

# Major sporting events versus human rights

## Parliament's position on the 1978 FIFA World Cup in Argentina and the 1980 Moscow Olympics

### SUMMARY

Major sports events and politics are closely intertwined. Well-known historical examples of major sporting events that were used by regimes for political propaganda purposes are the 1978 FIFA World Cup in Argentina and the 1980 Summer Olympic Games in Moscow. The 1978 World Cup took place around two years after the Argentinian military regime's right-wing coup and its violent repression of critics, and was then the most political World Cup in the history of the International Federation of Association Football (*Fédération Internationale de Football Association*: FIFA). The 1980 Summer Olympic Games in Moscow were the first to take place in eastern Europe and the first to be held in a socialist country. In addition, the 1980 Summer Olympic Games unleashed a hitherto, in the history of major sporting events, unprecedented boycott by 60 countries, in protest against the Soviet Union's invasion of Afghanistan in December 1979.

The European Parliament's involvement in the debates on the political reaction to these two major sporting events is a largely unknown aspect of the history of the 1978 World Cup and the 1980 Summer Olympic Games. This Briefing will reconstruct these debates and the policy action that followed, based on new analysis of sources held in the Parliament's Historical Archives, and demonstrates that the EP's leitmotiv was the violation of human rights in both countries. Furthermore, the Briefing shows that these debates set the basis for the EP's current policy action when it comes to major sports events in countries with a poor track record of human rights.



### In this Briefing:

- The EP and political debate on major sporting events
- Parliament and the 1978 World Cup in Argentina
- Parliament and the 1980 Moscow Olympic Games
- A source of EP team spirit: Moral responsibility for human rights

## The EP and political debate on major sporting events

On 14 June 2018, the 21st FIFA World Cup opens with the Russia versus Saudi Arabia match in the Luzhniki Stadium in Moscow – the first time that Russia has hosted the most important tournament for national football teams.

The International Federation of Association Football (*Fédération Internationale de Football Association*, FIFA) announced its decision to accord hosting rights for the 2018 World Cup to Russia in December 2010. Despite some calls for a political boycott due to Russian governmental policy under the leadership of President Vladimir Putin, there was little speculation that the tournament would not go ahead as planned. However, the United Kingdom and Iceland announced that no government officials would travel to the World Cup in the light of the attack on the former Russian spy Sergej Skripal and his daughter in Salisbury, on United Kingdom territory, in early March 2018.<sup>1</sup> Following this development, a group of 60 Members of the European Parliament from five political groups<sup>2</sup> and 16 European Union (EU) Member States signed an open letter to call on EU governments to join the governments of the United Kingdom and Iceland in staying away from the World Cup in Russia. Initiated by Rebecca Harms (Greens/EFA, Germany), the Members wrote:

*The Salisbury attack was just the latest chapter in Vladimir Putin's mockery of our European values: indiscriminate bombings of schools, hospitals and civilian areas in Syria; the violent military invasion in Ukraine; systematic hacking; disinformation campaigns; election meddling; trying to destabilise our societies and to weaken and divide the EU - all this doesn't make for a good World Cup host. While we agree that sport can help build metaphorical bridges, as long as Putin is blowing up real ones in Syria, we cannot pretend this World Cup is just like any other major sporting event.<sup>3</sup>*

The open letter is one of many examples that illustrate that major sporting events and politics are closely intertwined. Sport and politics have long been intertwined, a well-known example from European history is the Summer Olympic Games in Berlin in 1936. The German Nazi regime saw the Olympic Games as an opportunity to present Germany as a sophisticated country and to simultaneously promote ideals of racial supremacy and anti-Semitism. It is largely forgotten, however, that only thanks to international debate and a powerful American movement to boycott the Berlin Olympics, did the Nazi regime allow athletes of other ethnicities from other countries to participate in the Games.<sup>4</sup>

Other contemporary examples of sports events used by governments to achieve political advantage that triggered international debates on how to react are the 1978 World Cup in Argentina and the Summer Olympic Games in Russia in 1980. The Argentinian World Cup, occurring around two years after the Argentinian military right-wing coup and its violent repression of critics, was described then by many sports and political observers as the most political in FIFA's history to date. German journalist Erich Laser, for example, pointed out that such a broad discussion on the political situation of a country organising a major sporting event had never previously taken place.<sup>5</sup> The 1980 Summer Olympic Games in Moscow were the first to take place in eastern Europe, and the first to be held in a socialist country. The 1980 Games unleashed a hitherto unprecedented, in the history of major sporting events, boycott by 60 countries, in protest against the Soviet Union's (officially the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics: USSR) invasion of Afghanistan in December 1979.

