

display of goods, then the display of goods and machinery, including machine contests, until in the end they displayed ideas, scientific progress and achievements of social reform. The media then took over the job of publicizing manufactured goods. Advanced technology could no longer be transported to the exhibitions but becomes the exhibit itself today, as shown by the public display of the production in the new VW plant in Dresden. On the other hand the displays at international trade fairs are often closed to the public. International Corporations and the spread of information have contributed to the decline of the universal exhibitions and besides that *“the national competition element in world’s fairs was siphoned away by the Olympic Games.”*^{7 3}

In the course of the last two centuries the Olympic Games have replaced the universal exhibitions as the only world festival. Having the decline of the world’s fairs in mind, the question of the enduring success of the Olympic Games arises and also an awareness for corresponding signs of structural change. One clue to the success of the “Olympics” may be the simplicity of the display of men and (from 1912) women in competitive live action and the embedding of individual or group efforts in a ritual that is separated by solemn opening and closing ceremonies and ritual forms of gathering from

everyday life. Many of the ceremonial elements of the Olympic Games were copied from the international exhibitions. With its limitation to a period of about two weeks the Olympic Games today constitute a spectacle that in general sense follows the principles of drama: unity of place, time and action and as the media coverage reveals, this is a realistic span. The abolition of the four year cycle could be the first step to overkill and decline as well as over-commercialisation. The old question *temple or market* is still crucial, not as dichotomised opposition but as a dialectic issue.

The ambiguity that is a general token of rituals also applies to the Olympic Games. The future will prove whether they become the catwalk for the most advanced types of *l’homme machine*, who, powered by doping, genetic manipulation and advanced nutrition schemes, will compete in an event that could be a mixture of pop-festival and global marketing instrument. An alternative though possibly utopian view could hope that the Olympic Games can still retain in the triad of their constitutive structure of individual effort, national representation and international competition the vestiges of that “athleticism” that COUBERTIN began to transform into “Olympism” in 1889. For him it was a kind of social reform on the scale of mankind.

OLYMPIC OR NOT?

A DISCUSSION ABOUT THE STATUS OF EVENTS OF 1900 AND 1904

by Herman de Wael

When trying to write the definitive history of the Olympic Games, one of the very first discussions one faces is that of the status of the different events. Most cases are clear, but some cases are far more difficult.

By far the most difficult cases are those of the Olympic Games of 1900 and 1904. These two Olympics were conducted not by one organizing committee, but rather as a sideshow to the Universal Expositions held in Paris and Saint Louis respectively. An enormous amount of events were conducted, and it is clear to any historian that not all of

these events can or should be termed Olympic. For the other Olympic Games, there have been decisions made by the varying Organizing Committees, and by the IOC, as to which events were “official”, and which were “demonstration” events and sports. It seems logical to follow those decisions, even if this means including a swimming event for Greek sailors (1896). But for 1900 and 1904 such official decisions are lacking. There is mention of a report from 1912 that should have solved the problem for 1900, but the report is neither very official nor very reliable. No official IOC decision exists about 1904.



When considering the status of Olympic events in Paris and Saint Louis, there are as many opinions as there are publications. Every author has either simply copied previous works, or given a personal opinion about which events should be termed Olympic and not.

By far the best analysis of the problem is the one presented by the ISOH president, Bill Mallon, in his series of "official reports" on the early Olympic Games. But not even the status of this author can mean that this is any but a personal opinion, as I am certain Mr Mallon will readily acknowledge.

Nevertheless, Bill Mallon should be applauded for trying to sort some order into chaos, by setting off with a set of objective criteria, applying them rigorously, and sticking with the result, regardless of previously generally held opinions. This has resulted in him including such sports as 1900 Yachting and 1904 Boxing, while discarding 1904 Waterpolo. I shall come back to these decisions later, but for the moment we should note that these decisions are by far unanimous among authors in the field.

However, I do approve of the methodology, and of the basic criteria, and I would like to use Bill Mallon's work as the basis for a small discussion on this subject.

Let us then consider separately the criteria that Bill Mallon introduces.

1. Amateuism

At the re-establishment of the Olympic movement in 1894, at the Sorbonne Congress, this criterion was already mentioned. The Olympic Games should be for amateurs only, and only in the sport of Fencing would there be separate categories for Professionals. The reason behind this exception was that Fencing Masters were basically teachers of the sport, whose standing as "Gentlemen" was taken for granted. They did not perform their sport for money prizes.

