

MINUTES

7th I.A.F. CONGRESS
(At Katsu'ura City, Chiba Prefecture, Japan)

October 2nd (Wednesday) to October 6th (Sunday)

October 2nd (Wednesday), 1996

1. Official opening of the Congress

1.1. Ueshiba Moriteru Hombu Dojo-cho opened the Congress on behalf of the I.A.F. President Ueshiba Kisshomaru Doshu. M Ueshiba Dojo-cho read the opening remarks written by Doshu.

2. Opening remarks by Mr Giorgio Veneri, the I.A.F. Chairman.

3. Official roll call.

3.1. The I.A.F. Member Federations as of October 2nd, 1996 are as follows:

1) Argentina	13)	Greece	25)	Morocco
2) Australia	14)	Hong Kong	26)	The Netherlands
3) Belgium	15)	Indonesia	27)	New Zealand
4) Brazil	16)	Ireland	28)	Norway
5) Britain	11)	Italy	29)	Philippines
6) Bulgaria	18)	Japan	30)	Poland
7) Canada	19)	Korea	31)	Scotland
8) Chile	20)	Luxembourg	32)	Singapore
9) China/Rep of	21)	Macao	33)	Spain
10) Finland	22)	Malaysia	34)	Sweden
11) France	23)	Mexico	35)	Switzerland
12) Germany	24)	Monaco	36)	Thailand
37) USA	38)	Uruguay	39)	Yugoslavia

3.2. The Organizations seeking I.A.F. Membership are:

1) Canary Islands	4)	Portugal
2) Czech Rep.	5)	South Africa
3) Panama	6)	Spain

3.3. Dr Goldsbury called the names of the representatives of member countries.

1) Argentina: Mr. K Miyazawa	15)	Indonesia: absent	29)	Philippines: Mr J Humbilla
2) Australia : Mr T Smibert	17)	Italy: proxy to Mr H Tada	30)	Poland: Mr R Hoffmann
3) Belgium: Mr J Horny	18)	Japan: Mr S Arikawa	31)	Scotland: proxy to Mr K Cottier
4) Brazil: Mr J Limos	19)	Korea: absent		
5) Britain: proxy to Mr K Cottier	20)	Luxembourg: proxy to Mr Boscagli	32)	Singapore: Mr CK Ng
6) Bulgaria: absent	21)	Macao: Mr D Lemos	34)	Spain: absent
7) Canada: absent	22)	Malaysia: Ms S Yamada	35)	Sweden: Mr S Stenudd
8) Chile: Mr J Rojo	23)	Mexico: Mr M Moreno		Switzerland: Mr F Heuscher
9) R.O.C.: Mr CN Lee	24)	Monaco: Mr G Boscagli	36)	Thailand: absent
10) Finland: Mr H Rautila	25)	Morocco: absent	37)	USA: Mr T Okuyama
11) France: Mr M Delhomme	26)	Netherlands: Mr Dragt	38)	Uruguay: Mr M Cela
12) Germany: Mr K Asai	27)	New Zealand: Mr S Sugano	39)	Yugoslavia: absent
13) Greece: absent				
14) Hong Kong: Mr HY Wan	28)	Norway: absent		

3.4. Dr Goldsbury announced that 30 Member Federations were present, which formed the quorum.

3.5. Dr Goldsbury called the names of the organizations that were seeking membership.

1) Czech Rep.: absent	4)	Portugal: Mr L Antunes	8)	Panama: proxy to J Rojo
2) Paraguay: proxy to Germany	5)	(B): Mr M Holeinya	9)	Saipan: Ms M Minegishi
3) Slovakia(A): proxy to Mr M Ikeda	6)	South Africa: proxy to Mr G Veneri	10)	Hungary: Mr R Varzegi
	7)	Canary Islands: absent	11)	Columbia: absent

3.6. Dr Goldsbury allowed them to attend the Congress.

4. Confirmation of the Agenda.

4.1. Mr Ishihara, the Treasurer, proposed that the item 14 in the agenda should be moved to Oct. 6th, Sunday, and that items 15, 16, 17 to Oct 5th, Saturday, which was approved by the Congress. The others were approved as they were.

5. Election of Auditors.

Dr Goldsbury appointed the following three persons as the Auditors:
Mr Philip Lee; Mr Jose Lemos; Mr Guy Boscagli

6. Approval of the Minutes of the 6th Congress, held in Taipei, and the Decisions of the 1994 IAF Directing Committee Meeting, held in Tokyo.

6.1. The Minutes of the 6th Congress and the Decisions of the Directing Committee meeting were approved by 27 votes to 3 abstention.

7. **Matters arising from the Minutes of the 6th Congress: NONE.**
8. **Approval of the Reports of the IAF Chairman (see appendix 2), Vice Chairmen, and General Secretary (see appendix 3).**
- 8.1. The Reports were approved without objection.
9. **The Reports of the IAF Treasurer; Presentation of IAF Accounts and Balance Sheet for the period of 1992-1996; budget Proposal for the period of 1996-2000.**
- 9.1. Dr Goldsbury said that the Auditors' report is included in the Minutes of the 6th Congress. This stated that the IAF is in a state of bankruptcy. This is intolerable, and this problem has a relation with the statutes which we are about to revise, and also to what IAF should be. We must create a healthy financial state for the IAF. During this Congress we must discuss how we refund the deficit of ¥400,000.
- 9.2. Mr Stenudd stated that the debt of the IAF to Hombu must be paid. He stressed that the income must be larger than the expenditure; and the surplus should be used for payment of the debt. He considered other ways of raising money; there were forty members in IAF; and, if forty members paid \$500 each, the total would be \$20,000; there might be some members that could not pay \$500, but there would be others that could pay more.
- 9.3. Mr Ishihara explained about the Budget 1997 / 2000. He stated that all the figures were estimated according to the actual results of the former years. The budget is drawn up so that income and expenditure may balance in total. The affiliation fees are stated, but the uncollected fees are not counted. The refund of the debt to Hombu, is not considered. He added that if we were to refund the debt, there would be no other choice but to raise the annual fees.
- 9.4. Mr Stenudd asked if the budget for the Congress was not appropriated.
- 9.5. Mr Ishihara answered that the expenditure for a congress might be estimated ¥70,000; but we could expect income from the seminar, which could be appropriated to it. He presumed that it could be estimated approximately ¥1,000,000, though he had no concrete concept concerning the next Congress yet.
- 9.6. Dr Goldsbury said that Treasurer's Report and the Budget would be approved on Sunday, October 6th, and expected that the members would study them carefully.

10. Report from Technical Councillor

- 10.1. S Okumura Shihan, the IAF Technical Councillor, requested everybody to stand up and offer a silent prayer for late Seigo Yamaguchi Shihan and late Mr George Benzaquein.
- 10.2. Asai Shihan said that he was the Assistant Technical Councillor but nobody had sent any information to him, even when Hombu Shihan had visited foreign countries. He expressed that he would need to be fully informed in such cases from then on.
- 10.3. Dr Goldsbury said that there was the International Department in Hombu; and that one of the functions of Technical Councillor was to establish a close contact among the Shihan dispatched from Hombu Dojo; and that it was disagreeable that IAF had to ask about the activity of Hombu Dojo every time. Concerning the function of Technical Councillor he added that it was vague and that only thing he could do was to read out the Article 18 of the Statutes: [The Technical Councillor maintains close contact with the various officials appointed abroad by the Aikikai Foundation. The Technical Councillor will report on his activity to the Congress.]
- 10.4. Sugano Shihan pointed out the difference between the Japanese version and the English version.
- 10.5. Dr Goldsbury affirmed his argument and said that there were some other differences between the Japanese version and the English; and that Japanese version had the priority in a case of dispute, because the original text of the present Statutes had been written in Japanese; however, that as to the revised Statutes, English should have the priority for they were originally written in English.
- 10.6. Dr Goldsbury stated that all the items for that day had finished, and that all the Committee members were requested to attend the Directing Committee meeting that would be held at 17:00 that day. He also requested the delegates to discuss about the revised Statutes in small groups, which was one of the major items of that Congress.
- 10.7. Mr Veneri announced that the Directing Meeting would be held at 17:00, and that the meeting of the European Aikido Federation would be held at 18:30.

<The meeting was closed by Mr Veneri.>

October 3rd (Thursday), 1996

- 3.7. Roll Call
- | | | |
|------------------------|-----------------|--------------------|
| 1) Argentina (proxy to | 15) Japan | 30) Uruguay |
| Brazil) | 16) Luxembourg | Observers |
| 2) Australia | 17) Macao | 31) Czech Rep. |
| 3) Belgium | 18) Malaysia | 32) Paraguay |
| 4) Brazil | 19) Mexico | 33) Portugal |
| 5) Britain | 20) Monaco | 34) Slovakia (A) |
| 6) Canada(absent) | 21) Netherlands | 35) (B) |
| 7) Chile | 22) New Zealand | 36) South Africa |
| 8) China (Rep. of) | 23) Philippines | 37) Canary Islands |
| 9) Finland | 24) Poland | 38) Panama |
| 10) France | 25) Scotland | 39) Saipan |
| 11) Germany | 26) Singapore | 40) Hungary |
| 12) Hong Kong | 27) Sweden | 41) Columbia |
| 13) Ireland | 28) Switzerland | |
| 14) Italy | 29) USA | |

11. Reports from Member Federations.

11.1. Dr Goldsbury stated that according to the statutes a member federation might report and that reports used to be presented in writing, but he stopped doing it because too many reports would have to be sent. He proposed that reports could be presented if members had any.

11.2. Mr Stenudd said that he wanted to know the number of the members each Member Federation had.

11.3. Dr Goldsbury said that it was very difficult to answer that question; it had been asked at the previous Congress, but the figures had not been accurate. He continued he had sent out papers to the member Federations in which they had been asked to state their paid up members. He requested the Delegates to present the papers as soon as possible because the annual fees would be decided accordingly.

11.4. Mr Stenudd reported concerning the development of the number of members: In 1961, they had very few members. Then, the figure gradually increased. In 80s it increased rapidly. But in the middle of 90s the increase slowed down again and they had 4900 members. There might come the time that the number would reach a limit. If 1(one) percent of the Swedish population, which is about 9.000.000, were the limit, 10.000 would be the limit; which is comparable to the numbers of persons of other martial arts such as Karate, Judo and, the Aikido population of approximately 50.000 in France which was about 1 percent of her whole population.

11.5. Mr Rojo explained the situation in Chile and stated that they had 500 members, 6 Dojos in 5 cities; that both Tamura Shihan and Yamada Shihan were the instructors; and that they had 25 Yudansha.

11.6. Mr Hoffman from Poland announced that 20th anniversary was going to be held in Warsaw on 26 and 27th, 1996; that an international seminar would be held under the guidance of Ueshiba Dojo-cho. He invited the IAF members to come and join. He announced that 2 delegates from each Member Federation would be invited without a fee.

11.7. Mr Hoffman touched on the matter of dan-grading the Yudansha in his country and said that some of their members who did *not* have 1-kyu from the Polish Aikido Federation were tested for shodan in other countries and passed, which was not acceptable. He requested the delegates not to let the Polish Aikido members who did not have 1-kyu take the test for shodan.

11.8. Mr Heuscher said that the Swiss Aikido Federation was going to celebrate its 30th anniversary in 1999. Concerning their activities in East European countries he mentioned that Mr Ikeda, their Chief Instructor, had been invited by countries such as Czech and Slovak; and that they had helped those Federations, which were applying for the IAF Membership at 7th Congress. About Russia Mr Heuscher stated that they supported a group in Moscow which had only 200 members in January, '95, 500 members in November '95; in March '96 they had 1200 members, and in September 1996 their members were counted 1300. He stressed that it was important for an Aikido Federation in a country to cooperate with other organizations for the development of the Aikido.

11.9. In connection with the Russian Aikido activity, Dr Goldsbury reported that he had received letters from two Aikido organizations in Russia, in which they stated that four persons (2 persons from each organization) wanted to participate in the 7th Congress. Dr Goldsbury said that he had established contact with the Japanese Embassy in Moscow, but they failed to get visas.

12. Items proposed for discussion/resolution by IAF Member Federations.

12.1. Dr Goldsbury stated that the item 12.1.1. of the agenda (the troubles concerning DAN grades among countries) proposed by Argentina was not a matter that could be dealt with by IAF; but he invited the Argentine delegate to speak concerning the proposal. Mr Nishida from Brazil, who stood proxy for Argentina, said that he could not speak about the proposal because he had not been told anything about it; and hence the agenda moved to the next item.

12.2. Mr Veneri said that Italy would withdraw the proposal (Aikido promotion in the world), and the agenda moved to the next item.

12.3. Dr Goldsbury said that the item 12.1.3. (What is the role of continental federations within the IAF?) proposed by Scotland was very important because it was strongly connected to the IAF Statutes, and that he wanted to listen to the opinions directly from Scottish delegate. Mr Cottier who was proxy for Scotland said that he could not speak on behalf of Scotland because he had been told nothing about the proposal. The agenda moved to the next item.

12.4. Federation put its information in its Internet, and were amended by each organization when there was any change, one who wanted to get IAF information could easily access and get necessary information. Mr Smibert said that he felt that there were two ways to produce a list of dojos: one would be made by IAF, and the other by Hombu Dojo. He advised that IAF should help Hombu to produce one, and requested Hombu to install a computer.

12.5. The agenda moved to the item 12.1.5. which was presented by Uruguay (Annual Fee for South America), but Mr Cela withdrew this proposal, but presented a new proposal to include the Spanish Language as an IAF official language. Dr Goldsbury remarked that the proposal was related with the IAF Statutes and/or grouping, and refused to discuss over the matter at that moment, because the items had been already approved on the first day of the congress. But he proposed that the matter should be discussed in the item 18 of the Agenda, which was approved by the congress.