A largely unknown aspect of the history of the 1978 World Cup in Argentina and the 1980 Summer Olympic Games in Moscow is the European Parliament's involvement in the debates on the political reaction to these two major sporting events. Conversely, the role of the European Parliament (EP) and its engagement in such historical debates intertwining sports and politics is equally widely unknown. During the 1970s and at the beginning of the 1980s, the EP increased its activities on the international political stage. For example, Parliament already understood its role to be that of an attentive guardian of human rights worldwide. The EP thus no longer limited itself to its rights and duties defined in the European Community Treaties of the period, but began to discuss other important issues, including those of international concern. Original sources from the EP's historical

archives show that this was the case for the 1978 Argentinian World Cup and the 1980 Moscow Summer Olympics.

Against this background, the aim of this briefing is to reconstruct and analyse the EP's debates and policy actions with regard to these two major sporting events. Such historical analysis of the EP's debates on sports and politics reveals the societal changes in Europe over time. For example, during the Cold War and during a period of left-wing extremist group terrorist activities, in what were the European Community Member States at the end of the 1970s, the topic of football (or the Olympics) and human rights was caught up between ideological fronts and therefore debated intensively. Today, by contrast, major sports events taking place in countries with a poor government record on human rights are discussed rather carefully, despite some exceptions, as the recent open letter from a group of Members of the European Parliament from five EP political groups attests.

## Parliament and the 1978 World Cup in Argentina

Soon after the Argentinian military coup in March 1976 and its violent repression of critics, the EP began to debate human rights violations in the South American country. The issue was initially of rather limited priority on the EP's agenda. In view of the upcoming World Cup in Argentina in summer 1978, however, the EP's debate on human rights violations in the country became more intense in the first half of 1978. In that respect, the political scientist and journalist Georg Ismar has rightly argued that European interest in news on political situations in South American countries increases with the multiplying factor of football.<sup>6</sup> In that sense, football contributed to raising the issue of human rights violations in Argentina higher on the EP agenda.

In December 1977, a small group of socialist and communist Members of the EP tabled a motion for a resolution on violations of human rights in Argentina. Referring to 20 000-30 000 political prisoners and 'disappeared' persons, the motion for a resolution stated that the governments of the European Community Member States should 'propose that the World Cup Football Competition should not be held in Argentina next summer unless the government of that country gives the necessary guarantees that the physical integrity of all persons will be respected, in particular that of persons imprisoned because of their opinions and of those whose political beliefs have led to their disappearance'.<sup>7</sup> However, this motion for a resolution failed to obtain majority support in the EP.

A few weeks later, at its March 1978 meeting, the EP's then Political Affairs Committee (today the Committee on Foreign Affairs) agreed unanimously, with three abstentions, to hold a public hearing that should help to investigate human rights violations and the disappearance of around 100 European Community citizens in Argentina. Scheduled for 25 May 1978, and thus only a couple of days before the start of the World Cup, the purpose of the public hearing was to invite international participants to speak on the Argentinean regime's record on human rights while the country was the focus of international attention as the host of this major sporting event.<sup>8</sup> With this idea, the Political Affairs Committee followed the example of several non-governmental organisations (NGOs) that had launched initiatives to inform the western European public of human rights violations in Argentina. Furthermore, these initiatives were aimed at countering the Argentinian political propaganda about the World Cup that aimed at a positive international image and at stabilising the country's domestic political situation. The recommendations underlying the Political Affairs Committee's decision to hold a public hearing, prepared by John Prescott (Socialist Group, UK), later UK Deputy Prime Minister from 1997 to 2007, suggested supporting the announced policy action by the NGO Amnesty International.

