

THE TIES THAT BIND: SOUTH AFRICA AND SPORTS DIPLOMACY 1958-1963

Marc Keech

Chelsea School, University of Brighton

Introduction

During recent years there has been considerable interest in the contribution of sport, sports sanctions, and sports diplomacy to the end of apartheid. Nauright¹ and Nauright and Black² based their assessments of the impact of sports sanctions against South Africa on the psychological damage caused to the white population by international sporting isolation. Whilst the profile and cultural significance of sport in South Africa ensured that the apartheid system was particularly susceptible to sports-based protest and international sporting sanctions, two alternative criteria, other than psychological effects, can also be employed to evaluate the contribution of sport to the end of apartheid. The first is the ability of sport to prompt responses from internal policy actors in and outside sporting realms, such as the South African government or (white) sports federations. The second is the capacity of sports protest to influence international organisations such as the Commonwealth, or international sports organisations such as the International Olympic Committee (IOC) or FIFA, the international governing body for football. Initially, sports-based protest was predominantly a domestic phenomenon, but during the period 1958-63 the internationalisation of sports-based protest and the emergence of sports diplomacy as a tool of policy produced a complex interplay between domestic and international sports policies with regard to South Africa.

Sports diplomacy has been defined as ‘the whole range of international contacts and competitions that have implications for the overall relations between the nations concerned’.³ Whilst this definition draws attention to issues and relations between states and within a single state, it also provides scope for analysing the actions of domestic and international non-state actors, and how the use of sport as a tool of policy is applied in relation to the target state or states concerned. By its nature, sport is a highly sensitive, conditional, contextual, and ambivalent means of communication. The inherent unpredictability of results in sports diplomacy is one of the risks taken by those who initiate or sponsor it.⁴ The attraction of sports

diplomacy is that it is a relatively low-cost, low risk but high profile tool of foreign policy, by which states and non-state actors are able to publicise their views on the actions and policies of others.⁵

There are many instances of sport being utilised in support of diplomatic objectives, but little agreement among analysts on its overall effectiveness. For example, sport can be used to build bridges between countries, as in the case of the ping-pong diplomacy between China and the USA in 1971. The more recent examples of an American wrestling team visiting Iran in 1998 and the recent baseball matches between the Cuban national side and the Baltimore Orioles are evidence of the continuing attraction of sports diplomacy. Alternatively, sport can be used to voice displeasure or disapproval at the actions of other nations. This has been termed negative sports diplomacy and is perhaps best exemplified in the boycott of the 1980 Moscow Olympics by many Western nations.⁶ Sport can also be utilised as a focal point of contact between nations, as in the case of Cold War sporting contact between the USA and the USSR.⁷

Kanin challenged the value of sport as a political resource by suggesting that sport is a political process based on play, game, and posture. If the activity is not serious, neither can be the positions, political or otherwise.⁸ Conversely, the use of athletes by many nations as 'diplomats in tracksuits' has demonstrated that sport is a serious concern to many nations wishing to make a foreign policy statement through the sporting arena. Whilst sports diplomacy has been periodically associated with Olympic boycotts, Cold War politics, and other international problems, it was with the issue of apartheid that it was most closely associated. The attempt to isolate South Africa from the wider sporting community was one of the most sustained political campaigns of the post-war period and one that, for many observers, permitted sport a central role in policy making. Such a role created an understanding of, and familiarity with, the implications of apartheid.⁹ The historical origins of sports diplomacy with regard to South Africa have not been explicitly discussed in the surfeit of literature concerning the subject area. Thus, the aim of the paper is to trace some of the origins of sports diplomacy in the South African context. The paper highlights the roles of two prominent sports administrators in the period between 1958 and 1963, K.S. (Sandy) Duncan, Honorary Secretary of the Commonwealth Games throughout this period, and Sir Stanley Rous, President of FIFA from 1961 to 1974.

South Africa, the Olympics, and the origins of sports diplomacy

Although black South Africans protested as early as 1946 at being excluded from Olympic participation,¹⁰ their voices were little more than ineffectual. However, in 1947 the South African Table Tennis Board (SATTB), a body whose membership was organised on non-racial principles, became a provisional affiliate of the International Table Tennis Federation (ITTF). The ITTF had refused to acknowledge the white South African Table Tennis Union (SATTU) because of its discriminatory policies. In 1950, the President of SATTU claimed that his organisation did not have a colour bar, only a social bar.¹¹ Ignoring the ITTF ban on SATTU, a British player, Bergmann, visited the country at the request of SATTU and was subsequently fined and banned for flouting rules to which the British federation subscribed. According to one South African sports official, the ITTF's decision was the thin end of the wedge and would lead to the suspension of all South African sports associations.

Before exploring the issues concerning Duncan and Rous it is worth contextualising their actions in light of the work of Avery Brundage, President of the IOC from 1952 and the most significant sports administrator of the time. He fervently sought to place the movement beyond the reach of politics although, as Quick points out, he often failed dismally to adopt the more accommodating attitude necessary for the integration of diverse global cultures.¹² His support for the South African government was readily apparent throughout the 1950s and 1960s. A primary reason for his support was South Africa's role in maintaining the status quo within the Olympic movement, which ensured that power remained firmly with established (white) sporting nations rather than be shared with the newer ex-colonial nations who were increasingly demanding greater influence in the Olympic movement. The issue of South African participation in the Olympic Games first arose around the time of the Melbourne games of 1956. Brundage was a pivotal figure, having already made preliminary enquiries concerning the question of black participation in the South African Olympic team to Ira Emery, president of the South African National Olympic Committee (SANOC). Realising the nature of the situation, and also the fact that the USSR saw the issue as one with which to challenge the power distribution within the IOC, Brundage had to react. He wrote to Emery in 1958 saying that he (Brundage) did not know how long the IOC 'can defer action on the issue as we are receiving letters from all over the world'.¹³