<A short break>

12.6. Mr Veneri stated that the item 12.1.6. proposed by Yamada Shihan (The future of the IAF) was an important one. He said that the proposal would be read out first and the matter would be discussed after it; he requested everybody to listen to it carefully; but he also requested the delegates to make their observations brief.

12.7. Yamada Shihan said that he would apologise beforehand if the delegates should find in his opinion some points that were radical or negative; but he did not mean to destroy the IAF. His desire was that he wanted to create such an IAF which everybody who wanted could join. He also expressed that Tamura Shihan's proposal would be introduced after his. (The written proposals by Messrs Yamada and Tamura had been circulated prior to the Congress; both were read out.)

12.8. Mr Dragt., being involved in the organisation of Aikido-demonstrations at the IWGA 1993, replied that IAF had been created according to the Doshu's will, and that IAF had joined GAISF at his will. When IWGA was held in Karlsruhe, in 1988, nobody questioned whether IAF should participate or not; GAISF decided to hold the next IWGA in Netherlands, IAF Members did not have a choice. It was not NCAF that wanted the IWGA to be held in Netherlands, nor did the NCAF expect any benefit out of it. Actually, some of the NCAF-members held the opinion that they should not be involved in the matter. However, as an IAF member the NCAF thought that it was their responsibility to organise the demonstrations, and therefore NCAF drew up a budget for it. At the 6th Congress held in Taipei IAF's participation in IWGA, 1993 and the proposed budget were approved by majority. He felt that Yamada Shihan's statement contained a sad question: 'Yamada Shihan was doubtful whether IAF members truly understood the matter'. Mr Dragt stressed that NCAF had organised IWGA, 1993 according to the budget, which had been approved by the Congress; and, therefore, that Mr Yamada's idea that deficit should be borne by the organizer was unacceptable.

12.9. Mr Stenudd said that Yamada Sensei foresaw the future of IAF; the proposal had to be understood to make the IAF better; it was stated in the proposal that IAF should participate in the All Japan Aikido Demonstration, and the Swedish Federation would join it when they were invited. He was aware that there were some problems about Congress meeting, but, it was also true that there were some important business Congress had to decide, therefore we could not stop all the proceedings. He believed that a Congress meeting was necessary for the members as the field where members could exchange their opinions and increase their knowledge. He concluded that a meeting should be a place where members could discuss about the questions the members had, such as how we could teach Aikido to children, or, how to organise a seminar for the development of Aikido.

12.10. Mr Delhomme said that it was stated in Yamada Sensei's proposal that he wanted to exchange opinions frankly; it was also stated that USAF would withdraw its membership from IAF if it did not change. Mr Delhomme wanted to know what did the 'change' mean. He felt that the answer was simple: IAF that was represented by all the Aikidoists was not necessary; GAISF was not necessary, nor was IWGA. In other words, what USAF wanted to say was that nothing but Hombu was necessary. Neither Congress, nor Officers, nor annual fees were necessary. In short, 'Let's hold a happy party,' was their opinion; that is to say, we ought to pay respect to Hombu. He was doubtful whether this attitude were really respectful to Hombu; or whether they could really safeguard the Hombu. Aikido meant Hombu itself for everyone there, and, therefore, it was a matter of course to pay respect to Hombu. But, when we considered things in a wider range, he came to conclude that there ought to be another organization that was different from the Hombu, and that was the IAF. The IAF was very useful to spread Aikido. IAF was a Democratic organization, and through the existence of such a Democratic organization, Hombu itself would come to receive wider recognition. The most important thing is that Hombu and democratic IAF should cooperate by keeping good balance.

Mr Delhomme continued and pointed out that there was another proposal from USAF: IAF should allow two or more membership per country. But he thought that if such a system were to be adopted, the result would be much worse; it would quicken the split of organizations because of money and vanity, and, as a result Hombu recognition would become unnecessary. Mr Yamada stated in his proposal that 'All the Aikidoists have a right to speak.' Mr Delhomme also shared the opinion; it could hardly be said that an individual opinion represented the opinions of all; it was, therefore very important for a person to be modest when he represented others. He continued and said that those who were present at the meeting represented all the other members in their countries; and other persons in their countries who did not belong to their organizations; therefore, when a representative vote, he, whether he was a professional Aikidoist or not, ought not to think of his personal profit only, but also of the profit of his students and/or of other persons in his country.

12.11. Mr Cottier said that Yamada Shihan's opinion was very suggestive and that it contained many important things that everybody had to consider. Especially, stating about the present situation of the IAF, he questioned if all of us were content with it, which Mr Cottier himself, was very interested in; which he, too, wanted to ask Hombu Dojo. He added that he would ask Hombu Dojo directly, if he had any question.

12.12. Mr Yamada said that he had expected he could hear those kinds of opinions that he had just heard. He said that he had written the proposal so that everybody might have a chance to consider the present state of the IAF. He feared that there might be some places, which seemed he was attacking another person, but it was neither what he had meant, nor had USAF an intention to deny IAF or rather, USAF wanted to carry it on. He could understand how difficult it was to run it; he also knew that there had been a lot of problems. Therefore, the main purpose that he had written the proposal was how to solve those problems. Accordingly, he was not attacking Netherlands. What he wanted to say was that members had to study very carefully about the matter they should vote. He knew well that all the members were responsible for the decision made by voting. He could understand the point of NCAF that the decision to organize IWGA, 1993 was not made by themselves but by others. He would apologise for that he did not know the fact. He was thankful for the lecture about the Democracy. And, finally, mentioning the number of the membership per country in IAF, he said as follows: there was an opinion that the split of an organization would be quickened if IAF accepted plural membership per country. Of course, it was an ideal form that one nation had one national organization; but the fact was that there existed plural organizations in some countries at the moment.

12.13. Mr Veneri, the Chairman, stated his own opinion on the matter: as he stated in the chairman's report for the 7th Congress, IAF would grow larger in the future; and, if IAF accepted plural membership in a country, it might become still larger. But he could not agree with that idea because it would accelerate the subdivision of an organization in a country. He continued and said that it was important to observe the differences of the situation in each country; as for instance, in Belgium, only one organization was permitted by the government or by the Olympic Committee, though Belgium was not so a large country compare with USA. He said that they paid a great effort to fulfill the condition. And, further, he made a remark on Mr Yamada's opinion and said that it was possible IAF members to assemble in Tokyo on the occasion of Zen Nippon Aikido Demonstration.

12.14. Dr Goldsbury asked Yamada Shihan: it was stated in the document that the relationship between IAF General Secretary and Hombu Dojo was not going well; he wanted to know what the ground of it was.

12.15. Mr Yamada answered that Hombu had told him so.

12.16. Tamura Shihan said that he held the same opinion as Yamada Shihan. He stressed that both Mr Yamada's document and his were the same in contents. He continued and said that all of the members attended the Congress expecting that the Congress might solve their problems and they went home every time in vain; which had to be changed; everybody assembled there in order to discuss that large volume of draught of revised Statutes; but, as he believed, everything could not be solved by Statutes only; the aim of the proposals made by Yamada Shihan and himself was to find the way to solve the problems. He stated that he firmly believed that there would be the way. To put oneself in the jaws of death and find the way to free oneself: that was the secret of Budo. He believed that everybody there should abandon the thought that the Statutes could solve everything.

12.17 Mr Nishida (Brazil), after expressing his assent to Mr Yamada's opinion, explained about the geographical division of the South America and the North America. He said that he agreed to include Mexico in that because the Spanish language was spoken there, though it was an accepted opinion to divide them by Panama Canal. He stressed that he never meant to disregard the geographical knowledge.

<Mr Veneri closed the meeting>

October 4th (Friday), 1996

3.8. Roll call

1) Argentina (proxy to Brazil)	15) Japan	30) Uruguay
2) Australia	16) Luxembourg	Observers
3) Belgium	17) Macao	31) Czech Rep
4) Brazil	18) Malaysia (absent)	32) Paraguay
5) Britain	19) Mexico	33) Portugal
6) Canada(absent)	20) Monaco	34) Slovak (A)
7) Chile	21) Netherlands	35) (B)
8) China (Rep of)	22) New Zealand	37) South Africa
9) Finland	23) Philippines	38) Canary Islands (absent)
10) France	24) Poland	39) Panama
11) Germany	25) Scotland	40) Hungary
12) Hong Kong	26) Singapore	41) Columbia (absent)
13) Ireland	27) Sweden	
14) Italy	28) Switzerland	
	29) USA	

12.18. The item 12.2.2. of the Agenda (The opening of a branch office in Belgium for Europe) presented by Belgium was withdrawn.

12.19. Mr Rojo (Chile) stated all those who practise Aikido belonged to one family. He wanted to make an effort to develop Aikido through out the world, but he believed that it had to be done in accordance with the will of late O-Sensei. There seemed to exist two or more organizations in a country, but they had to be united respecting each other the good points the others had. He announced, also, that Latin American Aikido Federation had been established, which he hoped to link directly with Hombu and, also, with the IAF.

12.20. Dr Goldsbury requested Mr Rojo to submit beforehand a document written in English to General Secretary from next time on so that everyone could understand. Dr Goldsbury made a remark upon Mr Rojo's statement and said that three or more members might form a group according to the present Statutes and members could form any group they wanted until the Statutes were changed, therefore, it was not necessary to request the approval of the Congress.

12.21. Mr Yamada offered his congratulation to Mr Rojo but he added that there was another Federation in South America. He said that eleven organizations in the Federation had their intentions to apply for the membership of the IAF. He hoped that those two Federations would exist together in peace and would be united in the future.

12.22. Mr Dragt pointed out the fact that two Organizations or Federations had been established in the same area, and requested for further information about the circumstances of the matter.

12.23. Dr Goldsbury answered and said that the present situation was like that of a black hole and nothing could be clarified without going into it. The present Statutes went '*two or more National Federations or National Organizations from each continent are grouped as a Continental Federation: Statutes/Art. 6-Cont. Fed*' and IAF would not make any formal remarks concerning the matter. But it was important for the group to be formally recognized by IAF, for a group that was not recognised by IAF had nothing to do with it. So, if there was any group that was not recognised by IAF, it had to apply for an official recognition and to be approved by the Congress. According to Yamada Shihan, an organization was established; and if it made applied for affiliation, it would be recognised by IAF in accordance with the procedure.

Regarding Yamada Shihan's proposal, there would be two ways to choose before us: to dissolve the present IAF, or to improve it little by little. There was an idea to divide the present IAF into some small groups and to unite them into one big IAF, joining them together. But from his position as the General Secretary all that he could say was that everything should be dealt with according to the IAF Statutes.

12.24. Mr Veneri announced to proceed to the item 12.2.4. which was proposed by Germany. Germany withdrew the proposal.

12.25. Dr Goldsbury made an explanation about the item 12.2.5. of the Agenda. He said, though it was written in the Agenda that the item was proposed by the All Japan Aikido Federation, Arikawa Shihan had appealed that A.J.A.F. had not proposed it. Dr Goldsbury amended and said that the proposal was made from IAF. He announced that the discussion about the item 12.2.5. would be put off till Dojo cho was present.

12.26. Dr Goldsbury announced that all the items in the agenda, which should have been discussed for the second day, had finished. He continued and said that before the business moved to the next item, Revision of the IAF Statutes, the proposal which was made by Tamura Shihan should be discussed because the proposal was closely connected to the Revision of the Statutes, and he invited Mr Tamura to speak.

12.27. Mr Tamura said that his proposal written in Japanese and French had been circulated, but the English version had not been circulated yet. He asked Ms Minegishi to read it out.

<The English version was read out by her. >

12.28. Mr Veneri expressed his consent to Mr Tamura's opinions, save the part in which Mr Tamura stated the relationship between IAF and Hombu: especially Mr Tamura's metaphor comparing the relationship of all the Aikidoists to that of a FAMILY was very suggestive. He believed that *a son could not be his father*; but that there might be a case that the father gave the car key to his son when he felt that his son was better in driving a car than he. Mr Veneri thought that IAF was a useful tool for the development of Aikido; and Hombu should make good use of the tool. However, he had encountered difficulties when he had some chances to negotiate with national organizations that were new to IAF, because the structure of Hombu was not clear for him. He believed that *SEMPAI-KOHAI* system in BUDO was important, but feared that it was difficult to apply the system in the field of international affairs. Going back to Mr Tamura's metaphor, FAMILY, children would grow up; and when they grew up, they wanted to make their families. Similarly, an Aikido student would want to have his own Dojo when he grew up. He believed that it was unquestionable that we had DOSHU on the top, and that we should be united under him.

12.29. Mr Tamura feared that he might not be understood. Regarding Mr Veneri's metaphor of driving a car, he said that it was good that a son was better in driving than his father, or rather, it should be so; if a son became the president, the father would be happy. However, even after the son became the president, he would never make a fool of his father. He believed that it was an ideal form of a family that Mother was in the centre; Father took the lead; and children grew in it. He thought that the role of the IAF should be like that of Father in a family. He felt that IAF had a lot of functions to fulfill: such as sending forth instructors to an organization when it was in need, giving support to an organization when it celebrated its anniversary, and so forth; on the other hand, Aikikai had its own original functions: such as awarding DAN Grades, training of Aikido instructors, and, especially, taking the responsibility of instruction. He stressed that IAF ought not to separate itself from Hombu, and that it ought not to step into the field of Hombu, which, he said, was the gist of his proposal. A family, Mr Tamura said, had its own event such as New Year's Day, wedding anniversaries, birthdays, and so on. Family members would voluntarily gather together on those occasions. He believed that was what the Founder wanted to say when he said 'the world is a family'. A great power was necessary to unite a large number of persons. Mr Tamura believed that IAF needed to be reformed, neither was it good if each member should be seeking for different directions.