Crucially, Amnesty did not call for a boycott of the World Cup, but instead for a hearing to expose the conditions in Argentina, opposing the propaganda produced by the Argentinian hosting authorities.<sup>9</sup> Amnesty's strategy was to request that footballers, officials and supporters take the opportunity of the World Cup to draw attention to the political situation in Argentina. For example, Amnesty demanded the German Football Association (*Deutscher Fußball Bund*: DFB) stand up against Argentinian human rights violations while participating in the World Cup.<sup>10</sup> The Amnesty

campaign slogan was: 'Football Yes, Torture No', and was also adopted as the motto for an EP public hearing, as suggested by the Political Affairs Committee.<sup>11</sup>

The Political Affairs Committee's projected public hearing on human rights violations in Argentina was historically important, as the very first EP public hearing not dealing with an issue of European Community competences. In view of the upcoming 1978 World Cup, the Political Affairs Committee considered the public hearing to be politically necessary for the following reasons: firstly, to uncover the details of human rights violations in Argentina; secondly, to draw European and international public attention to human rights violations in the South American country; thirdly, to react to the Argentinian regime's misuse of its position as host of the World Cup to disguise its human rights violations; and fourthly, to put the Argentinian authorities under pressure to stop the human rights violations.<sup>12</sup>

Nevertheless, the EP Bureau (the body that decides on the implementation of EP rules) and the EP itself were unable to take a decision to allow this public hearing to take place. There was a discussion that such a public hearing would set a precedent for debating human rights violations worldwide, but that this would be technically impossible for the EP from the point of view of debating time.<sup>13</sup> Moreover, the Cold War strongly affected the political fighting for human rights in the 1970s. Those who condemned the right-wing Argentinian regime were criticised for remaining silent on human rights violations in communist eastern Europe and for not demanding a boycott of the Olympic Games to be held in Moscow in summer 1980.<sup>14</sup> The presence of this dispute in western European public discourse was also reflected in the EP.

The public hearing not authorised by the EP Bureau and with EP funding thus not being available, the Socialist Group decided to use its own funds to organise a public hearing on the violations of human rights in Argentina, but following the terms proposed by the Political Affairs Committee.<sup>15</sup> On the day the public hearing took place, 25 May 1978, representatives of all the EP's major political groups of the time were present.<sup>16</sup> The hearing was opened by the Chair of the Socialist Group, Ludwig Fellermaier (Socialist Group, Germany), who emphasised the importance of holding a public hearing on the violations of human rights in Argentina at a time when public opinion was focused on the country as the World Cup host. Fellermaier stated: 'In a country where so many people cannot raise their voices, we feel as European politicians that it is important we should tell the people of Europe what the reverse of the sunny Argentinian coin is: it is very bloody indeed.'<sup>17</sup>

The public hearing concentrated mainly on the following topics: the disappearance of thousands of Argentinian citizens over a period of years; the imprisonment of Argentinian citizens without warrant, trial or sentence; the use of torture; and the disappearance and imprisonment of over a hundred citizens from European Community Member States. Evidence to the public hearing was given, for example, by Dr Solari Yrigoyen, a former Argentinian Senator, and Wilson Ferreira, a former Uruguayan Senator, who both suffered imprisonment and torture in Argentina, and Father Patrick Rice, an Irish citizen, who suffered a similar fate. Lord Avebury, who led the Amnesty delegation to Argentina, and Tricia Feeney, the head of Amnesty's Latin-American Research Department, spoke on their findings and experiences in Argentina. Moreover, Christopher Dodd, a member of the United States Congress, called for several specific actions that parliamentarians of various countries might consider with regard to Argentina. Finally, John Prescott (Socialist Group, UK) made a specific appeal to the Argentinian regime to release the chair of the human rights movement in Argentina, who had been in prison for considerable time.<sup>18</sup> The Argentinian government was not invited to participate in the public hearing because of its refusal to cooperate with Amnesty, or any other body, on the issue of human rights in the country.<sup>19</sup>

On the basis of the declarations made during the public hearing, the EP adopted a resolution on 6 July 1978 on violations of human rights in Argentina, as well as on the procedure to be followed in future in the EP to combat such violations throughout the world.<sup>20</sup> A couple of days after the end of the World Cup the EP's resolution requested 'the Foreign Ministers of the Member States meeting in political cooperation, the Commission and the Council urgently to take all appropriate measures

to bring about an improvement in the situation as regards the respect of human rights and democratic freedom in Argentina'.<sup>21</sup>

In addition, the EP resolution announced Parliament would 'consider the further use of public hearings in order to inform the citizens of the Community and the world about the breaches of fundamental human rights wherever they occur'.<sup>22</sup> This intention consequently provided the grounds for discussions in the EP on a public hearing on human rights violations in the Soviet Union in view of the Olympic Games in Moscow in summer 1980.

