

## JOURNAL ARTICLE REVIEWS

Ferenc Takacs, "Ethos and Olympism: The Ethic Principles of Olympism," *International Review for the Sociology of Sport*, Vol. 27, No. 3, 1992, 223-234. Reviewed by Douglas Brown.

Ferenc Takacs suggests that critical studies of the Modern Olympic Movement must acknowledge the puzzling and contradictory nature of its moral credos. This article investigates the Olympic ethos on the basis of Takacs' interpretation of Pierre de Coubertin's Olympic philosophy. According to Takacs, there are two "pillars of Olympism." He suggests that these philosophical pillars can be extracted from two slogans that are part of the rhetoric of modern Olympism: "Citius, Altius, Fortius," and "participation is the main thing." In his philosophical analysis, the author concludes that between these two Olympic credos, several serious moral contradictions are enunciated. Takacs suggests that the primary discrepancy becomes apparent upon extracting the fundamental values contained in the slogans "Citius, Altius, Fortius" and "participation is the main thing." The first slogan describes a value system whereby the competitive environment promoted by the Olympic Games is structured and rationalized upon the objective of attaining maximal athletic performances. In Takacs' interpretation, this value system is socially elitist and condones extreme types of athletic behavior, many of which are dangerous to the athlete's health. The espousal of democratic sport, or mass sport, in the slogan "participation is the main thing" connotes a completely different set of moral objectives for sport. To Takacs, this stands in irreconcilable contrast with the elitism of "Citius, Altius, Fortius." Ultimately, the author suggests that the contradictions in these two slogans, the basic moral pillars of modern Olympism, somehow reflect the ambiguous historical milieu out of which they emerged.

A curious structural aspect of this article is the loose comparison between the ethical content of the Modern Olympic Games with that of the ancient Olympics. This is a familiar--but precarious--methodology to use in the analysis of the Modern Olympic Movement. In the context of this article, however, the use of such a comparative methodology contributes very little to the defense of the author's primary thesis. Takacs explores, at some length, the philosophical nature of *kalokagathia*. One of his more enlightening conclusions about *kalokagathia* is its dual ethical and aesthetic content. Unfortunately, this theme is not really developed or relevant to his analysis of the philosophy of the Modern Olympic Games.

This article does not include footnotes or references and consequently lacks the scholarly presentation and authority necessary to support the author's argument. The use of English in this article is awkward and flawed and detracts significantly from the comprehensibility of Takacs' arguments. This criticism is directed at the editor of the journal, rather than at the author of the article. Despite these flaws, Takacs presents an analysis and argument that is extremely relevant to the study of the Modern Olympic Movement. Too frequently the philosophical proclamations of the

Modern Olympic Movement are accepted as timeless moral prescriptions rather than artifacts from the history of ideas. Takacs has scrutinized these slogans and demonstrated that eloquence, altruism and *bravura* in language usage can easily disguise serious contradictions in philosophical content.

---

David B. Kanin, "The Olympic Boycott in Diplomatic Context," **Journal of Sport and Social Issues**, Vol. 4, No. 1, Spring/Summer 1980, 1-24. Reviewed by Gordon MacDonald.

Kanin wrote this essay while working as a resource person for the Central Intelligence Agency in the United States. He wrote it after the 1980 boycott was announced, but before the Moscow Games took place. Kanin begins by offering background information on two countries - China and Israel - each of which would have provided diplomatic challenges for the Olympic hosts if there had been no boycott. The background information on China and Israel provides some detail on the delicate relations that existed between these countries and the Soviet Union in the late 1970s, and speculates on possible outcomes had these two countries not decided to join the boycott of the Games. Kanin also mentions West Berlin briefly and the Soviet attempt to separate its athletes from the West German team. He then has three sections that deal, respectively, with Moscow's treatment of Soviet dissidents, Afghanistan, and the United States' reaction to the invasion. Next Kanin provides a profile of support for the boycott in various areas of the world both before and after dissident Andrei Sakharov's internal exile. He finishes the article with a discussion of 'third world' reaction to the boycott, and attempts to put the entire affair into diplomatic perspective.

