

**CONFIDENTIAL**

THIS DOCUMENT IS THE PROPERTY OF HER BRITANNIC MAJESTY'S GOVERNMENT

OD(80) 14

COPY NO

42

19 February 1980

CABINET

DEFENCE AND OVERSEA POLICY COMMITTEE

MOSCOW OLYMPICS

Note by the Secretaries

At the Meeting of the Cabinet on 14 February (CC(80) 6th Conclusions, Minute 2) the Secretary of the Cabinet reported that he had in hand the preparation of a paper for Ministerial consideration, dealing with a number of subsidiary issues arising from the Cabinet's decision on the Moscow Olympics. This is attached.

Signed ROBERT ARMSTRONG  
R L WADE-GERY  
R M HASTIE-SMITH

Cabinet Office

19 February 1980

**CONFIDENTIAL**

**CONFIDENTIAL**

MOSCOW OLYMPICS

Report by Officials

---

BACKGROUND

1. The Prime Minister wrote on 22 January to the Chairman of the British Olympic Association (BOA), asking him to propose to the International Olympic Committee (IOC) that the Summer Games be moved from the Soviet Union. The BOA agreed to put these views to the IOC, who nevertheless decided on 12 February that, under the Olympic rules, the Games must be held in Moscow. On 14 February the Cabinet decided (CC(80) 6th Conclusions, Minute 2) to advise British athletes not to take part in the Moscow Olympics. The Prime Minister announced this decision to Parliament on the same day. The Prime Minister wrote again today to the Chairman of the BOA explaining the Government's views and advising the Association not to accept the invitation to compete in Moscow.

2. The BOA, like other National Olympic Committees, are obliged to accept their invitation by 24 May, if they wish to be represented. They are due to hold a special meeting much sooner, on 4 March, to consider their own attitude in the light of the IOC decision. Meanwhile efforts are being made by a number of countries to muster support for the holding of alternative competitions in one or more cities other than Moscow. To this end there are plans for a meeting of senior officials on 27-28 February. While attendance may be affected by other discussions (eg today's meetings of European Community Foreign Ministers in Rome and of the Supreme Council for African Sports in Lagos), this meeting could have an important bearing on the attitude of many athletes and the organisations which represent them: the Olympics are unique, but the availability of alternative competition of similar quality might encourage defection from Moscow.

3. Many governments have called for a boycott of the Moscow Olympics. Clearest support for the lead given by the United Kingdom, Australia and the United States has come from the countries represented at the recent Islamic Conference in Pakistan. Elsewhere reactions have been mixed, as an initial survey shows (Annex I). An irony of the situation is that in the democratic countries, whose governments most abhor the invasion of Afghanistan, the sporting bodies are most sensitive to the charge of 'mixing politics with sport' and thus reluctant to conform to government wishes. At the same time, in

**CONFIDENTIAL**

countries where the sporting organisations are least independent, governments are arguing that failure by the west to forbid sporting contacts with South Africa justifies their athletes' presence in Moscow, notwithstanding their disapproval of the Afghanistan invasion. Notable exceptions to these generalisations are the United States Olympic Committee and the Kenyan government. The British Government's attitude so far has been in line with decisions taken in relation to sporting contacts with South Africa: pressed to ban the Rugby Unions from the coming tour of the Republic, Ministers decided (by correspondence) to advise against participation, but not to withdraw the players' passports and not to advise the Sports Council to cancel their grant to the Rugby Unions. Earlier, African countries regarded this decision as justifying a threat to force the exclusion of United Kingdom competitors from the Olympics. This threat is unlikely to be pressed. The Africans will not refuse to participate (on the grounds that Britain is allowed to do so, as they did in the case of the Montreal Commonwealth Games, in protest against New Zealand's playing rugby against South Africa) because that would offend the Russians as well as the West; and they will not be able to persuade the Moscow Organising Committee (the nominal host) to ban British participation, because that would give the IOC grounds for withdrawing their agreement to hold the Games in Moscow. The emergence of this dilemma for our detractors illustrates the advantage of maintaining strict consistency in the Government's attitude to British participation in sports with countries whose policies are unacceptable.

#### POINTS FOR DECISION

4. Against this background, a number of questions require early Ministerial decision -

- a. Should the United Kingdom continue to urge removal of the Olympic Games from Moscow?