12.30. Mr Dragt referred to the idea of family and said that he could feel the same way, for he would go to see his father and ask for his opinion when he had any trouble; and, it would be the same in Aikido. He stressed that everybody came over to Katsu'ura to see their parents, and that there might be a case when parents had different opinion from that of children; there might occur a case that they would part in anger, which might never occur in a good family, because they would overcome the crisis and step forward to the next stage. This idea was being used by the NCAF at the basis of its policy.

<A short break>

12.31. Mr Sugano, after expressing his sympathy with Mr Tamura's opinion regarding the reformation of IAF, stated about the ways how Aikidoists were awarded their dan ranks. He presumed, there could be four ways for one to be awarded dan grade by Hombu: a Dan grade given to a member who belonged directly to Hombu; his/her relation to Hombu was very clear; and that which was given to a member who belonged to a National Organization which had the Official Recognition by Hombu; his/her relation to Hombu was also clear because the relation between the Organization and Hombu was fixed; that which was given to a group member through a shihan, which group was recognised by Hombu through the shihan; in which case, the relation between he/she and Hombu could be said to be clear; that which was given to a group member through a shihan, which group was not recognised by Hombu. He continued and said that it was not necessary for IAF to intervene in any of these cases; however, as to the last case, i.e. regarding those organizations or groups that were not recognised by Hombu, IAF should obtain information and exchange it among the IAF Members. He added that Messrs Tamura and Yamada also had the same opinion.

12.32. Mr Stenudd said that all the cases presented by Mr Sugano had some relation with Shihan; but there were another case, or group, which had no relation with any Shihan. Mr Sugano believed that all of the cases would be classed as one of those four cases because dan was awarded through a Shihan in any cases; he added that a Shihan he meant was not necessarily a resident Shihan.

12.33. Mr Heuscher questioned that if there were any difference between the grades given through a resident Shihan of a National Organization recognised by Hombu and those given to members of a group through a Shihan, which group was recognised by Hombu through the Shihan. Mr Yamada answered that all the organization did not have its resident Shihan; and presented the case of Nishio Shihan to make the things clear.

12.34. Mr Stenudd amended and said that as Mr Nishio was nominated to the Shihan in Sweden, his case would come to the case 2 in Sweden. Mr Yamada commented that a National Organization was an organization that was recognised both by Hombu and IAF; secondly, there were more than ten organization which were recognised by Hombu in USA; the last one was such an organization that were connected to Hombu through a Shihan in person. And, referring to Mr Saito and Mr Saotome, he asked Mr Somemiya if there were any groups that were officially recognised among Mr Saito's groups.

12.35. Mr Somemiya answered that there was not Mr Saito's group that was officially recognised by Hombu, as far as he knew. Mr Stenudd said that any member was under a Shihan in any of those four cases, whether he/she might have Hombu membership or membership of the other four organizations. Tamura Shihan observed that it was not

always the case.

12.36. Mr Stenudd said that this Federation would be not IAF but ISF or International Shihan federation, because all the federations were under Shihan. But, he continued, as for Swedish Aikido Federation, it was under a Section concerned which was in the Swedish Government, to which various sports federations and martial organizations belonged to; all the dojos and groups belonged under them. The system of the sort was common in many of the European Countries; and the basic idea that lied in it was concentrated to profit the students who studied those sports or arts. Thus, in Sweden, they had firstly to consider the profit of the students; Shihan would not be centred. He stressed that democratic way of thinking was very important in operating a Federation in Sweden, which could also be applied in IAF.

12.37. Mr Rogers from Ireland said that 'the definite plan concerning the course and/or organization IAF should have for the future', which was requested by Mr Horny at the beginning of the second meeting that day, had not been presented yet. He requested the role of IAF, which everybody wanted to know, to be presented as soon as possible to avoid a waste of time

12.38. Mr Yamada made the following proposal: Everybody in the meeting had Dan grade. At the same time, lot of persons who belonged to such an organization that had no Shihan had the same DAN grade. Therefore, IAF should be such a Federation, which everyone who had DAN registered by Hombu could join. In other words, we should build a happy Federation to which everybody wanted could be affiliated. Then, there would be no conflict arising from the fact that one was affiliated but the other was not. He stressed that he was never denying IAF by that idea of his.

12.39 Mr Veneri observed that Mr Sugano's views were about the system of receiving Dan grade, but that the present state of the Aikido was much more complicated; there were Hombu, the Member Federations and other organizations that were not recognised; and they got entangled in a delicate manner. There might be some old Shihan who were at enmity with one another. The situation was like brothers who were always fighting against one another in a family; in Italy they had a saying 'Kinship is a dagger.' The most important thing was how to include the unorganised organizations and/or groups where Osensei's Aikido is practised.

12.40. Mr Dragt said that hearing what was discussed at the meeting, it seemed that all that IAF could do was how DAN grades to be given; but that was only a matter between Hombu and Shihan. He, showing his sympathy with the opinion that IAF ought not poke its nose in such a business, said that IAF had a lot of other business to do in which IAF should play an important role. He wanted to know the opinions of Shihan' beside the subject concerning DAN.

12.41. Mr Veneri requested Hombu to explain what the Provisional Recognition was, which question was from Mr Delhomme.

12.42. Mr Somemiya replied that the word Recognition was ambiguous and that it was important to clarify its meaning. He explained that IAF Members had the Recognition in its definite meaning. Apart from that Recognition, there was another sort of Recognition that non-IAF Members had, which was called Provisional Recognition. For instance, Mr Tamura's organization had Provisional Recognition. Mr Tamura protested and said that they had once had the Official Recognition as one of the Founding Members, which had been cancelled and they had lost the IAF Membership before they had been aware of it. Mr Somemiya continued and said that though the recognition Tamura Shihan's organization had was so called 'Provisional', it was called just 'Recognition' at Hombu; there was, therefore, no difference between an Official Recognition and a Provisional Recognition at present moment, i.e. his understanding was that all organizations that were connected with Hombu in an official manner were generally called Hombu recognized organization at Hombu.

12.43. Tamura Shihan remarked that Hombu might have answered because it was requested to, however, there had not been such a difference formerly. He questioned who was the first that had started Aikido in Netherlands. (Mr Dragt answered that Mr Tamura was.) He questioned again who had started Aikido in Italy, and he replied for himself that Miss Onoda, a sculptor, had. He said that in any country there had been someone who had started and founded Aikido, believing that Aikido is excellent; that was the course of the development of Aikido in the world and we could see the result. He continued and said that the Japanese Government was dispatching Japan Overseas Cooperation Volunteers on its own expense but they would go home on the expiration of their terms, which resident Shihan would never do. The idea of IAF was very good but those who assembled there ought deeply to consider who were doing the genuine Aikido.

12.44. Mr Delhomme requested the definition of the Recognition being confirmed. He said that the term of Recognition, including that of Provisional, had no meaning except for its definition. He felt that Mr Yamada's opinion seemed to be going by the Recognition but he believed that it was impossible to discuss without the clear definition on the term of Recognition.

12.45. Mr Rogers from Ireland felt that it was discussed as if the significance of IAF did not differ from that of the International Yudansha Card. He believed, however, that IAF ought to be based on the national base for those who were practising Aikido outside Japan, because there were many occasions when they had to have relations with the Government and/or with other sports organizations. He said that the meeting should move to the revision of the Statutes. He observed that Shihan seemed to feel misgivings about the revision, but that any organization had to have its Statutes subject to which the organization ran. He moved that the revision of the IAF Statutes should be discussed according to the Agenda that afternoon. He added that the Statutes were classified into three: extremely controversial, controversial and not controversial, but it was not necessary, that moment, those Statutes that were controversial to be dealt with; he proposed to start working on the Statutes, dealing with those Statutes that were not controversial.

12.46. Dr Goldsbury stated that it was very important to discuss about the opinions presented by Messrs Yamada and Tamura; however, it was proposed that business should be proceeded according to the agenda

12.47. Mr Rogers requested the Chairman to put his proposal to a vote.

(Mr Veneri talked with Dr Goldsbury how the proposal, which included the prolonging the meeting, should be dealt with.)

12.48. Mr Dragt said that there seemed to be some problem on proceedings, however, some decision had to be made regarding the proposal.

12.49. Dr Goldsbury requested those delegates who were in favour of the proposal to show their hands. The proposal

was adopted by 21 in favour and 9 against.

12.50. Dr Goldsbury said that a working group meeting was held in the afternoon the day before and there discussed about the Statutes from the Articles one to eleven. He advised that it would be efficient to proceed the discussion adopting the result of the working group.

12.51. Mr Veneri announced that the next meeting would start from 2:00 PM.

12.52. Mr Horny from Belgium asked to speak and allowed. He observed that the constructional system of Aikido seemed to be based upon the relation between Hombu and Shihan, then Shihan and IAF. He believed that IAF was not to intervene between that relation, but to devote itself to the establishment of its footings; if the roles of those two should become clear, there would be no trouble. He also believed that IAF should devote itself to develop the cooperative relation among the Members. And he mentioned that the following three would be what IAF should do: (1) establish the organizational footings; (2) devote itself to promoting mutual understandings among the members; (3) give hand to those organizations that were not affiliated to the IAF.

<The meeting for the 4th morning was closed>

<The meeting was re-opened at 14:00>

12.53. Dr Goldsbury proposed that the meeting would be closed at 16:00. And asked the meeting whether they would agree with it, which was agreed by silence.

3.9. Roll call

1) Argentina (proxy to	15) Japan	29) USA
Brazil)	16) Luxembourg (proxy to	30) Uruguay
2) Australia	USA	3.12. Observers
3) Belgium	17) Macao (absent)	31) Czech Rep
4) Brazil	18) Malaysia (absent)	32) Paraguay
5) Britain	19) Mexico	33) Portugal
6) Canada(absent)	20) Monaco	34) Slovak (A)
7) Chile	21) Netherlands	35) (B)
8) China (Rep of)	22) New Zealand	37) South Africa
9) Finland	23) Philippines	38) Canary Islands (absent)
10) France	24) Poland	39) Panama
11) Germany	25) Scotland	40) Hungary
12) Hong Kong	26) Singapore	41) Columbia (absent)
13) Ireland	27) Sweden	
14) Italy	28) Switzerland	

12.54. Mr Okuyama from USA stated that the USA's position was not to agree with certain procedures of revising IAF Statutes, as it was stated in Yamada Sensei's statement, and that they favoured in much simpler agreements, along interested Aikido practitioners and with now present IAF, with much simpler organization, for which USAF was prepared to work on the complete proposal with IAF. Therefore, they would step out from finding themselves to participate in trying discussions or revision of the present Statutes. Then, he asked if he might make a motion.

12.55. Mr Veneri, requesting Mr Okuyama to present the proposal in writing, asked what the proposal was about.

12.56. Okuyama replied that it involved whether to continue revising the Statutes or to freeze it leave it on and proceed with Yamada Sensei and Tamura Sensei's proposal which is the simpler form.

12.57 Mr Rogers said that it had already been decided in the morning session to work on Statutes, and he was against stepping back.

<Mr Veneri talked with Dr Goldsbury how the motion should be dealt with.>

12.58. Mr Veneri stated that the motion ought to be voted, and requested Dr Goldsbury to put the motion down on the board. Dr Goldsbury wrote the motion on the board which read: We do not continue the present revision of the Statutes, and freeze the process of revision and proceed with the proposal made by Yamada Yoshimitsu Shihan and Tamura Nobuyoshi to seek a simple form of the IAF.

12.58.1. Mr Tamura said that it should be not <simple form IAF>, but <future IAF>.

12.58.2. Mr Stenudd wanted to know if *proceed with the discussion* meant at that moment, there. Mr Okuyama answered that he could hardly believe that this problem would be solved right away, therefore, he meant to include that meeting and also the next Congress. Mr Rautila questioned if that motion meant to forget all about their work and efforts up to that time and build new Statutes. Dr Goldsbury answered in the affirmative. Mr Stenudd asked if *simple form of the IAF* meant such IAF that was proposed by Messrs Tamura and Yamada. Yamada Shihan's answer was 'yes'.

1259. Sugano Shihan proposed a secret vote. Dr Goldsbury said that subject to the provision of the Article 11-D of the Statutes, secret voting had to be proposed by three or more members. Mr Stenudd, Mr Dragt and other few persons showed hands and gave their names as proposers. Dr Goldsbury announced that those who were for the motion would put a circle on the ballots and those who were against would put a cross.

12.60. Tada Shihan, as the representative from Italy, questioned if Messrs Tamura and/or Yamada had any different draught of Statutes and/or specific proposal they had already made. Mr Tamura answered that they did not. Mr Tada asked if they meant to continue using the present statutes till new ones came up. Mr Tamura answered in the affirmative.

12.61. Mr Heuscher stated that it was proper to work on the draught, considering a lot of labour and time which had been spent on making it; besides we had to wait four more years until the next congress; therefore, the best way was to

go on working on the draught, adopting the opinions of Tamura Sensei and Yamada Sensei.

12.62. Mr Veneri announced that the proposal was rejected by 9 in favour, 18 against and 1 abstention, and that the next item in the agenda, Revision of the IAF Statutes, had to be discussed.

12.63. Mr Heuscher requested those federations that had made the motion to present a new definite proposal by the next Congress. Mr Okuyama from USA stated that they were prepared to work along with IAF.

