

## **The Effect of Sport Boycott and Social Change in South Africa: A Historical Perspective, 1955-2005**

### **Abstract**

This study examines the effect of sport boycott in South Africa; a country with a long history of racial discrimination. The struggle for political freedoms and all-inclusive-and-non-racial sport was intertwined. The former colonial power and major investor, Britain was strategic to-and-targeted for black people's diplomatic efforts after the establishment of the Union of South Africa in 1910. By 1940s, however, a comprehensive campaign against apartheid was undertaken by the Africa National Congress and Anti-Apartheid Movement (AAM). The oppressed majority's hope for-and-focus on British support had shifted to the United Nations and newly-independent African states. Non-racial sport movement approached the International Olympic Committee (IOC) and International Federations. South Africa's official participation in the Olympic Games between 1908 and 1960; racially discriminated against blacks sportspersons and resistance to this was observed in the mid-1940s. Radical struggle was, however, started in the 1950s; illustrated by the emergence of AAM and sport boycott campaigns. These campaigns were continued until controversially abandoned in the early 1990s, paving way for South Africa's re-admission into the Olympic family in 1992. This literature study utilized the IOC Archives. It sought to analyse the effect of sport boycott in South Africa and social change thereof, in relation to the IOC's attitude, response and actions towards apartheid sport in contrast to that of the non-racial sport proponents. This study is grounded in a qualitative, historical descriptive research design, with the aim of generating a body of literature and contextualising sport boycott campaigns in the period under investigation.

**Key words:** Sport boycott; IOC, SANROC, AAM, Apartheid sport

### **An executive summary of the research result**

#### **Background**

This study examines the effect of sport boycott campaigns and social change in South Africa in the context of the country's socio-political-socio-cultural transition from the apartheid state to a democratic dispensation. South Africa has a long history of subjugation, colonialism, imperialism and racial discrimination, and this was applied in all facets of social life, including culture and sport. The struggle against apartheid in sport and the fight for political liberties by the oppressed peoples of South Africa were thus always intertwined. The sport boycott campaigns under discussion in this work were a direct response to fight and defeat this racial quandary. In South Africa, therefore, the cliché "sport-and-politics do not mix" is not only misguided but mischievous.

#### **Early sporting influences in South Africa**

South Africa has a long and rich historical tradition of sport participation, both amongst South Africans within the country and internationally. The country is sometimes described as "sport-mad" nation. South Africa has enjoyed international successes from the early 19<sup>th</sup> Century. The literature that describes life in the early Dutch colony, sport is hardly

mentioned. What there is; is of a generally informal nature (Marquard, 1952; Leonard and Affleck, 1947; Anderson, 1979; Nongogo, 2004). The arrival of the British in 1795 initiated a new era in sport in South Africa. The former brought to the country a capitalist system and formal military organisation. It was around this period that organised sport in South Africa began to show signs of developing (Leck, 1977; Anderson, 1979; Nongogo, 2004). At the beginning of the nineteenth century the first formal cricket match was recorded between the officers of the Artillery and the Officers of the Colony (Odendaal, 1977; Anderson, 1979, Nongogo, 2004). In August 23, 1862, the first recorded rugby match, between the military and the civilians, took place at Green Point Common in Cape Town (Leck, 1977; Anderson, 1979; Nongogo, 2004).

### **South Africa's international sport participation**

The earliest recorded international participation by South Africa was in 1884, when E.L. Williams and E.W. Lewis competed and reached the final of the first men's doubles at Wimbledon Tennis, albeit they lost. It is also known that in 1893, Laurens S. Meintjes became South Africa's first world record holder, in the sport of cycling. Meintjes won the sixty-two mile international championship at the World's Fair Cycle Meeting in Chicago. In the same year in Springfield, Massachusetts, he set a world record in the hour's race. In the sacred year 1896 when the modern Olympic Games were revived, South Africa won its first rugby test ever, against the British Isles.

South Africans have had a long and special relationship with the Olympic Movement. The Olympic Games of 1904 were scheduled for Chicago, but eventually took place in St Louis and coincided with the World's Fair. Eight South Africans participated unofficially in these 1904 Games in St Louis. Five Boers took part in the Olympic tug-of-war event and tied in fifth place with a Greek team and three men including two black runners, Len Tau and Jan Mashiani and one white athlete, Robert Harris, partook in the Olympic Marathon in August 30, 1904 in extremely hot (32° Celsius) and humid conditions; and finished in 9<sup>th</sup> and 12<sup>th</sup> place respectively, out of 32 runners from 5 countries. The third athlete, Robert Harris dropped out of the race. Len Tau also competed in the mile race and finished third. There is evidence that the two black South Africans got the "opportunity" to participate in the Games by chance as they were there as part of workers of the Anglo-Boer War show that was put on at the World's Fair. This was the first and was to be the last time that black sportspersons got the opportunity to "represent their country", albeit unofficially in the Olympic Games until

1992. Since then South African official Olympic teams racially excluded black sportspersons between 1908 and 1960 Rome Games, as the country was to be suspended by the IOC from participating in Seoul Games and Mexico Games in 1964 and 1968 respectively, and eventually expelled in 1970.

### **Beginnings of racialism in South African sport**

There is evidence that South Africa's sporting participation was not always fraught with racial discrimination. This practice was deliberately introduced into the country's sport. Evidence of bigotry in South African sport is complex and longstanding; traceable from the colonial and imperial times, surely predating apartheid. The first of these incidents was recorded in the 1930s. Overt racial exclusions in the country's sport were observed in 1939, when the Weight-lifting Association that was initially open to all races started to bar black people from being members. In 1933, a national weight-lifting federation was formed by a group made up of all segments of the South African population. 'Inter-racial contacts were established and competitions held' until the fateful 1939 (Mbaye, 1995:76). Several scholars have also reported similar contacts and interracial competitions during this era in South African sporting history (Leonard and Affleck, 1947; Marquard, 1952; Odendaal, 1971; Anderson, 1979; Archer and Boullion, 1982; Grundlingh, Odendaal and Spies, 1995; Odendaal, 2003; Nongogo, 2004).

The history of racism, chauvinism and discrimination in South Africa's socio-political and socio-cultural life can be attributed to the settlers who landed in South African shores, including the Dutch, English, and/or those of any other origin. Colonialism, imperialism and apartheid created intricate relations between all the peoples of South Africa, including the English, the Afrikaners and the black populations (comprised of people of mixed racial groups or so-called coloured persons; peoples of Indian origin and Africans or so-called native peoples); and this was also observed in the sport fields over the years. This socio-historical transition, looked collectively, thus, forms the basis for the source of bigotry in the country generally and its sport, specifically. Apartheid apologists however contest this view, arguing for special consideration of the context unto which the South African sport evolved. For instance *A Guide to South African Sport* claims that the policy of separate development that the National Party government put in place in 1948 was not necessarily new. It asserts that this practice

*'...can be traced back to the days when (1650's) Jan van Riebeeck as commander of the refreshment station at the Cape planted the seeds for a hedge of wild almond trees to form the boundary between Hottentots (sic) [coloureds] and whites. Thus, sport clubs through most of South Africa's history have*

*been inevitably uniracial. Whites and blacks simply did not mix socially, and thus would not mix on the country's sport fields. This was the legacy of history for which the founder members of the first sport clubs, provincial and unions and national bodies cannot be held responsible. By the time it dawned upon sport men and women that in the eyes of God all are created equal, mixed clubs were out of the question owing to the historical separation which had now become government policy. ...* (Nedbank Group, *A Guide to South African Sport*, 1987:164).

There is evidence that racism in South African sport was not always necessarily an inherent practice, but was consciously introduced later in this long history, including the apartheid era. It is common knowledge that in the nineteenth century, racism in sport in South Africa was not entrenched by legislation, it was nonetheless firmly rooted. With the coming to power of the National Party (NP) government in 1948 however, the lines became more finely drawn, critically through legislation. On one side, the Afrikaners nationalists' government, with great determination, set about structuring apartheid society and thus, apartheid sport. In opposition to this systematic racism were the “*non-racialists*” sportspersons; arguing for and envisaging a society where sport was egalitarian.

There is evidence that the majority if not all the popular modern sport as they are known today, such as cricket, rugby, football and/or soccer to mention a few, are all of British culture and origin. Black and Boer populations in the country adopted these sport codes mainly from the British soldiers in the Cape and elsewhere in the country. The British did not only come into the country with their sport but with their social, cultural, class practices including racialism, albeit fell short of legislating it. There are several cases of racialism in sport in South Africa, under the control of the British and prior apartheid system. For instance, a New Zealand army rugby team visited South Africa in 1919 following an invite by the South African Rugby Board. One of their best forwards A “Ranje” Wilson was, however, not welcomed due to the country's colour bar. Again, two years later, when the Springboks toured New Zealand in 1921, a journalist wrote disapprovingly that “Bokke” had to play against the so-called coloured sportspersons. An even more embarrassing incident occurred in 1928, when the New Zealand rugby controlling body had to leave behind their crucial full-back because he was a Maori. George Nepia was omitted from the team in order to prevent a confrontation on the South African tour. This in turn led to the Maoris as a team refusing to play against the visiting Springboks in 1937. It was, however, the South Africa Athletics Association and the South African Cricket Union that made their intention, to segregate other sportspersons, on racial grounds, publicly in 1931 and around that time respectively; limiting selection into their teams to only players of European (white) origin and/ or all-white teams. This practice continued beyond World War II, with white-

controlling sport bodies excluding black counterparts but only prepared to act as their guardians for sport by representing them at international level. This was to become the major battlefield for almost half a century, with the oppressed majority non-racial sportspersons “triumphed” in the early 1970’s; isolating the racist South Africa from international sporting competitions and the Olympic Games (de Broglio, 1970; Ramsamy, 1982; Grundlingh *et al.*, 1995; Mbaye, 1995; Ramsamy, 2004; Nongogo, 2004; CBC, 2004; Clarity Films Educational Production, 2010).

British Imperial policy was notorious for its class distinction and this was true in South Africa as it were in many of its colonies throughout the world, treating black people under their rule as political and social subordinates (Nedbank Group, 1987; Van der Merwe, 1997, 2004). Available literature indicates that this practice is observable in all social facets, including sport during the early days of British rule. British Imperialists were in control of racially based clubs, provincial and national teams during this period. The life under British rule is complex in terms of race-relations and sport development intentions. There seems to be some considerable disjuncture in the rationale to develop and shaping of community social clubs as opposed to the diffusion of sport in Mission Schools. Diffusion of sport, games and physical education, with its accompanying values within the Mission Institutions such as Lovedale seems to have been different to that of the general community sport. The use of sport for the purpose of “civilizing” and “Christianising” young black population in a quest to create Bantu Missionaries to spread Christianity within the country and across the continent; and “Black-Englishmen” to serve the British administration agenda, with the “race question” less emphasised, is evident in Mission Institutions of the day (Shepherd, 1947; Odendaal, 1971; Odendaal, 2003; Nongogo, 2004; Ramsamy, 2004). In contrast, values of segregation and indifference seem to have been “emphasised” among the “unconverted” and/or “uneducated” adult black adult population (Meyer and Meyer, 1952; Odendaal, 1977; Nongogo, 1994; Odendaal, 2003). The Reverend RHW Shepherd, an eminent Principal of one of the oldest Mission Schools in South Africa, the Lovedale Institution, published a history of the School entitled *Lovedale, South Africa: The Story of a Century, 1841 – 1941*. In this story, Reverend Shepherd discussed the role of sport in the civilising mission that the Scottish Presbyterians had set themselves when they established Lovedale Missionary Institution. Reverend Shepherd specifically wrote:

*‘...Lovedale is concerned with the whole man, body, mind and spirit. With some 700 young people as boarders constantly within the Institution, special steps must be taken for the safe-guarding of health through games and other recreation. To look over Lovedale’s Annual Report in any year is to see a network of activities centring on the sport’ filed: athletics, rugby, soccer, cricket, netball, and tennis...*

*Recreation is a matter of supreme importance in the eyes of those responsible for Lovedale. Many of the amusement of the unconverted Bantu are incompatible with Christian purity of life, so have to be abandoned by those embracing Christianity. But youth is youth the world over, and therefore among the Bantu, as among all other races, provision must be made for social activities, healthy exercise and profitable employment of leisure. What is and what is not Christian in this connection is a burning question in rural areas and urban centres...*' (Shepherd, 1942:45; Ramsamy, 2004:iv)

Mixed racial community sport participation was however observed during goodwill boxing, cricket, tennis, golf and baseball matches and continued until 1948. The aftermath of the South African war (also known as the Anglo-Boer War) brought fundamental changes on how the country was governed, at least on the side of the white population. The situation worsened for black people in the country in 1948, when the Nationalist Party won the white-only election. The new government quickly consolidated and legislated the already racially charged and polarization populace, moving up the gear from the language question to hardcore colour-bar politics. The NP had a choice to remedy the situation and move away from racism as the rest of the world did post-Second World War but instead chose to take a different direction and adopted apartheid over racial harmony and peace.