Soviet leaders laboured to remove the chance of Western journalists meeting with dissidents during the Games. Long before the Games were to begin, Kanin argues that the Soviets took steps to isolate these two groups. In the end, though, the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan became the central issue before the Games. It created a tense situation internationally and, for some states, the Olympic boycott became a politically peripheral, yet a public manner of chastising the Soviets. Kanin's discussion of the United States' move toward a boycott points to its political leaders' lack of understanding concerning the Olympic Movement and the IOC. It also highlights a degree of uncertainty and disorganization among leaders of all the involved groups, including the government, the USOC and the athletes. The Soviet Union, in fighting back, tried to undermine the U.S. position while simultaneously defending its own actions.

Kanin spends considerable time profiling boycott support in various regions of the world, both before and after Sakharov's exile on January 22, 1980. His primary focus is on East and West Europe, with specific references for some larger countries. The East European countries, while not happy with the Soviets' activities in Asia, went along with the Soviet line. The West European countries, though protesting the

Soviet invasion, were not happy about the prospect of a boycott. Great Britain was the only country in the early stages to offer support to the U.S., but Margaret Thatcher underestimated the independence of the British Olympic Association that supported participation. West German leaders were studiously vague about their preferences, at least until after the Sakharov affair. The French also were hesitant to commit to a boycott, leaving the decision to their NOC.

Sakharov's exile to Gorky changed the complexion of the boycott issue. West European governments became much more supportive of the idea. West German politicians began to exert pressure on their NOC leaders, eventually coercing them to accept the boycott position. French political opinion shifted in favour of a boycott, but the NOC decided to participate anyway. This situation was repeated in Italy. Other European countries hedged on the issue, waiting until it was clear whether broad support for a boycott would evolve. In the end, only a small number recommended that their NOCs boycott the Games. Finally, at the end of his paper, Kanin provides a general survey of the reaction of the third world nations to the boycott issue. Here, the decisions of the various nations were based on a number of different criteria depending on the country involved.

The article concludes with some comments on the connection between sport and politics and a criticism of the Olympic Games as a place to showcase world differences rather than to bridge them. In retrospect, prophetically, Kanin argued that the site of the 1984 Winter Games, Sarajevo, could become a political hotspot. However, he also thought that a Soviet boycott of the Los Angeles Games would be unlikely.

Evidently, Kanin wrote this brief to provide background information on the positions of many countries regarding the 1980 boycott. It contains no really unifying argument and is aimed at providing information only. There are only a few citations, all of which are from news agencies. Unfortunately, there are a surprising number of typographical errors present as well.

---

Richard K. Alaszkievicz and Thomas L. McPhail, "Olympic Television Rights," **International Review for the Sociology of Sport**, Vol. 21, No. 2-3, 1986, 211-228. Reviewed by Scott Martyn.

Since 1960, the rapid escalation of revenue generated from the sale of U.S. television rights for the Olympic Games, has led to the emergence of television revenue as a primary source of income for the Olympic Family. The purpose of this article is to "discuss the scope and impact of U.S. television revenue" on the Olympic Games. Alaszkievicz and McPhail accomplish this through an analysis comprised of four major sections. First, a brief historical examination of the evolution of Olympic television rights is undertaken. Second, the major factors leading to the "geometric expansion" of television rights is highlighted. Third, the

actions of the Olympic Family are examined to determine the degree of impact of U.S. network television rights payments on the Olympic Games. Finally, the future of Olympic television rights are discussed.

The authors' discussion begins with the identification of the Modern Olympic Games as the single-most popular global event held on a regular basis. Support for this argument is gleaned from statistical data compiled on television viewers during the Apollo 11 moonwalk in 1969 and the opening ceremonies of the 1984 Los Angeles Olympic Games. And yet, as the authors point out, NBC refused to preempt "The Tonight Show" for Olympic telecasts from Tokyo in 1964. In 1984, however, "The Merv Griffin Show," produced in Los Angeles, cancelled production during the Los Angeles Games because guests could not be booked.

The 1948 London Games marked the first sale of television rights with the BBC paying a meager 1500 pounds. The next sale of rights occurred with the 1956 Olympic Games in Melbourne, with only a limited number of U.S. independent networks. These Games are identified by Alaszkiwicz and McPhail as a key turning point in the IOC's official stance towards coverage of the Olympic Games on the basis of entertainment rather than news. Consequently, Rule 49 entered the Olympic Charter in 1959, a Rule that the authors suggest paved the way for high future rights payments. The escalation in the price of exclusive U.S. television rights since 1960 is identified by the authors as closely resembling that of a "geometric progression." Alaszkiwicz and McPhail attribute this upsurgeance to two primary factors. The first of which is the commercial and highly competitive nature of the three major U.S. television networks. The second factor is the relative ease with which Olympic programming has traditionally attracted advertisers willing to spend large sums of money for commercial time.

