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ABSTRACT

Modern Olympic Games are unquestionably the biggest sporting event of the entire sports community. Their ecumenical nature and philosophical connections to the ancient institution of the Truce, made them a global benchmark of friendship and peace. A *sui generis* international sporting association such as the International Military Sports Council (or CISM) had the objective of promoting friendship between world armies by means of sport. It has tried to make its presence felt in the Olympic Games, through the establishment of special accommodations for military personnel modeled on the «Olympic Villages».

Recently declassified documents from the CISM Headquarters revealed that those initiatives took place more than once during Olympic Games. The purpose of this article is to identify the intentions and the efforts of the CISM to mark actively its presence in the Olympic Games, in the so-called “CISM Villages”. The conclusions of the research are as follows: a) CISM tried to approach all the armies of the world, despite political or other kinds of allegiances, using the «CISM Villages», b) the “CISM Villages” were aimed at hosting both military athletes and officials, although they appeared hosting only officials, c) the idea of establishing «CISM Villages» was receded throughout the years, due to a possible lack of interest, and d) the «CISM Villages» managed sporadically to attract countries, regardless their political allegiances.
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1. Historical Review

The Olympic Village is an entity with its own particularity, and is termed as “a miniature city” or a “city within cities”\(^1\), reserved to the participants of the Olympic Games. The Olympic Village is defined in Article 38 of Chapter 5 of the Olympic Charter: “With the objective of bringing together all competitors, team officials and other team personnel in one place, the Organising Committee for the Olympic Games shall provide an Olympic Village for a period determined by the IOC Executive Board”\(^2\). A new residence relationship model is intended to develop in Olympic Villages to enable athletes from different nations to benefit from interaction amongst themselves\(^3\). So far, the Olympic Village has already been the fundamental facility for the quadrennial Olympic Games and has been

---


written into the Olympic Charter, which defined it in an institutional form. The modern Olympic Village neither appeared by coincidence nor was changeless, and its development depends on particular historical and social background.

It is widely known that in ancient Greece, athletes lived together in Elis for training, beginning one month prior to the Olympic Games. There, athletes coming from all over the Hellenic territories were brought together, in order to be evaluated and learn the rules of the Games.

Centuries later, Pierre de Coubertin, the founder of the Modern Olympic Games, was also the instigator of the specific accommodation compound, which is widely known as Olympic Village. In his description of the “Olympic city”, in addition to his descriptions of competition sites, Coubertin made a special reference to the need for a hotel for the group of people connected with the organisation of the sporting events requiring temporary accommodation. He also envisaged, in a pamphlet published in the Olympic Revue addressing the people taking part in the International Architecture Competition (Paris, 1910), a space “nearby for a camp and a form of barracks to house the athletes during the Games” (Pierre de Coubertin, 1910).

This need for special accommodation was a result of the resonance of the newly founded institution had that time. The Panathenaic Stadium in Athens in 1896 hosted the first Olympic Games held under the auspices of the IOC. The Games brought together 14 nations and 245 athletes who competed in 43 events. In 1900 in Paris, 997 competitors took part, and in London 1908 2,008 athletes. So, it is more than obvious that every host city would face the problem of accommodation of an increasingly number of athletes and their entourage.

The Olympic Games just before and after the Great War (London, 1908; Stockholm, 1912; Antwerp, 1920; Paris, 1924; and Amsterdam, 1928) tried to address the accommodation problem with an “emergency residential menu”, comprising all manner of temporary dwellings – even the ships that had transported the athletes – in order to satisfy the accommodation needs that the Games involved. At the Olympic Games of London (1908), the majority of the participating teams couldn’t and didn’t stay for the whole duration of the Games. The British Army set up camps to accommodate athletes during the Antwerp Olympic Games (1920), while the Red Cross provided bedding and cooking utilities. Nevertheless, all the emergency solutions weren’t enough neither to give a proper response to the problem of accommodation, nor fulfilled the vision of Baron Pierre de Coubertin for establishing a “modern Olympia”.

---

7 Norbert Muller (ed.), “Pierre de Coubertin, Olympism, Selected Writings”, Lausanne, IOC, 2000, p. 258.
In the conferences that preceded the 1924 Olympic Games in Paris, the idea of an Olympic Village appeared\(^{14}\). The first attempt was barracks near the Colombes Stadium with the addition of some services, like post and telegraphs. According to Munoz (1997), those barracks “[were] the one envisaged by Coubertin in his explanation of the «Olympic city»”\(^{15}\).

