

Copyright  
by  
Yuxiang Hao  
2015

**The Thesis Committee for Yuxiang Hao  
Certifies that this is the approved version of the following thesis:**

**The International Olympic Committee Faced with Political  
Interference: Winning the Battle between the People's Republic of  
China and the Republic of China, 1952-1979**

**APPROVED BY  
SUPERVISING COMMITTEE:**

**Supervisor:**

---

Thomas M Hunt

---

Matthew T Bowers

**The International Olympic Committee Faced with Political  
Interference: Winning the Battle between the People's Republic of  
China and the Republic of China, 1952-1979**

**by**

**Yuxiang Hao, LL.B.**

**Thesis**

Presented to the Faculty of the Graduate School of  
The University of Texas at Austin  
in Partial Fulfillment  
of the Requirements  
for the Degree of

**Master of Science in Kinesiology**

**The University of Texas at Austin**

**May 2015**

## **Dedication**

To my parents

*Congli and Tao*

## **Abstract**

# **The International Olympic Committee Faced with Political Interference: Winning the Battle between the People's Republic of China and the Republic of China, 1952-1979**

Yuxiang Hao, MSKin

The University of Texas at Austin, 2015

Supervisor: Thomas M Hunt

This thesis studies the IOC's role during the 28-year battle between the PRC and the ROC for the exclusive right to represent China. It is argued that the IOC upheld its non-politicization principle, which suffered slight deviation, while showing certain flexibility. The flexibility refers to the willingness to make concession and professing politics. The IOC adhered to the principles through the years, but was more pragmatic on the Two Chinas Question and proactively played the game for desired outcome in the 1970s. It is the pragmatism that allowed the IOC to minimize external political infringement and maintain the inclusiveness of the Olympic Movement. Ironically, playing the political game turned out to be the key to end political interference. This thesis deems the Nagoya Resolution to be a hardly political solution, because it did not have substantial political influence or generate further political disputes. Therefore, compromise made by the Olympic Movement can be justified by the situation and the eventual result.

The Olympic Movement was the biggest winner among the three parties of the battle. The IOC and the Olympic Movement gained expansion and lost a smattering of integrity. Whether the loss matters is arguable, and in comparison, the PRC and the ROC suffered much more loss. The ROC's Olympic Committee kept its membership but had to relinquish political sigils. Despite the reinstatement of its NOC and the ban on ROC's political presence, the PRC had to accept the reality of dual recognition. What they lost or failed to achieve was exactly what they fought the politicized battle for.

The IOC's autonomy was ground on which the IOC eventually solved the Two Chinas Question with minimum political exploitation. The non-intergovernmental and apolitical decision-making mechanism helped the Olympic Movement stand firm and survive relentless exploitation of super powers and international conflicts. The Presidents' tremendous influence was made evident by the different paths in the development of the Two China Question during two Presidents' respective terms. The Executive Board, who discussed the matter deeply, balanced the IOC's position when the Presidents went too far with their personal opinions.

## Table of Contents

Chapter 1: Introduction.....	1
1.1 The Resolution, the Vote, and the Entry.....	1
1.2 Literature Review.....	3
1.3 The Neglected IOC-Perspective .....	5
1.4 Thesis Overview .....	7
1.5 Research Resources and Method .....	8
Chapter 2: The Twenty-Eight Years' Battle.....	10
2.1 “Fabricating Two Chinas” and the PRC’s Withdrawal .....	11
2.2 The Short-Lived GANEFO.....	12
2.3 Rapprochement and the Final Solution.....	13
Chapter 3: An IOC-centered Analysis .....	16
3.1 Overview: The IOC and The Two Chinas Question.....	16
3.2 The IOC’s role when Solving the Two Chinas Question .....	17
3.2.1 The Authority and Promoter of the Olympic Movement and Protector of Athletes .....	18
3.2.2 The Additional Rival of Both PRC and ROC.....	21
3.2.3 Mediator.....	25
3.3 Decision-Making and Individual Power .....	28
3.3.1 The IOC Members .....	29
3.3.2 The Executive Board.....	30
3.3.3 The President(s) .....	31
3.4 Non-Politicization and Political Influence.....	33
3.4.1 IOC Members Were More than Individuals .....	34
3.4.2 External Liaisons .....	35
3.5 Conclusion .....	36
Chapter 4: The Olympic Movement: More a Winner than a Victim.....	39
4.1 Autonomy Kept the Olympic Movement at Bay .....	40

