The Dissertation Committee for Scott Ryan Jedlicka Certifies that this is the approved version of the following dissertation:

A Structural Theory of Olympic Governance

Committee:

Thomas M. Hunt, Supervisor

Laurence Chalip

Marlene A. Dixon

John M. Hoberman

Janice S. Todd

A Structural Theory of Olympic Governance

by

Scott Ryan Jedlicka, B.A., M.Ed.

Dissertation

Presented to the Faculty of the Graduate School of

The University of Texas at Austin

in Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements

for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

The University of Texas at Austin

August 2014

Dedication

This work is dedicated to my family.

Acknowledgements

During the time it took to complete this project, I lived in three different cities in three different time zones. Needless to say, this project would not have been possible without the encouragement, inspiration, and contributions of a number of people. Writing the majority of this work away from Austin and the University of Texas, a place I called home for nearly five years, has made me appreciate even more the value of such support.

Though he will likely disavow any praise, I cannot overemphasize the importance of my supervisor, Dr. Thomas Hunt, in helping this project become more than merely an interesting idea. Indeed, the depth of his belief in this project sometimes exceeded my own. More significantly, his selfless guidance and unwavering friendship were invaluable in helping me to mature as a scholar and person. While I can't say for certain, I expect it is quite rare to find someone with whom you can enjoy both a close professional and personal relationship. In any case, I count myself lucky to have had such a person as a mentor.

I would also like to acknowledge the other members of my dissertation committee. Dr. Jan Todd saw my potential before even I did and helped me to realize it. She is a true leader and someone I admire greatly. She took a chance on me and I will be forever grateful that she did. Dr. Laurence Chalip continues to inspire me to be a better scholar and I am thankful for his timely encouragement. Likewise, I aspire to one day approximate Dr. John Hoberman's incisive scholarship; his comments were especially helpful in shaping the final revision of this project. Dr. Marlene Dixon showed me (perhaps unknowingly) the importance of maintaining a balance between career and

A Structural Theory of Olympic Governance

Scott Ryan Jedlicka, Ph.D.

The University of Texas at Austin, 2014

Supervisor: Thomas M. Hunt

This study investigates the suitability of applying international relations theory, specifically international regime theory, to Olympic sport governance. The reliance of the Olympic governance system upon its conception of sport as a politically transcendent source of moral inspiration and the importance of this ideology to political actors can be used to accurately classify it as an international regime or institution. Two outcomes derive from this argument. First, the Olympic regime recognizes states as free riders and allows them to accrue benefits from association with Olympic sport without bearing any of the costs of providing it. This makes the Olympics an especially appealing target for state political manipulation. Second, the regime is relatively unable to enforce any of its rules for state behavior not because it is weak or lacking in legitimacy, but because its ideological principles make enforcement impossible. The arguments advanced in the first section of the dissertation are supported by empirical case studies in the second. Historical process tracing methods are used to synthesize historical narrative with causal analysis. The decision to ban South Africa at the 1968 Summer Olympics, the 1980 U.S.-led boycott of the Summer Games in Moscow, and the development of the International Convention against Doping in Sport are all instances in which the Olympic movement and international politics intersected, and thus represent useful illustrations of the relationship between the Olympic regime and international politics.

Table of Contents

Introduction

        This study is nominally about sport and politics. That a relationship between the two exists at all is commonly accepted as true, especially among researchers and authors who specialize in this area. This collective acknowledgement is itself quite noteworthy, as much past (and some contemporary) scholarship treats the sport-politics connection as surprising or counterintuitive; many authors presume readers will be astonished that sport and politics do, in fact, "mix". However, sport's role in this relationship is too often misunderstood (to say nothing of the relationship itself). Sport is consistently and mistakenly treated as existing at either one of two philosophical extremes. One conception of sport portrays it as inherently "good" but nonetheless corruptible; it can only fail to be a positive moral force when we humans fail in one way or another to adhere to the unassailable principles of true sport. It is this notion that views any connection between sport and politics as unnecessary and probably harmful to sport. At the opposite end of the spectrum, sport is treated as a value-neutral social practice. This perspective views sport as produced by and reflective of its societal context. Sport's goodness is relative to its ability to achieve whatever ends desired of it by society. In this sense, sport is a social or political instrument, wielded by various actors at various times to achieve goals largely external to sport.[1] Depending on one's perspective, the relationship between sport and politics can thus take on very different meanings and can be evaluated in very different ways. What these views have in common, however, is their

---

[1] Juxtaposing conceptions of sport in this way is derivative of a larger and significantly more nuanced ongoing debate in sport philosophy. A well-articulated middle ground between these two positions, as well as accessible summaries of each, can be found in William J. Morgan, "Broad Internalism, Deep Conventions, Moral Entrepreneurs, and Sport," *Journal of the Philosophy of Sport* 39, no. 1 (2012): 65-100. An equally compelling response is Scott Kretchmar, "Pluralistic Internalism," *Journal of the Philosophy of Sport* (2014), doi: 10.1080/00948705.2014.911101.

treatment of sport as a fixed concept. Whether inherently good or inherently vacuous, sport, in its most elemental state, is unchanging.

I take a decidedly different approach to conceptualizing sport. Rather than lamenting the "intrusion" of politics into sport or expressing superficial astonishment at the existence of a connection between these two phenomena, this dissertation advances a theory of sport and politics that reassesses sport's influential, perhaps even causal role in shaping political choices and behavior. Sport is both possessive of inherent values and contingent upon the context in which it exists. Because sport is not a fixed construct (neither empty vessel nor moral beacon), its ability to have an impact on our lives is shaped to a significant degree by those who create and, on a larger scale, govern sport. In other words, those who exert control over sport—its constitutive and regulative rules, its administrative apparatus, the values it explicitly or implicitly symbolizes—are able to influence what sport is and what sport will do.

A trivial example illustrates this point. If, one day, I ask my friend to join me for a game of tennis, it is entirely up to us, both individually and collectively, to decide how the game will proceed and what meanings or lessons (if any) we draw from it. If we are both highly skilled, we might adhere very closely to rules of play set forth by some governing body and observe other strict protocols that will guide our conduct and behavior. Further, the game might be considered a reliable indicator of which one of us is the superior player; if we are not particularly close friends (or if one has recently wronged the other in some way), we may even end up being quite competitive with or hostile toward one another. However, if we are not that skilled, or simply not feeling that spirited, we might create a more relaxed atmosphere for ourselves, in which rule adherence is not as important and the outcome not quite so reflective of our relative abilities. In both cases, note that both the structure of the match and the meanings drawn

from it are left entirely up to the two people responsible for making the match possible in the first place. If we consider instead that all the available courts are occupied by a large tennis tournament organized by a local sport club (and our only option, if we want to play at all, is to enter the tournament), the locus of control shifts. Instead of the players getting to decide the rules, the intensity and pace of play, and so forth, these decisions now rest with the organizing club. If my friend and I are in a non-competitive mood, we may find our participation in the tournament (assuming we are allowed entry) quickly ended. Moreover, if the club is part of some larger network of tennis organizations, the level of institutional control becomes even greater and more diffuse. The only choice left up to the players is simply whether or not to participate.

What this rudimentary example shows is that when considering what sport is and what sport does with regard to politics, governance matters. Again, because sport is not a rigid concept, those who exert control over sport (whether individuals or institutions) are responsible for determining its outcomes and consequences. I am not suggesting that this control is absolute or that sport's utility is unlimited. As a mode of human performance, sport still possesses unique characteristics that distinguish it from other sets of behaviors. Rather, my point is that the ability to at least partially define sport's essence and utility is accompanied by a certain level of accountability when it comes to both the positive and negative effects of sport upon other areas of life. If the local sport club in the above example finds the number of tennis players in its membership dwindling, it may want to reconsider the extent to which it emphasizes competitive tennis relative to more recreational forms of the sport. By the same token, if another of the club's sport programs fails to achieve some desired external objective (like reducing crime or childhood obesity) the club may not be entirely at fault, at least in terms of implementation. That is,

it is possible that characteristics intrinsic to sport may have rendered it an ineffective device regardless of how well or poorly the program was managed.

These brief forays into sport philosophy and the relevance of governance to the study of organized sport may seem a bit odd or needlessly abstract. But, assuming the premises introduced above are true (that sport, while containing unique inherent characteristics, is also socially constructed and that, with regard to the latter point, governing entities exert a special type of control over sport's form and purpose), it becomes clear that they are essential to this study, as they imply that the relationship between sport and politics is symbiotic, not unidirectional. In other words, political behavior in relation to sport is not necessarily corruptive, nor does sport exist in political contexts as merely an instrument to be manipulated. These cases are certainly true some of the time, but to accept them as the only possible manifestations of the sport-politics relationship wrongly excludes the array of effects that sport can have on political behavior. If, as I have argued, the effects of sport upon other areas of life are largely dependent upon the way in which it is governed, then it seems quite reasonable and appropriate to concentrate upon sport governance in the study of sport and politics.[2]

In making the case for sport governance as the key to studying and understanding the relationship between sport and politics, the Olympic movement seems an intuitively suitable subject for such investigation. The Olympic games are perhaps the most visibly political sport form in the world. Their emphasis on national symbolism and representation coupled with the Olympic movement's quasi-political objectives for sport (e.g., the promotion of global peace and respect for cultural differences) contrast starkly

---

[2] Barrie Houlihan makes a similar argument with regard to international sport organizations. However, he focuses primarily on the instrumentality of sport *vis-à-vis* politics and sees the function of sport governance as mostly delimiting the scope of sport's political uses. See Barrie Houlihan, *Sport and International Politics* (New York: Harvester Wheatsheaf, 1994), 55-81.

with a corresponding fear of and utter disdain for being exploited by states or other political actors. Situated at the heart of these diametrically opposed positions is a system of governance that can accurately be described as undemocratic, lacking transparency, and historically corrupt. It is relatively clear that the Olympics are highly politicized and the governing organizations of the Olympic movement are political entities. What remains misunderstood are the particular ways in which the nature of Olympic governance and Olympic sport enable or encourage certain types of political behavior.

In this study, I advance a comprehensive argument in support of applying international relations theory to the study of Olympic governance. Specifically, I contend that both rational choice and constructivist regime theories can, in different ways, account for the role of Olympic governance in international politics. In making this argument, my primary objective is to show how international relations theory can provide an explanatory link between the contradictory logic of Olympism (which sees sport as politically useful yet transcendent of politics) and problematic outcomes; namely, the consistent politicization of Olympic sport by states and the inability of Olympic administrators to govern effectively.

The remainder of this dissertation is split into two sections. The first focuses on theory. In the first chapter I demonstrate the plausibility of explaining the political role of Olympic governance in terms of international regime theory. The second chapter contains a review of the relevant literature. In the third chapter, I explain the methodology used in providing empirical support for my arguments. The second section is devoted to empirical case studies which are used to demonstrate regime theory's utility as an explanatory framework, as well as to identify its limits and potential boundary conditions. Finally, I offer some concluding remarks on this study's contribution to future research and to the field of sport management more generally.

SECTION I: THEORY AND METHODS

In this section I explore the relevance of international relations theory to Olympic governance. Specifically, I advance an argument in support of not only its relevance but its accuracy in explaining how the configuration of Olympic governance, combined with the normative claims Olympic administrators make about sport, produce specific outcomes. In Chapter 1, I characterize Olympic governance as a type of international political regime, comprised of loosely associated national and international organizations which are collectively responsible for governing Olympic sport. The assumption, confirmed by a growing body of research, that international sport is inherently political is the fundamental premise on which this argument is constructed. Because the IOC strongly asserts its position as the sole authority over Olympic sport, it follows that the organization is thus responsible for the political effects achieved by and through sport. By describing Olympic governance as an international regime, I attempt to show how the inherent characteristics of Olympic governance produce suboptimal outcomes for the regime. Additionally, the literature review explains how this conception of Olympic governance addresses significant gaps in current knowledge and contributes to a deeper understanding thereof. The final chapter in this section reviews the methodology and methods used to provide empirical support for the claims made in Chapter 1.

Chapter 1: Regime Theory and Olympic Governance

Because this study attempts to develop a theoretical link between Olympic governance and politics, a reasonable first step might be to decide how exactly the concept of "politics" should be specified. After all, this term is suggestive of a number of different areas on which one might focus: international relations, domestic politics, issues of social justice and human rights, or even the internal power dynamics of the International Olympic Committee (IOC). For many reasons, this study will limit its conception of "politics" to international relations. First, the Olympic movement is, by design, an international phenomenon. Although its founder Pierre de Coubertin had domestic (specifically, French) political interests in mind when he first involved himself in amateur sport, the Olympics' emphasis on national representation and their view of sport as a force for peace are indicative of their international disposition. Second, scholarship concerning the politics of the Olympic movement focuses (explicitly or implicitly) on international relations, particularly on the ways in which nation-states use the Olympics for foreign policy purposes. Third (and assuming the first two reasons are valid), concepts borrowed from international relations theory can provide at least a starting point for explaining the Olympic governance system's international political status and function. That is, if the Olympics are an international political entity and "matter" to international relations, the robust theoretical literature in this area ought to be able to at least partially account for or explain Olympic governance.

Just as narrowing the scope of "politics" to the study of international relations is necessary to gain conceptual clarity, so too is it important to bring the idea of "Olympic governance" into sharper focus in order to conduct a more compelling analysis. In order to accomplish this task, two assumptions about the Olympic governance system must be

validated: first, that such a system exists and can be empirically identified and second, that it can, at least for the purposes of this study, be considered a unitary actor. That is, the Olympic governance system, though it is comprised of many different individuals, groups, and organizations, can nonetheless be described as a single entity. Clarifying the nature and structure of Olympic governance is fundamental to the core argument of this study, which relies on these two assumptions in order to characterize Olympic governance as an international regime.

The idea of an "Olympic system" is not new.[1] However, it is a concept that is at best ambiguous, especially given the diffuse and sometimes clandestine nature of its constituent organizations. If the objective here is to establish that a system of governance does indeed exist, it is probably best to begin with identifying what is exactly is being governed. To this end, two definitions are of note, both contained in the Olympic Charter. This document defines "Olympism" as:

> a philosophy of life, exalting and combining in a balanced whole the qualities of body, will and mind. Blending sport with culture and education, Olympism seeks to create a way of life based on the joy of effort, the educational value of good example, social responsibility and respect for universal fundamental ethical principles.[2]

It goes on to define the "Olympic Movement" as:

> the concerted, organised, universal and permanent action, carried out under the supreme authority of the IOC, of all individuals and entities who are inspired by the values of Olympism. It covers the five continents. It reaches its peak with the

---

[1] Richard Espy, in *The Politics of the Olympic Games* (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1979), refers repeatedly to an "Olympic system". A more recent descriptive analysis which uses the term prominently is Jean-Loup Chappelet and Brenda Kübler-Mabbott, *The International Olympic Committee and the Olympic System: The Governance of World Sport* (London: Routledge, 2008). Paavo Seppänen, "The Olympics: A Sociological Perspective," *International Review for the Sociology of Sport* 19, no. 2 (1984): 113-127, takes the additional step of building an analysis around the notion that the Olympic system can be considered a unitary actor.

[2] International Olympic Committee, *Olympic Charter: In Force as From 9 September 2013* (Lausanne: International Olympic Committee, 2013): 11.
<http://www.olympic.org/Documents/olympic_charter_en.pdf> (accessed July 31, 2014).

bringing together of the world's athletes at the great sports festival, the Olympic Games. Its symbol is five interlaced rings.[3]

Fundamentally, Olympism is the motivational force which makes possible all things Olympic. Indeed, the Olympic Charter from which these definitions are drawn is defined in its own pages as "the codification of the Fundamental Principles of Olympism."[4] Correspondingly, and as evinced by the second definition above, the Olympic Movement is simply the totality of observable actions taken by individuals or groups that claim to be inspired by Olympism.

While Olympism is foundational to all other Olympic phenomena, the way in which the Olympic movement is defined is much more helpful in the search for a practical definition of an Olympic governance system.[5] First, the Olympic movement is defined as actual behavior, making it a much more suitable target for governance than an idea or philosophy. Second, this aggregation of behavior is, by definition, "carried out under the supreme authority of the IOC". What this suggests, then, is that the IOC governs the Olympic movement, which can be restated as the IOC governs all actions undertaken in the spirit of Olympism. While the IOC claims to govern an entire subset of ideologically-motivated behavior, it seems simultaneously impractical (if not impossible) that one organization would be able to accomplish this feat. Moreover, it still does not provide the necessary detail to demonstrate that a system of governance actually exists.

The mechanism by which the IOC asserts authority over the Olympic movement is a system of official recognition.[6] The IOC alone possesses the ability to formally acknowledge that organizations, especially international sport federations (IFs) and

---

[3] Ibid.

[4] Ibid., 9.

[5] Stylistically, I avoid capitalizing nouns used in conjunction with the term "Olympic" (e.g., "movement", "governance", "games"), except when these terms are used in this way in a directly cited source.

[6] IOC, *Olympic Charter*, 18.

national Olympic Committees (NOCs), are members of the Olympic movement.[7] Such recognition does not, however, imply that these organizations are wholly subservient to the IOC. In fact, the Olympic Charter explicitly recognizes the importance of national and international sport organizations' independence:

> Recognising that sport occurs within the framework of society, sports organisations within the Olympic Movement shall have the rights and obligations of autonomy, which include freely establishing and controlling the rules of sport, determining the structure and governance of their organisations, enjoying the right of elections free from any outside influence and the responsibility for ensuring that principles of good governance be applied.[8]

What this preservation of sovereignty suggests is that the IOC is not in the business of establishing an international sport hierarchy, nor is it entirely responsible for the actions of organizations belonging to the Olympic movement. While this helps to delimit the scope of the IOC's authority with regard to other sport organizations, it also raises the question of what, exactly, remains to be governed within the Olympic movement.

To understand the nature of Olympic governance, it is important to understand and acknowledge the type of authority the IOC exerts. The organization is not interested in creating a vast bureaucracy to govern all aspects of international sport, nor is it particularly concerned with (in fact, it is in most cases vehemently opposed to) influencing sport at the national level. The IOC, rather, traffics in ideology. This is evident in the logic through which it positions itself at the forefront of a philosophical movement (i.e., the IOC governs the movement which is in turn a manifestation of the philosophy). Though the IOC calls Olympism a "philosophy of life", this set of principles

---

[7] For a more complete description of these as well as other important organizations in the Olympic movement, see the glossary appended to this study.

[8] IOC, *Olympic Charter,* 11.

also forms the basis for a normative conception of sport.[9] Essentially, the IOC exerts authority over an idea, and its most basic governance function is to determine whether the actions and behaviors of Olympic movement members are compliant with the Olympic Charter and by extension, with the principles of Olympism.

As a system of governance, the Olympic system can be described as a coalition of relatively autonomous private organizations which agree to comply with the principles of Olympism as established by the IOC in exchange for recognition as members of the Olympic movement. Fundamentally, each party to this transaction gives and receives credibility. The IOC's claim to be the central governing authority of the abstraction it identifies as "Olympism" is supported by the Olympic movement's membership, who in turn, through official IOC recognition, receive the benefits of public association with the movement's noble ideals (to say nothing of the commercial payoffs stemming from these values' marketability). So., while the IOC's authority over other members of the Olympic movement is quite limited, it exists nonetheless. More importantly, the existence of this authority supports the notion that a system of Olympic governance and the nature of such governance can be clearly identified.

Having established the existence of an Olympic governance system rooted in the concept of Olympism as well as the authority of the IOC to interpret and police behavior relative to this concept, the second assumption foundational to this study is that the Olympic governance system can be accurately described as a unitary actor. This is not to suggest that the Olympic system *is* a unitary actor in the ontological sense; the analysis up to this point very clearly acknowledges that the members of this system maintain a good deal of autonomy and that the IOC's authority over the Olympic movement is

---

[9] This normative view of sport is adduced more fully in the Olympic Charter's description of the IOC's mission and role which, unsurprisingly, lists the promotion of Olympism as the organization's fundamental task. See Ibid., 16.

limited in scope. Rather, the characterization of the Olympic governance system as a single entity is driven by theoretical necessity. The primary objective of this study is to identify the ways in which international relations theory (specifically, regime theory) can account for the role of Olympic sport in international politics. To this end, the classification of the Olympic governance system as an international regime inherently relies upon the idea that "the regime" can be grammatically referred to in the singular form. Doing so is motivated partly by convenience, but is also rooted in the idea that the disparate components of the Olympic governance system (or any governance system) have enough in common that they can be considered collectively while still maintaining a foothold in empirical reality. This aggregative practice is not specific to the field of international relations or even to academic scholarship. We typically refer to organizations, governments, and other types of groups as singular actors, even while recognizing that they are comprised of individuals and subgroups of individuals. Further, the interrelation of these components is often highly complex. It is possible to acknowledge this complexity while still attributing behavior to the larger, unified collective.[10]

Although subsuming complex parts under the unitary actor assumption is fairly common, it is still important to show that this assumption holds for Olympic governance. Obviously, describing the Olympic governance system as a unitary actor means that a good deal of nuance and intricacy is assumed away; the complex dynamics of interpersonal and interorganizational relationships within the Olympic movement are

---

[10] That the practice of identifying large, complex groups as unitary actors is commonplace does not necessarily settle the issue of whether doing so is the *best* way of conducting an analysis. Such a pronouncement is driven partly by epistemological commitments as well as by the nature of the question being posed. On these concerns, especially on how different levels of analysis (i.e., different conceptions of the same scenario) can produce varying conclusions, see Graham Allison and Philip Zelikow, *Essence of Decision: Explaining the Cuban Missile Crisis,* 2nd ed. (New York: Longman, 1999).

intentionally disregarded. The issue is whether this loss of detail will fundamentally undermine the analysis, which in turn suggests that such a determination must be made within the context of this particular study. Given that the focus here is on the relationship between Olympic sport and international politics, I contend that considering the Olympic governance system as a unified entity is appropriate. This is because, as I will more specifically demonstrate in subsequent sections, the political relevance of Olympic sport is primarily linked to a normative conception of sport derivative of Olympism, which sees sport as serving noble, quasi-political purposes, emphasizes the necessity of national representation in competition, and rejects any sort of governmental involvement. As the preceding discussion has shown, these issues are the IOC's main concerns and the province of its authority. If it can be assumed that the members of the Olympic movement cede authority to the IOC in matters involving the nature of Olympic sport (i.e., what Olympic sport is or is not, and what Olympic sport should or should not be), and that the nature of Olympic sport is what makes it politically attractive to international actors, then the IOC can reliably be considered as acting as a representative of the entire Olympic movement within the international political arena. Again, this line of reasoning should not be construed as a total discounting of the internal workings of Olympic governance or an assertion of the IOC's absolute preeminence in all areas of international sport. Rather, it is simply a demonstration of the usefulness and appropriateness of using the unitary actor heuristic in analyzing the relationship between Olympic governance and international politics.

Having established the validity of assuming that the Olympic movement can be described as a system of governance with the IOC as its central authority and that this system can be considered a unitary actor relative to the broader international political environment, the task of linking Olympic governance to international relations theory can

13

proceed. In the remainder of this chapter, I argue that the Olympic governance system can be characterized as an international regime or institution. Based on this characterization, I discuss the seemingly perpetual politicization of the Olympics in terms of two problematic outcomes: the failure of the IOC to live up to standards of good governance, and the ease with which the principles of Olympism are politically manipulated, especially by states. In doing so, I attempt to show that the "intrusion of politics" into the Olympic sphere is not a special or deviant case, but in fact a predictable result, stemming not from political interests or forces being imposed on Olympic sport but from the very nature of Olympic governance.

OLYMPIC GOVERNANCE AS INTERNATIONAL REGIME

The concept of regimes (sometimes called "institutions") originated within the field of international relations following World War II (most notably in the 1970s and 1980s) as a way to explain the absence of widespread international conflict, even as a perceived decline in American hegemony threatened to destabilize the bipolarity of the international system. Regimes are defined as "principles, norms, rules, and decision-making procedures around which actor expectations converge in a given issue-area."[11] What makes regimes interesting as an international political concept is their status as both an independent and a dependent variable. That is, researchers examine not only the effects of regimes on international relations but also their origins and the factors that lead to their creation.[12] From the assumptions foundational to the two major paradigms in international relations (rational choice and constructivism), several strains of regime

---

[11] Stephen D. Krasner, "Structural Causes and Regime Consequences: Regimes as Intervening Variables," in *International Regimes*, ed. Stephen D. Krasner (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1983), 1.

[12] Oran R. Young, *Governance in World Affairs* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1999), 4. Young makes a distinction between "contractarian" and "constitutive" perspectives with regard to regimes. The former is concerned with how and why actors create regimes, while the latter focuses on the effects of institutions on actors' behavior.

theory have been derived.[13] Especially because this study stakes out a middle ground between these two paradigms, it is important to understand the attendant assumptions that inform differing perspectives on both how regimes are created and what their functions are with regard to international relations. To achieve such understanding, it is probably best to start by describing the fundamental tenets of both rational choice and constructivist perspectives and then work towards identifying some shared elements.

Regime Theories

Using the definition introduced above, it is reasonable to assert that regimes are instances of cooperation among states or other international actors. Even if such cooperation is merely a shared acknowledgement of basic behavioral standards or agreement on rules governing simple processes, it is clear that some amount of collaboration takes place. While this point might seem trivial, it is actually quite important because of the way cooperation is treated by different international relations paradigms.

Rational Choice

Neorealism is a systemic view of international relations that is perhaps the most pervasive (if not always the most popular or accurate) theoretical perspective in the field.[14] Neorealist theory emphasizes the primacy of states as units of analysis and state behavior as a function of their relative arrangement in an anarchical international system. According to more traditional realist theories, states are inherently power-seeking or self-

---

[13] Contemporary characterizations of international relations identify realism, liberalism, and constructivism as the field's three major paradigms. However, I prefer to use the rational choice/constructivism distinction because it emphasizes the difference between the ways in which actors interact with their environment. Rational choice assumes actors that are calculatingly self-interested, while constructivism sees ideas, beliefs, and social norms—and the interpretation thereof—as the fundamental drivers of behavior.
[14] The most well-known (and probably most cited) work is Kenneth N. Waltz, *Theory of International Politics* (Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley, 1979).

serving, and power is the fundamental motivation for political behavior.[15] As Hans Morgenthau writes "A political policy seeks either to keep power, to increase power, or to demonstrate power."[16] In contrast to this view, neorealism views power-driven behavior not as a trait inherent to states but as a rational response to the realities of the international environment. With no guarantee of security, states are forced to "self-help", which in turns leads to a system in which stability (and peace) are functions of state capabilities.[17] In his seminal work, Kenneth Waltz concluded that self-interested states would only cooperate so long as doing so served their own immediate interests; ultimately, however, these arrangements were transient, as the nature of the international system would eventually drive states to choose self-help over cooperation. Others have used his assumptions to make stronger claims about the possibility of sustained state cooperation.[18] Of particular interest is the neoliberal perspective, advanced by Robert Keohane and others, which sees regimes, institutions, and other forms of collaborative behavior as rational outcomes of self-interested behavior among states.[19] Other derivative theories, emphasizing to varying degrees the nature of states and the structure of the international system, have drawn different conclusions.

Collectively, these theories are commonly termed "rational choice" theories of state behavior, because they assume (along with the idea that states are unitary actors) that states behave more or less rationally; they can accurately assess the consequences of

[15] Hans J. Morgenthau, *Politics among Nations: The Struggle for Power and Peace* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1950), 3-25.

[16] Ibid., 21.

[17] Waltz, *Theory of International Politics*, 102-128. This chapter also contains a (the) major restatement of balance-of-power theory.

[18] Two perspectives include hegemonic stability theory and neoliberalism (or more specifically, neoliberal institutionalism). See, respectively, Robert Gilpin, *War and Change in World Politics* (London: Cambridge University Press, 1981) and Robert O. Keohane, *After Hegemony: Cooperation and Discord in the World Political Economy* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1984).

[19] Keohane, *After Hegemony,* 65-84.

a decision and act to further their own interests. The most important implication of this assumption is its predictive capability. With the appropriate empirical measures, a given state's preferences can be calculated and its actions forecast with a relatively high degree of accuracy. While the importance and influence of specific factors may vary depending on the specific theory being used, the idea that states are rational actors remains constant.

Given the neorealist influence in this school of thought, cooperation among states is treated as mostly anomalous.[20] Because of the microeconomic underpinnings of rational choice theories, both the emergence and political function of regimes are explained in terms of market forces and rational self-interest. Hegemonic stability theory (of which there are several variants) treats the presence of a hegemon (a single most powerful nation) as a necessary or at least optimal condition for the emergence of cooperation. Regime creation is a result of mutual, rational self-interest. The hegemon, whose status is dependent mostly upon military and economic might (as well as less quantifiable factors like prestige), seeks to preserve its position through binding weaker states to agreements that reify the hegemon's global leadership. At the same time, less-powerful states enter into these agreements out of a sense of self-preservation, calculating any challenge to the status quo as too costly.[21]

A second rational choice perspective on regimes, neoliberal institutionalism, argues that regimes are more aptly characterized as the outcome of bargaining among states and that the presence or absence of a hegemon is not a consequential variable.[22]

---

[20] Waltz, *Theory of International Politics*, 210.

[21] Gilpin, *War and Change in World Politics,* 144-155. Also see G. John Ikenberry, "Institutions, Strategic Restraint, and the Persistence of American Postwar Order," *International Security* 23, no. 3 (Winter 1998/99): 43-78. Although Ikenberry characterizes the creation of many postwar international arrangements as at least partially influenced by American hegemony, his explanation of their persistence beyond the Cold War and in the face of changing international power relationships strikes a distinct middle ground between rational choice and constructivist theories of regimes.

[22] Keohane, *After Hegemony,* 80-83, 182-216.

Essentially, states are capable of recognizing certain instances when cooperation is preferable to conflict, and regimes are the result of negotiation among states in an attempt to maximize absolute (as opposed to relative) gains.[23] In this view, regimes are a solution to market failure; they provide a public good to states that would have otherwise been underprovided or not produced at all.[24] Common to all of these perspectives is the view that regimes or institutions serve an instrumental function. A set of actors (usually, but not necessarily, states) recognize a specific problem that might best be solved through cooperation and create the necessary international apparatus (i.e., "principles, norms, rules, and decision-making procedures around which actor expectations converge in a given issue-area") to achieve a satisfactory solution. While opinions vary on the ability of regimes to survive a change in the utility functions of the principals involved in their creation (Ikenberry calls this ability "institutional stickiness"), the notion that institutions are agents acting on behalf of their constitutive principals is fundamental to rational choice regime theory.[25]

Constructivism

A contrary and perhaps more fundamental view of international relations known as social constructivism (or just constructivism) typically grants the assumption of an anarchic international environment. However, proponents argue that the nature of this environment does not necessarily cause states to be self-helping and mostly unable to achieve anything more than fleeting cooperation.[26] Constructivists instead claim that the

---

[23] Ibid., 75-77.

[24] Ibid., 85-109. For a more succinct elaboration of this particular argument, see Robert O. Keohane, "The Demand for International Regimes," in *International Regimes,* ed. Stephen D. Krasner (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1983), 152-161.

[25] Ikenberry, "Institutions, Strategic Restraint, and the Persistence of American Postwar Order," 45-46.