Recommended answer: Yes

Comment. The IOC, in taking their decision to maintain Moscow as the site for the 1980 Olympic Games, made it clear that they did so in order to conform to the terms of their formal agreement with the city and to their own rules. At the same time the President of the IOC, Lord Killanin, stated that the IOC were "fully aware of, and sensitive to, the world conditions which have created the most serious challenge to confront the Olympic Games". Although the structure of the Olympic movement (see Annex II) makes it unlikely, unless the Russians misplay their hand, that an opportunity to resite the Games will occur, there is psychological advantage to be gained by maintaining that any incompleteness of the Games will be the result of persisting with an unacceptable site.

- b. Should the United Kingdom continue to take part in efforts to mount alternative (non-Olympic) Games?

Recommended Answer: Yes

Comment. The BOA and most of its constituent governing bodies of sport have so far remained firm to the idea of sending a British team to Moscow (evidenced by the deputation to the Prime Minister on 4 February) (see also Annex III). But over the coming weeks it is possible they might be influenced by the line taken by National Olympic Committees in other major sporting countries whose governments are opposed to Moscow. There is a suggestion that they may be more amenable to persuasion if alternative Games could be mounted at another site or sites, though, in the light of the IOC decision, such Games could not be "Olympics" as such. Following agreement reached during the visits of the Australian Prime Minister and the United States Counsellor to the President, Mr Lloyd Cutler, to London on 4 February, officials from a small number of countries opposed to Moscow, including the United Kingdom, attended a preliminary meeting in Washington on 12 February to examine possible options. The meeting showed that a number of difficult hurdles would need to be overcome. Sites might be available, eg in Canada and elsewhere, but further action would be needed urgently if adequate international support were to be found and if Games were to be held soon enough to offer a viable alternative in 1980 (or even 1981). A second meeting of officials, if possible with wider participation, is planned for 27-28 February. A decision is needed by Ministers whether the United Kingdom should continue to take part fully in this process eg in contacting international and British sporting organisations and (in line with the Prime Minister's letter of 22 January to the BOA) in maintaining the offer of support in arranging for suitable events to be held in the United Kingdom.

- c. Should the Government be represented officially at the Moscow Olympics?

Recommended Answer: No

Comment. i. The only Minister who would normally expect to be present in his official capacity is the Minister for Sport. It would clearly be inconsistent with the Government's position for a Minister to be present at Games whose site they regard as unacceptable and in which they have discouraged British participation.

ii. The British Ambassador would normally attend on occasion, as would the member of his staff designated Olympic Attache. Attendance by the Ambassador or his staff in an official capacity would

be as inconsistent with the Government's position as Ministerial attendance. The Foreign and Commonwealth Office intend to cancel their designation of an Olympic Attache. Normal consular assistance will be available.

d. Should the Government discourage British representation through the Sports Council?

Recommended answer: Yes

Comment. The Sports Council is the non-official body through which Government financial assistance to all British sports is channelled. The Chairman and Vice-Chairman are paid for their services, as are the Council's full-time staff. None of those concerned is a civil servant, but the full cost of attendance in Moscow by representatives of the Sports Council would be met from their Government grant. In circumstances where athletes are being discouraged from competing, it would be inconsistent for the Government to approve attendance by paid sports officials. The difficulty is that while the Sports Council is required to "bear in mind" Government policy, it is by no means clear that the Government can oblige it not to use the funds allocated to it for a particular purpose. The point has never been tested. One solution would be for the Minister for Sport to write to the Chairman of the Sports Council to make the Government's views abundantly clear.

THIS IS A COPY. THE ORIGINAL IS  
RETAINED UNDER SECTION 3 (4)  
OF THE PUBLIC RECORDS ACT

THIS IS A COPY. THE ORIGINAL IS  
RETAINED UNDER SECTION 3 (4)  
OF THE PUBLIC RECORDS ACT

- f. Should the Government facilitate i. participation (to compete or officiate) or ii. attendance (as spectators) of members of the Armed Services?

Recommended answer: No; the Services should be guided by i. - iv. below.

Comment. Annex V sets out the basis on which leave is granted to various categories of public employee. It would be completely contrary to the Government's policy to encourage participation by the Armed Forces at a Games to which they have objected on grounds of the host country's military adventures. This argument applies with particular force to the participation of Service teams, but nearly as strongly to the participation of individual athletes from the Services. Thus it would clearly be unacceptable to facilitate participation by the grant of special leave. Refusal of permission to participate during annual or unpaid leave would be harder to justify except on genuine operational or security grounds. An examination of the security implications of the certain Russian desire to exploit participation by members of the Armed Services is in hand. However, the Government could be criticised for discriminating against its own servants. Such criticisms would probably be made with greater vehemence if the authorities sought to prevent Servicemen's attendance as spectators. There is a difficult balance to strike, but the course most consistent with the Government's general position and objectives would be i. to forbid participation in the Moscow Games by Service teams on any basis; ii. to refuse special leave to serving personnel to enable them to participate as individuals; iii. to use all administrative measures available to discourage individual participation during annual or unpaid leave; and iv. to advise strongly against attendance as spectators.