4.2 Deus ex Machina: The IOC Embraced Flexibility .....	43
4.2.1 Seeking a Fourth-Party Authority: The United Nations .....	43
4.2.2 The IOC Became a Player in the Political Game.....	44
4.3 World Politics: Catalytic but not Decisive.....	46
4.4 The Switch: Before and After the PRC Returned the UN .....	48
Chapter 5 Conclusion.....	51
List of Abbreviations.....	56
Bibliography .....	57
Vita .....	63



## **Chapter 1: Introduction**

### **1.1 THE RESOLUTION, THE VOTE, AND THE ENTRY**

On October 25, 1979, the Executive Board of the International Olympic Committee (IOC) discussed the issue of the People's Republic of China's (PRC) seat in the Olympic Movement, the "Two Chinas Question," during their meeting held at Nagoya, Japan. The New Zealander member, Lance Cross, was alleged to be the last person who was defending Taiwan's sole seat on behalf of China in the Olympic Movement. His requests were dismissed by the Romanian member, Alexandru Siperco, with the support from the then President of the IOC, the Lord Killanin from Ireland, and his successor, Juan Antonio Samaranch from Spain. A resolution was reached unanimously at the end as follows,

China question

Resolution of the International Olympic Committee Executive Board adopted in Nagoya on 25th October 1979.

The People's Republic of China:

Name: Chinese Olympic Committee.

NOC's anthem, flag and emblem: flag and anthem of the People's Republic of China submitted to and approved by the Executive Board.

Constitution: in order.

Committee based in Taipei:

Name: Chinese Taipei Olympic Committee.

NOC's anthem, flag and emblem: other than that used at present, to be approved by the IOC Executive Board.

Constitution: to be amended in conformity with the “Olympic Charter” by 1st January 1980.

This resolution, sent to all members of the IOC, will be subject to a postal vote.

Ballots are to be returned to Vidy by 25th November 1979, with counting to take place the following day. (IOC, 1979b)

The voting result was 62 in favor versus 17 against, with 1 abstention and 1 ballot discarded. The PRC, after 28 years’ struggle, have the Chinese Olympic Committee recognized by the IOC and “recovered its rightful seat” (Liang, 2007, p.184). *Xinhua* (“New China”) News Agency (1979), the official news agency of the PRC, commented in its report that the resolution “shows that the IOC recognizes the Chinese Olympic Committee as the sole representative of China and the Chinese Taipei Olympic Committee only as a regional institution” and it “reflects the plain truth that there is but one China.” In Zhenliang He’s biography, his wife, Liang (2007, p. 184), considers the whole process a fight to “maintain China's legitimate rights in the world of international sport and uphold state sovereignty and territorial integrity.” The reinstatement in the IOC has been considered by the Chinese government a victory, not only in terms of expanded involvement in the international sport field, but also in terms of defending sovereignty, which is a hardcore political issue—the Beijing regime not only succeeded in taking over the right to represent China in this field, but has also rhetorically subordinated Taipei’s NOC and NGBs from then on.

## 1.2 LITERATURE REVIEW

A quintessential case where sport mixes with politics, the Two Chinas Question is included in most studies on the Olympic Movement's political history (Cha, 2009; Espy, 1981; Hill, 1992; Kanin, 1981). Most of the studies did not go further than an articulatory presentation of history and a brief overall comment that "the IOC had made a political decision" (Espy, 1981, p.188). The Two Chinas Question is mostly examined in a larger picture, along with the mutual boycotts of the United States and the USSR and other cases, in order to explore the reasons why political interference has always been inevitably keeping the Olympic Movement's company. However, the gap still exists between the reason and the outcome—how the decision came into being and was made a political one, and how the Olympic Movement dealt with political pressure. While external political interference could be easily confirmed, it was another question whether or not that the IOC did politics and, if so, whether or not it was justifiable. In addition, with idiosyncratic features and a unique path of development, the China-Taiwan problem, a spin-off of the Cold War, deserves more special attention.