13. Revision of the IAF Statutes.

13.1. Dr Goldsbury stated that the working group had discussed some of the not controversial articles the night before. He hoped that not controversial ones should be adopted as soon as possible. He brought up for discussion [The Article 3-MEMBERSHIP]. Dr Goldsbury said concerning the ARTICLE 3 of the Statutes that there were no questions particularly raised by the members in the working group.

13.2. Dr Goldsbury reported that the following three suggestions were made by the working group, concerning [the Article 3-ADMISSION OF NEW MEMBERS] of the Regulation; there was a question on a phrase in [3.2.] of the regulation, which read [Application for Membership of the International Aikido Federation must be submitted to the General Secretary at least 6(SIX) months before the commencing date of the General Assembly at which the application is to be decided.] it was stated in the [3.2.1. h)] that [a copy of the application for Recognition by the Aikido Foundation, Aikido World Headquarters], but the words [application for] should be crossed out, and the article should be changed as [a copy of the certificate of Recognition by the Aikikai Foundation, Aikido World Headquarters.] it was written in [3.5.] that [After it has been admitted to Membership of the IAF....duly signed by the President, Chairman and General Secretary of the I.A.F.,.....], but the words [General Secretary] should be removed.

13.3. Mr Dragt asked why the working group advised to remove the word 'General Secretary'. Dr Goldsbury answered that it was because the General Secretary's function was not sign. Mr Dragt insisted that the words General Secretary should be kept. Dr Goldsbury answered that [General Secretary] would be kept.

13.4. Mr Stenudd said that it was stated in the [Article 3.2.1. e)] of the Regulation that [a list of applicant's affiliated dojos, giving the weekly practice scheduled and the number of the paid-up members of each dojo at the time of the application] must be accompanied. He advised to jump from the word [*dojo*] to [and *the number*] because he felt it difficult, in reality, for an organization to do.

13.5. Mr Rogers said from the same reason that the phrase of [the number of paid-up members] should be removed, he felt that the number of dojos would do.

13.6. Mr Isoyama said concerning 3.5.of the Regulations that it was advised by the working group to delete the word *General Secretary*; then there was a question from the floor to keep it; then it was taken up as the decision of the Congress, which procedure he believed, was not right. Dr Goldsbury said that he had understood and he agreed that the decision had to be taken by voting; but his opinion was to discuss each provision that day and to put to the vote as a whole at the meeting, which would be held the next day.

13.6.1. Mr Rautila proposed that business should proceed by modifying and qualifying each article one by one so that the discussion might not to go back and forth. Dr Goldsbury explained that the majority of two third was required subject to the Statutes to revise them. He had chosen, therefore, the way to put to vote as a whole, because he thought it difficult to put to vote article by article, although he had prepared a lot of ballots.

13.6.2.□ Mr Smibert from Australia proposed that each article should be dealt with as an independent motion, and to put to vote as a whole after all. Mr Isoyama said that if one speaker agreed and the next speaker disagreed, the last statement would give a stronger impression upon the listeners than the first one. Therefore, it is important that discussion should proceed Article by Article; if there was an opinion, it should be opened to fully discussion until arriving the conclusion; then it had to be approved one by one; otherwise discussion would go round in circles and the same thing might be discussed repeatedly, and nobody had clear about what they were discussing.

13.7. Mr Veneri, accepting those opinions, requested everybody to express opinions concerning the Articles 3.1., 3.2. and 3.2.1. of the Regulation, but neither objection nor particular opinions was heard.

13.8. Dr Goldsbury said that in the event of argument involving the difference between the English version and the Japanese version, he was of the opinion that the English version would prevail as he had stated in the introduction because the I.A.F. was an international organization. Dr Goldsbury made an inquiry with the meeting whether they had any opinion about Article 3.1. of the Regulation, but there was no objection or opinion.

13.9. Dr Goldsbury, stating about the Article 3.2. of the Regulation, proposed to put in another phrase of [with all the supporting documents] after the phrase of [Application for the Membership of the International Federation]. The Article 3.2 was read out by him: [Application for the Membership of the International Aikido Federation with all the supporting documents must be submitted to the General Secretary at least 6(SIX) months before the commencing date of the General Assembly at which the application is to be decided.]

<There was no objection concerning the Article 3.2.>

13.10. Dr Goldsbury, stating about the Article 3.2.1.a) of the Regulation, explained that the reason why he put the words, *Constitution and/or Statutes and Bye Laws* in there was because situation varied in each country.

<There was no objection concerning Article 3.2.1.a.)>

13.11. Mr Rogers observed that too many things, which seemed to be not necessary, were stated in the Article 3.2.1.b). Or, as he thought, there would some other place where those things might be stated. Mr Stenudd thought that there would be no problem in stating the addresses of those offices if they existed there. Mr Dragt said that the addresses had to be stated because it was necessary to check if the offices and the representative were really there. Mr Smibert said that there might be a problem if I.A.F. did not know the address that was correct. But, as Mr Rogers insisted, it was a different issue as to whether it was necessary those addresses to be stated there. Dr Goldsbury said that it might be a way to add simply something like an official address of the organization. Mr Smibert said that the permanent address should be stated there because there might be a case when an address might be changed. Mr Dragt said that the provision would come into request because IAF had to check whether the organization that was applying

for IAF Membership existed or not. Dr Goldsbury answered that the address was not for checking because an organization which was applying for membership had Hombu recognition, and Hombu Dojo had checked it already. Mr Smibert said that Australia did not find necessity to continue discussion any further concerning the matter. Mr Leotte from Portugal (an observer) requested the chairman to speak, which was permitted. He thought that no applicant would write a false address because the applicant was applying for the Membership not for IAF's sake but for its own benefit.

13.12. Mr Rogers said that it was stated in the Article 3.2.1.d) that 'copies of the applicant's balance sheet and accounts, which give accurate and adequate information of the applicant's financial state;' but he felt it not necessary to submit such an internal documents. He proposed that 'the applicant will provide adequate evidence of correct financial procedures;' would be enough. He thought it too much. Dr Goldsbury suggested that it could be altered as 'documents which gives accurate and adequate information about the applicant's financial procedures.' Mr Leotte said that what IAF needed was applicant's financial situation; he had heard the IAF treasurer's report the day before and he felt that the report accurately stated the financial state of the IAF. Therefore, he thought what IAF needed was information of the same kind. He felt that balance sheet only for the last one or two years would do. Mr. Rogers said that all IAF wanted to know was the applicant's financial state, so if IAF could get necessary information about it, that would be enough. Mr Dragt said that in Netherlands Dutch public organizations had obligations to present the balance sheets, and that was not a private information at all, so he did not think that IAF was asking too much. Mr Leotte said that balance sheet for the past two years were required in Portugal. Mr Isoyama said that a simple financial report would be available; he felt that a detailed balance sheet would be not necessary. Dr Goldsbury answered that the reason he asked it was that the organization was not run for iniquitous purposes. Mr Veneri said that those were not controversial parts of the Statutes and that the meeting was discussing for two long hours. Mr Rogers suggested that '*for example, balance sheet*' should be put in. Mr Stenudd said that there would be no problem because those were what IAF to decide. He felt no necessity of changing the words of the draught. Mr Dragt felt that everything should be accurately stated otherwise there might be a possibility that deeper private things should be required. Dr Goldsbury answered that there would be no problem because there was a private school in Hiroshima where he was a committee member, and parents seeking financial assistance were required to present documents to show their financial state according to the judgment of the committee.

13.13. Dr Goldsbury proposed to change the Article 3.2.1. d) as follows and put down his idea on the board. [documents which gives accurate and adequate information about the applicant's financial procedures.]

<There was no objection concerning the change proposed by the General Secretary.>

13.14. Mr Stenudd proposed concerning the Article 3.2.1.e) that it should be altered as [list of the applicant's affiliated dojos and the total number of paid up members at the time of the application;].

<There was no objection concerning the alternation proposed by the Mr Stenudd.>

13.15. Mr Rogers proposed concerning the Article 3.2.1.f) that it should be changed as 'a list of all the persons in the organization who have dan ranks registered by the Aikikai Foundation, in each case indicating the rank, when and from whom each rank was received;' which was put down on the board by Dr Goldsbury. Mr Rogers continued and said that when and from whom each rank was received might be omitted because they were unnecessary. Mr Asai's opinion was that when and from whom each dan was received' should be clearly stated, for when and from whom was sure to be recorded in the International Yudansha Card, if the dan was registered at Hombu,. Mr Rogers thought that it would be OK as Asai Sensei recommended.

13.16. Mr Veneri said that it was already four o'clock then, but he proposed the Congress to continue the discussion till the Article three would be finished, which was approved by the congress.

13.17. Dr Goldsbury announced that the discussion would be moved to the Article 3.2.1.g).

13.18. Mr Veneri asked if there were any points concerning the Article 3.2.1.g), which was answered by silence. The Article 3.2.1.g) was approved by silence.

13.19. Mr Goldsbury moved to the Article 3.2.1.h) and announced that the words of [application for] were omitted from the Article 3.2.1.h) of the draught. The Article 3.2.1.h) was approved by a voice from the floor 'fine'.

13.20. Mr Veneri moved to the Article 3.3., which was approved by silence.

13.21. Mr Veneri moved to the Article 3.4., which was approved by silence.

13.22. Dr Goldsbury moved to the article 3.5.,and was approved by silence.

13.22.1. Mr Cottier confirmed whether the words of [**and general secretary**] were kept. Dr Goldsbury answered in the affirmative.

13.23. Dr Goldsbury said that the next question was how to approve the Article 3. He asked the congress if they vote, to which affirmative answers returned from the floor. He continued and said, however, that to approve it and when it would come into force was a separate question. Mr Rautila was of the opinion that it should come into force after the whole Statutes was finished. Dr Goldsbury remarked that this discussion was needed because if that happened the New Statutes would not come into force even after 2,000 AD. As he had written in Introduction, the present Statutes was a sort of hybrid consisted of old and new provisions. Mr Veneri observed that it took two hours to discuss about Article 3.,and that it was not a controversial one. He hoped that everything should be finished as soon as possible because he would not be the IAF Chairman any longer the next day. He added that America was founded in two months and France in a week. Mr Cottier said that it would be difficult to say when the Statutes would come into force, nobody really knew when the whole Statutes would have been finished. He said that it was most important how much progress we could make. Mr Stenudd was of the same opinion with Mr Cottier. He said that if the Article 3 was changed and approved, then the new one would take the place in the old Statutes.

<Many voices from the floor agreed to his opinion.>

13.24. Mr Smibert spoke the following, not as Australian delegate, but as a Vice-Chairman; he believed that it was a good thing to consider and discuss how IAF should be in the future, and it was also very useful to think deeply about those proposals which had come from Tamura Shihan and Yamada Shihan. However, they were separate from what should be done at that moment. IAF had decided to improve. A lot of work had been done so far in working groups and those provisions were carefully looked into spending a lot of time and energy. He believed that it was of no use

analysing and discussing what had been done there. The General Assembly had made a choice of making a change. Of course there was another choice of re-organising the Organization, but, as he believed, the best way was to improve the IAF as was decided. He suggested that when something was decided, then it had to come into effect immediately.

13.25. Mr Wan from Hong Kong stated that he was of the same opinion with Mr Stenudd. He thought that the Article 3, which was particularly concerned to the admission of new members, had to come into effect as soon as possible.

13.26. Mr Leotte said that everybody was here in order to do the best to solve the problems; the meeting would be not successful if he could not go home without any decision. As everyone had come there spending a lot of money, the problems had to be solved, even if it should become late in the evening. As for the legal points, he proposed that in case that new articles did not match with those of old, the new articles should be given priority to the old ones.

13.27. Mr Humbilla from Philippine expressed his opinion that the discussion should be started from the articles that were controversial, as there was not enough time.

13.28. Mr Stenudd proposed that the Article 3 should be put to the vote.

13.29. The vote on the Article 3 was taken by roll call, each member expressing yes or no.

13.30. Article 3. was approved by 23 votes in favour and 1 against.

13.31. Mr Somemiya from Hombu questioned if the result fulfilled the majority required by the Statutes. Dr Goldsbury, after having read out the provision concerned, answered that it did, because the majority required by the Statutes was two thirds of the voting members present. He declared that the Article 3 was approved.

13.32. Mr Dragt asked when the Article 3 would come into effect; because there was a proposal from 5 persons stating that it should come into effect immediately. Mr Heuscher proposed that it should come in to effect from that day. Dr Goldsbury said that there was no problem in voting, but that there would be another problem if it should come into effect on the day, because the Organizations that requested for the Membership to this Congress had made their documents subject to the old Statutes. It seemed to him, therefore, that it was reasonable that the Statutes took effect after the Congress, which he proposed by himself.

13.34. Mr Veneri stated that the vote would be taken on the proposal. <i.e.: the old Statutes would be adopted till the end of the congress and the new one would take effect from the end of the Congress.> Mr Veneri asked those who were in favour of the proposal to show their hands. The resolution was adopted by 20 in favour, which was the majority.

13.35. Mr Stenudd said that thing would make good progress if the working group would work hard this evening.

<Mr Veneri closed the meeting>

October 5th (Saturday), 1996

3.10. Roll call

1) Argentina (proxy to Brazil)	11)	Germany	21)	Netherlands
2) Australia	12)	Hong Kong	22)	New Zealand
3) Belgium	13)	Ireland	23)	Philippines
4) Brazil	14)	Italy	24)	Poland
5) Britain	15)	Japan	25)	Scotland
6) Canada (absent)	16)	Luxembourg (proxy to USA)	26)	Singapore
7) Chile	17)	Macao	27)	Sweden
8) R.O.C.	18)	Malaysia	28)	Switzerland (proxy to Germany)
9) Finland	19)	Mexico	29)	USA
10) France	20)	Monaco	30)	Uruguay

3.11. Dr Goldsbury announced that 29 countries were present.

Observers

31) Czech Rep.	35) (B)	39) Saipan
32) Paraguay	36) South Africa	40) Hungary
33) Portugal	37) Canary Islands (absent)	41) Columbia (absent)
34) Slovakia (A)	38) Panama	

15. Decision on Date and Location of the 1998 IAF Directing Committee Meeting; Decision on Date and Location of the IAF Congress in 2000.