The first official appearance of the Olympic Village took place at the 10\(^{th}\) Olympic Games, in Los Angeles, in 1932. Almost 250 acres on the Baldwin Hills, over Los Angeles, with 550 “Olympic Cottages” and 30,000 blooming plants not only were the ideal place for the athletes to rest, but also a social centre of friendship and communication\(^{16}\). After the 10\(^{th}\) Olympic Games, the Olympic Village was formally written into the Olympic Charter and was confirmed and guaranteed in an institutional form\(^{17}\).

2. The organized military sports

Having in mind the Inter-allied Games, which took place in France in 1919, another American General Joseph T. McNarney, the Military Governor of the American occupied zone of Germany, wanted to repeat General Pershing’s project soon after the end of the Second World War\(^{18}\). After the conflict, the idea of an international military sports council was revived. In 7 February 1946, the Allied Forces Sports Council (Afsc) set up in Frankfurt, Germany. Among the members of the first board were Major of the French Armed Forces Henri Debrus and Lieutenant Raul Mollet of Belgian Armed Forces, who would be the founders of the Conseil International du Sport Militaire (CISM) two years later\(^{19}\).

The first participating countries were Belgium, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, France, Great Britain, Holland, Norway, Poland, and the USA. Among the purposes of the Afsc, “cement further inter-allied relations and to concave, formulate, and to put into efficient operation plans and rules which will encourage, regulate and control contests or any large tournaments between the Allied Forces” was one of the most prominent\(^{20}\).

The research revealed the only copy of the first official proposal of establishing an inter-allied athletic council, conducted by the American Forces Headquarter of the European Theatre (Frankfurt)\(^{21}\). This proposal was also an invitation to the Allied Countries, such as the United Kingdom, the USSR, the Netherlands, Luxemburg, Denmark, Norway, Czechoslovakia, and Poland, to send a delegate to the upcoming meeting of the representatives of the Allied Forces\(^{22}\). So, on 6 February 1946\(^{23}\), the decision to organize an inter allied sporting events have been taken.


\(^{15}\) Ibidem.


\(^{20}\) Allied Forces Sports Council (here in after AFSC), Minutes of Meeting 6-7 February 1946, JFD/cdf/2-1774, 7 Feb 1946, p.1, in C.I.S.M., Général Secrétariat.


\(^{23}\) AFSC, Minutes of Meeting 6-7 February 1946, p.1, Source: C.I.S.M., Général Secrétariat.
From 1946 to 1948, 11 competitions were organized by this inter allied sports council. Two competitions of track & field (1946, 1947), two competitions of swimming (1946, 1947), two fencing tournaments (1947, 1948), two tournaments of football (1946, 1947), one cross country championship (1947) and one military pentathlon event (1947). 

3. The International Military Sports Council

Despite the coordinating efforts of the members of the Council, in June of 1947, the USA and the UK withdrew from membership, due to national and financial restrictions. More specific, the Usfet (United States Forces European Theatre) received a direct order that it was not allowed for the US troops to compete in sporting events outside the American occupied zone of Germany. In August 1947, the USSR, Poland and Czechoslovakia also withdrew from the Afsc, following their Cold War policies of their respective governments.

All those unfortunate events, which threatened the very existence of the Afsc, preceded the 2nd Afsc Fencing Tournament, which took place in February 1948 in Nice, France. At the same time, the 6th session of the Afsc Assembly was about to be held, which had on its agenda some issues relating to the Council. The only Member-Countries that took part were Belgium, Denmark, Holland, Luxemburg, Norway and France. The then President of the Afsc, Major Henri Debrus of France, proposed the establishment of a new institution for military sports to deal with the problems of Afsc.

That led to the establishment of the Conseil International du Sport Militaire (CISM) or International Council of Military Sports on February 1948. The 1st September 1948, the 1st CISM General Assembly took place in Vichy, France, and CISM took its way. It is worth mentioning that the founding countries were Belgium, Denmark, France, Holland and Luxemburg.

According to Major Debrus’s opening speech at the 1st General Assembly, the main target of the Council was to “advance”. That “advance” of the Council would come about by increasing the number of the member-nations, and ensuring the success of the international military sport events by reducing the number of the events and by limiting the number of the participants. Also, there was a need to face the current financial difficulties by organizing profitable athletic competitions and by promoting them through the press.