Brundage further advised Emery in the same letter that separate tryouts involving blacks might prove to be a viable alternative: while non-whites could be excluded on one pretext or another, SANOC would still be complying with IOC rules. Within South Africa, concerns were emerging regarding South African participation in international sport. It was acknowledged that once the process of expulsion and exclusion began, the trend could rapidly accelerate. One possible tactic discussed by white sports bodies to postpone such a trend was to push for dual recognition from the respective international federation for both white and non-white bodies.¹⁴ The issue of discrimination was not officially tabled until the IOC session in Rome in 1959.¹⁵ Nikolai Romanov, the Soviet delegate, accused SANOC of never having done anything to prevent apartheid and that, he argued, was an infringement of the Olympic charter. Reg Honey, the South African delegate, gave an assurance that all South African athletes entered by their National Olympic Committee were to be issued with passports.¹⁶ However, SANOC had no intention of picking a non-white athlete to whom they would have to issue a passport, and non-white federations would have had to affiliate to the white federations, recognised by SANOC, for a non-white athlete to participate in the Olympics.

Despite the gathering momentum of the non-racial sporting movement, Brundage remained steadfast in his refusal to make South Africa fully comply with the Olympic Charter on the grounds that it was not SANOC's fault that non-whites could not compete. He viewed National Olympic Committees as autonomous from government and therefore not to be held accountable for governmental policy.¹⁷ Brundage's refusal to acknowledge the overt political nature of SANOC influenced the IOC's unwillingness to take any punitive actions against South Africa in 1959.

The issue of apartheid remained in the international headlines in the early 1960s. The Sharpeville massacre of 1960 heightened international awareness of the political system in South Africa, and consequently the prospect of further participation by the country in international sport agitated a number of IOC members. Brundage's unwillingness to alter his position, combined with the declaration of South Africa as a republic in 1961, intimated to a growing number of IOC members that conditions for blacks in general, and opportunities to participate in sport in particular, would be severely curtailed.¹⁸ The government continued to provide evidence of their determination to extend further the policies of apartheid into the area of sport.¹⁹ On 29 March 1961, Minister of the Interior Jan De Klerk

announced that the government would not approve the participation of mixed teams in global sporting events; that mixed teams from other nations would not be welcome in South Africa; and that only separate white and non-white teams could compete abroad in international competition. After this, Honey felt there was little point in attending the next meeting of the IOC, as South Africa was sure to be suspended.²⁰ Yet at the IOC session in Moscow in 1962 only five members voted for the immediate suspension of the country from the Olympic movement. Indeed, South Africa was given until the next IOC session at Baden Baden in 1963 to eliminate the practice of apartheid in sport.

South Africa and the origins of Commonwealth sports diplomacy

The first tensions between South Africa and the administrators of British imperial and Commonwealth sports occurred in 1934 when the British Empire games were switched to London from South Africa because of the latter's racial policies.²¹ During the late 1950s and the early 1960s a raft of tensions were developing between South Africa and the Commonwealth. With hindsight, it is possible to view the situation between the Commonwealth Games Federation (CGF) and the South African Commonwealth Games Association as a forerunner for the sports diplomacy undertaken by the IOC in its attempts to play down the significance of South African participation in the Olympics. Indeed, many of the same personnel were involved. In 1958, South Africa had participated in the British Empire and Commonwealth Games in Cardiff. More than 500 protesters turned up at the Cardiff Arms Park to register their disapproval at South Africa's participation.²² Despite staunch support from traditional (old) Commonwealth allies, rumblings of dissent at South African participation within the Commonwealth movement as a whole were beginning to surface as many new Commonwealth nations began to unshackle themselves from colonial rule.

The 1960 referendum, which decided whether the constitution should be altered to incorporate republican status, was a sharp reminder to the international community of the internal decision-making process. Working under a republican constitution, the National Party was able to exercise a far greater degree of control over apartheid policies. At a meeting of the Commonwealth prime ministers in London during March 1961, South African Prime Minister Henrik Verwoerd stated that South Africa wished to remain within the Commonwealth as a republic. The significance of

remaining in an international organisation of such increasing status was clearly not lost on Verwoerd, but there was no chance of any compromise over his party's policies. The Communiqué from this summit stated:

In connection with this application, the meeting also discussed, with the consent of the South African Prime Minister, the racial policy followed by the Union Government. The Prime Minister of South Africa informed other Prime Ministers that in light of the views expressed on behalf of other member governments and with indications of their future intentions regarding the racial policy of the Union Government, he had decided to withdraw his application for South Africa's continuing membership of the Commonwealth as a Republic.²³

The withdrawal of South Africa from the Commonwealth should have solved the issue of their participation at the Perth Commonwealth Games of 1962. Only member countries of the Commonwealth were eligible to participate in the Games. The refusal of the Minister for the Interior, Jan De Klerk, to allow mixed team participation at global events served only to reinforce the notion that South Africa would not compete. However, the South African press made much of the continuous rumours suggesting South Africa would receive a special invitation to compete in Perth. The IOC remained non-committal regarding the issue, as they saw it as one of purely Commonwealth origins. Within the CGF, a strong and supportive friendship had developed between Ira Emery, who was the secretary of the South African Commonwealth Games Association as well as president of SANOC, and Sandy Duncan, the Honorary Secretary of the CGF.²⁴ Emery was viewed by many Afrikaners as a sporting liberal, part of the 'old school' that would acquiesce to international demands in order to maintain South Africa's position in the sporting arena. The challenge to Emery came from Frank Braun, a staunch supporter of Verwoerd and a committed republican. Emery wrote to Duncan in June 1961 regarding South Africa's possible participation in Perth:

I feel now that it would be going against the pricks in trying to keep us in the Games ... Mr. Braun is, I'm afraid, rather ambitious.²⁵

The portents were more ominous than Emery thought. Four days later, on 20 June 1961, Emery was relieved of his posts at SANOC and the South African Commonwealth Games Association with an official statement citing lack of accounts for the previous financial year as the reason for his

dismissal. Reg Honey, the IOC member in South Africa, resigned his post with SANOC in protest at Emery's treatment. Sandy Duncan soon became inundated with cuttings and correspondence from Emery who was clearly upset at his country's refusal to continue to participate in international sport on terms laid down by others:

Now that I'm out, those not anxious for South Africa to be concerned with non-white sports access, will do their utmost to keep them out of the Empire Games. 26

More worrying to Emery had been the emergence of a sports-based protest organisation. Included with one letter was a cutting from the Johannesburg *Sunday Times* that commented on the continuation of SASA's campaigns and the intention to target cricket and rugby union because of their significance to the white sporting establishment.²⁷ Emery had made his feelings regarding SASA explicitly clear in a letter to the South African government soon after SASA's formation in 1958. In addition Dennis Brutus, the founder of SASA, was condemned for not following what Emery termed as 'the rules of application' which stated that non-white bodies must affiliate to the respective white body.²⁸ The letter was passed on to the Secretary for Sport and Recreation who recommended to the Minister that:

The letter undoubtedly contains a great deal of useful material to combat misperceptions abroad and it should be sent to all our missions abroad. In doing so, I suggest we ask a competent journalist to prepare an accompanying article with suitable photographs. The letter has the advantage of being the product of a non-official non-governmental organisation, which fact, in the field of propaganda, adds weight to its contents.²⁹

The reaction of the government, to try and negate any influence SASA may have gained, was recognition that SASA could potentially have challenged the hegemony of sport established under white rule. The subsequent challenges to sports hegemony have their origins in the period 1958-1963. The pattern of governmental reaction to domestic and international protest had been established, although the strategies of pro- and anti-apartheid organisations became more complex and reflective of the sporting environment within the country. Clearly worried about SASA, Emery continued to send Duncan the cuttings on SASA's activities but refused to comment upon them in his correspondence. Towards the end of August

1961 a cricket match was arranged at the Wanderers ground in Johannesburg. Significantly it was scheduled to involve whites and non-whites. Immediately, the authorities invoked the Group Areas Act, thereby preventing any player, member, or guest to occupy land with people of different colour. Emery's despair was obvious:

This Sandy gives the death knell to our ever hoping having [*sic*] mixed trials for the Empire or Olympic Games until the act is repealed.³⁰

Sandy Duncan was Secretary to the CGF for nearly thirty years. He was a sports administrator held in high esteem by his colleagues. He also viewed politics as a most unwelcome intrusion in sport. In correspondence with Emery, and in repeated press releases throughout his tenure of office, he reiterated his belief that political pressures did not automatically mean any rule of sport had been broken. Additionally, Duncan disliked the actions of SASA because of their lack of official sporting recognition. He first received correspondence from Brutus in September 1961:

South Africa's withdrawal from the Commonwealth automatically forfeits the right of participation in Perth. We [SASA] believe it would do grave harm if racialism is permitted to take part with sportsmen from other parts of the Commonwealth (*sic*).³¹

The rumours in the South African media regarding an invitation to Perth persisted. Frank Braun told *The Star* of Johannesburg that if South Africa was wanted at the Commonwealth Games, then they would be pleased to go, but South Africa would not crawl to anyone or accede to any demands.³² Emery's correspondence with Duncan continued, but the sense of frustration and desperation was obvious:

If we are suspended by International Sports Associations, so sooner will the government be forced to take action for multi-racial sport in this country ... Mr. Brundage confidentially tells me that the IOC has been inundated with protests against South African participation at future Olympics.³³

The withdrawal of South Africa from the Commonwealth and the Commonwealth Games had serious implications for Brundage and the IOC. The contravention of the Olympic Charter, through the maintenance of apartheid policies, was a direct challenge to the Olympic movement. Yet Brundage continued to brush these problems aside, repeatedly citing

SANOC's inability to counteract problems presented by the prevailing political situation and stating that SANOC could not be held responsible for South African governmental policy.

Although SASA remained at the forefront of sporting protest, objections to South African participation had now begun to move beyond sports bodies to include governments and organisations such as the Commonwealth. Brundage disliked Brutus as much as Duncan did. They believed that SASA had no formal standing in international sport, and that it was politically motivated. It was apparent from Emery's correspondence that South Africa was intent on tightening the grip of apartheid on sport. Braun's pro-apartheid rhetoric during this period was given considerable coverage by the South African press but Brundage continued to keep close contact with Braun despite this. The issue of apartheid in sport was, by the early 1960s, beginning to become one component of the much wider struggle against the National Party's policies, with the Olympic movement targeted as one of the most prominent arenas within which this struggle would take place.