15.1. Mr Veneri confirmed that the Items 15.,16. and 17. of the Agenda would be discussed on the day as it was decided on the first day of the Assembly; and that the business would be proceeded to the Item 15. Goldsbury requested that no business other than Item 15. might be discussed there. Mr Veneri stated Date and Location of the IAF Directing Committee Meeting to be held in 1998 had to be taken decision and he questioned if there was any country that wanted to organise. Arikawa Shihan offered that it should be organised by Japan. Mr Veneri thanked Arikawa Shihan and stated that the Date and Location of the 1998 IAF Directing Committee Meeting were approved without discussion, which was approved by applause.

15.2. Mr Veneri stated that Date and Location of the 2000 IAF Congress had to be discussed. Mr Arikawa offered that it should be held it in Japan. Mr Veneri expressed his gratitude for the proposal made by Arikawa Shihan. Dr Goldsbury stated that Japan had offered to hold the next Congress in Japan, and that it was stated in the Statutes that the Congress would be held normally in Japan unless any other Federation made an offer, he said that he would be very happy if Japan should take on the Congress, if nobody offered.

15.3. Arikawa Shihan said: a decision that Congress would be hosted by Japan had been made by a certain congress meeting, though he did not remember when; and Japan was answering the decision because they paid respect it. The 6th Congress, which was held four years before, had taken place in Taipei according to the offer made by Mr Lee, the

R.O.C. President. Mr Arikawa said that he should be happy if a Federation would inform him beforehand proposing that it wanted to host a Congress when it had such an intention. He did not mean to insist that a congress should be held in Japan all the time. However, he believed that it was very good to hold Congress in Japan because Doshu was in Japan, and Japan was the Home of Aikido; it was also a very good place to hold Congress from the point of view of strengthening the relationship between the father and son which had become one of the topics the day before.

15.4. Tada Shihan from Italy proposed to hold the next Congress also at the Katsu'ura Budo Training Centre, because it was one of the most convenient for holding both meetings and seminars simultaneously. Dr Goldsbury answered that it was possible.

16. The Election of officers for period of 1996 to 2000.

16.1. Mr Veneri stated that the item would proceed to 16 and the election of the officers for the period of 1996 to 2000 would be made.

16.2. Mr Okuyama requested to speak saying that he would make a Statement before they went on, which was allowed by the Chairman. Mr Okuyama stated that the representative from USA had lots of discussions among themselves and also back in the States since afternoon the day before, and it was decision of USA that United States withdrew from IAF. He added that he, unfortunately, did not have any paper with him then, the official letter would be sent to the IAF later. Mr Veneri expressed his regret over Mr Okuyama's statement, but he showed his sympathy stating that the position of USAF was different from the actual IAF structure, over which he did not want to discuss; he, stating that he was very sorry for that it occurred at the last moment of his chairmanship, sincerely hoped that USAF would come back to the IAF soon. He added that USAF would be welcomed anytime and anywhere.

<Mr Okuyama went out of the meeting room.>

16.3. Mr Veneri, after holding consultation with Dr Goldsbury, questioned the meeting how the proxy of Luxembourg which USAF had been standing for should be dealt with. He explained that proxy could not be transferred; and he asked the Members to give their opinions. Mr Stenudd observed that it was an extraordinary situation, so the proxy must be paid respect. Mr Veneri agreed with Mr Stenudd and moved that the proxy from Luxembourg go to Monaco.

Dr Goldsbury thought that Luxembourg was a full member and it had the right to be represented at the Congress; Luxembourg had given the proxy to USAF, which had withdrawn; Luxembourg had not known that; so it was reasonable that Luxembourg should be allowed, in some sense, to transfer it again because the situation was very unusual. He said, however, that the Congress had to make the final decision. He asked the Congress if they had any objections.

<Voices were heard from the floor saying 'no.'>

16.4. Mr Veneri said that Monaco would vote also for Luxembourg.

16.5. Mr Veneri stated again that the business would proceed to the election of IAF Officers for the period of 1997 to 2000, and read out the names of the candidates; Mr Goldsbury from Britain and Mr Yonemochi from Japan for the Chairman; Mr Manuel Sera from Uruguay, Mr Delhomme from France, Mr Fukakusa from Japan, Mr Lee from ROC, Mr Leisinger from Germany and Mr Rautila Finland; Mr Rojo from Chile, Mr Smibert from Australia, Mr Tohei from USA and Mr Verona from Italy for the Vice-Chairmen. Then he announced that Mr Somemiya from Japan and Mr Stenudd from Sweden for the General Secretary; Mr Ishihara who was proposed from Japan and Ireland for the General Treasurer.

16.6. Dr Goldsbury notified that the election would be done four stages: first, Chairman; then, Vice-Chairman and then General Secretary. He invited Arikawa Shihan to speak according to his request. Arikawa Shihan stated that All Japan Aikido Federation would withdraw the candidate Mr Yonemochi who was put up by Japan. Mr Veneri confirmed that the candidate for the Chairman was Dr Goldsbury; and he stated that he could conduct the election because he was not seeking re-election for any office. Dr Goldsbury stated that all the voting for election should be by secret vote, in the way it had been done the day before.

16.6.1. Mr Veneri announced that result of voting was 27 YES votes and 1 null vote. He declared that Dr Goldsbury was elected the Chairman.

16.7. Dr Goldsbury, the newly elected Chairman, made a short statement, saying, he had been involved with the IAF since 1982 or '83; so he had some experience of the problems and or possibilities. Of course he would say in Japanese: Korekara gambaritai to omoi-masu (I will do my best); then he expressed his hearty gratitude to his predecessor, Mr Veneri, for being good friend and strong supporter for the time he had been the General Secretary. He hoped that Mr Veneri, in some sense, would continue.

16.8. Mr Veneri surrendered the Chair to Dr Goldsbury in applause.

16.9. Dr Goldsbury, the new Chairman, before the election to be continued, made a short statement about the withdrawal of the US Federation. He read out the following provision of the Statutes: Those National Federations or National Organizations which have given notice of their resignation in a letter sent to the Chairman of the IAF on the strength of a decision made at their General Meeting will no longer belong to the IAF; and, he said that USAF, so far, had expressed their intention to withdraw but had not officially withdrawn, and, therefore, that they were still a Member. He continued and said that he would be waiting for the letter signed by the Board on the strength of a decision made at their General Meeting. He confirmed that they could still vote and propose candidates.

16.10. Dr Goldsbury said that the election of the Vice-Chairmen would be done in the same way, but he did not know how the election of Vice-Chairmen with ten candidates could be dealt with because nothing was stated in the Statutes how it should be done. He proposed to run the election continent by continent. He stated that he was going to write the names of the candidates on the blackboard, and then the congress would have a short break so that the representatives could have a look and see where they came from. He added that withdrawal, amendments and/or changes could be related before the election.

16.11. Arikawa Shihan stated that the candidate, Mr Motohiro Fukakusa, who was proposed from All Japan Aikido

Federation would be withdrawn.

16.12. Dr Goldsbury wrote the following names of the candidates:

- 1) Mr Lee proposed from ROC for Asia;
- 2) Mr Smibert proposed from Australia for Oceania;
- 3) Mr Tohei proposed from USAF for North America;
- 4) Mr Cela proposed from Uruguay for Central and South America;
- 5) Mr Rojo proposed from Chile for Central and South America;
- 6) Mr Rautila proposed from Ireland for Europe;
- 7) Mr Leisinger proposed from Germany for Europe;
- 8) Mr Verona proposed from Italy for Europe;
- 9) Mr Delhomme proposed from France for Europe.

<A short break>

16.13. Mr Rojo from Chile withdrew his own candidacy stating that Mr Cela from Uruguay was a good candidate for the Central-South America because he had rich and wide experience, whom he also wanted to propose himself.

16.14. Dr Goldsbury said that the election would be done from Asian Area, which had the least candidates. Dr Goldsbury requested Mr Lee to stand up and express his ambition as a candidate for the Vice-Chairman.

16.15. Mr Lee thanked the Members' for their warm support when the previous Congress took place in Taipei, owing to which it had been very successful. He said that he would like to continue his sincere efforts for the future of IAF.

16.16. Dr. Goldsbury announced the result of the election of the Vice-Chairman for Asian Area and said that there were 25 votes in favour, 2 abstentions and 1 vote spoiled. He declared that Mr Lee was elected as Vice-Chairman for Asia.

16.17. Dr Goldsbury invited Mr Smibert to express his ambition. He stated that he would continue to do his best as Vice-Chairman.

16.18. Dr Goldsbury announced that the result of the election for the Vice-Chairman for Oceania was 'yes' 26 votes and 1 'no'; he declared that Mr Smibert was the Vice-Chairman for Oceania.

16.19. Dr Goldsbury stated that the next election would be the Vice-Chairman for North America. He wanted to remind the members that Tohei Sensei was still a valid candidate according to the Statutes because USAF expressed their intention to withdraw their membership from IAF but the official letter was not received by the IAF Chairman. Dr Goldsbury invited Mr Tohei to express his thought.

16.20. Mr Tohei stated that he wanted to make efforts in such a way that USAF would return to IAF as soon as possible, though it might take a year or more. He said that he would do his best. He hoped that IAF would create the atmosphere and/or Statutes so that USAF would be able to return.

16.21. Dr Goldsbury stated that the result of the election for North America was 22 votes in favour, 2 votes against and 2 abstentions. He declared that Tohei Sensei was elected Vice-Chairman.

16.22. Dr Goldsbury stated that the next election would be for the Vice-Chairman for Central-South America and invited Mr Cela to speak. Mr Cela thanked Mr Rojo for his withdrawal of candidacy and stated that he would work hard for the Central-South America.

16.23. Dr Goldsbury stated that the results of the election for the Central-South America were 'yes' 23 in favour, 2 against and 3 abstained. He declared that Mr Cela was the Vice-Chairman for Central-South America.

16.24. Dr Goldsbury announced that the election for the European Continent would be done next. Dr Goldsbury requested each candidate to introduce himself, and appointed Mr Delhomme.

16.25. Mr Delhomme stated that four candidates were nominated from Europe and any of the four would do his best when elected.

16.26. Dr Goldsbury requested Mr Rautila to speak. Mr Rautila said that he was of the opinion with Mr Delhomme. He also believed that any of the four candidates would do the best when elected.

16.27. Dr Goldsbury said that Mr Leisinger was not well and was unable to come to Congress but his wishes to stand for Vice-Chairman had been assured by the delegate from Germany. And he asked if Mr Asai had anything to say on behalf of him, who made no remarks.

16.28. Dr Goldsbury introduced that Mr Verona was the president of the Aikikai Italy, and asked Tada Shihan if he had anything to speak on behalf of him, to which Tada Shihan replied that he had nothing to say.

16.29. Dr Goldsbury requested the voters to write on the vote paper one number, 1, 2, 3, or 4; and begged them to write legibly.

16.30. Dr Goldsbury announced the result of the election: Mr Delhomme had 8 votes, Dr Leisinger had 8 votes, Mr Rautila had 5 votes, Mr Verona had 5 votes and there were 2 spoiled votes. He stated that the election was not valid because there were 30 votes for 28 voters. Dr Goldsbury requested to vote once again writing 1,2,3 or 4.

16.31. Dr Goldsbury announced that the election for the European Vice-chairman was unsuccessful again. The result was 10 votes for Mr Delhomme and also 10 votes for Dr Leisinger. He stated that he had the casting vote as the Chairman subject to the Statutes and, therefore, that he would exercise his right as Chairman to give his casting vote to Mr Delhomme. And He declared that Mr Delhomme had been elected as the Vice-Chairman for Europe.

16.32. Dr Goldsbury declared that the Vice-Chairmen would be ranked in the following order according to the number of votes cast for them:

The first Vice Chairman was Mr Smibert from Oceania

The second Vice Chairman was Mr Lee from Asia

The third Vice Chairman was Mr Cela from Central-South America

The fourth Vice Chairman was Mr Tohei from North America

The fifth vice chairman was Mr Delhomme from Europe

4) Brazil	13) Ireland	22) New Zealand
5) Britain	14) Italy	23) Philippines
6) Canada(absent)	15) Japan	24) Poland
7) Chile	16) Luxembourg	25) Scotland
8) ROC	17) Macao	26) Singapore(absent)
9) Finland	18) Malaysia	27) Sweden
10) France	19) Mexico	28) Switzerland
11) Germany	20) Monaco	29) USA(absent)
12) Hong Kong	21) Netherlands	30) Uruguay

Observers

31) Czech Rep.	35) (B)	39) Saipan
32) Paraguay	36) South Africa	40) Hungary
33) Portugal	37) Canary Islands(absent)	41) Columbia
34) Slovakia (A)	38) Panama	

(revision of the Statutes)

13.35. Dr Goldsbury drew attention to the Article 5; A Headquarters; Official Languages; 5.2. and said that the working group suggested that [The Administrative Office of the International Aikido Federation shall be established in the town of residence of the General Secretary.] should be changed as [The Administrative Office of the International Aikido Federation shall be established by the General Secretary.] Mainly because of the difficulty of defining domicile or town or city or village; and [established by] would be easier for General Secretary to establish it according to his/her judgment. He said that the office had been established in his office in Hiroshima; but he could not say where the new Office would be established by the new General Secretary.