At this point, it is extremely significant to mention the main ideal of the existence of the CISM. During the previous years, it is quite clear that every attempt to foster military sports events took place among allied armies. Those initial efforts didn’t have universal perspective, and that was the reason they failed over time or didn’t become widely known. On the other hand, the CISM was created in order to operate as a medium, a gathering area for the Armies of the World, regardless political or...
other allegiances, to establish friendly contacts among soldiers in the sporting fields\textsuperscript{33}. That’s how the “Friendship through Sport” doctrine came up.

4. The expansion of CISM

Over the following years, the Council was dedicated to attract more and more Member Countries, organizing sporting events on an international scale and promoting physical education among its members, as it was its initial goal. By 1960, the CISM had 24 member-countries from Europe, Asia, Africa and the Americas\textsuperscript{34}. At 1948, seven championships were been organized by the CISM. At the end of 1960, 14 championships were been organized annually by member countries of CISM\textsuperscript{35}. At the time, the press was showing a lot of interest in those championships, as newspaper and magazine clippings in CISM archival collections demonstrate\textsuperscript{36}.

Also, aiming at the promotion of physical education in the Armed Forces, Raoul Mollet of Belgium and Edmond Petit of France proposed a series of motions through the 5\textsuperscript{th} General Assembly in Cairo, at 1951\textsuperscript{37}. The General Assembly approved their ideas in the following years they developed the program “Physical Training for Aircrews”. They presented their training program in several airbases in Europe. The results were outstanding, according to their official reports. Both Mollet and Petit motivated more and more officers to take action and proposed new training programs for all branches\textsuperscript{38}.

Another critical step was the foundation of the “CISM Academy”, during the 11\textsuperscript{th} General Assembly, in 1957. The CISM Academy was meant to be a scientific committee, which had its research fields: Combat Physical Training (1\textsuperscript{st} section), Sports Medicine (2\textsuperscript{nd} Sector) and Sports Training & Techniques (3\textsuperscript{rd} Section). The head of each sector was a distinguished scientist with a lot of experience in the respective field of research\textsuperscript{39}.

During the same General Assembly, the delegates from member-countries approved the first periodical edition, the CISM Magazine. Its contents were articles concerning the three directions of the CISM Program (doctrines, techniques and training, medicine), news information and photos regarding athletic events, and, finally, sports related bibliography\textsuperscript{40}.

It could easily be suggested that the Council was on its way to deliver its purposes, as it was declared by its founding members. Moreover, CISM proved that it could support actions for promoting combat fitness through its scientific personnel (CISM Academy), including both individual and collective military development, but also, using international military sporting events, it could promote, encourage and nurture the friendly relations among military athletes coming from different countries.

\textsuperscript{33} C.I.S.M., Actes de la 1\textsuperscript{ère}, p. 3, in C.I.S.M., Général Secrétariat
\textsuperscript{34} C.I.S.M., Actes de la 14\textsuperscript{ème} Assemblée Générale du 1960 à Teheran. p. 4, in C.I.S.M./ Général Secrétariat.
\textsuperscript{40} C.I.S.M.: Actes de la 11\textsuperscript{ère} Assemblée Générale du 6 au 8 Mars 1951, p. 59, in C.I.S.M., Général Secrétariat.
5. **CISM during the Cold War Era**

The Cold War era was the period of geopolitical tension between the Soviet Union with its satellite states (the Eastern Bloc), and the United States with its allies (the Western Bloc) after World War II. Most historians have adopted the view that the Cold War began in 1947 with the signing of the Truman Doctrine (implementing the U.S. foreign policy to support countries that were threatened by Soviet expansionism) and ended in 1991, with the collapse of the USSR. Milestones of this period were the Berlin blockade (1948), the building of the Berlin wall (1961), the Cuban missile crisis (1962), the boycott of the Olympic Games in Moscow and Los Angeles (1980 and 1984, respectively). In the course of the years, the two Coalitions created military alliances (Nato and the Warsaw Pact), economic alliances (the Marshall plan and the Comecon), but also military sports alliances. Furthermore, at this point the great misunderstanding on the role of CISM arose. While the nations of the Warsaw Pact founded the Sports Committee of the Friendly Armies (Scfa) to promote sports activities among the armed forces of the Eastern bloc, CISM never became an instrument of the Western Alliance or NATO. The organizational institution of the Western countries for military sport was a sports section of Shape (Supreme Headquarters of the Allied Powers Europe).