- g. Should the Government adopt a similar policy to f. in respect of other categories of public servant?

Recommended answer: Yes, for civil servants and police.

Comment. Civil servants and police are subject to much the same leave regime as the Armed Services, though to less strict disciplinary constraints. It would be logical for the Government to apply similar

rules on participation, ie i. no special leave (the question of team participation does not arise); ii. discouragement of the use of annual or unpaid leave to go to Moscow. In the case of the police the Home Office would need to give suitable advice to Chief Constables.

h. Should the Government withdraw financial support from British sporting bodies involved in participation in the Moscow Olympics?

Recommended answer: No

Comment The arrangements for funding British participation in the Olympics are described in Annex IV. The essential points are, first, that sufficient money had already been collected to finance attendance at Moscow; the results of a collapse in the Appeal now would only be to make the BOA's financial position more precarious for the period after the Games. Second, in Government aid given through the Sports Council, it is not possible to identify a specific element for the Olympics. While therefore it would in theory be possible to apply pressure by threatening to cut the Sports Council's grant, implementation of the threat would entail severe damage to sport and to its voluntary administrative structure. Thirdly, such action would go beyond what was done to discourage the Lions tour of South Africa.

THIS IS A COPY. THE ORIGINAL IS  
RETAINED UNDER SECTION 3 (4)  
OF THE PUBLIC RECORDS ACT

THIS IS A COPY. THE ORIGINAL IS  
RETAINED UNDER SECTION 3 (4)  
OF THE PUBLIC RECORDS ACT

- j. Should the Government advise British office holders in International Sports Federations not to go to Moscow?

Recommended answer: No

Comment It is normal for the International Federations, which govern individual sports, to hold their Congresses to coincide in time and place with the Olympic Games. Western, and indeed British, influence in these organisations is substantial; and it is a clear British interest that it should remain so. Failure to take part in the Congresses to be held in Moscow would lose the United Kingdom the positions its nationals hold, and reduce the chances of future British candidates. Since individual events are run by the Federations concerned, individuals may well find it difficult to divorce their functions as officials of the Games from those as governors of the sport in question. Our judgement is that the national interest would be better served by encouraging such individuals to participate, unless there are over-riding arguments to the contrary (eg in the case of Prince Philip).

- k. Should the Government discourage attendance by British spectators?

Recommended answer: Yes, cautiously

Comment It would hardly be consistent for the Government to encourage British spectators to attend an Olympic Games to whose holding it is opposed, not least because of the likely use of the Games as a vehicle for Soviet propaganda. The Prime Minister has indeed already, in her statements to Parliament pointed to the obligations of athletes, like any other category of citizen, to consider the implications of involvement. But caution is required: travellers to Moscow must commit themselves by 1 March (see Annex VI); and they stand to lose part or even all their money if they change their minds. In the Law Officer's view, "In almost all cases the Crown would be under no contractual or statutory obligation to those who sustain loss; nor will it be readily demonstrable that the Government's action is such as to constitute, in any particular case, an intentional and



unlawful inducement to break a contract". Nevertheless, publicity could well be given to hard luck stories and pressure build up for ex gratia payments to those who "demonstrated their patriotism".

1. Should the Government blame the IOC?

Recommended answer: No

Comment: There is a temptation to look upon the IOC as an anachronistic, non-accountable gerantocracy. This view underestimates the body's caution in relation to the formal agreements made with the Soviet authorities; more importantly it underestimates both its limited degree of real independence from the International Federations which actually control their sports and run individual events; and the difficulty in sustaining an amateur ideal in an increasingly politicised world. If the IOC once lost the confidence of sports administrators, the pressures for control by a more 'responsible' and 'democratic' body would be liable to lead to a takeover bid by UNESCO or some similar body. Such a trend would be unlikely to improve the conduct of the Olympic Games and would almost certainly damage the United Kingdom's wider political interests. Thus it would be preferable for regrets at the IOC's stance to be expressed in terms of sorrow rather than anger.

m. Can circumstances be envisaged in which the Government would wish to reverse its present policy?