[26] Alexander Wendt, "Anarchy is What States Make of It: The Social Construction of Power Politics," *International Organization* 46, no. 2 (1992): 391-425.

influence of the international order on state behavior is socially constructed; anarchy is not, by itself, a predictive condition. Probably unintentionally (and somewhat ironically, given this dissertation's subject matter) invoking focal concepts of regulative and constitutive rules also used in sport philosophy, John Ruggie explains the distinction between rational choice and constructivism:

> This…permits us to identify an utterly profound gap in neo-utilitarianism: it lacks any concept of constitutive rules. Its universe of discourse consists entirely of antecedently existing actors and their behavior, and its project is to explain the character and efficacy of regulative rules in coordinating them. This gap accounts for the fact that, within their theoretical terms, neorealism and neoliberal institutionalism are capable of explaining the origins of virtually nothing that is constitutive of the very possibility of international relations: not territorial states, not systems of states, not any concrete international order, nor the whole host of institutional forms that states use, ranging from the concept of contracts and treaties to multilateral organizing principles. All are assumed to exist already or are misspecified.[27]

What Ruggie is saying is that rational choice theories of state behavior are built on a rather fixed view of the international system (and indeed, assume the existence of a system in the first place). While the parsimony and clarity achieved by these theories allow research to proceed in a very "scientific" manner, constructivists argue that doing so assumes away far too much; explanatory or predictive specificity is lost in the pursuit of elegance and parsimony. This tension is, in the abstract, a manifestation of the balance between the general and specific that can be found in any academic realm. Thus, the counterargument against constructivism is that the pursuit of nuance inevitably becomes mere description, and the lack of clearly-defined variables and predictable outcomes renders constructivist perspectives somewhat non-falsifiable.

---

[27] John Gerard Ruggie, "What Makes the World Hang Together? Neo-utilitarianism and the Social Constructivist Challenge," *International Organization* 52, no. 4 (1998): 871. The text commonly used in sport philosophy is Bernard Suits, *The Grasshopper: Games, Life, and Utopia* (Toronto: University of Toronto, Press, 1978).

Constructivist perspectives on regimes, while perhaps less theoretically rigorous, nonetheless offer a useful alternative view from which to proceed in assessing the degree to which Olympic governance can be accurately characterized as an international regime.[28] Constructivists explain the emergence and continued presence of international regimes and institutions in much the same way that they explain other international phenomena; namely, as the product of social interaction and processes of meaning-making among a set of actors. Diverging from rational choice perspectives, constructivism accords regimes a much greater degree of autonomy and influence over the behavior of other actors in the international system and, indeed, the system itself.[29] While rational calculation may play a role in their creation, international institutions are also the product of how actors engage with and derive meaning from ideas, beliefs, norms, values, and other less quantifiable (and much more highly variable) factors. Moreover, their legitimacy is not solely based on the ongoing support or endorsement of a principal or set of powerful principal actors, but also on their ability to embody or symbolize particularly powerful meanings.[30] In this sense, while regimes still exist in a state-dominated international system, their effects in and on this system are not dependent upon, and are at times autonomous from, state interest and action.

---

[28] Two of the most fully-developed theoretical contributions are Alexander Wendt, *Social Theory of International Politics* (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1999) and Martha Finnemore, *National Interests in International Society* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1996).

[29] Finnemore, *National Interests in International Society,* 1-33.

[30] Again, Ikenberry, "Institutions, Strategic Restraint, and the Persistence of American Postwar Order," 52 is instructive, although he does not accept outright the constructivist contention that social identity and interaction are fundamentally determinant of almost every observable phenomenon in international politics. Rather, he advances what he calls "historical institutionalism", which synthesizes elements of rational choice (which he characterizes as overemphasizing agency), constructivism (which overemphasizes structure) and history (claiming that institutions are path-dependent and historical antecedents affect future behavior). In any case, Ikenberry acknowledges that the ways in which regimes are socially constructed— the norms and beliefs which legitimize their creation and existence—matter just as much (if not more) than the rational purposes they might serve.

Regimes are a part of international political life. Whether one sees international politics as a state-based microeconomic market or a fluid society of international actors, regimes play a role in the functioning of this system. In the next section, I assess the utility of describing Olympic governance as a regime, and apply rational choice and constructivist ideas to the formation and persistence of the Olympic governance system. In doing so, I avoid adopting one paradigmatic lens to the exclusion of others. Rather, I attempt to show that, while the plausibility of the accounts offered by differing perspectives varies, the regime concept accurately captures the political status of Olympic governance regardless of paradigmatic commitments.

The Olympic Regime

It seems reasonable, returning to Krasner's definition of regimes, that Olympic governance could be considered a set of "principles, norms, rules, and decision-making procedures around which actor expectations converge in a given issue-area." The organizations comprising the Olympic governance system standardize sporting practices around the world in accordance with the principles of Olympism. As noted above, this is the fundamental transaction that forms the basis for Olympic governance; sport organizations recognize the IOC as the authority in Olympic sport and in return they reap the benefits of Olympic affiliation. For instance, IFs must enforce rules prohibiting drug use and the overt commercialization of athletes for any of their competitions to be considered legitimately "Olympic". However, calling the Olympic governance system a regime simply because it performs the task of clarifying what does or does not qualify as Olympic sport is a superficial application of the regime concept. Implied in the definition of regimes being used here is that the "issue-area" governed by the regime is of consequence to the broader international political environment. In other words, it may be

accurate to define Olympic governance as an international regime based solely on its essential functions, but if that regime toils largely in isolation, there is little more that needs to be said; the regime (and indeed, sport itself) would exist only for its own sake.

The ways in which Olympic sport has been theoretically and empirically linked to politics can be classified into two categories. The first characterizes sport as a political "tool" for states, wielded for purposes of diplomacy, prestige, constructing or reifying national identity, and asserting sovereignty, among other objectives.[31] These descriptions of international sport's political utility seem to align with a distinctly rational choice view of regimes. They show how the Olympic regime serves an instrumental purpose, allowing principals (i.e., states) to pursue foreign policy objectives through regime agents (i.e., national Olympic committees and Olympic athletes), even as realist and neorealist theories are criticized for their inability to account for Olympic sport as an international political phenomenon.[32] While somewhat contradictory, this criticism serves to identify a crucial tension in applying the regime concept to Olympic governance: reconciling the distinctly apolitical principles of Olympism with the notion that Olympic sport is indeed politically relevant. As I argue below, it is possible to resolve this issue using a combination of rational choice and constructivist ideas.

A second perspective on the relationship between Olympic governance and international relations assesses sport not as a political tool, but as a political entity in its own right. Much of this analysis focuses on the interaction of sport's espoused values and professed moral authority with its distinctly nationalist structure. This category of

---

[31] The most ambitious work is Barrie Houlihan, *Sport and International Politics*. Many of these links between sport and politics are also posited in Victor D. Cha, "A Theory of Sport and Politics," *International Journal of the History of Sport* 26, no. 11 (2009): 1581-1610.

[32] Ibid. Both Houlihan's and Cha's criticism of realism appears to be a reaction to the emphasis realism places upon states as primary actors. Because realism does not accord Olympic governance and other non-state entities the same status or importance as states and power politics, it is, in these authors' view, unable to adequately capture sport's political significance.

scholarship is mostly critical of Olympic governance, especially the incongruity of its liberal rhetoric and much more autocratic organizational configuration.[33] Moreover, this view of Olympic governance sees its reliance on values and principles as simultaneously powerful and disingenuous, or at best misleading.[34] Redeker's particularly excoriating view calls sport "political opium, a para-diplomatic theatre where states and their international affairs fall victim to the sportive illusion."[35] Regardless of the extent to which Olympic organizations live up to their guiding principles, the power of ideas, both within Olympic governance and with regard to states, is clear. This institutionalization of ideas that subsequently guide behavior fits well with Krasner's definition of regimes, especially when one considers that these "norms" and "principles"—sport as an instrument of global peace and sociocultural development, the necessity of political neutrality—have remained relatively constant over time, even as "rules" and "decision-making procedures" have changed.[36] For instance, rules about amateurism, the participation of women, and even the organizational structure of the IOC have been altered, but all of these changes have occurred under the constant umbrella of Olympism.

It thus seems reasonable to conclude that Olympic governance is a value-driven system which is attractive to states as a political tool. While the power of these values and ideas is subject to debate, it is clear that Olympic governance can accurately and

---

[33] John Hoberman, "Toward a Theory of Olympic Internationalism," *Journal of Sport History* 22, no. 1 (1995): 1-37.

[34] See John Hoberman, "The Myth of Sport as a Peace-Promoting Political Force," *SAIS Review* 31, no. 1 (2011): 17-29.

[35] Robert Redeker, "Sport as an Opiate of International Relations: The Myth and Illusion of Sport as a Tool of Foreign Diplomacy," *Sport in Society* 11, no. 4 (2008), 500.

[36] Krasner defines principles as "beliefs of fact, causation, and rectitude" and norms as "standards of behavior defined in terms of rights and obligations", and sees them as constitutive elements of a given regime. In other words, a change in principles or norms would change the regime itself. Relatedly, he defines rules as "specific prescriptions or proscriptions for action" and decision-making procedures as "prevailing practices for making and implementing collective choice", and sees these as variable within a given regime over time. See Krasner, "Structural Causes and Regime Consequences," 2-4.

meaningfully be defined using the terminology of international regimes. The institutionalization of ideas about what sport is and should be guides the behavior of stakeholders and provides a measure of predictability and standardization to Olympic sport provision. Moreover, the attention paid to the myriad ways in which sport is relevant to international relations serves as a clear indication of its political salience.

Origins

Most theoretical perspectives concerning international regimes and institutions focus on their creation. This is particularly true for rational choice adherents, but constructivists are also interested in the origination of regimes. Because both assume (to varying degrees) that states are the primary actors in a fundamentally anarchical environment, the creation of regimes is typically described or explained relative to state behavior and involves an investigation of the reasons states establish or agree (either implicitly or explicitly) to participate in cooperative institutions. Thus, the issue with regard to this study becomes one of assessing these perspectives' applicability to the origins of modern Olympic governance. The history of the modern Olympic movement is well-documented by sport historians.[37] Recounting this narrative is not important here. Rather, in this section I attempt to place the historical data within conceptual frameworks of international regimes, and in doing so, assess the explanatory merits of the competing theoretical perspectives on international regimes and institutions introduced above. Of

---

[37] In addition to Chappelet and Kübler-Mabbott, *The International Olympic Committee and the Olympic System*, other insightful analyses include Allen Guttmann, *The Olympics: A History of the Modern Games* (Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press, 1992), Robert K. Barney, ed., *Rethinking the Olympics: Cultural Histories of the Modern Games* (Morgantown, WV: Fitness Information Technology, 2009) and Barbara J. Keys, *Globalizing Sport: National Rivalry and International Community in the 1930s* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2006). John J. MacAloon, *This Great Symbol: Pierre de Coubertin and the Origins of the Modern Olympic Games* (London: Routledge, 2007) assesses the sociological and psychological motivations of the Olympics' founder.

primary concern is determining the role of states in the origination and growth of the modern international sport governance system.

Certainly, nationalist considerations informed Olympic founder Baron Pierre de Coubertin in his drive to use sport for social reform in France at the end of the nineteenth century.[38] However, as his focus shifted to internationalism and the development of an international sport festival, the balance between politics and sport became more precarious. Coubertin saw sport as transcendent of traditional cultural and political differences.[39] This at least partially explains the reasoning behind the decision to constitute the IOC as a distinctly private, nongovernmental organization while at the same time allowing athletes to compete as representatives of their native countries. As administrators of a distinctly international phenomenon, it was important for IOC members to be politically unaffiliated, so that their distinctly political (or more generously, humanitarian) goals of fostering peace and cultural understanding could be above reproach. Simultaneously, national representation was seen as a crucial element of the sport festival, as the symbolism of nations (not simply athletes) gathering to interact and compete peacefully was central to the broader objectives of Coubertin and the Olympic movement.[40]

Setting aside for a moment the use of nationalist symbolism in the Olympics, it is clear that, from the outset, the growth of the Olympic movement (as well as the proliferation of international sport more generally) occurred outside of state purview. The creation of the IOC was a private endeavor; the organization was initiated by aristocrats rather than politicians. The same was largely true of international sport federations,

---

[38] MacAloon, *This Great Symbol*, 43-82.
[39] Ibid., 267.
[40] Keys, *Globalizing Sport*, 35-39.

although their growth was motivated as much by a desire for standardization of sport across national cultures as it was a plan to use sport for other political ends.[41] This suggests that a straightforward application of rational choice regime theory cannot adequately explain the roots of Olympic governance, in the sense that the emergence of the Olympic system was not the direct result of collaborative state action. While a rational choice explanation for the Olympic system's creation could likely be developed, it would need to be constructed around the motives of the Olympic founders, paying particular attention to how (or whether) they considered the tension inherent in creating a sport festival that was simultaneously international and apolitical. Any such explanation would also, simply due to the nature of rational choice theory, be likely to characterize states as free riders with regard to the Olympic regime. This is derivative of the explicit exclusion of states from Olympic governance and the reality that, if Olympic sport is considered a "good", states are able to access this good (i.e., reap the political benefits of Olympic sport, as discussed above) while contributing relatively little to its provision.

Regardless of whether the Olympic regime can be explained in terms of rational choice regime theory, the fundamental contradiction embedded in the very idea of Olympic sport (apolitical yet politically useful) poses a distinct challenge to the rational choice perspective, precisely because it is so seemingly *irrational*. That is, the IOC presides over a system built on a paradox. This is especially with regard to the role of governments.[42] Specifically, a major tenet of Olympic governance is the view that governmental involvement is detrimental to the ability of Olympic sport to achieve its lofty objectives. While the IOC typically urges national governments to support sport programming within their respective borders, any political interference in either Olympic

---

41 Ibid., 40-63.
42 International Olympic Committee, *Olympic Charter,* 57-59.

governance or Olympic events is prohibited.[43] On the surface, and combined with the above characterization of states as free riders, this would seem to be a convenient alignment of preferences. States, given the opportunity, generally prefer not to contribute to the provision of Olympic sport, and Olympic governance is based in large part upon the belief that state involvement is, at best, undesirable.[44] Although these two positions seem compatible, what remains unclear is exactly why states accept a form of sport governance that is so strongly opposed to the idea of their involvement. In other words, assuming states enjoy taking advantage of the political opportunities afforded by Olympic sport while not contributing to its provision (i.e., free riding), it would seem more appropriate and perhaps more efficient for them to do so in a system that encouraged such behavior, or at least did not treat it as anathema.[45] So, while the free riding of states and the apolitical preferences of Olympic administrators seem to be aligned, the willingness of states to concede the *suitability* of Olympic governance remains a bit puzzling.

Just as modern Olympic governance seems to be suboptimal from a state perspective, a similar claim might be made on behalf of the Olympic leadership. That is, the same ideological beliefs which prompted the formation of the IOC and motivate other sport organizations to recognize its authority in Olympic sport simultaneously appear to discourage more efficient, egalitarian forms of governance. The system has apparently

---

[43] On the former point, Ibid., 20. The latter point is emphasized in several sections of the Charter.

[44] There is a distinction to be made here between types of free riding: a passive form through which states accrue benefit simply through the configuration of the governance system, and a more active form in which states (with little fear of repercussion) manipulate Olympic sport for political ends. This distinction is important and will be more fully explained later in the chapter.

[45] The Games of the New Emerging Forces (GANEFO) were one attempt to create such a system. See Chris A. Connolly, "The Politics of the Games of the New Emerging Forces (GANEFO)," *International Journal of the History of Sport* 29, no. 9 (2012): 1311-1324.

settled on an equilibrium in which free riding by states *and* any direct state involvement are both considered undesirable.

International Legitimacy and the Role of Sport

The analysis to this point has considered the suitability of rational choice explanations for the emergence and persistence of Olympic governance, and posited that regardless of how such an explanation might be constructed, it would likely characterize states as free riders relative to the Olympic regime. However, rational choice regime theory cannot by itself account for states' acceptance of the particular manifestation of modern Olympic sport governance which exists today, nor the insistence by Olympic administrators upon adhering to governing principles which prevent more efficient (and perhaps more effective *vis-à-vis* its humanitarian objectives) Olympic sport. What is particularly puzzling is why the system remains remarkably stable, given its inherent tensions and the availability of more preferable alternatives. While characterizing states as free riders could explain in very basic terms how Olympic governance fits into the broader international relations environment, this idea cannot capture, and indeed mostly ignores the ways in which sport acts as a mediating variable.

In many ways, the issue of developing separate explanations for the Olympic regime's form and function mirrors the fundamental shortcomings of rational choice and constructivist regime theories more generally. While rational choice theory captures the basic structure of Olympic governance, it cannot adequately account for the role of beliefs about sport, especially the ways in which both Olympic administrators and states attach normative meaning to international sport. This is where constructivist perspectives can be of service, especially from a state perspective. As Alexander Wendt argues, Westphalian sovereignty (the defining characteristic of what he calls a "Lockean

culture") has been the dominant international cultural principle for much of modern history.[46] This is a culture in which much significance is attached to the idea of state sovereignty. Recognition within the culture is dependent upon acknowledging others' right to self-governance and territorial boundaries. Because of this norm, state behavior and interaction is characterized not by an anarchical, self-fulfilling Hobbesian motivation to vanquish others in order to survive, but a somewhat more civil (perhaps one might even call it "sporting") structure based on respectful rivalry.[47] As Barbara Keys notes, it was within this culture that international sport first emerged and, following World War I, flourished. That Olympic governance (as well as other forms of international sport) proliferated is not entirely surprising, as the heavy emphasis international sport organizations placed upon national representation in friendly competition accurately mirrored the deeper structure of the international political landscape during this period. Many states recognized the opportunities this afforded them and, while not engaging directly with sport governance, nonetheless saw it as a natural and desirable development.[48] Moreover, based on Wendt's constructivist explanation of the international system as a set of social actors who respond to ideas and internalize norms, it seems reasonable to think that the rhetoric espoused by the Olympic governance system claiming sport's status as a moral good would serve to maintain Olympic sport's appeal to states over time.[49]

---

[46] Wendt, *Social Theory of International Politics,* 279-297.

[47] Ibid., 279-283.

[48] Keys, *Globalizing Sport*. Also see Richard Espy, *The Politics of the Olympic Games*, 3-20. Mark Dyreson, *Making the American Team: Sport, Culture, and the Olympic Experience* (Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press, 1998) provides a comprehensive account of the United States' use of sport for nationalistic purposes both foreign and domestic during the early years of the Olympic movement.

[49] On the internalization of values by international actors, see Wendt, *Social Theory of International Politics,* 312.

If states are essentially free riders when it comes to the provision of Olympic sport (reaping the benefits while not directly contributing or participating in its governance), it would seem somewhat contradictory for them to accept a governance system which decries and actively seeks to prevent their involvement. This is not because they necessarily want to take an active role in Olympic governance, but rather because the guiding principles of Olympism suggest that any link between states and sport (typically framed as "politicizing" the Olympics) is somehow socially or even morally undesirable. Thus, it would seem that states, given the opportunity, would prefer a form of Olympic governance which would allow them to free ride but that would not so heavily emphasize the necessity of apolitical sport. Moreover, states ostensibly have the wherewithal to initiate such a change, yet no move to alter Olympic governance seems to be forthcoming. In applying basic tenets of constructivist theory to this apparent contradiction, there is a strong possibility that over time, states have internalized Olympic values to the point that Olympic sport not only mirrors the fundamental political culture of our age but seems to be a part of the international system's broader liberal progression during the twentieth century. The claimed meritocratic nature of Olympic sport (for instance, the idea of the "level playing field" so heavily emphasized as essential to elite sport, particularly in reference to anti-doping policy development) reinforces the notion that open competition is desirable and rewards the most deserving actors.[50] More disturbingly, it justifies existing systemic disparities as natural outcomes.[51] The financial success enjoyed by the IOC and the Olympic movement as a corporate entity, especially

---

[50] This parallel between Olympic values and the tenets of liberal politics is addressed in David L. Andrews and Michael L. Silk, eds., *Sport and Neoliberalism: Politics, Consumption, and Culture (*Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 2012).

[51] Bruce Kidd, "Inequality in Sport, the Corporation, and the State: An Agenda for Social Scientists," *Journal of Sport and Social Issues* 19, no. 3 (1995): 232-248. Although couched in a domestic sport context and targeted at researchers, Kidd's arguments about institutionalized inequality in modern society and its relationship to sport continue to be highly relevant.

over the past three decades, serves in a similar way to confirm the capability and appropriateness of its governance structure. Combined with the benefits of free riding, the apparent compatibility of Olympic sport with ideas shared by the developed world about what the international system is and should be works to solidify Olympic governance as an appropriate and acceptable sport form in the eyes of states.

Having established an explanation using constructivist theory for state acceptance of Olympic governance, the issue can now be addressed from the perspective of the Olympic regime itself. It is clear that Olympic governance is motivated by, among other things, beliefs about the positive utility of its particular conception of international sport. As an extension of this idea, one might reasonably expect the regime to work towards broader participation from relevant stakeholders; essentially, to address the free riding issue and elicit contributions toward the provision of Olympic sport (or, conversely, to exclude non-contributors from accessing the good). However, the regime not only avoids this approach, it insists that doing so is fundamentally opposed to its conception of Olympic sport. Solving the free rider problem by requiring state involvement in Olympic governance would constitute a fundamental transformation of Olympic sport into something else entirely. Whether this is a reasonable expectation is debatable, but of more immediate interest is the underlying assertion about the nature of sport. The belief in the political sanctity of Olympic sport is not surprising. However, this belief is arguably an obstacle preventing the Olympic governance system from more effectively governing the Olympic movement. The centrality of these beliefs about sport to Olympic policymaking might be considered an indication of fundamentally irrational governance, unless the particular values embodied in and propagated through Olympic sport serve some other instrumental purpose.

Establishing the purposiveness of using Olympic values as a veil of legitimation for Olympic governance is a complex matter to say the least. It is relatively clear that they possess some utility for Olympic administrators, but to what degree this utility is intentionally pursued (as opposed to simply incidental to normal organizational behavior) is difficult to say with any degree of certainty. With regard to intentionality, there is ample evidence to suggest that the Olympic movement's leadership is acutely aware of the ways in which rhetoric can be used to simultaneously maintain the role of apparent global humanitarian authorities while abstaining from any meaningful action.[52] At the same time, the firmness with which particular beliefs about Olympic sport are held can be plausibly attributed to normal organizational inertia.[53] Especially because Olympic sport's effectiveness as a political tool was tied from the outset to its political neutrality (and because this view of sport possesses a certain ideological appeal), any impetus to alter this belief may not have been easily generated from within the Olympic governance apparatus. Regardless of the extent to which the persistence of normative beliefs about sport is intentional or incidental, the view of apolitical sport as a sufficient condition for achieving its stated humanitarian objectives serves to stymie institutional change within the Olympic regime.

In this section I have argued that the governance of Olympic sport can be defined in regime theoretical terms. Through a consideration of rational choice and constructivist perspectives, I have shown how Olympic governance is situated relative to states within the international political system as well as how ideas about sport serve to reify the legitimacy of the IOC and by extension, the Olympic movement. Additionally, I have

---

[52] Again, Hoberman, "The Myth of Sport as a Peace-Promoting Political Force" and Redeker, "Sport as an Opiate of International Relations" are two of the most insightful recent works addressing this point. Also see Andrew Jennings, *The New Lords of the Rings* (London: Simon & Schuster, 1996).

[53] See, for example, Michael T. Hannan and John Freeman, "Structural Inertia and Organizational Change," *American Sociological Review* 49, no. 2 (1984): 149-164.

argued that beliefs about sport's nature and political utility work to prevent a (theoretically) more efficient form of Olympic governance. In the final section, I explore the implications of this tension for both states and Olympic governance.

CHALLENGES FOR REGIME GOVERNANCE

Classifying Olympic governance as an international regime suggests that it provides predictability and standardization in an issue area of relevance to international politics. Further, this means that particular characteristics of the regime can be linked to predictable outcomes. Because this dissertation is focused upon explaining how the nature of Olympic governance is linked to the quality of that governance, as well as how it is linked to international relations in a more general sense, this section will focus on two specific types of outcomes. The first might be characterized as internal to the Olympic movement and is concerned with the impact of structure and ideology on the ability of the IOC to provide good governance. The second concentrates on the link between Olympic governance and international politics, logically extending the notion of the "Olympic regime" to assess the ability to govern sport not in the sense of organizational management, but in the sense of exerting control over sport as a politically meaningful international phenomenon. For both, the emphasis is on showing how the interplay between the structure of the Olympic governance system and the essence of Olympic sport produces the outcomes in question.

The IOC and Good Governance

Few (if any) serious contemporary Olympic researchers associate the IOC with good governance. This criticism stems from an organizational structure lacking in democratic mechanisms and general oversight, as well as a fallacious ideological

commitment to sport as a sufficient condition for achieving humanitarian objectives.[54] Recent empirical observations have confirmed the idea that Olympic governance is somehow deficient. While the Salt Lake City bid scandal in 1998 was probably the most notable in terms of its voracity, other issues both sport-related (such as judging controversies in figure skating at both the 2002 and 2010 Winter Olympics as well as the short-lived 2013 decision to remove wrestling from the Summer Olympic program) and political (including human rights controversies surrounding the 2008 Summer Olympics in Beijing and 2014 Winter Olympics in Sochi) have called into question the IOC's ability to adequately fulfill its leadership and management duties.[55]

What is good governance? As with any normative standard, a single definition is elusive. Typically, the term "governance" is used in reference to shared decision-making processes.[56] By extension, then, "good" governance is the development of these processes in a way that appeals to generally accepted ethical principles which emphasize, among other things, transparency and fairness. While the term originated in the international aid community as a way to judge post-Cold War progress in the developing world, it can simultaneously be used to evaluate compliance with the expectations and rules of international institutions, as well as the institutions themselves.[57]

---

[54] On the formation and effectiveness of the IOC's Ethics Commission, see John J. MacAloon, "Scandal and Governance: Inside and Outside the IOC 2000 Commission," *Sport in Society* 14, no. 3 (2011): 292-308. A more theoretical take is Daniel S. Mason, Lucie Thibault, and Laura Misener, "An Agency Theory Perspective on Corruption in Sport: The Case of the International Olympic Committee," *Journal of Sport Management* 20, no. 1 (2006): 52-73. The latter point is what John Hoberman refers to as "amoral universalism". See *The Olympic Crisis: Sport, Politics and the Moral Order* (New Rochelle, NY: Aristide D. Caratzas, 1986) for the most developed explanation of this idea.

[55] On the Salt Lake City scandal, see Stephen R. Wenn and Scott G. Martyn, "'Tough Love': Richard Pound, David D'Alessandro, and the Salt Lake City Olympics Bid Scandal," *Sport in History* 26, no. 1 (2006): 64-90.

[56] Daniel C. Esty, "Good Governance at the Supranational Scale: Globalizing Administrative Law," *Yale Law Journal* 115, no. 7 (2006): 1497.

[57] Martin R. Doornbos, "'Good Governance': The Pliability of a Policy Concept," *TRAMES* 8, no. 4 (2004): 372-387.

In assessing whether or to what extent the IOC provides good governance to Olympic sport, my intention is not to argue that one of the conditions posited above is more causally linked to (a lack of) good governance than the other. Rather, I simply extend the Olympic regime's inherent logic to show that, together, structure and ideology comprise a self-confirming feedback system which perpetuates what many have deemed to be a suboptimal status quo. In other words, these two causes are not independently contributing to the same outcome but are instead interactive. The combination of an ideologically motivated regime and powerful but mostly indifferent free riders serves to reinforce rather than challenge the pathologies of Olympic governance.

The Olympic regime's reasoning at the core of this problem can be summarized in the following statements:

1. *Apolitical sport is a sufficient condition for achieving the Olympic movement's objectives.* As discussed in the preceding section, this was at the heart of the motivation driving the formation of the Olympic movement. The (mostly genuine) belief that sport which was simultaneously nationalistic and divorced from international politics could be a powerful force for global peace is the Olympic movement's *raison d'être*.

If this statement is taken as true and immutable, two implications derive:

2. *Pluralistic governance of Olympic sport is unnecessary.* Because there is a belief in the direct causal link between the provision of Olympic sport and the Olympic movement's desired outcomes, governance becomes a question of simply ensuring that events like the Olympic games occur; other principles of good governance are rendered less important or irrelevant. The underlying assumption here is that as Olympic governance

becomes more expansive (in terms of bureaucratic structure or democratic inclusion) it becomes less effective.

3. *Pluralistic governance of Olympic sport is antithetical to Olympic values.* An extension of the previous statement, this assumption is directly linked to the necessity of sport remaining apolitical. The supporting logic is simple but compelling: as more actors and interests become involved in controlling the Olympic movement, the likelihood that "politics" (understood generally as the competition among diverse interests) will become more prevalent in Olympic governance increases.

The final link which closes the logic loop is implied by the preceding two statements:

4. *Deviations from the current governance system are a threat to Olympic sport.* While progressive attempts to democratize Olympic governance or institute more rigorous oversight might be deemed as moves toward a fuller realization of good governance, the Olympic movement's constitutive beliefs about sport imply the opposite and serve to undermine this sort of behavior. Further, the lack of democratic structures makes even initiating such a move very difficult. With opposition to the status quo effectively mitigated (and given the economic success of the Olympics), it thus appears self-evident that the current system is the most appropriate and effective for governing Olympic sport.

In this outline of the reasoning supporting the IOC's resistance to change and rejection of what it views as political intrusion, it is easy to see how structure and ideology complement one another. While it may seem as though causation flows in only one direction (i.e., beliefs about what Olympic sport is and should be lend support to a private, somewhat autocratic system of governance, or more generally, ideology justifies

36

structure), it was this very governance structure which created and reified the ideology at the founding of the Olympic movement. Although ideas about Olympic sport are powerful, they originate in the minds, words, and actions of individuals and the organizations they comprise.

Again, the point here is not to locate the shortcomings of Olympic governance in either organizational structures or values, but to show how these two phenomena work in tandem to provide a suboptimal outcome. Indeed, their mutual reinforcement thwarts efforts to initiate meaningful change. Perhaps more importantly, however, is the notion that even when change occurs, ostensibly progressive initiatives which might be considered steps toward good governance are nothing more than superficial moves to placate the harshest critics of Olympic governance.[58] In this view, both structure *and* ideology are subverted as means toward commercial or political ends.[59] While this is a significant and somewhat alarming possibility, making this assumption changes the fundamental problem. Any assessment of whether or to what extent the IOC provides good governance is based on the premise that doing so falls within the scope of the organization's objectives. If the Olympic governance system is (or has become) little more than a façade to mask the pursuit of other interests, the issue of good governance is beside the point.

In sketching the logic underlying the relationship between the structure and ideological principles of Olympic governance, I have attempted to show how the

[58] On this question, a recent collection of academic perspectives is Bruce Kidd and Heather Dichter, eds., *Olympic Reform Ten Years Later* (London: Routledge, 2012).

