

RACE, POLITICS, AND SPORT*

COLIN TATZ

MACQUARIE UNIVERSITY

1. INTRODUCTION

In 1972 my New England inaugural lecture compared race politics in Canada, South Africa, Australia, and New Zealand. It was complex task, but safe. Experience over two decades made it relatively easy to speculate about or even pontificate on race relations in those four once-upon-a-time Dominions.¹ But this is very different essay. The topic is new, unsure, uncertain, with no theoretical underpinnings as yet and with only a slight idea of how to connect the unhappy trinity of race, politics, and sport. At best, this can be only a sketch of things to come.

The mere pairing of politics and sport, or of race and sport, is less difficult. There is now a legitimate subdiscipline of politics and sport, respectable even at conservative Olympic symposia.² The Nazi Olympics in 1936; the riots, injuries, and deaths in Mexico's Olympic City in 1968; the killings in Munich in 1972; the 30-nation boycott of Montreal in 1976; the 61-nation stay-away from Moscow in 1980: all attest to the inseparability of politics and sport. The world has finally come to see that sport, and the Olympic movement in particular, is a vehicle for social and political causes that transcend sport itself. (Perhaps Olympic officials will come to see that the very structure of their Games emphasizes nationalism, not individualism.)

There is a semblance of a literature on racism and sport, albeit heavily American and South African based. Sport Bibliography - the eight-volume Canadian Humanities and Social Sciences compilation - lists only 49 race-related items to 1983. Of these, 43 are American-centred, two concern Olympism, one relates to the United Kingdom, one to Canada and two to South Africa. It could be a bad bibliography, but I don't think so.

* Revised version of Professorial Inaugural Lecture, Macquarie University, 21 October, 1983.

There are perhaps a dozen books on race, politics, and sport. Among them are important case studies: Stewart Harris' *Political Football*³ on the 1971 Springbok tour here; Derek Humphry's *The Cricket Conspiracy*⁴ on the "stop-the-seventy-cricket-tour" campaign in-Britain; and Richard Thompson's *Retreat from Apartheid*⁵ on New Zealand's sporting contacts with South Africa. More theoretical material is to be found in Richard Mandell's *The Nazi Olympics*;⁶ Richard Espy's *The Politics of the Olympic Games*;⁷ Richard Lapchick's *The Politics of Race and International Sport*⁸ (essentially a South African study); Archer and Bouillon's *The South African Game: Sport and Racism*;⁹ Ernest Cashmore's *Black Sportsmen*,¹⁰ about Britain; and Harry Edwards' famous work on American sport, *The Revolt of the Black Athlete*.¹¹ To which we can add a half-dozen book chapters on American racism by such writers as G.H. Sage, B.C. McPherson, W.M. Leonard, Roscoe Brown, and Harry Edwards.¹²

Why this paucity of material? Or rather, the question is why is sports culture generally so intellectually empty? Writing in Britain, Garry Whannel¹³ says sport is a taken-for-granted activity: "You don't need to talk or write about it. You just do it". Jean-Marie Brohm,¹⁴ the French socialist theoretician, argues that while sport is now a central political issue in the social conflict of our time, nevertheless "sport constitutes a *huge blind spot* for social consciousness - including intellectuals?

One of the few disciplines to show interest is sociology. But it has, in effect, inhibited the study of race, politics, and sport because it persists in relegating racism and race relations either to social psychology or to a relatively minor subset of social stratification. In that vein, sociologist Eric Dunning¹⁵ can make the underwhelming statement that "racial inequalities are a special type of class inequality which is growing in importance in the modern world". And from this stratification approach all else derives: social class, social change, social mobility, social deviance. It is both dehumanizing and distorting to analyse such events as the 1981 Springbok tour to New Zealand or the defiance of the black American athletes in Mexico within these narrow and constricting frameworks. The search for respectability as a social science, let alone that mythical thing called real science, has led

most sports sociologists to avoid the political, the racial, the emotional, the homicidal and, of course, the beautiful in sport.

Brohm's intellectual blind spot idea is nicely demonstrated here. At the Australian National University 22 years ago, Ian Turner and I were considered "sports poofers" - queer for sport - and admonished to forego such trivia if we sought academic careers. Having gained respectability through other interests, he and I began to write sport in the 1970s. There is now a delicate flicker of credibility. There have been four History of Sporting Traditions conferences since 1977, venues for younger academics to display their research and ideas. The consequent birth of this journal is significant; there is now a place for those interested in the politics, history, law, philosophy, and economics of sport, for those concerned with all that is embraced in the term *sporting traditions*. An earlier emphasis of this group was on history; deliberately and rightly so because that rubric prevented the proliferation of and suffocation by a *sociologie du sport*, in the European and American senses. But history is too narrow a framework for what constitutes *sports culture*, as opposed to that other legitimate but overemphasized activity in Australia: *sports physics*.

2. SOME DEFINITIONS

As always, the terms need defining. Social science offers some tortuous and turgid definitions of prejudice and racism. My choice has always been the wording of St. Thomas Aquinas: that prejudice is thinking ill of others without sufficient warrant. If thinking such thoughts is prejudice, then acting on those beliefs is racism. Throughout human history men have set themselves apart from others, making distinctions between "them" and "us" on the basis of real or imagined differences. And in the name of invidious racial or ethnic or cultural or religious comparisons they have maimed, injured, and killed - and still do - to prove the point.

My central concern is with institutional or organizational racism, that is, where governments, bureaucracies, corporations, and associations rationalize and justify both a philosophy and a practice that discriminates against a particular group. I am not

concerned here with red-necked remarks, social bigotry, or even the exclusion of Aborigines from some pubs or Jews from some clubs. Indeed, infinitely worse things have befallen these two groups at the hands of institutional racism than a knockback for a beer or a game of golf.

By sport is meant modern, organized, competitive sport, that which is either professional or national or in some way chauvinistic. The activities of play and leisure, of jogging, splashing in the pool, and social tennis are omitted here. As for politics, professor or no professor, I refuse to even try a definition of that third element in the trinity. However, it is plain that traditional political science is inadequate in this context; it is essential to incorporate the ideas, concepts, and values implicit and explicit in black politics and, in some instances, in women's politics.

3. ILLUSIONS, QUESTIONS, AND CASE STUDIES

(i) MUNICH

There is, as Brohm says, an ideological mystification of sport, a premise that the magic of competition transcends and overmasters the blunting and blighting of human lives in society proper, in that real world outside the stadium. Like the proverbial stage performance, the sporting show must go on - in order to suspend reality and the normality of misery. Gala festivals like Munich are meant to erase political reality from people's minds, substituting the fiction of peace and the illusion of a truce,¹⁶ albeit in mid-Vietnam, or Angola, Ireland, Bangladesh, or the Middle East. But Munich blew it apart, even if only for one day of excruciating uncertainty and for one day of mourning.

The Black September raid on the Israelis in the village was an avowed piece of race politics in its choice of victims. The choice of venue was meant to be something more than killing Jews in Germany, at the very Games that were meant to be an expiation of the Nazi's version in 1936. It was killing them in Olympia, thus demonstrating that real life for the oppressed cannot be suspended by the myths and mysticism of Olympism. They unleashed upon them-

selves the venom of anti-Arab and anti-Palestinian racism, of becoming pariahs less for killing Jews than for killing athletes in *that* place and in *that* fortnight when all men become civilized and all agree to be brothers and sisters in colour, race, ethnicity, and religion.

Chris Brasher, a 1956 British gold medallist, said that race politics at Munich signalled the end of the Olympic movement. Perhaps the best-penned of reasons for this view comes from an American athlete, Kenny Moore,¹⁷ on hearing of the massacre:

I went back to my room and wept. I experienced level after level of grief: for my own event, the marathon, those years of preparation now useless; for the dead and doomed Israelis; for the violated sanctuary of the Games. In Mexico, and here, the village has been a refuge, admittedly imperfect, for my larger, seedier world in which governments refuse to adhere to any human code. For two weeks every four years we direct our fanaticism into the essentially absurd activity of running, swimming and being beautiful on the balance beam. Yet even in the rage of competition we keep from hurting each other, and thereby demonstrate the meaning of civilization. I shook and cried as that illusion was shattered.