Nearly all of the existing handful of case studies in English-language literature on this subject mainly focus on the political significance for the PRC or the ROC. Scholars who view it from the perspective of China unanimously interpret the process with regard to "high politics" (Brownell, 2005; Chan, 1985 & 2002; Xu, 2008; Yu, 2008). Yu (2008) considers national security and territorial integrity the prime goal of China's foreign policy in sport, and the "Olympic Formula" allowed China to downgrade Taiwan regime to the local-level government and gradually erase the name of "the other China" from the

international community. Chan (1985) deems that the resolution satisfied all three parties—China (the PRC), Taiwan (the ROC), and the IOC—arguing that by accepting the Nagoya resolution, China was able to both return to international community and to have legal evidence to interpret Taiwan as an integral part of China. He further points out that China’s compromise in 1975 from the standpoint that Taiwan must be expelled to its eventual acceptance of the resolution, which maintained Taiwan’s status in the IOC despite “symbolic differences”, implicates China’s long-term plan on the country’s unification (Chan, 2002). Susan Brownell (2005) views the process from a geopolitical standpoint, relates it to China’s struggle for diplomatic recognition and considers it grounded in the shifting global balance of power.

It is similar when scholars study from the perspective of Taiwan, though the focus also covers issues such as national identity. Jacobs (1980) listed Taiwan’s setback in the IOC in a section on foreign relations, prior to foreign economic relations. Still using the name “Republic of China,” Bairner and Hwang (2010) point out that the adoption of the Nagoya Resolution by all parties signals the termination of this name in the field of international sport. Huang and Wang (2013) also argue that the Nagoya Resolution negatively affected Taiwan in the way that Taiwan must change the name, flag and anthem for continued participation in international sports.

However, few studies give sufficient attention to the International Olympic Committee, most of which is articulatory description of the events in which the IOC was involved. As aforementioned, Chan (1985) argues that reaching the Nagoya resolution was a win-win situation for all three parties. Sympathizing with the PRC, Brownell (2005)

criticizes the IOC's stance on the issue as well as its ideological and political affiliation with the Western countries. Huang and Wang (2013) partly attribute the different stages in the development of the China question to three IOC presidents,<sup>1</sup> but no more discussion is made on the organization.

### 1.3 THE NEGLECTED IOC-PERSPECTIVE

In the state trial of *Liang Ren-Guey v. Lake Placid 1980 Olympic Games, Inc.*, New York State Supreme Court Judge Norman Harvey ruled that the IOC succumbed to the PRC's political pressure and discriminated against the Taiwanese athletes, who swore allegiance to the flag of the Republic of China (*Liang Ren-Guey v. Lake Placid 1980 Olympic Games, Inc.*, 1980).<sup>2</sup> It is the fact, if only considering the political impact of the resolution—the Nagoya resolution was undoubtedly a victory for the PRC. However, when revisited, a few facts from the 28-year process mark the impressive impregnability and prowess of the IOC, vis-à-vis with state sovereignty<sup>3</sup> as a non-governmental international organization (NGO):

---

<sup>1</sup> The three presidents include the two presidents whose roles are talked about in later chapters in this thesis, Avery Brundage and Lord Killanin, and Juan Antonio Samaranch, who was Lord Killanin's successor and guaranteed Taiwan that the status of Chinese Taipei Olympic Committee, despite the changes, would not be lowered.

<sup>2</sup> Although the result was reversed after two appeals, the reason for the final judgment was that “[s]ince the Department of State, acting on the President's behalf, elected to defer to the IOC in matters concerning national representation at the Olympics, the issue was a political question, and beyond the powers of the court to review.” 72 A.D.2d 439; 424 N.Y.S.2d 535; 1980 N.Y. App. Div. LEXIS 9699. Retrieved from [www.lexisnexis.com/hottopics/lnacademic](http://www.lexisnexis.com/hottopics/lnacademic)

<sup>3</sup> Although Taiwan is not diplomatically recognized as a sovereign nation by most government in the world, it had been the sole representative of China in the United Nations until 1971, and has still been governed by an independent government and is *de facto* a sovereign nation.