[59] The situation in which so-called humanitarian organizations are used for less noble purposes is not new and certainly not unique to sport. See, for example, Graham Hancock, *Lords of Poverty: The Power, Prestige, and Corruption of the International Aid Business* (New York: Atlantic Monthly Press, 1989) or more recently, Thomas W. Dichter, *Despite Good Intentions: Why Development Assistance to the Third World Has Failed* (Amherst, MA: University of Massachusetts Press, 2003). Also see Michael N. Barnett and Martha Finnemore, "The Politics, Power, and Pathologies of International Organizations," *International Organization* 53, no. 4 (1999): 699-732.

interaction between the two contributes to the failures of governance which have been well-documented both recently and throughout Olympic history. Unfortunately, while regime theory can be useful in identifying obstacles to good governance and explaining why and how they work, it is not possessed of the predictive power to offer further insight. From a rational choice standpoint, the system has reached an equilibrium in which the incentives for the majority of actors (especially the most powerful) are weighted toward maintaining the status quo. In a constructivist sense, too, the power of Olympic ideology makes change seem almost antithetical to the values which lend the Olympic movement its legitimacy. While there remains much work to be done in this area, doing so requires a shift in focus and theoretical commitment (perhaps in the direction of critical theory) that moves beyond the scope of this study. The final section in this chapter will deal more explicitly with the Olympic regime structure's implications for the relationship between governance and international relations.

Regime Enforcement and Political Exploitation

The brief discussion of rational choice theory above suggests that states (and other non-participating actors) are strongly incentivized to free ride on the provision of Olympic governance. Generally, free riding in this context can be understood as the accrual of benefit from the existence of Olympic sport without contributing to its production. In the specific case of states, this benefit is often political in nature.[60] Taken as a starting point, the idea that states free ride on the Olympic regime requires further elaboration, especially given the pervasive belief within the Olympic movement that Olympic sport is able to promote global peace and intercultural respect as well as the popular belief that hosting Olympic events can be beneficial to a city, region, or country.

---

[60] See note 31.

38

To once again reiterate a crucial point, there is an inherent contradiction between the conception of Olympic sport as politically useful and the rejection of all political influence. This apparent contradiction can be reconciled, however, by distinguishing among types of free riding.

One type of state free riding can be characterized as passive. Indeed, the idea that states might realize political benefit through their association with the Olympics is an extension of Olympism's basic logic.[61] Moreover, the IOC has in recent years partnered with intergovernmental organizations in sport development efforts which extend beyond the sphere of elite competition.[62] It seems reasonable to assume, then, that the assertion of strictly apolitical sport's importance to the success of the Olympic movement is a qualified (rather than absolute) statement. In other words, there exists a set of appropriate political behaviors in which states can engage with the Olympic movement's tacit blessing. These include many of the "benefits" or "uses" of sport typically associated with Olympic participation: the demonstration of membership in the international community and national vitality, the development of national sport programs and governance systems, as well as the oft-cited (though highly dubious) ability to use sport competition as a sort of proxy for settling international political conflict. Additionally, states that host Olympic competitions are usually assumed to accrue political and economic gains through the construction of physical and technological infrastructure, tourist spending, and in a more general sense, the ability to leverage the event's visibility

---

[61] International Olympic Committee, *Olympic Charter,* 11. The Fundamental Principles of Olympism (specifically the second and fourth) emphasize the ability of sport to promote peace and human rights, two ostensibly political objectives which are also of consequence to a broader array of international actors.
[62] See, for example, Bruce Kidd, "A New Social Movement: Sport for Development and Peace," *Sport in Society* 11, no. 4 (2008): 370-380 and Ingrid Beutler, "Sport Serving Development and Peace: Achieving the Goals of the United Nations through Sport," *Sport in Society* 11, no. 4 (2008): 359-369.

to promote themselves to global audiences, political or otherwise.[63] Despite their apparent political nature, these sorts of behaviors are tolerated (and at times even encouraged) by the Olympic regime.

States can also be more aggressive in their manipulation of sport for political ends. Most often this occurs when domestic or foreign conflicts are publicly linked to Olympic participation. Typically, the linkage is made by a state or other international actor (such as an interest group or NGO) and calls into question the compatibility of a particular state's policies with the values of the Olympic movement. This claim is followed by a response which denounces the initial charge as equally un-Olympic on the grounds that it wrongly "politicizes" the event. However, aggressive free riding by states can also occur outside the context of a specific event, such as when national governments exert undue influence over the administration of their national Olympic committees. In these cases as well as myriad others, states can penetrate the Olympic governance process and pursue political objectives relatively assured that they will not face any consequences.

Because of this inescapable reality, borne out through the nature of regime dynamics, it seems reasonable to examine how the Olympic regime might better enforce its own rules. After all, this is a primary task for any institution. If the regime exists to provide order in a particular issue area, and this order is achieved through normative pressures and more explicit behavioral guidelines, it follows that the regime should be prepared to assess what sorts of actions constitute violations of these rules and be able to take the steps necessary to achieve modification of that behavior (or, if modification is

---

[63] There is a growing consensus among both scholars and policymakers that these are essentially convenient assumptions that lack any strong empirical support. See Jonathan Barclay, "Predicting the Costs and Benefits of Mega-Sporting Events: Misjudgment of Olympic Proportions?" *Economic Affairs* 29, no. 2 (2009): 62-66 as well as Douglas Booth, "Olympic City Bidding: An Exegesis of Power," *International Review for the Sociology of Sport* 46, no. 4 (2011): 367-386.

not possible, to deny the violating party access to the privileges obtained through regime membership).[64] However, by claiming sport is and should be apolitical, even as certain uses of sport by states are deemed acceptable, the Olympic regime undermines its own enforcement capabilities. This occurs in three ways. First, the Olympic regime mistakenly views its ideological principles as sufficiently self-enforcing. Second, the ideologically-driven decision to prohibit state involvement renders enforcement by exclusion very difficult, if not impossible. Because states are not technically members of the regime, they cannot be sanctioned or expelled. Third, any response to alleged politicization is itself political, making any attempt at maintaining sport's neutrality a political act; enforcement becomes a violation of the very rules being enforced.

As noted in the section on good governance above, the Olympic regime's persistent assertion of sport's political transcendence bespeaks a belief that this ideology is sufficiently powerful to be self-enforcing. Sport, in the abstract, is not *a priori* apolitical. It is not difficult to imagine (and indeed, there are several historical examples of) overtly political sport.[65] By casting sport as apolitical, the Olympic regime makes participation contingent upon recognizing, at least tacitly, the validity of this characterization. Thus, the reasoning goes, any state represented in Olympic sport must at least tacitly agree that sport is and should be politically neutral. By extension, this logic assumes that if states endorse the apolitical characterization of sport (and the attendant belief that it is a necessary condition for the Olympic regime to achieve its humanitarian objectives), they would not have any reason to violate this principle. Obviously, this is an

---

[64] This is a somewhat murky area for regime theorists, as some regimes' requirements for membership significantly reduce the need for enforcement while other regimes have a high tolerance for rule violation. See Young, *Governance in World Affairs*, 79-107.

[65] See John M. Hoberman, *Sport and Political Ideology. Austin, TX: University of Texas Press, 1984,* as well as Jim Riordan and Arnd Krüger, *The International Politics of Sport in the Twentieth Century* (London: Routledge, 1999).

invalid conclusion because it ignores the possibility that states would want to be involved in Olympic sport for reasons beyond those suggested by Olympic values, and perhaps more fundamentally, confuses a normative belief that state interests and regime principles should be totally aligned with a reality in which they are often divergent.

The same apolitical ideology that provides the motivation for Olympic governance effectively excludes states from the administration of the Olympic regime. While this presumably preserves the autonomy of the IOC and NOCs, when states inevitably politicize sport, these organizations are left with very few methods of recourse. Certainly, Olympic organizations cannot sanction state governments; they are not regime members and the regime thus lacks the authority to punish their rule violations. The Olympic regime may localize the problem, identifying any "intrusion of politics" as a rogue incident involving only a small number of organizations or individuals. While this serves to minimize the issue, it does little to punish transgressors or deter future deviant behavior. The regime might decide to sanction or ban a state's national sport apparatus (i.e., its national Olympic committee and national sport federations), or revoke hosting rights for an international event, but these actions present further problems which will be discussed below. The lack of viable options for addressing violations of sport's political neutrality is directly tied to the ideological underpinnings of this rule.

Fundamentally, what undermines the ability of the Olympic regime to enforce its policy of political isolation is the fact that any response to a rule violation is itself political. Despite every effort to act in the furtherance of apolitical sport, any attempt to punish what I have called aggressive free riding can be subverted by claiming that the enforcement response is politically motivated. This effectively ties the hands of the Olympic regime. Because any attempt at enforcement can be considered a violation of the rule being enforced, the IOC is unwilling to take any meaningful action in this area. Even

if the regime can successfully expel a member on these grounds, exclusion is not a very palatable recourse, as it contradicts the regime's efforts to be wholly inclusive. Again, the fear is that making any sort of judgment about which states' sport organizations should or should not be allowed to participate in international sport directly contravenes the notion that sport is an apolitical, cosmopolitan sanctuary where all are welcome.

The Olympic regime's ideological edifice is a duality of sorts. While it is immensely helpful in legitimizing Olympic governance in the eyes of states, it also attracts unwanted politicization and ultimately sabotages the ability of the regime to protect this fundamental principle. Because states are essentially free riders with regard to the Olympic regime, they will continue to passively reap the benefits of international sport as well as use sport for (in the IOC's view) undesirable political purposes until they are forced to either bear the costs of supplying it or are denied access to it entirely. This places the regime in a difficult position, as these options suggest either a fundamental reconsideration of states' role in Olympic sport, significantly expanded efforts to protect sport from political intrusion, or a shift in the basic principles which sustain Olympic governance.

CONCLUSION

This chapter conceptualizes the Olympic governance system as an international regime. Doing so addresses a number of gaps in current knowledge about the relationship between the Olympics and international relations. Characterizing Olympic governance as an international institution simultaneously acknowledges sport's political significance and identifies it as part of a class of recognizable international phenomena. By extension, this enables the opportunity for more dispassionate and objective analysis of the Olympic regime's ideological power; in other words, creating a space for examining questions of

"how" and "why" without necessarily grappling with normative questions of "whether" or "ought". Additionally, bridging the divide between studies of Olympic sport and international relations provides the foundation for generating testable questions which can subsequently be empirically investigated. As I will show in the following chapter, such questions and systematic investigation have been largely absent from the field of Olympic studies.

Chapter 2: Literature Review

This review of the literature relevant to this study is divided into four sections. Because of the central role ideas and meaning making play in the theoretical discussion in Chapter 1, the first section examines constructivist theory and its application to empirical cases within the international relations canon. The second section assesses the relative merits of various attempts to theorize the relationship between sport and politics. In the third section, literature pertaining to the politics of the Olympic movement is reviewed. The final section analyzes empirical studies of international sport and international politics.

CONSTRUCTIVISM IN INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

In Chapter 1, I introduced some of the most fundamental constructivist international relations literature.[1] Wendt's *Social Theory of International Politics* continues to serve as the major theoretical formulation of constructivism.[2] The constructivist perspective's major contribution to international relations is its challenge to rational choice as a foundational assumption for studying international politics; in many ways, constructivism exists at a more abstract level than rational choice theories. While rational choice research assumes many characteristics of the international system are fixed, "constructivists cannot take identities and interests for granted, and understanding the processes by which they originate and change has been a big part of the constructivist

---

[1] Alexander Wendt, "Anarchy is What States Make of It: The Social Construction of Power Politics," *International Organization* 46, no. 2 (1992): 391-425; John Gerard Ruggie, "What Makes the World Hang Together? Neo-utilitarianism and the Social Constructivist Challenge," *International Organization* 52, no. 4 (1998): 855-885; Michael N. Barnett and Martha Finnemore, "The Politics, Power, and Pathologies of International Organizations," *International Organization* 53, no. 4 (1999): 699-732.

[2] Alexander Wendt, *Social Theory of International Politics* (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1999).

research program."[3] Although now somewhat dated, Martha Finnemore and Kathryn Sikkink's review of constructivist empirical literature identifies the effect of global norms in local contexts, the relationship between ideas and power, the influence of identity on state action, and the ways in which social construction occurs as major problems addressed by the constructivist research agenda.[4] These authors also survey the empirical areas which have received attention from constructivists, particularly international organizations, international law, epistemic communities, the particular effects of structural configuration, and the role of persuasive language.[5]

More recent empirical work relevant to this study has challenged the idea that humanitarian international organizations challenge ethical norms and are progressing or evolving toward a higher moral order.[6] Michael Barnett argues that, rather than being guided solely by their founding principles, humanitarian organizations are affected by the same sorts of political and bureaucratic forces as other organizations. Over time, these organizations end up reinforcing the status quo rather than challenging it; indeed, what it even means to be a humanitarian organization is subject to constant redefinition. Barnett's findings suggest that principled organizations (like those of the Olympic regime) struggle to maintain true to their espoused principles when faced with environmental and organizational pressures acting at cross purposes.

In a similar vein, Ted Hopf's study of hegemony challenges the notion that ideology, as a causal variable, is a product solely of the ruling elite.[7] Hopf contends that

---

[3] Martha Finnemore and Kathryn Sikkink, "Taking Stock: The Constructivist Research Program in International Relations and Comparative Politics," *Annual Review of Political Science* 4, no. 1 (2001), 394.
[4] Ibid., 396-400.
[5] Ibid., 401-403.
[6] Michael Barnett, "Evolution without Progress? Humanitarianism in a World of Hurt," *International Organization* 63, no. 4 (2009): 621-663.
[7] Ted Hopf, "Common-sense Constructivism and Hegemony in World Politics," *International Organization* 67, no. 2 (2013): 317-354.

studies of hegemony have treated ideas as imposed by the hegemon. Specifically, he argues for a more accurate application of Gramscian theory and the concept of common sense to the study of hegemony and ideology. Essentially, Hopf shows that ideology is not simply imposed, but negotiated. His argument provides for a more instrumental role of "the masses" in the way hegemony functions internationally. In a roundabout way, this reasoning is applicable to the study of international sport organizations. The theory advanced in this study argues that the ideological conception of sport held by the Olympic regime is inherently unenforceable, especially with regard to states. Hopf's argument supports this theory, as it takes into account not only the creator and promoter of the ideology (in this study, the IOC), but also the targets of that ideology (states) and how their interpretation and reaction to this ideology influences the hegemonic status of the Olympic regime.

While international relations scholars have not paid much attention to sport as a phenomenon with much relevance to international politics, this attitude is beginning to shift.[8] The recent acknowledgement of sport's importance is particularly true with regard to its relationship to diplomacy; scholars in this area of study have begun to explore the limits of sport's use as a diplomatic implement as well as to identify best practices.[9] This brief review has shown how ideas borrowed from constructivist perspectives can inform

---

[8] Aaron Beacom, "Sport in International Relations: A Case for Cross-Disciplinary Investigation," *The Sports Historian* 20, no. 2 (2000): 1-23; Jonathan Grix, "Sport Politics and the Olympics," *Political Studies Review* 11, no. 1 (2013): 15-25; and Simon C. Darnell and David R. Black, "Mainstreaming Sport into International Development Studies," *Third World Quarterly* 32, no. 3 (2011): 367-378. Indeed, the case for a stronger relationship between sport and international relations was being made as early as the mid-1980s; see Trevor Taylor, "Sport and International Relations: A Case of Mutual Neglect," in *The Politics of Sport,* ed. Lincoln Allison (Wolfeboro, NH: Manchester University Press, 1986), 27-48.
[9] Stuart Murray and Geoffrey Allen Pigman, "Mapping the Relationship between International Sport and Diplomacy," *Sport in Society* 17, no. 9 (2014): 1098-1118, as well as Stuart Murray, "The Two Halves of Sports-Diplomacy," *Diplomacy & Statecraft* 23, no. 3 (2012): 576-592.

studies of international sport, including this one. The following sections examine the ways in which sport scholars have linked sport to international politics.

THEORIZING THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN INTERNATIONAL SPORT AND INTERNATIONAL POLITICS

Foundational Issues

At the heart of the scholarly study of sport and politics is the persistent question of whether the two are, in fact, relevant to one another. Likely a reaction to the endemic normative assertion that sport and politics should *not* mix, much of the literature in this area exhibits at least a subtle contrarian response to this belief by suggesting (or exclaiming) that sport and politics are not so separate after all. This tends to confound the advancement of scholarship. Characterizing the belief in sport's political transcendence as widely held (even if only to demonstrate its inaccuracy) propagates a false equivalency; repeatedly constructing straw men just to knock them over incorrectly legitimizes the possibility that they may be made of more than straw. By extension, the ability to hinge a study's novelty on the refutation of this belief prevents researchers from achieving anything that might be considered scientific progress, instead trapping them in a cycle of continuous justification for sport and politics receiving scholarly attention in the first place. Despite a growing body of scholarship that demonstrates the link between sport and politics, it is still often considered necessary to acknowledge that discussing the two in the same breath could be surprising.

An equally confounding issue in the field is definitional ambiguity. While "sport" and "politics" are useful parameters for identifying an area of scholarship in general, most studies do not differentiate between various types of sport or politics. With regard to sport, one might reasonably distinguish among sport forms (baseball, football, hockey,

etc.), levels of sport (amateur, professional), purposes for sport (commercial, development), and contexts (national, international). With regard to politics, the primary point of distinction is between domestic and international, although comparative politics (the study of similarities and differences across domestic polities) as well as the interaction between the domestic and international spheres are also relevant areas for sport research. Regardless of how or to what extent the scope of "sport" or "politics" is defined, because it has been sufficient to use these terms without further specification, many arguments and findings are easily undermined or contradicted. This, in turn, frustrates efforts to develop testable theories of "sport and politics" and the field struggles to progress beyond its treatment of the relationship as merely novel or anomalous.

These issues are obviously not applicable to the entire body of literature which examines sport and politics, and I certainly do not wish to suggest that work which employs this device is somehow deficient or wrongheaded. In describing these problems, I simply wish to point out some fundamental challenges that have not been adequately resolved by those who work in this field, challenges I have attempted to overcome or at least more fully address in this study.

The Applicability of International Relations Theory to International Sport

Although published nearly twenty years ago, Barrie Houlihan's *Sport and International Politics* remains the most comprehensive attempt to connect sport and international relations theory within an explanatory framework.[10] While Houlihan does not advance a theory *per se*, several of his arguments are relevant to this study and will be addressed below. First, however, I wish to focus on Houlihan's assessment of international relations theory and its applicability to international sport.[11] Houlihan

---

[10] Barrie Houlihan, *Sport and International Politics* (New York: Harvester Wheatsheaf, 1994).
[11] Ibid., 29-54.

identifies realism, pluralism, and globalism as the three main schools of international relations theory. His descriptions of pluralism and globalism track closely with what many scholars might identify as "liberalism" and "Marxism", respectively. Houlihan does not include constructivism in his review, though to be fair, this work was published just as constructivism was gaining a foothold as a legitimate paradigmatic commitment within international relations, and Houlihan does argue for the inclusion of constructivist principles in international relations theorizing, particularly with regard to pluralism and globalism.[12] Essentially, Houlihan argues that realist theory cannot account for international sport because of the primacy it grants to states and material determinants of power.[13] He instead argues that pluralism (with its emphasis on non-state actors) and globalism (with its emphasis on economic power relations) are better suited for studying international sport.[14] While the general point is valid, the notion that realism cannot explain international sport simply because it does not accord sport much importance or significance begs the question.

The claim of sport's uniqueness is stated even more strongly by Cha, who writes that "International relations scholarship…leaves us with no clear answers about the link between sport and international relations."[15] Unfortunately, Cha offers only anecdotal examples in support of his "theory of sport and politics", which might more accurately be described as a typology of sport's political functions. A more recent collection of essays takes up the thread of Houlihan's earlier work, locating sport within a neoliberal political

---

[12] Ibid., 53-54.

[13] Ibid., 40, 52-53.

[14] Ibid. Houlihan does hedge a bit on this issue, citing early rational choice work on regimes as evidence that realists have attempted to incorporate explanations of international cooperation and the role of institutions into their frameworks.

[15] Victor D. Cha, "A Theory of Sport and Politics," *International Journal of the History of Sport* 26, no. 11 (2009), 1584.

and cultural context.[16] In particular, the introductory essay argues that modern sport (the book deals with sport at all levels, not exclusively international) is a product and creator of a neoliberal political culture which subverts the state and elevates (or perhaps glorifies) the market.[17] While the essays in this collection take on a wide range of topics, the common theme is that sport's political value is based almost entirely on its ability to reflect what the editors see as a dominant and globally pervasive neoliberal ideology. This is at once innovative and repetitive; sport is still being used for political ends, only corporations, international institutions, and interest groups have replaced states as the ones pulling the strings.

A more radical, atheoretical conception of sport sees it not as instrumental (i.e., being manipulated by an actor or set of actors in the furtherance of some agenda), but an ideological institution unto itself.[18] Redeker argues that, rather than states using sport as a diplomatic tool, sport—as a symbol, an idea, or what Redeker calls "an ensemble of exigencies"—determines the legitimate and the appropriate in terms of political behavior.[19] In calling sport both an "anthropo-factory" and "spiritual power", Redeker writes:

> "Sport is something entirely different than a tool or means that wouldn't alter whoever used it; it is a total system, a planetary machine that profoundly transforms men and women as well as their relation to the world (for example, we can no longer pass by snow covered hills without imagining ski trails etc.). Therefore, it's illusory to believe, naively, that the relation between sports and humans is purely an external one, and that it is possible to utilize it in all innocence and impunity – while, really, sport has markedly transformed the

---

[16] David L. Andrews and Michael L. Silk, eds., *Sport and Neoliberalism: Politics, Consumption, and Culture* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 2012).

[17] Michael L. Silk and David L. Andrews, "Sport and the Neoliberal Conjuncture: Complicating the Consensus," in Ibid., 9.

[18] Robert Redeker, "Sport as an Opiate of International Relations: The Myth and Illusion of Sport as a Tool of Foreign Diplomacy," *Sport in Society* 11, no. 4 (2008): 494-500.

[19] Ibid., 495.

human being, inducing anthropological changes, if not mutations. It's just as much of an illusion to think of sports as controllable, because in this case one simply forgets the essence of sport, which is both the manufacture of humans and spiritual authority. Sport is nothing other than a devouring monster-machine, become autonomous in relation to individuals and states, swallowing up everything in its way."[20]

In this view, sport has been elevated to the status of religion; it is irrevocably woven into the fabric of social life to the point of near-infallibility. In Redeker's view, it is not accurate to assess which international relations theory best explains sport, because the ideological foundations of international sport essentially comprise a theory of international relations. While this perspective is not fully developed in Redeker's brief essay, it emphasizes the prominence of ideas and international sport's reliance upon them for legitimacy and political power.[21]

Sport Governance: Utility vs. Autonomy

One issue that is derivative of the struggle to place international sport within theories of international relations is the question of whether to characterize "sport" as political tool or political actor. Sport is often seen as a facilitator of diplomacy, a medium for asserting or reflecting ideology, a useful tool in "nation-building", an access point (particularly for smaller states) to the broader international political system, and a burgeoning global industry.[22] In any case, with the exception of sport's growing

---

[20] Ibid., 499.

[21] John M. Hoberman, *Sport and Political Ideology* (Austin, TX: University of Texas Press, 1984) is almost certainly a forerunner to Redeker's position. While Hoberman's focus is primarily on state use of sport for domestic purposes, the particular qualities of sport that allow it to be used for political purposes (or more abstractly, to appear to be used politically while in fact transcending politics) are discussed. A more succinct argument can be found in John M. Hoberman, "The Myth of Sport as a Peace-Promoting Political Force," *SAIS Review* 31, no. 1 (2011): 17-29.

[22] Houlihan, *Sport and International Politics,* 8-25. The utility of sport in nation building might reasonably be classified as more relevant to sport and domestic politics, although Houlihan rightly points out the use of sport by imperialist nations during colonization. On this point, a thorough and illuminative study of American sport is Gerald R. Gems, *The Athletic Crusade: Sport and American Cultural Imperialism* (Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press, 2012). Cha, *Theory of Sport and Politics,* echoes Houlihan's

relevance to the global economy, all of these descriptions of sport identify it as a tool for state use. Sport's relevance to international relations is primarily rooted in the ability of states to freely incorporate sport into their foreign policymaking.

At the same time, sport is often described as a relatively autonomous political entity. Houlihan has difficulty reconciling these two views. After listing the ways in which sport serves state interests, he stresses the importance of international sport organizations as key political actors and their ability to influence state behavior.[23] In attempting to combine these two views, his argument appears to be that while sport serves an instrumental purpose for states, international sport organizations dictate the scope of sport's allowable uses. This still leaves the question, however, of why states would acknowledge the authority of international sport organizations and, more importantly, whether the international sport governance system is capable of policing what it deems to be unacceptable behaviors.

Keys' study of the development of international sport governance during the interwar years suggests the apparent autonomy of international sport was a function of isolationist foreign policies by many states following World War I as well as the cosmopolitan rhetoric espoused by sport leaders.[24] Essentially, war-weary states were not interested in participating in the development of international sport, but did not see the Olympic movement and its adherents as politically threatening given their staunch belief in sport's political neutrality and espousal of utopian values. Other scholars have focused on sport's political relevance through the lens of political economy, defining its

---

"themes for discussion" with his typology which classifies sport as a tool for constructing and broadcasting national identity, for fostering diplomacy, and for instigating domestic political and social change.

[23] Houlihan, *Sport and International Politics,* 55-81.

[24] Barbara J. Keys, *Globalizing Sport: National Rivalry and International Community in the 1930s* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2006), 40-63.

importance in terms of its revenue potential and economic impact.[25] Collectively, these views emphasize sport's importance in international affairs, but lack a deeper exploration of this relationship.

POLITICS IN AND OF THE OLYMPIC MOVEMENT

While the preceding literature focused on international sport, the works in this section deal specifically with the Olympic movement. These are highly relevant given this study's scope. One of the earliest works aimed at analyzing the politics of the Olympics succinctly describes them as a reflection of the tension between an increasingly international and transnational world still clinging to nationalist sentiments.[26] John Hoberman, focusing on Olympic ideology, has been highly critical of the IOC, arguing that its ideological façade masks more sinister motives.[27] Peacock has adopted ideas about the socially-constructed nature of reality and meaning to demonstrate how the Olympic movement adapts to and takes advantage of changing international conditions.[28] Others have taken a more subtle, empirically-oriented approach in drawing attention to the various moments in Olympic history when sport and politics intersected.[29] Although not strictly academic, the investigative journalism of Andrew Jennings and (to a lesser degree) Dave Zirin has provided powerful insight into the depth and breadth of Olympic

---

[25] John Forster and Nigel K.Ll. Pope, *The Political Economy of Global Sporting Organisations* (New York: Routledge, 2004).

[26] Richard Espy, *The Politics of the Olympic Games* (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1979).

[27] John M. Hoberman, "Toward a Theory of Olympic Internationalism," *Journal of Sport History* 22, no. 1 (1995): 1-37. The "moral bankruptcy" of the Olympics is also explored in John Hoberman, *The Olympic Crisis: Sport, Politics and the Moral Order* (New Rochelle, NY: Aristide D. Caratzas, 1986).

[28] Byron Peacock, "'A Secret Instinct of Social Preservation': Legitimacy and the Dynamic Reconstitution of Olympic Conceptions of the 'Good'," *Third World Quarterly* 32, no. 3 (2011): 477-502.

[29] Two comprehensive though now out-of-date studies are Allen Guttmann, *The Olympics: A History of the Modern Games,* (Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press, 1992); and Christopher R. Hill, *Olympic Politics* (New York: Manchester University Press, 1992).

politics and international sport governance.[30] Unburdened by the strictures typically associated with academic writing, these authors have directly challenged the corrupt, immoral practices of these organizations and, perhaps more importantly, the effects of such poor governance for those inside and outside the sphere of elite international sport.

Although they are historical studies, Nicholas Evan Sarantakes' *Dropping the Torch* and Thomas M. Hunt's *Drug Games* both explore the more general ways in which the Cold War made the connection between sport and politics more explicit.[31] Sarantakes' study of the 1980 U.S.-led Olympic boycott, an exemplar in historical data collection, focuses primarily on the individual failings of President Jimmy Carter and his administration's misunderstanding of Olympic governance. Hunt deals more explicitly with the international sport governance apparatus, showing how, especially during the 1970s and 1980s, the power and prestige of the IOC had not exploded to the level at which it exists today. This fractured, often contentious governance system was unable to efficiently or effectively deal with the growing drug use problem in international sport; it took nearly four decades from the anti-doping movement's "focusing event"—a death attributed to drug use at the Olympics in 1960—for comprehensive anti-doping policy and enforcement to take effect.

These studies as well as others comprising the abundance of Olympic literature confirm several basic assumptions of this study. Namely, that the Olympics have been

[30] Andrew Jennings, *The New Lords of the Rings* (London: Simon & Schuster, 1996) and *Foul! The Secret World of FIFA: Bribes, Vote Rigging, and Ticket Scandals* (London: Harpersport, 2006). Zirin is prolific in the area of sport and politics, though his most recent work, *Brazil's Dance with the Devil: The World Cup, the Olympics, and the Fight for Democracy* (Chicago: Haymarket, 2014) deals most explicitly with the Olympic movement.

[31] Nicholas Evan Sarantakes, *Dropping the Torch: Jimmy Carter, the Olympic Boycott, and the Cold War* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2011); Thomas M. Hunt, *Drug Games: The International Olympic Committee and the Politics of Doping, 1960-2008* (Austin, TX: University of Texas Press, 2011). *Drug Games* builds on the arguments first developed in Thomas M. Hunt, "Sport, Drugs, and the Cold War: The Conundrum of Olympic Doping Policy: 1970-1979," *Olympika: The International Journal of Olympic Studies* 16 (2007): 19-42.

politicized throughout history and continue to have political appeal, and that sport governance itself is not immune to the forces of organizational politics and bureaucracy. However, while the importance of demonstrating *that* the Olympics are a political phenomenon cannot be overstated, there is less engagement in this literature, in general, with the questions of *why* and *how* this process occurs. This is a problem or gap addressed by this study, which advances a theoretical framework that can account for the empirical consensus of the relationship between international sport and international politics.

EMPIRICAL STUDIES OF SPORT AND INTERNATIONAL POLITICS

As discussed above, it is somewhat difficult to organize empirical studies of "sport and politics" into more discrete categories. Most studies take a phenomenon- or case-based approach to studying this relationship (e.g., Olympic boycotts, the 2008 Beijing Olympics, sport for development policy) and do not delineate between specific types of sport or politics, although the Olympics are the overwhelmingly favored laboratory of choice for scholarship in this area. This section examines this literature, assessing its conclusions and how it informs or contradicts the arguments advanced in this study.

Sport and the Cold War

The bipolar international system during the Cold War offers scholars an accessible opportunity to study the ways in which states used sport to further their foreign policies (particularly the demonstration of political ideology) as well as the efficacy of international sport governance in developing and managing its relationship with the broader political environment. Curiously, many of the empirical examinations of sport during the Cold War focus on its effects in domestic political contexts. Chalip, in

formulating a heuristic method of performing sport policy analysis, shows how Cold War concerns undermined the development of a more robust amateur sport policy in the United States.[32] Koller elaborates on these preliminary findings, demonstrating how America's desire to use sport to symbolize the superiority of Western ideology effectively strips its athletes of many constitutional rights and protections.[33] Essentially, these studies suggest that in an effort to manipulate sport into a useful foreign policy tool, the United States has adopted sub-optimal sport policies which harm both individual athletes and the general development of sport within its borders.