Amid the obscenity, Avery Brundage - chairman of the International Olympic Committee (IOC) - persisted with the illusion in his famous, or infamous, "the Games must go on" speech.¹⁸ That master sports writer, Red Smith, filed this perspective to the *New York Times*:¹⁹

This time surely, some thought, they would cover the sandbox and put the blocks aside. But no. "The Games must go on", said Avery Brundage, high priest of the playground, and 80,000 listeners burst into applause. The occasion was yesterday's memorial service for 11 members of Israel's Olympic delegation murdered by Palestinian terrorists. It was more like a pep rally.

Brundage claimed the Olympics had been subjected to "two savage attacks? "We lost the Rhodesian battle against naked political pressure...". This was a reference to the vote (36 to 31) which four days before the Games decided to exclude Ian Smith's illegal Rhodesia. Yet, wrote Red Smith, here was Brundage equating that African boycott with "the cold-blooded guerrilla operation that wiped out 17 lives".

(ii) BLACK BOXERS, WHITE HOPES

Another major sporting precept in similar vein may prove to be illusion. British sports writer Ron Pickering says that there is indeed a universal sporting ethos: that "sport is based on the ethos of play, of competition being fair and equal for all...of opportunities having to be fair and equal".²⁰ Three questions arise. Firstly, in racist societies why should sport be fair and equal when all else in life isn't? Secondly, is sport exempted from the prevailing political and civic cultures of those societies because of some special ideology or mystique? And thirdly, if sport is exempted, how real is equality of competition, of opportunity and facility?

Logic suggests that where racism occurs in political, legal, social, and economic life so it will occur in the sporting sphere. The United States offers both rich and wretched evidence, especially in boxing, baseball, football, and athletics.

The American Bill of Rights was intended to end the institution of slavery and the marginality of people who were black; to provide a chance for life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness in that American Dream. Reality was very different even before the Supreme Court ruled in 1896 that "separate but equal" was a valid interpretation of the social justice sought in the constitution.

There was indeed separation in all things, but never equality. In boxing the twain of George Godfrey, the first black heavyweight champion, and John L. Sullivan, the first white champion of that division, did not and could not meet. The "Black Prince of the Ring", West Indian Peter Jackson, succeeded Godfrey. Sullivan's refusal to fight a black man left Jackson no choice but to work in England and Australia. He was popular here because he "knew his place"; the public erected a monument above his grave in Toowong cemetery because he was, said the *Brisbane Courier*, "modest".

In 1906 black Jack Johnson - literate in five languages, musical, well-read and a protagonist of black civil rights - challenged the champion, Canadian Tommy Burns, catching up with him only out of Burns' priority prejudice for money on (of all dates) Boxing Day 1908, in this fair Sydney town.

We have an excellent account of Australian reaction to Johnson from Richard Broome.²¹ The fight formed "a landmark in relations between black and white" in this country. Unlike Jackson, Johnson was considered an upstart, uppity, flash, and worse, a marrier of white women: three say some, four say others. The build-up was replete with a racist vision of the contest. "This is the first time in history", the promoter announced, "that champion representatives of the white and black races have met for racial and individual supremacy".²² One reporter wrote: "citizens who have never prayed before are supplicating Providence to give the white man a strong right arm with which to belt the coon into oblivion? The image, writes Broome, was of beauty and the beast, of civilization versus animalism. An *Australian Star* cartoon depicted coloured and white races watching the fight in progress, captioned: "A waiting world. Race war cloud!" Letters to the papers expressed fears about the inevitability of race war, of the Anglo-Saxon race at peril from the yellow and the coloured. Norman Lindsay's fight poster symbolized the towering black over the courageous white, the populous coloured races versus the numerically smaller white races.

The pundits abroad foresaw the inevitable outcome. Only Australians plumped solidly for Burns. Johnson, probably the best heavyweight of all time, baited and brutalized Burns before the police superintendent stopped it in the fourteenth.

Johnson said he didn't expect sympathy here. "I am a descendent of Ham: I must bear your reproaches because I beat a white man". With a final twist of the knife, says Broome, he added that he was unperturbed because he could always find solace in his favourite books - *Paradise Lost*, *The Pilgrim's Progress* and *Titus Andronicus*. Australian newspapers, writes Peter Corris,²³ found solace in printing "nigger" and "coon" jokes and cartoons.

Johnson's championship gave rise to one of the ugliest episodes in American sport: the concept of the *White Hope*. Since whites couldn't beat him, a separate championship - with the title *White Hope*, or *Great White Hope* - was devised. Jim Jeffries, champion till 1905, was induced to come out of retirement in 1910 to take on the hated nigger. He was duly butchered by Johnson, who protracted the fight to punish the racist Jeffries. Gunboat Smith,

White Hope champion for six months in 1914, said in 1973 that although Jeffries "was all washed up", if the fight had taken place in San Francisco and not Nevada "it was in the bag for Jeffries to win": "It was common gossip. They wouldn't stand for a nigger to beat a white man in California?"²⁴

Racism in boxing continued even though blacks were seen as necessary gladiators to entertain white spectators. Henry Armstrong, Sugar Ray Robinson, Archie Moore, and even the legendary Joe Louis had immense difficulties gaining title bouts. For some seven years Sugar Ray was called "uncrowned welterweight champion of the world" (he sent me his picture with that caption when I was a kid). Moore waited 12 years to fight for the light-heavyweight title. Joe Louis had lost to the German Max Schmeling in 1936. The Nazis, humiliated by black American successes at the Olympics, promoted Schmeling as the apostle of Aryan purity whom destiny had ordained superior to the degenerate black. In 1938, this time as champion, Louis fought him again, delivering 41 punches to none in the 124 seconds that the match lasted. Said Louis: "This was more than just a fight. Country against country. At that time the Jews were taking an awful beating in Europe?"²⁵

The *Universal Jewish Encyclopaedia* credits Daniel Mendoza, an 18th century bareknuckle heavyweight champion, as being a "potent psychological influence in the liberation of the Jews of England some years later"²⁶ Speaking at a Zionist congress in 1901, the German scientist Max Nordau called for the development of "muscular Judaism? The Encyclopaedia goes on to say that Jewish athleticism in America this century helped reduce notions of racial difference. I am not so sure. The Jews took an ugly kind of beating from the anti-Semitism rampant in the United States between the two wars. Dozens of Jewish fighters came to prominence, many as world champions: Abe Goldstein, Mushy Callahan, Charley Phil Rosenberg, Max Baer, Maxie Rosenbloom, Barney Ross, Benny Leonard, Louis Kid Kaplan, and many others. In 1928 the rank order of the number of prominent boxers by ethnic grouping showed Jewish boxers first; by 1936 they were third.²⁷ They were fighting against poverty, the Depression, the alienation of the ghetto, and for social mobility rather than acting as agents of change in race relations. Jackie Fields (née Jacob Finkelstein) was

world welterweight champion in 1929-1930 and again in 1932-1933. He said it for all of them in one pithy, ungrammatical sentence: "Every town that I went to I started trouble account of the Jew situation".²⁸

Louis was followed as champion by Ezzard Charles, Jersey Joe Walcott, and Floyd Patterson, with white Marciano and Johansson. in between. Then came black Liston, Ali, Ellis, Frazier, Foreman, Spinks, the present Holmes, and a poor quality white hope called Cooney - erected and demolished in recent times (assuming we are prepared to omit *Rocky I*, *Rocky II* and *Rocky III* from the list). The black discrimination resumed with Ali. His story is well known. Black, he became a Muslim and a disciple of Malcolm X. He added to these offences by refusing induction into the army. He said: "I ain't got no quarrels with them Vietcong. No Vietcong ever called me nigger!"²⁹ His fights and licences were cancelled and in 1967 he was sentenced to imprisonment and his titles stripped from him. By 1965 he had indicated his Vietnam stance; in that year he was to fight Patterson. Backed morally by the Establishment (in the shape of Sinatra) to take the title from the "traitorous" American, Patterson thus became the first black white hope in history. Ali, bad poetry and all, was adamant:

Clean out my cell
and take my tail
on the trail
for the jail
without bail
because its better in jail
watchin' television fed
than in Vietnam somewhere dead.