Alaszkiwicz and McPhail conclude by arguing that the historical geometric progression of exclusive U.S. television rights has come to an end. They attribute this to the "bottom-line" management style adopted by ABC since becoming part of Capital Cities Communications, and the present status of the U.S. television sports market. Little did the authors know that Rupert Murdoch and the FOX Network would enter the television rights bidding competition in the early 1990s, driving the rights fees for Olympic coverage to dizzying heights.

The authors have used a variety of sources, most of which are secondary. They have, however, conducted personal interviews with a number of individuals who are intimately involved with the issue of television rights.

---

John J. MacAloon, "The Ethnographic Imperative in Comparative Olympic Research," **Sociology of Sport Journal**, Vol. 9, No. 2, June, 1992, 104-130. Reviewed by Douglas Brown.

This article originates from a conference address that John J. MacAloon delivered to the Leisure Studies Association in Birmingham, England, in 1988. MacAloon had been asked to comment on the debate between British cultural studies and American cultural anthropology. Based on the content and tone of this article, MacAloon's speech must have had a provocative impact on the audience. His article offers a potent critique of contemporary sociological scholarship related to sport. British cultural studies (as well as cultural reproduction and hegemony theory) and the individuals who subscribe to these schools of research received the brunt of MacAloon's negative assessment. As is typical of MacAloon's writing, the reader is forced to work throughout the article rather than permitted to merely glean facts and opinions from it. The rather harsh and pointed nature of the criticism is typically MacAloonian. Ultimately, however, he establishes a more conciliatory, collegial, and constructive style of criticism as the article develops. The authority with which MacAloon argues reflects, I sense, his ardent enthusiasm and commitment to exploring the cultural systems that structure how we understand sporting experiences. This enthusiasm has taken him further into the epistemological critique of sociocultural sport studies than the majority of contemporary scholars. Although one might find the authoritative tone of his discourse caustic, it does, somehow, seem merited in particular instances. Near the end of his article MacAloon proposes a more collaborative solution for the international study of the Olympic Games. He concedes that "... equal recognition of scientific continuities and discontinuities (which merely reproduce national and international sociocultural differentiation) is the very precondition for the study of Olympic sport." Although this article was published in 1992 and originates from a speech delivered in 1988, MacAloon's assessment and synthesis of the differences in comparative sociology between several nationalities is still relevant in 1996. This article will be valuable and thought provoking for a wide variety of academics (beyond sociologists) who enjoy the struggle of studying international sport amidst the cynical, and more often than not chaotic theoretical discourses that have contoured contemporary sociocultural scholarship.

MacAloon's central argument is expressed in the following statement: "If the study of Olympic sport is entitled to any privilege, it is precisely and obviously with respect to comparative matters and the disciplining that the object provides against ethnocentrism and scientific imperialism masquerading as a general sociology." The purpose of MacAloon's article is reflected clearly in the title of his article. He argues that comparative sociological studies of international sport must incorporate an ethnographic methodology. He defines ethnography as "intensive, long-term, and face-to-face participant observation in natural settings and the systematic recording of

conception, discourses, relations, and behaviors of the sports actors, agencies, and communities selected for analysis.” He claims that “ethnographically based anthropology of international sport makes greater headway than neo-Marxist cultural studies approaches.” Neo-Marxist based scholarship--British cultural studies and Canadian sociology of sport specifically--with its emphasis on state and economic structures, does not offer the comparativists of international sport logical and coherent objects of comparison that represent or constitute the production of meaning. MacAloon’s critique reflects the ontologica/epistemological assumption that “sociological objects do not exist apart from the cultural and theoretical discourses that constitute them.” Thus, by espousing the use of ethnographically based anthropology, culture is accorded primary status in sociological discourse. To demonstrate that ethnographic research does not have to be limited to “microsociological contexts,” MacAloon describes how ethnography is “relevant to the study of state-level organizations, such as government sport agencies, and to the comparison of national political cultures and cultural politics.” To illustrate the diverse possibilities that this methodology offers, he describes a number of research projects. He explains that studying state security agencies like the CIA can help us understand how different countries use sport to suppress social and political discourse. He discusses how Olympic sport has factored into political party presidential campaign strategies in the United States. Olympic rituals like the torch relay are presented as another legitimate object for international comparative study. MacAloon also promotes collaborative ethnographic research.