Some form of resistance to the latter was first observed in the mid-1940s. 'The first documented response to racial segregation in sport dates back in 1946, when T. Ragasamy applied to the British Amateur Weightlifters Association for affiliation on behalf of the non-white weightlifters' (Van der Merwe, 1997:111). E.S. Reddie, however, writes that

*'...The issue of discrimination and segregation in sport was first raised during the Indian passive resistance campaign of 1946-48. ...'* (UN Archives / UN Documents and Reports, 1998:3).

It is known however that radical developments in this struggle only started in the 1950s (United Nations Archives / United Nations Unit on Apartheid, Notes and Documents, No. 16/71, April 1971); with a Committee for International Recognition formed by non-racial sportspersons in 1955 (UN Archives / UN Unit on Apartheid - Notes & Documents, No. 16/71: 1971; Ramsamy 1982; Mbaye, 1995). The latter was succeeded by the South African Sport Association (SASA) in 1958 and the South African Non-Racial Olympic Committee (SAN-ROC) in 1963; with the purpose of fighting against racism in sport and press for international recognition of the non-racial sport bodies in South Africa (IOC Archives/SANROC Files; SASA Memorandum, 1959; de Broglio, 1970; Ramsamy, 1982; Mbaye, 1995). Subsequent to this development, the International Table Tennis Federation recognised the non-racial South African Table Tennis Board (SATTB) in 1956 and expelled the white body from South Africa. The SATTB team was able to participate in the world championships in Stockholm in 1957. The apartheid regime then began to refuse passport to

its teams, making it clear that no one would be allowed to compete internationally except through a white sport body. International action against apartheid sport, ably led by SANROC, nonetheless began in earnest in 1963 and quickly, won many victories. White-only South Africa was suspended from 1964 and 1968 Olympics and eventually expelled from the Olympic movement in 1970. FIFA expelled South Africa from world soccer in 1976. The 1978 Springbok tour of the UK and the 1979 Wallabies tour of South Africa were both cancelled. In 1975 the UN General Assembly adopted a resolution on apartheid in sport, calling on all sport organisations to uphold the Olympic principle of non-discrimination. In 1977 the Commonwealth Heads of Government Meeting (CHOGM) adopted the “Gleneagles Agreement”, which resolved that all member states should take ‘ever step to discourage contact or competition by their nationals with sporting organisations, teams or sportspersons from South Africa’ (UN Archives / UN Unit on Apartheid - Notes and Documents, No. 16/71: 1971:8).

### **A Review of International Olympic Committee’s Humanist Sport Policy on South Africa**

South Africa’s initial contacts with the Olympic Movement and the IOC were made by the upper class and on racist and capitalist problematic basis. This was therefore inherently contrary to the philosophy of Olympism that governs the Olympic Movement. The *Africa’s First Olympians* (1987:3) by Opperman and Laubscher (in IOC Archives/IOC-Olympic Movement and South Africa, 1907) documents that following the social difficulties of the South African war (also known as Anglo Boer War that ended in 1902); ‘rich men including Abe Bailey, Sir Leander, Starr Jameson and Henry Nourse, with close and strategic contacts in London’; decided to use sport to promote harmony and peace between the English and the Afrikaners. Significantly, no mention of black people is made in this equation. It is also interesting to note that Abe Bailey personally financed a cricket tour by a white-only “South African team” to England. The latter might thus, explain black people’s exclusion on the basis of race from this early period?

It is apparent that this development was from the onset set-out initiated on an imperialist, capitalist and class-and-racial exclusionary path. These early contacts therefore initiated strong social-cultural, socio-economic and socio-political polarized sporting nature in the country. This somehow explains the stark racial contrast between the “unofficial 1904” and the “official 1908” South African Olympic teams in St. Louis and London Games respectively. In fact it is interesting to observe that the first South Africa’s “official” Olympic

was white-only and that the IOC did not take any issue with this racially comprised team albeit the existence of the non-discrimination Rule in the Olympic Charter, especially Articles 24 and 25.

Imperialism, politics of class-differential and racial segregation underpinned the early Olympic sport organisation in South African. In fact politics and political representatives played a major role in formalising the contacts and getting the country closer to the Olympic Movement and the Olympic Games. It is common knowledge that it was through the influence of the Office of Sir Starr Jameson, who at the time was the Prime Minister of the Cape Colony, that the British National Olympic Committee was mobilised that an invitation be extended to “South Africa” to take part in the fourth Olympiad, which the city of London was to host (*Africa’s First Olympians*, 1987:3). There is evidence that in its meeting in The Hague in May 23, 1907, the IOC unanimously carried a motion that the four British Colonies, the Cape Province, Natal, the Orange River Colony and the Transvaal (*Africa’s First Olympians*, 1987:3; IOC Archives/IOC-Olympic Movement and South Africa, 1907), notwithstanding that the latter excluded the country’s black sportspersons population.

This hypocrisy continued to pervade both South Africa’s white-only National Olympic Committee as it did within the IOC over the years. In response to the end of the Second World War, the IOC held an Executive Committee meeting in London in August 21<sup>st</sup>-24<sup>th</sup>, 1945, which point 4 of the minutes, reads as follows:

*‘...[T]he Committee decided that letters should be sent to the National Olympic Committees suggesting that they resume their activities, stimulate public interest in the Olympic Movement, stress the principles of true amateurism, etc. Political influence in the movement should be avoided. ...’* (IOC Archives / IOC Executive Board Meetings / IOC Executive – London, Meeting Minutes, 1945:2).

It is yet common knowledge that South Africa’s National Olympic Committee was excluding black sportspersons on political grounds and the IOC was aware of this fact. Embarrassing and rather disastrous public relations was witnessed when the IOC and the host City Organising Committee, extended an invitation to the racist SANOC for the Mexico City Games in 1968. The IOC President at the time, Avery Brundage wrote:

*‘... [T]here seems to be a serious misunderstanding of the action of the International Olympic Committee at its meetings in Grenoble last month. It did not approve either the Government of South Africa or its policies. It does not deal with governments nor with the political policies of any country. ...’* (IOC Archives/IOC-Olympic Movement and South Africa/SAONGA Annual Report, 1983/4:5).

It is nonetheless a well established fact that SAONGA voluntarily chose to exclude black sportspersons of in South Africa; doing so in direct response and alignment to its government's racist policy of apartheid. The IOC and its President were well aware of this reality. The IOC resolution on its relationship, attitude and approach towards SANROC as captured in *Annexure V* of the minutes of IOC Executive Board in Munich 1959 (i.e., to snub SANROC albeit using the word "Olympic" in its title) is indicative of this hypocrisy and bias towards the racist SANOC. In its annual report for 1983/1984 season, the SAOAGA reports that:

*'...Morally, it is equally wrong for the IOC to boycott sportspersons in accordance with political acceptability or not. ... .'* (IOC Archives / IOC Executive Board Meetings / Munich Board Meeting/ - Minutes, 1959: Annexure V - IOC OSC Archives).

There is evidence that the Olympic Movement and the IOC did not only tolerate white-only South Africa's indifference towards the country's black sportspersons for a long time, but also sympathised and supported the racist regime. The IOC's Presidents (both Avery Brundage and Lord Killanin) belief that sport and politics do not mix was not only flawed, within the South African context but downright bias against the black sportspersons plight. This approach also furthered the racial divisions in South Africa and; promoted the black population's exclusion from the Olympic Movement and the Olympic Games. The latter occurred in the face of strong protestations by the non-racial sport movement and AAM, broadly. That the IOC specifically and the Olympic Movement generally, never co-opted nor elected a black South African sportsperson into their midst respectively, is an indictment on their part. That the IOC opted to snub SANROC as opposed to giving it an ear and more importantly, working closely with it, even after it had suspended and later expelled the racist SANOC in 1960 and in 1970 respectively, is bizarre. There is evidence that both the IOC Presidents, who reigned between 1952 and 1980, shared the view and belief that even though SANROC used the appellation "Olympic" in its name; it should be dismissed with contempt because it was led by "politicians" rather than sportspersons; a view also shared by the suspended racist South Africa's NOC (South African Olympic and National Games Association (SAONGA) and its apartheid government (IOC Archives/ IOC Sessions: CIO D\_RMOI\_AFRIS/0387787-IOC SESSIONS 1959-1972; Annual Report, 1983/84:3). *Annexure V* in one of the IOC Session in 1959 reads:

*'...The International Olympic Committee resolved that, whilst SANROC uses the word "Olympic" in its title, neither the International Olympic Committee nor any of its officials shall have any*

This stance delayed the liberalization of South African sport from apartheid and thus, denied multitude of South Africa's youth from taking its rightful place within the Olympic Movement.

Available literature on sport boycott shown that SANROC and AAM were not inherently boycott-enthusiasts but sport-loving non-racialists individuals that were in fact reconciliatory driven. A body of knowledge illustrates that to the non-racial sport movement; boycotts were potent weapon and yet last resort (IOC Archives / IOC-SANROC Files/SASA Memorandum, 1959; IOC Archives / Apartheid and Olympism Conference, 1988; Mbaye, 1995). It was only after considerable efforts to persuade the establishment sport structures to organise the country's sport on non-racial basis that black sportspersons contemplated and eventually initiated sport boycott campaigns against ejection of apartheid sport from the Olympic Games and the Olympic Movement. In the process the non-racial sport movement outlined its primary objectives to campaign for the total eradication of colour bar in country's sport; that it should be organised on non-racial basis; replacement of white-only racist sport from the international federation with the non-racial sport organization and expulsion of South African Olympic and Commonwealth Games Association (SAOCGA) from the Olympic Games (IOC Archives/IOC-SANROC Files/SASA Memorandum, 1959; de Broglio, 1970; Ramsamy, 1982; Mbaye, 1995; Nauright, 1997; Ramsamy, 2004).

There is evidence that it was the apartheid system; grounded on the notion of white supremacy; that subsequently gave birth to the AAM, SASA, SANROC, sport boycott campaigns against apartheid sport in South Africa. It is known that in South Africa under apartheid, both the sport administrators, who control all official sport and the Government jointly, took measures deliberately to exclude country's black population from participating in representative sport. In fact it is also know that for the greater part of the country's history, racial segregation in sport was not a law and that the sport organisation chose to deliberately exclude the majority black sportspersons, without due pressure from government. This development preceded apartheid. The imposition of apartheid in sport meant in effect that no "mixed" sport is permitted under the auspices of the official organisations which were accorded international recognition and bore the responsibility for selecting representative teams for international competitions. No open trials to permit the selection of the best sportspersons in each class from the entire sporting community. Competition in sport was

instead limited to whites only and it is from them that national teams are selected. The Olympic Movement was well-aware of this situation, yet it granted unqualified recognition to the racist “official” sport organisations in South Africa. Just as the South African white sport bodies were responsible for enforcing racial discrimination in domestic sport, so the Olympic Movement or International Federations (IFs) which granted them membership were responsible for bestowing respectability upon such practices (UN Archives / UN Unit on Apartheid - Notes and Documents, No. 16/71:1971).