Ali didn't politicize boxing. Rather, he used that white-perceived symbol of strength and superiority, the world heavyweight championship, to draw attention to black oppression and to highlight the most abysmal and dismal war engagement in America's history. In 1970 the Supreme Court was unanimous in setting aside his conviction.

(iii) BLACK BASEBALL

Baseball is America's national game - and for long probably its most racist sport.³⁰ The first black professional played in

1872 and the Walker brothers played in a major league in 1883. Moses Fleetwood (Fleet) Walker and George Stovey, known as the "Mulatto Battery", quit when a team called, appropriately, the (Chicago) White Stockings refused to play against them. The colour line was drawn then. Barred from organized baseball, blacks formed their own teams and to get games had to resort to such team titles as the Cuban Giants and to speak a gibberish on field that purported to be Spanish. The colour bar held, despite ruses such as Baltimore, at the turn of the century, signing on a well-known black as an Indian named Tokohoma. Unfortunately for him, in a Chicago game the jubilant black fans had packed the stands waving banners worded: "Our boy, Charlie Grant". Black careers, wrote baseball historian Harold Seymour,³¹ "were blemished by racial prejudice, often of the most virulent kind" The paradox was that as the Civil War receded, so Jim Crowism became more widespread and more pronounced. And it took until 1946 for a black man to be signed to play organized baseball with whites once more. In that year Jackie Robinson played for Montreal and in 1947 he joined and helped the Brooklyn Dodgers to a National League flag.

It is surprising that the colour bar was unchallenged and unbroken for so long.³² It was only in 1943 that Branch Rickey, head of the Dodgers, began scouting for black talent - at least seven if not fifteen years after black athletic prowess had shown how good it was. By then the political scene was changing. In that year there were race riots in New York, Detroit and in Beaumont, Texas. As blacks died in battle they began to ask: why no equality on the playing field? The new baseball commissioner said: "If a black boy can make it on Okinawa or Guadalcanal, hell, he can make it in baseball? An End-to-Jim-Crow-in-Baseball committee was established in New York City in 1945 and thousands petitioned for baseball integration. Baseball officials said they were worried about inter-racial romances between white women fans and the black players - a fear unabated by time since.

Robinson was carefully selected as the breaker of the colour bar; he had unblemished character and a college education. He took a great deal of abuse and was often described as the loneliest man in sport. One writer said Robinson "had to be as honest as Jesus, as clean as laundered white-on-white, as emotionless as the

Sphinx... merely to get the chance to play the sport which had, before him, boasted of all sorts of people of foreign extraction, rowdies, drunkards, temper tantrum throwers and wastrels".

Having made it, Robinson talked only of race and black rights. He became the key figure in the black rights struggle, making perhaps two mistakes *en route*. One was his criticism of Paul Robeson for saying blacks shouldn't fight in a war against Russia, something he regretted later. The other was to endorse Nixon for President in 1960 because John Kennedy had told him, very coldly: "I don't know much about the colored people because I come from New England".

(iv) THE MYTH OF EQUALITY

Robinson represents a shift from passive acceptance of racism to political use of athletic prestige in pursuit of black rights. Unhappily, he also represents the myth that he not only broke the colour bar but began integration with such a vengeance that blacks now dominate the major spectator sports.

The research literature tells us that black sporting predominance is startling. By 1975 blacks comprised more than 60 per cent of all professional basketballers; more than 42 per cent of pro footballers; 21 per cent of major league baseballers; and at least 25 per cent of US track and field teams (the percentage at Munich).³³ The statistical picture would have us believe that sport is not a microcosm of American society but an oasis free of racial problems, with equality rampant. Since winning is everything, the colour of players doesn't matter and black over-representation and performance is indeed proof positive.

The years of truth were the late sixties. In 1968 Jack Olsen wrote a five-part series for *Sports Illustrated* on the treatment of black sportspeople.³⁴ His basketball essay was shock enough. He showed how losing college teams imported blacks, enrolled them in Mickey Mouse courses that didn't count as credits for majors, refused them social privileges, banned them from picking up under-the-table money, forbade wives joining husbands, prohibited players from dating white or Mexican girls, and discarded them - without

course credits or degrees - at the end of their utility.

Social scientists were caught off-guard by the ensuing turmoils from this and other case studies. Said Harry Edwards: "They usually assigned sports to the toy department of human affairs, deeming it unworthy of logical, professional inquiry".³⁵ Enquiries did begin and a start made on dismantling the myths surrounding sports equality. Much of it was formal, sociological, neat; but it did document, amid the tables and *chi square* correlations, what blacks in sport had always known. For example, Loy and McElvogue,³⁶ using some sophisticated theories of centrality, of location and interaction in a network, showed that in baseball and football very few blacks occupied central positions: if you like, the "brain positions" of catcher or pitcher or quarterback or captain. They played in the corners; by analogy, they would be lucky to bowl six overs in a match, or they'd all bat at number 11, or field on the long-on boundary. Questioned on this by a researcher, one National Football League cornerback had this derisive reply: "Yassuh, white man boss, we ain't got the brains to play center 'cause we can't count, but we can follow that flanker's ass all the way down the field, yuck, yuck, yuck". Another racist strategem is "stacking", that is, making blacks compete for the same field positions in order to "keep the racial balance of the team".

Green, McMillan and Gunnings³⁷ - three black administrators in the Big Ten universities - concluded their study thus: "The patterns of racial discrimination, both overt and covert, institutional and individual, found in the larger society are reflected in and perpetuated by athletics in the United States".

Some research tries to focus on whether there are race-linked or genetic characteristics to explain black superiority in some sports, whether the factors are racially cultural or just plain cultural, or whether the answers lie in the social structure of both society and of sport.³⁸ I won't repeat the arguments of writers like Harry Edwards, Jack Olsen, and Martin Kane here. I share Edwards' rejection of the biological determinism mythology. My view is that blacks excel where and when they are hungry and needy; when they have earlier role and demonstration models, like Louis, Robinson, Wilt Chamberlain, and O.J. Simpson; and when they have

access to a particular sport and its facilities. Two writers, with an earnestness and excitement becoming of Archimedes, have now discovered this grand thesis: "Few blacks are competitive skiers for the obvious reason that most blacks live far removed from snow and mountains and because skiing is very expensive".³⁹

The Big Ten administrators state that only seven per cent of black students with sporting talent expect to get a degree. This is what Roscoe Brown scathingly calls the "Jock Trap", the system by which the athletes are left without an education or a job when the college has finished with their skills.⁴¹ To make All-American is laudable, he says, but for the black "it does not insure success in life". It is the degree and the job that matters. All this is now part of the revolt in black sport, as summarized succinctly by James Mitchener⁴² (he of *Hawaii*). Black salvation through sport is an enervating myth. Obsession with sport is destructive of black youth. The danger starts in junior school and ends after the college athletic scholarship because the statistical probability of landing a paying job in professional sport is bleak. The publicized salaries are illusory or even fake and at the career end blacks face more unusual difficulties than whites. Even the successful athlete can be a destructive force because he sets role models for kids who cannot emulate them. Finally, sports are the opiate of the black masses and need more realistic evaluation.

(v) BRUNDAGE AND THE MEXICO OLYMPICS

In a sense that evaluation came from Harry Edwards, a black sociology professor at San Jose College, in November 1967. In forming the black American Olympic boycott committee (later the Olympic Committee for Human Rights), he said:⁴³

Is it not time for black people to stand up as men and women and refuse to be utilized as performing animals for a little extra dog food? Would not an excellent beginning point be the 1968 Olympic Games?

Blacks, he argued, were being asked to perform abroad to bring international acclaim to a nation that spurned them at home, "a system of athletic slavery".