Recommended answer: Yes, with difficulty

Comment: All governments opposed to the holding of the Olympics in Moscow have related their opposition to the presence of Soviet forces in Afghanistan. It is unlikely that any significant withdrawal will take place before 24 May (the date by which formal acceptance or rejection of invitations to the Moscow Games is required). Perhaps for this reason the United States have made a reversal of their policy dependant upon an adequate Soviet response by 20 February. On the other hand some European countries, notably the Federal Republic of Germany, have sought to leave open at least the theoretical possibility that the Soviet Union will create conditions which would enable the Games to take place with universal support. The advantage of the latter approach is that it offers the Soviet Union some

continuing inducement to pull out of Afghanistan earlier rather than later; the disadvantage is that it reduces the pressure to concentrate on planning alternatives to the Games, for which speed is essential.

5. In the light of their views on the points a.- m. above, Ministers will wish to consider how to win full domestic and foreign support for their Olympic policy. Since the support of the sporting community is necessary to the infliction of maximum embarrassment to the Soviet Union, there would appear to be advantage in airing the issues involved frequently and vigorously, particularly in order to avoid any impression that Soviet occupation of Afghanistan is an irreversible fait accompli. It is important to bear in mind that the Government cannot themselves organise Games; only the responsible Federations, national or international, can do so. Thus the Government's initiative is limited to the investigation of possibilities which do or are likely to meet the desires of the responsible sporting bodies. Steps which could be considered are -

- a. the securing of parliamentary endorsement for the Government's Olympic policy (OD(80) 1st Meeting, Minute 2, Conclusion 1);
- b. the establishment of a temporary sub-committee of OD charged with the task of following up the Government's decisions;
- c. private lobbying by the Ministers concerned, of the Presidents of the British Federations responsible for individual sports; and similar action with other distinguished individuals in the sports world;
- d. devotion of public speeches to the Olympic question;
- e. special attention to the issue in press and television briefing;
- f. lobbying of foreign governments by United Kingdom representatives abroad.

6. Depending upon Ministers' decisions and on the outcome of the Government's efforts to win support for their approach to the problem, there could be financial implications, which will require to be examined in detail. At present it is not possible to do more than draw attention to possible areas for expenditure and suggest the orders of magnitude involved. These are -

- a. Contribution to the enhancement of facilities in the United Kingdom to meet Olympic standards. (The Prime Minister, in her letter of

22 January, stated that "the Government are prepared to play a full part in supporting arrangements in this country for those parts of the Games that might be held here".) (For details of British facilities which might be available see Annex VIII.)

b. Possible support for the improvement of facilities abroad. (The United States have said that they would be prepared to provide such assistance and would look to their allies to assist. No commitment has been given to respond.)

c. Support for sending competitors to alternative Games (on the assumption that the proceeds of the Olympic Appeal are, for practical or judicial reasons, not available for this purpose).

d. Support for media coverage of alternative Games (the current position of the BBC and ITV is described at Annex VII).

e. Possible ex gratia payments to individuals who have suffered unreasonable losses as a consequence of following the Government's lead.

Were the Government to make some contribution under all these heads, it is difficult to see how the liability could exceed, say, £5 million. But this figure must be extremely tentative, given the many uncertainties surrounding the Games.

19 February 1980

## OLYMPIC GAMES : KNOWN ATTITUDE OF GOVERNMENTS AS AT 15 FEBRUARY

A Governments not wanting their athletes to go to Moscow

Australia	Fiji	Liberia	Quatar
Bahrain	Germany	Malawi	Saudi Arabia
Bermuda	Haiti	Malaysia	Singapore
Canada	Honduras	Netherlands	Somalia
Chile	Italy+	New Zealand	Sudan
China	Ivory Coast	Norway	United States
Djibouti	Japan	Pakistan	Zaire
Egypt	Kenya	Papua New Guinea	

B Governments still undecided

Austria	Iceland	Nigeria	Sweden
Belgium	Iran	Portugal	Switzerland
Denmark	Ireland	South Korea	Turkey
Greece	Luxembourg	Spain	Yugoslavia

C Governments who will not support a boycott

Cyprus	Guyana	Malta
Finland	India	Senegal
France	Jamaica	

1. Twenty-five out of the thirty-six countries attending the Islamic Conference supported that part of a resolution calling on member states to boycott the Moscow Games. Precise details are not available.
2. The analysis of Government's attitudes towards the Olympics does not necessarily reflect the attitude of the local National Olympic Committee.
3. In some countries, as in the United Kingdom, the National Olympic Committee is at odds with its Government where that Government is requesting a change of venue or favours a boycott.

