressed by Samaranch's policy:

He made members feel responsible and involved in development of the organisation and showed the world that the IOC was socially and politically important as a contributor to peace. I was on the point of resignation in 1980, but after his election Samaranch took me to one side, saying he was relying on me to help change the policy, that there was an important job to do, and I withdrew my resignation. He was an open-minded leader and would change his mind when he felt the majority had another opinion.

A reflection of Samaranch's determination to involve the members – having half an eye on their votes – was the immediate initiation of his bi-lingual *Information Letter*, constituting a progress report sent intermittently to all IOC members, and later introducing a similar letter to NOCs and IFs on subjects concerning them directly.

Arriving for the Congress at Baden-Baden in 1981, in the aftermath of the Moscow boycott, which had left many in a state of sustained anxiety, Samaranch warned the assembled representatives that the dangers were not past. 'The Olympic Movement, during the last few years, has survived storms that would have capsized any other ship,' he said. 'The hostile forces that have tried without success to de-mast it are still there. All athletes, coaches, journalists, officials must remain united if we are to thwart them.' At Baden-Baden, the delegates were rapidly to get a picture of Samaranch as a man on a mission. Many inaugural policies were to emerge in the space of the next few days, which included the annual Session.

While Samaranch recognised that on the issue of Berlioux he would have to bide his time, that of Keller needed swiftly to be resolved. Keller had infuriated Killanin, just prior to the Moscow Games, by sending unilaterally to all members of the Tripartite Commission a letter suggesting that the themes for the next year's Congress should be rearranged on the following basis: Day 1 – IOC debate on years 1973–81; Day 2 – NOC debate on boycott; Day 3 – IFs debate on future of the Olympic Games (!).



A bid by Thomas Keller, president of the General Association of International Sports Federations, to upstage the IOC was swiftly crushed by Samaranch. (© IOC/Baranyi)

Killanin considered this document outrageous, he being chairman of the Tripartite Commission, and duly rebuked Keller. Samaranch knew the time had come to act.

My first trip from Lausanne as President was to the annual assembly of the General Association of International Sports Federations [GAISF], invited by Keller. He was emphatic that the IOC should deal only with the Olympic Games. I told him that the IOC had some responsibility for the whole of sport. For all his bluff, he was not a particularly strong character.

Together with the threat from Keller, as president of GAISF, Samaranch was likewise concerned, though less so, with the potential power of the Association of National Olympic Committees (ANOC) under the presidency of Mario Vazquez

Raña of Mexico, never mind that Vazquez Raña had helped coordinate Samaranch's election campaign. Samaranch therefore put into effect the ancient policy of divide and rule. Part of Keller's power came from the GAISF's share of revenue from the Olympic Games. He now wanted the finances of the Summer and Winter Games to be amalgamated and then shared among IFs. Samaranch realised the solution was to split the IFs, Summer and Winter, into two groups: ASOIF (Association of Summer Olympic International Federations) and AIOWF (Association of International Olympic Winter Sports Federations), under the respective leadership of Primo Nebiolo of Italy and Marc Hodler of Switzerland, presidents of athletics and skiing. These two organisations would have the right to deal with the IOC regarding share of Games' revenue, thus leaving the GAISF, and Keller, with reduced influence. Nebiolo, in his own covert move towards personal membership of the IOC, grandly forfeited the 20 per cent share of the IAAF from the total granted to Summer IFs – the remaining 80 per cent having been divided equally among the others – so that now they would all have an equal amount, archery and athletics alike.

In parallel with this development, Samaranch had already established – in collaboration with the Supreme Council for Sport in Africa – the Association of NOCs of Africa (ANOCA), the first assembly of which took place in June 1981 at Lomé, Togo, under the presidency of Anani Matthia, subsequently elected to the IOC in 1983. The Pan-American sports movement, PASO, had been in operation since 1940 – and was now also under the leadership, and financially dependent upon, the wealthy patronage of media multi-millionaire Vazquez Raña. The Olympic Council of Asia (OCA), replacing the Asian Games Federation, would be created in 1982. By such manoeuvres Samaranch was gaining control over existing power bases and

simultaneously establishing allegiances with the newly created heads of fresh bodies.