The essence of MacAloon’s proposed ethnographically based comparative sociology is reflected in his statement that “cultural production today sees interconnection and differentiation as two sides of the same global process.” He explains that this is “accomplished through a set of transnational forms, none of them transcendental, innocent, or neutral in political history, but each of them more or less empty of substance, as pure forms in and of themselves, once caught up in a transnational world of global flows. That is to say, they become available for appropriation to different political, economic, and social purposes and projects that cannot be known in advance, even as they constitute interconnection in a world system.”

---

John Hargreaves, “Olympism and Nationalism: Some Preliminary Consideration,” **International Review for the Sociology of Sport**, Vol. 27, No. 2, 1992, 119-137. Reviewed by Gordon MacDonald.

**J**ohn Hargreaves begins his article by discussing the concepts of Olympism and nationalism, both of which, he claims, are not well defined in most discussions of the Olympic Movement. Hargreaves critiques both the view of Olympism that posits it as a normative theory, and the response that reduces it to an ideology. He also

mentions the argument that sport can act as a safety valve for people, and that it can possibly be used to lessen nationalism. In contrast, the Olympic Games seem to create the opposite effect, at least with regard to nationalism. Moving to an international relations model, Hargreaves sees the Olympics as a forum in which nations can play out their interests in a non-political forum. This approach, however, neglects the argument that the Olympic Movement is not passive and, in fact, exercises political power of its own while maintaining a significant level of autonomy in some areas.

A better approach, in Hargreaves' view, is to distinguish analytically between Olympism and nationalism, as well as between culture and politics. He provides basic working definitions for these terms and then moves into a discussion of the nature of nationalism that has undergone a resurgence in spite of the impact of globalization. Nationalism is also created with the concomitant growth of state forms and the attempts of sectors in societies to encourage identification with those forms. Of course, nations can exist without a formal state. For Hargreaves, then, we must maintain distinctions between nationalism as analytical construct, and nationalism as a 'true belief'.

In the second section of this essay, Hargreaves moves to a consideration of the link between Olympism and nationalism. Providing brief historical examples of the increasing centrality of the nation-state to the Olympics in its early years, he claims that Pierre de Coubertin, in the long term, probably underestimated the role of nationalism in the Games. While discussing some more powerful national symbols present at the Games, Hargreaves notes that there are also symbols surrounding the Olympics that are international or commercial in nature. However, he argues that the former is much stronger than the latter two.

Hargreaves contends that the mass media play a crucial role in maintaining and constructing nationalism at the Games. The media play an important role in constructing perceptions of the Games in another way too - television networks pay huge sums of money for broadcast rights, and in doing so, expect to be able to cover the events in a way that will guarantee maximum-size national audiences. Because of this connection between financing of the Games and nationalism, any attempt to 'denationalize' the Games would face much resistance.

The third section of Hargreaves' essay focuses on the role of the nation-state. He states that nations use the Games to enhance prestige, and that there has been 'exponential growth' in intervention by nation-states and 'associated manifestations of nationalism'. Examples of each follow in his discussion. In addition, nations use the Games for pursuing conflict, securing legitimacy or, for developing countries, creating an international presence. He also notes that groups may use the Games to promote calls for independence for their particular nation, or to point to social injustices. Finally, the Games may even be used in the struggle to unify nation-states.

The fourth and final section of the essay is a brief examination of the Barcelona Olympics in Spain. Given the history of the city of Barcelona and its role as the capital of the independent-minded Catalonia, conflicts over the Olympics were certain. Hargreaves gives a general overview of the key political players involved and the interests each were bringing to the Games. Because of the Catalonia connection, organizers designed the ceremonies to accommodate its own

self-interests, as well as those of greater Spain. In addition, national interests were heightened in Spain in 1992 because of the Seville World's fair and the 500th anniversary of Columbus' voyage to America.