It is this exception that might cause some discussion when applying the criterion in 1900 and 1904. Certainly, for those sports that were under consideration in 1894, it should be clear that (barring extraordinarily changed circumstances), professionalism should discount the sport from Olympic status in 1900 and 1904. But what of sports that were not considered in 1894? Might not

the IOC have also provided an exception, when considering the problem at that later date? It is known that Baron de Coubertin was against all forms of professionalism, yet he never pronounced himself on the status of sports in 1900, never excluding them from consideration on this mere basis.

Let us look at the events that Bill Mallon lists as professional. The last column indicates Mallon's decision on Olympic status.

year	Sport	Event	excluded for other reasons	c o m	M a l
1900	Athletics	professional events	no	(1a)	no
	Cycling	professional events	some	(1b)	no
	Fencing	professional events	no	(4)	YES
	Pelota Basque	professional events	no	(1c)	no
	Shooting	professional events	some	(2)	no
	Tennis (Lawn)	professional events	no	(3)	no
1904	Cycling	professional events	no	(1b')	no

We can distinguish four different categories of events:

(1a) In Athletics, there are special events for professionals. Mallon does not mention money prizes.

(1b) In Cycling in 1900, there are a number of events with big money prizes. The participants in these events did not participate in the events for Amateurs.

(1b') In Cycling in 1904, there were events for professionals.

(1c) In Pelota, there was an event for professionals

These sports have separate categories for professionals. The athletes made money from their sport, and they should indeed be excluded from consideration as Olympic events.

(2) In Shooting, there was a large number of events that held money prizes. Some of the winners of these prizes are also classed in the amateur events. This poses a different problem. Apparently, the mere fact of receiving prizes was not yet a reason for disqualification from the Olympic Games. I don't think that this should be a reason to retroactively disregard Shooting as an Olympic sport in 1900, but I do agree that the events that held money prizes should not be given Olympic status.

(3) In Tennis, there are six professionals who contest a singles and a doubles tournament.

The players receive money prizes totaling 2250 FF.

The six professionals are shown as representing tennis clubs from Dublin, Paris (2 clubs), Berlin and London (2 players from Queens' Club). It seems as if these players are teachers, and they should perhaps receive the same status as their counterparts in the Fencing competitions. However, Tennis was a sport that was also mentioned in 1894, and no exception was given, so it does not seem right to award Olympic status now. Also the awarding of prizes is contrary to the practice for the Fencing masters.

(4) the Fencing events are included despite being for "Masters". There were no money prizes. It seems correct to accept the general view, also held by the IOC itself at the time, to consider these events as Olympic.

All in all, there seems to be no reason to question any of Mallon's decisions with regards to amateurism.

2. Internationalism

In Paris in 1900 and especially in Saint Louis in 1904, a number of events were conducted merely as national championships. It is quite clear that these championships should not be awarded official Olympic status. However, it is not always clear what constitutes an international event, and which events were truly restricted to nationals. Let's therefore examine the list of events which saw only competitors from the host nation. There are a number of cases where this was merely the result of a lack of interest from foreign competitors, not any limit on their participation. Mallon has decided to award Olympic status in such cases. Indeed, competitors that enter an event should not be disadvantaged by the mere fact that others do not.

(18) A German team wanted to enter the swimming relay, but was refused entry because the swimmers were not members of the same club. See below

(19) the situation for Waterpolo is exactly the same as for the swimming relay. See below.

Again we can consider a number of sports and events together:

(1a) Archery, (1b) Boxing, (1c) Cycling, (1d) Wrestling, the team events in (1e) Golf and (1f) Gymnastics, and some events in (1g) Rowing and (1h) Weightlifting suffered from the distance between Europe and Saint Louis. No foreign competitors made it to the Games, but Mallon does not exclude these sports for that reason. Mallon finds reference to Filipino Archers and German Cyclists, who entered the competitions but did not make it to the start. It is worth mentioning that the team events in Golf and Gymnastics are included by Mallon, although they had exactly the same regulations as the Waterpolo, of which more below.