The emergence of SASA in the period 1958-1962 was an important watershed in the history of sports-based protest against apartheid. Its targeting of the IOC and CGF showed an acute awareness of the strategy that would be needed if South African participation within international sport were to be prevented. As independent international actors, the IOC and the CGF were key players in the high profile issue of sport and South Africa. The non-participation of South Africa in the 1962 Commonwealth Games was a prototype for the more significant decisions that the IOC was going to be forced to take. Although apartheid was a clear source of tension in the Commonwealth, it also became the issue on which the principles of the organisation became based. Conflicts between newly independent nations and South Africa began to focus on the Commonwealth Games so as not to jeopardise the primary focus for Commonwealth diplomacy, which was the biennial Heads of Government meeting. Conversely, the focus on the Commonwealth Games provided South Africa with links to sports administrators and permitted Emery to use his relationship with Duncan to further his tenuous diplomatic intentions. However, by also keeping contact with government departments, Emery unwittingly contributed to his country's continued isolation.

The involvement of the Commonwealth Games in patterns of international

relations involving sport also has its origins here. The relationship between the Commonwealth and the IOC had, at its heart, the common problem of how to deal with the South African question. Part of the problem faced by the IOC was the steadfast and convenient refusal to challenge the fiction that all National Olympic Committees were autonomous of government. The fiction was easier to maintain in the early 1960s than it has since become, and it led the IOC to claim that all NOCs were free of state interference, so that sport could not be used as a vehicle for politics. As an international actor, this was a naive assumption, especially in the case of South Africa where Braun's replacement of Emery as President of SANOC ensured that the National Party controlled SANOC decisions. Brundage refused to accept that the Olympic Games should become a forum for political issues, despite the possible implications of South African participation.

South Africa and football diplomacy

The embryonic association between sport, discrimination, and diplomacy alluded to in the Bergman affair was followed by a similar dispute in football, in which the non-white South African Soccer Federation (SASF) sought recognition from FIFA, who already recognised the white Football Association of South Africa (FASA) in 1952.³⁴ FASA would permit SASF's affiliation only if the latter agreed to the loss of voting rights on the national committee as a condition of entry. In 1954, SASF applied to FIFA for full membership. In response, FASA was told to negotiate with SASF and find a compromise. In 1955 FASA told FIFA that no compromise could be found, explaining that:

The laws of South Africa preclude Europeans and non-Europeans participating in the same matches or tournaments and even if my association desired to do so (and it certainly does not desire to do so) the laws of South Africa and the established practice would preclude my association from being allowed to do so.³⁵

FIFA's response was to propose an inter-federal committee to co-ordinate the activities of both organisations, which also prevented either organisation selecting a team that would represent 'South Africa'.³⁶ Both organisations rejected this proposal. In 1956, FIFA sent the first international delegation to South Africa to try and resolve the problems between the two federations. Whilst FASA was persuaded to drop the colour bar, FIFA could not

solve the stalemate and put off any decision regarding SASF's application until the FIFA congress in 1958. Prompted by debates over football, one commentator looked at the foreboding portents for other sports:

It is in the realm of sport that white South Africa's pride can be hurt most easily, and it is here most readily that South Africa can be forced into isolation. The problem is (currently) on the size of a man's hand in the sky but its presence must not be forgotten.³⁷

On his departure for the FIFA congress, FASA President Fred Fell was asked what hope existed for (white) South Africa's full return to international football. He replied,

I suppose a lot really depends on whether we can appeal to the reason of FIFA delegates. If so then they will realise that FASA is bound by the laws of its country and we cannot logically be expected to flout those laws.³⁸

Despite reiterating this point later in the year, Fell's deputy Dave Snaier proudly announced that Real Madrid and Eintracht Frankfurt were in negotiations to play in South Africa.³⁹ Although neither team eventually made the trip south, such actions demonstrated that white sports administrators were keen to circumvent any ban. To have persuaded such teams to play in South Africa would have been the ultimate propaganda coup.

South Africa had been one of the founding members of the African Football Federation (CAF). Yet, with a vastly distinct history from that of Egypt, Sudan, and Ethiopia, the other founding members, South Africa's sport was institutionalised and governed by white people of European origins rather than by members of the indigenous population. However, the period between the late 1950s and early 1960s witnessed the initial dismantling of European colonial power in Africa. Sir Stanley Rous became President of FIFA at a momentous time in world affairs. With a strong measure of regional control, it was hardly likely that CAF would tolerate the apartheid structures that shaped South African sport. In this context, FIFA, led by Rous, and dominated by European members, became wary of the growing power of CAF.

At the 1960 FIFA congress held in Rome, FIFA stated that the FIFA executive would expel any member whom continued to practise racial discrimination within twelve months.⁴⁰ Remarkably, South Africa remained in FIFA until 1961 when the resolution adopted in Rome necessi-

tated the former's eventual suspension.⁴¹ But this led to even more concerted efforts on the part of FASA's allies to reinstate the offending member. Rous entertained a number of ideas proposed to him by V. H. Grainger, the General Manager of the South African National (white) Football League. Grainger suggested that South Africa might field an all non-white team in the qualification rounds of the 1966 World Cup and an all white team in the 1970 competition. Furthermore, should the South African team have reached one of the finals, Grainger suggested that the non-white team and the all-white team could be fielded in alternate games. Grainger concluded by saying that he, Fell, and Dave Marais, chair of the league and vice-president of FASA, would treat Rous's reply in the strictest confidence.⁴² At the 1962 FIFA congress in Santiago, the device chosen to initiate FASA's reinstatement was to send a FIFA commission to investigate the situation in South Africa. Rous and Jimmy McGuire of the USA constituted the mission, for which the terms of reference were to ascertain whether FASA was in anyway responsible for (other) associations and clubs not becoming members of that association (FASA).⁴³ SASF attempted to challenge Rous's membership of the committee.