+ has not declared itself publicly.

1. The Olympic Movement is only one part of the international sports scene and only really comes into its own every four years. But its precepts set the tone for international sports events and relationships and its principles are those of international sport generally. The twenty-six International Federations of the sports which form part of the Olympic Games have a special relationship with the Olympic Movement, but all the Federations almost certainly regard the Movement as having a special place in World Sport. Indeed the International Olympic Committee (IOC), the Association of National Olympic Committees and the General Assembly of International Sports Federations apart from their separate roles have close links with each other, not least by virtue of the fact that some officers hold posts in the several organisations at any one time. The various sports are, therefore, albeit very loosely in some respects, linked with each other. This reflects an attempt to compromise between the voluntary, amateur ideal of sport surviving from the last century with a modern need for organisation in order to get things done in an increasingly bureaucratic world. The attitudes of national sporting bodies are inevitably coloured, and in many cases largely circumscribed by the nature of the regimes within which they operate. It is worth noting that the Congresses of the International Federations are normally held to coincide in time and place with an Olympic Games.

2. Against this background it is not altogether easy to make useful distinctions between the attitudes adopted by, on the one hand, governments and, on the other, sports bodies. But, in general terms, the more open the society, the more likely are sporting bodies to be influenced by their fellow sportsmen; and, partly because of the interaction between national sports bodies and the international federations, (with their special relationship with the Olympic Movement) the latter's views will more readily permeate the views of national sporting bodies in the freer societies. In contrast the attitudes of Governments to the Moscow Games are determined by a wide variety of ill-assorted motives. Governmental reactions known to date are set out in Annex I. Many national sporting bodies (including those of the United Kingdom) have however refrained from taking a formal view until the IOC had considered the issue. Annex II described the known position of certain British governing bodies.

3. The IOC is a self-electing autonomous body, entirely responsible for every aspect of the Olympic Movement and currently of eighty nine members. The members are chosen for their personal attributes and experience. They are not the representatives of their countries on the Committee but rather the IOC's "ambassadors" in them. The IOC has just decided, unanimously, to go ahead with the Games in Moscow. The background to this decision is as follows.

4. The IOC awarded the 1980 Summer Games to Moscow some six years ago when that city was the only applicant (Olympic Games are awarded to a city not to a country). Ironically, perhaps, it is understood that Detroit was the only other city interested but withdrew through lack of support, mainly financial, from the United States Government. The IOC would claim that the Games were duly awarded, that it has a legally binding contract with Moscow, that the Moscow Olympic Committee has met all its requirements, and that it has no grounds for abrogating its agreement with the Moscow Organising Committee. The Olympic Rules only allow for the organisation of the Games to be withdrawn from a city "in the event of a breach of the Rules being committed or a failure to observe the duties and obligations that have been entered into". Such a withdrawal would be without prejudice to any liability for loss or damage. A "state of war" has been quoted in Olympic circles recently as the only other reason for removing the Games once awarded. No definition of a "state of war" has been given and there would appear to be no mention of it in the Olympic Charter or Rules. A change of the Rules requires the votes of two-thirds, and not less than thirty, of IOC members present at a session.

5. The IOC is firmly against mixing politics and sport. Rule 24C, for example, says "NOCs must be autonomous and must resist all pressures of any kind whatsoever, whether of a political, religious or economic nature. In pursuing their objectives, NOCs may co-operate with private or government organisations. However, they must never associate themselves with any undertaking which would be in conflict with the principles of the Olympic Movement

and with the Rules of the IOC". The President of the IOC, Lord Killanin, has said that it would be impossible at this late stage to organise alternative Games if they were removed from Moscow now, in any case. It takes many years to make all the necessary arrangements and the availability of the required facilities is only one of the many problems involved. As to postponement Olympic Rule 54 states "The Olympic Games must take place during the last year of the Olympiad which they are to celebrate" (ie 1980 for the XXIIInd Olympiad). "In no circumstances may they be postponed to another year." Postponement would, therefore, also entail a change in the Rules.

In reply to a letter from the Prime Minister asking the BSA to approach the IOC to propose that the Summer Games be moved from the Soviet Union, the Chairman undertook to get the Government's suggestion to the IOC at late March. The members of the BSA felt, however, unable to support the suggestion themselves. The Chairman, Sir Denis Preece, has been advised (as well in various pressouncements) on the matter that sport and politics should not be mixed and that it was impossible at this late stage to relocate the Games. BSA members also regard it as impossible to hold a relocated Games in different places. They see no alternative to holding the Games in Moscow.