One of the preeminent sport and Cold War scholars, Thomas M. Hunt—in addition to his work in anti-doping—has explored the connection between sport and politics both in the United States and within the Soviet bloc.[34] While Hunt confirms the notion that U.S. domestic sport policy is primarily influenced by a desire to be distinctive from Soviet (i.e., state-controlled) sport policy, his study of national sport policy in the German Democratic Republic shows that sport was used to assert national identity within the Soviet bloc; East Germany was competing with the U.S.S.R. for national autonomy just as much as it was competing with the United States. This finding not only confirms the belief of sport's utility in nation-building, but also undermines the American belief

---

[32] Laurence Chalip, "Policy Analysis in Sport Management," *Journal of Sport Management* 9, no. 1 (1995): 1-13.

[33] Dionne L. Koller, "How the United States Government Sacrifices Athletes' Constitutional Rights in the Pursuit of National Prestige," *Brigham Young University Law Review* 2008, no. 5 (2008): 1465-1544. Koller actually concentrates more on the effects of U.S. compliance with WADA's policies, but situates this analysis within the milieu of the Amateur Sports Act of 1978.

[34] Thomas M. Hunt, "Countering the Soviet Threat in the Olympic Medals Race," *International Journal of the History of Sport* 24, no. 6 (2007): 796-818; "American Sport Policy and the Cultural Cold War: The Lyndon B. Johnson Presidential Years," *Journal of Sport History* 33, no. 3 (2006): 273-297. The Soviet study is Thomas M. Hunt, Paul Dimeo, Matthew T. Bowers, and Scott R. Jedlicka, "The Diplomatic Context of Doping in the Former German Democratic Republic: A Revisionist Examination*," International Journal of the History of Sport* 29, no. 18 (2012): 2486-2499.

that, in international sport, the U.S. faced a united Soviet front in international sport during the Cold War.

While studies of sport during the Cold War offer an excellent set of circumstances under which to study sport and politics, the major criticism of this work is that, given the end of the Cold War over two decades ago, its conclusions are only specific to that particular international environment. The end of bipolarity as well as the spread of Western capitalism and popular culture suggests that the relevance of sport to the projection of political ideology is waning. This is a legitimate criticism. However, as these scholars have shown, although the Cold War may be over, the policies developed during this period have had and continue to have far-reaching effects on sport policies around the world.

The Olympics as a Site of Protest

One of the most visible links between sport and politics is the Olympic boycott. The boycott which has received the vast majority of scholarly attention (likely due to the involvement of the United States) is that of the 1980 Summer Olympic games in Moscow.[35] The scholarly consensus with regard to this event highlights the United States' fundamental ignorance of international sport governance as well as the impotence of the IOC to influence the United States' or the U.S.S.R.'s foreign policy. More comprehensive examinations of protest activity in international sport question the efficacy of Olympic boycotts in general, while others emphasize the utility of the Olympic games as a mechanism for enhancing the visibility of political issues.[36] While

---

[35] Sarantakes, *Dropping the Torch.* See also Derick L. Hulme, Jr., *The Political Olympics: Moscow, Afghanistan, and the 1980 U.S. Boycott* (New York: Praeger, 1990).

[36] Scott Rosner and Deborah Low, "The Efficacy of Olympic Bans and Boycotts on Effectuating International Political and Economic Change," *Texas Review of Entertainment & Sports Law* 11, no. 1 (2009): 27-79; M. Patrick Cottrell and Travis Nelson, "Not Just the Games? Power, Protest and Politics at the Olympics," *European Journal of International Relations* 17, no. 4 (2010): 729-753.

Rosner and Low suggest that, in terms of influencing broad political change, Olympic boycotts have historically failed to accomplish their objects, Cottrell and Nelson show that protest activity has shifted from being state-driven to being initiated primarily by interest groups and other non-state actors. Moreover, this protest activity has increased over time. A synthesis of these two studies' findings seems to indicate that while protests which utilize sport are not effective in terms of achieving measurable change, they can be highly effective in elevating the awareness and significant of particular issues to a broader audience. Berg, Kessler, and Hunt have more recently attempted to reassess state-driven boycotts in terms of realist international relations theory, although their findings seem to be targeted at assessing the utility of the realist paradigm rather than the effectiveness of boycotts.[37]

Sport and Diplomacy

There is a wealth of literature examining how sport has factored into diplomatic relations for many different states and in many different settings. One of the most comprehensive attempts at empirically studying the use of sport as a tool of foreign diplomacy is Heere, et al.'s study of relations between South Korea and Japan surrounding the 2002 World Cup.[38] Utilizing a mixture of methods and drawing on a wealth of primary and secondary data, this study assesses the impact of the World Cup on instigating or sustaining the changing nature of both diplomatic and cultural relations between the two nations. The key finding was that (perhaps unfortunately) the administration of the event had less to do with affecting change than the performance of

---

[37] Brennan K. Berg, Seth A. Kessler, and Thomas M. Hunt, "A Realist Perspective of Governmental Perceptions of Olympic Boycott Movements, 1936-2008," *International Journal of Sport Policy and Politics* 4, no. 3 (2012): 307-320.

[38] Bob Heere, et al., "The Impact of World Cup 2002 on the Bilateral Relationship between South Korea and Japan," *Journal of Sport Management* 26, no. 2 (2012): 127-142.

the national teams, particularly for South Koreans. In a similar vein, Stevenson and Alaug studied the role of football during Yemeni unification.[39] However, these authors found that the particular construction of the national football team had a positive impact on the ability of Yemen's government to promote an image of a unified state.

Other studies, in the spirit of Houlihan's notion of sport providing states "access" to the international system, have examined how states have used international sporting events to develop a greater international diplomatic presence. Two recent important studies include Ndlovu's assessment of South Africa's incorporation of the 2010 World Cup into its foreign policy and Grix and Lee's more comprehensive analysis of event hosting as a projection of soft power.[40] Both of these studies suggest that nations bid for and host large sporting events not so much as a demonstration of ideology as a sign of commitment to international norms, development, and socioeconomic progress.

Summary of Empirical Literature

Two major themes emerge from the empirical literature on sport and international politics. First, the purposes for which states incorporate sport into their foreign policy agendas have changed over time. Whereas the Cold War political environment encouraged states to use sport's international visibility as a method for asserting the superiority of ideological claims, the post-Cold War world is one in which sport provides a venue for demonstrating conformity to global norms. Given the increase in prevalence and importance of non-state actors on the international stage, the use of sport to address political issues is not the sole province of states, either.

---

[39] Thomas B. Stevenson and Abdul Karim Alaug, "Sports Diplomacy and Emergent Nationalism Football Links between the Two Yemens, 1970–1990," *Anthropology of the Middle East* 3, no. 2 (2008): 1-19.
[40] Sifiso Mxolisi Ndlovu, "Sports as Cultural Diplomacy: The 2010 FIFA World Cup in South Africa's Foreign Policy," *Soccer & Society* 11, no. 1/2 (2010): 144-153; Jonathan Grix and Donna Lee, "Soft Power, Sports Mega-Events and Emerging States: The Lure of the Politics of Attraction," *Global Society: Journal of Interdisciplinary International Relations* 27, no. 4 (2013): 521-536.

More fundamentally, however, much of the empirical work in sport and international politics is based upon the assumption that sport is a political tool. When states or other actors wish to use sport, they do so relatively freely, with little threat of punishment or serious backlash. Again, this underscores the fundamental question addressed in this study. International sport possesses a complex and highly political governance structure, and is decidedly relevant to international politics. Further, international sport draws much of its legitimacy from its ideological underpinnings, particularly (though not exclusively) to its claim as a cosmopolitan movement where all states are welcome regardless of political stripe. If this is the case, why do non-sport actors appear to use sport for political purposes, ostensibly violating a fundamental legitimizing tenet of international sport governance, with relative impunity? The extant theoretical and empirical literature has not, to date, examined this question with any vigor or specificity.

Chapter 3: Methods

RESEARCH DESIGN

The purpose of this study is to elaborate a parsimonious theoretical framework that can offer a deeper and more useful explanation of the relationship between Olympic governance and international politics. In Chapter 1, I argued that the Olympic governance system can accurately be described as an international regime. Further, I explained how the meanings and values with which the regime imbues sport in order to legitimize the regime's authority, when interpreted by free riding states in the broader international political arena, can be used to undermine the regime's ability to enforce its rules and protect its guiding principles. The key component of the reasoning supporting this theory is the fundamental contradiction between asserting sport's apolitical status and believing it can serve political purposes. While this logic is compelling, the utility of a theory is measured not only by its underlying logic but its applicability to empirical observation. This study will provide empirical support for the proposed theory through a qualitative case study research design. A qualitative approach is most appropriate here, as it allows for the type of detailed exploration of causation not found in most quantitative or experimental methodologies. This is especially relevant because the proposed theory specifies causal mechanisms—the structure of the Olympic governance system and its rigid beliefs about sport—linking characteristics of the Olympic regime to problematic outcomes.

METHODOLOGY

Case study methodology has been identified as a valuable approach in theory building and will be used in this study.[1] Specifically, data gathered from historical case studies will be analyzed using process tracing methods to assess the plausibility of the theoretical propositions and arguments articulated in the first chapter of this dissertation. A case study is "an empirical inquiry that investigates a contemporary phenomenon in depth and within its real-life context, especially when the boundaries between phenomenon and context are not clearly evident."[2] Further, "the case study inquiry copes with the technically distinctive situation in which there will be many more variables of interest than data points, and as one result relies on multiple sources of evidence, with data needing to converge in a triangulating fashion, and as another result benefits from the prior development of theoretical propositions to guide data collection and analysis."[3] While this definition deals with case studies in a very general sense, it illuminates two important points. First, case studies can better account for particular contextual effects than more generalized, large-*n* studies; by extension, using multiple case studies can better control for context as an intervening variable and thereby identify consistencies in observations across varying sets of circumstances. Second, because of their emphasis on contextual detail, case studies have the ability to provide the richness and depth necessary to better support causal claims. This makes the methodology more useful for tasks such as theory development than strictly experimental designs.

---

[1] Kathleen M. Eisenhardt and Melissa E. Graebner, "Theory Building from Cases: Opportunities and Challenges," *Academy of Management Journal* 50, no. 1 (2007): 25-32. In the field of political science, case studies are suggested to be particularly useful in building theories involving "macropolitical phenomena" (like the theory advanced in this study). See Harry Eckstein, "Case Study and Theory in Political Science," in *Case Study Method: Key Issues, Key Texts,* eds. Roger Gomm, Martyn Hammersley, and Peter Foster (London: Sage Publications, 2000), 119-120.

[2] Robert K. Yin, *Case Study Research: Design and Methods*, 4th ed. (London: Sage Publications, 2009), 18.

[3] Ibid.

Before delving into the specific methods and procedures used in this study, it would be inappropriate to forgo a discussion, however brief, of the epistemological underpinnings of the selected methodology. Case study methodology has been criticized for, among other things, a potential lack of rigor and generalizability.[4] This criticism is particularly relevant for the purposes of this dissertation, as the same debate over the specific versus the general (the relative merits of induction and deduction) is also found in the fields of history and political science.[5] Because this study thoroughly engages ideas from political science (specifically international relations) and because I utilize traditionally historical modes of research (particularly documentary analysis and the use of narrative), it is pertinent to address these criticisms.

At the core of critiques leveled against small-*n* research methodologies, whether they be case studies, historical narratives, hermeneutics, or other similar approaches, is an epistemological belief that narrow, highly specific analyses are inherently unable to contribute to a broader corpus of knowledge about a given subject. This is, of course, indicative of a deeper logical positivist or post-positivist belief that the most important types of knowledge are obtained through the natural scientific model of deduction and the testing of hypotheses.[6] By rejecting the *a priori* existence of theories or laws and counting as important (or at least relevant) the contextual details that make a given case or set of cases unique or unlikely to be replicated, these strategies seem to readily admit that generalization beyond narrowly-defined contexts is an innately fruitless endeavor.

---

[4] Ibid., 14-16.

[5] Jack S. Levy, "Explaining Events and Developing Theories: History, Political Science, and the Analysis of International Relations," in *Bridges and Boundaries: Historians, Political Scientists, and the Study of International Relations,* eds. Colin Elman and Miriam Fendius Elman (Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press, 2001), 39-84. Many of the contributions in this volume are thematically similar to Levy's.

[6] A standard text which offers an accessible explanation of scientific philosophy as well as a rejection of the central tenets of logical positivism is Thomas S. Kuhn, *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*, 2nd ed. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1969).

The emphasis on induction and the reluctance to accept the existence of an objectively-defined "truth" to be proved or disproved tends to group small-*n* research strategies into either the social constructionist or postmodernist epistemological camps. These basic philosophical differences are not easily resolved if indeed they can be resolved at all. This irreconcilability suggests that further expounding on the merits of the particular assumptions and logics informing these positions would be largely unnecessary for the purposes of this dissertation. It would instead be more productive to assess whether the particular methodology in question is being appropriately used in this study to accomplish the task of theory building.

The use of a methodology strongly linked to epistemologies which reject ideas like the objectively neutral researcher and the existence of truth independent of human experience to construct and provide support for a theory may seem contradictory. In other words, a methodology that elevates the importance of the specific and questions the validity of generalization would seem ill-suited for use in developing generalized statements about the relationship among phenomena. However, this wrongly assumes an incompatibility between small-*n* research and a positivist or post-positivist epistemology. As E.H. Carr wrote, "The historian is not really interested in the unique, but in what is general in the unique."[7] If this is true, and the study of "the unique" can be used to say something general about observed phenomena, what advantages can this sort of strategy provide in the pursuit of theory construction? Because the theory proposed in this study advances a causal relationship, a more specific form of this question might be, "What advantages can a small-*n* study provide in an investigation of causation that large-*n* studies cannot?"

---

[7] Edward Hallett Carr, *What is History?* (New York: Random House, 1961), 80.

A concise and useful response to this question lies in one of Andrew Bennett's and Alexander L. George's many explications of process tracing as a useful method for political scientists (i.e., proponents of "the general") and historians (i.e., proponents of "the unique") alike. In advocating for this common ground, they assert:

> The epistemological middle ground consists of the assertion that causal mechanisms and causal effects are both essential to causal explanation. The methodological middle ground is the use of process tracing to identify and test hypothesized causal mechanisms in historical cases. The theoretical middle ground centers on typological theories. These theories allow for equifinality, path dependency, interaction effects, and nonlinear relations. They also sacrifice a substantial degree of parsimony to achieve greater explanatory richness.[8]

In essence, Bennett and George admit that historical or case study research will never generate parsimonious theories or achieve broad generalizability in the same way or to the same extent as large-*n* studies. However, what these studies lack in elegance they make up for with explanatory power. While analyzing large amounts of data can uncover strong correlative relationships, a greater attention to detail can explore causation with a much higher level of precision. Moreover, the explanatory power gained through small-*n* research need not be isolated to a single case or narrative. Given a posited causal relationship or causal mechanism, a case study methodology offers a highly useful way of investigating these claims and deriving general conclusions.

These points are certainly not original. The preceding discussion is therefore not particularly enlightening, but it serves to emphasize that the selected methodology is

---

[8] Andrew Bennett and Alexander L. George, "Case Studies and Process Tracing in History and Political Science: Similar Strokes for Different Foci," in *Bridges and Boundaries: Historians, Political Scientists, and the Study of International Relations,* eds. Colin Elman and Miriam Fendius Elman (Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press, 2001), 165. Bennett and George define a typological theory as one that "identifies generalized pathways, whether the path in question has occurred only once, a thousand times, or is merely hypothesized as a potential path that has not yet occurred at all" (p. 157). The point here is that typological theory offers a way to situate otherwise atheoretical historical scholarship within a generalizable theoretical framework without committing to the precise specification of variables and relationships required by, say, mathematical modeling.

appropriate for the task of theory construction undertaken in this study. As Bennett and George argue, process tracing methods link case study methodology to the construction of sound theoretical frameworks. In the following sections, this method and its application in this particular study will be described in greater detail.

METHODS

Process tracing methods are applied in this study to three historical cases involving the Olympic regime. This research strategy is designed to test the central theory of sport and state behavior advanced in this dissertation; specifically, the causal link between the Olympic movement's governance structure and ideological principles, and the concomitant struggle to enforce those principles, as well as the ability of states to manipulate Olympic sport when they feel it politically advantageous to do so. Process tracing is "the attempt to trace empirically the temporal and possibly causal sequences of events within a case that intervene between independent variables and observed outcomes."[9] When used for theory testing and development, process tracing involves comparing the historical data or narrative to predictions derived from the theory. Typically, this calls for the selection of cases that are both "most likely" and "least likely"; that is, cases which represent relatively "easy" and "difficult" tests of the theory under investigation.[10]

Case Selection

Given the relative simplicity of the theoretical framework under investigation, cases were selected primarily for the explicitness of the relationship between Olympic sport and international politics evinced within them. Only the postwar era was considered

---

[9] Ibid., 144.
[10] Ibid., 150-151.

for potential cases, as both the international sport system and the international political system were markedly different than either before World War I or during the interwar era. Because some variation on the dependent variable is necessary in a research design such as this, and in line with the guidelines suggested by Bennett and George, three cases with differing outcomes were selected.[11] The first case, concerning the boycott of the 1980 Moscow Olympics, represents a failure of the IOC to prevent politics from intruding into sport. The second, concerning the issue of South African participation in international sport, demonstrates mixed results for the regime. The third, concerning the involvement of intergovernmental bodies in the development of the World Anti-Doping Agency, suggests positive results for Olympic governance, as it was able to assert its authority over international sport issues and control the extent to which sport and politics mixed; this represents a "hard" case for the theory.

As I will address in more detail in the section on variable designation, it may seem as though there is a bit of selection bias evident here. All of the cases involve an instance of the Olympic regime asserting the political neutrality of sport, which would seem to exclude all other cases in which the independent variable took on a different value. This seeming bias is not due to intentional selection of theory-confirming cases, but rather the construction of the theory itself, as well as the essential nature of the Olympic regime. I have argued that the causal phenomenon which works to undermine the regime's ability to enforce its own rules is a feature of the regime itself, and that this feature has remained constant over its lifetime. In other words, there are no cases involving a typologically different Olympic governance system, one that acknowledges sport's political significance. Nonetheless, I have attempted to select cases in which

---

[11] Ibid. Also see Gary King, Robert O. Keohane, and Sidney Verba, *Designing Social Inquiry: Scientific Inference in Qualitative Research* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1994), 129-137.

relatively small but significant differences in the independent variable can be ascertained and analyzed. The following sections briefly describe these cases and the data used in constructing and probing the processes linking the different theoretical components under investigation.

"The South African Problem" at the 1968 Summer Olympics

Synopsis

The question of how to reconcile South African domestic policies of apartheid with the Olympic movement's values and desire to remain apart from political issues was debated within the larger context of a global shunning of South Africa initiated by the United Nations in 1962. U.N. General Assembly Resolution 1761 denounced apartheid, and called upon U.N. member nations to break diplomatic ties and sever economic relations with South Africa. The IOC had to balance, on one hand, the appropriateness of becoming embroiled in what it saw as an issue of South African domestic policy and, on the other, the growing consensus among many states that South African participation in international sport was inexcusable. After banning the South Africa National Olympic Committee (SANOC) in 1964 after it refused to denounce national apartheid, the IOC again took up the issue of South African participation prior to the 1968 Games. Despite a commitment from SANOC to send a mixed-race team to the Olympics and the IOC's strong desire to not exclude any nation for political reasons, international pressure and the fear of widespread protests or boycotts ultimately influenced the IOC to rescind South Africa's invitation. A few years later, South Africa was officially expelled from the Olympic movement; it would eventually rejoin in 1992 following the repeal of apartheid.

Data Sources

Two books are of great importance in constructing and analyzing this case. The first, Kevin Witherspoon's *Before the Eyes of the World* provides the only serious recounting of the Mexican perspective on the Games as well as the myriad controversies that plagued these Olympics.[12] The Mexican government was vocal in both its desire to host a successful event as well as its opposition to South African participation (which, admittedly, may have been a function of international pressure). *The Race Game*, Douglas Booth's treatise on South African sport during apartheid, will complement data gleaned from official IOC documents which evince the progression of the debate over South Africa.[13]

The U.S.-Led Boycott of the 1980 Moscow Olympics

Synopsis

This case represents a "most likely" case for the theory advanced in this study. The U.S.-led movement to not participate in Moscow as a response to the Soviet Union's invasion of Afghanistan was overtly political. Despite the IOC's use of ideas about sport's political neutrality to undermine the boycott, the U.S. and sixty-four other nations abstained from Olympic competition in 1980. Most of these nations argued that their actions were, rather than condemnable, justified in terms of Olympic values; the ideological platform of the Games was incompatible with the military occupation of a neighboring country by the Olympic host. In the end, the IOC adopted a strategy of stern rhetoric coupled with inaction, ultimately allowing all sides to claim success in the name of sport. The boycott was carried out, the Games were held, and the Soviets remained in Afghanistan for most of the decade.

---

[12] Kevin B. Witherspoon, *Before the Eyes of the World: Mexico and the 1968 Olympic Games* (DeKalb, IL: Northern Illinois University Press, 2008).
[13] Douglas Booth, *The Race Game: Sport and Politics in South Africa* (Portland: Frank Cass, 1998).

Data Sources

Nicholas Sarantakes' *Dropping the Torch* is the authoritative study of the 1980 boycott.[14] This book contains a list of sources that might reasonably be described as comprehensive with regard to this subject and which will be indispensable as a guide to supplemental research.[15] Primary source material is utilized as well, including the IOC meeting minutes from the period as well as the public papers of U.S. President Jimmy Carter, who was largely responsible for the origination of the boycott idea.[16] Relevant volumes of the Foreign Relations of the United States (FRUS), 1977-1980 series (particularly Volume VI, which contains material related to the Soviet Union) are also used as primary source data.[17]

UNESCO, the IOC, and the International Convention against Doping in Sport

Synopsis

One of the major policy issues for the Olympic regime throughout much of its existence has been policing drug use in sport. While performance enhancement through the use of chemical substances is evident as far back as the early twentieth century, addressing "doping" did not become a significant agenda item for international sport organizations until the 1960s. For the next few decades, the IOC struggled to gain control of what it perceived as a rapidly growing and increasingly complex problem, from defining "doping" to developing accurate testing protocols to determining appropriate

---

[14] Nicholas Evan Sarantakes, *Dropping the Torch: Jimmy Carter, the Olympic Boycott, and the Cold War* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2011).

[15] Ibid., 321-331.

[16] The Carter public papers are available through the American Presidency Project. Online by Gerhard Peters and John T. Woolley, *The American Presidency Project*. <http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/>

[17] *Foreign Relations of the United States, 1977-1980* (Washington, DC: Department of State, 2013). <http://history.state.gov/historicaldocuments/carter> (accessed June 18, 2014).

sanctions for rule violations. Despite a contentious history with the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO), the IOC, beginning in the late 1980s, worked with UNESCO, an intergovernmental organization, to develop an international legal instrument that reified the commitment of member states to combating illicit drug use in sport.

This case represents a "least likely" scenario and a difficult test for the theory under investigation. Unlike the other two cases, the IOC initiated and encouraged the involvement of a (rather reluctant) governmental entity. Moreover, the legal instrument eventually passed by UNESCO—the International Convention against Doping in Sport— acknowledges the authority of the World Anti-Doping Agency (WADA) as the leader of the global anti-doping effort. This runs somewhat counter, at least superficially, to the predictions and assumptions of the theory, which suggest that the IOC would avoid governmental involvement in sport policymaking.

Data Sources

This chapter is a revised version of my article concerning this case in *The International Journal of the History of Sport*.[18] The primary source material used in that article, the UNESCO archive, will be drawn on as necessary to provide supplemental data.[19] Additionally, Thomas M. Hunt's *Drug Games* is the leading study of anti-doping policy in international sport and can provide additional context for the particular details of this case.[20]

---

[18] Scott R. Jedlicka and Thomas M. Hunt, "The International Anti-Doping Movement and UNESCO: A Historical Case Study," *International Journal of the History of Sport* 30, no. 13 (2013), 1523-1535.
[19] The online UNESCO archive, UNESDOC, is accessible at http://unesco.org/ulis.
[20] Thomas M. Hunt, *Drug Games: The International Olympic Committee and the Politics of Doping, 1960-2008* (Austin, TX: University of Texas Press, 2011).

Designation of Variables

Independent Variable

The causal variables in this study are the Olympic regime's structure and its commitment to apolitical sport as a necessary and sufficient condition for achieving the Olympic movement's objectives. Quantifying different values for these variables is admittedly difficult. Indeed, with regard to regime structure, there is very little measurable variance, especially in the relatively short time frames of the cases under investigation. The same is true for the regime's conception of sport. The lack of variance here can largely be attributed to the fact that the Olympic regime is stubbornly committed to this belief. However, it is theoretically conceivable that an organization like the IOC might choose to relax its allegiance to this particular tenet (or modify the tenet itself), which may in turn affect the ability to enforce regime rules. So, while wide ranges of values on this variable are not empirically evident, smaller changes on the Olympic regime's implementation of this particular policy can still be ferreted out from the historical data.

What might different values for this variable look like? In the extreme, unwavering assertions of sport's apolitical status will be evident. Incremental changes toward the other end of the spectrum might include a normative restatement (i.e., sport should aspire to neutrality, even if reality makes this unattainable), conditional rationalization (i.e., particular, perhaps unlikely circumstances in a given situation trump the importance of this policy), or, more radically, a softening of the position in general (i.e., sport and politics *do* mix on a regular basis). The theory suggests that as values move toward the middle of the spectrum, the Olympic regime will be more likely to enforce its rules and achieve its objectives.

Causal Mechanism

The causal mechanism linking the independent variable to the dependent variable is how states interpret both their status as free riders and the values foundational to the Olympic regime. The theory predicts that, as the regime redoubles its commitment to apolitical sport, states will be more able to pursue political objectives through sport. This is because 1) states recognize that they are free riding, making Olympic sport a low-cost political tool and 2) the regime's staunch devotion to a particular conception of sport undermines its ability to enforce the rules stemming from it. Obviously, this oversimplifies the complexities and diversities of state interests and behavior. It also does not account for the possibility that states will at times be persuaded by this rhetoric and that regime enforcement will function normally. However, it is not the purpose of this study to investigate how the independent variable affects state behavior, but rather how it affects the ability of the Olympic regime to govern effectively. Thus, state response to the regime is simply the mechanism through which these two variables are linked; it is the process of state involvement in and reaction to the policies of Olympic organizations that ultimately affects the governance of international sport.

Dependent Variable

The outcome variable in this study is the relative effectiveness of the Olympic regime to enforce its rules and achieve its objectives. For each case, this will necessitate a clear description of the regime's interests, intentions, and preferred outcomes. The actual "value" of the dependent variable will thus manifest as an assessment of the difference between stated objectives and actual events. As with the independent variable, quantification is elusive. However, in general, the expectation is that greater flexibility in the Olympic regime's stance toward sport and politics in a given case, the more likely it

is that the regime will be able to achieve a greater percentage of its stated (or, if not stated, inferred) objectives or goals.

SECTION II: CASE STUDIES

The cases presented in this section are all relatively well-known instances in which the Olympic regime had to grapple with international political concerns. As noted in Chapter 3, my primary concern in presenting and analyzing these cases is not to completely reconstruct or significantly contribute to existing historical narratives, but to use these accounts to assess the validity of the theory advanced in this study. The cases, therefore, are not presented as strict chronologies. Rather, they focus on important decision points and include considerations of the choices faced by individuals and organizations. This allows for a deeper and broader exploration of the key actors and sequences of events in each case, as well as a more specific investigation of the relationship between the Olympic regime and political behavior.

Chapter 4: "The South African Problem" at the 1968 Summer Olympics

The 1968 Olympic games in Mexico City are considered by many historians to be a watershed moment in Olympic history. From the uncertainty surrounding new sporting technologies and methods (most notably the ability to control for the effects of altitude training and performance enhancing drugs), to the disturbing Tlatelolco massacre ten days before the opening ceremonies (in which over 1,300 Mexican protesters were arrested and death toll estimates rose into the hundreds), to the very visible symbolic protest of sprinters John Carlos and Tommie Smith of the United States and Peter Norman of Australia during the medal ceremony for the men's 200 meter event, the Mexico City Olympics were a crucible of social and political unrest magnified by the lens of international sport. However, perhaps the most significant political issue in terms of its breadth and depth faced by the Olympic regime in the months preceding the 1968 games was the policy of South African apartheid and its relationship to Olympic sport.

Although the language of cultural harmony and inclusiveness that buttresses the Olympic ideological edifice would seem to be very much aligned with an opposition to apartheid, the matter, at least for the IOC, was not so straightforward. The IOC's president, Avery Brundage, adhered closely to the belief that political concerns of any kind had no place in sport, and this included racial politics.[1] This was particularly problematic in the case of South Africa. Segregation was not just a cultural practice but a legal institution, which meant that taking a moral stand on racial discrimination in South Africa would constitute interference with the country's domestic policies, something which was beyond the scope of the IOC's authority. This case presents an interesting test

---

[1] Richard E. Lapchick, "South Africa: Sport and Apartheid Politics," *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 445, no. 1 (1979): 156. Also see Allen Guttmann, *The Games Must Go On: Avery Brundage and the Olympic Movement* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1983).

for the Olympic regime theory because it deals explicitly with the relative ability of Olympic governance to foist its interpretations of its rules and principles upon other actors. Though the IOC isolated the issue of South African participation in Mexico City strictly to the practices of its national Olympic committee, external pressures ultimately forced the IOC to not only withdraw South Africa's invitation but to ultimately expel it from the Olympic movement in 1970.

BRINGING SOUTH AFRICA BACK IN: 1965-1967

At the seventeenth session of its General Assembly in 1962, the United Nations (UN) issued Resolution 1761. This statement, in no uncertain terms, condemned apartheid in South Africa. Further, identifying this policy of racial segregation as a global security risk, the UN called on its member states to break off any existing diplomatic ties with and impose trade embargoes upon South Africa, as well as close their borders to all South African government officials.[2] Though apartheid was instituted in 1948, this resolution marked the beginning of UN engagement with the problem and signaled the start of a subtle coalescence of international attitudes in opposition to it. International sport was no exception.[3] Prior to the 1964 Summer Olympics in Tokyo, the IOC imposed a deadline of December 31, 1963 for the South African National Olympic Committee (SANOC) to publicly commit to ending segregationist practices in South African sport. Since the early 1950s, the racial separation of sport in South Africa had been reinforced by both cultural tradition and legislative decree.[4] Though SANOC complied with the

---

[2] UN General Assembly, Resolution 1761, "The Policies of Apartheid of the Government of the Republic of South Africa," November 6, 1962. <http://www.un.org/documents/ga/res/17/ares17.htm>.

[3] Douglas Booth, "Hitting Apartheid for Six? The Politics of the South African Sports Boycott," *Journal of Contemporary History* 38, no. 3 (2003): 479-480. Booth notes that the growing inclusion of Eastern bloc and African nations in international sport governance worked to challenge prevailing Eurocentric attitudes about sport's political utility.

[4] Douglas Booth, *The Race Game: Sport and Politics in South Africa* (Portland: Frank Cass, 1998), 57.