The sport boycott campaigns were therefore aimed at challenging this status quo, both internally and internationally. The non-racial sport movement fought for the organization of country’s sport on non-racial basis and more critically, the latter, to get the racially organized sport structures expelled by the respective IFs and be replaced by the non-racially organised ones. This report evaluates this long and complex relationship between South Africa’s Olympic sport participation; the IOC and its Olympic Movement. It assesses the nature of Olympic sport during the period 1904 to 1994; examines the influences and proponents of racist sport and their adversaries; and the IOC’s attitude, role and response to this struggle (IOC Archives/IOC-SANROC Files/SASA Memorandum, 1959; UN Archives / UN Unit on Apartheid - Notes and Documents, No. 16/71:1971; de Broglio, 1970; Ramsamy, 1982; Mbaye, 1995; Nauright, 1997; Ramsamy, 2004).

It is known that albeit favoured the white-only SAOCGA during the 1950’s down to the 1970s, the IOC President, Avery Brundage, due to growing pressure from the AAM and SANROC, was forced to review his and the IOC’s approach towards South African racial question in sport. The racial problem in South African sport was formally brought to the IOC’s attention in the 1950s; this seemingly did not really bother the IOC until the 1960s. In December 1966, African countries came together at Mamaki in Mali, and established the Supreme Council for Sport in Africa (SCSA). Guttman (1984:232) reported that these countries agreed that the SCSA would use any means possible to fight for the exclusion of the racist South African sport organisation from the Olympic movement. This decision was evoked in 1968 when thirty two nations came together and announced the decision to boycott the Mexico City Games. It is at this time that

*‘... Brundage and Exeter, fearing that the African countries might desert the Olympic movement en bloc to join Sukarno’s Games of the Newly Emergence Forces (GANEFO), reluctantly acquiesced in the exclusion of South African and Rhodesia from the African Games, but they were not ready yet to recommend the final expulsion of either country from the international sport community...’ (Guttman, 1984:232; Al-Tauqi, 2003:102).*

It is interesting that when the African countries initially decided to boycott the Mexico Games, Brundage announced that ‘the Games must go on’ and he opposed the idea of calling a special IOC Session to investigate the problem. It was however only after the boycott movement escalated and integrated the Caribbean nations, the Islamic world and the Communist bloc, led by USSR and all threatened to stay away if the racist South Africans came to Mexico Games (IOC Archives/IOC Files/Mexico Games Press Cuttings, 1968; Guttmann, 1984:232; Al-Tauqi, 2003:102). It is common knowledge that the decision concerning South Africa’s exclusion was put to vote, and the verdict was 47-16, with 8 abstentions. It also established that South Africa’s friends came mainly from America, Australia, Germany and Scandinavia (Guttmann, 1984; Al-Tauqi, 2003:102). There is evidence showing this longstanding relationship between the racist South Africa and/or ‘European Africa’ and the ‘brothers across the seas’ (Ramsamy, 2004:vi). It is possible this relationship that made the long-standing leader of the South African Rugby Board, Danie Craven, miscalculate the strength of opposition by the New Zealand people to the racist Springboks tour to that country in the early 1980s. When Craven was told of the extent of opposition New Zealand to the then forthcoming 1981 tour of the Springboks, he stubbornly said:

*‘...I can hardly believe it of New Zealand. To me it is incredible that the nation I know so well has succumbed to that... You know, in 1937 and again in 1956, I preached from the pulpits in New Zealand, not once but dozens of times... I believe – I really believe in my soul I believe - that their love of rugby will triumph over their love of demonstrating. There may be demonstrations at the start, but they will soon peter out. ...’* (Richards, 1999:35; Ramsamy, 2004:vi).

Danie Craven was however, certainly wrong. The demonstrations did not peter out. Even the love of rugby could not stop thousands of New Zealanders from demonstrating in favour of non-racial sport in South Africa and freedom for the oppressed black majority. This struggle, in the eyes of the New Zealanders, was a noble and a just cause as opposed to cheap propaganda that the likes of Craven and the apartheid government wanted the world to believe. Despite the latter’s innate love for rugby, as Craven “believed in his soul”, New Zealanders could not dare compromise their own “soul beliefs”. Craven seemed to have failed to appreciate and predict the intense opposition experienced on the 1981 New Zealand –Springbok tour because he was clouded by his firm belief and knowledge of the bonds that existed among the white Dominions of the British Empire – Australia, New Zealand and South Africa.

It took a long time and hard work on the side of the non-racial sportspersons to engage and convince the IOC around the racialism in South African sport. When the non-racial or non-white South African Amateur Weight-Lifting and Bodybuilding Federation (SAAWBF), for example, approached the IOC for it to be allowed to participate in the 1956 Melbourne Games, the IOC referred it to the white-only SAOCGA because the President did not want to interfere in the local affairs of the country; yet through pressure it eventually did four year later in Rome Games (IOC Archives / IOC Sessions / Rome Session, 1960). Noteworthy in the President's response was his bold and suggestive view on the question of recognising the non-white sport organization that:

*'... the sole question was whether the South African Olympic and Commonwealth Games Association could continue to be recognised by the IOC? ...'* (Mbaye, 2004:76).

The IOC President, Avery Brundage, again made a telling statement to the SAOCGA in 1958 that *'[P]ressure is mounting, and I am receiving many protests and requests for official statement from all over the world'* (Mbaye, 1995:80). He further warned that soon rather than later, the apartheid question would be placed on the IOC agenda and when that time came, *'there could only be one result'* because the Rules of the Olympic Charter were clear (Mbaye, 1995:80). The IOC President here seemed to imply that South African National Olympic Committee would be sanctioned given the that the Charter unequivocally prohibited any racial discrimination albeit doing very little to action this, taking twelve years for the IOC to ultimately expel South Africa from the Games. There is, however, evidence that, ironically, in 1958, SANOC initially threatened the IOC of withdrawing itself from the activities of the IOC and Olympic Movement. This SANOC's threat came even before the boycott campaigns to expel it the IOC and the Olympic Movement were initiated and explored by the non-racial sport movement and the AAM. This is observed in Emery's (the Secretary-General of the SACGA) response to the solemn warning about the country's apartheid question, from the highest echelons of power on the IOC, the President Brundage himself, who wrote not only a threatening letter but quite chauvinistic one too, stating that:

*'... [I]t is to us a tragedy that through a few political agitators in two Non-European sport – Weight-lifting and Football – from all the sport on the Olympic programme should place the European population of this country [SA] in such a predicament that it may have to withdraw from the Olympic Games. ...'* (Mbaye, 1995:80).

It is know that when the IOC suspended the racist SANOC in 1964 and 1968 and eventually expelled it from the Olympic Games in 1970; South African Government worked

tirelessly to keep the racist sport' contacts afloat on international front albeit through propaganda and at exorbitant price. In fact in its Annual Report for the 1983/4 season, SAONGA complained about being "boycotted" by the IOC (SAONGA Annual Report, 1983/4:3). There is evidence that "relative progressive" stance by IOC towards South Africa's racist sport came solely due to mounting pressure. Signs of this "relative changed" were observed during Avery Brundage's Presidency and Lord Killanin seemed to have maintained a similar approach to the racial question in South African sport. Interestingly, however, signs of "bending-over-backwards" to satisfy and keeping the racist SANOC at bay by sending controversial "fact-finding-commissions" to South Africa were witnessed. This approach was adopted in conjunction with AAM and SANROC snubbing. A case in point is Avery Brundage's view to Lord Killanin led IOC "Fact Finding Commission" to South Africa in 1967, that:

*'... If we were to judge apartheid per se, it is not necessary to send a commission at all. Our concern is with the National Olympic Committee and what it is doing to comply with Olympic regulations, especially Articles 24 and 25. ...We must not become involved in political issues, nor permit the Olympic Games to be used as a tool or as a weapon for extraneous causes. ...'* (IOC Archives/IOC Commissions/SAONGA Annual Report, 1983/4:5).

It seems that the IOC President here is oblivious of the apartheid system as it was carried out in the country's sport and/or failing to appreciate that South Africa's NOC and its Government were actually sharing the same view, which was to exclude the black population in sport based on the colour of their skin. Interestingly, during Lord Killanin's reign in 1972 to 1980, SANOC was not given space to meet up with the IOC and within its structures, as its recognition had been withdrawn in 1970, thus from the President and the IOC's point of view, South Africa's NOC was non-existent (IOC Archives/IOC Commissions/SAONGA Annual Report, 1983/4:5). It was in the 1980s that the IOC's and the Olympic Movement's attitudes and response towards South Africa's non-racial sport movement started to alter dramatically; with Juan Antonio Samaranch reigning as President. The latter's "African Doctrine" towards the South Africa question did not only prove to be progressive but highly strategic and thoughtful towards abolishing apartheid in sport; creating a climate of vigilance within the IOC and Olympic Movement; the non-racial sport movement, AAM, UN and African countries.

There is evidence that SANOC with the help of its Government and its sympathisers continued to fight to return to the Olympic Movement long after its recognition by the IOC was withdrawn. SANOC and the apartheid Government never attempted to create

environment to genuinely organise sport on non-racial basis. They instead seemed satisfied with and committed to cosmetic “reforms” of the apartheid system, illustrated by the introduction of the “multi-national or otherwise multi-racial sport policy”, and; concomitantly unleashing its expensive propaganda machinery. This created a complex environment within the Olympic Movement, with the SANROC and the broader AAM continuing to maintain vigilance to safe-guard their gains. The battle lines were drawn between the apartheid apologists and the AAM. This also made the IOC not to fault in its commitment and responsibility to mobilise and galvanise the Olympic Movement around the goal of maintain coherent support for the fight against apartheid in sport. That in 1984, ahead of the Seoul Games, IOC Executive Board did not foresee the impending challenge by the African countries when it considered approving Tennis as an Olympic sport, with the IOC Executive Board keen on the idea to prepare it to make it to the Olympic programme whilst the International Tennis Union was yet to either suspend and/or expel the racist South African Tennis Association; appears not only suspect but rather clumsy. This IOC’s “mishap” disgusted the Africans and fuelled suspicions and; this worth-noting (IOC Archives/IOC Commissions/ Apartheid and Olympism Conference Report, 1988; Mbaye, 2004:86). This occurred on the backdrop of the well coordinated Apartheid Governments propaganda machinery that is often evident around the Games and/or any major event. This practice continued well into the early 1990s. Solace is however drawn for the outstanding leadership and foresight of the IOC President, Juan Antonio Samaranch, who convened a controversial yet equally important gathering of the African sport leaders on the question of apartheid sports in Lausanne in 1988.

It is the developments like these that seemed to justify the African sportspersons’ vigilance around South Africa’s Apartheid question between 1970 and 1992. During the IOC’s “States General” Conference in Lausanne in 1988, Africans tabled their significant positions on the question of apartheid South African sport (IOC Archives/IOC Commissions/Apartheid and Olympism Conference Report, 1988; Mbaye, 1995:127). In fact around the period of this conference and beyond it, several platforms were created by Africans; indicative of cautious manner and vigilance towards the Apartheid Government and expelled SANOC. Specifically, between 1986 and 1988, the world witnessed a flurry of activities aimed at reversing the sanction of withdrawal or recognition against SANOC ahead of the Seoul Games. This crusade was led amongst others by South Africa’s influential whitely-only sport leader and Kenya’s ever-forceful Reggie Alexander (Mbaye, 1995:128; de Broglio, 2010). The latter, several times campaigned for a delegation to be sent to South

Africa to view “progress” and “non-application” of apartheid in sport in the country. In any event this initiative was short down by the IOC, Africans and African sport leaders within OAU, the ANOCA and SCSA, assisted by numerous journalists, including David Miller (Mbaye, 1995:128).