- The PRC replaced the Nationalist regime based in Taiwan as the sole representative of China in the United Nations in 1971, eight years before IOC passed the Nagoya Resolution.
- Avery Brundage, who was criticized for siding with the Western countries and isolating China from the international sport community, stepped off the position of IOC President in 1972, seven years before the Nagoya Resolution was reached.
- The Games of New Emerging Forces, another international sport organization established by developing countries, sponsored by the PRC, and supported by the Soviet, didn't survive more than five years. One of the reasons was the IOC's containment.
- Beijing China made a huge compromise and the Taiwanese athletes were retained in the Olympic Movement, which was rare and almost unprecedented, considering the PRC's intransigence on the issue of sovereignty and territorial integrity.
- Despite the severe relationship between the PRC and the IOC and the slow rapprochement, the PRC has been attaching extreme importance to the Olympic Games and relating Chinese athletes' performance to national glory.

The PRC's victory was politically unconventional, if not discounted, because Beijing would have eradicated Taiwan's opportunity of international exposure as much as possible. What's more, reinstating the PRC's Olympic Committee had been reasonable since the PRC replaced the ROC in 1971, but the IOC did not immediately honor the PRC's request for certain reasons. The prolonged process and the discounted victory could be seen

as the consequence of the IOC's intransigence and the West's dominance of the world order, like Brownell does. However, it can also be argued from a different angle. The current literature lacks scholarly works that study the IOC's role when solving the China question, peruse its organizational behavior and decision-making process, or examine how and to what extent the political batter between the PRC and the ROC, and even the IOC, infringed the Olympic Movement's integrity.

#### **1.4 THESIS OVERVIEW**

Intended to fill the gap identified above, this thesis posits a revisionist interpretation of the twenty-eight years' battle fought between the PRC and the ROC—with the IOC as the focus of this study, it is argued that the IOC was a proactive participant and ended up a winner in the battle between the PRC and the ROC. The battle took its tolls—the IOC had to sacrifice the integrity of the Olympic Movement by professing politics itself. But this concession can be justified by the *fact* that sport, by its nature, is subject to political interference and infringement, and the *outcome* that the Olympic Movement finally included the largest population group in this world without excluding another much smaller but indispensable one. Although the Nagoya Resolution was the product of a long-lasting political game, it might not have direct political impact in Cross-Strait relations or world order. It may also indicate that, by professing politics, the IOC avoided further involvement in the political dispute.

In Chapter 2, this thesis briefly revisits the history of the battle between the PRC and the ROC for the right to exclusively represent China in the Olympic Movement. The

IOC's role, organizational behavior and decision-making process is then perused in Chapter 3. This chapter also continues to examine the conflict between the non-politicization ideal, which the IOC strived to uphold, and the political influence that it could not avoid. Chapter 4 studies the IOC's wins and losses while solving the Two Chinas question. The IOC is considered more a winner than a victim of political infringement, thanks to its organizational behavior determined by organizational characteristics, as well as the changes in world politics. The thesis reaches the conclusion in Chapter 5, along with the significance of this study, and indications for further studies.

## **1.5 RESEARCH RESOURCES AND METHOD**

Most Chinese and Taiwanese official records are not accessible to the public, but key information is available from biographies and autobiographies of important individuals, such as Zhenliang He and Lord Killanin. The researcher also studied interviews with the key figures as sources of facts. They help throw light on how the Chinese and Taiwanese authorities manipulated their respective representatives in the IOC and pursued their respective interests.

In addition, since the press in the PRC is owned, operated, regulated, and censored by the propaganda departments of the CPC at difference levels, the available reports and documentaries represent the official rhetoric at least to some extent. This is especially true with *Renmin Ribao* (People's Daily), the Chinese government's official newspaper, *Xinhua* (New China) News Agency, the CPC's official news agency, and CCTV, which is the state television broadcaster and managed by a vice minister in the state council.



The IOC keeps better historical records of meetings, events, and communication between individuals. The Olympic Studies Centre of the IOC provided meeting minutes upon the researcher's request.

The major research method of this thesis is document analysis based on the resources aforementioned. The differences in the narratives also provide grounds for cross-examination.

## Chapter 2: The Twenty-Eight Years' Battle

After the Chinese Civil War, the People's Republic of China (PRC) was founded in mainland China by the Communist Party of China (CPC) in October, 1949. At the same time, the Nationalist Government was exiled to the island of Taiwan where it still claimed to be the sole legitimate government of the Republic of China (ROC). Neither recognized the legitimacy of the other.