IOC's mandate, nominating seven black athletes to its Olympic team, the South African government denounced the move and asserted its authority in determining how South Africa would be represented in international competition.[5] When SANOC refused to publicly defy its national government, the IOC withdrew its invitation to the Tokyo games.[6] The IOC's decision was not surprising given its disdain for governmental interference in Olympic governance, especially when it so visibly undermined assertions of national Olympic committee autonomy.

This skirmish set the stage for the question of South African participation at the 1968 Summer Olympics in Mexico City. On October 5, 1965, Brundage raised the issue to the IOC's Executive Committee, expressing hope that progress could be made toward ending racial discrimination in South African Olympic sport.[7] The following day, however, tensions flared at the General Session meeting. Earlier that year, Italian Giulio Onesti had organized a meeting of the national Olympic committees in Rome, designed to allow the NOCs to express their views and concerns to the IOC so that their needs might better be addressed within the Olympic movement. Though he received an invitation to and attended this meeting, the South African delegate Reginald Honey was asked by Onesti to leave after several African NOCs protested his presence. From Honey's perspective, the ordeal was offensive and placed him in an awkward position. Onesti responded that he was bound to act in the interests of all NOCs, and South Africa's racial policies clearly placed SANOC in violation of the Olympic Charter.[8] After a brief debate, the Committee, while recognizing that Honey was not necessarily at fault (being as he was an IOC representative to South Africa and not necessarily representative

[5] Booth, *The Race Game,* 87.
[6] Ibid.
[7] Minutes of the IOC Executive Committee, October 5, 1965, Madrid, p. 1.
[8] Minutes of the 63rd Meeting of the IOC, October 6-9, 1965, Madrid, pp. 1-3.

of the South African government), decided to unconditionally suspend SANOC from the next IOC meeting in 1966.[9] The fact that South Africa had recently expanded its segregation of sport to spectators, requiring black sport fans to obtain permits to attend white events (and vice versa), may have contributed to the IOC's decision to extend the position it had taken with regard to the Tokyo Olympics and keep SANOC at arm's length.[10]

Though officially suspended, a South African delegation did appear in Rome six months later to again plead its case to the IOC Executive Board, asserting its commitment to creating an NOC with equal racial representation and giving every assurance that it had government approval to pursue this initiative.[11] While the Executive Board was enthusiastic about this development, the General Session was more skeptical, deferring until the IOC's 1967 meeting to take any formal action regarding South Africa's status.[12] In introducing discussion on the topic, Brundage noted that expulsion of SANOC, should the IOC decide to take such action, would likely be permanent. The South African delegation was composed of Frank Braun, Rudolf Opperman, and Denis McIldowie.[13] Braun and Opperman, who would both serve as SANOC presidents, had previously and publicly avowed their support for apartheid and segregated sport.[14] Nevertheless, in their presentation to the General Session, these men reiterated their earlier claims made to the Executive Board and also pledged to institute unbiased, meritocratic selection procedures for SANOC's Olympic teams.[15]

---

[9] Ibid.

[10] Booth, *The Race Game*, 92.

[11] Minutes of the Meeting of the Executive Board of the IOC, April 21-23, 1966, Rome, p. 2.

[12] Minutes of the 64th Meeting of the IOC, April 24-30, 1966, Rome, pp. 14-15.

[13] Ibid.

[14] Booth, *The Race Game*, 59.

[15] Minutes of the 64th Meeting of the IOC, pp. 14-15.

The IOC, while withholding judgment for another year, did take steps to ensure that the South African committee was at least making an effort to live up to its promises. It decided that prior to the official invitations being extended for the 1968 Olympics a delegation comprised of the IOC president (or a proxy) along with two African IOC members would visit South Africa to assess what progress had been made in bringing SANOC's operations into compliance with Olympic principles.[16] While the IOC was understandably suspicious, the cautious approach it took regarding South Africa seems a bit odd. Given the IOC's (and especially Brundage's) total contempt for political interference in sport and its corresponding urge to be as unequivocally inclusive as possible, the promises of Olympians—even those who, like the South African contingent, had tended toward government interference in the past—would seem to be sufficient. Indeed, as the 1968 games approached, the tenor of the discussion surrounding South Africa changed, appealing less to compliance with Olympic principles and exhibiting a stronger advocacy for apolitical sport. At the Executive Board's second meeting in 1966, Brundage was clear in his position that "Apartheid is a political affair and has nothing to do with sport as such."[17] He also somewhat condescendingly cautioned:

> African Olympic Committees in new African countries do not understand that one cannot use sports as a stick for achieving political objectives. Whatever we are going to decide we have to be very careful as there is a danger with new countries, which may not understand our position.[18]

Also at this meeting, Reginald Alexander of Kenya, Sir Ade Ademola of Nigeria, and Lord Killanin of Ireland were appointed to the investigative committee that would travel to South Africa.[19]

---

[16] Ibid., Annex No. 5.

[17] Minutes of the Meeting of the Executive Board of the IOC, October 22, 1966, Mexico City, pp. 4-5.

[18] Ibid.

[19] Ibid. The committee would keep all of its findings secret and report directly to Brundage.

Brundage summarized the core issue facing the IOC early in 1967, shortly before the committee was to leave on its fact-finding mission. Rather than stake out a clear position on apartheid, he chose to portray the situation as a delicate balance between, on one hand, a wish for full, nondiscriminatory participation at the games and, on the other, the fact that apartheid was a governmental policy and thus beyond the IOC's purview.[20] Brundage, in addition to reiterating his concern that some (African) NOCs would not understand the IOC's preference for inaction on this issue, also laid out a tentative set of evaluative benchmarks for SANOC. These were essentially the same claims made by the South African delegation in 1966; namely, that there would be unbiased selection procedures and that the government had committed to supporting SANOC's compliance with Olympic rules. If the South African committee could demonstrate that these steps were being taken, its path back to the Olympic movement seemed clear.[21]

With the IOC's visit looming, South African Prime Minister John Vorster announced new state policy in April regarding the country's representation in international sport events, including the Olympics. The policy, which allowed for the inclusion of black athletes on national teams, was specifically designed to comply with the IOC's rules prohibiting discrimination.[22] This preceded a very eventful May meeting of the IOC. SANOC submitted an extensively-argued brief demonstrating its desire to rejoin the IOC and to comply with its rules. The report, prepared by Frank Braun, also exhibited a deep understanding of Brundage's views on the matter. In appealing to the IOC president's belief in the power of sport, Braun asked rhetorically, "Mr. President, what will engender greater goodwill, respect, and understanding among the different

---

[20] Minutes of the Meeting of the Executive Board of the IOC, February 11-12, 1967, Copenhagen, p. 4.
[21] Ibid.
[22] Booth, *The Race Game,* 89.

races of South Africa than to share in one another's achievements at the Olympic Games and for a non-white to become a national sports hero?" More powerfully, though, Braun tapped into Brundage's growing exasperation with what he increasingly viewed as an intractable domestic political issue in which the IOC had no business being involved:

> …Mr. President, time and again new issues are being raised after previous ones had been met. The question we have to answer for ourselves is whether we shall ever again be welcome in the Olympic Games. By the look of things this time will not arrive until a complete political reorientation has come about in South Africa, in other words, only when South Africa fully complies with the political destiny that the world desires of it, something which is clearly beyond the realm of sport.[23]

This slippery slope argument reinforced what some members of the IOC feared most. By condemning an Olympic organization for complying with the policies of its government (regardless of whether doing so conflicted with Olympic guidelines), the IOC was committing itself to a policy of establishing guilt by association. Banning the South African NOC for its conformity with certain aspects of the apartheid regime would set a precedent with which the IOC was extremely uncomfortable and which it was not prepared to sustain.

The General Session also received a resolution adopted by the Supreme Council for Sport in Africa (a regional sport governing body responsible mostly for organizing continental sport events in Africa) calling for South Africa's expulsion from the Olympic movement, charging that the reforms claimed by SANOC were superficial and that the sport situation in South Africa was "totally opposed to Olympic morality and principles."[24] The most important statement in the resolution, however, was the final clause, which called on the organization's members (essentially, African NOCs) to

---

[23] Minutes of the 65th Session of the IOC, May 6-9, 1967, Tehran, Annex VI.
[24] Ibid., Annex VIII.

boycott the 1968 Olympics should South Africa fail to send a fully integrated team.[25] The IOC, for its part, was mostly unprepared to act on these strong statements, as its fact-finding committee had not yet completed its trip.

More than a year before the 1968 games, it was becoming clear that the malleability of Olympic principles allowed them to be used in support of a variety of positions regarding South African participation. Taken as strict moral prescriptions, the sport situation in South Africa clearly violated the Olympic rules prohibiting racial discrimination in sport. However, a more rigid interpretation of these regulations (one favored by Brundage as well as SANOC) suggested that their applicability was limited to Olympic sport alone.[26] Regardless, the fact that the Olympics' governing principles were being used to defend both sides of the same debate should have signaled to Olympic administrators that attempting to stake out a middle ground could be a precarious and perhaps impossible feat. Nevertheless, this strategy—that South Africa could achieve compliance with Olympic rules, even as a growing opposition suggested that South Africa's commitment to apartheid categorically contradicted these ideals—was the one to which the IOC had devoted itself.

A DECISION AND A REVERSAL: 1968

Meeting in February 1968 prior to the Winter Olympics in Grenoble, France, the General Session was once again considering the South African issue, now with increased urgency given the short amount of time before the Summer Olympics. First, the Session was presented with the results of the fact-finding committee's September trip to South Africa, which indicated that while SANOC was more or less complying with the letter of

---

[25] Ibid.

[26] The most conservative view, which advocated absolutely no interference in domestic sport decisions by international sport organizations, was isolated mostly (in this case, at least) to South African politicians. See Booth, *The Race Game*, 87-88.

Olympic law, the organization was still very much missing the mark in terms of its spirit. However, on the instructions of Brundage, the committee focused its conclusions on the former point, suggesting that SANOC had done enough to make sending a multiracial team to Mexico City a feasible task.[27]

The meeting attendees then listened to another lengthy statement from SANOC President Frank Braun. Braun once again employed Olympic rhetoric to his advantage, asserting that Coubertin himself would have desired South African inclusion in the Olympic movement and pointedly questioning whether the IOC wanted to be responsible for "dashing the hopes" of black South African athletes. In making the second point, he also suggested that banning SANOC could prompt some sort of (perhaps violent) protest action against the South African government, something for which the IOC would be directly responsible.[28] More importantly, Braun knew that with time growing short, SANOC had leverage. He appealed to the bureaucrats on the Committee, saying that South Africa had fully complied with the requests made of it at the 1967 meeting in Tehran, and emphasized that "further demands on South Africa will result in a complete break in its relationship with the IOC."[29] While threatening such a move was clearly a gamble, Braun likely knew that Brundage could not abide the idea that the IOC would be responsible for driving nations away from the Olympic movement. If the decision came down to a potential public backlash against South African attendance in Mexico City and the country's certain (and perhaps permanent) absence from the Olympic family, it seemed likely that the IOC would opt for inclusivity.

---

[27] Kevin Witherspoon, *Before the Eyes of the World: Mexico and the 1968 Olympic Games* (DeKalb, IL: Northern Illinois University Press, 2008): 64-65. On Brundage's influence, see Booth, *The Race Game,* 86.
[28] Minutes of the 66th Session of the IOC, February 1-5, 1968, Grenoble, Annex V.
[29] Ibid.

The IOC was satisfied that SANOC had lived up to the requests made of it in Tehran, which were to achieve multiracial representation among both athletes and administrators, to integrate housing and travel accommodations for the team, and to compete as a single team under the South African flag.[30] Some members, however, continued to voice concerns that the integration of the South African Olympic team had had virtually no impact upon the ongoing segregation of sport in South Africa, and that in this sense, SANOC was not living up to the spirit of the Olympic ideal. Here again, the IOC found itself mired in the drudgery and uncertainty of interpreting its organizational purpose. How extensively should Olympic rules be applied? Did the IOC have a responsibility to govern a state's entire sport infrastructure, or simply its Olympic arm? Would a decision to ban South Africa in 1968 set a precedent the organization could not live up to? The IOC had been grappling with these questions for almost five years with no clear resolution or statement of policy. Some members saw SANOC's achievement of the standards set for it at the Tehran meeting as sufficient for inclusion in 1968, while others favored returning to the original requests made in 1963, asking for a public declaration of SANOC's opposition to segregated sport. Though the IOC was not prepared to issue a formal organizational statement on South Africa's status within the Olympic movement in general, a decision for Mexico City needed to be made. Putting the matter to a vote, the IOC, by absolute majority, supported South African inclusion at the 1968 Summer Olympics.[31]

Though the possibility of a negative response (particularly a boycott) was known to the IOC and discussed prior to opting for South African participation, it does not appear that the organization lent much credence to the threat itself or its potential scope.

---

[30] Ibid., Annex VI.
[31] Ibid., p. 7.

This was a miscalculation. The IOC expected that many African nations would oppose the decision and quickly commit to a boycott, something that occurred almost immediately following the decision. Unexpected, however, was the rapid growth in global support for these moves. With public opposition to South Africa's inclusion stretching into the Soviet Union and Scandinavia, the IOC grew worried that it had unwittingly and irreparably ruined the 1968 games.[32] As it became clear during the spring that a concerted boycott effort reaching far beyond the African continent was in the offing, Brundage dug in. Using rhetoric both he and the IOC would employ in coming years to deal with a variety of so-called political intrusions, Brundage pledged that "the Mexico Games will go on," and expressed his displeasure that boycotting nations would use the Olympics for political purposes.[33] Though some nations supported these views and promised to attend the games in Mexico City, Brundage eventually acquiesced to the growing calls from within the Olympic movement to reopen the issue.[34]

At the urging of Mexican General and IOC Vice President Jose de J. Clark, Brundage convened an emergency meeting of the IOC's executive board in April.[35] Tensions were high. Calling attention to a letter circulated by Brundage in the wake of the Grenoble decision defending the IOC's stance, Soviet IOC member Constantin Andrianov accused Brundage of essentially taking a cheap shot at the Soviet Union. In the letter, Brundage compared the implications of the South Africa vote to the decision to admit the USSR to the IOC in 1952, and to continue to include it even after Soviet attempts to quell the Hungarian Revolution in 1956.[36] Though perhaps petty, this

---

[32] Witherspoon, *Before the Eyes of the World,* 65-66.
[33] Ibid.
[34] Ibid., 67.
[35] Ibid.
[36] Minutes of the Meeting of the IOC Executive Board, April 20-21, 1968, Lausanne, p. 1-2.

squabble carried symbolic weight, as the USSR had been a supporter of the African NOCs and its own threats to boycott were considered very credible.[37] Following this exchange, the Board members confirmed their procedural limitations with regard to revisiting the South Africa decision, noting that the Board could not enact policy, only make recommendations to the General Session.[38] Further, Brundage noted that the General Session, which would not meet again until immediately before the games in Mexico City, could not call an emergency meeting without twenty-four formal requests for such, a number that had not yet been reached.[39] Confident in its understanding that it could take no immediate action, the board adjourned for the day.

On Sunday, April 21, Brundage and the Executive Board finally began to assess policy options. The Board identified two choices available to it; essentially, to uphold or reverse the decision made in Grenoble to accept a South African team's participation in Mexico City. A third option, in which SANOC would be asked to voluntarily withdraw from the games, was also considered.[40] If the IOC persisted in its position that SANOC, having satisfactorily complied with Olympic rules, should be allowed to attend the games, the Executive board projected that the result would be nothing short of chaos. The Mexico City Organizing Committee, under domestic pressure to bar South Africa from the Olympics, might refuse to extend an invitation to SANOC. More seriously, the Mexican government might withhold visas for the South African team. In either case, the IOC would be forced to withdraw and ultimately cancel the games.[41] Additionally, the threat of a mass boycott was accompanied by a concern that IFs might also revoke their

---

[37] Witherspoon, *Before the Eyes of the World,* 66.
[38] Minutes of the Meeting of the IOC Executive Board, April 20-21, 1968, p. 2-3.
[39] Ibid.
[40] Ibid., p. 5.
[41] Ibid.

support, choosing instead to stage a separate multi-sport event independently of the IOC.[42] Finally, there existed real trepidation that SANOC's presence in Mexico City could prompt an act (or acts) of violence.[43]

At the same time, the view that admitting South Africa was the right choice endured. Brundage, again invoking the 1952 decision to admit the USSR to the Olympic movement, suggested that immediate reactions should not deter the IOC from making the right long-term decision, which was (in this case and most cases) to be as inclusive as possible. He also raised the concern first mentioned by SANOC President Frank Braun several months prior that South African exclusion might ultimately become a permanent reality.[44] Rather astutely, Brundage pointed out that within South Africa, nothing had changed since the Grenoble decision. A reversal now would be tantamount to allowing politics to govern Olympic sport; the time for a substantive decision on the matter had come and gone. The debate to that point had thus revealed the impossible position in which the Executive Board found itself. It was responsible for maintaining solidarity within the Olympic movement and preserving the integrity of the Mexico City games, objectives which would be rendered very difficult if not impossible to achieve if South Africa was allowed to compete. At the same time, it strongly objected to the appearance of submitting to external political forces or excluding any nation from the games, which would be the case if the Grenoble decision was reversed.[45]

---

[42] Ibid. At this point in time, the idea that IFs might break away from the Olympic movement was still a legitimate concern for the IOC. The possibility that South African attendance in Mexico City would provide cause for such a move was thus something the IOC wanted to avoid.

[43] Ibid., p. 3. Witherspoon identifies the assassination of Martin Luther King, Jr., in early April as perhaps being at the forefront of the Executive Board members' minds on this point. The concern about potential violence did not however appear to extend beyond the South Africa issue. The IOC largely ignored the state crackdown on student protests in Mexico City that left several thousand imprisoned or killed. See *Before the Eyes of the World,* 68, 104-122.

[44] Ibid., p. 5-6.

[45] Ibid., p. 7.

Up to that point, the only concrete proposal on the table was one submitted by General Clark, which relied upon a fuzzy legal interpretation of IOC procedure to disqualify the Grenoble decision and uphold the organization's original 1963 decision to bar South Africa from the games.[46] This was summarily dismissed by Brundage as unbecoming of the Olympic movement; such a grave decision could not be resolved on technicalities alone.[47] It had become clear during the course of the meeting that, in the interests of safety as well as the preservation of the Olympic movement, the consensus favored withdrawing South Africa's invitation to Mexico City. With the games only six months away, it was also clear that bringing the issue to the General Session in accordance with IOC rules (or relatedly, asking SANOC to voluntarily withdraw) was infeasible. The Board, forced to choose between two undesirable options, sent a telegram to all IOC members urging them to support a proposal to revoke South Africa's invitation to the 1968 Olympics, a proposal that was ultimately approved.[48]

The backlash from SANOC and the South African government was predictably vitriolic.[49] In addressing the decision at the General Session's meeting in Mexico City before the Olympics began, the IOC clarified that SANOC had never been suspended from the IOC, only refused invitation to specific Olympic events.[50] The IOC appears to be engaging in a bit of revisionist history on this point. The documentary record and the tenor of South Africa's appeals leading up to the 1968 games suggest that the question of SANOC's status ran much deeper than its participation in Mexico City. Nevertheless, the IOC committed itself to reaching a more permanent decision in the near future.[51] True to

---

[46] Ibid., Annex 2.
[47] Ibid., p. 6.
[48] Ibid., p. 9.
[49] Witherspoon, *Before the Eyes of the World,* 70.
[50] Minutes of the 67th Session of the IOC, October 7-11, 1968, Mexico City, p. 9.
[51] Ibid.

its word, the IOC voted in favor of South African expulsion from the IOC in 1970.[52] This decision corresponded to a broader worldwide sporting boycott of South Africa which was gaining momentum around the same time.[53] Upon the commencement of the negotiations to end apartheid in 1990, South Africa was readmitted to the Olympic movement, participating in the 1992 Olympics in Barcelona after a thirty-two year absence.

IOC STRATEGY AND THE ROLE OF POLITICS

The IOC's reversal of its decision to reinstate South Africa in 1968 presents an interesting theoretical test of the Olympic regime, primarily because the "intrusion of politics" so feared and loathed by Olympic administrators emanated not from states but from within the Olympic movement. The idea that governments can free ride on the efforts of the Olympic regime is an important component of the theory advanced in this study, but equally important are the ways in which the regime's reliance on vaguely-defined principles as governing mechanisms puts the IOC in situations where its decisions are easily influenced and manipulated by other actors. The IOC's inability to enforce its decision to reinstate South Africa was driven primarily by its insistence upon linking the decision to and justifying it in terms of Olympic ideology.

Fundamentally, the doctrine of apolitical sport so closely subscribed to and emphasized by the IOC leadership in this case is, as the theory suggests, a concept open to interpretation. By extension, it lends itself to myriad contradictions based on how it is applied in different settings. As the IOC worked to bring South Africa back into the Olympic movement following its absence from the Tokyo Olympics in 1964, the organization struggled mightily to interpret and apply this doctrine. The first issue

---

[52] Minutes of the 69th Session of the IOC, May 12-16, 1970, Amsterdam, p. 28.
[53] Booth, *The Race Game,* 85-122.

91

confronted by the IOC was establishing the bounds of its authority, especially when faced with governmental interference in or influence over an NOC. On one hand, NOCs are supposed to maintain their autonomy and work to prevent political interference in their operations. By extension, they as well as the IOC do not involve themselves in matters of domestic or international politics. On the other hand, domestic political power dynamics usually give governments the upper hand, meaning political interference in Olympic matters is often beyond NOCs' control. In the South Africa case, the IOC seemed to more closely adhere to the first position in 1964, refusing to invite South Africa after its Olympic committee failed to publicly endorse the IOC's position regarding discrimination in sport. However, between 1965 and 1968, this position evolved, driven primarily by an interpretation of the *nature* of Olympic sport as more fundamental and thus more important than any specific Olympic rule. That is, the appearance of political autonomy trumps the application of any single Olympic rule, as it is this autonomy which legitimizes the rule in the first place. It was thus more important to isolate South African Olympic sport as a separate sphere of governance, wholly distinct from yet continuing to exist within the context of apartheid politics, and limited to the selection and participation of athletes for Olympic events. The IOC was obliged to ensure rule application within this sphere alone.

While the logical steps taken to arrive at such a conclusion are seemingly valid, the entirety of the reasoning process is undermined by the fact that it relies upon individual and contextualized interpretation of abstract beliefs, not absolute truths. A different IOC, comprised of different members and existing in a different time and political context, might very well have interpreted the fundamental tenets of the Olympic movement as clearly in support of expelling South Africa at the very beginning of apartheid's institution in the country, not reluctantly twenty years later. However, the

pliability of Olympism is not limited to thought experiments. The global negative reaction to the Grenoble decision indicates the fragility of the IOC's reliance on its principles to guide its actions and the weakness of Olympic governance to make effective policy decisions.

Armed with the belief that it had settled its jurisdictional problem surrounding the issue of South Africa's participation, the IOC seemed confident that it had decided correctly to reinstate SANOC early in 1968. Indeed, the reforms enacted in South Africa to achieve compliance with Olympic rules were championed by the IOC as evidence of the organization's effectiveness and the power of sport to promote cultural harmony. Though it anticipated some backlash, this was mostly dismissed as the ignorance of new, mostly African NOCs that had not yet come to terms with the Olympic movement's high-minded ideals. However, the rapidity of the boycott movement's growth was only slightly less shocking to the IOC than the reasons used to support it. Beginning from the same principles the IOC used to justify its decision, the boycott movement was based upon the idea that Olympic principles dictated that the IOC should not endorse or at least passively appear to support racist domestic policies. For an organization whose very existence and legitimacy relies upon the symbolism inherent in international sport, the IOC severely misjudged the emblematic significance of its decision to permit South Africa to attend the 1968 Olympics, as well as the ability of other actors to draw different conclusions about the IOC's obligations as an international humanitarian organization.

While the accessibility of Olympic principles to justify the entire spectrum of opinions regarding South Africa's participation in 1968 is interesting, what is more important from a theoretical perspective is the IOC's corresponding inability to assert itself as the authority in this area. Ostensibly, as the unquestioned leader of the Olympic movement, the organization should have the final word when it comes to interpreting

Olympic doctrine. However, instead of making such an assertion, the IOC was forced to accede to international political opinion and reverse its decision. In this instance, the IOC's dogmatic adherence to the idea of apolitical sport prevented it from taking a stronger stand in defense of its position. As Brundage noted at the emergency Executive Board meeting in April 1968, conditions in South Africa had not changed; the same set of circumstances and assurances which the IOC had deemed acceptable in February remained in place. However, each of the two options available to the IOC at that point— confirm or reverse the Grenoble decision--had been linked publicly to political concerns, rendering both unpalatable. If the IOC reiterated its support of SANOC's participation, it would appear (to its mind, unfairly) to endorse South African apartheid. If it reversed its decision, it would acknowledge, however fleetingly, the political nature of sport and perhaps more significantly, its inability to transcend political problems. With an opportunity to assert itself as the true authority in Olympic sport and defend its interpretation of Olympic rules, the IOC rather meekly (but defensibly) appealed to the safety of athletes and spectators as the reason for its ultimate reversal on the South African issue.

While the case of South African participation at the 1968 Olympic games does not include an explicit instance of state intervention in Olympic governance, it does demonstrate quite clearly the inherent contradictions that undermine the effectiveness of Olympic governance. First, the IOC fundamentally misjudged that its interpretation of Olympic principles might be questioned or challenged. Second, the ease with which opponents of the Grenoble decision used Olympic principles to justify a boycott and create divisiveness within the Olympic movement took the IOC by surprise. Finally, the IOC's commitment to maintaining its apolitical status prevented it from formulating a stronger response to the global backlash following the reinstatement of South Africa.

Though Brundage would have preferred to stand his ground and allow the South Africans to participate, both the symbolic and tangible outcomes of doing so would have created substantial and perhaps insurmountable challenges for the Olympic movement. IOC administrators feared that yielding to public pressure in 1968 would doom it to a future of continuous intervention in the domestic affairs of state sport, if indeed such a highly politicized Olympic movement could exist at all. Somewhat ironically, what would have amounted to the IOC's political endorsement of South African apartheid by allowing the South African team to participate in Mexico City likely would have done far greater damage to the movement than the perceived politicization caused by the boycott threat or the IOC's ultimate concession to political pressure.

The primary source of legitimacy for Olympic governance is its declaration of transcendent political status. Its commitment to a noble ideology, one that sees sport as a useful and sufficient tool for achieving humanitarian objectives, makes its claims to be a self-described peace movement appealing and often unquestioned. However, as the circumstances surrounding the attempt to reinstate South Africa to the Olympic movement in the years leading up to the 1968 Olympics in Mexico City demonstrate, it is an ideology that is ill-suited to support good governance.

Chapter 5: The U.S.-Led Boycott of the 1980 Moscow Olympics

The Soviet Union's invasion of Afghanistan on December 24, 1979 is generally credited as the impetus for what eventually became a widespread boycott of the 1980 Summer Olympics. The military intervention was considered by USSR officials to be a relatively minor response to growing political instability within Afghanistan.[1] Nevertheless, U.S. president Jimmy Carter and others in his administration perceived the Soviets' move as an overt act of aggression, especially surprising and upsetting after ten years of détente.[2] The decision to boycott was thus very much a function of Cold War politics; this point has been explored at length by scholars.[3] Indeed, one of the important and oft-examined issues surrounding the study of the boycott is the extent to which it helped the U.S. to achieve its political objectives *vis-à-vis* the initial Afghanistan occupation. However, for the purposes of this study, the key questions asked of this case are somewhat different.

The decision by the Carter administration to even attempt a government-led boycott of the Olympics represents the aggressive type of free riding introduced in Chapter 1, in which states attempt to use the Olympic platform for (in the eyes of Olympic governing bodies) inappropriate political purposes. The test of the theory with regard to state action, then, is not whether such action is successful or effective in

---

[1] Nicholas Evan Sarantakes, *Dropping the Torch: Jimmy Carter, the Olympic Boycott, and the Cold War* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2011), 62-63. In quoting Soviet political adviser Georgy Arbatov, Sarantakes notes that in hindsight, the USSR failed to consider the international implications of its foray into Afghanistan.

[2] Ibid., 75-80.

[3] Ibid. Also see Derick L. Hulme, Jr., *The Political Olympics: Moscow, Afghanistan, and the 1980 U.S. Boycott* (New York: Praeger, 1990) and Baruch A. Hazan, *Olympic Sport and Propaganda Games: Moscow 1980* (New Brunswick: Transaction, Inc., 1982). A contemporary scholarly perspective is David B. Kanin, "The Olympic Boycott in Diplomatic Context," *Journal of Sport and Social Issues* 4, no. 1 (1980): 1-24. Kanin was working as a CIA analyst at the time of this article's publication.

political terms, but simply whether the state engaging in such behavior recognizes and acts successfully on the opportunity to free ride. The corresponding test, regarding Olympic governance, concerns the ability of the Olympic regime to deter, punish, or in some other way remedy the effects of this behavior. Because of the particular theorized dynamics of the regime, it will be unable to enact effective enforcement measures, stymied mostly by its own guiding principles and the interpretation thereof. These two tests can be placed in the context of the events surrounding the Moscow games. First, did the U.S. government recognize not only the opportunity to co-opt the Olympics for political purposes, but that it could do so with relative impunity? Second, given the U.S. decision to attempt a boycott, how did the IOC formulate its agenda in managing the situation, and was it able to achieve any of its objectives with regard to preventing or minimizing the impact of the boycott? The U.S.-led boycott in 1980 presents an ostensibly "easy" test of the theory. However, the details of the case (while mostly supportive of this study's theoretical arguments) are not by any means straightforward in terms of establishing direct causality. What follows is an exploration of the above questions and an analysis of the degree to which the Olympic regime theory can account for both U.S. and IOC behavior in the months leading up to the 1980 Summer Olympics.

U.S. POLICY FORMULATION: JANUARY 1980

The Carter administration was cognizant, even well before the Afghanistan invasion, of the potential for political turmoil at the Moscow Olympics, as well as the ways the Games might be leveraged to exert pressure on the Soviet government to pursue reforms.[4] When news of the invasion reached Washington, initial intelligence reports

---

[4] Memorandum From Jessica Tuchman Mathews of the National Security Council Staff to the President's Assistant for National Security Affairs (Brzezinski), September 20, 1978, *Foreign Relations of the United States, 1977-1980* (Washington, DC: United States Government Printing Office, 2013), II: 531-533 (hereafter *FRUS*, with appropriate year, volume, and page numbers).

suggested that while a boycott of the Olympics would not hurt the USSR economically (an approach the administration preferred), it would be symbolically powerful.[5] Though a boycott would have "almost no effect" on the state's pocketbook, a successful boycott was described as a potential "political setback", something that would "humiliate the leadership" and "deprive the USSR of the prestige and propaganda opportunities it clearly hopes to extract from a well run, noncontroversial Olympics."[6] While the opportunity to embarrass the Soviets was appealing, the immediate counsel in the wake of the invasion was to proceed with caution in pursuing an Olympic boycott, assessing what other Western nations would do before committing to a single course of action.[7] In fact, Carter, while recognizing the potential power of an Olympic boycott, also saw it as feasible only as part of a larger international cooperative effort.[8] While the initial public relations effort may have been cautious, advisers in the Carter administration were more than eager to pursue the use of the boycott as a political tool. Vice President Walter Mondale, in a memo dated January 3, made known his desire to "really go after the Olympics—I don't see why that is sacrosanct."[9] This sat in stark contrast to the attitude of United States Olympic Committee (USOC) leaders, who wrote to President Carter voicing unequivocal opposition to any sort of boycott.[10]

The debate over the boycott was essentially comprised of three interconnected questions. The first, which was resolved almost from the outset, was whether a boycott

---

[5] Overview of an Intelligence Assessment Prepared in the Central Intelligence Agency, January, 1980, *FRUS: 1977-1980,* VI: 723-725.