6. **The Sports Committee of the Friendly Armies (Спортивный комитет дружественных армий)**

The Sports Committee of the Friendly Armies (С.к.д.а., Scfa) was founded in Moscow in 1958, “for the strengthening of friendship between armies, improve the quality of fitness and sport among soldiers and the dissemination of the achievements of military sport”[^41], with a emphasis, in particular, in its members-countries of “Socialist and developing countries”[^42]. Its main member States were also the Warsaw Pact countries, as well as other socialist countries from all continents.[^43] The Scfa was dissolved in 1991, with the dissolution of the Warsaw Pact. What is important is the fact that in April 1991, the Central Committee of Scfa signed a memorandum of understanding with the CISM, according to which, the countries-members of the Scfa joined CISM, recognizing it as the only international military athletic corps[^44].

In parallel, CISM aimed at the adhesion of armed forces from all the countries of the world regardless of their political or other alliances and, since 1948, began sending invitations for participation to the Governments of both blocs. An important clue that emerged from the research in the archives is that the United States of America and the United Kingdom, which were not among the founding members of the institution, initially faced the Council with skepticism[^45]. Countries such as Yugoslavia (1948-1989), Romania (1948-1953, 1956-1971, 1975-1990), the USSR (1948-1951, 1955-1989), Poland (1948, 1952-1975, 1981-1989), Hungary (1948, 1952-1978, 1981-1989) and Czechoslovakia (1948-1978, 1981-1989) were often voted as proposed members of the Council by the other member-countries[^46].

The findings coming from the original archives of the constitutional actions of the Council is solid proof that CISM didn’t choose sides in a world divided by politics.

**7. The first “CISM Village (Villaggio CISM)”**

After 12 years of ambitious work, CISM wanted an extra opportunity to communicate its ideals in a global scale. This opportunity came in the year 1960. In that specific year, it was Rome’s turn to host the 17th Olympic Games. Scoping the success of the Games, the Italian government engaged among others its respective Armed Forces by establishing a special unit under the name Rom (Raggruppamento Olimpico Militare, Olympic Military Group). That military unit consisted of 4,500 Officers, Ncos (Non Commissioned Officers) and soldiers of the Italian Armed Forces and their mission was to support the Italian Olympic Committee providing general and sporting services. This special military unit contributed in many ways to the organisation of the Olympic Games by supporting ceremonies and installations, performing field works (bridges, roads, obstacles, tribunes, etc), providing telecommunications for the Games (wireless radios, telephones, pigeon-couriers), transportation (cars, drivers), and health services for all the Olympic installations and events. Moreover, in the clearly athletic program, Italian Armed Forces had the responsibility of administrating the Olympic Village in Rome, organised and conducted the Modern Pentathlon, Equestrian, Shooting, Track and Field, Rowing and Cycling events. The multi-level involvement of Italian Armed Forces generated a good opportunity for the Italian military sports to highlight their presence in the CISM.

As a result, during the CISM General Assembly of 1959 that took place in Lahore, Pakistan, the Italian Delegation proposed the construction of a CISM Village (Villaggio CISM) at the Castel Fusano, Ostia, 30 km from Rome, which hosted the Olympic Village, in order to host CISM Delegates who would like to attend the 17th Olympic Games. The CISM embraced this idea with enthusiasm. As the President of the CISM remarked, the upcoming CISM Village would be an exceptional opportunity for CISM to approach a wider athletic audience, to promote its activities and ideals and to perform scientific activities by the scientific personnel of the CISM Academy.

Commenting on this initiative on behalf of both the Italian Armed Forces and the CISM, it is very significant to mention that, according to the data collected by the delegations of the Council that year, the percentage of military athletes coming from a CISM member-country, which participated in the 17th Olympic Games, reached 20%. For, a total of 2,414 male athletes coming from CISM member-countries, 467 were active duty personnel of their respective Armed Forces. Despite the fact that there is no data from the countries outside the CISM regarding their athletes (military or not), we can easily understand that the military presence among Olympian athletes was quite considerable. Taking in account the intense presence of the Italian military throughout the Olympic Games, the idea of establishing a village dedicated exclusively to the military sports and the ideals of the CISM came up as a logical consequence. Nevertheless, it was a perfect opportunity for the Council to make a stand and present to the wider audience its work and its vision.