A special meeting of the BSA will be held on 3 March, however, to decide whether or not to accept the invitation to Moscow in view of the concern of the Government and others. The Chairman has said that all the opinions expressed to the BSA will be taken into account.

The majority of Governing Bodies of the twenty-one sports concerned in a Summer Olympics is expected to decide to go to Moscow if the Games go ahead there and the BSA accepts the invitation. Notably the British Amateur Athletic Board has said that its athletes will be in Moscow and reports suggest that most others share this determination. The British Equestrian Federation, however, has called on the BSA not to accept the invitation to Moscow and reserved the right to boycott the Games if the BSA decides to send a team. The Governing Bodies of shooting, women's hockey and yachting are also thought to be doubtful of going to Moscow. And there may be one or two others; but probably no more. The Brazilians have said that they will attend but boycott the Opening and Closing Ceremonies.

## KNOWN POSITION OF THE BRITISH OLYMPIC ASSOCIATION (BOA) AND GOVERNING BODIES

The BOA is the National Olympic Committee (NOC) for the United Kingdom and as such is autonomous. It is the BOA, not the Government which receives the invitation to send a team to the Olympic Games. The BOA has received an invitation to Moscow this summer and must reply by 24 May ie eight weeks before the Games open on 19 July. Final entries for actual events must be received by the organisers at least ten days before the event.

In reply to a letter from the Prime Minister asking the BOA to approach the IOC to propose that the Summer Games be moved from the Soviet Union, the Chairman undertook to put the Government's suggestion to the IOC at Lake Placid. The members of the BOA felt, however, unable to support the suggestion themselves. The Chairman, Sir Denis Follows, has been adamant himself in various pronouncements on the matter that sport and politics should not be mixed and that it was impossible at this late stage to relocate the Games. BOA members also regard it as impossible to hold a relocated Games in different places. They see no alternative to holding the Games in Moscow.

A special meeting of the BOA will be held on 4 March, however, to decide whether or not to accept the invitation to Moscow in view of the concern of the Government and others. The Chairman has said that all the opinions expressed to the BOA will be taken into account.

The majority of Governing Bodies of the twenty-one sports concerned in a Summer Olympics is expected to decide to go to Moscow if the Games go ahead there and the BOA accepts the invitation. Notably the British Amateur Athletic Board has said that its athletes will be in Moscow and reports suggest that most others share this determination. The British Equestrian Federation, however, has called on the BOA not to accept the invitation to Moscow and reserved its right to boycott the Games if the BOA decide to send a team. The Governing Bodies of shooting, women's hockey and yachting are also thought to be doubtful of going to Moscow. And there may be one or two others; but probably no more. The Wrestlers have said that they will attend but boycott the Opening and Closing Ceremonies.



## BOA FUNDS

The BOA organises an Olympic Appeal Fund to raise from organisations and individuals the necessary funds to send teams to the Winter and Summer Games and to cover its own administrative costs between Games. The Sports Council and the Sports Councils for Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland are the only bodies through which financial support from public funds would be provided for British participation in the next Olympic Games. None of them has contributed to the current Appeal Fund. The Sports Councils do grant-aid Governing Bodies of Sport, including those concerned with Olympic events, for coaching and preparation of their athletes. But it would be impossible to separate the proportion of grants spent on pre-Olympic preparation from that spent on preparation for other events throughout the year. The Sports Council does consider requests from the BOA from time to time for administrative grant. The last occasion was March 1978 when £45,000 was given.

The target for the present Appeal Fund is £1 million. So far some £600,000 is understood to have been received or firmly promised. The BOA regard this as meaning that there will be enough to cover the costs of sending a British team to Lake Placid and to Moscow. But the Association might be in difficulties over its own running costs in the following years.

Continued uncertainty over the Games is bound to have an increasing affect on response to the Appeal.

PARTICIPATION BY SERVICEMEN, CIVIL SERVANTS AND  
OTHER PUBLIC SECTOR EMPLOYEES

Size of the problem

1. Likely Service participation in the Games is as follows -

RN	ARMY	RAF
Modern Pentathlon (1)	Modern Pentathlon (2)	Athletics (3)
Swimming (1)	Judo (2)	Boxing (1)
Sailing (2)	Canoeing (2)	Fencing (1)
	Athletics (2)	Target shooting (1)
	Target shooting (2)	

As far as is known there are no Olympic Games officials being sought from the Services.