Martin Luther King and Louis Lomax joined this movement. It drew up six demands that illustrate the race, politics, and sport connection:⁴⁴

1. Avery Brundage resign as head of the International Olympic Committee (IOC) because he was anti-Semitic and anti-black.
2. The New York Athletic Club cease refusing black and Jewish members.
3. Ali be reinstated as world heavyweight champion.
4. The US Olympic Committee appoint one more black as track coach.
5. A black be appointed to that national committee.
6. The United States cease competing with South Africa and Rhodesia.

In typical fashion Brundage twisted the facts (as we will see later) to make him appear *the* Jewish benefactor in 1936 Berlin. But his final comment was to be the trigger for what happened in Mexico. He said: "If the American Negro athletes boycott the Olympic Games, they won't be missed". The next day he told colleagues that "it made them furious when I told them we would not miss them". Brundage, of course, was the man who tried to bring South Africa back into the 1968 Olympics following expulsion in 1964 for breaking the Olympic charter on discrimination. It took the threatened boycott of 40 nations to prevent Brundage re-admitting the Republic. That decision was also taken against the background of King's assassination, Enoch Powell's strident racist speeches in England, the sacking by blacks of Brundage's hotel in Chicago (while he was in it), and the signals of violence to come from Mexico City.

The black athletes' boycott did not materialize. Edwards called it off when only 50 per cent of those selected supported the action and he chose not to divide the participants. But at Mexico the men's 200m. sprint was to become the major political point in that and subsequent Games. Winner Tommy Smith and bronze medallist John Carlos, instead of standing to attention for the "Star Spangled Banner" on the victory dais, turned in a circle to the stadium and gave the raised fist salute of the Black Power movement. Brundage had them shipped home but they won their political point: *that* action became part of black sporting legend and a focal point for

black athletes both in the United States and elsewhere. Smith explained: ⁴⁵

I wore a black right-hand glove and Carlos wore the left-hand glove of the same pair. My raised right hand stood for the power in black America. Carlos' left hand stood for the unity of black America. Together, they formed an arc of unity and power. The black scarf around my neck stood for black pride. The black socks with no shoes stood for black poverty in racist America. The totality of our effort was the regaining of black dignity.

Amid worldwide publicity several items went unreported: the truth about Brundage's racism, the origins of and background to the Smith-Carlos behaviour, and - important in its way - that the man who finished second to Smith, the Australian Peter Norman, wore the badge of the Olympic Committee for Human Rights throughout the ceremony.

(vi) BRUNDAGE AND THE NAZI OLYMPICS

Ostensibly the last of the world's noble and generous ideals, the Olympic one is an illusion. Pierre de Coubertin's grand phrasing was that the important thing is not to win but to take part, that "the essential thing is not to have conquered but to have fought well". But the Olympic motto is not participation. It is *Citius, Altius, Fortius*, or "faster, higher, stronger", not between individuals but between nations in combat. The good Baron founded the modern Games for two reasons: firstly, to bolster the morale of French youth after the debacle of the Franco-Prussian war, to develop their character and vitality through fighting competition; secondly, to lessen, not end, tensions between nations through athletic competition.

Munich was to be ideally Olympic. It was also intended to wipe the slate clean, to obliterate Berlin 1936 and all that followed. Unofficial expiation ceremonies were held at nearby Dachau, key centre in the Genocide. Willi Brandt worked frantically to have Germany readmitted to "the family of great civilized nations".

We know a great deal about Munich. We are not all that knowing about Berlin but have learned with the publication of Mandell's

work.⁴⁶ Nearly all books talk about Berlin simply as the vehicle for Nazi propaganda and as the place where Hitler, humiliated by the successes of the black *untermensch*, left before he had to present Owens his medals. From Mandell we have a much fuller picture, summarized very briefly here.

With Hitler came the *Gleichschaltung*, the forced co-ordination and Nazification of German sport. Initially some boycott noises came from Sweden, the Netherlands, and Czechoslovakia. But Britain, with a lead from that chariot of fire, Harold Abrahams, and France, led by Jewish socialist Premier Léon Blum, headed off boycott moves and made preparations to send elaborate teams. It was the Americans who posed the most serious boycott threat and who came close to holding a monopoly of moral outrage and political action.

The American move began at news of Hitler's removal of Dr. Theodor Lewald, a Jew, as president of Germany's Olympic Committee. American Olympic officials threatened to campaign for the removal of the Games from Germany if she discriminated against her Jewish athletes and if Lewald was not re-instated. Lewald was given the post of "adviser", and then ordered to announce publicly that "as a principle" Jews would not be excluded from German teams. Brigadier-General Charles Sherrill was one of three Americans on the IOC. He said the IOC executive battled grimly with the Germans in Vienna to obtain the following concessions: other nations could bring Jews, no publicity would be given to *that* German backdown and Germany had to declare expressly that she would not exclude her Jewish athletes. The British thought the IOC shouldn't interfere in German domestic politics.

Sherrill wanted proof of German compliance and asked that Helène Mayer, a Jewess who had won the fencing gold for Germany in 1928 and who then lived in Los Angeles, be invited to join the German team. Hans von Tschammer-Osten, Hitler's *Reichssportfuehrer* who had replaced Lewald as head of the German Olympic Committee, told his colleagues: "You are probably astonished by the decisions in Vienna, but we had to consider the foreign political situation". But nobody was really astonished to learn that the German policy of cleansing sport meant that Jews were barred from access to clubs and facilities and therefore from trials for the German team.

In 1933 the American Amateur Athletic Union - the body which supervised trials for the American team, headed by a former judge, Jeremiah Mahoney - voted for boycott unless Germany changed her policy on Jewish participation "in fact as well as in theory". That resolution was supported by Avery Brundage, then president of the American Olympic Committee, whereupon that American body postponed acceptance of the German invitation to participate. In June 1934 Germany announced that 21 Jews had been nominated for training squads. Suspicious, the AOC sent Brundage to see for himself and for them. Utterly bedazzled by the Germans and enamoured of their sense of order, he interviewed Jewish leaders - always in open cafes and always with Nazi chaperones. He "was given positive assurance: "there will be no discrimination against Jews. You can't ask more than that". All was well, he reported, and America joined the Games.

Mahoney was deeply suspicious. Atrocity stories abounded and it was found that of the 21 Jews "nominated" for training, none was "invited". Brundage argued that the Germans were keeping their promises and that Olympism as an institution was more important than any other consideration: "American athletes should not become needlessly involved in the present Jew-Nazi altercation", His determination ran into that of Commodore Ernest Lee Jahncke, one of the American members of the IOC. In September 1935 Hitler proclaimed the notorious "Nuremburg Laws", the decrees that deprived Jews of their citizenship and made them unfit to intermarry or employ Germans as domestic workers. Jahncke denounced the proclamations and the atrocities following. Brundage accused him of "betraying the athletes of the United States", had him squeezed off the IOC and took his place.

During the Nuremburg rallies, Sherrill stated that he had gone to Germany to get one Jew on the German team (Mayer) and that his job was finished. He added that imprudent Yankee intrusion into Nazi politics could cause a wave of anti-Semitism in the United States. The Secretary of the American Olympic Committee, Frederick Rubien, had this to say:

Germans are not discriminating against Jews in their Olympic tryouts. The Jews are eliminated because they are not good enough as athletes. Why, there are not a dozen Jews in the world of Olympic calibre.

Sherrill followed this with the information that "there was never a prominent Jewish athlete in history". (One can only wonder at the bland acceptance of such assertions. In fact, in the nine Olympics between 1896 and 1932, Jewish competitors won 50 gold, 37 silver and 32 bronze medals!⁴⁷)

Finally, there was the confrontation between the Belgian *grand seigneur*, Comte Henri Baillet-Latour, President of the International Olympic Committee, and Hitler. While motoring in Garmisch, site of the winter Olympics, the President was astonished at the visible anti-Semitic posters along the highways and the "no Jews allowed" signs at the Olympic village. He demanded immediate audience with Hitler. The latter declared that he couldn't alter "a question of the highest importance within Germany...for a small point of Olympic protocol": that technically, once the flag of Olympia was raised, that made Olympia and not Nazi Germany the sovereign over the village. The Count threatened cancellation of both the summer and winter Olympics. "You will be satisfied: the orders will be given" was the reply.

