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Abstract. Purpose: to determine the place of Olympic sports in modern world; to analyze dynamic of its political, economic and social significance progress. Material: publications on the topic of this article were used as sources of information. Results: we characterized influence of Olympic sports on transformation of views and practical functioning in sphere of elite sportsmen’s training. Main stages of modern Olympic sports’ formation have been regarded. Strategy of elite sports’ development in historical aspect has been presented. Changes in attitude of political leaders, state figures and general population to Olympic Games have been shown. Directions of development and perfection of elite sportsmen’s training national systems have been outlined. Conclusions: recent years, potential of Olympic sports have being reflected in foreign and home policy of many countries. It resulted in drastic changes in spheres of organization, management, financing, material technical and personnel provisioning of sportsmen’s training.
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Introduction
Since 1930-s of 20th century, Olympic sports has being gradually transformed from competitions between sportsmen, sports clubs and other organization into competitions between social-political systems. First it clearly was noticeably at Olympic Games and winter Olympic Games in 1936, which were used by Hitler Germany as vivid tool for demonstration of advantages of Nazi ideology. Following example of Germany, the work on preparation for Olympic Games and activation of participation in Olympic movement was increased in countries –allies of Germany – Austria, Italy, Hungary and Japan [7].

Success of German sportsmen at Olympic Games 1936 demonstrated high effectiveness of governmental role in elite sports’ development as well as political potential of Olympic Games and sportsmen’s successful performances. Results of Second World War and defeat of Germany caused nearly irrevocable loss of organizational and methodic experience of Olympic training. It became rather noticeable after seven years at Olympic Games 1952. At these Games Germany was quite helpless. German sportsmen did not win any gold medal and turned out to be at the end of third ten in resulting table [6].

Starting from Olympic Games 1952 long period of political opposition between USSR and USA, socialists and capitalist countries, countries of East and West had begun. In this opposition elite sports were used as tool of ideological struggle. However, political and sports figures avoided demonstration of attitude to sports successes as tool of “cold war”. For example, president of the USA John Kennedy was seriously worried by defeats of American sportsmen. He noted that “United States faced severe challenge to their international prestige… One of criterion, by which we would be judged, is successes of our men and women on sports arenas… I call men and women of all kinds of sports to unite for superiority in sports competitions” [18]. Minister of Justice of the USA Robert Kennedy, brother of presidents, also reacted painfully to defeats of American athletes: “We do not want to read in newspapers that our country is the second after Soviet Union at Olympic Games… We want to be the first” [12].

In USSR leaders of the country did not use sports successes as argument in ideological struggle and political opposition. However, it did not prevent USSR from creation of highly effective system of state-public management of elite sports and sportsmen’s preparation for the most important international competitions and Olympic Games. At the end of 1952 the basis of strategy of elite sports’ development was initiated by state sports and physical culture administrative organ at Council of Ministers of USSR. Just after participation of Soviet sportsmen in Olympic Games in Helsinki, targeted program of preparation for Olympic Games and winter Olympic Games was offered. It preconditioned all further history of Soviet sports’ development just up to breakup of USSR in 1991 [2, 3, 4, 9, 10, 14].

Realization of this strategy by four years’ Olympic cycles was ensured exclusively by governmental organ, managing the branch. Potential of specialized higher educational establishments, scientific-research institutes and laboratories, sport societies and organizations was widely involved in solution of this task. Role of public organizations...
(federations of kinds of sports, national Olympic committee, voluntary sport societies, trade unions and etc.) reduced mainly to practical functioning on realization of the adopted strategy. In respect to main questions of sports’ development this role had mainly nominal character [7].

In the beginning of 1960-s there was made unsuccessful attempt to pass over elite sports and Olympic training to public organization. It resulted in heavy defeat from USA team at Olympic Games in Mexico city in 1968. Return to state system of elite sports management (in 1969) quickly renewed leading positions in the world: convincing victory over USA team at Olympic Games 1972 in Munich (USSR won 50 gold medal, USA – 33). It principally distinguished sports’ management system in USSR from practiced in most of western countries. In western countries elite sports sphere was included in competence of kinds of sports, national Olympic committees, and sport clubs and so on.