2. Eleven civil servants and a small number of others employed in the more closely related public sector bodies are known to have taken part in the 1976 Olympic Games as participants, technical advisers or officials. Some may also have attended meetings of international sports authorities held at the same time and place. It is not yet known how many may wish to attend the 1980 Games but the numbers are likely to be of the same order, including one or two leading figures such as shot-put champion Geoff Capes (Cambridgeshire Police).

Policy

3. In the normal way a Service competitor if selected would apply for special leave. If granted he would then come under the control of the national body of the sport concerned. Each Service Department has a Sports Control Board whose Director is a retired officer who is involved in all aspects of Service sport, and who is a member of the British Olympics Association. It is clearly desirable, to avoid circumstances in which Servicemen might be seen to be acting in any way at variance with the Government's decision. The way this could be prevented would be if S of S gave instructions that the leave necessary for participation in the Moscow Olympics should not be granted. It should be

explained that there is special leave which is being granted now for training purposes (this will continue), and privilege leave. If the former were withheld for travel to Moscow, the Services would have to be prepared to withhold privilege leave as well, if the individual should apply for it. This could not be done as an administrative device and would have to be seen as a result of Government policy. It is worth pointing out that it is unlikely that this action could be defended on grounds of security. Present policy does not discourage Servicemen from travel to the Olympics provided they have made acceptable travel arrangements and they do not come from a specially sensitive background.

4. Civil Service policy on participation in international sport is similar -

- With Special Leave :           paid special leave is refused for sporting activities contrary to stated Government policy eg involving South Africa.
- With Unpaid Leave :           refused only on genuine operational grounds related to the employee's work: if allowed a request would be made to the person to consider the position in the light of Government policy.
- With Annual Leave :           although strictly a privilege, annual leave can be withheld only for genuine and pressing operational reasons, and would normally be granted without any explanation being required.
- Security :                       civil servants are required to obtain permission to travel to the Iron Curtain countries. This permission can be withheld only on genuine security grounds.

5. Similar rules apply to the more closely related Public Sector bodies (eg Police, Post Office). Except where there are any special security considerations, it is expected that the Nationalised Industries would follow commercial practice.

6. Local Authorities are independent statutory bodies. Under S112 of the Local Government Act 1972 their staff are employed under such terms and conditions as the authorities themselves see fit. The Department would therefore have no

locus to intervene directly. Members of Local Authorities are of course private individuals, and formally determine those conditions, so the Government would have no greater leverage on them.

The only powers available to Government would be those of advice and persuasion. Even here, the local authority associations might be reluctant to co-operate because of their opposition to aspects of the current Local Government Bill.

7. Apart from the Chairman and Vice-Chairman, members of the Sports Council are unpaid. The Government therefore has no direct financial sanctions; the only powers available would seem to be those of appointment and reappointment. The Minister could make public his views on the seriousness with which he regarded the need for a boycott. However, it is not clear that the Minister has powers of dismissal, so this would be a blunt instrument. No action has been taken against members publicly disagreeing with Government's views on South Africa. The staff of the Sports Council are employed by the Council not Government. They are not civil servants. However, the Sports Council is required to take account of Government policy in deciding its own actions; so, we could expect the Council to issue similar advice/instructions to its staff, as CSD would to other Departments.

8. At present, therefore, it would in theory be possible to refuse special leave in the light of stated Government policy on British participation, but not other unpaid or annual leave except on genuine operational or security grounds. Any attempt to discriminate in this way against public service employees would be likely to give rise to protest from the Civil Service and other trade unions, and possibly other bodies such as the National Council for Civil Liberties. As regards Servicemen the Government having made its position plain, there can be no question of a Service team taking part. As regards individuals, permission to take leave could be withheld, but only as a result of a Ministerial decision to do so. It is important that Servicemen should not be treated in this respect any differently from other Crown servants, even though the Service Discipline Acts place them under different constraints. While it is recognised that the impact on world opinion of Service participation in Moscow Games would be greater, and would be exploited by the Russians, to take formal steps to prevent individual Servicemen from participating would incur a great deal of public controversy in the United Kingdom. Unless Ministers decide otherwise, such steps are not at present contemplated.