Hargreaves wrote the article just prior to the Games and, so, does not offer full conclusions on all of the issues the Barcelona Olympics faced. Thus, the connection between the theoretical assumptions in the first sections of the paper are not as strongly linked to the Barcelona case as they might be. Depending largely on secondary sources, Hargreaves' article is fully referenced, including endnotes. As normal, for this journal, abstracts in several other languages are included.

---

Ian Jobling, "The Making of a Nation Through Sport: Australia and the Olympic Games from Athens to Berlin, 1896-1916," **Australian Journal of Politics and History**, Vol. 34, No. 2, 1988, 160-172. Reviewed by Scott Martyn.

Sport, between 1896 and 1916, experienced many developments which influenced its role and significance within western societies. Jobling states that Australia, unlike most other western societies during this period, struggled with its transition from a collection of self-governing colonies to a federation of states. Furthermore, Australia's affinity for sport was such that its involvement and attitudes resulted in the development of a "national identity" which conflicted with its loyalty to Great Britain and devotion to Empire. Jobling suggests that the extent of awareness of the significance of sport to the "making of a nation" and to the development of an Australian identity are factors worthy of consideration.

Jobling's argument begins with a discussion of Australia's planned involvement in two proposed international sport festivals: (1) J. Astley Cooper's proposed Pan-Britannic Festival, and (2) the proposed revival of the Olympic Games being considered by Baron Pierre de Coubertin. While both proposals were international in context, only Coubertin's revival was successful. Jobling attributes Coubertin's success to his active recruitment of international support for the Olympic Games. Cooper's Pan-Britannic idea, although receiving support from the Australian media, simply vanished "on the drawing board," so to speak.

Jobling contends that Australians would have shown little interest in Coubertin's successful revival had it not been for a lone Australian competitor at the 1896 Olympic Games in Athens. Edwin H. Flack's victories in the 800 and 1500 metre races, as well as his efforts in both singles and doubles tennis, and the race from Marathon to Athens, all resulted in daily press coverage of the Olympic Games in parts of Australia. Upon his return home, Flack was frequently interviewed and featured in Australian newspapers. Flack is identified by Jobling as a key personality in the development of Australia's national sporting identity.

Jobling indicates that although Coubertin and the International Olympic Committee were enthusiastic about the second Olympic Games in Paris, Australia's

only track representative wrote in a letter home that the games “were treated by most of the competitors as a huge joke.” Australia’s attitude towards, and involvement in, the third Olympic Games were negligible. Only a single representative actually competed. However Jobling states that by the 1908 Olympic Games, considerable evidence can be found indicating that the Olympic movement was taking root in Australia. A major reason for this increase was that two powerful antagonists, Great Britain and the United States, had developed a keen sporting rivalry; one which Jobling contends affected the relationship between Britain and her former colonies. By the end of the first decade of the twentieth century, Australia’s loyalty to the Empire had evolved away from one which centered around Great Britain towards one which strove for its own self-identity.

The bulk of Jobling’s sources are gleaned from Australian newspaper reports of the early editions of Olympic Games, bits of international newspaper coverage, and books written during or about the period under consideration.

---

Xavier Pujadas and Carles Santacana, “The Popular Olympic Games, Barcelona 1936: Olympians and Antifascists,” **International Review for Sociology of Sport**, Vol. 27, No. 2, 1992, 139-150. Reviewed by Douglas Brown.

**H**istorically, the Popular Olympic Games that were scheduled to take place in Barcelona in 1936 stand as one of the most significant challenges to the social and political essence of the Modern Olympic Movement. The Popular Olympic Games were conceptualized and organized as a cultural demonstration of resistance. The initiative to host this international sport festival was an overt rejection of the International Olympic Committee’s dominant role in the administration and social orientation of modern sport. This article provides a valuable analysis of the historical, social, political and cultural factors that explain the relevance of the Popular Olympic Games and how they developed from a mere concept into a fully realized international sporting event. The games were canceled on the very day they were scheduled to begin because the Spanish Civil War began in earnest the same day. Pujadas and Santacana claim that 6,000 athletes and 20,000 spectators from 23 different countries had gathered in Barcelona to celebrate the games. If these statistics are valid, the Popular Olympic Games are clearly an episode in the history of modern sport that must not be overlooked regardless of whether or not they took place.