## Parliament and the 1980 Moscow Olympic Games

Simultaneous to the preparations for the public hearing on human rights violations in Argentina, in April 1978, Willie Hamilton (Socialist Group, UK) tabled a motion for a resolution on the holding of the 1980 Olympic Games in the Soviet Union. During the early 1970s *détente* between the Soviet Union and the United States, the role of host of the 1980 Olympic Games had been awarded to Moscow in 1974. Parliament's motion for a resolution was addressed directly to the International Olympic Committee (IOC), requesting that the body revoke its decision that the 1980 Olympic Games should be held in the USSR. Furthermore, the motion for a resolution stated that the EP 'invites the IOC to declare that in the future the Games will not be held in any country in which human rights, as defined in the United Nations Universal Declaration on Human Rights of 1948 and in the European Convention on Human Rights, are not adequately respected'.<sup>23</sup>

The Political Affairs Committee held an initial exchange of views on Hamilton's motion for a resolution at its meeting in September 1978. Following an exhaustive discussion, the Committee felt that it needed further information before deciding what policy action should be taken, and unanimously agreed to hold a public hearing on the issue of respect for human rights in the USSR. Moreover, it instructed its rapporteur, Cornelis Berkhouwer (Liberal and Democratic Group, the Netherlands), to submit detailed plans for the organisation of a public hearing at its next meeting.<sup>24</sup>

Berkhouwer's report mirrored the two main positions on the issue within the Political Affairs Committee. Members that endorsed Hamilton's motion for a resolution, believing that the USSR intended to exploit the holding of the Olympic Games in Moscow for propaganda purposes concluded from this argument that the Games should be boycotted or even cancelled. However, a majority of Members felt that the EP should adopt the same attitude towards the USSR as it had previously taken to Argentina's hosting of the World Cup.<sup>25</sup> According to these two positions, Berkhouwer's report considered two different main courses of policy action: First, to act on Hamilton's motion for a resolution, in which case it would be necessary to contact all national and international bodies on which the organisation of the Olympic Games depends, with a view to notifying them of the EP's position and exerting sufficient pressure to ensure that the boycott (or cancellation) of the Olympic Games was respected. The second course of action was to require the Soviet authorities, even before the Games were held, to guarantee the freedom of movement of visitors and journalists and unrestricted freedom for such persons to enter into contact with the Russian people. Another approach, linked to the second possible course of action, envisaged requesting each of the sports organisations travelling to the USSR to take up the cause of various political prisoners, establish contacts with them and give maximum publicity to their plight. This approach was very much in line with policy action suggested by Amnesty International.

Two political developments in particular, however, changed the conditions and perspective for the EP's considerations on the right course of policy action. First, after a period of *détente*, the international situation deteriorated following the Soviet Union's invasion of Afghanistan in December 1979; and second, the USSR began a wave of repression against protagonists of human rights. This included the arrest in January 1980 of the academic Andrei Sakharov, a symbolic figure for the human rights movement and winner of the 1975 Nobel Peace Prize.

At the Political Affairs Committee meeting in January 1980, the Members attending expressed deep concern that Sakharov's arrest and the USSR's invasion of Afghanistan were a threat to international détente and peace.<sup>26</sup> Similar concerns were expressed by Members from all political groups when the EP discussed the Moscow Olympic Games in a plenary debate in mid-February 1980. Carlo Ripa di Meana (Socialist Group, Italy), for example, considered Sakharov's arrest an open violation of the commitments of the Final Act of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe,<sup>27</sup> held in Helsinki in summer 1975 with the aim of improving relations between communist eastern Europe and the West. Similarly, Jean Penders (European People's Party, EPP, the Netherlands) emphasised that the USSR's invasion of Afghanistan was contrary to the spirit of the Helsinki Final Act.<sup>28</sup> Albert Pürsten (EPP, Germany), said the Olympic Games should not take place in a country which violated the fundamental obligations of the Olympic ideal, namely to maintain peace in the world. Only a minority of Members advocated the route of taking part in the Games and subsequently making representations on behalf of dissidents in Moscow. A majority of Members favoured a boycott, underlining the USSR's human rights violations as exemplified by Sakharov's arrest.