In the end some curious concessions were made. Rudi Ball, exiled in France, was invited to join the German ice-hockey team. He was one of two Jews in the German team; Miss Mayer was finally invited to fence, which she did for a silver medal. Other Jewish medal prospects, like high jumper Gretl Bergmann and sprinter Werner Schattman, were not invited to trials. Captain Wolfgang Fürstner, administrator of the Olympic village, was deemed mixed Jewish. Shortly before the athletes arrived he was replaced and dismissed from the army. He was allowed to remain second in command and following the banquet in honour of his successor after the Games, he shot himself. The press was instructed to say he had had an accident. Foreign journalists discovered the cover-up and he was buried with full military honours. *The Times*, however, still insisted that the "strain of preparing for the Games" was the cause of his suicide.⁴⁸

Finally, the Americans left out two of their fastest runners in the men's 4 x 100m. relay finals, Sam Stoller and Marty Glickman, both Jewish. Although the Americans won, we should note that Glickman ran in that relay event during the customary USA versus Empire contest at the end of the Games. At Stockholm in 1912 an

American sprinter, Howard Drew, won his 100m. heat but did not appear in the final - ostensibly for tendon reasons. Described as "the smoothest piece of running machinery the world has ever seen", the Swedish press claimed his own officials had locked him in the dressing room to avoid an Olympic title being won by a black athlete! With that kind of precedent in mind, presumably for Americans and Germans in Berlin the only thing worse than black medalists was a pair of Jewish ones. (The Hungarians had no such qualms: they won ten gold medals, six of them through Jewish athletes.)

(vii) RACE, POLITICS, AND SPORT IN SOUTH AFRICA

Under the Nazis race was a crucial factor in the politicization of sport. The "cleansing" began in 1933 and ended in 1945. Racism in South African sport began in effect in 1803, the year cricket began and the third Kaffir War ended. It remains 180 years later. There is too much to say about race, politics, and sport in South Africa, and its major ramifications abroad. Selectivity is necessary.

The history of black sport is well documented by Archer and Bouillon.⁴⁹ Significant is that the first Cape Coloured and African cricket clubs were formed in Kimberley and Port Elizabeth in 1876; the MCC played a Cape Malay team in 1892; and the first black rugby federation was established in 1896. Significant because in 1980 the renowned Dr. Dawie de Villiers, former Springbok captain and ex-ambassador to London, explained the sovereignty of white sport to the world in this way: "the blacks have really known western sports for only the past ten years".⁵⁰

Another pervasive myth is that the evil of apartheid began in 1948 with the election of Dr. D.F. Malan's Nationalist Party. A closer date would be about two centuries earlier. Suffice it to say that a stack of discriminatory laws from 1910 onwards - together with those two inventions of the previous century, the Pass Laws and the Master and Servant Acts - proscribed and prescribed African life to the point where mixed anything was out of the question. That simple folkway, called so simply "the South African

way of life", saw to it that sport was never mixed. Thus in 1926 when former tennis champion G.H. Dodd played a few sets with Africans at the Bantu Men's Social Centre, the press roared in agitation. Dodd quickly disowned his behaviour: his actions, he explained, "were an exhibition, merely, as having no inter-racial significance whatever".⁵¹

The post-1948 era saw the inevitable extension of the apartheid framework laid down at the turn of the century. It also saw logical but insane extensions, such as apartheid in blood transfusions. Given the Afrikaners' fundamentalist Calvinism, their belief in a divine calling in life to preserve white civilization, their puritanism, fanatical nationalism, their secret band of Broeders (brothers) and its pervasive power, Dr. Hendrik Verwoerd could readily define apartheid as a monolith, granite, immovable and implacable. For all races this means the stark reality by which zealously administered law makes gross distinctions between the racial groups - because of their race - in Parliament, in the courts, in political, social and economic life, in housing, wages, health, education, pensions, in areas of domicile, in houses of prayer, in sex, love and marriage, in the factories, and on the beaches. And sport has no special magic that exempts it from the list that covers birth, procreation, and death.

For nearly 20 years South Africa has been banned internationally from one sport or another - from the Olympics in 1964, 1968, and subsequently; from amateur boxing and cycling, cricket, soccer, swimming, weightlifting, and wrestling - not by governments but by the sports themselves. Exclusion has been because race is the determinant of competition, opportunities, and facilities and because Pickering's universal ethos that such must be fair and equal for all simply cannot be met in that society. And so the phrase "no normal sport in an abnormal society" becomes not only the *raison d'être* of the South African Council of Sport (SACOS) but an axiomatic representation of reality. SACOS, the Republic's largest sports association, is hated and berated by Government: for its reporting of discrimination; for its campaigning against tours to South Africa; for wanting non-racial sport rather than so-called inter-racial sport.

Elsewhere I have documented in detail the inequalities in facilities, the convolutions and euphemisms in government sports policy, the myth of integration and South Africa's sporting war against the world.⁵² Some overlapping here is inevitable but repetition is kept to a minimum. The examples following are chosen at random and not as a mischief to present only the worst of it.

In 1982-1983 the government spent R9.9 million on promoting sport for some 900,000 white schoolchildren and R14,700 on 3.6 million black children.⁵³ Explaining to Parliament why, by comparison, R15,000 had been spent on foreign gliders, R20,000 on a fencing visit, R47,000 on cycling tours and R35,000 on an international tug-o-war, the Minister - Professor Gerrit Viljoen - said these expenditures were related to the importance of the events and the publicity they would bring South Africa. In 1982 the Human Science Research Council documented the enormous gulf between black and white facilities: whites own 73 per cent of all athletic tracks, 83 per cent of public pools and 82 per cent of all rugby fields. Soweto, that overcrowded dormitory black township outside Johannesburg's white boundaries, has some 1,500,000 people - for whom there are five swimming pools, six cricket pitches, four rugby fields, 140 soccer pitches (mostly in poor condition), one bowling green, one golf course, and one gym - which has a Tilley lamp, a punch bag, no shower, no locker, and "no semblance of a ring".

Apartheid demeans. In 1973 Glen Popham won the karate gold medal at the South African Games. The silver and bronze medallists were awarded Springbok colours but he was denied them following the decision that he was to be reclassified a Coloured.⁵⁴ Ten years earlier Indian golfer Papwa Sewgolum won the Natal Open - only to be left in the rain outside the clubhouse while his 113 rivals were served drinks by Indian staff. He was passed his cheque through the window. In 1976, having won the Dutch Open three times, he was refused permission to play in the Western Province Open. In 1960 the Cape Coloured cricket Basil d'Oliveira had to export himself to Britain in order to play first-class cricket. On making British citizenship and the MCC team, he found himself declared unacceptable as a member of the MCC tour to South Africa in 1968-1969. The MCC cancelled and the d'Oliveira affair became *the* symbol of racist sport in South Africa.

In 1960 an all-white All Black team toured South Africa, an event which drew this complaint from the Afrikaans paper, *Die Burger*:⁵⁵

They [the 8000 occupants of the segregated Coloured stand at Newlands Ground] jeered every move made by the Springboks... It was obvious to everyone... that there could not have been a single non-white spectator who wanted the Springboks to win...their cheers and screams were thunderous and no one left the ground without the feeling of the political undertones of their demonstration.

Which is why, given the perennial black predilection for all visitors, always, Bloemfontein banned all non-white spectators from its stadium as of 1955. For the 1967 tour, Senator Jan de Klerk said that Maoris would not be acceptable as members of a touring team, a stance that resulted in cancellation of the tour. At this point a whole new dimension in New Zealand political life began: race politics, of a particularly angry, emotional, and bitter kind, a virulent politics highly divisive of that society. In 1970 an "off-white" All Black team went to the Republic. The informal understanding was, said an Afrikaans editor, "that they won't send us any very dark ones just now".⁵⁶ Three part-Maoris and one part-Samoan - "so white you wouldn't notice them" - were in the team.