[6] Ibid.

[7] Memorandum From the President's Assistant for National Security Affairs (Brzezinski) to Vice President Mondale, Secretary of State Vance, and Secretary of Defense Brown, January 2, 1980, *FRUS: 1977-1980,* VI: 727-729. On initial European support of a boycott, Sarantakes, *Dropping the Torch,* 80.

[8] Sarantakes, *Dropping the Torch,* 81.

[9] Memorandum From Vice President Mondale to President Carter, January 3, 1980, *FRUS: 1977-1980,* VI: 730-731.

[10] Sarantakes, *Dropping the Torch,* 79.

would have any material economic impact on the USSR. The consensus on this issue was that a boycott would have little to no effect, especially relative to other proposed sanctions. The second was related to the symbolic power of the boycott, and to what degree Soviet leaders would be "hurt" by the visible absence of a major nation like the United States. On this, both public and governmental sentiment seemed to lean toward an affirmative response, though the punitive effect was considered, at least initially, to be a function of international harmony on the issue; the more countries that agreed to boycott, the more pain would be inflicted upon the Soviets.[11] The third issue, somewhat the inverse of the second, was based on concern that choosing not to boycott was tantamount to an endorsement of the Soviet invasion and perhaps a sign of American weakness internationally. Counterbalancing these latter two issues was concern for the athletes. A boycott, while perhaps effective at punishing the USSR, would also deprive athletes of their opportunity to compete in an event that was for many the culmination of many years spent dedicated to sport. At the same time, this opportunity had to be weighed against the larger meanings it potentially represented: would competing be worth it if doing so was interpreted as support for the Soviet regime?

As the administration debated these options, public support for the boycott grew.[12] Riding this momentum, Carter on January 20 laid out his policy platform with regard to an Olympic boycott.[13] At the core of his proposal were a series of progressively more serious measures aimed at pressuring both the USSR and the Olympic governance system to comply with U.S. wishes. Carter first set a deadline of February 20, 1980, for

---

[11] Ibid., 85.

[12] Ibid., 86-89.

[13] Jimmy Carter, "1980 Summer Olympics Letter to the President of the U.S. Olympic Committee on the Games To Be Held in Moscow," January 20, 1980. Online by Gerhard Peters and John T. Woolley, The American Presidency Project. http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/?pid=33059.

Soviet withdrawal from Afghanistan. If this did not occur, Carter urged the USOC to propose either moving or cancelling the Summer Olympics. Should that prove unfeasible, the USOC should attempt to organize a large-scale boycott and perhaps organize an alternative international sport festival for those nations that joined the U.S. in staying away from Moscow.[14] Carter also suggested selecting permanent sites for both the Summer and Winter games. This would, in his view, eliminate the politicization of the Olympics tied to the bidding and hosting process. These proposals were sent to all American embassies in an attempt to begin securing the necessary international support for the potential boycott.[15]

Though Carter has been criticized for his lack of nuanced thinking in calling for the boycott, his manipulation of Olympic rhetoric to support the measure is impressive. In his letter to USOC President Robert Kane, Carter walks a fine line between applauding Olympic values, using them to justify the boycott, and exposing their empty hypocrisy. For instance, Carter acknowledges that the Olympics should be apolitical and that a boycott would certainly contradict that stance, but defends his position by pointing out the control exerted by the USSR over Soviet sport, suggesting that if the Olympics were truly apolitical such behavior would not be tolerated. Carter also invokes the amateur ideal in trying to assuage concerns about the effects of the boycott upon athletes, claiming that they would know better than most "the meaning of sacrifice to achieve worthy goals."[16] Finally, he uses the utilitarian view of the Olympics as a peace movement to claim that failing to support his plan counteracts efforts to "help secure the

---

[14] Ibid.

[15] Telegram From the Department of State to All Diplomatic Posts, the Embassy in Pakistan, and the Embassy in Libya, January 20, 1980, *FRUS 1977-1980,* VI: 743-746.

[16] Carter, "1980 Summer Olympics Letter".

peace of the world at this critical time."[17] Although he may have not entirely understood the consequences of his actions or how events would ultimately play out, these initial comments and proposals suggest a President who understood very clearly both the symbolic political power of the Olympics and the malleability of the Olympic value system. Further, though framed as a request, the detail with which he lays out his plans to the USOC suggest a dictation of orders more than a respectful suggestion. In his State of the Union address on January 23, Carter intimated as much, saying "I have notified the Olympic Committee that with Soviet invading forces in Afghanistan, neither the American people nor I will support sending an Olympic team to Moscow."[18] That this policy was distributed through all of the U.S.'s diplomatic channels indicates a belief that other governments would be able to accomplish within their borders what Carter hoped to at home.

OLYMPIC ALTERNATIVES AND THE IOC RESPONSE: FEBRUARY—MARCH 1980

Given only a month's notice, a Soviet withdrawal by the February 20 deadline seemed unlikely. Thus, the Carter administration began to explore the possibility of moving the games to an alternate site. At the same time, the first stirrings of unrest were becoming evident among both American Olympians and the IOC. Shortly after Carter had laid out his plans for the U.S. team with regard to the Moscow games, White House counsel Lloyd Cutler attended a USOC meeting in the hopes of assuaging concerns about the administration's Olympic policy. While Cutler failed to gain the USOC's full endorsement, he did secure a promise from the USOC to call on the IOC to relocate the Olympics, something officials from both organizations knew was practically

---

[17] Ibid.

[18] Jimmy Carter, "The State of the Union Address Delivered Before a Joint Session of the Congress," January 23, 1980. Online by Gerhard Peters and John T. Woolley, The American Presidency Project. http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/?pid=33079.

impossible.[19] Though the Carter administration viewed this tenuous agreement from the USOC with cautious optimism, Secretary of State Cyrus Vance's speech to the IOC in advance of its regularly scheduled meeting prior to the start of the Winter Olympics in Lake Placid, New York did much more harm than good. Though government leaders were more or less correct in assuming that they could exert influence over the UOSC, the IOC was not about to be ordered around. Vance's threat to boycott should the IOC persist in holding the Games in Moscow was received with barely concealed contempt.[20]

Indeed, at the IOC's General Session meeting on the eve of the 1980 Winter games, the idea of moving the Summer Olympics to a different site was a non-starter.[21] Though Kane argued persuasively, using the IOC's rules as justification for finding a different site, most of the questions posed to him by the session seemed targeted at uncovering contradictions in his argument or suggesting inappropriate involvement by the U.S. government. The discussion which followed focused on NOC autonomy and how best to maintain public credibility. Many members favored doubling down on the idea of sport's apolitical status. By continuing to assert the moral high ground and essentially taking no action, the IOC could avoid putting itself in, as Sir Reginald Alexander of Kenya put it, "an embarrassing situation." Balancing this view was Canada's Richard Pound, who voiced concerns that the IOC may be putting NOCs in very difficult and potentially dangerous situations by asking them to defy their national governments.[22] Despite some rather blunt comments to the effect that political involvement had always been a part of the Olympics (particularly with regard to the

---

[19] Sarantakes, *Dropping the Torch,* 108-109.
[20] Ibid., 123-124.
[21] Minutes of the 82nd Session of the International Olympic Committee, February 10-13, 1980, Lake Placid, p. 6-7.
[22] Ibid., p. 15.

NOCs in developing countries), IOC President Michael Morris—known more popularly by his noble title Lord Killanin—concluded that all views presented by the session "were basically the same."

The statement issued on behalf of Lord Killanin to the press on February 12 confirmed the IOC's commitment to Moscow, defining the IOC's "prime responsibility" as ensuring "that the Olympic Games are held every four years in accordance with the principles, and within the rules, of the I.O.C.". Interestingly, the final paragraph of the statement acknowledged that "[t]he International Olympic Committee cannot solve the political problems of the world." [23] Although in context this comment is clearly meant to establish a bright line between the IOC and the political uproar in which it found itself embroiled, it at least partially reveals the extent to which simply ensuring that the event took place was a significant motivating factor for the organization. By extension, this also shows how little authority the IOC actually wielded when confronted by more powerful political players. When asked specifically what the IOC could do to assist the USOC in navigating the crisis, Kane responded that only U.S. and Soviet leaders could resolve the dispute, effectively ending the discussion before it began. Though Englishman David Cecil (identified as "Lord Exeter" or "The Marquess of Exeter" in the meeting minutes) voiced his dismay over the aggression shown by the USSR, "sport was not the weapon which should counteract it. Sport made people respect each other and created warmth and friendship between young people."[24] Further, he noted that ownership of the Olympics rested with the IOC, not the host country, in the same breath remarking how disappointing it would be if the Games were used to divide the world rather than bring it together. The apparent contradiction between asserting ownership of the Olympics and

---

[23] Ibid., Annex 10
[24] Ibid., p. 14.

acknowledging that they might be used by other actors to the detriment of the movement seemingly went unnoticed.

At this juncture, both the U.S. and the IOC were approaching critical decision points, though the latter's strategy of attempting to remain above the fray was essentially locked in at the Lake Placid meeting. In addition to refusing to move the Olympics, Lord Killanin also made it known that he would not pursue any punitive actions against the USOC should it, through its potential absence from Moscow, be found in violation of the Olympic Charter.[25] On February 20, the deadline for the peaceful withdrawal of Soviet troops from Afghanistan, Lloyd Cutler appeared on television to confirm the administration's position that the U.S. would not send a team to Moscow.[26] Even given the USOC's ambivalence and the outright refusal of the IOC to entertain any disruption of the status quo, the U.S. still viewed a boycott as a legitimate (and effective) policy option. This persistence might reasonably be construed as a fundamental misunderstanding of how Olympic governance worked; by failing to recognize IOC and NOC autonomy, the U.S. perhaps misread the ability of a boycott to achieve its political objectives. However, the important question here is not whether the U.S. correctly calculated the outcomes of its foreign policy maneuvers, but whether it accurately assessed its power and authority in relation to Olympic governance. The U.S. commitment to the boycott, and the corresponding lack of anything other than strong rhetoric as a response from Olympic officials, confirmed the belief of the Carter administration that it could use the Olympics to exert political pressure on the USSR.[27]

---

[25] Sarantakes, *Dropping the Torch,* 126.
[26] Ibid., 131-132.
[27] Cutler's televised comments reasserting the administration's position came on the heels of several public relations blunders and an ill-fated attempt to challenge the legal status of both Olympic organizations and international sport federations. See Ibid., 127-130.

Thus, the U.S. continued to act more or less unilaterally in its use of the Olympics as a political lever, despite being presented with information that an alternate Olympic-type festival would be almost impossible to stage in such a short time frame.[28] With its self-imposed deadline for Soviet withdrawal now past, the administration had to begin to consider the logistics of both a potential boycott as well as whether any manner of substitute games could be accomplished. These objectives were seen as interdependent. A boycott would be more likely to gain international support if there were a suitable alternative to the Olympics, and such an alternative would be increasingly feasible as more countries committed to supporting U.S. policy.[29] To this end, a special committee of White House officials led by Cutler which also included Peter Ueberroth, the director of the Los Angeles 1984 Olympics Organizing Committee (LAOOC), decided to approach leaders of western European nations about joining the U.S. effort, as the support of these nations (along with China, Mexico, Japan, Kenya, and New Zealand) was seen as crucial to its success.[30] This committee also investigated the possibility of using NBC's television contract with the IOC as a source of leverage. NBC had suggested that it would not televise the Moscow Games if a U.S. team was not present; if this was going to be the case, the company wanted to withhold its next scheduled rights payment on April 1.[31] Upon reviewing the notes of the meeting, however, President Carter indicated that this was not a priority for the boycott movement.[32] In a few weeks, however, he would reassess this position.

---

[28] Ibid., 137-139.

[29] Summary of Conclusions of a Special Coordination Committee Meeting, February 26, 1980, *FRUS 1977-1980,* VI: 753-755.

[30] Ibid.

[31] Summary of Conclusions of a Special Coordination Committee Meeting, February 28, 1980, *FRUS 1977-1980,* VI:756-761.

[32] Ibid.

As winter slowly turned to spring in Washington, three realities were crystallizing. The first was that, according to U.S. intelligence, governmental support for the boycott was relatively widespread. Ninety-five states had either publicly or privately expressed support for the boycott, though this support ranged from public statements of support to "leaning or evolving toward non-participation". Additionally, a handful of these states were not necessarily aligned with U.S. policy, but simply could not attend due to lack of resources.[33] The second was that even with governmental support, national Olympic committees were in many instances existing in an uneasy stasis, torn between asserting their autonomy in accordance with Olympic principles and complying with their home government's wishes. The USOC was among this group of undecided NOCs.[34] Finally, champions of the boycott were beginning to concede that an alternative to the Olympics—the carrot being used to drum up support for the boycott, especially among the NOCs—would be far more difficult to stage than anyone had anticipated. The Carter administration, finally realizing that a single-site event was too tall of a task settled instead on a multi-site option as the next-best solution. However, what were quickly being termed (pejoratively) "the White House Games" still faced several obstacles, not the least of which was the fact that the international sport federations would not support such an event, fearful as they were of running afoul of the IOC.[35] On top of this, some nations began to express displeasure with the lack of progress and leadership in developing an Olympic alternative, suggesting that if a single-site event could not be held, their support for the boycott would have to be reevaluated.[36] The USOC managed to

---

[33] Telegram From the Department of State to All Diplomatic and Consular Posts, March 1, 1980, *FRUS 1977-1980,* VI: 763-765.
[34] Ibid.
[35] Sarantakes, *Dropping the Torch,* 141-142.
[36] Ibid., 144.

avoid involvement in this particular facet of the boycott fracas, and for good reason. Peter Ueberroth's involvement as a consultant for the White House's proposed event raised the eyebrows of IOC President Killanin, who moved swiftly to ensure that the U.S. Olympic apparatus—especially the USOC and the LAOOC—were not contributing to Carter's efforts. If they had been, it would have been difficult for the IOC to turn a blind eye to such a blatant violation of IOC rules, which would have in turn put Los Angeles' status as host of the 1984 Olympics in jeopardy.[37]

Aside from ensuring the United States' Olympic organizations did not do anything untoward, the IOC was largely content to stick to the position it had adopted at Lake Placid in February: confirm its support for a Moscow Olympic festival and shield NOCs, when possible, from governmental pressures. The Olympic movement scored a major coup in late March when it became clear that public sentiment in the United Kingdom favored attending the Games, in defiance of Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher's wishes. Not wanting to waste this momentum, the British Olympic Association (BOA) readily accepted the Soviet invitation to attend the Games in Moscow.[38] This dealt a crucial blow to the boycott effort, which saw the UK's support as essential to its success.

THE FINAL PUSH TOWARD A BOYCOTT: MARCH—MAY 1980

Around the same time as the BOA decision, the Carter administration was preparing for a final confrontation with the USOC. The push for an alternate international sport competition had all but evaporated once it had become clear that neither time nor resources nor widespread support were readily available. Still, the administration had

---

[37] Ibid., 145. USOC President Robert Kane had already asserted that the USOC would have no part in an Olympic alternative when he addressed the IOC General Session in February.
[38] Ibid., 175-176.

staked out a strong position on the issue and simply admitting defeat was not an option. On March 21, President Carter addressed U.S. athletes in the East Room of the White House. He was clear and firm in his remarks, especially with regard to the question of whether the U.S. would boycott:

> I can't say at this moment what other nations will not go to the Summer Olympics in Moscow. Ours will not go. I say that not with any equivocation; the decision has been made. The American people are convinced that we should not go to the Summer Olympics. The Congress has voted overwhelmingly, almost unanimously, which is a very rare thing, that we will not go. And I can tell you that many of our major allies, particularly those democratic countries who believe in freedom, will not go.[39]

Carter went on to justify the decision as a defense of Olympic principles and values, and once again suggest both a permanent site for the Olympics as well as the possibility of an alternative competition in 1980, though progress on both initiatives had severely stalled.[40] In responding to questions from athletes, he made it clear that the government possessed the authority to revoke athletes' passports and would do so if necessary.[41]

One week after expressing unwavering commitment to the boycott, Carter suspended all U.S. exports to the Soviet Union related to the Olympics.[42] The primary target of this action was the NBC broadcasting contract, something Carter had dismissed as irrelevant only a few weeks prior. While the effect on the Moscow organizing committee, to which the bulk of the $87 million contract was owed, was minimal, the

---

[39] Jimmy Carter, "Remarks to Representatives of U.S. Teams to the 1980 Summer Olympics," March 21, 1980. Online by Gerhard Peters and John T. Woolley, The American Presidency Project. http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/?pid=33171.

[40] Ibid.

[41] Sarantakes, *Dropping the Torch,* 174.

[42] Jimmy Carter, "1980 Summer Olympics in Moscow Memorandum on Prohibition of U.S. Transactions With Respect to the Olympic Games," March 28, 1980. Online by Gerhard Peters and John T. Woolley, The American Presidency Project. http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/?pid=33193.

gesture was powerful.[43] Combined with Carter's unambiguous remarks at the White House, the message to the USOC was clear: while the decision to boycott was nominally left to the Olympic body, the administration had already made up its mind.

The deadline for accepting the Soviet invitation to attend the Games was May 24. In early April, the USOC leadership began to float proposals in the press that, while stopping short of a boycott, would express American dissatisfaction with the Soviet occupation of Afghanistan, such as boycotting the opening and closing ceremonies, participating as independent (rather than American) athletes, or refusing to stay in the Olympic Village.[44] These measures, in the eyes of the Carter administration, were inadequate. In a somewhat desperate attempt to motivate the USOC to see things their way, administration officials began reaching out to USOC corporate sponsors, urging them to make further donations contingent upon full USOC support of the boycott.[45] Both Carter and U.S. Attorney General Benjamin Civiletti reiterated publicly that the government would use all legal remedies at its disposal to prevent U.S. athletes from traveling to Moscow.[46] It was becoming clear to USOC administrators that a vote to go to Russia would essentially seal their fate as an organization; if Carter did not get his way, it would likely mean a revocation of the USOC's charter.[47] To its credit, the USOC recognized that, though on the verge of acquiescing to the administration's wishes, it still held one bargaining chip. While Carter had taken a strong stance, it was clear that he

---

[43] Richard Sandomir, "Remembering Games That Were Barely There," *The New York Times,* July 21, 2005. Carter's move to block Olympic-related exports triggered NBC's insurance policy on the broadcast rights contract, enabling it to fulfill its financial obligation while still complying with the directive. As noted above, however, the point was moot once the boycott was approved by the USOC; NBC had already stated that it would not cover the Games if the U.S. was not competing.

[44] Sarantakes, *Dropping the Torch,* 181.

[45] Ibid., 184.

[46] Ibid., 186.

[47] Ibid., 187.

preferred the USOC to at least *appear* to support him willingly, rather than prevent Olympic attendance through more forcible means. The USOC was thus able to secure promises from the administration for several million dollars in governmental support in exchange for a show of solidarity on the boycott issue.[48]

On April 5, Carter sent a letter to Robert Kane and other members of the USOC's House of Delegates, once again asking them to support the boycott. Given the recent actions taken by the administration, it was clear that this letter was largely perfunctory. Though invoking the specter of national security and the message a vote against the boycott would send about the U.S.'s level of resolve, the subtext of the President's letter was far simpler: a vote against the boycott would be a vote against the will of the government and that of the American people.[49] One week later, the USOC membership voted by a 1,604-797 margin to boycott the 1980 Olympics in Moscow.[50] The administration, as promised, immediately and publicly supported the decision, indicating that it would not only help the USOC financially but also take steps to recognize the athletes whose opportunity to compete had just been revoked.[51]

With the boycott now official, all that remained to be seen was, first, which nations would follow the Americans' lead and second, how the boycott would impact the Games. By this time, the boycott was nothing more than a symbolic measure; the administration's initial belief that it might force the Soviets to leave Afghanistan had eroded rather rapidly since February. Ultimately, sixty-four other nations joined the U.S.

---

[48] Ibid., 188.

[49] Jimmy Carter, "1980 Summer Olympics in Moscow Mailgram to the President of the United States Olympic Committee on U.S. Participation in the Games," April 5, 1980. Online by Gerhard Peters and John T. Woolley, The American Presidency Project. http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/?pid=33238.

[50] Sarantakes, *Dropping the Torch,* 193.

[51] Jimmy Carter, "1980 Summer Olympics in Moscow Statement by the White House Press Secretary on a Vote by the U.S. Olympic Committee House of Delegates," April 12, 1980. Online by Gerhard Peters and John T. Woolley, The American Presidency Project. http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/?pid=33268.

in avoiding the Moscow Olympics, though as noted above, at least a handful of these did so for pragmatic rather than ideological reasons. The question of whether the boycott was "successful" is more difficult to answer. If the U.S.'s sole objective was to demonstrate its strong opposition to the USSR's incursion into the Middle East, the message was unequivocally clear. However, in terms of embarrassing the Soviets by assembling a coalition of powerful states committed to the boycott (as Carter had originally hoped), the effort was far less effective. Of the sixty-five states not in attendance in Moscow, only a handful (most notably Canada, China, Japan, Norway, West Germany) could be considered significant enough to either international politics or international sport to render their absence meaningful. If, as it seemed to be at the outset, the primary objective was to coerce the Soviets out of Afghanistan and also take from them the Olympic Games, then the boycott was an utter failure.

As a sort of epilogue to the turmoil generated by the United States' actions, President Carter met with Lord Killanin in May. This was part of an effort by Killanin to meet with the leaders of both the United States and the Soviet Union in an attempt to, however belatedly, resolve the issue to the satisfaction of the IOC and perhaps salvage the games. Soviet General Secretary Leonid Brezhnev was mostly optimistic about the upcoming event and seemed to care little whether the U.S. was in attendance. Killanin's meeting with Carter was congenial but tense. While Carter expressed his support for the Olympic movement, he was unwilling to take the one step that would, for Killanin, demonstrate this support more than any other: allowing the U.S. to compete in Moscow.[52]

---

[52] Jimmy Carter, "Meeting With Lord Killanin, President of the International Olympic Committee White House Statement," May 16, 1980. Online by Gerhard Peters and John T. Woolley, The American Presidency Project. http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/?pid=33420. Also, Sarantakes, *Dropping the Torch,* 222-224.

These meetings were largely ineffective, but represented (at least in the IOC's view) a good faith effort to address and attempt to resolve the boycott conflict.

THE OLYMPICS AND UNILATERAL STATE ACTION

Regardless of how one defines American objectives in assessing its behavior relative to the 1980 Summer Olympics, it is clear that the Carter administration viewed the Olympics as a venue in which it could meaningfully act without incurring much corresponding cost or risk. Almost from the moment it learned of the Soviet invasion, the U.S. entertained an Olympic boycott as a viable policy option. As a test of the Olympic regime theory which characterizes states as free riders, this seems to be a fairly straightforward confirmation. Although not directly involved in the Olympics, the U.S. government was able to successfully insert itself as a powerful and controlling actor into matters of Olympic governance, ultimately succeeding in enacting a boycott as a form of political protest.

The strongest contrary evidence to the applicability of the theory is linked to the U.S.'s inability to enact the entire range of its policy objectives. Specifically, the failure to persuade the IOC to move the Olympics and the corresponding inability to rally support for an alternative event could be considered an indication that the exercise of state power *vis-à-vis* sport can be limited or restrained. However, this explanation assumes that, like the boycott, the U.S. had the wherewithal to act unilaterally, which was clearly not the case. Though the Carter administration was certainly willing to commit resources toward pursuing its Olympic boycott policy, it is difficult to conclude that the U.S. was willing and able to act alone in planning and hosting a non-Olympic sport festival. Indeed, the option is most appropriately understood as an incentive for other states to join in the boycott effort, contingent upon a collective commitment to the

principled action being advocated in Washington. Because a major concern was the effect of a boycott on athletes, the option of competing in a comparable event was at least partially a palliative measure, designed to assuage fears that supporting the boycott meant sacrificing the athletes' ability to participate. The inability of the U.S. to stage such an event, then, should not be considered as an isolated policy failure, but rather the result of circumstances that stretched beyond the Carter administration's control. While it is probably true that better planning and strategic thinking would have allowed the administration to garner more collective state support for its policies, this particular initiative's dependence on the decisions of other actors pushes it slightly beyond the scope of the Olympic regime theory. In other words, because the U.S. had no concrete intention to take on the task by itself, it should not bear sole responsibility for failing to enact this measure.

The inability of the U.S. to effectively persuade the IOC to relocate the Games still presents a difficult test of the theory. Unlike the alternative games, this was something the U.S. thought it could accomplish on its own. President Carter's initial policy statement appealed strongly to Olympic values, demonstrating how the Soviets had violated the fundamental ideals from which the Olympics and the IOC drew their legitimacy. This proved unconvincing, as the IOC did little more than politely dismiss Robert Kane when he formally introduced Carter's proposals to the General Session in Lake Placid. The question thus becomes whether this inability to influence the IOC might be considered evidence of a limit on the theorized abilities of states to act indiscriminately in Olympic sport. In order to provide a satisfactory answer, a distinction must be made between the ability to "act" and the ability to "persuade". The boycott itself might very well be considered an instance of governmental persuasion. The USOC, not the government, was the organization ultimately responsible for determining whether the

U.S. would be represented in Moscow. Ostensibly, the most the administration could do was influence the USOC's decision. The same might be said for the attempt on the part of the U.S. to get the Games out of Moscow. It had no jurisdiction or authority to enact such a decision, but it nonetheless appealed to the IOC using its own rhetoric, citing the peacefulness and morality of sport and juxtaposing the Soviet invasion (and by extension, the USSR's host status) as antithetical to these beliefs.

While these are both instances where the U.S. attempted to persuade Olympic policymakers, the important distinction to be made is that in the case of the USOC, the government was prepared to act (and indeed, in halting Olympic-related exports to the USSR and asking USOC sponsors to withhold funds, it did). Though the decision nominally was the USOC's to make, the Carter administration made it clear that failure to comply with its views on the boycott would be met with swift retribution. Whether it would have taken these aggressive steps in the event of a defiant USOC vote cannot be known for certain, but the administration's dogged commitment to the boycott, even in the face of so many setbacks and failed initiatives, suggest that it was not simply bluffing. The same power dynamic was not present in the circumstances involving the IOC and the possibility of relocating or canceling the Games. While U.S. leaders could talk about the desecration of Olympic values until they were blue in the face, it was evident that a public relations campaign represented the limit of their jurisdiction. The IOC knew this and was content to let the situation play itself out. More generally, however, the idea that a state's ability to act unilaterally in using the Olympics for political purposes is tied in some way to its legal (and perhaps legislative) authority over its NOC represents an important potential boundary condition for the theory advanced in this study.

The American-led boycott is popularly regarded as a failure of tactics and of leadership. Indeed, over three decades later, both government and Olympic officials

invoke the 1980 debacle as clear evidence that Olympic boycotts do not work.[53] Certainly, President Carter and his advisers lacked a deep understanding of international sport and the particulars of Olympic governance. Given this knowledge deficiency, the administration's early and strong commitment to the boycott was unwise; Carter's willingness to personally involve himself in the matter only made the problems with the policy that much more visible. Whether the U.S. accomplished its objectives and whether the price paid by the athletes offset any political gain is, for the purposes of this study, somewhat immaterial. At issue is whether the U.S. was able to, unimpeded, use the Olympics for political purposes. On this matter, the answer is unquestionably "yes". The Carter administration was able to successfully carry out its boycott despite the protestations of both the IOC and USOC. Indeed, when push came to shove, the government was able to overpower Olympic leaders (at least in the U.S.), first requesting, then demanding, and finally coercing them into supporting its policy. That it is left to Olympic scholars and the media to assess the legacy of these actions is an indication of the utter lack of any significant consequences for states when they choose to pursue such strategies.

THE IOC AS IMPOTENT POLITICAL ACTOR

While the U.S. was constantly redefining the objectives of its boycott venture, the IOC's goals remained relatively static. First, it wanted to support and preserve Moscow as the Olympic host city. To do otherwise would have simultaneously allowed the supposed corruptive influence of politics into the Olympics and laid bare the weakness of the IOC relative to other geopolitical actors. However, the IOC was largely able to rely on its status as a private organization to protect its ability to hold the Games wherever it

---

[53] Julian Pecquet and Jeremy Herb, "White House, Boehner, US Olympic Committee Fire Back Against Boycott," The Hill (Washington, D.C.), July 18, 2013.

chose. Second, the IOC did not want to see a rival international sport event created as a viable alternative to the Olympics. On this, the results are somewhat mixed. Shortly after the boycott proposal was made public, there existed strong support for such an alternative among many nations and NOCs. As the realities of limited time and limited resources became more tangible, however, the moral outrage fueling the push for a different sport festival waned. While it is certainly possible that, under different circumstances, a rival international sport event might have gained traction, the unwillingness of both IFs and NOCs to break away from the Olympic cartel speaks to the legitimating power of Olympic governance. Finally, the IOC desired full participation, and it was on this point that the fundamental struggle between Olympic governance and state use of the Olympics was most evident. While the IOC could make strong claims to the independence of its affiliated NOCs, it could not compel them to attend. Indeed, especially in its dealings with the USOC, the IOC was mostly sympathetic, choosing not to pursue any sort of punishment should the USOC choose to align itself with the boycott movement. At least in this instance, this is indicative of both structural and ideological barriers to action predicted by the Olympic regime theory. Certainly, the IOC could not pursue punitive action against the U.S. government. However, by asserting the vital importance of Olympic political autonomy in defending the decision to stay in Moscow, and then refusing to take action when this element was compromised, the IOC evinced its fundamental inefficacy at enforcing its own rules.[54]

The 1980 Olympic boycott is an excellent test case for the Olympic regime theory because it created a situation in which (like so many Cold War ideological battles) the circumstances were essentially distilled into two choices. For the IOC, this did not

---

[54] Sarantakes, *Dropping the Torch,* 214-220.

necessarily mean aligning with Soviet or American interests, but it did mean staking out a position on sport's utility as a political tool. When the USSR invaded Afghanistan, the appropriateness of moving the Games was tied to the strength of the relationship between Olympic sport and government action in a domestic political setting. The IOC, not surprisingly, chose to assert that one had nothing to do with the other; the actions of the Soviet government had no bearing on the ability of the Soviet NOC or the Moscow organizing committee to live up to Olympic principles. This view was based on the notion that, above all else, the apolitical status of the Olympics was inviolable. However, if this was truly the case, the NOCs which yielded to government pressure and chose to boycott ought to have been in some way reprimanded for their decisions. Again, however, the IOC's position was to view this political interference as coercive and the NOCs as largely powerless to resist, victims caught in unfortunate political circumstances. This is compelling evidence of the fundamental inability of Olympic governance to do anything more than ensure that the Games are held as scheduled.