In accordance with this majority position, Parliament's motion for a resolution on the Moscow Olympic Games, subject of the debate and calling for a boycott, was tabled by 130 Members, on behalf of almost all the political groups. The motion for a resolution followed United States President Jimmy Carter's ultimatum of mid-January 1980 that the US would boycott the Olympic Games if Soviet troops had not withdrawn from Afghanistan by 12:01 a.m. Eastern Standard Time on 20 February 1980.<sup>29</sup> The Carter administration lobbied the EP to support its boycott campaign, as evidenced in a letter from US Congressman Christopher Dodd to the EP President, Simone Veil (Liberal and Democratic Group, France, 1979-1982).<sup>30</sup> The EP resolution adopted after the debate in mid-January stated: 'The European Parliament calls on the Governments of the Nine [the European Community Member States at that time] to express abhorrence of Soviet oppression and aggression by advising their National Olympic Committees to ask their teams and individual athletes not to take part in the Olympic Games in Moscow'.<sup>31</sup>

## A source of EP team spirit: Moral responsibility for human rights

As analysis of the EP's debates on the 1978 Football World Cup and the 1980 Olympic Games shows, the EP's leitmotiv was violations of human rights in both hosting countries. Then, as now, the protection of human rights was one of the EU's fundamental values.<sup>32</sup> The EP saw raising public awareness of human rights violations in Argentina and the USSR as a moral responsibility at a time when both countries gained high public attention as hosts of these major sports events. Crucially, this moral responsibility for human rights provided the basis for the EP consensus on taking policy action. In addition, the question as to how to react to major sporting events at this time was strongly ideologically charged. Besides Sakharov's arrest, the USSR's invasion of Afghanistan induced the EP to call for a boycott of the 1980 Olympic Games in Moscow, as had the Carter administration in the US. In the case of the 1978 World Cup, there was also consensus on the need to take policy action against human rights violations in the South American country, as exemplified by the Political Affairs Committee's decision to hold a public hearing. However, a public hearing as an instrument to fight human rights violations was a controversial issue in the EP at the time. Neither the boycott of the Moscow Olympic Games nor the public hearing on human rights violations in Argentina, just a couple of days before the start of the World Cup, changed politics in either country. Nevertheless, the debates, especially the public hearing, triggered some effects; including the EP's own policy action towards major sporting events in countries with a poor record on human rights.

The public hearing on human rights violations in Argentina, the very first in the EP not related to a European Community competence, generated great media interest in western Europe. All main daily newspapers in the core Community Member States published reports on the speakers' statements. Moreover, the Argentinian authorities reacted to the public hearing, with the Argentinian military government protesting strongly even before the hearing took place. In the

course of the public hearing, John Prescott (Socialist Group, UK) and others called for the release of the leader of the Argentinian human rights movement; who was freed by the Argentinian authorities just one day after the public hearing.<sup>33</sup> It can therefore be argued that the EP's public hearing successfully contributed to pressuring the Argentinian regime into this release. Finally, the EP's public hearings became a useful and oft-applied instrument for investigating and protesting against human rights violations in countries organising major sports events.

A more recent example is a public hearing in Parliament's Subcommittee on Human Rights of February 2014, which focused on the situation of migrant workers in the construction of football stadiums for the 2022 Qatar World Cup.<sup>34</sup> During the hearing, the French footballer, Zahir Belounis, who was trapped in Qatar for over two years, demanded FIFA representatives present at the hearing make a real effort to end the Qatari *kafala* sponsorship system, which gives Qatari employers control over movement of foreign workers. In that respect, the EP's public hearings help to put pressure on international and national sports associations to put human rights violations on their agendas when countries with poor human right records host major sporting events. This and other EP public hearings, as well as the above-mentioned open letter from a group of 60 Members from five political groups calling on EU governments to stay away from the 2018 World Cup in Russia follow a tradition that originated in EP debates and policy action regarding the 1978 World Cup in Argentina and the 1980 Olympic Games in Moscow.