It was this background that strengthened Africa and Africans’ vigilance and zeal to oppose apartheid sport during the period of the 1980s. In fact between 1983 and 1988 several conferences were held by Africans. For example, three (in London in 1983, in Paris in 1985 and in Harare in 1987) International conferences against apartheid in sport were organised and held by the SCSA, the ANOCA, the Union of African Sports Confederations (UASC) and the SANROC, with the UN Special Committee against Apartheid often assisting and lending its support (Mbaye, 1995). In fact the UN International Convention Against Apartheid in Sport came into force around this time, and specifically in April 03, 1988. These developments should be seen in the broad context of the work coherent work by the AAM in Africa, with the help of the IOC and UN. The South African question here, seen in context, with other sport struggles and world programmes. The latter include Olympic Solidarity programmes; the revival of the Olympic Truce, seems to justify the long-overdue, closer and coordinated working relationship between the IOC and UN; that was only realized in October, 21, 2009 (IOC Webpage, 2009). That the IOC was granted an observer status by the UN and; this quickly followed a landmark address by the UN General Secretary, Mr Ban Ki-moon, in the 2009 Copenhagen Olympic Congress.

This in fact is line with the main humanistic goal of the IOC and the Olympic Movement and; that from inception the modern Olympic Games and the IOC had humanism as the foundation of a sport policy (Mbaye, 1995:21). This approach can be traced back in Pierre de Coubertin era (Rioux, 1889; Mbaye, 1995:21-22). Critical here is the “father” of the modern Olympics’ firm view that sport should ‘be understood not simply as a game or a physical activity, but as a way of being, that is, a philosophy’ (Mbaye, 1995:21-22). The spirit that shaped and steered de Coubertin’s intellectual approach and action is well documented and that is humanism as the basis for all sport theory and policy. In fact, de Coubertin’s ideas constructed the foundation of Olympism, which culminated in philosophy based on the cult of best man, regarded as the centre of universe. Mbaye (1994:22) states that this philosophy of Olympism ‘made the human person, in the totality of his very being, the centre of interest for Coubertin, who sought remedies for world “weariness” and; which is also ‘the origin of the creation of the IOC and today continues to be a driving force behind all the policies and activities of that institution’.

It is apparent that throughout its history, the Olympic Movement and the IOC have never, at least, at the level of policy framework and thus legally, abandoned the positions that were espoused by de Coubertin at its inception. The same, however, cannot always be said about the IOC's operations, especially in the period between 1952 and 1980. Mbaye (1994:22) is helpful in articulating the nature of the modern Olympism, stating that the IOC is, as the head of the modern Olympism

*'...from which the Olympic Movement stems, a dynamic catalyst for understanding among peoples, a force for respect for fundamental human rights. It is a pillar of humanism, of inter-cultural dialogue of cooperation and peace. ...'* (Mbaye, 1995:22).

It is, thus, worth noting that for several years, the IOC appeared to have reneged in this regard, in relation to the exclusion of black sportspersons in South Africa and maybe elsewhere in the world.

The leadership of Avery Brundage and Lord Killanin inherently seemed to be at fault for dereliction of duty as they failed to act on the South Africa's apartheid question; and only to do so, when heavily pressured by the SANROC and the AAM. The Fundamental Principles of the Olympic Charter, however, have always been clear in relation to anti-discrimination of any form; upholding human dignity; cultivating understanding among peoples and being a force for respect for fundamental human rights. For instance, Paragraph 6 of the Fundamental Principles of the Olympic Charter is helpful here, as it reads:

*'The goal of the Olympic Movement is to contribute to building a peaceful and better world by educating youth through sport practised without discriminating of any kind in the Olympic spirit, which requires mutual understanding with spirit of friendship solidarity and fair play' and its 'activity is permanent and universal'* (IOC Archives / Olympic Charter, 2010:11; Mbaye, 1995:22).

Paragraph 3 of the Fundamental Principles of the Olympic Charter is even more eloquent in understanding and defining the goal of Olympism, which is the capacity,

*'[To place everywhere sport at the services of the harmonious development of man, with a view to encouraging the establishment of a peaceful society concerned with the preservation of human dignity'* (IOC Archives / Olympic Charter, 2010:11; Mbaye, 1995:22).

It is apparent that the latter was not seriously considered by the IOC leadership and by some sections of the Olympic Movement since the mid 1950s, in relation to South Africa's apartheid question. The IOC was aware of apartheid sport and the subsequent subjugation,

oppression and discrimination of the majority black South African population and specifically, its sportspersons.

It has been shown that in broad terms, the goal of the IOC, is to lead the Olympic Movement in accordance with the Olympic Charter, which its reading, evidently illustrate the foundation of the humanist and pacifist goals assigned to the IOC. These include leading the Olympic Movement, ‘whose objectives coincide with those of the United Nations, namely to bring about peace and ensure respect for human dignity’ and; the other twelve ways the Olympic Charter lists in which the IOC directs the promotion of Olympism (IOC Archives / Olympic Charter / Rule 2 of the Olympic Charter, 2010:11; Mbaye, 1995:31). To address specific objectives of the topic at hand and for the purpose of this report, the following are worth mentioning:

*‘...The IOC assigns for itself the task, within the framework of the role that it has defined for itself, of collaborating with the competent public or private organisations in endeavour to place sport at the service of humanity. It fights against any form of discrimination affecting the Olympic Movement. It supports and encourages the promotion of sports ethics. It opposes any political and commercial use of sport and athletes. ...’* (IOC Archives / Olympic Charter, 2010:11; Mbaye, 1995:31).

It is apparent that, through its Olympic Charter, the IOC has long set itself critical objectives, which can be summarised as follows, amongst others:

*‘...international cooperation, the development of sport, the implementation and defence of the principle of non-discrimination, the promotion of sport ethics, the defence of fair play, etc. ...’* (Mbaye, 1995:32).

Reading the Olympic Charter, it becomes apparent that the IOC sees itself as the guardian of an ideal that has withstood over a century and which is rooted in respect for humanist mission that uses education as a lever to implement the principles that are at the foundation of a society based on understanding, solidarity, fraternity and peace. It has been indicated that these ideas developed by Coubertin, however, they did not find prominence within the Olympic Charter and/or the clarity and precision in wording until the seventh IOC President, Juan Antonio Samaranch, ordered, in the mid-1980s, a revision of what might call the basic law of the IOC (Mbaye, 1995:42). The special place enjoyed by the first principles of the Olympic Movement and the force that the new wording of the Charter gives them goes together with a synchronising effort between the IOC and the other members of the Olympic family which places the IOC among the major international organisations working to bring about world peace through fraternity, that is, through solidarity and cooperation in strict equality (Mbaye, 1995). This work of the IOC and the strengthening of its underlying Rule

are new, and they are due without any question to the policy that Samaranch has introduced in the Olympic Movement. It is apparent that President Samaranch firmly believed that the IOC and the Olympic Movement wielded power to influence the world greatly. In 1990 he declared that:

*'..Alone, we can reform neither man nor society... The Olympic Movement has possibly a unique opportunity, amidst the present disarray, to show through deeds that it is one of the great and beneficent social forces of our time; that in all places, and in all times, it places sport, such as we conceive it, at the service of the human community. ...'* (IOC Archives / Olympic Media, 2010).

It is in this background that when President Samaranch entered the fray and the IOC, whose work is to be defined unequivocally in terms of a clear humanist policy, could not coexist indefinitely with apartheid, to which the IOC played a critical role in eradication between the early 1980s to mid-1990s. In fact, in his own words, President Samaranch argued in 1988:

*'... The social and political phenomenon of Apartheid cannot be reconciled with the Olympic ideal, and is a source of concern for the entire world. We must all fight to eradicate it, while listening carefully to the Africans who, once this objective is achieved, will tell us when and how South Africa can be reinstated in the international sports community, from which the International Olympic Committee was the first organisation to exclude it.'* (IOC Archives / Presidents/Samaranch, 1988; IOC Archives / IOC Media, 2010:3).

The pragmatic stance by the IOC President, Samaranch in the late 1980s through to the early 1990s, proved to be a defining moment for not only resolving the South African apartheid sport question but in effecting a radical socio-political change in the South Africa. It should be mentioned however, that the latter was achieved on the background of some intuitive initiative by the IOC President and the IOC as opposed to the initiative of the Africans as he purports above; and more significantly, this process saw the obliteration of one major traditional force of the liberation movement, SACOS and its principle of: “No normal sport in an abnormal society”; in favour of NSC and its pragmatic stance towards “sport unity” (Roberts, 1988, Roberts, 1989; Booth, 1995; Nauright, 1997:154; Thomas, 2006; Brown, 2006). Here, the IOC is seen as not entirely responsible for this but is seen to have contributed. There is evidence that the IOC, through its extra-ordinary Apartheid and Olympism Commission, able led by the late Judge Kéba Mbaye, at the time the Vice-President of the IOC, took its tune, on the question of apartheid sport, the direction of apartheid question in South Africa and its eradication, more from the politicians (mainly the ANC and the NP), rather than, from the sport organisations and/or from the collective non-racial sport movement to be specific (Mbaye, 1995:200-201 & 214-217; Nauright, 1997:154).

In any event, around this time, the traditional and sometimes considered the “authentic” non-racial sport movement, led by SACOS. During this period SACOC was however strongly challenged by the 1989-established National Sports and Olympic Congress/Council (NSOC); which did not hide its affiliation to the broad Mass Democratic Movement (MDM), with a core objective to push for national liberation and national democratic revolution (NDR), including its sport. In the early 1990s, sporting officials were well ahead of politicians in negotiating for a new non-racial order, albeit, not all non-racial sportspersons agreed with the negotiation strategy. SACOS continued to hold on to its stubborn stance that there could be ‘no normal sport in an abnormal society’ yet, it quickly lost ground to the NSC. At this point and with this in mind, an interesting observation is made: SACOS that had long claimed non-political affiliation died a natural death, with and/or as the New Unity Movement (NUM). In fact, some former leaders of SACOS would later confess that indeed SACOS found its expression in the NUM policies (Thomas, 2006:40; Brown, 2006).

The country’s sport transition from apartheid to “non-racialism” and; more specifically, in an extra-ordinarily short period of four years, between 1991 and 1992, South Africa went from sporting divisions at home and isolation abroad, to “unity” at home and ‘full international interaction in global sporting competitions’ (Nauright, 1997:154) This transition is discussed on the backdrop of the last apartheid President, FW de Klerk’s watershed announcement to release all the imprisoned political leaders, including the iconic Nelson Mandela; unbanning political organizations and allowing free political activity in the country; and it is found that the IOC acted pragmatically, creatively and boldly, yet, in the process, seemed to have relayed more on politicians rather than, sport leaders. The study summarizes the dynamics of the South Africa’s transition from segregationist entity to “non-racialism” and observes that the IOC, with the ANC-and-the-NP seemed to have been the critical players and custodian of the process, with SANROC-SACOS-NSC, playing secondary roles. In the final analysis, during the deliberation with the sport movement in South Africa, the IOC seemed to have downplayed and ignored some level of opposition to the process and suggestions not only to lower the pace of the process but also to reconsider its position to re-integrate South African sport; and that of recognising the newly formed National Olympic Committee of South Africa (NOCSA); first from within its ranks and, by some members of the IOC in its Sessions (IOC Archives / IOC Sessions / 95<sup>th</sup> IOC Session, 1989:7; IOC Archives / IOC Sessions / 96<sup>th</sup> IOC Session, 1990:4-5; IOC Archives / IOC Sessions / 97<sup>th</sup> IOC Session, 1991:3-9; Mbaye, 219) and by SACOS, some members of

SANROC and the Pan Africanist Congress (PAC). In fact the PAC even went further to argue that

*'...[I]t was up to the oppressed peoples of occupied Azania, and up to them only, to set the date for the removal of the cultural boycott. With all due respect, athletes were in no position to take such an important decision alone; they could do so in conjunction with the progressive political organisations inside occupied Azania. ...'* (IOC Archives / Apartheid and Olympism Commission Report / PAC's Presentation to the IOC's Apartheid and Olympism Commission, 1991; Mbaye, 1995:219).