Blinding and blinded "science" accompanies the humiliations. Frank Braun, former president of the South African Olympic Committee, declared that there were no quality black swimmers because "the water closes the pores of their skin so they cannot get rid of carbon dioxide and they tire quickly".⁵⁷ A *propos* of a slow time by Humphry Khosi, a great sprinter, a white official explained:⁵⁸

You must understand that Africans cannot perform well on a chilly day, because of their black skin. They are black because their skin must absorb heat so they do their best in warm weather.

(Black comedy indeed, if not for the gross consequences of it all.)

The Broederbond - the secret band of 12,000 "super-Afrikaners" - harnesses all political administrative, social and, where possible, economic forces to its cause: the sovereignty of the Afrikaners. By 1971 they were beginning to accept the seriousness of political

reaction, of boycotts and bannings because of sports apartheid; and to this end they dictated a new policy for government. Firstly, since the Bantustans are independent countries they can look after their own sports affairs. Secondly, sportspeople of all races, called "internal nations", should belong to their own clubs and play among themselves. But committees of the nations could decide on inter-nation competition. By Ministerial permit there could be leagues comprising the different nations. Each nation could arrange sports with overseas countries and award their own badges and colours for these "Inter-nation-als". If invited - and only when agreed to Ministerially - multiracial, that is, non-racially selected teams can represent South Africa. Thirdly, black facilities would be improved and their use reserved for those who respected this policy. The latest variation is that sport is to be depoliticized, that is, sport is to be left to provincial, municipal, and sports authorities.

There is no need to comment on the first three of these dictates. But if the latest policy means leaving local authorities to act out their natural inclinations and attitudes, then the outcomes are inevitable. The following have occurred over the past three years:⁵⁹ Afrikaans High School boys walked off a rugby field upon discovering two black players in a Christian Brothersteam; fifteen East Rand schools refused to play in the Craven Week rugby competition when some Coloured players were in some teams; the Johannesburg City Council refuses black teams the use of the Rand Stadium and closes Ellis Park Pool to all non-whites; the Pretoria City Council refuses the Caledonian Ground to black soccer and bans all marathons because the finish has to be in the Fountains picnic area, which is barred to blacks; the Port Elizabeth Council prohibits Africans on their ice-rink but allows Coloureds and Indians to skate on Tuesdays and Thursdays; the Newlands Ground refused lunch to a Coloured cricketer, Omar Henry - upon which the Liquor Board, amid the outcry, admonished the restaurant for not phoning Pretoria, 1800 km. distant, for permission to feed Mr. Henry. And so on and on.

White South Africans have a blunted sense of normality. They are incapable of understanding that apartheid of this kind and at these levels places them beyond the sporting pale. Their criterion

is Errol Tobias in a Springbok XV, complete with Springbok blazer as a concession post-Popham. Brundage was happy with this type of concession. In May 1967 the IOC accepted a bundle of South African concessions as the price for re-admission to Mexico the following year. Reading them, one must wonder where normality begins and ends. There would be one South African team. They would travel together. They would live together in the village. They would wear the same uniform. Whites and blacks could compete against each other, in trials and at the Games, and a committee of black and white representatives, under the admirable Braun, would choose the team.⁶⁰ The IOC accepted South Africa. But in 1968 Ethiopia and Algeria began to ask the blunt question: what was to happen to the black athletes and their sports opportunities *after* the Games? The Organisation of African Unity (OAU) then committed 32 of its members to boycott. All opponents pointed to the gross inequalities at the local levels of sport. Incredibly, Brundage claimed that the Olympics were between individuals, not nations, and that individual sportspeople from South Africa were being invited, not South Africa. He added: "There was the same flurry in 1936 about fascism when the Games were held in Berlin although the German government had nothing to do with them". To his chagrin, South Africa was expelled from Mexico by the IOC Executive in the face of a 40-nation boycott.

The repercussions of South African sport warrant serious study. Peter Hain's "stop-the-seventy-cricket-tour" campaign was probably the most successful pressure group action in post-war British political history. The harassment of the 1969 rugby Springboks, the mass demonstrations, the confrontations between protesters and police led the MCC to mount the (literal) barricades.⁶¹ Surrendering that precious cliché about sport and politics not mixing, they were prepared to barb-wire Lords, Headingley, and the Oval grounds so that they could "build bridges" with South Africans rather than isolate them. The debate became not one of moral principle but simply one of method. Finally, the Home Secretary asked Lords to call it off and the Lords obeyed.

(viii) RACISM AND RUGBY

Some countries are slow learners, Australia notoriously so. Ignoring the freshness and the sharpness of *that* British lesson, the Springbok rugby men came here in 1971. Against a background of Vietnam, of moratorium marches and conscription, the tour was turned into a particular kind of race war, often very physical indeed: pro-tour was to be racist, anti-communist, anti-Vietcong; anti-tour was to be anti-racist, anti-war and communist. Barbed wire, tear gas, hoses, batons, dogs, mass arrests, daily violence on television and on the fields, were but part of it. Queensland declared a state of emergency, suspending all normal legal processes, to my knowledge the only state in an English-speaking democracy to do so in peacetime - let alone to do so over three football matches. McMahon's Federal Government offered the Springboks use of RAAF military aircraft for transport and protection - to my knowledge the only (western) national government ever to do so over sport.

New Zealand, it seems, learns even more slowly and painfully. The 1981 Springbok tour was a duplicate, plus, of the 1971 visit here. Only this crisis was a much deeper one. The whole dimension was greater: greater confrontation and violence, greater intransigence by government and police, more anger from the protesters, more polarization between friends, lovers, and families. It will probably be recorded as the saddest event in 20th century New Zealand history: this misbegotten, foreseeable, and preventable piece of race politics occasioned by sport.

The essential cause of the African boycott of Montreal was the South Africa-New Zealand rugby connection. With the very real threat of internal violence, the New Zealand Labour Government had called off the 1973 Springbok tour. The National opposition said it preferred to build bridges rather than walls. Montreal was set to be trouble-free, until an All Black tour of South Africa was announced in May 1976. East European, Caribbean and African nations threatened boycott. The Supreme Council of Sport in Africa called for boycott, or at least of those events in which Kiwis participated. The OAU said the same for member states. A mere 48 hours before the Games, fifteen African states demanded that New Zealand be "disinvited" or the boycott was on. The IOC protested that they had nothing to do with rugby, rugby was not an

Olympic sport and, on grounds more quicksandish, New Zealand did practise apartheid. The IOC would not budge and 30 nations stayed away from Montreal.

1984 could be a crisis year for sport, for the Los Angeles Games and for the future of the Commonwealth Games if rugby union does what it has always done: behave without a care for anyone or anything. As I write, in June 1984, the English have toured the Republic: in defiance of black South African rugby, of Mrs. rather than rugby-loving Mr. Thatcher, of the Commonwealth Games Federation warning that England would be expelled from the 1986 Edinburgh Games if the tour proceeded. The Australian Rugby Union is reported to have been offered \$1,000,000 for a tour. Logic, and some immediate history, suggests that these rugby connections should signal the end of the Commonwealth Games: such a Games on British soil without an England seems improbable. Los Angeles, bereft of the major Communist states, could be further impoverished by an African boycott.

(ix) ABORIGINES AND THE BRISBANE GAMES

Following the strife of 1981, it seemed likely that African states would boycott the 1982 Commonwealth Games if New Zealand was present. In their eyes New Zealand had clearly violated the 1977 Gleneagles Agreement by which all Commonwealth states agreed "to take practical steps to discourage sporting contests with South Africa by their national sports authorities and individual sportsmen?"