The practiced in USSR system of elite sports’ development evidently surpassed (especially in 1980-s – 1990-s) any system in western world by effectiveness of sportsmen’s performances at international and Olympic arenas. However, for propagandistic and ideological aims it was used only on mass media level.

Experience of development of elite sports and Olympic training in Soviet Union became an example for other countries of socialist camp. The most brightly it manifested in sports of German Democratic Republic, Bulgaria, Romania, Poland, and Republic of Cuba. In some of these countries political and ideological orientation of usage of successes on Olympic arena was more acute than in USSR. In particular, such situation was in GDR. After successful performances on 19th Olympic Games in Mexico-city, GDR authorities marked out Olympic sports as one of main spheres of their functioning. It shall demonstrate effectiveness of social-political system, foreign and home policy of the country; ensure consolidation of society. In GDR idea about not political character of sports were criticized and sportsmen’s achievements were used as powerful tool of propaganda [12, 13]. The same approach to participation in Olympic Games was realized in Cuba.

Purpose, tasks of the work, material and methods

The purpose of the work: is to analyze dynamic of Olympic sports development in modern world; its political, economical and social significance as well as to characterize influence of Olympic sports’ development on transformation of views and practical functioning in sphere of elite sportsmen’s training. As sources of information we used publications on topic of this article.

Results of the researches. Discussion

The turning point in Olympic Games’ history was rising of Juan Antonio Samaranch to leadership of IOC in 1980. He was initiative, wise and keen. His being the leader of IOC influenced radically on popularity and significance of Olympic Games in life of world community. Sharp change of IOC polity in respect of politicization, professionalization and commercialization of Olympic Games became a powerful factor of their development. In past decades IOC tried to isolate Olympic Games and Olympic sports from these processes. New president changed policy cardinally. IOC could demonstrate political and social attractiveness of Olympic Games, their exclusive significance for positive image of countries. It facilitated consolidation of nation, development of patriotism and national proud, strengthening of arena of international cooperation. Not less important was attracting of mass media, TV, big business – the largest companies and leaders on commodities and services markets – to Olympic Games. These companies desired that their brands would have been associated with Olympic Games, their symbols and values [5]. In this connection removal of item about amateur character from Olympic chart was quite natural as well as admittance of sportsmen-professionals to participation in Olympic Games. So intensive commercialization of Olympic kinds of sports, development of sponsorship system in respect to international and national sports federations, National Olympic committees and sportsmen personally is being continued [6].

And here, all potentials of cross effect manifested. Increase of Olympic Games’ political significance facilitated attraction of TV companies’ and Business representatives’ interest. Interest and active functioning of the latter ensured strengthening of Olympic Games’ political attractiveness. To the mentioned we can add: financial independence, political significance of IOC, Olympic Games, sports federations, National Olympic committees, interest in increasing of sportsmen’s professionalism. The growth of Olympic Games’ popularity is the most vividly demonstrated by growth of TV companies’ expenditures for the right to broadcast Olympic Games. Expenditures of TV companies for the right to broadcast Olympic Games in London in 2012 (comparing with expenditures for broadcasting of Moscow Olympiad in 1980) increased 20 times. Expenditures for broadcasting of winter Olympic
Games in Sochi, in 2014, (comparing with expenditures for Olympic Games in Lake Placid in 1980) increased 40 times [7, 16].

The same changes touched also competition of cities and countries for the right to be the place of Olympic Games and winter Olympic Games. IOC had to give right to be the place of Olympic Games 1984 to Los Angeles without required in such case governmental support of the country (because there were no other countries-candidates). At finalizing session of IOC delegations form Chicago, Madrid, Tokyo and Rio de Janeiro struggled for the right to be the place of Olympic Games 2016. These delegations were headed by president of USA, king of Spain, prime ministers of Japan and Brazil. Also situation in respect to finance expenditures for conduct of Olympic Games and winter Olympic Games changed [7].