The positions held by both the PAC and SACOS, which apparently shared closed semblance positions, thus, contributed to the general belief (irrespective of its merit) that the ANC "used" sport as a critical bane during the political negotiated settlement with the NP, with the IOC, offering strategic assistance to this project (Booth, 1995:45; Nauright, 1997:154). In fact, up until this day, in some quarters of the sport movement in South Africa, especially the disgruntled former SASCOC and SANROC members such as Douglas Brown, Van De Horst, Reginald Feldman, Denis Brutus, Chris de Broglio, to mention but a few, accuse the ANC for "selling out" non-racial sport for political expediency (Booth, 1998; Nauright, 1997; Thomas, 2006). Booth (1995) argued that the unity the NSC managed did not mean the real empowerment of black sportspersons, thus was sham unity.

*'...In many cases, black sports officials became ceremonial figureheads, often on large salaries, alongside a core of old establishment officials who called on their supposed expertise to maintain key administrative positions. ...'* (Booth, 1995 also quoted in Nauright, 1997:154-155).

Taking this view further, Nauright (1997:154) writes:

*'...ANC officials supported the moves to sporting unity, as they quickly identified a return to international sport as a key arena from which to reach out to whites who were afraid of some kind of cultural swamping in a non-racial South Africa where everyone had the vote. While negotiations for unity were difficult, and a long process involving the efforts of hundreds of sporting officials, many sporting organizations agreed on unity by the end of 1991. ...'* (Nauright, 1997:154).

It is therefore critical to realise that whenever these accusations come up, irrespective of their merit, somehow, have a potential to bring the IOC and the Olympic Movement, into disrepute and undue criticism. For instance, in 1997, prominent scholars of South African sport history, André Odendaal, Douglas Booth, and John Nauright wrote extensively on this matter, and the former specifically declared:

*'... After the unbanning of the ANC in 1990 and the release of long-term political prisoners, the international sports boycott was speedily (and some would argue unjustifiably) abandoned. In his rush*

*to get all the world to his hometown Olympic Games in Barcelona, for 1992, IOC President Juan Antonio Samaranch announced the recognition of the new National Olympic Committee of South Africa (NOCSA) in July 1991. With NOCSA and the South Africa officially back in the Olympic movement, it was difficult for other international associations to resist the urge to re-establish links with South Africa. ...'* (Nauright, 1997:154).

That there was no law and/or official apartheid policy that banned inter-racial or non-racial sport in South Africa is well-documented (de Broglio, 1970; Ramsamy, 1982; Roberts, 1988; Merrett, 1996). While master of the ambivalent statement of policy of variable interpretation, the apartheid government position on this matter was ever consistently in rejecting mixed racial trials, insisting that sport had to follow the wider policies of apartheid. Similarly, the apartheid government never formally banned neither SASA nor SANROC, albeit its respective leaders were banned, arrested and harassed (Roberts, 1988:15; Grundlingh *et al.*, 1995:45; Nauright, 1997:129). Both white-only sport organisations and the apartheid government opposed the calls to organise the country's sport on non-racial basis throughout history and way into early 1990s. It is therefore difficult to comprehend the fact that they suddenly changed their beliefs and custom of racial exclusion and developed authentic affinity for non-racialism by the late 1980s and early 1990s; especially amidst comments by Craven and Wynand Claassen in 1987 and 1991, respectively:

*'...We need overseas tours to maintain our high ceiling. ...We are losing out on international competition and it has affected our rugby. ... (Craven in Cape Times, June 22, 1987); ... We simply cannot afford to wait one day longer to get our rugby house in order. ...'* (IOC Archives/ IOC and Olympic Movement/*Star*, October 06, 1991).

It is equally true that to the white-only sport and apartheid government, unity was never seen as a mechanism to effect genuine social change in South African and South African sport that had to be transformed from apartheid to democratic and on non-racial basis. It is known that white-only sport, in collaboration with the big business (Anglo-American, South African Breweries and other companies), solicited and poured massive amounts of money into 'rebel' tours. These companies received massive tax breaks from governments for their efforts and this meant that a semblance of high class international competition could be maintained and/or legitimated to the countries white population starved of sporting links (Nauright, 1997:153).

Similarly, the NP government, throughout history until 1991, did all in its power to ensure that there would be no mixing in sport in South Africa. One of the earliest official,

government position and/or policy statements on the topic is by the Minister of the Interior, Theophilus Dönges, who declared in *Die Burger* that:

*'...Whites and non-whites should organize their sporting activities separately, there should be no inter-racial competition within South Africa, the mixing of races in teams should be avoided, and sportsmen from other countries should respect South Africa's customs and she respects theirs. ...'* (also quoted in Race Relations Survey, 1958:9; Nauright, 1997:126).

This position was maintained and continued until the postponement of the 1967 All Blacks tour precipitated the first reforms in apartheid and unleashed a slow, but ever increasing flow of government reforms (Nauright, 1997:153). Nauright further write that it was however the cancellation of the 1985 All Blacks tour; the victory over the rebel New Zealand 'Cavaliers' in 1986, and the barring of South Africa from the inaugural Rugby World Cup in 1987, combined that forced the rugby officials to seek negotiations with the non-racial South African Rugby Union and the ANC in Harare in 1988 and; contributed to massive public outcry at exclusion. Although the apartheid government, through F.W. de Klerk, branded the rugby officials, Danie Craven and Louis Luyt, traitors to white South Africa, speaking to the IOC's Apartheid and Olympism Commission in 1991, President de Klerk, expressed enthusiasm to the country's sport organised on non-racial basis and yet, showing a calculated and conditional support for maintaining moratorium on international sport:

*'...if the [sport] moratorium were imposed upon us by someone like Ramsamy, we would regard it as unacceptable. But if the moratorium were the result of a consensus, we would be prepared to go along with it, as we believe it is not in the interests of South African sport to be in a state of conflict with the rest of the world...'* (Mbaye, 1995:210).

It is apparent that de Klerk, here, had been irritated by the battle which the SANROC leader was engaged in fighting against apartheid sport. In fact, he also seemed agitated by the entire AAM and specifically the IOC response to the latter, especially beyond 1960. Responding to Kéba Mbaye Commission presentation, President F.W. de Klerk stated amongst other things:

*'... Concerning the moratorium, if the problem can be settled as you suggested, all the better. However, I wish to underscore the need for you to honour your commitments. In the past, we have been told that if we did A, B and C, we would be readmitted. We did this but readmission never occurred... We were told we would be readmitted if we modified the fundamental laws on which apartheid rested. We are currently seeing to this and we very much hope that, this time at least, the "goal sports" will not be moved. What I am trying to say is that, if we respect the moratorium, we want to be sure that you will not come with yet another condition. If this were to happen, you would be strengthening the case of those who are still reluctant, of those who claim we misjudged the situation and who believe that they have been right all along... As you know, there are some countries which go unpunished although they do not systematically respect individual freedoms... In other countries, dictatorship rages; these countries are not punished either. Why should there be double standards? ...'* (Mbaye, 1995:209-210).

The above comments seem to suggest that to some white South Africans, including the leaders, the fight against apartheid was not justified and thus unfair. Further, in the eyes of the last leader of the Apartheid State, the IOC has treated the apartheid youth and population unfairly by excluding apartheid sport and supporting the fight against apartheid. This could have opened the eyes of the IOC and specifically the Mbaye Commission that the de Klerk's government was not really sincere, in bringing about the genuine non-racial sport in the country.

In the final analysis, however, this report concludes that the sport boycott campaigns were a success and a just cause and the apartheid sport and apartheid government were all along not only found to be off-step, but were proven by the international community, including the IOC, the Olympic Movement, the AAM and the United Nations (Harvey and Houle, 1994:348; Nauright, 1997: 135; Ramsamy, 2004:1-5). In fact Harvey and Houle (1994:348) declares that the 'anti-apartheid movement had been the most effective social movement in sport to date'. In 1998, E.S. Reddy, former Director, United Nations Centre against Apartheid, concur that in South Africa, as nowhere else, sport boycott made a great contribution to liberation (UN Archives / UN Files/Docs & Reports, 1998). This report, thus, leads to the conclusion that solely blaming the NSC-ANC-IOC trio is not only unfair but simplistic. Close analyses of the period, with hindsight reveal much more than meets the eye. Proper understanding of and the power of the international community and the pressure that the ANC and IOC found themselves in the early 1990s, can only make the analysis of this period deeper and richer. Proper understanding of the intentions and role of the white-only sport leaders, the white population and the apartheid government in this transition is critical. More critically, is the appreciation of the work and capacity of the IOC and the Olympic Movement. In 1999, President Samaranch argued that:

*'... No organisation can find a single universal answer to all the contradictions and oppositions that affect our planet... Faced with the development of society and the vicissitudes of politics, the International Olympic Committee cannot remain unmoved and has a duty to react – and does react – in the right way, committing itself to culture, peace and the well-being of society...'* (IOC Archives / Presidents/Samaranch, 1999; IOC Archives/ IOC Media, 2010:5).

This view is also shared by the current IOC President, Jacques Rogge. Rendering forewords to the First International Forum on Sport, Peace and Development (2009), President Rogge somehow illustrate the general misconceptions some people have on the IOC and its work.

More critically to the topic at hand; the IOC President outlines the capacity, limits of the IOC and the difficulties that Mbaye might have faced in adequately responding to the proposals and the demands put forth by SACOS, PAC, COSAS and President de Klerk himself, during the IOC's Apartheid and Olympism Commission visit to South Africa in 1991. President Rogge declared that:

*'...Indeed, today there is no longer any doubt that the IOC and the sports movement have a social responsibility – namely to enable the largest number of people to have access to the practice of sport, and to make this a key element of sustainable social and human well-being for individuals and society. At the same time, as I have often said, sport is not a cure for all the ills of our society. The IOC and the sports movement on their own cannot solve all the socio-economic problems which constantly threaten peace in the world. This is the role of the competent authorities, such as governments or the United Nations. What sport can do, however, and what it has been doing up to now, is to work with partners capable of supporting its vast network, encouraging sports practice among young people, expanding its reach and providing it with resources. For this reason, the IOC is involved in various development initiatives in cooperation with numerous organisations active in this area, both within and outside the sports family, which recognise the value of sport as a development tool and a means of establishing peace around the world. ...'* (IOC Archives / IOC Reports/ International Cooperation and Development report, 2009:5).

It was therefore, in this background, that the non-racial sport movement approached the IOC and the Olympic Movement in the apartheid saga and; that the former duly obliged, leading to the 1992 “breakthrough”, when South Africa's youth participated in the Olympic Games in Barcelona; a deed that was celebrated by the entire world.

## **Bibliography of sources and studies**

The IOC Archives held by the Olympic Museum in Lausanne, Switzerland: IOC DVD Files comprising the of the IOC and the Olympic movement from the earlier days of the modern Olympic Games, these are augmented by the correspondence and other related documents covering the period 1913-1918. Specific documents critical to this study include:

IOC Archives / IOC Sessions 1920-1930s: 23<sup>rd</sup> IOC Session, in Paris, 1924 or Séance du Jeudi 10 Juillet 1924 (this a French report, discussing the issue of sport development and the state Olympic Movement in Africa, generally (IOC Archives / IOC Session, 1924:21).

IOC Archives / IOC and South Africa: IOC Docs: Correspondence 1939 - MBR – Lindbergh, Albert Victor – a letter sent to the IOC by Ira.

IOC Archives / IOC and South Africa: IOC Docs: Correspondence 1939 / G. Emery, General Secretary; South African Olympic and British Empire Games Association, in 13 November 1939 barely five months after his election to be the “second delegate of the IOC to South Africa in 07 June 1939, and the letter of his acceptance received on the 27 June 1939.