Pujadas and Santacana have explored the diverse factors that were unique to the conceptualization and organization of these Games. They demonstrate that this event must be studied from two perspectives: 1) the history of international sport and the Modern Olympic Movement, and 2) the particular context of Catalonian sport during the 1920s and 1930s. The authors have structured their article into three sections. The first section provides a descriptive summary of the popular sports movement in

Catalonia. The second section examines the administrative and political history of the 1936 Popular Olympic Games. The third section describes the historical events that resulted in the games being canceled. The authors state succinctly in the introduction of the article that they sought to expand on previous narrow interpretations of these games and intended to provide a different and more complete analysis of this historical event. They have succeeded in this objective and have made a valuable contribution to the history of international sport and the Modern Olympic Movement. This history of the Popular Olympic Games of 1936 reveals a thorough use of primary sources, principally newspaper, archival documents, and personal interviews. The authors have substantiated their analysis with informative endnotes. This article is an abbreviated version of the authors' previously published article *L'Altre olimpiada*.

The article offers several significant contributions to the study of international sport. Pujadas and Santacana provide a vivid, but refined distinction between *popular* sport movements and *workers'* sport movements of the 1920s and 1930s. Furthermore, they demonstrate that popular sport, as a concept, held different meanings in different regions throughout Europe. In Catalonia, popular sport was more "similar to the Sokols of the Tyrs in Czechoslovakia than the 'red sport' of the Communist and Socialist Internationals." The Catalonian organizations that endorsed the Popular Olympic Games represented a range of social and political interests that included antifascist and ardent supporters of the workers' movement, among others. The Catalonian objective, however, was to avoid giving the impression that the games were simply an extension of the workers' movement. As a result of the organizers' desire to mediate between causes, the social and political orientation of the Popular Olympic Games scheduled for Barcelona remained ambiguous throughout their short and abrupt history. The authors of the article explain that the organizers were also concerned that their event might be interpreted as nothing more than a political boycott of the Berlin Olympic Games. Apparently, the organizers were determined to preserve Olympic values that they felt the German's had corrupted. This analysis addresses briefly an interesting, and frequently overlooked philosophical issue concerning the Modern Olympic Movement; that is, do Olympic values have a transcendental nature that extends the proprietorship of mere administrative structures? The enduring value of Pujadas and Santacana work is that it describes the complex and discursive political, social and cultural environment where international sport emerged in a variety of forms and for a variety of causes during the 1920s and 1930s.

---

Donald MacIntosh, Hart Cantelon, Lisa McDermott, "The IOC and South Africa: A Lesson in Transnational Relations," **International Review for the Sociology of Sport**, Vol. 28, No. 4, 1993, 373-395. Reviewed by Gordon MacDonald.

In this article, the authors concentrate on the IOC's dealings with South African sports authorities since the Second World War. They divide the article into three sections. The first two focus on the periods before and during South Africa's alienation and eventual exile from the IOC. The third examines South Africa's return to the Olympic Movement. A concept of the IOC as a non-governmental transnational organization informs the authors' analysis. Accordingly, they argue that the IOC behaves as a transnational organization throughout the episode.

Borrowing on S. Huntington's definition, the first section of the article is devoted to defining the concept of transnational organization. The authors contend that the IOC meets all the definition's major criteria. Importantly, they also note that transnational organizations need access to nations, rather than agreement among them. For the IOC this access allows it to spread its ideology of Olympism. While the authors believe that IOC members are committed to the goal of spreading this ideology of Olympism, the nature of the organization and its symbols make this process contradictory at times. Hence, the IOC simultaneously promotes both internationalism and nationalism. Nation-states have taken advantage of this situation and have used the Games to promote their own aims.

The second section of the essay focuses on the historical details surrounding the South Africa issue. The authors provide a brief sketch of the major events between the end of the Second World War and 1970 when the IOC finally expelled South Africa from the Olympic Movement. The main issue for the IOC was whether the South African NOC was following, or at least appearing to follow IOC rules concerning participation in the Games. Over the period examined, several groups were created to confront both the IOC and the South African NOC on the issue. Several of these groups were African in origin. Significantly, within the IOC, Soviet members took up the nonwhite South African cause just when South African members were defending the apartheid regime. The authors note that the IOC could function successfully, even with certain members holding widely divergent political opinions because of its focus on a narrow goal. In the end, pressure on the IOC from various quarters was too much to resist and it banned South Africa from participating in the 1964 and 1968 Olympic Games. It then expelled South Africa from the Olympic Movement in 1970.