SASF most urgently request recusal of yourself from the proposed FIFA commission on grounds that you are deeply committed, by statements from within FASA to lifting the suspension of FASA. Some examples of these statements include:

- a) Mr. Fell (at the Annual General Meeting of FASA) stressing 'he had no doubt that Sir Stanley would have the suspension lifted.'
- b) that delegates at the AGM of FASA revealed to the press that FASA and Sir Stanley have been in correspondence with each other and that FASA has been advised by Sir Stanley on the lines and policies they must take to have the suspension lifted.
- c) Sir Stanley Rous, probably the most powerful man in world soccer is determined to keep South Africa in FIFA.

SASF suggests that if Sir Stanley insists on coming as commissioner our federation would have lost faith and confidence in the commission and that the confidence which the non-whites in this country have reposed in FIFA for their emancipation from racial oppression would have been shattered.⁴⁴

During the visit to South Africa in January 1963, it was reported that Rous had said that no provision in the FIFA constitution required its members to apply the principle of multi-racialism: if South Africa applied segregation in soccer, that was its concern. He stated that 'All we are interested in is to see the controlling body of soccer in this country furthering the cause of football to the best of its ability'.⁴⁵ Rous and McGuire met with representatives from a range of footballing bodies, local councils and representatives of national associations in the region such as Sudan, Nyasaland (Tanzania) and Basutoland (Lesotho). In meeting with SASF, Rous and McGuire were immediately subjugated to complaints from the former that SASF were unable to prepare properly for the Commission's visit as FIFA did not send preparatory information to SASF, in the same way that it did for FASA.⁴⁶ However, in directly addressing the commission's terms of reference SASF cited that it represented 46,000 players whereas FASA and its affiliates represented only 20,000.⁴⁷ SASF asked the commission to recall that FIFA had previously criticised the way FASA ran football in the Republic. The letter to which they referred followed the previous commission some seven years earlier. It stated that FASA did not comprise and control all clubs and players in South Africa, and that FASA did not have the standing of a National Federation required to govern and develop football in accordance with the structure of the population.⁴⁸

In response to SASF's plea for FIFA to take note of the facts that FASA promoted in order to remove the suspension upon the latter, FASA drew the Commission's attention to the political situation in the country:

The inability to solve the difficulties (between FASA and SASF) are twofold. Firstly, the Laws and established customs of the Union of South Africa relating to 'Apartheid' have not in any way been relaxed, but secondly [and] on the contrary, [have] become more strict.⁴⁹

This remarkable admission went almost unnoticed by Rous in particular. Instead, he chose to concentrate on FASA's invective against SASF whom FASA believed were 'not prepared to assist in devising a satisfactory method of working in close collaboration between all sections of the community solely in the interests of football'.⁵⁰ FASA also admitted that SASF had lobbied the former to implement the non-racial clauses in FASA's constitution, but FASA could not accede to such a demand because of the laws in the country. The FASA memorandum was tanta-

mount to an admission that the organisation and administration of football in South Africa was regulated by apartheid. However, FASA chose to try and use their close linkages with Rous to depoliticise the issue in a classic example of apartheid 'doublespeak':⁵¹

My association is certain that FIFA, which is entirely non-political, will allow the Federation to adopt our course which has as its chief aim a number of reasons but mainly because the political agitators who are now ruling the Federation behind the scenes are merely using soccer as a catspaw for their own selfish ends. I do not desire to enter into any political discussions, as I am aware that your body does not allow politics into any of its deliberations I repeat therefore that my association is not prepared to defy the laws of this country and I am certain that FIFA would not and could not order my Association to do so.⁵²

The report to FIFA recommended the reinstatement of FASA, which was confirmed at a meeting of the FIFA executive in Cairo in January 1963. However, the result was not unanimous. Rous informed Aleck Jaffe of FASA that the votes against South Africa's reinstatement were 'left wing', and for the first time these members demonstrated their solidarity with the African bloc.⁵³ The decision met with widespread opposition in Afro-Asian countries, and resulted in the reimposition of the suspension at the 1964 FIFA congress in Tokyo. In retaliation, the South African government imposed banning orders, including 12-hour-a-day house arrest, on George Singh of SASF.⁵⁴ This brief account of developments in the field of soccer reveals a pattern of behaviour which was repeated in other battles that moulded the nature and character of sports diplomacy. In most cases, the most important and senior officials of international bodies worked desperately to maintain the status quo and retain the all-white bodies as full members. The South African organisations were, therefore, very well placed to receive high level advice about ways of retaining membership, as well as support for their position.

It is possible that FASA's second suspension in 1964, only a year after having been reinstated, was due not so much to any material change in the situation within South Africa as to the fact that more Afro-Asian members were present at the FIFA congress in Tokyo where the Olympic Games were held. Because of the high cost of international travel, many members from African and Asian countries were often absent from meetings of international bodies. But on those occasions when the international federa-

tions held meetings simultaneously with major gatherings such as the Olympic Games, attendance was much improved. It was at these meetings that the majority of members were able to voice their opposition to apartheid sport, in order to counter manoeuvres and tricks used by friends of white South Africa to keep it in international sport. Rous failed to appreciate that the emergence of a footballing power bloc in Africa had at its heart the desire to isolate South Africa from football. Adopted by indigenous populations as a 'people's game', the sport became a popular forum for the denunciation of colonial rule.⁵⁵ In turn, this resulted in a clash between nations that had recently emerged from the umbrella of post-colonial rule and the paternalistic, Eurocentric approach of FIFA to an issue which was rapidly ensnaring football as a key component of sports diplomacy regarding South Africa.