However, it is also a predictable outcome. In either case, establishing a clear position would have meant making the IOC vulnerable to charges of politicizing the Games, something to which it was very much opposed. What the organization failed to realize (or perhaps realized and chose to ignore) is that good governance is at least partially a function of meaningful action. Claims about the Olympic movement's ability to promote peace and global harmony were thus undermined by a governance system which willingly painted itself into a rhetorical corner of ineffectual inertia. Indeed, as Lord Killanin admitted in his most significant public response to the boycott threat, "[t]he International Olympic Committee cannot solve the political problems of the world."

Chapter 6: UNESCO, the IOC, and the International Convention against Doping in Sport

The portions of this chapter based on archival sources were previously published in Scott R. Jedlicka and Thomas M. Hunt, "The International Anti-Doping Movement and UNESCO: A Historical Case Study," International Journal of the History of Sport *30, no. 13 (2013): 1523-1535. Professor Hunt's contributions to the original article were purely analytical and are not reproduced here.*

The history of anti-doping policy in Olympic sport is a fascinating study in organizational management, international politics, ethics, and international sport governance. While scholarly consensus typically dates drug use in the Olympics to 1960, performance enhancement's breadth and depth as a sport (as well as social) issue are far more expansive.[1] The notion that doping is a concern not just for sport but for public policymakers was no more evident than in 2005, when the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) adopted the International Convention against Doping in Sport. By ratifying this international legal instrument, member states agreed to adopt national anti-doping measures through their respective governments and to ensure that these measures are aligned, in principle and in practice, with the World Anti-Doping Code, the governing document of the World Anti-Doping Agency (WADA). That the relatively specific issue of drug use in the Olympics ballooned into a

---

[1] On the history of anti-doping and the IOC, see Thomas M. Hunt, *Drug Games: The International Olympic Committee and the Politics of Doping, 1960-2008* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 2011). Paul Dimeo, *A History of Drug Use in Sport, 1876–1976: Beyond Good and Evil* (New York: Routledge, 2007) examines a wider swath of history and simultaneously reassesses the often stark moral context in which drug use is usually discussed. A perceptive examination of the connection between sport and the cultural fascination with performance enhancement is John Hoberman, *Testosterone Dreams: Rejuvenation, Aphrodisia, Doping* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2005).

major international concern presents an interesting and somewhat difficult test for the Olympic regime theory. On one hand, the ease with which states were able to involve themselves in anti-doping governance and oversight processes is predictable. While not a typical political "use" of sport, states willingly and without fear of reprisal co-opted anti-doping's salience within international sport to address broader policy concerns within their own borders. On the other hand, the idea that states would choose to act at all is a bit counterintuitive. Theoretically, states would be expected to free ride on the efforts of Olympic governance, reaping the benefits of legitimately "clean" sport without directly helping to address the problem. After all, the IOC had been developing and enforcing (or at least attempting to enforce) anti-doping rules for decades prior to serious governmental involvement. As this analysis will show, the decision by states to give up their status as free riders was foreseeable as the returns on that status began to diminish. The inability of the IOC to control drug use in the Olympics and international sport, and the subsequent erosion of the Olympics' perceived legitimacy, prompted states to intervene in order to preserve sport's political utility.

A FIRST ATTEMPT: 1988—1993

Established by the UN in 1945, UNESCO was charged with combating intellectual and cultural ignorance in the pursuit of world peace. The organization's constitution states, "[t]hat since wars begin in the minds of men, it is in the minds of men that the defences of peace must be constructed".[2] The creators of UNESCO believed that intelligence (and by extension, education) was valuable not simply for its own sake, but for its ability to prevent future global conflict. They reasoned that the devastating wars

---

[2] UNESCO, Constitution of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, November 16, 1945. <http://portal.unesco.org/en/ev.php-URL_ID=15244&URL_DO=DO_TOPIC&URL_SECTION=201.html> (accessed December 7, 2011).

that occurred during the first half of the twentieth century stemmed from a fundamental lack of respect and understanding between nations; furthermore, because political and economic ideals were transient, an armistice designed primarily around these interests was inherently unsustainable.[3] Thus, if these deficiencies could be addressed and corrected, war could be averted. Armed with this belief, the organization's leaders set out to implement systems that would develop education within and facilitate the transmission of culture among member nations, while still preserving national identities.[4]

Since at least the mid-1950s, sport has been one tool in UNESCO's educational arsenal. Viewed initially as a way to ease the physical and psychological burden of postwar recovery efforts, sport eventually came to be recognized as an important component of childhood as well as adult education, especially as the relationship between UNESCO and the International Council of Sport Science and Physical Education (ICSSPE) developed.[5] Throughout its history, and in accordance with its high-minded aims, UNESCO generally maintained a broad construction of the term "sport", de-emphasizing competitive aspects of sport in favor of those that promote health and social cohesion. UNESCO consistently eschewed involvement in elite sport, preferring to deal with sport as a means to greater egalitarian ends. The organization's involvement in anti-doping, then, should be considered within this context.

In late November 1988, the Second International Conference of Ministers and Senior Officials Responsible for Physical Education and Sport (MINEPS II) convened at the House of Unions in Moscow. Hosted by UNESCO, this conference brought together delegates from 104 member nations as well as representatives from several NGOs,

---

[3] Ibid.

[4] Ibid.

[5] See Steve Bailey, *Science in the Service of Physical Education and Sport: The Story of the International Council of Sport Science and Physical Education, 1956–1996* (New York: Wiley and Sons, 1997).

including the IOC. Among the IOC delegation were the organization's president, Juan Antonio Samaranch, and Prince Alexandre de Merode, a key figure in the burgeoning anti-doping movement.[6] Only two months removed from Canadian sprinter Ben Johnson's disqualification at the Olympic games in Seoul, it was likely that doping was on the minds of many of the delegates. UNESCO Director-General Federico Mayor of Spain alluded to the growing specter of doping in his opening address, noting that "Unesco's role here is to see, in conjunction with the Olympic movement and the other relevant non-governmental organizations, that steps are taken to counter the threats – widely condemned but unhappily still present – which are hanging over sport and which could hinder its expansion just as they could dim its international prestige".[7]

Like MINEPS I in 1976, the Moscow meeting was precipitated and guided by a questionnaire distributed to member nations beforehand. In addition to an array of sport-related concerns, respondents identified many of the problems commonly associated with early doping controls: the inability to account for natural substances, the lack of coherent guidelines, and the general ineffectiveness of testing programs to produce results in the face of an increasingly pervasive problem.[8] At the conference, many speakers identified doping as "the most immediate threat to international sport".[9] While delegates described their nations' individual efforts at interdiction, of greater interest were measures of broader scope enacted by regional and intergovernmental entities as well as the IOC.[10]

---

[6] Final Report, Second International Conference of Ministers and Senior Officials Responsible for Physical Education and Sport (hereafter referred to as 'MINEPS II'), (ED/MD/87, Moscow, November 21–25, 1988), 63–82. This and similarly cited documents were retrieved from UNESCO's online archive, UNESDOC <http://unesdoc.unesco.org> (accessed December 2011). Where possible, the document code is included in the citation.

[7] Ibid., Annex III, 4.

[8] Reference Document: The Development of Physical Education and Sport since 1976, MINEPS II (ED.88/CONF.206/COL.6, Moscow, November 21–25, 1988), 52.

[9] Final Report, MINEPS II, 10.

[10] Ibid.

The delegates also identified the key complicating factors with which the anti-doping movement would grapple for the next several years; namely, the balance between international cooperation and national autonomy, and the protection of basic standards of justice and human rights for athletes.

This discussion produced a recommendation targeted at three groups: UNESCO member states, NGOs, and UNESCO itself. Linking this statement to other initial efforts (e.g., the First Permanent World Conference on Anti-Doping in Sport) and emphasizing the threat drug use posed to sport, the MINEPS II recommendation called on UNESCO to facilitate international cooperation in anti-doping, specifically mentioning national governments, the Olympic movement, and non-governmental sport organizations.[11] While not reflected in the language of the final recommendation, the possibility of UNESCO creating an international anti-doping instrument was discussed as well.[12] In the early stages of the anti-doping movement, the organization was viewed as an important actor in the process of international harmonization.

In addition, the conference also saw Mayor and Samaranch issue a joint declaration emphasizing the common goals of UNESCO and the Olympic movement and the organizations' commitment to working together toward those ends. The declaration contained three areas of concern: closing the gap between industrialized and developing countries in terms of sport opportunities, ensuring the universality of the Olympic games, and fostering cooperation in anti-doping efforts, emphasizing again the possibility of UNESCO adopting an international instrument of some sort.[13] This formalization of the link between UNESCO and the IOC was not entirely bilateral. As with the MINEPS II

---

[11] Ibid., 30.
[12] Ibid., 10.
[13] Ibid., 43.

recommendations, the organizations' cooperative anti-doping efforts would be based on the already-established International Olympic Charter against Doping in Sport. While UNESCO gained a powerful ally in its efforts to promote sport across the globe, it sacrificed a bit of autonomy in terms of its stance toward doping.

In his report to the UNESCO General Conference the next year, Mayor heavily stressed UNESCO's relationship with the Olympic movement, while at the same time offering a three-pronged plan for anti-doping policy. In addition to cooperation between intergovernmental and non-governmental entities, he also suggested "education and consciousness-raising campaigns" and "systematic and co-ordinated [sic] long-term examination and analysis of the problem" as viable methods of dealing with drug use in sport.[14] At this time, Mayor still appeared to believe that maintaining an educational stance toward doping while still cooperating fully with international anti-doping efforts were compatible pursuits.

The General Conference did not disappoint. Adopting the MINEPS II recommendations nearly word-for-word in its resolution, it also ensured that anti-doping efforts were extended to developing countries and that UNESCO's International Charter of Physical Education of Sport would be updated to reflect the organization's attitude toward doping.[15] Additionally, UNESCO called on Mayor to continue to investigate "the possibility of promoting an international instrument against doping in sport".[16] These steps further committed UNESCO to the anti-doping cause. The reasoning supporting this allegiance is evident in the 1989 resolution: drug use, symptomatic of a more general

---

[14] Follow-up to MINEPS II: Moscow Declaration and Recommendations Concerning, in Particular, the Fight Against Doping, Protection of the Olympic Games and Co-operation Between UNESCO and the Olympic Movement, UNESCO General Conference (25 C/82, Paris, August 18, 1989), 6.
[15] Records of the General Conference: Resolutions, UNESCO (25 C/Resolutions, Paris, October 17–November 16, 1989), 89–90.
[16] Ibid., 90.

trend in mainstream society, threatened to undermine the positive outcomes sport could potentially produce.[17] Because UNESCO had increasingly committed itself to sport as an educational tool (especially since MINEPS I in 1976), it had a compelling interest to protect sport, or perhaps more specifically, sport's ability to have a positive impact on education.

One year later, the Intergovernmental Committee for Physical Education and Sport (CIGEPS), a group constituted by UNESCO in 1978, met in Ottawa to consider the issue of adopting an international anti-doping instrument. Interestingly, the study driving the debate at this meeting was entitled, "Proposals for an International Instrument for Education against Doping".[18] The specific inclusion of "education" as the primary objective of a proposed instrument indicates how UNESCO viewed this project and its role in anti-doping efforts. After demonstrating that existing legal instruments were, on the whole, ineffective, the study declared, "[i]t is therefore for Unesco, whose essential tasks in this respect are education and information, to monitor and prevent doping in sport."[19] Toward this end, three options were presented for consideration by CIGEPS: an international convention (an agreement governed by international law), a recommendation (a standard-setting and regulatory instrument with moral and political but little legal force), and a declaration (a rare and solemn assertion of universal principles).[20]

Although there was a strong push within CIGEPS for UNESCO to take the lead in adopting an international convention, UNESCO ultimately avoided the issue almost

---

[17] Ibid.

[18] Annotated Provisional Agenda, Intergovernmental Committee for Physical Education and Sport (hereafter referred to as 'CIGEPS'), Annex 2 (ED.90/CONF.203/3, Paris, August 23, 1990).

[19] Ibid., 2.

[20] Ibid.

entirely. Falling back on the organization's role as a disseminator of knowledge, the Committee, stating that "UNESCO must assume responsibility for education, prevention, co-operation and information relating to doping in sport", meekly submitted a recommendation that essentially called for more research.[21] Interestingly, at the same meeting, CIGEPS issued its Ottawa Declaration, reaffirming its commitment to intergovernmental cooperation in sport.[22] This proclamation of intergovernmental solidarity combined with the reluctance to act meaningfully to combat doping illustrates the growing contrast between UNESCO and the anti-doping movement. Nevertheless, the General Conference of UNESCO, meeting in 1991, agreed to act on CIGEPS' recommendations, commissioning further study of the feasibility of an international instrument.[23]

By July 1993, a much more extensive study had been produced for consideration by the General Conference. Referencing the Dubin Report as well as other Canadian data, the study specifically described the widespread and complex nature of doping, an issue that had not been explicitly addressed in previous documents.[24] Like the previous study, this report examined the existing anti-doping instruments and found them all insufficient in one way or another.[25] It also noted an apparent lack of emphasis on "education,

---

[21] Final Report, CIGEPS (SHS/MD/1, Ottawa, October 22–26, 1990), 24–25.

[22] Ibid., 27.

[23] Records of the General Conference: Resolutions, UNESCO (26 C/Resolutions, Paris, October 15–November 7, 1991), 32.

[24] The Dubin Report resulted from a study conducted by the Canadian government in response to Ben Johnson's positive drug test following his victory in the 100 meters at the 1988 Seoul Olympics. Released in 1990, the report criticized Canadian anti-doping policies and procedures and influenced significant reform. See, on the Dubin Report, John J. MacAloon, "Steroids and the State: Dubin, Melodrama and the Accomplishment of Innocence," *Public Culture* 2, no. 2 (1990): 41–64.

[25] Study on the Technical and Legal Aspects of the Desirability of Developing a New International Instrument to Combat Doping in Sport, Covering Education, Prevention, Co-operation and Information, UNESCO (27 C/43, Paris, July 30, 1993).

prevention, information and cooperation activities" among existing regulations.[26] This claim preceded the most emphatic statement in the document concerning UNESCO's role with regard to anti-doping: "Since the urgent need to combat dope-taking is now abundantly clear and punitive measures have proved to be ineffective, UNESCO would seem to provide a suitable worldwide framework for co-operation between States on research, information exchange, education and prevention."[27] The report, after rehashing the available options put forth in the first study, left it to the General Conference to decide UNESCO's level of involvement.

Despite the portrayal of doping as a significant threat to sport in meetings and reports, the increased emphasis on international cooperation in sport, and the apparent lack of efficient doping regulation in international sport, the 1993 UNESCO General Conference concluded that UNESCO "should not at present envisage standard-setting activities to combat doping in sport".[28] Further, it instructed the director-general to continue the organization's contributions to anti-doping through information and education.[29] This resolution effectively closed the book on UNESCO's involvement at the highest level of anti-doping policy for several years. At the same meeting in 1993, the General Conference suspended CIGEPS' operations in order to conduct an external review of the Committee.[30] While UNESCO by no means ceased to organize and fund sport-related initiatives, it did so without the assistance of a body that had only three years ago renewed the organization's commitment to intergovernmental cooperation in

---

[26] Ibid., 6.

[27] Ibid.

[28] Records of the General Conference: Resolutions, UNESCO (27 C/Resolutions, Paris, October 25– November 16, 1993), 71.

[29] Ibid.

[30] Ibid., 70.

sport. The Committee would begin submitting reports to the General Conference again in 1999, but would not play a significant role in UNESCO's stance toward anti-doping.

In 1993, UNESCO faced a crucial decision. One course of action involved becoming more enmeshed in the growing anti-doping movement led by the IOC; indeed, such involvement would likely mean taking a strong and visible stand in favor of this organization's tactics. While this course offered the chance at enhancing international and intergovernmental cooperation in the fight against doping (not to mention the potential pooling of resources), it also meant UNESCO would likely have to fully endorse, and perhaps enforce, the increasingly prohibitive policies espoused by the anti-doping movement. For an organization that had continuously stressed its commitment to (and preference for) educational approaches to curbing drug use in sport, this was a step too far. By refraining from adopting an international legal instrument in 1993, UNESCO remained consistent with its organizational mission, while still maintaining a firm anti-doping posture. However, the idea that doping in sport could be successfully fought with an approach that balanced interdiction with education would become more and more unlikely as the decade progressed.

FINAL STEPS: 1999-2005

On February 4, 1999, the First World Conference on Doping in Sport, convened in response to a perceived need for cooperation in anti-doping policymaking, adopted the Lausanne Declaration.[31] This document, agreed upon by delegates from national governments, intergovernmental organizations, and NGOs, included a provision for the creation of an international anti-doping agency, a goal that was realized with the establishment of WADA on November 10 of that year. Concurrent to these events,

---

[31] Lausanne Declaration. Olympic Review, February–March 1999, 17–18.

UNESCO was renewing its own inquiries into sport and physical education. On June 29, its Executive Board approved the decision to convene the Third International Conference of Ministers and Senior Officials Responsible for Physical Education and Sport (MINEPS III) in December, bringing together government officials as well as representatives from national and international sport organizations in Punta del Este, Uruguay.[32]

The conference was opened by the president of the host country, Dr. Julio María Sanguinetti, whose comments painted a stark picture of doping in sport:

> If the world of sport suffers from doping, it is because society suffers from drug addiction…The drug addiction we are trying so hard to combat arose, after all, in our well-off societies, not as a consequence of poverty but in the developed world, as a by-product of prosperity. It is the expression of a vacuous society, whose members feel dissatisfied and alienated by the limitations of a material world that offers so much yet...invariably confronts them with the loneliness of life itself.[33]

With these words as a backdrop, the delegates who engaged in the doping debate were generally in favor of the efforts of the IOC and other organizations that helped to create WADA.[34] UNESCO emphasized the harmonization of effort in combating doping. Delegates introduced proposals to limit the trade of performance-enhancing substances, increase testing and other doping controls, as well as redoubling efforts at education. However, the consensus of the delegates was that "UNESCO's role in this field should be that of promoting education and information".[35] Despite this statement, Director-General Koïchiro Matsuura of Japan professed his desire to see UNESCO involved in the

---

[32] Decisions Adopted by the Executive Board at its 156th Session, UNESCO (156 EX/Decision, Paris, June 29, 1999), 9.

[33] Final Report, Annex 4, Third International Conference of Ministers and Senior Officials Responsible for Physical Education and Sport (ED.99/CONF.209/CLD.11, Punta del Este, Uruguay, November 30-December 3, 1999), 1–2.

[34] Final Report, MINEPS III, 9.

[35] Ibid.

development of "an appropriate and effective institutional framework" in the field of anti-doping.[36] Curiously, especially given the prominence of doping on the meeting's agenda, IOC president Juan Antonio Samaranch made only brief mention of it in his remarks to the conference.[37]

MINEPS III was the first major UNESCO-sponsored sport meeting following WADA's creation. While the delegates were explicitly supportive of this development in the anti-doping movement, it was clear that they did not see UNESCO as an enactor of policy. As it had through much of its past *vis-à-vis* sport, the organization served as a facilitator. In this manner, UNESCO could encourage its members—representatives of national governments—to enact WADA's anti-doping policies and controls without itself committing to particular methods or practices.

One of the most important outcomes of MINEPS III was the suggestion for a round table meeting of sport officials to follow up on the discussions of the 1999 conference. This meeting, convened at UNESCO headquarters in Paris in January 2003, had only three agenda items, one of which was the "drafting of an international legal instrument to combat doping in sport".[38] In the interim, several steps had been taken toward coalescence of the global anti-doping effort. First, WADA had implemented unprecedented levels of drug testing at the 2000 Sydney Olympics.[39] The creation of the International Intergovernmental Consultative Group on Anti-Doping in Sport (IICGADS) in February 2000 and that group's Cape Town Declaration in May 2001 strengthened the

---

[36] Ibid., Annex 6, 4.
[37] Ibid., Annex 5.
[38] Annotated Agenda, Round Table of Ministers of Physical Education and Sport (ED.2003/CONF.802/1, Paris, January 9–10, 2003), 3.
[39] See Hunt, *Drug Games*, 116–20 for an overview of these developments.

links between national governments and WADA in terms of funding and representation.[40] At an earlier meeting of IICGADS in November 2000 in Oslo, WADA president Richard Pound assured national government representatives that, "whatever the cost to win the fight against doping in sport, we will bear it together within a context that we will design together".[41] Reportedly, the meeting agenda also included a discussion of what authority might be accorded to groups like WADA that had no governmental jurisdiction.[42] These steps served to bolster WADA's legitimacy and the organization's quest to unify anti-doping efforts at the global level.

The sport ministers at the round table in Paris in early 2003 were working within this context as they contemplated the possibility of UNESCO adopting an international anti-doping instrument. They borrowed much of the language in the working documents from this meeting from the studies of ten years prior. Indeed, they appear to have given very little consideration to new material.[43] However, they drew far different conclusions from this material than earlier UNESCO committees. In 1993, the general consensus had been to provide the UNESCO General Conference with options; ten years later, the majority opinion was that UNESCO should play a more active role in adopting an international legal instrument.[44]

In July 2003, the UNESCO Executive Board met to consider (among other things) the possibility of once again putting this decision before the General Conference. The

---

[40] Cape Town Declaration on Anti-Doping in Sport (Cape Town, South Africa, May 30–31, 2001), <http://www.wada-ama.org/rtecontent/document/capetowndeclaration.pdf>

[41] Doug Mellgren, 'International Conference Seeks to Combat Drugs in Sport', *Independent* (London), November 15, 2000.

[42] Ibid.

[43] Working document, Round Table of Ministers of Physical Education and Sport (ED.2003/CONF.802/2, Paris, January 9–10, 2003).

[44] Follow-up to the Round Table of Ministers and Senior Officials Responsible for Physical Education and Sport: Preliminary Study of the Technical and Legal Aspects of an International Anti-Doping Convention in Sport (32 C/50, Paris, July 18, 2003), 1.

Board considered two options, taking the lead in adopting an international convention, or reaffirming UNESCO's commitment to physical education and sport within the context of promoting education more generally. The second option, the Board claimed, would preclude the adoption of any international legislation.[45] By this time, it had become clear that any international instrument would need to be a convention; anything less would do little to address the jurisdictional problem confronting the anti-doping movement at the time.

The first option was fraught with caveats. First, the difficulty and complexity of adopting an international convention was great, and it was questionable whether UNESCO possessed the resources to accomplish the task.[46] Indeed, the Executive Board projected that two full-time positions would need to be created and projected a budgetary allocation of $200,000, which UNESCO could not realistically accommodate without additional contributions from member states.[47] This course of action was further obstructed by UNESCO's existing commitments to educational initiatives related to physical education and sport.

Conversely, the second option maintained the status quo. UNESCO would remain an "interested partner" in the growing anti-doping movement, and continue to combat doping through its educational efforts.[48] In essence, this tack would allow UNESCO to endorse the creation of an international instrument without having to deal with the tedium of actually creating one. It would also allow the organization to remain consistent with its previous actions *vis-à-vis* doping in sport. While UNESCO had expanded its role in

---

[45] Follow-up to the Round Table of Ministers and Senior Officials Responsible for Physical Education and Sport (166 EX/42, Paris, March 21, 2003), 3–4.
[46] Ibid.
[47] Ibid.
[48] Ibid.

international sport, it had always ensured that this was done with a view toward education. The organization recognized the value and importance of elite sport, but had refrained from direct involvement in this area.

Despite the apparent obstacles, the Executive Board ultimately decided that UNESCO should take the lead in adopting an international anti-doping convention.[49] In his address to the Executive Board, Director-General Matsuura said:

> I must confess that I was not originally convinced that it was for UNESCO, rather than the United Nations itself, to undertake this task. However, given the strong feelings expressed by many Member States at the Round Table and subsequently, I am increasingly persuaded that it is UNESCO's proper responsibility and that, although the timeline is short, the goal is achievable.[50]

Matsuura went on to mention the anticipated support of WADA, the IOC, and the Council of Europe, indicating that perhaps the task would not be as daunting as it first appeared. All that remained was a vote of support from the General Conference.

At its 2003 meeting, the General Conference unsurprisingly confirmed this recommendation, and proposed that a draft convention be submitted at its next meeting in 2005.[51] In its resolution, the Conference "reaffirm[ed] its belief that UNESCO should play a major role in the preparation of an international convention against doping in sport".[52] While worded to maintain the appearance of consistency, this marked a significant departure from previous policy. In fact, the 1993 Conference, by deciding not to adopt an international instrument, effectively expressed the opposite belief. Despite the concerns voiced at several points in the process leading to this decision, at each step (MINEPS III, the round table meeting, the Executive Board, and the General

---

[49] Decisions Adopted by the Executive Board at its 166th Session, UNESCO (166 EX/Decisions, Paris, April 4–16, 2003), 6.

[50] Summary Records, Executive Board, UNESCO (166 EX/SR.1-11, Paris, April 4–16, 2003), 22.

[51] Records of the General Conference: Resolutions, UNESCO (32 C/Resolutions, Paris, September 29–October 17, 2003), 22–23.

[52] Ibid.

Conference), the threat of doping outweighed concerns about UNESCO's role in the anti-doping movement and the organization's compatibility with WADA's anti-doping policies. After convening MINEPS IV in 2004 in Athens to essentially draft the convention, the 2005 UNESCO General Conference adopted the International Convention against Doping in Sport.[53] While some extra qualifications were added, in basic terms, the Convention ensures that all signatories will abide by the World Anti-Doping code developed by WADA. On December 11, 2006, Luxembourg became the thirtieth state to ratify the Convention, bringing the treaty into full effect for all signatories on February 1, 2007.[54]

OLYMPIC ANTI-DOPING EFFORTS

As a test of theory, this case is somewhat less straightforward than the two presented in preceding chapters. One of the reasons for this ambiguity is that Olympic governance preferences in this case are not uniform. Whereas the South Africa issue in 1968 and the 1980 boycott were both more clearly bounded in terms of problem definition, relevant actors, and chronological scope, the issue of policing anti-doping was (and is) far more diffuse and open-ended. Correspondingly, WADA's creation and relatively rapid growth legitimacy and authority were not always perceived by the IOC as positive or desirable developments, even though both organizations were ostensibly possessed of the same fundamental objectives with regard to preventing drug use in sport. In theoretical terms, then, it is difficult to assess applicability and predictive utility without first deciding how to treat WADA. Its organizational composition blurs the line

---

[53] Records of the General Conference: Resolutions, UNESCO (33 C/Resolutions, Paris, October 3–21, 2005), 29–48.
[54] UNESCO, Ratification by Luxembourg of the International Convention against Doping in Sport, December 15, 2006. < http://portal.unesco.org/en/ev.php-URL_ID=36159&URL_DO=DO_TOPIC&URL_SECTION=201.html>.

between sport and state governance, which means it can be considered neither a completely Olympic organization nor a free-riding governmental entity. WADA's organizational makeup is reflective of the widespread and pervasive nature of the performance enhancement issue; the dimensions of the chemical performance enhancement problem stretch far beyond the Olympics and elite international sport. Moreover, WADA could reasonably be considered both a constituent and an outcome in terms of Olympic governance. The organization was created as the result of interaction between sport and public leaders, but its quick transition to and persistence in maintaining autonomy means it is not simply an agent through which other actors work. Recalling the discussion of regime theory in Chapters 1 and 2, this suggests that WADA might more accurately be described as part of (or governing) an anti-doping regime in its own right, related to but distinctly separate from the Olympic regime.[55] This is all a somewhat roundabout (but necessary) way of saying that WADA's preferences and behaviors in the development of the International Convention against Doping in Sport are not immediately predictable or clearly accounted for by the Olympic regime theory under investigation here. While it undoubtedly played a role in the development of the international legal instrument, and is thus alluded to throughout the brief historical narrative above, WADA's actions will not be explicitly considered by any theoretical test.

Shifting the focus of the analysis to the IOC, the matter is still decidedly less clear in this case than in the other chapters in this work. One would expect the IOC to eschew government interference in anti-doping efforts, just as it does in other instances when states attempt to defy its authority. Even so, Samaranch's presence and comments at the

---

[55] This possibility has been defended elsewhere. See Barrie Houlihan, "Harmonising Anti-Doping Policy: The Role of the World Anti-Doping Agency," in *Doping and Public Policy*, eds. John Hoberman and Verner Møller (Odense: University Press of Southern Denmark, 2004), 19-30.

1988 MINEPS conference in Moscow suggest a softening of this stance.[56] The IOC's initial interaction with UNESCO is probably better understood as a search for renewed legitimacy, however, especially given the organization's difficulties in addressing the doping problem up to that point in time. On the heels of the highly visible Ben Johnson episode, and with the Dubin inquiry underway in Canada, the IOC needed to demonstrate that it was meeting the urgency of these recent developments. It was clear that UNESCO's reticence to become involved in anything more than doping education meant that it would not likely threaten the IOC's authority in international sport.[57] Given the historically tense relationship between the two organizations, the IOC's willingness to reach out to UNESCO signaled its confidence that it could exert some authority over the nature of UNESCO's ultimate involvement in anti-doping efforts. Coupled with the push for a separate anti-doping body within the IOC shortly after MINEPS II, it is relatively clear that the IOC had little regard for the idea of ceding authority over doping controls in Olympic sport.[58]

After a relatively quiet decade on the anti-doping front, in which the IOC celebrated the reunification of the German Olympic teams, the admittance (or in some cases, re-admittance) of Eastern bloc national Olympic committees, and the "Centennial Olympics" in Atlanta, the Festina affair at the 1998 Tour de France once again brought doping in international sport to the forefront of public debate.[59] The French government's

---

[56] See above as well as Hunt, *Drug Games,* 84.

[57] There existed some sentiment in the 1970s that international sport might be better governed by an intergovernmental body like UNESCO, rather than a private organization like the IOC. See Urho Kekkonen, "The Olympic Games to UNESCO!" *Instant Research on Peace and Violence* 2, no. 1 (1972): 42. Kekkonen was the president of Finland at the time.

[58] Hunt, *Drug Games,* 85.

[59] Dag Vidar Hanstad, Andy Smith, and Ivan Waddington, "The Establishment of the World Anti-Doping Agency: A Study of the Management of Organizational Change and Unplanned Outcomes," *International Review for the Sociology of Sport* 43, no. 3 (2008): 228-229.

role (rather than that of sport organizations) in uncovering the possession and use of drugs at the Tour, together with the developing Salt Lake City bid scandal, served to undermine the notion that the IOC possessed the means and integrity to adequately deal with what was becoming an increasingly serious challenge.[60] The First World Conference on Anti-Doping in Sport, held in Lausanne, Switzerland in February 1999, was in many ways a response to both the immediacy of the problem evinced by the 1998 Tour de France scandal as well as the sentiment that international sport organizations could not be relied upon to combat doping on their own. Though convened by the IOC with the intention of reasserting its authority over anti-doping, it was at this meeting (which led to the establishment of WADA) that the organization lost control of the issue for good. The attempt to enfold public authorities in the warm embrace of the Olympic faith backfired utterly. Instead of acquiescing to the IOC's preeminence, speakers at the conference derided the organization's efforts and strongly argued against its further leadership in harmonizing anti-doping policy.[61] By the time MINEPS III convened in November 1999 to revisit the question of adopting an international legal instrument, WADA (though only recently established) was clearly the recognized anti-doping authority in international sport.