Both established their respective National Olympic Committees (NOCs), the All China Sports Federation (ACSF) for the PRC and the Chinese National Amateur Athletic Federation (CNAAF) for the ROC.<sup>4</sup> Both claimed to be non-governmental organizations, but were *de facto* managed and operated by the governments.<sup>5</sup> Consequently, both committees claimed *de jure* jurisdiction over all amateur sport activities, including Olympic-related ones, despite the fact that neither was able to preside on the other's territory. Although there was not clear prohibition of multiple NOCs for a country in the most recent version<sup>6</sup> of the Olympic Charter, it was certainly indicated that a certain territory could be represented by only one NOC, and "territory" generally referred to a

---

<sup>4</sup> The ACSF was founded in 1950, it served as the PRC's Olympic Committee until it was replaced by the non-governmental Chinese Olympic Committee in 1979 (though the head of COC has been governmental officials). During that period, ACSF was annex to the State Sports Commission and was managed by governmental officials. The CNAAF was established in 1924 and recognized as China's Olympic Committee until the end of the Civil War in 1949.

<sup>5</sup> Both governments controlled their respective NOCs by all means. The President of the ACSF was the Secretary General of Youth League (the Youth League is the Communist organization for youngsters and directed by the Communist Party). Taiwan was also a *de facto* authoritarian state before democratization in the 1980s, without strong governmental control over all civil organizations. In addition, the CNAAF followed the Nationalist government to Taiwan showed its allegiance.

<sup>6</sup> Revised in 1946. Retrieved from [http://www.olympic.org/Documents/Olympic%20Charter/Olympic\\_Charter\\_through\\_time/1946-Olympic\\_Charter.pdf](http://www.olympic.org/Documents/Olympic%20Charter/Olympic_Charter_through_time/1946-Olympic_Charter.pdf)

sovereign nation.<sup>7</sup> The battle between the PRC and the ROC over the right to represent the “but one China” was doomed to take place.

## **2.1 “FABRICATING TWO CHINAS” AND THE PRC’S WITHDRAWAL**

The struggle officially began with the invitation the IOC sent to the CNAAF to attend the 1952 Helsinki Olympic Games. The Soviet Union encouraged both the IOC—to invite the PRC—and the PRC—to participate in the Olympic Games. Consequently the ROC boycotted the Games. Thanks to Soviet Union’s instigation and Taiwan’s absence, The PRC team decided to attend and arrived five days before the closing ceremony, but finished the only task assigned to it—raising the national flag of the PRC at the Olympic Games.

In 1954, the IOC recognized ACSF as China’s Olympic Committee. The CNAAF announced its withdrawal in protest but was kept in the list of recognized NOCs by President Avery Brundage, which the PRC considered deliberate fabrication of “two Chinas” in international sport federations with political intentions. In 1955, the only Olympic Committee member from the PRC, Shouyi Dong,<sup>8</sup> attended the Paris Session of the IOC, condemned the IOC for creating “two Chinas” and attacked Brundage and the U.S. Government. In 1958, the PRC officially withdrew from all international sport

---

<sup>7</sup> Not until 1960 did the IOC clearly expand the definition of “country” that to “a geographical area, district or territory within the limits of which an Olympic Committee recognized by the International Olympic Committee functions or operates”.

<sup>8</sup> Another way to spell Shouyi Dong’s name is Shou-yi Tung. They represent two different way to translate Chinese names, though the former gradually replaced the latter in mainland China.

organizations which acknowledged both the PRC and the ROC. Consequently, the ROC's Olympic Committee remained in the Olympic Movement as the only NOC from China.

That the ROC's Olympic Committee stayed did not mean that it could represent the whole China, as it had proclaimed. The IOC passed a resolution in 1959, requesting the Olympic Committee from Taiwan to change its name in correspondence with the territory over which it actually had jurisdiction (IOC, 1959c). A few substitutes were submitted, but the IOC did not arrive at unanimity. The delegation sent by the ROC's Olympic Committee to the Olympic Games was able to compete under the name Olympic Committee of Republic of China after some upheavals (IOC, 1959a, 1960a, 1960b & 1964; Lord Killanin, 1983, p. 103).