13.36. Arikawa Shihaan thought it was not good to define narrowly to the place where individual lived. Dr Goldsbury answered that it was the reason why the phrase was to be cancelled. Mr Somemiya wrote the amended provision of the Article 5.2. of the Statutes on the board and translated it into Japanese. [The administrative Office of the International Aikido Federation shall be established by the General secretary.]

13.37. Dr Goldsbury explained concerning the revised Statutes: B Article 5.3.; Official Language that the provision was the same as that of the present Statutes.

13.38. Mr Veneri thought that the Article 5.3.1. was not necessary. If there were three official languages, IAF would be obliged to do everything in those three languages. Dr Goldsbury showed his intention of adding an item, the Article 5.3.3. which stated [The language of official documents shall be English and Japanese].

13.39. Mr Rojo wished the Spanish language to be included as one of the official one. Mr Stenudd presumed that there would be strong sentiments to have French in the official languages. Dr Goldsbury feared that four official languages would put a very heavy burden on the IAF in translation. He said it would make it impossible the Chairman and General Secretary to carry out the Statutes. Mr Veneri said it would be practical to use the English and Japanese as the official language as it had been done for the last 20 year.

13.40. Dr Goldsbury proposed that the provisions in the Article 5 should be put on vote. On the condition that the Article 5.3.1. should be kept, and that the Article 5.3.3. should be added.

13.41. Mr Isoyama requested to speak as the Technical Councillor. He said that different countries had different cultures and different languages, and he understood that it was difficult to come to agreement; but the more the official languages were, the more the practical difficulties would be caused. He asked the Members to be patient until the IAF would be richer.

13.42. Mr Delhomme demanded as the delegate from France that the French language should be kept from the point of view that it was the language which could express the things most precisely. Mr Smibert believed that every efforts to provide other languages had to be made, but that was another matter that could come back again. Nevertheless, he thought, as a Vice-Chairman, that it was practical for the IAF to limited the official languages within the two considering the circumstances that IAF was in. Mr Dragt said that they were at all times at disadvantage because his country was a small one that had a small population of only 14,000,000. Therefore, he believed that the matter of translation was that Members should take care of themselves; his opinion was that the official language should be two: English and Japanese. Mr Rogers remarked that they were not talking whether French should be cancelled or not. He believed that the matter should be put to the vote if French were to be cancelled.

13.43. Dr Goldsbury proceeded the business to the Article 5 of the Regulation: Headquarters; Official Languages; Communications with Members, and read out the provision of the Section A of the Regulation, 5.1: Headquarters; [All official communication directed to the International Aikido Federation shall be sent to the administrative office, established by the General Secretary.]

13.43.1. Dr Goldsbury continued and said that the Provision of the Article 5..1.1. would be [Communications which have not been sent to the administrative office referred to above, in Paragraph 5.1., shall not be deemed to have been officially received by the International Aikido Federation.] He confirmed that paragraph number was changed; [5.1.1.] in the draught was not needed, and [5.1.2.] in the draught would be numbered [5.1.1.] instead.

13.44. Dr Goldsbury stated that the working group had made no change in page 20 of the Draught. (i.e., Regulation; Article 5; B: Official Languages, paragraph 5.2. through C: Communications, paragraph 5.4.2.). And he asked the members to read them through.

13.45. Arikawa Shihaan said that Article 5; B: 5.3. of the Statutes read as ‘The spirit, techniques and certain official texts of Aikido shall be written in Japanese.’; however, it was stated in the Article 5; B: 5.2. of the Regulation that ‘Notwithstanding the provisions of the Statutes, Paragraph 5.3., above, in the event of a dispute between one of other of the official languages, the English version shall prevail.’ He questioned if they meant that English prevailed in those

matters concerning spirit and/or techniques of the Aikido.

13.46. Dr Goldsbury replied that 5.3. of the Statutes did not conflict with 5.2.1. of the Regulation. He said that the Statutes were originally written in English, therefore, English would prevail in the event of a dispute.

13.47. Arikawa Shihan proposed that the phrase something like 'except for the spirit and techniques' should be placed before the paragraph 5.2.1.

13.48. Dr Goldsbury agreed with Mr Arikawa and said that 5.2.1. would be modified as follows, and put the new paragraph on the board: [Except for the provisions of the Statutes, paragraph 5.3. above, concerning the spirit, techniques and certain official texts of Aikido, in the event of a dispute between one or other of the official languages, the English version shall prevail.]

13.49. Arikawa Shihan asked what 'certain official documents' meant. Dr Goldsbury did not know, either; he said that the existing Statutes had that phrase and, therefore, he had not changed it. Arikawa Shihan said that all the documents issued by Hombu would be written in Japanese; they were official documents and they were the originals; English should not prevail there; English versions were not originals. But as to other documents, it did not matter in whichever language they might be written. Mr Delhomme said that an official document could not be changed by translation, in what language it might be written. The official documents, therefore, meant some documents that could not be changed.

13.50. Arikawa Shihan said that International Regulations issued by Hombu, for instance, were official Documents and they could not be changed by translation. He continued and said that the IAF Statutes were originally written in English, but the original of International Regulations issued by Hombu was written in Japanese; of which the both are official documents. He said, therefore, that he could not agree the expression of '*certain documents*' because it was vague. He believed that it should be clearly stated as 'the documents issued by Hombu.'

13.51. Mr Smibert proposed to change 5.2.1. as [Except for the provisions of the Statutes, paragraph 5.3. above, concerning the spirit, techniques and certain official texts of Aikido including official documents issued by Hombu Dojo, in the event of dispute between one or other of the official languages, the English language will prevail.]

13.52. Mr Dragt thought, concerning official documents which was written in one of the official languages, that the language in which the document originally written should prevail. Dr Goldsbury explained that if a document was originally written in Japanese, of course Japanese would prevail; but he would write official documents as IAF Chairman, and they would be translated into Japanese, in which case, not Japanese but English ones, which were originally written, had to be the official documents; 5.3.1. presupposed such cases and it had nothing to do with the spirit and/or techniques of Aikido.

13.53. Mr Delhomme said that documents which came from outside IAF could not be ruled by those provisions; those provisions would only rule texts inside IAF.

13.54. Arikawa Shihan said that he could understand what Mr Delhomme said; but it was not right, as he believed, that the IAF Statutes should include something that could be understood from its context that English prevailed even in the spirit and/or techniques of the Aikido.

13.55. Dr Goldsbury wrote the 5.2.1. of the Regulation, which Mr Somemiya translated into Japanese. [Regulation 5.2.1.; Except for the provisions of the Statutes, paragraph 5.3. above, concerning the spirit, techniques and certain official texts of Aikido, including official documents issued by Hombu Dojo, in the event of dispute between one or other of the official languages, the English language will prevail.][5.2.1..2; 5.3..3.]

13.56. The Congress approved both the English version and the Japanese version.

<the business proceeded to Regulation, C: Communication>

13.57. Dr Goldsbury explained that from 5.3. to 5.4.2. of the Regulation were provisions which concerned with communication.

13.58. Mr Dragt proposed the following two concerning 5.3.: (1) 'properly delivered' should be 'properly dispatched'; (2) 'or Assistant General Secretary' should be removed, which were approved by silence.

13.59. Dr Goldsbury stated that 5.4.2. dealt with giving nominations for candidates; and that the nominations of candidates, or giving nomination for official posts of federation officials, were regulated by Article 11.; therefore, it was stated that those important mails had to be sent by telegram, telefax, or registered air mail and so on; he added that, in some situations, of course, they were handed to the General Secretary.

13.60. Dr Goldsbury read out 11.18.2. of the Regulation in connection to the 5.4.2.; of which the Japanese translation was read out by Mr Somemiya. He explained that the provision dealt with such a situation when no nominations were received for particular post. (It was pointed out that 11.18.2. was wrongly numbered as 11.11. in the Japanese version, which was corrected.)

13.61. Dr Goldsbury asked if there were any questions or objections concerning those provisions.

<Neither questions, nor objections were heard from the floor.>

13.62. Dr Goldsbury stated that whole of Article 5, including Statutes and Regulation, would be put to vote, if there were no opinions or objections or comments.

13.62.1. The Article five of the Statutes and Regulation was approved by 24 in favour to no objection.

13.63. Dr Goldsbury said that the new version would be sent out to the Members as soon as possible. He wanted to go through the Article 11 at that Congress but it was impossible to go on, because that Article was the longest one in the Statutes, and it was already 15:45 then. He requested the Members that he would like to ask the Congress for its opinion about the rest part of the revision, and, also, how it should be proceeded.

13.64. Mr Stenudd said that he would appreciate if the working group would continuously go on taking care of the job of revising the Statutes after the Congress.

13.65. Dr Goldsbury said that the revision would be done also at the next Congress. He observed that *the 1998 IAF Directing Committee would be a good target, if the acceptable revision could not be made at the 7th Congress* as it was suggested by him in the Introduction of the Fourth Version.

13.66. Dr Goldsbury asked the Congress if they wanted to hold the general meeting that evening from 20:00 to 22:00, and requested those who wanted to meet to show their hands. 11 hands were counted, which failed to meet a

quorum of the general meeting. Dr Goldsbury said, however, that they could meet as a working group and continue making suggestions.

17. Admission of New Members.

17.1. Dr Goldsbury proposed to go through the item 17 of the Agenda: Admission of New Members. He had circulated the documents, which stated precise status of the applicants, in order the matter to be decided at the Congress whether they were admitted members, or not. He stated that the descriptions of the Statutes on the question of membership to be admitted as the member of the IAF was that federations had to have the Recognition by the Aikikai Foundation; and, then, IAF would decide the membership by simple majority. He explained that the five federations in the documents, i.e. organizations from Czech Republic, Paraguay, Portugal, Slovakia, and South Africa, could be admitted.

17.2. Dr Goldsbury started with Czech Rep. and said that he had received the application from Czech Rep., which met all the conditions for the membership and possible to be put to vote.

17.3. Isoyama Shihan wanted to have some information about the Czech Aikido Association, such as numbers of dojos members and else. Dr Goldsbury answered that Czech Aikido Association had received Hombu Recognition on 8th April, 1994, that the Technical Advisor was Masatomi Ikeda Shihan, that there were 30 Dojos and that it had 900 members. He added that Mr Veneri was one of the founders of Czech Aikido.

17.4. Mr Dragt said that some information available should be presented to the Congress as Isoyama Sensei had said. But for that time it would be better to trust the fact that they had Hombu recognition. Dr Goldsbury replied that he was also aware of it. However, he added what he could say there was that those five organizations had Hombu Recognition and that Hombu Dojo had already examined them carefully.

17.5. Dr Goldsbury requested those who accept the Czech Aikido Association to membership to show their hands. The result was 22 in favour and none against. He declared that Czech Aikido Association was a Member.

17.6. Dr Goldsbury said that the second one was Paraguay. And related that Paraguayan Association of Aikido had received Recognition from Hombu Dojo in 1994. And he requested Miyazawa Shihan of Argentina, who was instructing there, to give information concerning the Association. To which he replied that it had 4 dojos and 100 members. Mr Dragt asked if there were not any other Aikido organizations in Paraguay. Dr Goldsbury was not sure about it. Mr Rojo replied that they were the only one, as he believed.

17.7. Dr Goldsbury requested those who were against the affiliation of Paraguayan Association of Aikido to raise their hands. There was none against. Dr Goldsbury declared that Paraguayan Association of Aikido was a member.

17.8. Dr Goldsbury requested the representative from Portuguese to make brief statements introducing themselves. Mr Leotte spoke on behalf of Mr Antunes, the President of Federação Portuguesa de Aikido. He stated that it had received Hombu Recognition in 1993, that they had 25 dojos, that there were 700 practitioners and that their Technical Advisor was Tamura Shihan.

17.9. Dr Goldsbury requested those who were not in favour of affiliating Federação Portuguesa de Aikido to IAF to raise their hands. There was none against. Dr Goldsbury declared that Federação Portuguesa de Aikido was a member.

<The discussion proceeded to Slovakia.>

17.10. Dr Goldsbury stated that the Slovak Aikido Federation had 8 dojos and 220 members according to the file he had, and that Technical Director was Ikeda Sensei. in the document, but that it had 120 members according to the information he had. He, however, drew attention to the fact that there was another Aikido group in the country, which was not recognised by Hombu, and the group was represented at that Congress as an observer.

17.11. Mr Dragt asked if that non-recognised group had applied Hombu for Recognition. Dr Goldsbury questioned the Assembly if an observer should be allowed to speak; which was agreed by silence. The representative from the non-recognised group, Mr Holeinya, stated that they had approximately 1,000 members in 6 large cities in their country, and that he came to Japan for the first time as the representative from that group. He said that they had no direct contact with IAF or Hombu up to that time, but that they desired to have Hombu Recognition as soon as possible and to become a member of IAF.

17.12. Dr Goldsbury said that the other group which had Hombu Recognition was not represented at the Assembly because they were on their way to Japan. Therefore he requested the proxy of the group to make statements on behalf of them. Mr Heuscher, who was the representative from Switzerland, spoke on behalf of the group and said that the best way was that those two groups should try to be united and establish a unified Federation. Mr Dragt questioned if the two groups were willing to be united and/or making any efforts to be united, or if there were any proposal in order to be united. Mr Heuscher replied that he had no information about the communication between the two groups. Mr Sugano asked if the non-recognised group had receiving supervision or instruction from any particular Japanese instructor. Mr Holenia answered that their Shihan was Tamura Sensei.