IOC Archives / IOC and South Africa: IOC Docs: Correspondence 1946-1951 - MBR – Dowsett, Sydney Charles

### DVDs:

IOC Olympic Studies Centre – IOC Historical Archives / Folder (Modified CD: 11/01/2010-1607: IOC Session & Executive Board – (1940 -1949) – 1945-08 London Mantes;

### Disc1: 1945

IOC Archives / IOC Executive Board Meetings 1940 to 1949 / Disc1: 1945- This disc contains minutes of the Executive Board of the IOC, held in London, August 21-25, 1945. The Vice President of the IOC, Mr Edstron opened the meeting and reported the death of the IOC President, Count Henry Baillet-Latour, in January 1941, thus living a void, which he filled; and proposed Mr Aberdare Avery Brundage to take over as his Vice-President. The Executive Board agreed (interesting how cooption worked within the IOC at the time);

IOC Archives / IOC and South Africa and Olympic Movement and South Africa 1950 to 1959 - South African Olympic Committee Files and; SANROC files - the FIRST SASA/SANROC MEMORANDUM TO THE IOC IN 1959;

IOC Archives / IOC Presidents/ Killanin - These files also detailing Lord Killanin life and his views on Apartheid SA and the Anti-apartheid struggle – like Avery Brundage, his predecessor, he declared ‘that the latter was political and should not be entertained by the IOC and the Olympic Movement’;

IOC Archives / IOC Presidents/ Brundage/Berlin Files/ (and in IOC Archives / IOC Sessions 1950 to 1959 - CIO D\_RMOI\_AFRIS/0387787)- The latter view was in fact at this point well-established within the IOC, with its chief architect par excellence, Mr Avery Brundage, who says in the **Berlin files** that ‘sport should not be mixed with politics’, and that ‘SANROC was a political organization, and even though it uses the world Olympic in its

titled; it should be ignored and the IOC and the Olympic Movement should not have anything to do with it’;

IOC Archives / IOC Sessions 1950 to 1959 - CIO D\_RMOI\_AFRIS/0387787 – (...the above letter is also found in the IOC Archives / IOC Sessions 1950 to 1959 - CIO D\_RMOI\_AFRIS/0387787-IOC SESSIONS 1959-1972). Annexure V in one of the IOC Session in 1959 reads: ‘...The International Olympic Committee resolved that, whilst SANROC uses the word “Olympic” in its title, neither the International Olympic Committee nor any of its officials shall have any communication or dealings with it’ (IOC Archives / IOC Sessions / CIO D\_RMOI\_AFRIS/0387787-IOC SESSIONS 1959-1972 –Extraits des Session: Sur Afrique du Sud, 1959-1972). This is also found in the Annual Report, 1983/84:3;

IOC Archives / IOC Commissions / IOC Commission to South Africa/ South Africa / CIO D\_RMOI\_AFRIS/0387787-IOC SESSIONS 1959-1972 –Extraits des Session: Sur Afrique du Sud, 1959-1972 - The first “IOC Commission to South Africa”, led by an old Apartheid friend, Mr Alexander of Kenya. The Alexander and Kenya’s relationship with South Africa should be seen in a broader context of the Sport Aid given by the USA to the developing counties especially Kenya through an institution called Peace Corpse. See the Doctoral Thesis of Mansour, S. Al-Tauqi., *Olympic Solidarity: Global Order and the Diffusion of Modern Sport Between 1961 to 1980*, Loughborough University, 2003;

IOC Archives / Olympic Charter, IOC, 2007/2009, Chapter 4, Rule 29(5); Rule 24(3) - It should also be noted that Rule 24(3) of the Olympic Charter provides that “In the case of divergence between the French and English texts of the Olympic Charter... the French text shall prevail unless expressly provided otherwise in writing.” The French version of Rule 31(1), however, does not seem to offer any additional insight: “Dans la Charte olympique, l’expression ‘pays’ signifie un État indépendant reconnu par la communauté internationale.”

Benedict Anderson, *Imagined Communities*, New York (1983); For a broader discussion of these issues, see Daniel Chernilo, Gerard Delanty, and Krishan Kumar, *Handbook of Nations and Nationalism* (London: Sage, 2006); Allen Guttmann, *The Olympics: A History of the Modern Games* (University of Illinois Press, 2002); Pierre de Coubertin, *Géographie Sportive*, *Revue Olympique*, no. 64 (1911): 51;

IOC Archives / IOC and Olympic Movement / South Africa - The SANROC Files/IOC Archives; SASA Memorandum, 1959; for instance, in response to the end of the Second World War, the IOC held an Executive Committee meeting in London in August 21<sup>st</sup>-24<sup>th</sup>, 1945, which point 4 of the minutes, reads as follows: ‘...[T]he Committee decided that letters should be sent to the National Olympic Committees suggesting that they resume their activities, stimulate public interest in the Olympic Movement, stress the principles of true amateurism, etc. Political influence in the movement should be avoided. ...’ (IOC Archives / IOC Board Meetings / IOC Executive Meeting Minutes, 1945:2;

The IOC President at the time, Avery Brundage wrote: ‘... [T]here seems to be a serious misunderstanding of the action of the International Olympic Committee at its meetings in Grenoble last month. It did not approve either the Government of South Africa or its policies. It does not deal with governments nor with the political policies of any country. ...’, (SAONGA Annual Report, 1983/4:5);

In its annual report for 1983/1984 season, the SAOAGA reports that: *'...Morally, it is equally wrong for the IOC to boycott sportspersons in accordance with political acceptability or not. ... .'* (IOC Archives / IOC Executive Board / IOC Munich Executive Board Minutes, 1959: Annexure V - IOC OSC Archives). *'The goal of the Olympic Movement is to contribute to building a peaceful and better world by educating youth through sport practised without discriminating of any kind in the Olympic spirit, which requires mutual understanding with spirit of friendship solidarity and fair play'* and its *'activity is permanent and universal'* (IOC Archives / Olympic Charter, 2010:11;

In fact, in his own words, President Samaranch argued in 1988: *... The social and political phenomenon of Apartheid cannot be reconciled with the Olympic ideal, and is a source of concern for the entire world. We must all fight to eradicate it, while listening carefully to the Africans who, once this objective is achieved, will tell us when and how South Africa can be reinstated in the international sports community, from which the International Olympic Committee was the first organisation to exclude it.'* (IOC Archives, Presidents/ Samaranch, 1988; IOC Archives / IOC Media, 2010:3);

It is apparent that President Samaranch firmly believed that the IOC and the Olympic Movement wielded power to influence the world greatly. In 1990 he declared that: *'...Alone, we can reform neither man nor society... The Olympic Movement has possibly a unique opportunity, amidst the present disarray, to show through deeds that it is one of the great and beneficent social forces of our time; that in all places, and in all times, it places sport, such as we conceive it, at the service of the human community. ...'* (IOC Archives / Olympic Media, 2010);

#### IOC and Boycott Documents

IOC Archives / IOC/Olympic Movement and South Africa - The reflections on the 1968 Mexico City's 20<sup>th</sup> Olympiad; It has been forty years since these historic Games. They are historic in the sense that they were the first to be hosted by a developing, Spanish-speaking Latin American country. The look on these Games will not be complete without investigating the IOC's reasoning;

The IOC's position and pronouncements on boycotts, see, the IOC Archives / BOX A3: 1 PRESS CUTTINGS (articles de presse) – 1959 to 1987;

**The Mexican Games and South African question: IOC Archives / IOC/Olympic Movement and South Africa - SDI: 1959 to 1968 – IOC: RELATIONS TO THE OLYMPIC MOVEMENT (CIO) D: RMOI. AFRIS/013;**

IOC Archives / BOX A3: 1 PRESS CUTTINGS (articles de presse) – 1959 to 1987 - Article: "Mexico withholds Olympic invitation to S.A"- Brungade in secret move, Sunday Times Diplomatic Correspondent, London, Saturday, n.d. (1968);

IOC Archives / BOX A3: 1 PRESS CUTTINGS (articles de presse) – 1959 to 1987 - The Mexican (Olympic) Committee organizing the 1968 Olympic Games to be held in Mexico City has withheld an invitation to South Africa pending an extraordinary meeting of the executive of the International Olympic Committee in Lausanne, Switzerland, next month. This surprise development, secretly agreed with the I.O.C. president Mr Avery Brundage in Chicago yesterday, cast doubt over South Africa's being allowed to take part in the Games.

The move came after African, Asian, “communist” and several Western nations announced or threatened to boycott the Games if South Africa took part.

IOC Archives / BOX A3: 1 PRESS CUTTINGS (articles de presse) – 1959 to 1987 - **Political:** The shadow of the walk-out has spread to Mexico itself where political authorities are pressing for the exclusion of South Africa. Their case is that Mexico should abandon plans to stage a fragmented Olympic Games thereby implicitly lining up with those countries campaigning for a reversal of the decision to readmit South Africa.

Meanwhile the opponents of the apartheid have begun putting the heat on the Japanese Olympic Committee to withdraw on the grounds that this would make it virtually impossible for any Asian country to take part. If this were to happen the Games would begin to look like a White man’s athletic festival, so wrecking the event’s true purpose and spelling its failure, if not collapse.

(Again), in the **IOC Archives / IOC/Olympic Movement and South Africa -SDI: 1959 to 1968 – IOC: RELATIONS TO THE OLYMPIC MOVEMENT (CIO) D: RMOI. AFRIS/013** - Article: “Campaign to gain support in U.S”, Sunday Times Diplomatic Correspondent, London, Saturday, n.d. (1968), by Raymond Heard, Washington, Saturday, 1968;

IOC Archives / BOX A3: 1 PRESS CUTTINGS (articles de presse) – 1959 to 1987 - South African diplomats in America are distributing a pamphlet claiming that the Republic’s “expanding multi-racial and multi-national population” is making itself increasingly felt in international sporting events. The pamphlet, entitled, “South Africa – Sportsman’s Country”, is expected to help win support in the United States for the Republicans’ controversial readmission to the Olympic Games. It contains several photographs of Whites and Black athletes in action. One picture is of American coach, Raymond Cizek, working with a group of African athletes.

United Nations Archives / United Nations Unit on Apartheid, Notes and Documents, No. 16/71, April 1971.  
<http://www.aafila.org/SportLibrary/ISS/ISS2102/ISS2102h.pdf>; <http://www.la84foundation.org/SportLibrary/ISS/ISS2102/ISS2102c.pdf>, (Booth, D).detail the AAM and the struggle against SANROC;

(Also the Minutes of the IOC) IOC Archives / IOC Sessions / 95<sup>th</sup> IOC Session in Puerto Rico, August 30 to 01<sup>st</sup> September 1989. In the Agenda South Africa’s apartheid question is list in point (c) ‘Apartheid and Olympism’ – Report by the Chairman, H.E. Judge Keba Mbaye, (IOC Session, 1989: 7) The main crux of the report was revolving around the measures taken to fight against apartheid in sport that have been taken by the Australian and Canadian governments. He proposed that the IOC to remind the NOCs of its position, asking them to ensured that this be unscrupulously respected; as far as tennis players having taken part in competitions in South Africa since the Games in Seoul were concerned, they should not be authorized to take part in future Olympic Games.

Mr Daume requested the IOC President, explained that athletes who took part in competitions in South Africa would no longer have the possibility of taking part in Olympic Games; that was to apply from that moment the decision was taken onwards. On this subject, H.E. Judge Mbaye was pleased to confirm that the Executive and the Programme and Apartheid Commission were moving in the same direction.

IOC Archives/ IOC Session, August 30 - September 01, 1989:59 - Following a question by Mr. Attarabulsi, H.E. Mbaye replied that the Commission could only forward proposals and recommendations to the Executive Board, to the President and to the Session and that consequently it was not for the Commission to enter into contact with the federations regarding disqualifications or impose limits on their activities. President proposed that the Commission's report be accepted, assuring the meeting that 'little by little, all members of the Olympic Movement would follow the direction taken by the IOC'. Critical, the decisions taken by the Session were: The report by the Chairman of the Apartheid and Olympism Commission was accepted by the Session. With effect from that session, athletes having taken part in competitions in South Africa since the Seoul Games to be banned from future Olympic Games.