Sports diplomacy and sports administrators

It has been argued elsewhere that one of the most intriguing questions regarding the practical utility of sports diplomacy was how effective it actually was in precipitating the downfall of apartheid structures. The increased diplomatic profile of sport during the 1950s and 1960s paralleled and reflected the increasing interest in domestic and international sport, and in particular the escalation of international competition and the associated media coverage of many of these events. Whilst it is possible to perceive the intention and impact of sports diplomacy and boycotts against South Africa as effecting direct policy change, it is perhaps more prudent to argue that sports diplomacy symbolised condemnation of apartheid, which manifested itself in attempts to ostracise South Africa from the international sporting community.⁵⁶ That is not to say that sport was central to the collapse of apartheid, but that sport served to provide a point of access to more central policy arenas and acted as a prototype for the use of more substantial political resources in the international campaign to eradicate apartheid.⁵⁷ This paper has shown that, in order for sport to become a viable diplomatic resource, sports administrators had to acknowledge that sport was to become a primary focus in helping to prevent apartheid becoming a permanent form of injustice. The use of sport as a tool of diplomacy inside and outside of governmental policy-making created an understanding of, and familiarity with, the implications of apartheid.

Three main conclusions can be drawn from the actions of Duncan and

Rous. First, the support for South Africa's role in maintaining the status quo within the international sporting community was designed to ensure power remained firmly with established (white) sporting nations. The period from 1958 to 1963 was characterised by the fragmentation of former colonies, and both Duncan and Rous failed to appreciate the implications of the growing diplomatic use of sport by nations looking to develop foreign policies in areas of international relations outside the realms of economic trade. In the Commonwealth and in football, many nations emerging from the colonial umbrella delicately sought access to a number of diplomatic channels, primarily through a contribution to sports-based protest. The problem for many nations was the lack of diplomatic leverage at global levels of policy making, whilst South Africa took little notice of protest organisations until the weight of pressure on sports administrators who retained notions of sport as apolitical by third world nations in particular, forced changes in policy. The issue of South Africa's involvement in the 1962 Commonwealth Games brought prominence to the changing politics of the organisation and forced sports administrators to bow to wider political pressures. In addition, Duncan seemed oblivious to the emergence of sport as a tool for cultivating unity in the rapidly expanding family of Commonwealth nations. Rous, too, demonstrated a lack of understanding as to how the collapse of colonialism would affect what he considered to be a European game. In his autobiography Rous lamented the lack of support from African nations when he lost the Presidency of FIFA to Joao Havelange.⁵⁸

Second, with reference to examining the origins of sports diplomacy, it can be seen that the political naivete of sports administrators demonstrated a lack of sensitivity to the politicisation of sport and the growth of the concept and realpolitik of sports diplomacy. Whilst it could also be argued that the actions of Rous and Duncan were representative of British politicians of the time, many of whom were overwhelmed by the pace of post-colonial development, both men were highly important sports administrators in an era of post-colonial fragmentation and consequently were asked to play roles that apolitical sports administrators had, up until this time, yet to encounter. Participation in the Commonwealth Games and membership of FIFA were two important forums through which newly formed nations could make diplomatic and political statements. Both men believed that their organisations could not, and should not, be used to force a government to change its internal sports policy. In doing so they failed

to appreciate the influence that newly-independent nations could exert on international sports organisations through bloc voting that opposed the Eurocentric approach to the organisation of the CGF and FIFA. Sugden and Tomlinson have made much of the inability of Rous to understand the location of football in the broader struggles for independence.⁵⁹ The parallels between Rous and Duncan are striking, and demonstrate that Eurocentric sports administrators involved with global sport were unable to grasp the increasing politicisation of sport, particularly with regard to South Africa. Whilst both men publicly pronounced their dislike of apartheid, they also maintained personal contact with white sports administrators in South Africa, old friends and allies. Furthermore, both chose to have a much smaller degree of involvement with non-racial sports administrators, with whom, because of apartheid legislation, they were not able to come into contact with on a regular basis.

Finally, in reflecting upon this paper, we must consider adopting a wider frame of reference for the study of sports diplomacy that examines the socio-cultural background to domestic and international decision-making processes. The early 1960s were an important period for three main reasons. First, although the IOC did not expel South Africa, the issue of apartheid became firmly lodged on the IOC agenda. Second, the emergence of domestic protest organisations with sporting origins, namely SASA, and later, SAN-ROC (South African Non-Racial Olympic Committee) as the focal point for international sporting protest encouraged protest by other countries and some international sports federations against sports apartheid. Third, the South African government was forced to take notice of the international community's mounting concern with and criticism of apartheid. The development of organisational protest, which became entrenched within anti-apartheid culture, forced domestic and international policy actors to publicly defend their policies. Furthermore, it is not sufficient to study sports diplomacy through an examination of the decisions of nation states. The reactions of sports administrators often provide a more sensitive understanding of how shifts in policy occur, and this paper demonstrates a need for further research into effects of actions by international sports administrators, particularly when considering the political history of sport.