Aborigines had pleaded that Africans boycott Brisbane because of *their* condition, not because of the South Africa-New Zealand connection. That plea was ignored. The boycott did not materialize, for two reasons.⁶² Firstly, by dint of much lobbying and diplomacy, fourteen OAU members announced early in September 1982 that they would participate because "Australia has worked so hard to ostracize South Africa". Our reward was their presence. Secondly, there

was some fancy footwork and neat side-stepping by the Commonwealth Games Federation (CGF) On 5 May that year all CGF members present in London agreed to go to Brisbane but accepted two constitutional amendments: a code of conduct which supports and strengthens Glen-eagles, followed by mechanisms for enforcement, including expulsion or suspension of a member (for things like playing ball with South Africa). All, including New Zealand, endorsed the draft. Formal ratification was to occur before the Games began. On 15 September, Lance Cross - president of the New Zealand Commonwealth and Olympic Games Association - announced that the Kiwis would not ratify the amendments: the London meeting was "unconstitutional" and New Zealand "will play with whomever she pleases!"⁶³ This seemed to signal boycott. The CGF General Assembly then met on 7 October, a mere three days before the end of the Games, and was unanimous in ratifying the London draft - after the events, so to speak. (My view is that New Zealand has defied the black sporting world for the last time.)

But the Games were indeed politicized by racial factors. In the manner of Russia clearing Moscow of all Jews and other dissidents in 1980, Queensland enacted the *Commonwealth Games Act* to keep Brisbane free of Aborigines and their "friends". Singularly un-commented upon publicly, that Act gave the police rather than government the power to declare a state of emergency, gave non-police full police powers, and additional ones, to seize both people and property on suspicion, In a display of great technological advance, it made provision for the palm, foot, toe, and voice-printing of people, with \$2,000 or two years gaol or both for offences under the Act.

With Africans and the media present, the way was open for Aborigines to march, speak out, and appear daily on the world's television reports.⁶⁴ Aborigines did not stop the Games, or even disrupt them. But they won something. From the start they insisted on peaceful demonstrations and they maintained that stance. Apart from two senior officers and their political masters, the police handled matters well. Aborigines won something from the public, from the street spectators at the marches. Many citizens felt - especially after the televising mid-Games of the ABC's *Four Corners* programme on land rights - that "there has to be some right

about their cause, somewhere". The conservative Queensland press was sympathetic. Moir's cartoon was not untypical. Premier Bjelke-Petersen addressing a black land rights marcher: "I may disagree with what you say, but I'll defend to the death my right to stop you saying it!"⁶⁵ The full story of Aborigines and the Games needs telling. Here it need be said that this particular sporting tradition has proved to be the most effective avenue yet for the "internationalization" of Aboriginal affairs.

(x) RACISM IN ASIA

Racism is not a two-dimensional phenomenon confined to what white, western majorities do to black minorities. There is need to look at other societies, certainly Asia and the rest of Africa. Richard Cashman,⁶⁶ an authority on Indian cricket, has pointed to 19th century notions about cricket breaking down racial barriers and as an instrument of imperialism; and to the system of the quadrangular and then pentangular communal cricket competitions in which Hindus, Muslims, Parsis, Europeans and the "Rest" played each other. The Broederbond would have approved of such inter-nation stuff. Gandhi did not and a national system replaced the communal religious (or racial) one in 1947.

It would be worth probing the predilection of India and Pakistan for drawing most of their cricket Tests. One writer⁶⁷ suggests a habit of playing not to lose rather than to win - "such glory as there might be in victory is far outweighed by the discredit of defeat". Perhaps. But his more interesting point is that cricket in the subcontinent has to "heal the deep and monstrous wounds of the Great Division". I suspect that racial tension has more to do with crowd riots in India, Pakistan, and the West Indies than heat, gambling fever, lack of shade, and that whole catalogue presented so well to us by the late Ray Robinson.⁶⁸

Another field of study is the Asian Games, particularly the fourth in Indonesia in 1962.⁶⁹ Race politics did indeed intrude. President Sukarno refused entry to the teams from Israel and Taiwan. India suggested that the Games were thenceforth "unofficial" - whereupon trade relations were broken off and the Indian Embassy in Jakarta vandalized. The IOC in turn banned Indonesia from the

Tokyo Olympics. Sukarno then established, unsuccessfully in the very short term, the "Games of the Newly Emerging Forces" -avowedly political and implicitly racial.

4. CONCLUSIONS

Much of this material has inbuilt conclusions, or even messages and morals. On reflection, some general propositions rather than grand theories emerge. Sport is not divorced from life, from the civic culture of a society, its institutions and processes, from its economics, law, national politics, and foreign relations. Organized sport receives massive assistance from the private and government sectors in sponsorships, subsidies, gifts, and facilities. Sport in turn allows itself to be used, even exploited, for commercialism, chauvinism, politics, and foreign policy. It conives at being part of the nationhood and nationalism of the state, an arm of its ideology or an advertisement for its way of life. "What they've done for Australia is immeasurable - historically, technologically and economically". These words from Prime Minister Robert Hawke⁷⁰ about Alan Bond, his men and their victorious yacht, *Australia II*, a sentiment no doubt shared by every (or almost every) Australian. And so, when the going gets tough - as in Britain, New Zealand and here over the South African connections - sport cannot hide, as it is wont to do, behind the facade, or charade, of being a private group of citizens doing their private thing for the private pleasure of its players and spectators. Nor has sport the right to demand that government use the coercive forces in society - the police or army - to enforce those "private" rights to the cost, the discomfort, and often the detriment of the general population.

Conversely, governments - in the manner of McMahon, Thatcher, and Muldoon - cannot hide behind the mask of democracy: the one which asserts that it is undemocratic to deny a Springbok visit or to refuse one's players going abroad, albeit in the name of nation, in the national colours, and under the national flag. Many things negate democracy: denying visas or passports is one; arming the riot police to engage in civil violence is another. The lesser of these two evils is very plain indeed. I hear that New Zealand

rugby is toying with another South African tour in 1985 or 1986, now claiming that all of 1981 was just Commies, radicals, and other riff-raff. To allow such a tour - let alone facilitate it - would not be an act of democracy, or optimism about the innocence of sport, but one of premeditated, culpable criminality.

Logic cannot sustain the view that sport should not figure in a nation's politics or foreign policy, just as other topics and activities do. Sport does - as we see so clearly from the foreign policies of countries in Asia, Africa, the communist and the capitalist bloc. We need only witness the efforts of Dr. Denis Worrall, South African Ambassador here, who has thrice used Australia's sports policy towards his country as a stick with which to brand Australians as prescriptive, hypocritical, confused, and even pseudo-moralistic. Sport cannot produce reasons for an exemption certificate from such political concern.

Liberation movements the world over have made conscious use of sport as a means of creating national identity. So too do groups within a society, as shown by the revolt of the black athletes and the solidarity of those men and women at the time of the black consciousness movement in America and South Africa. Many nations have underestimated or misunderstood the racial factor in sport, the brotherhood and sisterhood of black identity that crosses national boundaries and ideological systems. Possibly those lessons may have been learned from Olympia in 1968, 1972, and 1976.

Writers like Callois⁷¹ and Huizinga⁷² define sport as the suspension of reality, or a substitute for reality. Sport is illusion, a set piece in a set place and time under special rules, all different from real life. But even in those sets of illusions, in those games and matches, the ugliness of bigotry and racism and hatred of skin intrudes. To say that they should not or ought not doesn't mean they don't. Sport as the suspension of reality? Yes, perhaps for the majority in a mainstream. But for those who cannot compete, or who have to be doubly good in order to compete, it cannot be. Nor can it be pleasant illusion for those who do compete but find they are doing so for someone else's glory, someone else's entertainment, someone else's gladiatorial satisfaction. To be king or queen for 9.3 seconds or 90 minutes or fifteen rounds and then coon forever leads to frustration, then alienation, then

either political action or withdrawal from the whole miserable mess. Surely their presence with their politics is preferable to their absence.