IOC Archives/ IOC Session, August 30 - September 01, 1989:59) - Annexure 4 on page 59 outlines the specific aspects of this report and discussion. This annexure details the terms of reference for the commission and its member and advisors. The listed members of the Commission "Apartheid and Olympism" were General Henry E.O. Adefope; H.E. Mr. Jean-Claude Ganga; Mr. R. Kevan Gosper; Mr Zhenliang HE; Mr. Marc Hodler; H.E. Judge Kéba Mbaye and Ivan Slavkov. H.E. Judge Keba Mbaye was nominated President of the Commission "Apartheid and Olympism". The following were nominated as advisors to the Commission "Apartheid and Olympism": Mr Lamine BA; Mr Fekrou Kidane and Mr Sam Ramsamy, with Mr Alain Court nominated Secretary to the Commission (IOC Session, August 30 - September 01, 1989:59).

IOC Archives / Kéba Mbaye, *The International Olympic Committee and South Africa*, International Olympic Committee, Lausanne, 1995 at 75 and 186. Mbaye went on to heap praise upon the ITTF and then-president Ivor Montagu: "At the time [mid-1950s], there was only one exception to this hesitant attitude [of IFs unwilling to expel apartheid sporting institutions]: that of the International Table Tennis Federation, which agreed to recognize the South African non-white Table Tennis Federation and to exclude the white Federation. It must be said that its president at the time, Ivor Montagu, was a humanist well known for his ideas on justice and his commitment to the principle of equality and basic human rights. He criticized not only the South African Government for being responsible for apartheid, but more generally, the sport organizations and even athletes taken individually. He found it scandalous that the white South African athletes acquiesced to the situation created by their Government. He continued to repeat to anyone who would listen that 'Like any Briton, I believe in the universality of sport'. If a list is drawn up one day of great athletes who fought for the Olympic ideal, we should not forget to include Ivor Montagu."

IOC Archives/Members of the IOC - For another excellent resource on these issues see Sam Ramsamy, "Apartheid: The Real Hurdle." London: International Defence and Aid, 1982.

**IOC Archives / OlympicInformationCenter / OlympicReview / 1988 / ore249/ORE249f.pdf. IOC Archives / (This details the outcome of the "State General" Conference of the IOC and/or the Apartheid and Olympism Conference that was held in Lausanne in 1988;**

IOC Archives / Twelve NOCs Recognized but Unified Team in Barcelona, Olympic Review, 295 (1992): 221-222;

United Nations Archives / United Nations Security Council, Resolution 757, May 20, 1992.

IOC Archives / The State of the Olympics as seen by the IOC President Jacques Rogge, Vancouver Sun, March 2, 2008;

IOC Archives / International Olympic Committee (IOC), Biographies: Members of the IOC, (2009) [www.olympic.org](http://www.olympic.org).

The Canadian Broadcasting Corporation (CBC): Canadian film. (2004). *Madiba: The Life & Times of Nelson Mandela*.

Anti-Apartheid DVD Video Series. (2010): “*Have You heard from Johannesburg*”: Hell of A Job; Fair Play; Road to Resistance; The New Generation; From Selma to SOWETO; The Bottom Line & Free at Last. [www.clarityfilms.org](http://www.clarityfilms.org). Clarity Educational Productions, produced and directed by Connie Field. U.S.A. and Canada.

### List of Documents and references

African National Congress, Archives. *Sport Boycott 1987-1990, Box 31 Folder 210*. (CARE) Campaign Against Racial Exploitation (Australia) 2 July 1985 - letter to representations of Adelaide Sport organizations by Irene Gale, CARE National Secretary. “Stofile to stop rebel tours - Brief Profile of Reverend Arnold Stofile, contained in the

*African Studies Quarterly*: <http://www.africa.ufl.edu/asq/v8/v8i3a14.htm>  
Spring 2006.

Australian Mission of the ANC archives, house at Fort Hare University, Alice, South Africa.

Archer, and Boullion, A. (1982). *The South African Game*, London.

“Boipatong Massacre”. ANC. 18 June 1992.  
<http://www.anc.org.za/ancdocs/pr/1992/pr0618.html>; Retrieved 2007-04-28.

Booth, D. (1998). *The Race Game. Sport and Politics in South Africa*. London: Frank Cass.

Booth, D. (1999). *The Antinomies of Multicultural Sporting Nationalism: A Case Study of Australia and South Africa*, University of Otago, New Zealand.

De Broglio, C. (1970). *South African Sport: Racism in Sport*, Christian Action Publishers (Ltd), London.

De Klerk, F.W. (1998). *Die Laaste Trek – n nuwe begin: Die Outobiografie*. Human & Rousseau (Edms) Bpk, Cape Town, South Africa (or *The Last Trek – A New Beginning: A Biography*. Macmillan Publishers Ltd, London, UK).

Cilliers, Jakkie (1998). “From Pariah to Partner - Bophuthatswana, the NPKF, and the SANDF”. *African Security Review* 7 (4). <http://www.iss.co.za/pubs/asr/7No4/Pariah.html>. Retrieved 2006-12-19.

“Country Studies: South Africa, Towards Democracy”. Federal Research Division of the Library of Congress. <http://countrystudies.us/south-africa/36.htm>. Retrieved 2006-12-19.

Edwards, H. (1973). *Sociology of Sport*, Dorsey Press, Homewood, Illinois.

Van Der Merwe, F. (1997). *Sport History*, Stellenbosch, RSA

Goslin, A. (1996). ‘Human Resource Management as a Fundamental Aspect of a Sport Development Strategy in South African Communities’, *Journal of Sport Management*, 10: 207-217.

Gosper, K.R. with Korporaal, G. (2000). *An Olympic Life: Melbourne 1956 to Sydney 2000*, Allen & Unwin, NSW, Australia.

Grundlingh, A, Odendaal, A. and Spies, B. (1995). *Beyond the Tryline: Rugby and South African Society*, Ravan Press, Johannesburg, 1995.

Guttmann. A. (1984). *The Games Must Go On: Avery Brundage and the Olympic Movement*. Columbia University Press. New York

Gutto, Shadrack B. O. Black “Racism” against Whites in the New South Africa: How the South African Human Rights Commission got it Wrong and the Challenges to Transformation of Knowledge Production and Application in South Africa. Guest Speech at the Graduation Ceremony, Tshwane University of Technology, Soshanguve Campus, Thursday, April 24 2008.

Hain, P, *Don't Play with Apartheid: The Background to the Stop The Seventy Tour Campaign*, 1971.

Hartman, R.A (2004). *The Life of Ali Bacher*. Johannesburg: Viking, 2004.

<http://www.socresonline.org.uk/socresonline/1/2/1.html>)

IOC Archives / International Olympic Committee/ Members of the IOC / 2009 / Biographies: Members of the IOC. IOC, Lausanne, Switzerland.

Johns, K, (1995). ‘A Second Innings for Cricket: The Political Economy, Nation-building and Cricket Development Programmes in South Africa’, unpublished. MA thesis: University of the Witwatersrand.

Leck, N, *South African Sport*, Cape Town, MacDonald, 1977,p.4, in Anderson, ‘An investigation into the effect of race and politics on the development of South African sport, 1979, p.35.

Lijuan. L. (2007). *He Zhenliang and China's Olympic Dream*. Foreign Languages Press. Beijing China.

Mandela, Nelson (1994). *Long Walk to Freedom*.

Marquard, L, *The people and politics of South Africa*, Oxford University Press, Cape Town, 1952, p.63; Leonard, FE and Affleck, GB, *The History of Physical Education*, Lea and Febiger, Philadelphia, 1947, p.423, in PG Anderson, 'An investigation into the effect of race and politics on the development of South African sport (1970-1979)', University of Stellenbosch: D. Phil, 1979, p.35

Mbaye, K. (1995). *The International Olympic Committee and South Africa: Analysis and Illustration of a Humanist Sports Policy*. International Olympic Committee, Lausanne, 1995.

Merrett, C, (1995). 'Comrades of a Particular Type: An Alternative History of the Marathon, 1921-1983' *Natalia* 25, pp.65-70.

Merrett, C. (2001) 'Aurora: the Challenge of Non-Racial Cricket to the Apartheid State of the Mid-1970s' *International Journal of the History of Sport* 18(4): 95-122.

Murray, B and Merrett, C. (2004). *Caught Behind: Race and Politics in Springbok Cricket*. Johannesburg and Pietermaritzburg: Wits University Press and University of KwaZulu-Natal Press.

"Minutes and Accords between the ANC and the South African Government, May 1990 - February 1991". African National Congress. Archived from the original on 2006-09-24. <http://web.archive.org/web/20060924080916/http://www.anc.org.za/ancdocs/history/transitions/minutes.html>. Retrieved 2006-12-19.

"National Peace Accord". 14 September 1991. Archived from the original on 2007-07-14. <http://web.archive.org/web/20070714064314/http://www.anc.org.za/ancdocs/history/transitions/npaccord.html>. Retrieved 2007-04-28.

Nauright, J. (1997). *Sport, Culture and Identities in South Africa*. Cape Town: David Philip.

Nedbank Group. (1987). *A Guide to South African Sport*. p. 164.

Nongogo, P. (2004). *The Origins and Development of Black Rugby in East London and Mdantsane: A Case Study of Selected Clubs – 1911 to 2000*. An unpublished Masters Dissertation, Fort Hare University, Alice, Eastern Cape, South Africa.

O'Meara, D. (1996). *Forty Lost Years*. Johannesburg: Ravan: 170-189; Procter, M. and Murphy, P. *South Africa: the Years of Isolation and the Return to International Cricket* (Durban: Bok, 1994), p.58.

Odendaal, A. (1977). *Cricket in Isolation: The Politics of Race and Cricket in South Africa*. Andre

Odendaal, A, (1984). *Vukani Bantu: The Beginnings of Black Protest Politics in South Africa to 1912*.

Odendaal, A. (1977). *Cricket in Isolation: The Politics of Race and Sport in South Africa* (Cape Town: Self-published (Odendaal, A.).

Padayachee, V, (2005). *Living in Cloud Cuckooland: Politics and Cricket in White South Africa Transformation: Critical Perspectives on Southern Africa*, Michigan State University Press-59, pp. 109-121.

Peires, J, “‘Facta non Verbal!’: Toward a History of Black Rugby in the Eastern Cape’, Johannesburg, (unpublished paper) 1981.

Phillips, M. & Nauright, J. (1999), *Sport Fan Movements to Save Suburban-based football Teams threatened with amalgamation in different Football Codes in Australia.*, *International Sport Studies*, Press.

Ramsamy, S. (1982). *Apartheid - The Real Hurdle: Sport in South Africa & International Boycott*, North American Society for Sport History.

Ramsamy, S. (2004). *Reflections On A Life In Sport*. Greenhouse: Cape Town.

Rex, J. (1996) 'National Identity in the Democratic Multi-Cultural State', *Sociological Research Online*, vol. 1, no. 2,

Roberts, C, eds., (1990). *Challenges Facing South African Sport: Challenges facing Non-racial sport by Tshwete, VS*, Township Publishing Co-operative Editions, Cape Town, South Africa.

Roberts, C, eds. (1989). *Sport and Transformation: Contemporary Debates on South African Sport*. Township Publishing Co-operation.

“Record of Understanding”. African National Congress. Archived from the original on 2006-10-12.

<http://web.archive.org/web/20061012064901/http://www.anc.org.za/ancdocs/history/record.html>. Retrieved 2006-12-19.

Schobel, H. (1968). *The Four Dimensions of Avery Brundage*. Leipzig

Shepherd, R.H.W. (1942). *Lovedale, South Africa: The Story of a Century, 1841-1941*. Lovedale, Lovedale Press.

South African Government magazines and papers including the Department of Sport and Recreation White Paper, (1996), Sport and Recreation South Africa – webpage.