17.13. Mr Stenudd thought that Hombu Dojo Recognition was not exclusively given to one organization in a country. He said, therefore, that there might be a case that Recognition might be given to plural organization as he understood.

17.14. Dr Goldsbury said that what he could simply state was that the Federation whose director was Ikeda Sensei had applied the request for affiliation for IAF and that the Federation had Hombu Recognition. He thought that he could not deny the request sent; and that the matter should be put to the vote.

17.15. Mr Stenudd thought it was not necessary to discuss whether there were two or more organizations that had Recognition. IAF demanded a member had to have Hombu Recognition to allow membership, however, that did not automatically mean membership. He stressed the Assembly had to know whether the organization which would be allowed membership was the proper representative of the country.

17.16. Dr Goldsbury said that he understood what Mr Stenudd said. He stated that there were two things we had to think over, one was whether to decide on that application or not; the other was whether to accept or object that application.

17.17. Mr Dragt could understand what Chairman said; but he believed that it was not good to accept on the ground

that an organization had Recognition. Things had to be studied carefully by the Congress itself. He said that Congress could decide if it was certain that the Aikikai would not give Recognition to the other group.

17.18. Mr Cottier said that he did not know whether to say yes or no because there was little information. He thought also that it had been irresponsible of IAF that it should have been giving admission only on condition that an organization had recognition.

17.19. Mr Rogers thought that IAF's situation was that it was not in the position, because it did not have a policy dealing with that situation, and, therefore, that IAF could not decide. He suggested that the vote should not be taken on the matter, but that some recommend should be made by IAF so that the both groups get together through Tamura Sensei and Ikeda Sensei. He also suggested that it would be one of the items at the next Directing Committee how to formulate a policy dealing with that situation and avoid conflict.

17.20. Asai Shihan believed that the matter had been discussed at the Directing Committee Meeting and Directing Committee had already approved the application, which he guessed because their names were found in the documents which were circulated.

17.21. Dr Goldsbury answered that a Directing Committee Meeting had not been held concerning the matter and these federations had not been admitted membership at the Directing Committee Meeting held in 1994, for the application for these Federations had not been in the Agenda. He said that the Statutes stated that Directing Committee could give provisional membership, however, it was also stated that Congress could also elect membership directly.

17.22. Mr Veneri related the rather complicated historical background, why it should have come to exist two federations in the country. He said that there was only one organization called Czechoslovakian Aikido Association, whose Technical Advisor was Ikeda Sensei, when Czech and Slovakia was one country under the name of Czechoslovakia. In 1993, Czechoslovakia separated into two, and two countries, Czech Republic and Slovak Republic were founded; but the former Czechoslovakian Aikido Association remained and had been active even after the separation under the name of *Slovenska Aikido Asociacia*, which was the one in question. He continued that another group was established after the separation, whose delegate was present at the Congress as an observer. But he believed from those historical backgrounds that Slovenska Aikido Asociacia had the right to have the IAF membership as the successor of the Czechoslovakian Aikido Association

17.23. Mr Heuscher said on behalf of the Slovenska Aikido Asociacia that it had been receiving instruction by Ikeda Shihan in succession to the Czecho-Slovakia Aikido Association: it had received new Hombu Recognition as the organization in their country and had affiliated EAF in 1994. He stressed that Slovenska Aikido Asociacia should be accepted as Mr Veneri had stated, although he did not know whether the other organization had requested for Hombu Recognition or not.

17.24. Dr Goldsbury stated that he would stop the discussion on the question then, but it would be discussed by the newly elected Direct Committee Members at the Directing Committee Meeting which would be held that evening; he would ask also for the advice of Superior Councillors there, when the opinions stated by Messrs Veneri and Heuscher would be referred to. He said that he would come back to the Congress the following day with the results of the discussed of the Directing Committee Meeting

17.25. Dr Goldsbury proposed that the request from South African Aikido Federation should be discussed before the Congress being closed, because there was no other groups in South Africa and the situation was quite simple there. He requested to speak on behalf of them.

17.26. Mr Veneri said that he had visited South Africa in 1995 and got the following information. He stated that they had 14 dojos with approximately 800 members, but one should be aware that South Africa was so large a country that cities were isolated and it was, sometimes, some 1,000 kilometres from one dojo to another. He said that they had the Governing Board of which the members were regularly elected; that the Chairman was Mr Solven.

17.27. Mr Dragt thought that the situation again, had to be studied with more information before they came to the decision. He proposed that the situation should be also studied at the Directing Committee that evening.

17.28. Dr Goldsbury asked if there were any objections to the proposal. He closed the meeting because no objection was heard.

<the meeting was closed at 17:10>

October 6 (Sunday), 1996

3.14. Roll call

1) Argentina	13) Ireland	24) Poland
2) Australia	14) Italy	25) Scotland
3) Belgium (proxy to Australia)	15) Japan	26) Singapore
4) Brazil	16) Luxembourg (proxy to Monaco)	27) Sweden
5) Britain	17) Macao	28) Switzerland (proxy to Germany)
6) Canada (absent)	18) Malaysia (absent)	29) USA(absent)
7) Chile	19) Mexico	30) Uruguay
8) R.O.C.	20) Monaco	(new members)
9) Finland (proxy to Sweden)	21) Netherlands	31) Czech Republic (absent)
10) France	22) New Zealand	32) Paraguay
11) Germany	23) Philippines	33) Portugal
12) Hong Kong		

Observers

34) Slovakia (A)	37) Canary Islands	40) Hungary
35) (B)	38) Panama	41) Columbia
36) South Africa	39) Saipan	

3.15. Mr Somemiya announced that 30 countries were present (including proxies).

17.29. Dr Goldsbury announced that the item 17 of the Agenda, **Admission of New IAF Members**, would be discussed.

17.30. Dr Goldsbury stated that the Directing Committee had a meeting the evening before and that the point of discussion at the meeting was application of Slovenska Aikido Asociacia, and he asked Mr Smibert, the first vice-chairman to report the results of the meeting.

17.31. Mr Smibert stated that the following was the recommendation of the Directing Committee: Because of the current Regulations, given the current Regulations, and the precedents set by previous recognitions, we believe that there is ground to recognise the Slovenska Aikido Asociacia. Point number 2: The other group is encouraged to seek Hombu Dojo Recognition. Point 3: If in the future, there are two recognised Organizations, there are two possibilities. It is possible that the IAF will change the Regulation, and it is possible that the change may allow two Representative Organizations for one country. On the other had, the Regulation might not change. At which time, it will be an issue to be discussed at the Congress how the Organization to be dealt with.

17.32. Dr Goldsbury proposed that the application of the Slovenska Aikido Asociacia should be put to vote.

17.32.1. Slovenska Aikido Asociacia was accepted as a member by 24 votes in favour, none against and 4 abstention. Dr Goldsbury declared that Slovenska Aikido Asociacia was a Member of the IAF.

17.33. Dr Goldsbury advised the Congress to vote on the admission of the Aikido Federation of South Africa and he proposed a vote by roll call because there was no controversial situation.

17.34. Mr Tamura asked the representative of the group that was not admitted to stand up. He asked the representative if the group admitted was his group or not. To which the representative replied 'no'. Then Mr tamura asked the Congress if it recognised the situation.

17.35. Dr Goldsbury insisted that the election had been done and it had finished.

17.36. Mr Tamura said that he wanted to make sure whole the Congress to understand that it was not the group of the representative that was admitted.

17.37. Dr Goldsbury proceeded to the vote on the Aikido Federation of South Africa, and asked if there were any objection to South Africa. Dr Goldsbury confirmed that there was no objection, and declared that the Aikido Federation of South Africa was a Member of the IAF.

17.38. Mr Isoyama asked who was the advisor of the federation. Mr Veneri replied that he, himself, was the Technical Director.

17.39. Dr Goldsbury stated that the Directing Committee did not propose to admit more members at that Congress, because none of the other federations seeking membership had Hombu Recognition. He added that the next occasion of granting membership of the IAF would be, the possible granting of Provisional Membership at the next Directing Committee Meeting in 1998.

14. Presentation of Auditor's Report; Approval of Accounts and Balance sheet for Period 1992-1996; Approval of Budget for Period of 1996- 2000; Decision on IAF Membership Fee for Period of 1996-2000.

14.1. Dr Goldsbury proceeded to the item number 14 of the Agenda. He said that the first item was the *Presentation of Auditor's report* and that the Auditors had been working for the previous four days on the accounts. He requested the Auditors to report.

14.2. Mr Boscagli, who was the Auditor, requested Dr Goldsbury to interpret for him because he wanted to speak in French, but he refused because he was not an interpreter. Mr Delhomme translated for Mr Boscagli.

14.3. Mr Boscagli stated that they had examined the books, accounts and papers by sampling at random because it was difficult to check everything. He reported that no question could have been found by them. But he said that they had found some trouble in checking the bills because they were not kept in chronological order, though book keeping was very well done. He gave advice towards the next period that the bills should be arranged in the same order as stated in the books so that it might be easier for the next Auditor to examine.

14.4. Mr Ishihara answered that he understood what Mr Boscagli said, and that he would keep the books for the future in the understanding that the Auditors might not be professional accountants.

14.5. Dr Goldsbury thanked the Auditors for the very important job they had done.

14.6. Dr Goldsbury stated that the next item was *Approval of Accounts and Balance sheet for Period 1992-1996*, and he asked if there are any questions, comments or opinions from delegates before he asked for votes. Seeing that there were no question, asked the Congress to vote on the *Approval of the Accounts and Balance sheet for Period 1992-1996*.

<the vote was taken by roll call>

14.7. **The Accounts and Balance sheet for Period 1992-1996** was approved by 29 votes in favour and 1 abstention. Mr Goldsbury said that the Accounts and Balance sheets were approved.

14.8. Dr Goldsbury made comments before the business proceeded to the next item, **Approval of Budget for Period of 1996-2000**. He stated that it was the decision of the IAF Directing Committee of 1994 that IAF would participate in the World Games, 1997 which would be held in Lahti, Finland; and the decision was that the cost of participating by each member federation shall be at their own expense, however, that there would be some expenses that IAF had to pay in order to manage preparatory organizations, and these expenses should be included in the budget. He explained, further, that the World Games, 2001 would be held in Japan, though the decision would be made at the General Assembly Meeting. But he believed that the World Games, 2001 would be held in the city of Akita, in the north of Honshu, because Japan was the only candidate. He said, however, that the Hombu Dojo could not participate in the

World Games directly because it was not an international federation, and, therefore, that IAF should participate in the World Games, 2001, and, also, participate in the World Games in Lahti, 1997, as it had already been decided.

14.9. Mr Ishihara asked when the World Games would be held.

14.10. Dr Goldsbury answered that the World games would take place in August and IAF would demonstrate either on 13th or 14th August, that there would be an Aikido demonstration lasting for an hour or an hour and a half for which the Finnish Aikido Federation had already been preparing, and that the Organizers were expecting 60 participants and 10 officials to attend it from IAF. He added that Ueshiba Dojo-cho was expected to demonstrate in the Demonstration.

14.10.1. Dr Goldsbury continued that the participation had been decided by the Directing Committee and approved by the Congress, and, therefore, that the question left at that moment was how the things should be dealt with in the budget. He said that the costs for participation by members, such as transportation and accommodation, had to be borne by each member federation itself as it was decided, but that IAF had to send somebody, which costs must be borne by IAF. And he requested the Treasurer to consider over the situation mentioned above and amend the budget.

14.11. Mr Sugano wanted to reconfirm whether IAF's participation in the World Games was decided by the Congress held in 1992. Dr Goldsbury answered that the decision to take part in the 1993 World Games was made in Taiwan in 1992, and the decision to take part in the 1997 World Games was made at the Directing Committee in 1994, which was approved by the Members on the first day of the Congress. Mr Sugano asked if it was possible to confirm whether everybody had the same understanding. Dr Goldsbury stated that of course it was possible but he did not want to go around the Congress again and confirm what had been decided, for the documents necessary had been circulated; Members had read the decisions, and all the decisions had been approved; it is, therefore, impossible to go back and ask or confirm if the Members had the same understanding.

14.12. Mr Ishihara wanted to know when the budget for the IWGA, 1997 would be decided. Dr Goldsbury answered that he did not know because Delegate of Finland had gone home; but he thought that Mr Rautila would prepare the budget after he got home. Mr Ishihara said that it was impossible for the treasurer to determine the budget without any material. Dr Goldsbury answered that it seemed to him reasonable to look at what happened in the World Games in Karlsruhe. Mr Ishihara stated that the expenditures for the IWGA, 1997 was not included in the budget for the next four years which he presented to the Congress, and, therefore, that once the budget was approved by the Congress, the expenditure for the IWGA, 1997 could not be spent from IAF. He said that it was rather difficult to make a budget for four years, and that he could not include in the budget expenditures uncertain to him or he could not foresee how much it would cost. He added, however, that he could include the budget for IWGA, if the Congress would so decide; or if the Congress decided to commit the final decision to the Directing Committee, that would be one of the solutions.

14.13. Mr Delhomme remarked that he could understand the difficulty to appropriate uncertain expenditure in the budget; he thought, therefore, that only way might be to look at a previous instance. Mr Ishihara explained that there was not a previous instance; and that the expenditure for the IWGA had never been put in the IAF budget. He added that he had not paid the deficit occurred from the IWGA, 1993, which was requested by Netherlands, yet.

14.14. Mr Cottier asked if the World Games had already been informed that the IAF would be participating. Dr Goldsbury answered that he had communicated the decision after the Directing Committee Meeting, but that he had also stated that the financial matters would have to wait until that congress. He explained and said that the preparation for the World Games would take one or two years; but, unfortunately, the World Games always takes place the year after the IAF Congress.