The emergence of an international doping regime has perhaps done more to reveal the limits of Olympic governance than any other event in Olympic history. Armed only with its vacuous moral arguments about the sanctity of sport and the adequacy of Olympic ideology as a governing mechanism, the IOC was poorly prepared to effectively deal with growing public concern about the doping problem.[62] When confronted with the

---

[60] Ibid. Also Hunt, *Drug Games,* 106-107.

[61] Hanstad, et al., "The Establishment of the World Anti-Doping Agency," 237-239.

[62] John Hoberman, "How Drug Testing Fails: The Politics of Doping Control," in *Doping in Elite Sport,* eds. W. Wilson and E. Derse (Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics, 2001): 241-274.

empirical evidence of its repeated shortcomings in curbing drug use in sport at the Lausanne conference, the IOC was powerless to construct a counterargument. Because it lacked and actively avoided the sort of oversight and transparency that might have reassured governmental actors of the IOC's ability to effectively govern, the organization had nothing to which it could appeal as a justification for continuing to lead the anti-doping regime. While this account explains the IOC's failure to prevent intervention in an issue area that had for many years been its sole province, the reasons why governmental bodies involved themselves in the first place still needs to be clarified.

UNESCO AND THE LOSS OF FREE RIDER STATUS

According to Olympic regime theory, actors outside of the Olympic governance system (especially states) are expected to free ride. That is, they will be content to allow sport organizations to bear the costs of providing international sport, safe in the knowledge that they can not only reap the benefits of Olympic sport but also use it for political purposes should the need or opportunity arise. However, unlike state action in the other two case analyses, the fact that governments (and in particular an intergovernmental organization like UNESCO) sought involvement in sport policymaking presents a distinct challenge for the theory. Because the theory also explains how punishing free riders or extracting contributions from them is beyond the capabilities of the Olympic regime, it is admittedly puzzling why these actors would voluntarily give up their status in order to take on the burden of, in this case, developing and maintaining anti-doping policy.

In tracing the progression of UNESCO from unwilling participant to treaty enactor, it is important to reiterate the nature of states' relationship to international sport in terms of costs and payoffs. As free riders, states do not bear any costs.

Correspondingly, they will (at least theoretically) not be overly discerning in terms of product quality. What this means is that as long as Olympic governance provides an acceptable form of international sport which states can use without incurring costs, states will not take any action to alter their position in the system. Put more simply, as long as states can free ride, they are highly unlikely to attempt to fix something that is not broken. This has arguably been the case for most of the Olympics' history. Despite anachronistic views toward the participation of women, major event security failures, and deep-rooted organizational corruption, the Olympic regime and states have coexisted in relative stasis. The logical follow-on from this, however, is that if something *is* broken, states' free-riding status is fundamentally altered. The entire premise of nonintervention, especially concerning sport-specific matters, is based on the idea that states are accruing some nonzero benefit simply through the nature and existence of Olympic governance. If that benefit is reduced or eliminated, the incentive to free ride is eliminated as well. Further, if the benefit is transformed into an imposed cost on the free riding group, the motivation for correcting the situation is elevated to an even greater extent.

UNESCO's pivot from educational advocate to policymaker can thus be explained in terms of these dynamics. Though it had for many years acquiesced to the IOC's alleged authority in elite competitive international sport, preferring to see sport as but one of several educational and development tools, the failure of the IOC to successfully police doping in sport and the corresponding belief that this would have a profound effect on society at large prompted a shift in governmental preferences.[63] From a theoretical standpoint, the perception that drug use in elite sport would have negative

---

[63] This change has been well-documented. See, for example, Hunt, *Drug Games,* 111-114, Hanstad, et al., "The Establishment of the World Anti-Doping Agency," 243-245, and Barrie Houlihan, *Dying to Win: Doping in Sport and the Development of Anti-Doping Policy*, 2nd ed. (Strasbourg: Council of Europe, 2002).

implications for their own jurisdictions meant that states could no longer see anti-doping efforts as the sole responsibility of sport organizations.[64] Not surprisingly, these preferences were enacted not only through the actions of individual states but through existing collaborative institutions like UNESCO and the Council of Europe. As the policy harmonization effort which began with the formation of WADA in 1999 continued to gather momentum, and as the claims about doping's negative effects expanded in their voracity, it became clear that UNESCO could no longer justifiably remain a disinterested observer.[65]

Though state involvement in what was for many years a sport-specific issue may seem counterintuitive to the theoretical arguments advanced in this study, the IOC's inability to effectively deal with the problem led to a fundamental shift in state preferences. No longer able to reliably free ride on the IOC's anti-doping governance, governmental actors were able to reassign this governing responsibility at least partially outside of the Olympic governance system, creating what has become a pervasive network of organizations committed to what is popularly described as the "fight" against doping. While the young anti-doping regime's methods and tactics remain highly debatable, its existence as a relatively independent entity, as well as the intervention of national governments in supporting that independence, are outcomes that be explained in terms of regime forces.

---

[64] Some authors have noted that this calculation may have been motivated by more than a genuine concern for public health. See for example Dionne L. Koller, "How the United States Government Sacrifices Athletes' Constitutional Rights in the Pursuit of National Prestige," Brigham Young University Law Review 2008, no. 5 (2008): 1465-1544.

[65] An earlier version of this article explains UNESCO's progressively deeper involvement in the international anti-doping regime using theories of institutional isomorphism. See Scott R. Jedlicka and Thomas M. Hunt, "The International Anti-Doping Movement and UNESCO: A Historical Case Study," *International Journal of the History of Sport* 30, no. 13 (2013): 1523-1535.

Conclusion

This study (both the arguments advanced in Section I and the empirical support found in Section II) represents a significant contribution to the study of Olympic sport and to sport management more generally. From a theoretical standpoint, this study engages prominent ideas in both international relations and sport policy, bridging a gap consistently identified as problematic in the extant literature.[1] The key insights of this study are its classification of Olympic governance as an international regime, the isolation of the regime's ideological governing principles as fundamentally problematic, and the identification of the paradoxical effects these principles have on the ability of the regime to provide effective governance in a state-based international political system. Each of the cases presented in Section II demonstrate these effects in different ways.

The IOC's response to South Africa's place in the Olympic movement in 1968 shows, perhaps more so than the other two cases, the inadequacy of Olympism as a guide for policymaking. Though the IOC interpreted Olympic doctrine in such a way that inviting South Africa to the Summer Olympics in Mexico City seemed the best course of action (reasoning that inclusiveness and a narrow construction of the IOC's responsibilities *vis-à-vis* its own rules prohibiting racial discrimination most closely adhered to the principles of Olympism), other members of the Olympic movement did not share its views. While this illustrates the malleability of Olympism as an ideology, perhaps more telling in this case was the inability of the IOC to assert its authority as the supreme leader of the Olympic movement. Faced with the possibility of a massive

---

[1] Roger Levermore and Adrian Budd, "Sport and International Relations: Continued Neglect?" in *Sport and International Relations: An Emerging Relationship*, eds. Roger Levermore and Adrian Budd (London: Routledge, 2004), 6-15.

boycott and political protests at the games, the IOC acquiesced to mounting pressure and rescinded its invitation to the South African NOC, eventually electing to ban it altogether.

The South Africa case provides a glimpse into the tenuous nature of Olympic governance. As I argued at the beginning of this study, the Olympic governance system is built upon a transaction between members of the Olympic movement and the IOC in which inclusion in the movement is traded for recognition of the IOC's authority over what amounts to the Olympic brand. While it is probably true that the value of Olympic movement membership is greater now than it was in 1968, what this case demonstrates is that even such a valuable ideological association is not entirely invaluable. Further, the case demonstrates the limits of the IOC's power. Though it is officially recognized as having the final word on the interpretation of Olympic principles, it lacks the ability to enforce its proclamations in the face of concerted resistance. Again, while these conclusions may be historically contingent, the case provides a general sense of the ways in which a reliance on Olympism (as opposed to more official structural or legal arrangements) undermines the IOC's authority in Olympic governance.

The well-known U.S.-led boycott of the 1980 Moscow Olympic games switches the focus to state behavior. Perhaps having learned from its mistakes in 1968 (and having weathered a large boycott of the 1976 games in Montreal), the IOC remained largely above the fray as the Carter administration pushed for a widespread boycott in protest of the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan. While the IOC's commitment to Moscow as the host site did not waver, this case demonstrates the ease with which a national government can manipulate an Olympic event for its own political interests. On this point, two important conclusions emerge from the analysis. First, it is once again evident that Olympic ideology is easily manipulated. Indeed, President Carter's justification for demanding a boycott was couched almost entirely in Olympic rhetorical terms, as he argued that

allowing an overtly hostile state to host the games undermined the Olympic spirit and all that the Olympic movement stood for. While this reasoning did not persuade the IOC, it was enough to persuade dozens of other governments to join the boycott movement.

Second, and perhaps more importantly for future scholarship, the particular ways in which the U.S. government exerted itself in the boycott effort demonstrate the mechanism through which states pursue political action in Olympic sport. While the Carter administration made demands upon both the USOC and the IOC, it was only able to gain leverage over the former, ultimately coercing the USOC to boycott against its own wishes. That the U.S. (a state which mostly maintains a bright line between sport and politics within its own borders) was able to so easily influence its NOC while simultaneously failing to even gain the IOC's full attention suggests that the NOC may be an important mediating factor when analyzing how states "use" Olympic sport for political purposes. If a state pursues political objectives through Olympic sport (calling to mind the aggressive free riding discussed in Chapter 1), the range and probable success of those objectives may be limited by the amount of leverage the government is able to exert over its NOC.

The final case in this dissertation deals in a different way with the limits of state free riding on the Olympic regime. The rapid transformation of UNESCO from interested bystander to international legislator with regard to anti-doping and the concomitant decline of the IOC's authority in this area demonstrate both the limits of states' tolerance for ineffective governance and the limits of ideology as a governing mechanism. The IOC struggled for decades to adequately address performance enhancing drug use in sport, which led to increased governmental involvement in the issue. What is most surprising is that the IOC actually encouraged UNESCO's involvement in an effort to turn this trend

to its advantage, perhaps reasoning that UNESCO's reluctance to involve itself in elite international sport would make it more accepting of the IOC's authority.

As with the other two cases, the bounds of the Olympic regime's jurisdiction are once again laid bare when confronted with a serious challenge. Called on by governmental interests to demonstrate its commitment to more transparent and democratic governance in anti-doping, the IOC's only strategy was to reassert its ideological principles. The shift in governmental attitudes in this case is also indicative of how governments treat the overlap of sport-specific issues with those related to public policy. In the case of UNESCO's involvement in drafting international anti-doping legislation, the problem of doping in sport became sufficiently serious that the IOC's perceived authority over Olympic sport was eroded. In other words, the pervasiveness of drug use in sport (along with the attendant perception of moral corruption, cheating, and so forth) signaled to governments that the Olympic regime could no longer effectively govern the issue, which in turn meant that it could not provide the type of sport that they found so politically attractive and useful. That the doping issue was reframed in terms of broader health and educational concerns only helped reaffirm the appropriateness of governmental engagement, especially from UNESCO's perspective. This push toward governmental involvement in what was for many years an issue confined to Olympic sport as well as the result of this involvement suggest two possible conclusions. First, when the Olympic regime fails to effectively govern an issue that is linked to problems outside of the Olympic movement, governments may be more likely to assert their authority and claim jurisdiction over the issue. Second, that this case led to the creation of what might reasonably described as an international anti-doping regime (led by WADA) indicates that governments may be willing to take a more active role in international sport governance.

The conceptualization of Olympic governance as an international regime provides the beginnings of a research agenda for future scholarship, which might examine how the basic causal relationship posited in this study is affected or bounded by any number of variables and contextual conditions. Further, the regime concept applied to Olympic governance might be transferred to other sport settings. Certainly, the notion that sport should remain free from political interference is evident and popular outside of the international arena. From a more general (and practical) standpoint, sport governance plays a prominent role in the sport industry, especially as increasingly more sport organizations adopt corporate structures.[2] Indeed, the distinction between good governance and good management is largely trivial. This study identifies a major obstacle to effective governance. Sport leaders and managers can use the ideas presented in this study to more carefully consider the effects of incorporating ideological principles into their policymaking, as well as the ways in which a reliance on ostensibly noble principles can contribute to the propagation of suboptimal structural arrangements. While the symbolism of politically-transcendent sport may be an effective marketing tool, this study suggests that policies enacted in support of this ideal are ultimately self-sabotaging.

In the introductory essay, I suggested that when considering sport's place in society, governance matters. That is to say, the individuals and groups who exert control over sport are responsible for the outcomes it effectuates. Though the achievable social objectives of sport are diverse, it is not simply a value-neutral set of behaviors, manipulable for unlimited ends. Rather, the responsibility associated with sport governance is rooted in understanding the nature of sport and the limits it places upon

---

[2] Lesley Ferkins, David Shilbury, and Gael McDonald, "The Role of the Board in Building Strategic Capability: Towards an Integrated Model of Sport Governance Research," *Sport Management Review* 8, no. 3 (2005): 195-225. See also John Forster, "Global Sports Organisations and Their Governance," *Corporate Governance* 6, no. 1 (2006): 72-83.

sport's social utility. Ultimately, this study does not attempt to study sport solely for sport's sake, or to simply transfer theories from other fields and assess their applicability in a sport setting.[3] Rather, this study recognizes that sport, while similar to many other social phenomena, simultaneously possesses characteristics that make it distinctly and consequentially different. Synthesizing these views, I have advanced a conception of Olympic sport that can inform both future scholarship and practice.

---

[3] Laurence Chalip, "Toward a Distinctive Sport Management Discipline," *Journal of Sport Management* 20 (2006), 1-4.

Bibliography

Allison, Graham, and Philip Zelikow. *Essence of Decision: Explaining the Cuban Missile Crisis.* 4th ed. New York: Longman, 1999.

Andrews, David L., and Michael L. Silk, eds. *Sport and Neoliberalism: Politics, Consumption, and Culture.* Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 2012.

Bailey, Steve. *Science in the Service of Physical Education and Sport: The Story of the International Council of Sport Science and Physical Education, 1956–1996.* New York: Wiley and Sons, 1997.

Barclay, Jonathan. "Predicting the Costs and Benefits of Mega-Sporting Events: Misjudgment of Olympic Proportions?" *Economic Affairs* 29, no. 2 (2009): 62-66.

Barnett, Michael. "Evolution without Progress? Humanitarianism in a World of Hurt." *International Organization* 63, no. 4 (2009): 621-663.

Barnett, Michael N. and Martha Finnemore. "The Politics, Power, and Pathologies of International Organizations." *International Organization* 53, no. 4 (1999): 699-732.

Barney, Robert K., ed. *Rethinking the Olympics: Cultural Histories of the Modern Games.* Morgantown, WV: Fitness Information Technology, 2009.

Beacom, Aaron. "Sport in International Relations: A Case for Cross-Disciplinary Investigation." *The Sports Historian* 20, no. 2 (2000): 1-23.

Bennett, Andrew, and Alexander L. George, "Case Studies and Process Tracing in History and Political Science: Similar Strokes for Different Foci." In *Bridges and Boundaries: Historians, Political Scientists, and the Study of International Relations,* edited by Colin Elman and Miriam Fendius Elman (Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press, 2001), 137-166.

Berg, Brennan K., Seth A. Kessler, and Thomas M. Hunt. "A Realist Perspective of Governmental Perceptions of Olympic Boycott Movements, 1936-2008." *International Journal of Sport Policy and Politics* 4, no. 3 (2012): 307-320.

Beutler, Ingrid. "Sport Serving Development and Peace: Achieving the Goals of the United Nations through Sport." *Sport in Society* 11, no. 4 (2008): 359-369.

Booth, Douglas. *The Race Game: Sport and Politics in South Africa.* Portland: Frank Cass, 1998.

---. "Hitting Apartheid for Six? The Politics of the South African Sports Boycott." *Journal of Contemporary History* 38, no. 3 (2003): 477-493.

---. "Olympic City Bidding: An Exegesis of Power." *International Review for the Sociology of Sport* 46, no. 4 (2011): 367-386.

Carr, Edward Hallett. *What is History?* New York: Random House, 1961.

Cha, Victor D. "A Theory of Sport and Politics." *International Journal of the History of Sport* 26, no. 11 (2009): 1581-1610.

Chalip, Laurence. "Policy Analysis in Sport Management." *Journal of Sport Management* 9, no. 1 (1995): 1-13.

---. "Toward a Distinctive Sport Management Discipline." *Journal of Sport Management* 20 (2006), 1-4.

Chappelet, Jean-Loup, and Brenda Kübler-Mabbott. *The International Olympic Committee and the Olympic System: The Governance of World Sport.* London: Routledge, 2008.

Connolly, Chris A. "The Politics of the Games of the New Emerging Forces (GANEFO)." *International Journal of the History of Sport* 29, no. 9 (2012): 1311-1324.

Cottrell, M. Patrick, and Travis Nelson. "Not Just the Games? Power, Protest and Politics at the Olympics." *European Journal of International Relations* 17, no. 4 (2011): 729-753.

Darnell, Simon C., and David R. Black. "Mainstreaming Sport into International Development Studies." *Third World Quarterly* 32, no. 3 (2011): 367-378.

De Coubertin, Pierre. *Olympism: Selected Writings.* Edited by Norbert Müller. Lausanne: International Olympic Committte, 2000.

Dichter, Thomas W. *Despite Good Intentions: Why Development Assistance to the Third World Has Failed.* Amherst, MA: University of Massachusetts Press, 2003.

Dimeo, Paul. A History of Drug Use in Sport, 1876–1976: Beyond Good and Evil. New York: Routledge, 2007.

Doornbos, Martin R. "'Good Governance': The Pliability of a Policy Concept." *TRAMES* 8, no. 4 (2004): 372-387.

Dyreson, Mark. *Making the American Team: Sport, Culture, and the Olympic Experience.* Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press, 1998.

Eckstein, Harry. "Case Study and Theory in Political Science." In *Case Study Method: Key Issues, Key Texts,* edited by Roger Gomm, Martyn Hammersley, and Peter Foster, 119-164. London: Sage Publications, 2000.

Eisenhardt, Kathleen M., and Melissa E. Graebner. "Theory Building from Cases: Opportunities and Challenges." *Academy of Management Journal* 50, no. 1 (2007): 25-32.

Esty, Daniel C. "Good Governance at the Supranational Scale: Globalizing Administrative Law." *Yale Law Journal* 115, no. 7 (2006): 1490-1563.

Espy, Richard. *The Politics of the Olympic Games.* Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1979.

Ferkins, Lesley, David Shilbury, and Gael McDonald. "The Role of the Board in Building Strategic Capability: Towards an Integrated Model of Sport Governance Research." *Sport Management Review* 8, no. 3 (2005): 195-225.

Finnemore, Martha. *National Interests in International Society.* Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1996.

Finnermore, Martha, and Kathryn Sikkink. "Taking Stock: The Constructivist Research Program in International Relations and Comparative Politics." *Annual Review of Political Science* 4, no. 1 (2001): 391-416.

Forster, John. "Global Sports Organisations and Their Governance." *Corporate Governance* 6, no. 1 (2006): 72-83.

Forster, John, and Nigel K.Ll. Pope. *The Political Economy of Global Sporting Organisations.* New York: Routledge, 2004.

Gems, Gerald R. *The Athletic Crusade: Sport and American Cultural Imperialism.* Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press, 2012.

Gilpin, Robert. *War and Change in World Politics.* London: Cambridge University Press, 1981.

Grix, Jonathan. "Sport Politics and the Olympics." *Political Studies Review* 11, no. 1 (2013): 15-25.

Grix, Jonathan, and Donna Lee. "Soft Power, Sports Mega-Events and Emerging States: The Lure of the Politics of Attraction." *Global Society: Journal of Interdisciplinary International Relations* 27, no. 4 (2013): 521-536.

Guttmann, Allen. *The Games Must Go On: Avery Brundage and the Olympic Movement.* New York: Columbia University Press, 1983.

---. *The Olympics: A History of the Modern Games.* Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press, 1992.

Hancock, Graham. *Lords of Poverty: The Power, Prestige, and Corruption of the International Aid Business.* New York: Atlantic Monthly Press, 1989.

Hannan, Michael T., and John Freeman, "Structural Inertia and Organizational Change," American Sociological Review 49, no. 2 (1984): 149-164

Hanstad, Dag Vidar, Andy Smith, and Ivan Waddington. "The Establishment of the World Anti-Doping Agency: A Study of the Management of Organizational Change and Unplanned Outcomes." *International Review for the Sociology of Sport* 43, no. 3 (2008): 227-249.

Hazan, Baruch A. *Olympic Sport and Propaganda Games: Moscow 1980.* New Brunswick: Transaction, Inc., 1982.

Heere, Bob, Chiyoung Kim, Masayuki Yoshida, Hidemasa Nakamura, Toshiyuki Ogura, Kyu Soo Chung, and So Youn Lim. "The Impact of World Cup 2002 on the Bilateral Relationship between South Korea and Japan." *Journal of Sport Management* 26, no. 2 (2012): 127-142.

Hill, Christopher R. *Olympic Politics.* New York: Manchester University Press, 1992.

Hoberman, John M. *Sport and Political Ideology.* Austin, TX: University of Texas Press, 1984.

---. *The Olympic Crisis: Sport, Politics and the Moral Order.* New Rochelle, NY: Aristide D. Caratzas, 1986.

---. "Toward a Theory of Olympic Internationalism." *Journal of Sport History* 22, no. 1 (1995): 1-37.

---. "How Drug Testing Fails: The Politics of Doping Control." In *Doping in Elite Sport,* eds. W. Wilson and E. Derse, 241-274. Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics, 2001.

---. *Testosterone Dreams: Rejuvenation, Aphrodisia, Doping*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2005.

---. "The Myth of Sport as a Peace-Promoting Political Force." *SAIS Review* 31, no. 1 (2011): 17-29.

Hopf, Ted. "Common-sense Constructivism and Hegemony in World Politics." *International Organization* 67, no. 2 (2013): 317-354.

Houlihan, Barrie. *Sport and International Politics.* New York: Harvester Wheatsheaf, 1994.

---. *Dying to Win: Doping in Sport and the Development of Anti-Doping Policy.* 2nd ed. Strasbourg: Council of Europe, 2002.

---. "Harmonising Anti-Doping Policy: The Role of the World Anti-Doping Agency." In *Doping and Public Policy*, eds. John Hoberman and Verner Møller, 19-30. Odense: University Press of Southern Denmark, 2004.

Hulme, Jr., Derick L. *The Political Olympics: Moscow, Afghanistan, and the 1980 U.S. Boycott.* New York: Praeger, 1990.

Hunt, Thomas M. "American Sport Policy and the Cultural Cold War: The Lyndon B. Johnson Presidential Years." *Journal of Sport History* 33, no. 3 (2006): 273-297.

---. "Countering the Soviet Threat in the Olympic Medals Race." *International Journal of the History of Sport* 24, no. 6 (2007): 796-818.

---. "Sport, Drugs, and the Cold War: The Conundrum of Olympic Doping Policy: 1970-1979." *Olympika: The International Journal of Olympic Studies* 16 (2007): 19-42.

---. *Drug Games: The International Olympic Committee and the Politics of Doping, 1960-2008.* Austin, TX: University of Texas Press, 2011.

Hunt, Thomas M., Paul Dimeo, Matthew T. Bowers, and Scott R. Jedlicka. "The Diplomatic Context of Doping in the Former German Democratic Republic: A Revisionist Examination." *International Journal of the History of Sport* 29, no. 18 (2012): 2486-2499.

Ikenberry, G. John. "Institutions, Strategic Restraint, and the Persistence of American Postwar Order." *International Security* 23, no. 3 (Winter 1998/99): 43-78.

Jedlicka, Scott R., and Thomas M. Hunt. "The International Anti-Doping Movement and UNESCO: A Historical Case Study." *International Journal of the History of Sport* 30, no. 13 (2013): 1523-1535.

Jennings, Andrew. *The New Lords of the Rings.* London: Simon & Schuster, 1996.

---. *Foul! The Secret World of FIFA: Bribes, Vote Rigging, and Ticket Scandals.* London: Harpersport, 2006.

Kanin, David B. "The Olympic Boycott in Diplomatic Context." *Journal of Sport and Social Issues* 4, no. 1 (1980): 1-24.

Kekkonen, Urho. "The Olympic Games to UNESCO!" *Instant Research on Peace and Violence* 2, no. 1 (1972): 42.

Keohane, Robert O. "The Demand for International Regimes." In *International Regimes,* edited by Stephen D. Krasner (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1983), 141-171.

---. *After Hegemony: Cooperation and Discord in the World Political Economy.* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1984.

Keys, Barbara J. *Globalizing Sport: National Rivalry and International Community in the 1930s.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2006.

Kidd, Bruce. "Inequality in Sport, the Corporation, and the State: An Agenda for Social Scientists." *Journal of Sport and Social Issues* 19, no. 3 (1995): 232-248.

---. "A New Social Movement: Sport for Development and Peace." *Sport in Society* 11, no. 4 (2008): 370-380.

Kidd, Bruce, and Heather Dichter, eds. *Olympic Reform Ten Years Later.* London: Routledge, 2012.

King, Gary, Robert O. Keohane, and Sidney Verba. *Designing Social Inquiry: Scientific Inference in Qualitative Research.* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1994.

Koller, Dionne L. "How the United States Government Sacrifices Athletes' Constitutional Rights in the Pursuit of National Prestige." *Brigham Young University Law Review* 2008, no. 5 (2008): 1465-1544.

Krasner, Stephen D. "Structural Causes and Regime Consequences: Regimes as Intervening Variables." In *International Regimes*, edited by Stephen D. Krasner, 1-22. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1983.

Kretchmar, Scott. "Pluralistic Internalism." *Journal of the Philosophy of Sport* (2014). DOI: 10.1080/00948705.2014.911101

Kuhn, Thomas S. *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions.* 2nd ed. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1969.

Lapchick, Richard E. "South Africa: Sport and Apartheid Politics." *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 445, no. 1 (1979): 155-165.

Levermore, Roger and Adrian Budd. "Sport and International Relations: Continued Neglect?" In *Sport and International Relations: An Emerging Relationship*, eds. Roger Levermore and Adrian Budd, 6-15. London: Routledge, 2004.

Levy, Jack S. "Explaining Events and Developing Theories: History, Political Science, and the Analysis of International Relations." In *Bridges and Boundaries: Historians, Political Scientists, and the Study of International Relations,* edited by Colin Elman and Miriam Fendius Elman, 39-84. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press, 2001.

MacAloon, John J. "Steroids and the State: Dubin, Melodrama and the Accomplishment of Innocence." *Public Culture* 2, no. 2 (1990): 41–64.

---. *This Great Symbol: Pierre de Coubertin and the Origins of the Modern Olympic Games.* London: Routledge, 2007.

---. "Scandal and Governance: Inside and Outside the IOC 2000 Commission." *Sport in Society* 14, no. 3 (2011): 292-308.

Mason, Daniel S., Lucie Thibault, and Laura Misener. "An Agency Theory Perspective on Corruption in Sport: The Case of the International Olympic Committee." *Journal of Sport Management* 20, no. 1 (2006): 52-73.

Morgan, William J. "Broad Internalism, Deep Conventions, Moral Entrepreneurs, and Sport." *Journal of the Philosophy of Sport* 39, no. 1 (2012): 65-100.

Morgenthau, Hans J. *Politics among Nations: The Struggle for Power and Peace.* New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1950.

Murray, Stuart. "The Two Halves of Sports-Diplomacy." *Diplomacy & Statecraft* 23, no. 3 (2012): 576-592.

Murray, Stuart, and Geoffrey Allen Pigman. "Mapping the Relationship between International Sport and Diplomacy." *Sport in Society* 17, no. 9 (2014): 1098-1118.

Ndlovu, Sifiso Mxolisi. "Sports as Cultural Diplomacy: The 2010 FIFA World Cup in South Africa's Foreign Policy." *Soccer & Society* 11, no. 1/2 (2010): 144-153.

Olson, Mancur. *The Logic of Collective Action: Public Goods and the Theory of Groups.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1971.

Peacock, Byron. "'A Secret Instinct of Social Preservation': Legitimacy and the Dynamic Reconstitution of Olympic Conceptions of the 'Good'." *Third World Quarterly* 32, no. 3 (2011): 477-502.

Pinard, Maurice. *Motivational Dimensions in Social Movements and Contentious Collective Action*. Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2011.

Redeker, Robert. "Sport as an Opiate of International Relations: The Myth and Illusion of Sport as a Tool of Foreign Diplomacy." *Sport in Society* 11, no. 4 (2008): 494-500.

Riordan, Jim, and Arnd Krüger. *The International Politics of Sport in the Twentieth Century.* London: Routledge, 1999.

Rosner, Scott, and Deborah Low. "The Efficacy of Olympic Bans and Boycotts on Effectuating International Political and Economic Change." *Texas Review of Entertainment & Sports Law* 11, no. 1 (2009): 27-79

Ruggie, John Gerard. "What Makes the World Hang Together? Neo-utilitarianism and the Social Constructivist Challenge." *International Organization* 52, no. 4 (1998): 855-885.

Sarantakes, Nicholas Evan. *Dropping the Torch: Jimmy Carter, the Olympic Boycott, and the Cold War.* New York: Cambridge University Press, 2011.

Schelling, Thomas C. *Micromotives and Macrobehavior.* New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 1978.

Seppänen, Paavo. "The Olympics: A Sociological Perspective." *International Review for the Sociology of Sport* 19, no. 2 (1984): 113-127.

Silk, Michael L., and David L. Andrews. "Sport and the Neoliberal Conjuncture: Complicating the Consensus." In *Sport and Neoliberalism: Politics, Consumption, and Culture,* edited by David L. Andrews and Michael L. Silk, 1-19. Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 2012.

Stevenson, Thomas B., and Abdul Karim Alaug. "Sports Diplomacy and Emergent Nationalism Football Links between the Two Yemens, 1970–1990." *Anthropology of the Middle East* 3, no. 2 (2008): 1-19.

Suits, Bernard. *The Grasshopper: Games, Life, and Utopia*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1978.

Taylor, Trevor. "Sport and International Relations: A Case of Mutual Neglect," in *The Politics of Sport.* Edited by Lincoln Allison, 27-48. Wolfeboro, NH: Manchester University Press, 1986.

Waltz, Kenneth N. *Theory of International Politics.* Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley, 1979.

Wendt, Alexander. "Anarchy is What States Make of It: The Social Construction of Power Politics." *International Organization* 46, no. 2 (1992): 391-425.

---. *Social Theory of International Politics.* Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1999.

Wenn, Stephen R., and Scott G. Martyn. "'Tough Love': Richard Pound, David D'Alessandro, and the Salt Lake City Olympics Bid Scandal." *Sport in History* 26, no. 1 (2006): 64-90.

Witherspoon, Kevin B. *Before the Eyes of the World: Mexico and the 1968 Olympic Games.* DeKalb, IL: Northern Illinois University Press, 2008.

Yin, Robert K. *Case Study Research: Design and Methods.* 4th ed. London: Sage Publications, 2009.

Young, Oran R. *Governance in World Affairs.* Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1999.

Zirin, Dave. *Brazil's Dance with the Devil: The World Cup, the Olympics, and the Fight for Democracy.* Chicago: Haymarket, 2014.