The Villaggio CISM in general was a success. On September 24, 1960, the Villaggio CISM started its operation and hosted 291 people, both officials and military athletes, for 25 days (circa 150...
people per day\(^5\). For the first time in its history, the Council had been formally invited by the Italian Government to such an international major event and the Villaggio CISM was not just a resort for CISM representatives, military athletes which didn’t qualify for participation in the Games and the scientific personnel of the Academy, but also a communication zone for the purposes of the CISM. The CISM exhibition that has been formed inside the Villaggio attracted many dignitaries from around the world, promoting the activities of the Council to a wider audience\(^52\).

8. The CISM Dorf

The research of the unpublished CISM Archives revealed that, despite the intention of the Council to be present in every Olympiad as an entity, only on a few occasions did this come about. Since 1960, another CISM Village became a reality in 1972, during the 20\(^{th}\) Olympic Games that took place in Munich, West Germany. After the proposal of the German Delegation to CISM in 1970, German Armed Forces provided a designated place inside the Bundeswehr Communications School, in Feldafing, 35 km south-west from Munich. The Olympic Village, in which the tragic events of the terrorist attack took place, was inside the city of Munich, nearby the Olympiapark\(^53\). According to the official project reports submitted to the CISM, the CISM Dorf could accommodate 438 persons, providing shelter, food, sporting and scientific activities, transportation to all the Olympic events and information regarding the Games\(^54\). The very existence of the CISM Dorf would be based on the principles of friendship and military comradeship. Also, the Dorf could be an exceptional medium for CISM to promote its activities and to integrate the whole CISM personnel to the spirit of the Olympic Games\(^55\). Additionally, according to the statement of Raul Mollet, the then General Secretary of CISM, the Dorf was supposed to be a “living exposition of what CISM really is”\(^56\).

A very important fact about the CISM Dorf is that CISM President, after the approval of the German government, invited the non member-countries of the Eastern bloc to attend the facilities. Those countries were the USSR, Poland, Hungary, Romania, Yugoslavia, and Czechoslovakia\(^57\). Despite the fact that those countries, eventually, didn’t attend the CISM Dorf, it was a significant outreach effort on behalf of the Council to approach the countries of the Eastern bloc. Nevertheless, there were 186 military athletes from 29 countries, which didn’t qualify for the Olympic Games that stayed at the Dorf\(^58\). Among them there were Rwanda and Zaire (Congo), which joined CISM one month later that year, and, also, India, a country that became a CISM member not before 1999\(^59\).

Another incident that also took place during the operation of the Dorf was the impact of the terrorist attack of the Munich Massacre, on 6 September 1972\(^60\). According to Mr. Gerd Dieter-Schramm, who was a professor of physical education for the German Armed Forces and was present during the operation of the Dorf, when the news of the attack came to the residents’ knowled-
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\(^{54}\) C.I.S.M., Minutes of the 25\(^{th}\) General Assembly at The Hague, p. 82-83, in C.I.S.M., Général Secrétariat.


\(^{56}\) C.I.S.M., Minutes of the 25\(^{th}\) General Assembly at The Hague, p. 83, in C.I.S.M., Général Secrétariat.

\(^{57}\) C.I.S.M., Minutes of the 25\(^{th}\) General Assembly at The Hague, p. 80-81 in C.I.S.M., Général Secrétariat.


the German Officer in charge of the Dorf, Colonel Wilhelm Rieke, expressed his condolences to the families of the dead Israeli athletes and organized a memorial for the victims. According to Mr. Wilhelm Bruns, who was then a young soldier and stationed in Feldafing, the authorities of the delegations coming from Arabic countries considered this action as an insult and left the Dorf. On the other hand, according to Mr. Gerd Dieter-Schramm’s narration of the event, the day of the incident, after an intensive discussion with Colonel Rieke, the delegations of the Arabic countries decided to stay in the Dorf. Anyhow, in the official report submitted by the German delegation to the CISM after the Games, there is no evidence that the delegations from Arabic countries ever left the Dorf.

Finally, the CISM exposition and the academic research conducted by the CISM Academy were a success. Many distinguished guests visited the Dorf, among them the German Chancellor Willy Brandt and the Grand Duke of Luxemburg, Jean de Luxemburg, Ministers of Defence from various countries and sportsmen. The overall achievement of this initiative was to successfully promote the activities of the Council and the friendly relations between military athletes, both from the member-countries and non member-countries, demonstrating the worldwide orientation of the Council.