The third section of the paper covers the period when South Africa was banned from participating in the Olympics. Even then, some nations retained sporting contacts with the country. The authors use the famous example of New Zealand's rugby tour of South Africa and the subsequent African boycott of the 1976 Olympics to show how the issue remained current. As a transnational organization with a

narrow focus, the IOC was ill-prepared to deal with the African boycott because they were protesting the actions of a sport not on the Olympic program.

The final section of the paper deals with South Africa's return to the Olympic Movement. The authors chronicle the changes made by the de Klerk government in South Africa and the IOC's reaction to them. They also argue that the IOC placed several requirements on the South Africans before readmittance could occur. However, in 1991, when the International Amateur Athletic Federation became the first international sport organization to reinstate South Africa, the IOC quickly followed suit. This move implied that the IOC's requirements were less important than being upstaged by the IAAF. An important point from the transnational perspective is the result that the IOC's decision had on the Commonwealth of nations that had levied sanctions against South Africa. The Commonwealth nations had to lift sport sanctions against South Africa if they wanted their athletes to be eligible to compete in Barcelona. This example, according to the authors, points to the ability of transnational organizations to have an impact on the behaviour of nation-states.

The paper concludes with a discussion of the nature of transnational organizations as shown by the IOC's experience with this issue. Transnational behaviour was present and influential even in the early stages of the conflict, when several organizations pressured the IOC from both sides of the issue. Tellingly, the IOC did not move rapidly to oust South Africa, and when it did, it was not by a large majority vote of its membership. This showed the conservatism of the organization and its slowness to embrace change. The authors argue that the opposing positions of IOC members points to the access transnational organizations need, rather than accord. IOC recognition of South Africa also sent a signal to other organizations to reassess their relations with that country. The authors conclude that this case shows the continuing growth of transnational organizations in international issues and their growing importance in relation to nation-states.

The authors have relied on a number of primary and secondary sources and, in the usual format for the **International Review**, it is abstracted in several other languages, though not, surprisingly, in French.

---

Bruce Kidd, "The Culture Wars of the Montreal Olympics," **International Review for the Sociology of Sport**, Vol. 27, No. 2, 1992, 151-164. Reviewed by Scott Martyn.

To this day, the Montreal Olympics are to many a symbolic representation of extravagant mismanagement and unfulfilled expectations. However, the purpose of Kidd's article is to argue "that the difficulties of the Montreal organizers must be understood in the context of a bitter clash of national egos and a deep-rooted debate about the purposes of sport, both of which served to divide the governments responsible for funding Canadian sport and undermine public confidence in the Games." Kidd reveals that Canadians have historically shown remarkable talent for

staging international and domestic multi-sport games. But the 1976 Olympics, while creating a brief moment of festive intercultural celebration, emerged as a troubling chapter in this “emerging” tradition.

From the onset, Montreal’s bid for the 1976 Summer Olympic Games was hampered by doubt and opposition. The Federal Government’s support for Vancouver’s simultaneous bid for the 1976 Winter Olympic Games and Quebec’s resurgent aspirations for autonomy increasingly divided French and English speaking Canadians. Kidd contends that the failure of these Games must be understood in the context of these emergent culture wars. Amidst this clash of nationalisms, Kidd identifies that a growing debate about sport emerged, resulting in the formulation of a White Paper which attempted to reconcile the aims of high performance sport with the social benefits of mass participation. It is because of this attempt to reconcile the aims of high performance sport and sport-for-all, that Kidd believes was reflected in the Government’s support for the Vancouver bid.

For Kidd, “the Montreal Olympics was a joyous 15 days of breath-taking performances and moving personal encounters.” The events themselves were “marvellously” successful, contributing significantly to the long term development of sport and fitness in Canada. However, the accomplishments achieved continue to be clouded by contending nationalisms. While federalists took solace in the many accomplishments of the Games, Kidd states they may have turned Quebec citizens away from pan-Canadian nationalism. On November 16th, 1976 Quebec voters elected the separatist Party Quebecois (PQ), a Party which has recently seen a resurgence of support. Kidd concludes by stating that the Montreal Games, although creating a brief moment of festive intercultural celebration, did not unblock the dominant cultural rigidities of the Canadian community. This conclusion can be said to ring true today.