NOTES:

1. *Four Kinds of Dominion* (Armidale: University of New England, 1972)
2. "Politics and Sport" was a section of the Sport, Health and Well-being Olympic Scientific Congress, University of Oregon, July, 1984
3. Melbourne: Gold Star Publications, 1972
4. London: National Council of Civil Liberties, 1975
5. Wellington: Oxford University Press, 1975
6. New York: Macmillan, 1972.
7. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1979
8. Connecticut: Greenwood Press, 1975
9. London: Zed Press, 1982
10. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1982
11. New York: Free Press, 1969
12. See, for example, "Sport and Racism: Fact or Fantasy?" in A. Yiannakis, T.D. McIntyre, M.J. Melnick and D.P. Hart, *Sport Sociology* (Dubuque, Iowa: Kendall, Hunt, 1976, pp. 152-180. This section includes essays by Barry McPherson, Harry Edwards, and Jonathan Brewer; also "The Athlete, Black and White" in H. Edwards, *Sociology of Sport* (Illinois: Dorsey Press, 1973), pp. 175-236; "Race and Sport" in George Sage, *Sport and American Society: Selected Readings* (Massachusetts: Addison-Wesley, 1980), pp. 313-347; "Racial Discrimination in Sport" in D.M. Landers, *Social Problems in Athletics* (University of Illinois Press, 1976), pp. 115-173
13. *Blowing the Whistle: The Politics of Sport* (London: Pluto Press, 1983), p. 14

14. *Sport: A Prison of Measured Time* (London: Ink Links, 1978), pp. 2 and 6
15. E. Dunning, *The Sociology of Sport* (London: Frank Cass, 1976), p. 233
16. Brohm, *op.cit.*, p. 149
17. Quoted in my "The Corruption of Sport", *Current Affairs Bulletin*, vol. 59, no. 4, September 1982, p. 7
18. See Allen Guttman, *The Games Must Go On: Avery Brundage and the Olympic Movement* (Columbia University Press, 1983)
19. *The New York Times*, 8 September 1972, p. 21
20. "South Africa, Sport and the Boycott", produced by Ron Pickering for BBC 1, televised in the U.K., 28 June 1983
21. This section is drawn from Richard Broome, "The Australian Reaction to Jack Johnson, Black Pugilist, 1907-9" in R. Cashman and M. McKernan, *Sport in History* (University of Queensland Press, 1979), pp. 343-363
22. Peter Corris, *Lords of the Ring* (Sydney: Cassell, 1980), pp. 93-94
23. *Ibid.*, p. 94
24. Peter Heller, "In this Corner...!", *Forty World Champions Tell Their Stories*, (Dell Books, 1973), p. 39
25. *Ibid.*, p. 188
26. Quoted by Richard Boyle in his "Negroes in Basketball" in Dunning, *op.cit.*, note 15, p. 259
27. S.K. Weinberg and Henry Arand, "The Occupational Culture of the Boxer" in Dunning, *op.cit.*, p. 286
28. Heller, *op.cit.*, 136
29. Michael Washington, "From Jack Johnson to Muhammad Ali: The Story Continues", *Arena Review*, vol. 2, no. 2, Spring 1978, pp. 29-30
30. George Scully, "Discrimination: The Case of Baseball" in Roger Noll, *Government and the Sports Business* (Washington: Brookings Institution, 1974), pp. 221-273

31. Harold Seymour, *Baseball: The Early Years* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1960), pp. 334-335
32. Lee E. Lowenfish, "Sport, Race and the Baseball Business", *Arena Review*, vol. 2, no. 2, Spring 1978, pp. 1-12
33. "Racism in Sport", in D. Stanley Eitzen and George H. Sage, *Sociology of American Sport* (Dubuque, Iowa: Wm. Brown, 1978), p. 239
34. Published as a book, *The Black Athlete: A Shameful Story* (New York: Time-Life, 1968)
35. "The Black Athlete: 20th Century Gladiators for White America", *Psychology Today*, vol. 7, no. 6, November 1973, p. 44
36. J.W. Loy and J.F. McElvogue, "Racial Segregation in American Sport", *International Review of Sport Sociology*, vol. 5, 1970, pp. 5-23
37. R.L. Green, J.R. McMillan and T.S. Gunnings, Blacks in the Big Ten" in *Integrated Education: A Report on Race and Schools*, vol. X, no. 3, May-June 1972, pp. 32-39
38. See Harry Edwards, "The Myth of the Racially Superior Athlete" in George H. Sage, *Sport and American Society: Selected Readings* (Massachusetts, Addison-Wesley, 1980), pp. 317-322; John Phillips, "Towards an Explanation of Racial Variations in Top-Level Sports Participation", *International Review of Sports Sociology*, vol. 3(11) 1976, pp. 39-56; Eitzen and Sage *op.cit.* (footnote 33), "Genetic Differences and Achievements in Sport", in Jay J. Coakley, *Sport and Society: Issues and Controversies* (St. Louis: C.V. Mosby Co., 1978), pp. 304-306; "Race and Sport", chapter in Donald Chu, *Dimensions of Sport Studies* (New York: John Wiley and Son, 1982), pp. 182-211
39. Eitzen and Sage, *op.cit.*, pp. 240-243
40. "Blacks in the Big Ten", *op.cit.*, note 37
41. "The 'Jock Trap' - How the Black Athlete Gets Caught!" in Wm. F. Straub, *Sports Psychology - An Analysis of Athlete Behaviour* (New York: Monument Publications, 1978), pp. 195-198
42. *Michener on Sport* (Corgi, 1976), chapter 6, particularly pp. 208-215

43. R.E. Lapchik, *The Politics of Race and International Sport*, *op.cit.*, (note 8), pp. 60-135, esp. pp. 101-121
44. *Ibid.*, pp. 102-103
45. *Ibid.*, p. 131
46. *The Nazi Olympics*, *op.cit.*, (note 6). See also Mandell's chapter from that work in B. Lowe, D.B. Kanin and A. Strenk, *Sport and International Relations* (Illinois: Stipes Publishing Co., 1978) pp. 135-152. Most of this section is drawn from that important chapter
47. Geoffrey Wigoder, *Encyclopedic Dictionary of Judaica* (New York: Leon Amiel, 1974), p. 462
48. *The Times*, 21 August 1936, p. 9
49. *Op.cit.*, note 9: see pp. 15-55; 112-140
50. *L'Equipe*, 10 March, 1980
51. Archer and Bouillon, *op.cit.*, pp. 121-122
52. Colin Tatz, "Sport in South Africa: The Myth of Integration", *Australian Quarterly*, vol. 55, no. 4, Summer 1983, pp. 405-20
53. *House of Assembly Debates* (South Africa), 2 May 1983, columns 6115-6128
54. Lapchick, *op.cit.*, p. 212
55. Thompson, *op.cit.*, (note 5), p. 25
56. *Ibid.*, pp. 58-59
57. Lapchick, *op.cit.*, p. 92
58. *Ibid.*, p. 133
59. Summarized from my *Australian Quarterly* article (note 52)
60. Lapchick, *op.cit.*, pp. 93-94
61. *The Cricket Conspiracy* (note 4), *op.cit.*, pp. 7-17
62. See my articles "Aborigines and the Brisbane Games", *Social Alternatives*, vol. 2, no. 2, August 1981, pp. 48 and 51; "Politics and the Games", *Weekend Australian*, 25-26 September 1982
63. ABC radio, AM, 15 September 1982

64. See my article "The Games Really Have Been Worth the Candle", *Weekend Australian*, 9-10 October 1982
65. *Courier Mail*, 8 October 1982
66. "The Phenomenon of Indian Cricket" in Richard Cashman and Michael McKernan, *Sport in History* (St. Lucia: University of Queensland Press, 1979), pp. 180-204 and *Patrons, Players and the Crowd: The Phenomenon of Indian Cricket* (New Delhi: Orient Langman, 1980)
67. R.A. Roberts in E.W. Swanton, *The World of Cricket* (London: Michael Joseph, 1966), p. 599
68. Ray Robinson, *The Wildest Tests* (Sydney: Cassell, 1974)
69. See Swanpo Sie, "Sport and Politics: The Case of the Asian Games and the GANEFO" in *Sport and International Relations, op.cit.*, (note 46), pp. 275-296; also Lapchick *op.cit.*, p. xviii
70. ABC radio, *AM*, 27 September 1983
71. "The Classification of Games" in Dunning, *op.cit.*, pp. 17-39
72. "The Play Element in Contemporary Sports" in Dunning, *ibid.*, pp. 11-16.