(2a) Archery, (2b) Gymnastics, (2c) Shooting in 1900 and (2d) Athletics in 1904 appear to be purely national championships that were

year	Sport	Event	excluded for other reasons	com	Mal
900	Archery	National Championships	no*	(2a)	no
	Archery	Tir äärbälëte	no*	(4a)	no
	Bowls	two events	no	(5a)	no
	Cycling	Grand Prix Regional	yes	(3a)	no
	Gymnastics	national championships	no*	(2b)	no
	Longue-Paume	four events	no	(4b)	no
	Motorboating	all events	no	(6a)	no
	Shooting	French army champions's	yes	(3b)	no
	Shooting	National Trap cham'ps	no*	(2c)	no
	904	Archery	five events	no	(1a)
Archery		Flight shooting	yes	(3c)	no
Athletics		several national champ's	some*	(2d)	no
Basketball		Olympic Championship	no	(6b)	no
Basketball		3 other championships	yes	(3d)	no
Boxing		all events	no	(1b)	YES
Cycling		all events	no	(1c)	YES
Fencing		Junior Foil	yes	(3e)	no
Football		American Football college	yes	(3f)	no
Football		Gaelic Football	yes	(7a)	no
Golf		Men's teams	no	(1e)	YES
Golf		3 other events	yes	(3g)	no
Gymnastics		team event	no	(1f)	YES
Gymnastics		YMCA championships	yes	(3h)	no
Hurling			yes	(7b)	no
Roque			no	(5b)	no
Rowing		singles, doubles, fours	no	(1g)	YES
Rowing		intermediate events	yes	(3i)	no
Swimming		4 x 50 yds	yes	(8a)	no
Tennis		2 other meets	yes	(3j)	no
Water Polo		yes	(8b)	no	
Weightlifting	all-around dumbbell	no	(1h)	YES	
Wrestling		no	(1d)	YES	

held in Paris and Saint-Louis. These should pose no problems in non-accepting, as long as the correct status of the championship is determined. It should be noted that Mallon also classifies these events as non-open, although he does not give a good reason for this.

The national championships in Gymnastics are only mentioned in the total list, not in the rest of Mallon's book.

Some events in (3a) Cycling and (3b) Shooting in 1900, and (3c) Archery, (3d) Basketball, (3e) American Football, (3f) Fencing, (3g) Golf, (3h) Gymnastics and (3i) Rowing in 1904 are listed by Mallon as being non-international. They are also faulty in some other criterion and I would rather consider them on that count, as they still might be national purely by chance. In (3j) Tennis in 1904, there is simply a second tournament during the year in Saint-Louis, with no claim to Olympic status.

Mallon's list has the Junior Foil event excluded only for internationalism, but I presume this is incorrect, since it is clearly to be excluded only as a "junior", i.e. non-open event.

In some sports and events, the absence of foreign competitors is not so easy to explain.

For instance, there were no foreign entrants for the (4a) Arbalète (crossbow) and the (4b) Longue-Paume, a precursor of tennis. These are international sports of long standing (Paume was included in the 1908 Olympics) and nothing suggests that there were restrictions on foreign entrants. I feel these may be open to reconsideration.

This is not true for the (5a) Boules, which is a sport of purely French origin. It is not entirely clear that there were, in 1900, any other nations where these events were practiced. Drevon adds that there were money prizes as well.

Mallon excludes (5b) Roque because of the lack of foreign competitors, and because the sport is a purely US form of Croquet. I prefer the second reason to the first. I don't know why Mallon also lists the sport as "non-open".

The (6a) Motorboating presents a different problem, since this was in 1900 a very new sport. According to Drevon, the first club

practicing this sport was only founded in 1899. There are only French competitors, which Drevon attributes to the short delay (3 months) between the announcing of the sport and the holding of the event. The jury was international however. The same problem arises for the (6b) Basketball, a sport completely unknown outside the US in 1904. Both these sports would later become fully Olympic (Motorboating just once in 1908). Both sports were certainly open to all comers, but there just weren't any.

I don't really know what to think of this reason for exclusion. De Coubertin certainly intended the Olympic Games to be for sports that were practiced in many countries, but in the early years many sports were included that were only popular in the organizing country, and foreign entrants had hardly any effect on the final outcome (such as the Archery in 1920, still the main source of Belgian Olympic medals). To exclude a sport simply because it is practiced in just one country, while accepting sports that are practiced in just two seems a little arbitrary.

Then we come to two Irish sports, (7a) Gaelic Football and (7b) Hurling. In the Gaelic, the Chicago Fenians beat the St. Louis Innisfalls, while only one team entered the Hurling, the Innisfall of St. Louis. It is not said if teams from Ireland could or could not take part. They are described as the "Olympic Irish Sports Gaelic Football / Hurling Championship", and both were scheduled on the 20th of July. In Sullivan's book of 1905, mention is made of "Irish sports" to be held on 20-23 July. These also include an Athletics meet (excluded by Mallon on grounds of non-openness). I feel these two should also open for discussion.