14.15. Mr Wan asked if it was possible to estimate the expense from the cost actually took in 1993 World Games. Dr Goldsbury answered that according to the figure stated in the Report (Treasurer's Report; P6; World Games), ¥1,536,732 was expended at the World Games, but he thought that approximately half a million yen would be a reasonable estimation, if the demonstration would be much smaller. Mr Wan remarked that inflation should be taken into account because the report stated the cost spent in 1993, which was three years before.

14.16. Mr Leotte said that in the budget was included the annual fees from the USAF, which had expressed their intention of withdrawal from IAF the day before. He wanted to know what was the influence of USA's withdrawal and the newly admitted countries in the budget. He asked, secondly, of the a difference of expenses of one million yen between that of 1996 to 1997 and of 1999 to 2000. (Treasurer's Report; P.9; Budget). Mr Ishihara answered that the difference of the damage caused by the USA's withdrawal was \$1,000, which would give IAF some damage, but, since five new countries were admitted, the damage would be covered. He said, secondly, that the amount of income from the Membership fees in the Report was different each year because it was stated according to the actually received amounts; on the other hand, the expenditures in the Budget were stated by the average taken from the actual expenditure for the last four years; and it was made so that income and expenditure might balance on the end of the four years in total; thus, there was difference between the amount stated in the Budget and actual amount.

14.17. Dr Goldsbury thought that it was reasonable at that moment to estimate the cost for the World Games as ¥500,000, despite inflation; he also thought that Congress could decide to allow the 1998 Directing Committee to make the final decision.

14.18. Mr Leotte wanted to know how the delegates from so many countries could demonstrate within one or one and half an hours. He asked if Shihan would also demonstrate at the demonstration. Dr Goldsbury said that the question should be answered by the technical Councillor. Sugano Shihan stated he had heard, that Japanese Shihan had demonstrated so much time in the past that participants from other countries felt not fair. He believed that the time of demonstration in the programme should be allotted equally to the participating countries. Dr Goldsbury said that the actual time span for the demonstrations allotted by the Organising Committee was three hours, on three days; but the number of days and/or the time could be shortened.

14.19. Isoyama Shihan questioned if it was not about the World Games, 1997 to be held in Finland that was discussed at the moment there. <To which Dr Goldsbury replied 'yes.'> Mr Isoyama continued that it was impossible, then, to discuss about the matter at the Directing Committee meeting which would be held in 1998, because the World Games would be over at that time. So, he advised that the things had to be decided at that Assembly. Dr Goldsbury acknowledged the mistake and said that it had to be done at once.

<15 minutes break>

14.20. Dr Goldsbury stated that the financial arrangements for the World Games, 1997 should be solved, but there were some other financial matters which should be solved by the IAF, i.e., those of the World Games, 1993 also had to be managed. IAF, to his knowledge, was not a legal body, and therefore that he had to assume that individual members of the Committee were liable for debts and financial arrangements undertaken by Members, and there was nothing in the Statutes which limited the financial liability of the Directing Committee Members or the President, Doshu. Therefore, he wanted the Congress to be clear that if the argument about the World Games' finances were taken into court, Chairman and President had to answer. As he explained, it was stated in the Statutes that *The Chairman represents the I.A.F. in all through civil actions and is vested with all powers for this purpose*; he was vested with power, but it did not say what kind of power. Dr Goldsbury continued and said that he was a government official; it was, therefore absolutely unacceptable for him to face trial. Therefore, he wanted the Congress to solve the question, and requested Mr Ishihara to include in the budget some one million yen for the World Games, 1997, as he proposed.

14.21. Mr Ishihara answered that it was not he that had proposed one million yen, however, as he was requested, he would re-do the budget. He proposed that one million yen which had been allocated for the Congress of 1996 to 2000 would be transferred to the expense of the World Games, 1997. He added that the budget for the Congress for the period of 1996 to 2000, therefore, would come to be zero.

14.22. Asai Shihan said; when the World Games was held at Karlsruhe, in which IAF participated for the first time, he had organised and prepared everything, but he had not even dreamed of getting any support from IAF; and so he had organised a seminar and paid all the expenditures for the World Games with the income he had got out of it. He wondered why they could not do so in Holland or in Finland.

14.23. Dr Goldsbury explained that he had met Dojo-cho privately and had a talk with Dojo cho on the matter; he told Dojo-cho that Finland Aikikai had requested support from IAF, then Dojo-cho had agreed to demonstrate at World Games and also to do some courses in Finland. He stressed that it was not a Member Federation, but IAF that must organise the Demonstration in the World Games.

14.24. Mr Dragt said that it was almost a miracle that Asai Sensei could have managed to organise it successfully without support of IAF; he thought, however, that IAF should supported it, in principle, because all Federations were not like Asai Sensei's Federation. He stressed that everybody had to realise that it was not the country that decided the place where the World Games to be held; and, therefore, if IAF did not give support to the Member Federation which organise the World Games, the Federation would become a victim of World Games.

14.25. Asai Shihan said that the most important point was that the Congress had made a decision to participate in the World Games and give contribution to the organizer; in spite of the decision, there were those Members which had not paid their share, which was absurd. If there were Members which did not follow the decisions of the Congress, the Congress itself would become meaningless. He wanted to know what the Congress was for. Dr Goldsbury agreed with Asai Shihan and confirmed again that the Members had approved the Minutes of the Congress in Taipei and the decisions taken by the Directing Committee and agreed that financial balance of the World Games in Holland should be paid.

14.26. Dr Goldsbury answered the next question was how it should be paid and added that he had managed to make some sort of provisional arrangement with the Dutch Federation, but he proposed that the discussion about budget for the World Games, 1997 should be made before the payment to the Netherlands was discussed.

14.26.1. Isoyama Shihan stated that it was proposed by the General Treasurer that one million yen which was allocated in the budget as Congress expense for 1997 to 2000 would be transferred to the expenditure for the World Games, 1997, but it seemed for him that it was impossible to do so because the World Games would be held on 13 and 14 in August of 1997. Dr Goldsbury asked if the Congress would approve the proposal amended by the General Treasurer. He asked, also, if the proposal should be put to the vote by asking objections but there was no objection. The budget amended by the Treasurer passed with no objections and 5 abstentions.

14.27. Tamura Shihan proposed that the information about the IWGA had to be circulated among the Members before the Congress, otherwise Members were not able to decide whether they were participating or not.

14.28. Dr Goldsbury announced that the next item was a decision on IAF Membership Fee for the period of 1996 to 2000.

14.29. Dr Goldsbury stated that the list of the IAF Membership Fee which was proposed by the Treasurer at the last Congress, which was on page 26; 16.4.3. of the Minutes of Taipei Congress, would be used also for the period of 1996 to 2000, because there was no particular proposal from the Treasurer. He added that request for report for the number of members in each Member Federation would be sent to the Member Federations later, according to which the invoices would be made.

14.29.1 □ Dr Goldsbury read out the following list of annual fees.

	Number of members		Annual Fee	
	less than 100		100 .US\$	
from	101	to	300	250 .US\$
from	301	to	500	250 .US\$
from	501	to	999	700 .US\$
from	1000	to	4999	1,000 .US\$
from	5000	to	19999	1,500 .US\$
from	20000	to	50000	2,000 .US\$
	more than		2,500 .US\$	

14.30. Mr Leotte remarked that a member in small groups had to pay 1US\$, on the other hand, a member in a large countries would pay only 0.1US\$, which he felt not fair. Mr Veneri said that there was a difference between a small country and a large country, but he thought that it was a very easy system though he did not know of any other system in other organizations. Mr Delhomme thought that it should be corrected in the future. Dr Goldsbury thought that if the annual fee was to be corrected, the discussion should be made at the next Congress; and he requested the congress to vote on the IAF Annual Fee for the period of 1996 to 2000.

14.31. Dr Goldsbury announced that the IAF Annual Fee for the period of 1996 to 2000 as stated in 14.8.1.3. of those minutes. was approved, with 5 abstentions.

18. Any Other Business

18.1. Dr Goldsbury announced that he came to the item 18. of the Agenda: Any Other Business

18.2. Mr Pierre Gullimaldi from France requested to speak. He said that he had a declaration and information, and was allowed to speak for five minutes. Mr Gullimaldi said that he would speak on behalf of Mr G Benzaquein. He was grateful for that he was warmly accepted by the Congress. He stated that he was teaching Aikido in the Federation which was supervised by Tamura Shihan; that the Organization had 28,000 members that included 2,875 dan holders; that they had sent a letter, in September, 1996, to Hombu Dojo and IAF stating that the two Federations in France had been united into one and formed one Federation called Union of Aikido Federation upon the request of French Government, and, therefore, 55,000 French Aikidoists who had been practicing in two separate groups were trying to join together at that moment; however, that a half of them were not represented at the Congress. He expressed his earnest desire that all the Aikidoists would be represented at the IAF Congress in the nearest future, because all the necessary documents had already been sent to Hombu Dojo and IAF.

18.3. Dr Goldsbury said that he had one thing to do as Chairman before he close the Congress. The matter was connected to the outstanding money of the World Games, 1993. He asked Mr Smibert to make the explanation of what had to be suggested to the meeting.

18.4. Mr Smibert said that what he was going to explain had been very carefully negotiated. He asked everybody to listen to him carefully because everything was very delicately provided and it could collapse. First : the decision to participate in the World Games in Netherlands was made at the Taipei Congress; and at that point, the Netherlands Organization understood that they would act on IAF's behalf. Second: the exact nature of the presentation of accounts, statements and figures. There had been problem over the presentation of the papers and everybody had misunderstanding over them. He thought that these papers were made by somebody who was not working at figures and accounts, though he was not critical about it. Mr Smibert was happy for that IAF had the Treasurer like Mr Ishihara who could examine the counts carefully. Third: payment. Some nations had already paid and some had not. Four: whether or not invoices had been received by everybody. And, if an agreement to pay was made, how it should be paid. The final problem to consider was how to move the solution to Congress.

18.5. Mr Ishihara had been confronted with those problems as the IAF Treasurer. Mr Ishihara had been properly concerned for the nations that had already paid. Mr Ishihara had agreed to make the payment, if the Congress direct him to pay them, or, in other words, if the Congress freed him of his obligations to receive the papers which he was normally required, he would allow the payment to be made. That was what Congress was required to do.

18.6. The second solution was that the Dutch Federation generously agreed not to require any concrete payment from the IAF, but to allow the IAF to pay the debt by compensating with their Membership fee they pay until the day the debt would be filled up.

18.7. The third point was on the double payment issue. Mr Smibert referred to Australia as an example. He said that Australia had voted against the World Games, but they said that they would pay if required. They had received one invoice and made payment. But the second invoice they had not made payment. Though he did not know where it was right then, but Australia was also going to pay it.

18.8. The next issue was that Congress should allow the Directing Committee to talk to the people who had not made their payments for one reason or another, and to come back to the issue to the next Congress; the matter was an item that should be carried over.

18.9. Mr Smibert said that the solution enabled the IAF to clear the debt, and the Directing Committee agreed the solution because there was no other proper payment from the IAF's fund; but that this gave time to the Directing Committee because the Directing Committee had to check all invoices which had not been paid, and to talk to abstaining nations and so on. He thought that it needed three steps, if the Congress agreed.

18.10. Mr Smibert moved to the motion: that the Treasurer makes the payment on Dutch World Games resolved by the parties involved.

18.11. Dr Goldsbury asked if everybody agreed, to which many voices answered **yes**. He asked if there were anybody that abstained; one abstained.

19.12. Mr Varsegi (from Hungary/observer) wanted to know about the procedures and the obligations which was necessary to become an IAF Member and to be represented at the next Congress. Dr Goldsbury answered that they should ask Hombu Dojo for Recognition, and then send the copy of the recognition to the IAF General Secretary; and it would be considered at the Directing Committee.

18.13. Mr Varsegi stated that they had been doing Aikido for 23 year and they had about 1,000 Aikidoists in their country. They were supervised by Tamura Shihan. He asked on behalf of those Aikidoists who were behind him that IAF would give support to them so that they might become a Member.

19. Official Closure of the Congress

19.1. Dr Goldsbury stated that the last item of the Agenda was the Official Closure of the Congress by the Ueshiba Kisshomaru Aikido Doshu. He formally asked Doshu to close the Congress.

19.2. The following closing remarks were made by Ueshiba Kisshomaru Doshu, the IAF President.

“I would like to thank you all from deep within my heart for participating in this Congress. When I realize the precious time and money you have given and the great efforts you have made for this Congress, which, I believe, is an expression of your love and support for Aikido, I am very sure that Aikido will continue to develop. Now we are nearly at the end of this century. The next Congress will be held in 2,000, which makes me believe that we have to change our timeworn clothes and prepare for the rapid strides towards the 21st century.

This 20th century has been a significant century for the Aikido. It is in this century that Aikido was founded by the Late Ueshiba Morihei. And his enthusiasm, going hand in hand with that of many other Aikido practitioners, the Aikido has developed in this century. And as one of its fruits, International Aikido Federation was established 20 years ago, by which Aikido made another long stride. The IAF might not be a perfect and faultless one as it stands; there might be some differences of opinions among you; but it is my strong belief that there is no barrier that cannot be overcome before your sincerity. I am convinced that the IAF has a bright future before it with your enthusiasm and sincerity for Aikido.

It is my sincere desire that the peaceful World may be realized with the development of the Aikido, which was the dream of the Founder.

Please continue to devote yourselves even harder to the practice of Aikido hand in hand, so that this dream of ours may come true.”

<The 7th IAF Congress Closed>