## MOSCOW GAMES: TRAVEL FOR SPECTATORS

1. The General Agents in the United Kingdom for selling tours and tickets for the Moscow Games are David Dryer (Sports Travel) Limited. In a letter to the Chairman of the BOA the Solicitor for this firm, who is also a Director of the Company and Vice President of the British Olympic Travel Committee, estimates that about 5,000 members of the public have booked to go to Moscow at the time of the Games. Most of them have made stage-payments and many have paid for the trip outright. The average cost of each tour he estimates to be £500 per person. David Dryer Ltd have deposited funds in advance in Moscow in accordance with contractual obligations. These deposits cover hotel bookings, Olympic Games tickets and general travel arrangements. Their Solicitor believes that if the United Kingdom does not participate or the venue is changed for no reason allowed for under Olympic rules there would be scant hope of recovering the sums deposited with the Soviet authorities.
2. By virtue of the particular circumstances relating to David Dryer the usual statutory safeguards in relation to licensed air travel organisations do not apply to this company. In the event of a liquidation these safeguards would not be available to protect members of the public who have made payments.
3. A Member of Parliament has written to the Minister for Sport about two of his constituents who say they are faced with a potential moral as well as a financial dilemma. If they decided that to attend the Games in Moscow would signify support for recent Soviet actions and did not go, they would lose £218 each of the total cost of £420 each for the trip, of which they have already paid £325. They ask for advice as to whether to expect help from official sources.

Moscow Olympic Games: BroadcastingGeneral

1. Under the traditional arrangements governing broadcasting in this country the broadcasting authorities have editorial responsibility for the content of their programmes and for the day to day running of their affairs, subject to the law and within the general rules prescribed by charter and licence for the British Broadcasting Corporation and by Act of Parliament for the Independent Broadcasting Authority. In public statements Ministers have asserted the present Government's adherence to that policy and have recognised the danger of government interference with the broadcasting authorities' independence. The Governors of the BBC and members of the IBA, who are appointed as guardians of the public interest in broadcasting matters, do however take account of views expressed in Parliament and by the public on programmes and other broadcasting matters.

Moscow Olympics

2. In exercise of their responsibility for making programme decisions it is for the BBC and the IBA individually to decide what coverage to give to the Moscow Olympic Games. In face of the uncertainties surrounding the event they issued the following joint statement on 24 January:-

"The BBC and the IBA (in consultation with the programme companies) have decided to act jointly in any review which may become necessary of their planned coverage of the Moscow Olympic Games. This review would take account of any changes in the nature of the Games or of British participation in them."

3. The Home Office understands that the BBC has already incurred some expense in advance preparations for covering the Games. The Independent Broadcasting Authority estimate that the event will cost them about £1 million to cover, part of which has already been spent. Both authorities are waiting to see what emerges from British Olympic Association meeting on 4 March before deciding whether to change their plans for covering the event.

## UNITED KINGDOM FACILITIES

If it were decided to spread the alternative Games the United Kingdom has facilities to the Olympic standards as set out in the table below. This does not take account of availability, accommodation for competitors, officials, the media etc or of costs. Presumably those countries subscribing to an alternative games would be expected to contribute to financing the overall costs whether for a games in one site or spread over several locations. If Olympic standards were not required there might be other facilities available in Britain.

<u>SPORT</u>		<u>VENUE</u>
Athletics	No	
Rowing	Yes	‡ Holme Pierrepont
Basketball	Poss	* Earls Court/Olympia/Wembley/NEC
Boxing	Poss	* Earls Court/Olympia/Wembley/NEC/Royal Albert Hall
Gymnastics	Yes	* Wembley Main Arena/NEC 8 Training Areas ??
Weightlifting	Yes	* YMCA/Sobell/Picketts Lock/NEC
Judo	Yes	* NEC
Wrestling	Yes	* NEC
Volleyball	Yes	* NEC
Canoeing - Sprints	Yes	Holme Pierrepont
- Slalom	Yes	Bala
Cycling	Yes	Leicester, possible but uncovered
Equestrian	Poss	Crystal Palace/Badminton /Hickstead
Fencing	Yes	Crystal Palace
Football	Yes	Wembley, etc.
Handball	No	
Hockey	No	<u>but</u> Wembley, if turf is acceptable
Swimming	No	
Diving	No	
Water Polo	No	
Modern Pentathlon	Yes	Crystal Palace
Shooting	No	
Archery	Yes	
Yachting	No	Weymouth Bay and Portland H. in 1984

\*Suitable Indoor Arena Facilities, subject to availability, are Earls Court, NEC, Wembley Arena, Royal Albert Hall

‡Temporary Stand for 10,000 required