Finally we come to the (8a) Swimming relay and (8b) Waterpolo. Both events were held together with the normal swimming contest of undoubtably Olympic status, with international competition from a successful German delegation. This delegation also wanted to enter the relay and the waterpolo, but they were refused this entry. Mallon uses this argument to exclude both these events from Olympic status, and I felt he was wrong in that. Both entries were not refused because of the nationality of the competitors, but rather because they were not members of one club,

but rather an all-star team. The competitions did take place, and both were won by the New York Athletic Club ahead of the Chicago Athletic Association. From all accounts it is clear that the regulations for all team sports held at St. Louis included a rule that the players should represent clubs, not countries. Two Canadian teams entered the Lacrosse. Entries in the Tug-of-War came from the "Boer Team" and the "Pan-Hellenic Athletic Club", not South Africa and Greece. A similar situation must have existed for the Gymnastics, were apart from an individual contest, with German participation, there was a team contest, in which the competitors were clubs. The Germans, if considered a team, would have won that competition, but they are not so recognized. Mallon accepts that competition as Olympic (with reservations), probably because there is no mention of a German willingness to enter it. The same is true of the Canadian participants in the Golf. I felt the exclusion of the swimming relay and the waterpolo merited reconsideration and wrote this to Bill Mallon. He has graciously accepted this point of view and has since changed his opinion. This can be seen on the IOC website, which Bill Mallon helped put up and where one can find the results of 1904 Waterpolo with full Olympic status.

3. Handicapped

In 1900 and 1904, many sports manifestations were being held under a handicap system. This made for interesting competition, of course, but not for fair one. There is no doubt that handicapped events should not be considered Olympic. The following sports had events that were handicapped:

year	Sport	Event	excluded for other reasons	com	Mal
1900	Athletics	handicapped events	no		no
	Cycling	3000m	yes		no
	Golf	handicapped events	no		no
1904	Athletics	handicapped events	no		no
	Athletics	several meets	yes		no
	Cycling	handicapped events	some		no
	Swimming	handicapped events	no		no

4. Openness

During both Olympic Games in question, there were a number of events that were restricted to small categories of participants. These were contrary to the spirit of the Olympic Games, and should not be included among the official events. The following events were marked by Mallon as non-open: Some of these exclusions are completely correct.

year	Sport	Event	excluded for other reasons	com	Mal
1900	Archery	2 championships	yes	3a	no
	Archery	Arbalète	yes	3a	no
	Cycling	2me series	some	1a	no
	Gymnastics	3 National meets	yes	3b	no
	Longue-Paume		yes	3c	no
	Rowing	juniors & novices	no	1b	no
	Shooting	several events	yes	1c	no
1904	Archery	Flight Shooting	yes	2a	no
	Athletics	several meets	some	2b	no
	Basketball	several meets	yes	2c	no
	Football	American College	yes	4	no
	Football	Gaelic	yes	5a	no
	Golf	President's match	no	6	no
	Gymnastics	YMCA meet	yes	2d	no
	Hurling		yes	5b	no
	Rowing	Intermediate	yes	1d	no
	Tennis	Interscholastic	yes	1e	no
	Tug-of-War		no	7	YES

There is no reason to award Olympic status to events for "second series" in (1a) Cycling, Army Personnel in (1c) Shooting, Juniors, Novices and Intermediates in (1b and 1d) Rowing, or Scholastics in (1e) Tennis.

Also tournaments restricted to the members of a particular Sports association should not be included. That seems to be the main reason for the exclusion of some events in (2a) Archery, (2b) Athletics, (2c) Basketball and (2d) Gymnastics. No problems there either, except perhaps in the correct determination of the entry criteria.

In (3a) Archery, (3b) Gymnastics, (3c) Longue-Paume of 1900, Mallon seems to double the criteria of nationalism and openness. I feel these should be treated under the international criterion, as there is no indication that these competitions were not open to all, except of course non-nationals.

The case of (4) American college Football is a difficult one, but there are so many reasons not to include this sport that there is no need to go deeper into this here.

The cases of (5a) Gaelic Football and (5b) Hurling are also treated in the international section. It is not clear whether the invitations for these sports were sent out world-wide or just to a selection of Irish clubs in the US. These sports should certainly not be excluded on the international criterion, but they might be considered non-open. In one sentence (p13) Mallon mentions "Irish athletes". It is of course useless to limit competitions in Gaelic and Hurling to athletes of Irish descent, since there are bound to be very few others. I would like to investigate whether or not invitations to these tournaments were sent to Ireland. If there were, I see no reason to exclude these two sports.