Another move, in 1984, was the creation of ARISF (the Association of IOC Recognised International Sports Federations) under the presidency of Un Yong Kim, by then successor to Keller as president of GAISF. By granting this recognition, the IOC was encouraging collaboration with regard to event schedules, calendar coordination and other matters of mutual interest. 'He had no great sporting achievement, little administrative prominence outside Spain, no one knew his capacity,' Siperco, Romanian intellectual, said of Samaranch. 'At his election, he was given the benefit of the doubt, but once elected there was a huge change in his personality. What worked for him was his charm. He led the Congress outstandingly, holding the three arms of the Movement together. It was the moment he first established himself.'

The perceived possible threat from ANOC concerned, as with GAISF, the distribution of funds. At Baden-Baden, the Solidarity Fund was modified in its composition as the 'Commission for Olympic Solidarity', no longer a joint IOC-NOC Commission, but additionally embracing IFs. Television rights from Lake Placid and Moscow had increased the available fund to \$8.5 million. Anselmo Lopez, a Spanish businessman and long-standing friend of Samaranch, became honorary director of a new Solidarity office with a staff of four. Samaranch said:

ANOC could have been a challenge to the distribution [of funds], but now we were following the true meaning of *solidarity*. Those who needed the money most were Africans. At that time, Africa alone was receiving more than \$500,000 a year, but it was going through ANOC to the NOCs, and for this reason channelling the money through continental federations, as we now did, made them strong and avoided many problems.

By 1984, Lopez and his staff would be handling funds of more than \$12 million, directly aiding Third World sports development.

Accepted at Baden-Baden was the suggestion for an NOC inspection of potential Olympic candidate cities, an issue that 17 years later would be at the heart of the crisis to which Samaranch referred at the beginning of this chapter. Part of the agenda for the Session that now took place alongside the Congress was the election of the host cities for 1988, and there is no doubt that the report of Don Miller and Dick Palmer, from the respective NOCs of the USA and Britain, helped to determine the IOC's controversial yet imaginative selection of Seoul, South Korea, for the Summer Games. Samaranch admitted himself astonished by the vote, Nagoya of Japan having been the favourite. There was political criticism during and after the Session. The older Japanese IOC member Kiyokawa drew attention to South Korea's \$6 billion debt to Japan, while the gymnastics federation president, Titov from the USSR, condemned the country that had no diplomatic relations with more than half the world. The effect of these criticisms, and more particularly the street demonstrations by hundreds of ecological protestors from Japan, plastering lamp-posts around the spa town with banners, was to push the members towards Seoul. The vote was 52-27. The Winter choice was for Calgary. Samaranch, however, was instantly alarmed at the fresh danger facing the IOC with the preference for Seoul.

Other decisions reached at the Session included amendment to Eligibility Rule 26, which now stated: 'Each IF is responsible for the wording of the eligibility code relating to its sport', the guideline for which was that a 'competitor's health should not suffer nor should he or she be placed at a social or material disadvantage as a result of preparation for and participation in the Games and other international competitions'. For the moment it remained illegal to be professional, to be involved in advertising other than under IF/NOC/national federation supervision, or to carry

advertising material on clothing other than trademarks agreed by the IOC with IFs.

In the evolution of the eligibility rule, the IOC was being more re-active than pro-active. The financial reward for competitors, however illegal in theory, had long been in practice and was rapidly accelerating. Killanin had some while before expressed the view that athletes 'should have some sort of cut'. The IAAF had established in 1981 the principle of Trust Funds. Thereby, monies received could be paid into such funds during the athlete's career but not officially 'cashed' until the athlete had retired. Random cash payments, as alleged grants or awards by equipment companies, were wantonly corrupting any last remnants of the amateur ethic. Samaranch knew that it had become absurd for the IOC to continue to live the lie: the more so when, in 1984, the IAAF would create a Grand Prix of 12 to 15 meetings, comparable to tennis, with hefty financial prizes. Yet anomalies remained. At the Winter Games in Sarajevo, Samaranch would be treading water when asked to explain the moral difference between Carl Lewis freely advertising under the control of his national federation while Ingemar Stenmark of Sweden was excluded from Alpine skiing for similar arrangements. Samaranch passed the question to Hodler, president of skiing - who could not answer it. With eligibility now the responsibility of each IF, some of the heat was off the IOC.