Bruce Kidd has used an impressive array of sources in his research including, but not limited to, a number of government documents, newspaper articles, various secondary sources, and, finally, his own personal reminiscences of the Montreal Olympics.

---

George Matthews, “The Controversial Olympic Games of 1908 as Viewed by the *New York Times* and the *Times* of London,” **Journal of Sport History**, Vol. 7, No. 2, Summer 1980, 40-53.  
Reviewed by Scott Martyn.

**B**y the beginning of the twentieth century the “steam of industrialism,” which had provided England with the economic base to become one of the wealthiest nations on earth, was beginning to cool. The United States however, with its tremendous supply of barely tapped natural resources was beginning to rival and in some cases even surpass the economic achievements of Great Britain. Matthews states that this economic rivalry between the two countries was also manifested

within the social realm. Furthermore, sport competition between the United States and Great Britain was viewed, at least by the newspapers of the period, as a means of demonstrating the overall cultural superiority and as a tool for the promotion of nationalism within both countries.

Matthews argues that the Olympic Games of 1908, held in London, provided an international forum in which both countries sought to establish athletic supremacy and thereby demonstrate their "superior national vigor." The athletic competitions themselves resulted in numerous conflicts between the representatives of each nation. A review of the first five days of competition revealed that the United States had lodged four official protests. These included tirades against the failure of the British Olympic Committee to display the American Flag in the opening ceremonies, regulations for the pole vault competition, the English method of scoring to determine the Olympic victor, and a tug-of-war controversy concerning the footwear worn by the British team.

American bitterness and protests continued to mount throughout the remainder of the Games. James Sullivan, America's top Olympic official, filed a protest against the drawings for the 800 metre run which placed all the American runners in the same preliminary heat. The most controversial and memorable events, however, according to Matthews, were the 400 metre race and the marathon.

As a result of perceived interference by American runners against the lone British runner causing him to run wide during the last bend of the 400 metre final, British officials declared the race void and disqualified the American offender. The two other competitors, both American, refused to abide by the British ruling and as a protest would not compete in the scheduled re-run. As a consequence, the sole competitor in the re-run was the lone British athlete.

The last day of the Games witnessed the running of the most prestigious event of the Olympics, the marathon. Prior to the running of the marathon the Americans lodged a protest directed at Tom Longboat, a Canadian runner, who had been declared a professional by the Amateur Athletic Union of the United States. The British Olympic Council rebuffed the protest, stating that the country of nationality was the sole authority empowered to determine amateur status, and Canada declared Longboat to be an amateur. However, Matthews identifies the finish of the marathon as the hallmark controversy of the 1908 Olympics. Italy's Dorando Pietri entered the stadium first, albeit in a state of total exhaustion. He was unable to negotiate the final distance around the track. Surrounded by British officials supporting him as he alternately staggered and fell, he finally crossed the finish line, hypothetically winning the race. The second man to enter the stadium and cross the finish line was the American Johnny Hayes. Upon learning that Pietri had not been disqualified for receiving assistance, the American delegation lodged an official protest which finally resulted in the awarding of the victory to the American.

Following a review of the American and British viewpoints, as reported by the *New York Times* and *The Times* (London), respectively, Matthews argues that the number of protests and degree of dissatisfaction generated among the visiting nations, most notably the United States, was justified. However, the antagonistic attitude adopted by the Americans did little to reconcile the disputes which arose. The international confrontations in London during the Olympic Games produced dual

ramifications, according to Matthews. First, the hard feelings generated between the American and British representatives were hardly conducive to the promotion of Pierre de Coubertin's Olympic ideal of brotherhood and understanding among the nations of the world. On the other hand, confrontations between the two rival nations (America and England) produced world-wide press attention, further establishing them in the global psyche. Most importantly, perhaps, following the "tumultuous discord" generated at the Olympic Games of 1908, regulations were enacted that altered the responsibility for the management of the athletic events. Matthews concludes that the Games served as a vehicle for change and provided the impetus to restore a sense of dignity and credibility to the Olympic Movement.