9. The latter efforts

Another CISM Village, which emerged between the two Olympic boycotts (Moscow, 1980 and Los Angeles, 1984), was the CISM Olympic Village, in Port Hueneme, California, on the occasion of the 23rd Olympic Games in Los Angeles, 1984. Being the third CISM Village in the history of the Council, it operated from 27th July to 13 August 1984, hosting 230 guests from 21 countries (from a total of 51 member-countries), but no military athletes. Regardless the fact that this Village established in the ‘80s and someone would expect to find many details about its operation or the dignitaries who visited it, there are only a few clues about it. Perhaps, the boycott of the 1984 Olympic Games affected not only the Olympic community but also the CISM, which was constantly approaching Eastern bloc countries and promoting its ideals at the international audience. During the 24th Olympic Games in Seoul, the South Korean Armed Forces established one more CISM Village, but only for the officials of the Council. Unfortunately, regarding this Village, there are no further data in the document of CISM General Secretariat.

Those two aforementioned efforts turned up to be fruitless for the purposes of the Council. For some years, the organizing countries of the Olympic Games didn’t take over the responsibility of organising a CISM Village. The last initiative of setting up a CISM Village brought up by the Chinese delegation, on the occasion of the 29th Olympic Games in Beijing. From August 7 to 25, the CISM village accommodated 61 military officials from 13 (from 131 in total) member-countries and no mi-

---

68 C.I.S.M., Minutes of the 42nd General Assembly at Lisbon, p. 23, in C.I.S.M., Général Secrétariat.
Military athletes\textsuperscript{69}. They attended the opening and closing ceremonies of the Games, watched some events and held a meeting with military athletes who participated in the Games.

It took 20 years for a member-country of the Council to take over the responsibility of a CISM Village. In 2008, the capital city of China, Beijing, was about to host the XXIX Summer Olympic Games. The Chinese delegation in CISM proposed to the General Assembly to make a CISM Village in Beijing. The basic ideas of the CISM Village in Beijing were “to show the CISM Flag during the Games and to offer to the CISM authorities a place to meet and discuss and some accommodation”\textsuperscript{70}. Additionally, a Press Conference coupled with an Opening Ceremony and a decoration awarding ceremony for the military athletes who participated in the Beijing Olympic Games were organised by the CISM high authorities.

At this point, it is quite clear that the sporadic efforts of CISM member-countries in hosting a CISM Village during the Summer Olympic Games show a significant lack of interest. Having in mind the fact that after the end of the Cold War, and the adhesion of the former Eastern bloc countries to the Council in 1991, a significant target-audience was already approached and embraced by CISM.

10. Conclusions

The study of the newly available CISM archives leads to several conclusions on the outreach policy of the Council regarding its presence in the Olympic Games. Firstly, the ideal of the Council to establish a common ground for military athletes couldn’t find a better occasion than the Olympic Games. The initiative of both the Council and the respective delegations of establishing a CISM Village during the Olympic Games assisted in the promotion of the work of the CISM to a larger audience than that of the member-countries. The fact that the Council invited for attendance in its Villages countries from the Eastern bloc in 1972 constitutes a solid proof of its friendly intentions.

On the other hand, the two first Villages could host not only officials, but also military athletes, who weren’t qualified in the respective Olympic Games. The following Villages were dedicated to the accommodation of the officials of CISM, a fact that indicates the different orientation of those Villages, having a more political scope. Likewise, elite athletes who participated in those Olympic Games followed their National Olympic Committees, and there is a strong possibility that the member-countries wouldn’t finance other military athletes –who didn’t qualify for the Olympics– to watch the Games under government budget. The latter can partially explain the lack of archival material regarding the activities that took place in those villages, which were mostly ceremonial rather than athletic.

Additionally, the fact that during the 1990’s no Olympic organising country took over the responsibility of making a CISM Village leads to the conclusion that there might have been a lack of interest regarding military sports as a notion or the work of the Council.

Nevertheless, an international athletic celebration of peace such as the Olympic Games was the perfect chance for the Council to declare its peaceful intentions and vision. The doctrine “Friendship through Sport” couldn’t find a better occasion to be presented, implemented and promoted, especially during the Cold War era. This initiative of the Council, both promising and optimistic, appealed to a few countries, which weren’t members of any allegiance, such as India, and promoted efficiently its work and its goals.

\textsuperscript{69} C.I.S.M., Minutes of the 63\textsuperscript{rd} General Assembly at Montreux, p. 18, in C.I.S.M., Général Secrétariat.

\textsuperscript{70} C.I.S.M., Minutes of the 63\textsuperscript{rd} General Assembly at Montreux, p. 18, in C.I.S.M., Général Secrétariat.