Glossary

In South Africa the large number of organisations involved in sport has

been exceptional. A substantial number of acronyms are used throughout this paper. While the full name for each organisation is presented when first mentioned in the text, the glossary below provides a brief background to indicate which policy community the respective organisation represented. The glossary is presented in the following format: Acronym, full title of the organisation, comments.

References

Primary Sources

Letters held at the offices of the Commonwealth Games Federation, London.

Materials from the National Archives of the Department of Sport and Recreation, the Republic of South Africa, Pretoria, South Africa.

Materials from the Rous Papers, Sport Cultures Archive for Investigative Research (SCAIR), Sport and Leisure Cultures, Chelsea School, University of Brighton

Documented resource

International Boycott of Apartheid Sport, Paper prepared for the United Nations Unit on Apartheid in 1971. United Nations Unit on Apartheid, Notes and Documents, No. 16/71, April 1971

Newspapers

Daily News (South Africa)

Pretoria News

The Star (Johannesburg)

Sunday Times (Johannesburg)

Secondary sources

Bose, Mihir, *Sporting Colours: Sport and Politics in South Africa* (London: Robson, 1994)

Commonwealth Secretariat, *Communiqués of the Commonwealth Heads of Government Meetings* (London: Penguin, 1986)

Draper, Mary, *Sport and Race in South Africa* (Johannesburg: SAIRR, 1963)

- Guttman, Allen, *The Games Must Go On: Avery Brundage and the Olympic Movement* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1984)
- Harvey, Jean and Houle, Francois, Sport, World Economy, Global Culture and New Social Movements, *Sociology of Sport Journal*, 11 (1994), pp. 337-55
- Houlihan, Barrie, *Sport and International Politics* (Hemel Hempstead: Harvester Wheatsheaf, 1994)
- Houlihan, Barrie, Sport and the Commonwealth in: Collins, Michael (ed.). *Leisure in Industrial and Post-Industrial Societies* (Brighton: LSA, 1996), pp. 125-44
- Kanin, David, Superpower sport in Cold War and détente, in: Lowe, Benjamin; Kanin, David & Strenk, Andrew (eds). *Sport and International Relations* (Champaign, Ill.: Stipes, 1978), pp. 249-62
- Kanin, David, The Olympic boycott in diplomatic context, *Journal of Sport and Social Issues*, 4 (1), 1980, pp. 1-25
- Keech, Marc, At the centre of the web: the role of Sam Ramsamy in South Africa's readmission into international sport, *Culture, Sport and Society*, 3 (3), (2000), pp. 41-62
- Keech, Marc and Houlihan, Barrie, Sport and the end of Apartheid, *The Round Table*, 349 (1999), pp. 109-21
- Lapchick, Richard, *The Politics of Race and International Sport: The Case of South Africa* (Greenwich, Conn.: Westport Press, 1975)
- Killanin, Lord Michael, *My Olympic Years*, (London: Secker and Warburg, 1983)
- Mahjoub, Faouzi, The Long Struggle of the Executive Committee, in: *Confederation Africaine de Football, 1957-1997* (Cairo: CAF. 1997) pp. 121-2
- Nauright, John, *Sport, Cultures and Identities in South Africa* (Leicester: Leicester University Press, 1997)
- Nauright, John and Black, David, It's Rugby that really matters: New Zealand-South Africa rugby relations and the moves to isolate South Africa, 1956-1992, in Wilcox, Ralph C. (ed.), *Sport in the Global Village* (Morgantown, WV: Fitness Information Technology, 1994) pp. 165-83

Nauright, John and Black, David, Hitting them where it hurts: Springbok-All Black Rugby, masculine national identity and counter-hegemonic struggle, in Nauright, John & Chandler, Timothy (eds). *Making Men: Rugby and Masculine Identity* (London: Frank Cass, 1996) pp. 205-26

Peppard, Victor and Riordan, James, *Playing Politics: Soviet Sports Diplomacy to 1992* (Greenwich, Conn.: Westport Press, 1993)

Quick, Shane P. 'Black Knight Checks White King'; The conflict between Avery Brundage and the African nations over South African membership of the IOC, *Canadian Journal of the History of Sport*, 21 (2), (1990) pp 20-31.

Ramsamy, Sam, Apartheid, boycotts and the Games, in: Tomlinson, Alan and Whannel, Garry (eds). *Five Ring Circus: Money, Power and Politics at the Olympic Games* (London: Pluto Press, 1984) pp. 44-52

Ramsamy, Sam, Apartheid and Olympism: on the abolishment of institutionalised discrimination in international sport, in Landry, Fernand, Landry, Marc, and Yerles M. (eds). *Sport: The Third Millennium* (Quebec: Presses de l'Universite Laval, 1991) pp. 537-45

Rous, Stanley, *Football Worlds: A Lifetime in Sport* (London: Faber and Faber, 1978)

Sugden, John and Tomlinson, Alan, *FIFA and the Contest for World Football: who rules the Peoples' Game?* (London: Polity, 1998)

Sugden, John, Tomlinson, Alan and Darby, Paul, FIFA versus UEFA in the struggle for the control for world football, in: Brown, Adam (ed.). *Fanatics! Power, Identity and Fandom in Football*, (London: Routledge, 1996) pp. 11-31

Notes

1 Nauright, 1997, pp. 124-56.

2 Nauright and Black, 1994, pp. 165-75; Nauright and Black, 1996, pp. 207-9.

3 Peppard and Riordan, 1993, p. 2.

4 Peppard and Riordan, 1993, p. 6.

5 Houlihan, 1994, pp. 9-12.

6 See Kanin, 1980, pp. 4-19.

7 Kanin, 1978, pp. 255-7; Peppard and Riordan 1993, pp. 90-92.

8 Kanin, 1980, p. 23.

9 The status of the Anti-Apartheid movement as perhaps the most successful global social movement in sport was due to the combined efforts of internal and external protest organisations in lobbying a broad range of national and international organisations. Harvey and Houle concluded, 'the movement leaned on communication networks at intra- and supra-national levels that were independent of national structure. The movement aimed for a regrouping of individuals at a global level. The individuals in this movement shared an idea of the human condition based on race equality, in which one identified with "the other" regardless of national differences. This movement was very active at the international level, lobbying the IOC and the UN.' Harvey and Houle, 1994, p. 349.