The president's match of (6) Golf is clearly not open.

Mallon has made a typing error in saying that the (7) Tug-of-War is not open.

The (8) Waterpolo, and the Swimming relay are excluded by Mallon because only Club teams could enter. The same is true for each and every team sport in Saint Louis and no other sport is excluded for that reason. See the treatment above.

5. Motorized sports

There is one criterion that certainly exists today, and that should at least be considered in 1900: motorization. Bill Mallon is absolutely right in saying that this criterion should not be used to eliminate sports in 1900. The criterion was not mentioned in 1894, there were no negative sounds in 1900, and in 1908, Motorboating was put on the official program. The elimination of motorized sports came later than that and there is no need to exclude motorized sports in 1900.

However, Mallon does not include these sports either. This is what he writes:

In automobile racing, it would also appear that the racers were professional, which would certainly eliminate it. Balloon racing and Motorboating are not so easily eliminated but we cannot in good faith call them Olympic

sports either. I am omitting them as Olympic sports but would welcome any criticism while continuing to defend the decision.

Let us therefore discuss these three sports.

Automobile racing was certainly international (4 German entries), and not handicapped, while there is no reason to consider them non-open. That leaves the allegation of Professionalism. There were money prizes for the Paris-Toulouse-Paris race (which might be excluded for that reason), but not for the other events held in Paris. It seems strange to call riders professionals simply because they might be connected to the constructors (one of the gold medal winners was Fernand Renault). The example of Shooting tells us that rules on Professionalism were not as strict in those days, and acceptance of money prizes did not make one a professional. I would urge further investigation and the inclusion of automobile racing among Olympic sports.

Motorboating is also discussed under the International criterion. This sport was very new, and no foreign entries were received. There is no reason to disqualify the sport for openness or handicapping, and there are no traces of professionalism. I would urge a similar handling to the 1904 Basketball.

Ballooning presents a first different problem: is it a sport or a manifestation connected to the World's Fair? Well, in a manner of speaking, all events held in 1900 are connected to the World's Fair. So it would seem that if competitions are held and prizes are awarded, the thing is a sport.

Then, there is a problem about internationalism. There are no other competitors than French, and this is certainly due to technical advantage in France, than to any wish of the organizers to keep the event national. The juries were international, as they were in the Motorboating. Here too, I think the final decision on the 1904 Basketball should be followed.

There does not seem to be a problem with openness or Professionalism (winners received the same type of plaques also given in many other sports), but there is mention of handicapping. André Devon speaks about

this: apparently it consisted in weighing down the balloons to correct for volume of the balloon. It seems to me as if this is not handicapping, but rather the creation of specific regulations that are destined to make the competition more honest. After the start, all results were correctly measured and no correction for handicap was made. But even if these competitions are excluded, there were a few competitions that were not handicapped. In my opinion, 1904 Ballooning merits inclusion into the official Olympic results.

6. No reason

In 1904 there were two tennis tournaments in St. Louis. One was called the Olympic tournament, another one the World's Fair tournament. Although this second tournament was open, international, and for Amateurs only, there is no reason to call it an Olympic event.

The same reasoning can be used for any of the different meets that were held during the year 1904, especially in Athletics. Even if some of them are considered international, non-handicapped, open and reserved for amateurs, there is no reason to call them Olympic.

7. Forgotten Sports

The book by Andre Drevon on the 1900 Olympics mentions a sport that Bill Mallon completely ignores : Line Fishing. Apparently, at a series of competitions in August, some 600 fishermen, of whom 40 are from 5 other

countries than France, participate, and final prizes are awarded.

Mallon also fails to mention the competition in Cannon shooting, but this was in any case a purely national event.

Lifesaving is not forgotten in Mallon's book, but he calls it an exhibition rather than a competition.

8. Conclusion

As a final word, I would like to see that the following events would be further investigated and perhaps included into the list of official Olympic events:

- The Tir à l'arbalète (Crossbow) of 1900, excluded for having no foreign entrants
- The Longue-paume of 1900, idem
- The Motorboating of 1900, basically excluded because the sport was not practiced outside France in 1900
- The Basketball of 1904, excluded because the sport was unknown outside the US in 1904
- The Roque of 1904, excluded because it is a purely US form of Croquet
- The Gaelic Football of 1904, for which it should be investigated if foreign teams were invited, and the Hurling, this being complicated by the fact that only one team entered that one.
- Automobile Racing in 1900, excluded for Professionalism.
- Ballooning in 1900, excluded for no clear reason.