## ENDNOTES

- <sup>1</sup> For example, Marrow A. and Kelleher M. '[UK ministers and royal family members will boycott the World Cup, Theresa May confirms](#)', Sky Sports, 14 March 2018; O'Connor, P., '[Iceland's leaders to boycott Russia World Cup over Salisbury attack](#)', Reuters, 26 March 2018.
- <sup>2</sup> Greens/European Free Alliance (EFA), European Peoples Party (EPP), Progressive Alliance of Socialists and Democrats (S&D), Alliance of Liberals and Democrats for Europe Group (ALDE), and European Conservatives and Reformists Group (ECR).
- <sup>3</sup> Harms R. et al, [Open letter to all EU governments](#), 'We, Members of the European Parliament, call on you, as representatives of the people in the European Union, to join the governments of Iceland and the UK in not attending the 2018 FIFA World Cup in Russia', 20 April 2018.
- <sup>4</sup> See, for example, 'The Movement to Boycott the Berlin Olympics of 1936', Holocaust Encyclopaedia, United States Holocaust Memorial Museum, <https://www.ushmm.org/wlc/en/article.php?ModuleId=10007087>, date accessed 22 May 2018.
- <sup>5</sup> Laser E., Die Fußballweltmeisterschaft 1978 in der Tagespresse der Bundesrepublik Deutschland, Berlin: Volker Spies, 1980, p. 62.
- <sup>6</sup> Ismar G., Der Ballsport im Dienst der eigenen Sache. Die Politisierung des Fußballs in Südamerika, in Mittag J. and Nieland J-U. (eds.), Das Spiel mit dem Fußball. Interessen, Projektionen und Vereinnahmung, Essen Klartext, 2007, pp. 237-261, here p. 240.
- <sup>7</sup> Motion for a resolution tabled by Bertrand A., Glinne E., Granneli L., Schmidt H. and Zagari M., pursuant to Rule 25 of the Rules of Procedure on certain violations of human rights in Argentina, European Parliament Working Document 1977, Document 456/77, 23 December 1977, Historical Archives of the European Parliament (HAEP).
- <sup>8</sup> Minutes of the Political Affairs Committee meeting of 21 and 22 March 1978, Historical Archives of the European Parliament (HAEP), European Parliament.
- <sup>9</sup> Debates of the European Parliament, No 230, Session Report of Proceedings from 8 to 12 May 1978, Official Journal of the European Communities, p. 172.
- <sup>10</sup> See, for example, Havemann N., *Samstags um halb 4, Die Geschichte der Fußballbundesliga*, Munich: Siedler, 2013, p. 248.
- <sup>11</sup> 'Fußball ja – Folter nein', Menschenrechtsverletzungen in Argentinien, Vorwärts, 1 June 1978.
- <sup>12</sup> Debates of the European Parliament, No 230, Session Report of Proceedings from 8 to 12 May 1978, Official Journal of the European Communities, p. 172ff.
- <sup>13</sup> Ibid., p. 175ff.
- <sup>14</sup> See also Kaleck W., 'Fußball und Menschenrechte, Deutschland und die Fußball-WM 1978 in Argentinien', in Azzellini D. and Thimmel S. (eds), *Futbolista – Fußball und Lateinamerika. Hoffnung, Helden, Politik und Kommerz*, Berlin: Assoziation B, 2006, pp. 166-173, here p. 172.
- <sup>15</sup> Report drawn up on behalf of the Political Affairs Committee on violations of human rights in Argentina (Document 456/77) and on the procedure to be followed in the European Parliament to combat such violations throughout the world, Rapporteur: Prescott J., Working Documents 1978-1979, Document 200/78, 03 July 1978, Historical Archives of the European Parliament (HAEP), European Parliament.