After 87 years, the first two female IOC members were elected: Flor Isava Fonseca (Venezuela) and the Olympic runner Pirjo Häggman (Finland). Many regretted the omission of Nadia Lekarska (Bulgaria), eminent Olympic authority and widow of horseman Kroum Lekarski. The IOC membership of his colleague Vladimir Stoytchev had blocked Nadia's path. Also inaugurated was the Athletes' Commission, bringing 12 active competitors inside the corral, Sebastian Coe advocating a life ban for convicted drug offenders.



Flor Isava Fonseca (left) of Venezuela and Pirjo Häggman of Finland, belated inaugural women members of the IOC. (© IOC/Riethausen)

A third request by Sweden for the award of a boxing silver medal to Ingemar Johansson, denied for 'not fighting' in his 1952 final, was accepted. Other developments were an ultimate agreement between the IOC and, respectively, the People's Republic of China and Taiwan on the recognition of their NOCs. To Samaranch's credit, the IOC was the first international body in any field to embrace the two Chinas within a single organisation. Prior to Samaranch's conclusive intervention, Taiwan's affiliation to IFs had fallen from 18 to 11 as IFs increasingly adopted allegiance with the People's Republic. Concurrently, M'Baye formulated draft statutes for an international arbitration court – ultimately CAS – so that the IOC might keep abreast of litigation issues, real or potential, in which various bodies of the Olympic Movement might be involved, there being previously no such legal centre-point.

It was in Baden-Baden, too, that Samaranch first sounded the introduction of Nebiolo (IAAF) and Vazquez Raña (ANOC) as ex-officio members of the IOC. Constitutionally, it made sense for the leaders of two major branches of the Olympic Movement to hold places on the executive, but he was

obliged to back off when it became apparent there was resentment from the floor: less on the basis of the formal position of the two men than on their personalities.

Meanwhile, in Britain, an independent inquiry into sponsorship, under the chairmanship of Denis Howell, Labour MP, former football referee and minister for sport in the 1960s, saw fit to make a string of ethical pronouncements:

- Governing bodies negotiating sponsorship linked to television should assess the value to all interested parties.
- The government should refer to the Office of Fair Trading the relation between the International Management Group (Mark McCormack) and UK Sport to establish whether monopoly exists.
- The IOC should involve all NOCs and IFs in a dialogue about the future of the Olympics regarding eligibility and commercialism.
- GAISF must assess the financial involvement of Adidas with FIFA and the IOC.

The findings were something of an insult. The IOC were already knee-deep in analysis of relationships, under the aegis of the Commission of the Olympic Movement, while for GAISF to assess the activities of Adidas was all but laughable, for it was only the benevolence of Horst Dassler that had rescued GAISF itself from financial embarrassment following the formation of the summer and winter federations. The self-righteousness of some observers led to Dassler being branded an ogre bent on manipulating international sport. He was said to have engineered the election of Samaranch and the choice of Seoul as Olympic host city. Of course Dassler was interested in the projection of sportswear and equipment – less than a third of the

company's overall output, which was primarily leisurewear – but equally he was a benefactor. He provided sponsorship in kind to numerous African and Eastern European sports bodies, at a substantial loss, as well as the more obvious and expedient promotional provision of footwear and clothing, bearing the familiar three-stripe logo, to prominent athletes. Samaranch knew that the IOC's survival lay in financial independence: that without money they had no strength. It was through commercialisation and collaboration with such men as Dassler that the IOC would be able to generate the wealth that would ensure their survival.

At the Session in New Delhi in 1983, the IOC took charge as sole authority over the marketing of the Games, and its symbols and emblem, at the same time formulating an initial agreement with ISL, a Swiss-based company that would coordinate commercialisation of the Olympic logo in 30 major advertising categories such as petrol, cameras, tobacco, motor cars, electronics and food and drink. ISL was a company owned by Adidas and later jointly with Dentsu of Japan. The project initiated in Delhi rested on Dassler's assurance that he had the personnel to co-opt NOCs in a commercial partnership, this leading to the establishment, post-1984, of The Olympic Programme (TOP). This would specialise in a small number of exclusive contracts for sponsors paying millions of dollars per head for membership, ISL acting on behalf of NOCs worldwide. It was also decided in Delhi that Olympic Solidarity would cover the travel and daily expenses of two competitors and one official for the 1984 Winter Games, and for four athletes and two officials for the Summer Games, for every NOC; and that the eligibility codes of a majority of federations, other than those for ice hockey and football, were approved. Ice hockey was to be a thorn in the Winter Games the following year.