10 Ramsamy, 1984, p. 45.

11 Draper, 1963, pp. 72-3.

12 Quick, 1990, pp. 20-31.

13 Brundage to Emery, 27 April 1958, quoted in Quick, 1990, p. 26.

14 'Anxiety About Future of South African Sport', *Pretoria News*, 5 June 1958.

15 Lapchick, 1975, p. 31.

16 Killanin, 1983, p.34; Ramsamy, 1984, p.45.

17 Guttmann, 1984, pp. 134-5.

18 Killanin, 1983, p.35.

19 Lapchick, 1975, pp. 34-5, 39-43 provides a detailed account.

20 Bose, 1994, p.54.

21 Houlihan, 1996, p.126.

22 Ramsamy, 1991, p. 540.

23 The Commonwealth Secretariat, 1986, p. 66.

24 The CGF library in London holds many cuttings and correspondence sent to Duncan by Emery over a period of years. The letters begin in 1956 and demonstrate the close relationship that existed. Emery frequently

refers to the progress of his youngest daughter whom he asks Duncan to receive on her trips to Europe.

25 Letter, Emery to Duncan, 16 June, 1961 CGF Library.

26 Letter, Emery to Duncan; 18 July 1961, CGF Library

27 'Sports Federation to Continue Campaign', *Sunday Times* (Johannesburg), 18 July 1961

28 Ira Emery to the Minister of Education, Arts and Science, 1 May 1959. Department of Sport and Recreation National Archives, Pretoria (hereafter DSR) 14/15/3/3.

29 Internal memorandum, Secretary of Sport and Recreation to the Minister of Education, 4 August 1959. DSR, 14/15/3/3.

30 Letter, Emery to Duncan, 31 August 1961. CGF Library.

31 Letter, Brutus to Duncan, 10 September 1961. CGF Library.

32 *The Star* (Johannesburg), 4 October 1961.

33 Letter, Emery to Duncan, 2 and 9 October 1961. CGF Library.

34 The Long Struggle of the Executive Committee, in F. Mahjoub (ed.). *Confederation Africaine de Football, 1957-1997*. (Cairo: CAF, 1997).

35 F. W. Fell, President of SAFA to FIFA. 23 April 1955. DSR, 14/15/3/3.

36 FIFA to SAFA and SASF, 29 June 1955. DSR 14/15/3/3

37 Editorial, 'As Big As a Man's Hand', *Daily News*, 14 May 1958.

38 'Soccer Chief Off On "Most Crucial Journey"', *The Star* (Johannesburg), 22 March 1958.

39 'European Giants May Tour South Africa', *The Star* (Johannesburg), 29 May 1958.

40 Brief memo, presented to the FIFA commission by SASF, January 1963, p.9. Rous Papers, SCAIR.

41 Registered Circular no. 13, Dr. H. Kaser, General Secretary of FIFA to National Associations Affiliated to FIFA, 31 October 1961. Rous Papers, SCAIR.

42 V.H. Grainger to Rous, 27 August 1962. Rous Papers, SCAIR.

- 43 Report of the FIFA Commission to South Africa, executive summary, January 1963. Rous Papers, SCAIR.
- 44 SASF to Dr. H. Kaser, Secretary of FIFA, 20 December 1962. Rous Papers, SCAIR.
- 45 *The Star* (Johannesburg), 18 January 1961.
- 46 Brief memo, presented to the FIFA commission by SASF, January 1963, p.4. Rous Papers, SCAIR.
- 47 Brief memo, presented to the FIFA commission by SASF, January 1963, p.4. Rous Papers, SCAIR.
- 48 FIFA to SASF and FASA, 29 May 1955. DSR 14/15/3/3.
- 49 Memorandum to FIFA by FASA, January 1963, p.1. Rous Papers, SCAIR.
- 50 Memorandum to FIFA by FASA, January 1963, p.1. Rous Papers, SCAIR.
- 51 The commitment of Sir Stanley Rous to keeping FASA as a full member of FIFA, despite its colour-bar, was also evident in the lengthy correspondence between him and the British Anti-Apartheid Movement, which called for the exclusion of the body from international football.
- 52 Memorandum to FIFA by FASA, January 1963, p.2. Rous Papers, SCAIR.
- 53 Rous to Jaffe, FASA, 1 February 1963. Rous Papers, SCAIR.
- 54 'International Boycott of Apartheid Sport', paper prepared for the United Nations Unit on Apartheid in 1971. United Nations Unit on Apartheid, Notes and Documents, No. 16/71, April 1971.
- 55 Sugden, Tomlinson and Darby, 1998, p.28.
- 56 Keech, 2000, p.44.
- 57 Keech and Houlihan, 1999, pp. 118-20
- 58 Rous, 1978, pp. 202-203; Sugden and Tomlinson, 1998, pp. 139-44
- 59 Sugden and Tomlinson, 1998, pp. 133-7.