South African Rugby Football Union-Conference Against Racism, Prejudice and Discrimination in South African Rugby: The Emergence of the SA Rugby Chapter 2000, 30-31 May 2000.

Sparks, Allister (1994). *Tomorrow is Another Country*. Struik.

Stiff. P. (2001). *Warfare by Other Means: South Africa in the 1980’s and 1990s*. Alberton: Galago.

Terreblanche, Sampie. (2002). *A History of Inequality in South Africa, 1652–2002*.

Pietermaritzburg: University of Natal Press, 2002. This is can also be seen in Limb, P. (2006). *A History of Inequality in South Africa, 1652–2002*. *African Studies Quarterly*,

Volume 8, Issue 3, Spring 2006. 527 pp and in The Canadian Broadcasting Corporation (CBC): Canadian film. (2004). *Madiba: The Life & Times of Nelson Mandela*.

“The history of the Constitution”. Constitutional Court of South Africa. <http://www.constitutionalcourt.org.za/text/constitution/history.html>. Retrieved 2007-04-28.

“The 1994 Elections”. U.S. Department of the Army. <http://countrystudies.us/south-africa/77.htm>. Retrieved 2007-04-28.

“The CODESA Negotiations”. SA History Online: <http://www.sahistory.org.za/pages/governance-projects/constitution/codesa.htm>. Retrieved 2007-12-03.

Thomas, C. (Ed). ( 2006). Sport and Liberation in South Africa: Reflections and suggestions, Sport and Recreation, South Africa and University of Fort Hare, a chapter by Basil Brown, “The Destruction of the Non-racial Sport – A Consequence of the Negotiated Political Settlement”.

“Turning Points in History Book 6: Negotiation, Transition and Freedom”. <http://www.sahistory.org.za/pages/library-resources/online%20books/turningpoints/bk6/intro.htm>. Retrieved 2007-12-03.

Turton (2010), *Shaking Hands with Billy* (Shaking Hands with Billy ed.), Durban: South Africa: Just Done Productions. [http://openlibrary.org/books/OL22656001M/Shaking\\_Hands\\_with\\_Billy](http://openlibrary.org/books/OL22656001M/Shaking_Hands_with_Billy) or <http://www.shakinghandswithbilly.com>.

“1992: South Africa votes for change”. BBC. 18 March 1992. [http://news.bbc.co.uk/onthisday/hi/dates/stories/march/18/newsid\\_2524000/2524695.stm](http://news.bbc.co.uk/onthisday/hi/dates/stories/march/18/newsid_2524000/2524695.stm). Retrieved 2007-04-28.

Welsh. F. (2000). A History of South Africa. London: Harper Collins.

### **The annexes, including any additional information interesting for the project**

IOC Archives / IOC Sessions 1920-1930s: 23<sup>rd</sup> IOC Session, in Paris, 1924 or Séance du Jeudi 10 Juillet 1924 (this a French report, discussing the issue of sport development and the state Olympic Movement in Africa, generally (IOC Archives / IOC Session, 1924:21).

IOC Archives / IOC and South Africa: IOC Docs: Correspondence 1939 - MBR – Lindbergh, Albert Victor – a letter sent to the IOC by Ira

IOC Archives / IOC and South Africa: IOC Docs: Correspondence 1946-1951 - MBR – Dowsett, Sydney Charles

IOC Archives / IOC Executive Board Meetings 1940 to 1949 - This disc contains minutes of the Executive Board of the IOC, held in London, August 21-25, 1945. The Vice President of the IOC, Mr Edström opened the meeting and reported the death of the IOC President, Count Henry Baillet-Latour, in January 1941, thus leaving a void, which he filled; and proposed Mr

Aberdare Avery Brundage to take over as his Vice-President. The Executive Board agreed (interesting how cooption worked within the IOC at the time);

IOC Archives / IOC and South Africa and Olympic Movement and South Africa 1950 to 1959 - South African Olympic Committee Files and; SANROC files - the FIRST SASA/SANROC MEMORANDUM TO THE IOC IN 1959;

These files also detailing Lord Killanin life and his views on Apartheid SA and the Anti-apartheid struggle – like Avery Brundage, his predecessor, he declared ‘that the latter was political and should not be entertained by the IOC and the Olympic Movement’. The latter view was in fact at this point well-established within the IOC, with its chief architect par excellence, Mr Avery Brundage, who says in the **Berlin files** that ‘sport should not be mixed with politics’, and that ‘SANROC was a political organization, and even though it uses the world Olympic in its titled; it should be ignored and the IOC and the Olympic Movement should not have anything to do with it’;

This is found in the IOC ARCHIVES / IOC Sessions 1950 to 1959 - CIO D\_RMOI\_AFRIS/0387787-IOC SESSIONS 1959-1972). Annexure V in one of the IOC Session in 1959 reads: ‘...The International Olympic Committee resolved that, whilst SANROC uses the word “Olympic” in its title, neither the International Olympic Committee nor any of its officials shall have any communication or dealings with it’ (IOC Archives / IOC Sessions / CIO D\_RMOI\_AFRIS/0387787-IOC SESSIONS 1959-1972 –Extraits des Session: Sur Afrique du Sud, 1959-1972). This is also found in the Annual Report, 1983/84:3;

IOC Archives / IOC and Olympic Movement and South Africa - The SANROC Files/IOC Archives; SASA Memorandum, 1959; for instance, in response to the end of the Second World War, the IOC held an Executive Committee meeting in London in August 21<sup>st</sup>-24<sup>th</sup>, 1945, which point 4 of the minutes, reads as follows: ‘...[T]he Committee decided that letters should be sent to the National Olympic Committees suggesting that they resume their activities, stimulate public interest in the Olympic Movement, stress the principles of true amateurism, etc. Political influence in the movement should be avoided. ...’ (IOC Archives / IOC Board Meetings / IOC Executive Meeting Minutes, 1945:2;

The IOC President at the time, Avery Brundage wrote: ‘... [T]here seems to be a serious misunderstanding of the action of the International Olympic Committee at its meetings in Grenoble last month. It did not approve either the Government of South Africa or its policies. It does not deal with governments nor with the political policies of any country. ...’, (SAONGA Annual Report, 1983/4:5);

(IOC Archives / IOC Executive Board / IOC Munich Executive Board Minutes, 1959: Annexure V - IOC OSC Archives). - In its annual report for 1983/1984 season, the SAOAGA reports that: ‘...Morally, it is equally wrong for the IOC to boycott sportspersons in accordance with political acceptability or not. ... .’ (IOC Archives / IOC Executive Board / IOC Munich Executive Board Minutes, 1959: Annexure V - IOC OSC Archives). ‘The goal of the Olympic Movement is to contribute to building a peaceful and better world by educating youth through sport practised without discriminating of any kind in the Olympic spirit, which requires mutual understanding with spirit of friendship solidarity and fair play’ and its ‘activity is permanent and universal’ (IOC Archives / Olympic Charter, 2010:11;

In fact, in his own words, President Samaranch argued in 1988: ... *The social and political phenomenon of Apartheid cannot be reconciled with the Olympic ideal, and is a source of concern for the entire world. We must all fight to eradicate it, while listening carefully to the Africans who, once this objective is achieved, will tell us when and how South Africa can be reinstated in the international sports community, from which the International Olympic Committee was the first organisation to exclude it.*' (IOC Archives / Presidents /Samaranch, 1988; IOC Archives / IOC Media, 2010:3);

It is apparent that President Samaranch firmly believed that the IOC and the Olympic Movement wielded power to influence the world greatly. In 1990 he declared that: '*Alone, we can reform neither man nor society... The Olympic Movement has possibly a unique opportunity, amidst the present disarray, to show through deeds that it is one of the great and beneficent social forces of our time; that in all places, and in all times, it places sport, such as we conceive it, at the service of the human community. ...*' (IOC Archives / Olympic Media, 2010);

United Nations Archives / United Nations Unit on Apartheid, Notes and Documents, No. 16/71, April 1971.

<http://www.aafila.org/SportLibrary/ISS/ISS2102/ISS2102h.pdf>; <http://www.la84foundation.org/SportLibrary/ISS/ISS2102/ISS2102c.pdf>, (Booth, D).detail the AAM and the struggle against SANROC;

Also the Minutes of the IOC Archives / IOC Sessions / 95<sup>th</sup> IOC Session in Puerto Rico, August 30 to 01<sup>st</sup> September 1989. In the Agenda South Africa's apartheid question is list in point (c) 'Apartheid and Olympism' – Report by the Chairman, H.E. Judge Keba Mbaye, (IOC Session, 1989: 7) The main crux of the report was revolving around the measures taken to fight against apartheid in sport that have been taken by the Australian and Canadian governments. He proposed that the IOC to remind the NOCs of its position, asking them to ensured that this be unscrupulously respected; as far as tennis players having taken part in competitions in South Africa since the Games in Seoul were concerned, they should not be authorized to take part in future Olympic Games.

IOC Archives / IOC Sessions / 95<sup>th</sup> IOC Session in Puerto Rico, August 30 to 01<sup>st</sup> September 1989 - Mr Daume requested the IOC President, explained that athletes who took part in competitions in South Africa would no longer have the possibility of taking part in Olympic Games; that was to apply from that moment the decision was taken onwards. On this subject, H.E. Judge Mbaye was pleased to confirm that the Executive and the Programme and Apartheid Commission were moving in the same direction.

IOC Archives / IOC Sessions / 95<sup>th</sup> IOC Session in Puerto Rico, August 30 to 01<sup>st</sup> September 1989. - Following a question by Mr. Attarabulsi, H.E. Mbaye replied that the Commission could only forward proposals and recommendations to the Executive Board, to the President and to the Session and that consequently it was not for the Commission to enter into contact with the federations regarding disqualifications or impose limits on their activities. President proposed that the Commission's report be accepted, assuring the meeting that 'little by little, all members of the Olympic Movement would follow the direction taken by the IOC'. Critical, the decisions taken by the Session were: The report by the Chairman of the Apartheid and Olympism Commission was accepted by the Session. With effect from that session, athletes having taken part in competitions in South Africa since the Seoul Games to be banned from future Olympic Games.

IOC Archives / IOC Sessions / 95<sup>th</sup> IOC Session in Puerto Rico, August 30 to 01<sup>st</sup> September 1989. / Annexure 4 on page 59 outlines the specific aspects of this report and discussion. This annexure details the terms of reference for the commission and its member and advisors. The listed members of the Commission “Apartheid and Olympism” were General Henry E.O. Adefope; H.E. Mr. Jean-Claude Ganga; Mr. R. Kevan Gosper; Mr Zhenliang HE; Mr. Marc Hodler; H.E. Judge Kéba Mbaye and Ivan Slavkov. H.E. Judge Keba Mbaye was nominated President of the Commission “Apartheid and Olympism”. The following were nominated as advisors to the Commission “Apartheid and Olympism”: Mr Lamine BA; Mr Fekrou Kidane and Mr Sam Ramsamy, with Mr Alain Court nominated Secretary to the Commission (IOC Session, August 30 - September 01, 1989:59).

**IOC Archives / Olympic Information Center / Olympic Review / 1988 / ore249/ORE249f.pdf. IOC Archives / (This details the outcome of the “State General” Conference of the IOC and/or ) the Apartheid and Olympism Conference that was held in Lausanne in 1988;**

IOC Archives / International Olympic Committee (IOC), Biographies: Members of the IOC, (2009) [www.olympic.org](http://www.olympic.org).

The Canadian Broadcasting Corporation (CBC): Canadian film. (2004). *Madiba: The Life & Times of Nelson Mandela*.

Anti-Apartheid DVD Video Series. (2010): “*Have You heard from Johannesburg*”: Hell of A Job; Fair Play; Road to Resistance; The New Generation; From Selma to SOWETO; The Bottom Line & Free at Last. [www.clarityfilms.org](http://www.clarityfilms.org). Clarity Educational Productions, produced and directed by Connie Field. U.S.A. and Canada.