- <sup>16</sup> Debates of the European Parliament, No 232, Session Report of Proceedings from 3 to 7 July 1978, Official Journal of the European Communities, p. 202.
- <sup>17</sup> 'Europe's football hooligans can expect heavy penalties in Argentina, Labour MP advises', *The Times*, 23 May 1978.
- <sup>18</sup> Report drawn up on behalf of the Political Affairs Committee on violations of human rights in Argentina (Document 456/77) and on the procedure to be followed in the European Parliament to combat such violations throughout the world, Rapporteur: Prescott J., Working Documents 1978-1979, Document 200/78, 3 July 1978, Historical Archives of the European Parliament (HAEP), European Parliament.
- <sup>19</sup> See, for example, 'Fußball-WM im Land eines Terror-Regime". Hearing in Brüssel: In Argentinien wird gefoldert – Käsemann beschuldigt deutsche Behörden', *Süddeutsche Zeitung*, 26 May 1978.
- <sup>20</sup> Debates of the European Parliament, No 232, Session Report of Proceedings from 3 to 7 July 1978, Official Journal of the European Communities, p. 223-225.
- <sup>21</sup> Resolution on violations of human rights in Argentina and on the procedure to be followed in the European Parliament to combat such violations throughout the world, Official Journal of the European Communities, No C 182/42, 31 July 1978.
- <sup>22</sup> Ibid.
- <sup>23</sup> Motion for a resolution tabled by Hamilton W. W., pursuant to Rule 25 of the Rules of Procedure on the holdings of the Olympic Games in 1980 in the Union of the Soviet Socialist Republics, Working Documents 1978-1979, Document 30/78, 10 April 1978, Historical Archives of the European Parliament (HAEP), European Parliament.
- <sup>24</sup> Minutes of the Political Affairs Committee meeting of 25 and 26 September 1978, Historical Archives of the European Parliament (HAEP), European Parliament.
- <sup>25</sup> Political Affairs Committee Working Document presented by Berkhouwer C., rapporteur, on the action to be taken on the motion for a resolution by Hamilton W. W., on the holding of the Olympic Games in 1980 in the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (Doc. 30/78), Historical Archives of the European Parliament (HAEP), European Parliament.
- <sup>26</sup> Minutes of the Political Affairs Committee meeting of 22 and 23 January 1980, Historical Archives of the European Parliament (HAEP), European Parliament.
- <sup>27</sup> Debates of the European Parliament, No 251, Session Report of Proceedings from 11 to 15 February 1980, Official Journal of the European Communities, p. 290.
- <sup>28</sup> Ibid., p. 292.
- <sup>29</sup> For an in-depth study of the Olympic Boycott in the light of the Cold War, see Sarantakes N., *Dropping the Torch: Jimmy Carter, The Olympic Boycott and the Cold War*, Cambridge: CUP, 2011.
- <sup>30</sup> Letter from Dodd C. to Veil S., 18 January 1980, Historical Archives of the European Parliament (HAEP), European Parliament.
- <sup>31</sup> Resolution on the Moscow Olympic Games, Official Journal of the European Communities, No C 59/57, 10 March 1980.
- <sup>32</sup> The EP support human rights, inter alia, through its annual Prize for Freedom of Thought, established in 1988 in honour of Andrei Sakharov.
- <sup>33</sup> Debates of the European Parliament, No 232, Session Report of Proceedings from 3 to 7 July 1978, Official Journal of the European Communities, p. 223ff.
- <sup>34</sup> [Hearing on sport and human rights](#) focusing on the situation of migrant workers in Qatar, European Parliament Subcommittee on Human Rights, 13 February 2014.

## DISCLAIMER AND COPYRIGHT

This document is prepared for, and addressed to, the Members and staff of the European Parliament as background material to assist them in their parliamentary work. The content of the document is the sole responsibility of its author(s) and any opinions expressed herein should not be taken to represent an official position of the Parliament.

Reproduction and translation for non-commercial purposes are authorised, provided the source is acknowledged and the European Parliament is given prior notice and sent a copy.

© Manuscript completed in June 2018, Luxembourg © European Union 2018.

Photo credits: © vectorfusionart & hin255 / Fotolia.

[\(contact\)](mailto:eprs@ep.europa.eu)

[www.eprs.ep.parl.union.eu](http://www.eprs.ep.parl.union.eu/intranet) (intranet)

[www.europarl.europa.eu/thinktank](http://www.europarl.europa.eu/thinktank) (internet)

<http://epthinktank.eu> (blog)