Permanent increase of elite sports’ popularity and significance of successes on international sports arena at the end of 20th and beginning of 21st centuries resulted in radical change of political leaders’ and general population’s attitude to Olympic Games and achievements of national teams on them. Countries already can afford to endure shock, which was endured by Great Britain after Olympic Games in 1996. This country turned out to be on 36th position in final table, having only one gold medal. Its historical competitor (team from France) was on fifth position with 15 gold medals. It became a serious stimulus for development and perfection of national systems of elite sportsmen’s training. Alongside with different sports organization and educational boards, noticeable political and business figures started activity in this process. As a result in many countries elite sports became one of strategic spheres of functioning, factor of national prestige, consolidation and self affirmation of nation, development of national identity and unity [15, 17, and 19]. Financial potential of sports also sharply increased. Infrastructure of elite sportsmen’s training, of mass sports, of population’s involvement in healthy life style became intensively develop. In many countries these directions of work became a part of state policy with formation of appropriate strategy and required financing. In past years the picture was quite opposite in most countries [7, 8, 16].

Naturally, in most of highly developed countries these changes resulted in substantial growth of achievements and sharp increase of competition on international sports arena. In policy of China experience of Soviet sports and its intensive modernization take place.

In these conditions competitiveness of athletes and teams, their achievements on international competitions and on Olympic Games became to large extent to be conditioned by influence of multiple external factors. These factors are closely connected with organizational, financial and material-technical components. Intensive development of these components radically changed requirements to training of sportsmen and their surrounding. Effective training and competition’s functioning required increasing of financing of many sports facilities’ building. Besides it was necessary to ensure production and constant perfection of modern sport form; sport equipment; stimulators and diagnostic equipment; rehabilitation and recreation means. It opened new opportunities for involvement of different qualified specialists and ensuring them with all necessary for effective work [6].

Such changes permitted for some specialists to present modern state and development of sports as “global sporting arms race”. Just so was titled monograph of group of European specialists (“The global sporting arms race”, 2008, edition «Meyr Meyer») [15]. Such interpretation of competition medium on international level was not properly assessed. It became replicated in many scientific publications. Let us note that competition in many spheres of human activity on global level (world policy, military opposition, economic, different branches of industry and so on) is much stronger that in elite sports. Besides, methods of competition struggle often are out of commonly accepted frames. They are not comparable with competition in elite sports. Such competition can be an example of sound international competition by its uncompromising character. However, even in these spheres specialists try to avoid aggressive rhetoric. They understand the danger of usage of such terms as “arms’ racing”, “global arms racing”, “cold war” and other.

The most surprising is the fact that these terms and concepts were introduced by representatives of academic circles of European universities in sport science. They are representatives of countries, which are rather far from successful participation in declared by them “global arms racing” [15]. The presence of strongest competition on world and Olympic arenas is conditioned by intensive development of sports and systems of Olympic training in 25-30 counties of the world. These countries have rather high potential for sports’ development at present stage. With it, it should be noted that the strongest competition in modern sports touched not only purely sports’ component. It is noticeable in competition of many sponsors and partners of Olympic movement; in strive of cities-organizers of
Olympic Games to surpass their predecessors. Besides, there is functioning of a number of international sports federations on expansion of their participation in Olympic Games.

**Conclusions**

Olympic sports are a global phenomenon of modern life that is reflected in its political, social and economic power; in its exclusive popularity in world society.

Recent years potential of Olympic sports have had found its reflection in foreign and home policies of many countries. It facilitated positive image of countries, consolidation of nation, development of patriotism and national proud; fruitful international cooperation. Such changes cause great interest of world community, TV and other mass media, representatives of big business. It resulted in radical changes in organization, management, financing, material-technical and personnel provisioning of sportsmen’s training as well as in creation of highly effective national systems of preparation for Olympic Games and other international competitions.
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