## **2.2 THE SHORT-LIVED GANEFO**

Beijing did not willingly sit out. Nor did its Communist regime stop intervening in international sport events with political proclamation. In 1962, Indonesia, the host of the Asian Games, was persuaded by the PRC and Arab nations to refuse the participation of the ROC and Israel, two members of the Asian Games Federation. As a result, Indonesia's NOC was suspended by the IOC in 1963 for discrimination based on politics (IOC, 1963b). Still supported by the PRC, along with the Soviet Union, Indonesia established the Games of New Emerging Forces (GANEFO) to boycott the IOC and the Olympic Games. The PRC was the biggest sponsor and proponent of the GANEFO. The IOC illegalized the GANEFO immediately (IOC, 1963a). In consequence, despite the large number of the

countries participating, only Indonesia, North Korea, and the PRC sent athletes at the Olympic level (Connolly, 2012).

The first GANEFO was held in Jakarta, Indonesia in 1963. The PRC was the biggest winner. *Renmin Ribao* (1963) argued in an editorial that the success of the GANEFO was a powerful weapon to counter the Olympic Movement manipulated by the imperialists. The first Asian GANEFO was held in Cambodia at the same time as the IOC-sanctioned Bangkok Asian Games. Again, *Renmin Ribao* (1966) celebrated the Games and aimed harsh criticism against the “U.S. domination and manipulation over international sports.” However, Egypt, the host of the second GANEFO scheduled in 1967, could not host for financial reasons (Lutan & Fan, 2005). Meanwhile, the PRC was inundated by the disastrous Cultural Revolution, and retired itself from most international activities. The GANEFO did not make it to the fourth anniversary. The PRC-sponsored politicization of sport failed.

### **2.3 RAPPROCHEMENT AND THE FINAL SOLUTION**

In 1971, the PRC replaced the ROC as the sole representative of China in the United Nations, which was considered a sign of the PRC’s comeback into the Olympic Movement. In 1972, Lord Killanin succeeded Avery Brundage and tried to ameliorate the IOC’s relationship with the PRC. Meanwhile, the PRC, though quite passive, began to reach out and make friends, especially with IOC members, in the international sport community. In 1975, the PRC’s Olympic Committee reapplied for IOC recognition and requested that

Taiwan be expelled once it was admitted. It then became a problem for the IOC as to how the Taiwanese athletes could avoid being excluded from the international sport community.

The PRC requested the Canadian government to by no means allow the ROC delegation to enter and compete in the 1976 Montreal Olympic Games. However, the Canadian government had, since the bidding, guaranteed the IOC that the Olympic Games would not be infringed by political issues. The confrontation between the IOC and the Canadian government generated a global outrage, whether against or in favor of Taiwan's participation. Eventually the IOC made a concession and proposed that the Taiwan delegation compete under the name Taiwan instead of Republic of China. The ROC delegation withdrew in protest.

In 1977, Lord Killanin visited Beijing. He formed a China commission to investigate the Two Chinas Question, and visited Taiwan in 1978. The three members of the China commission did not reach consensus. Whether to include both NOCs or to expel Taiwan's Olympic Committee remained undecided among the IOC members. The ROC's position changed as well—while the PRC insisted that only one Chinese Olympic Committee could be recognized by the IOC, the ROC side did not object to the ideal of dual recognition. At the Montevideo Session in 1979, the IOC passed a resolution again recognizing both—the PRC found it unacceptable but proposed that it didn't oppose an interim Taiwanese team which did not use its current name, national anthem, or national flag (Espy, 1981, p.186). Then there was the scene at the beginning of this thesis—the Nagoya Resolution, the postal vote, and the Chinese Olympic Committee's return to the Olympic Movement.

The ROC refused to accept the conditions of change, filed three lawsuits but didn't win, and boycotted two Olympic Games in protest. Then Juan Antonio Samaranch, the successor of Lord Killanin, guaranteed that the status of Taiwan's Olympic Committee, despite the name change, would not change. In 1984, the ROC's Olympic Committee changed its name to Chinese Taipei Olympic Committee and participated in the 1984 Los Angeles Olympic Games.

## **Chapter 3: An IOC-centered Analysis**

### **3.1 OVERVIEW: THE IOC AND THE TWO CHINAS QUESTION**

Brundage perfectly summarized the nature of the Two Chinas Question as follows, After the war the Chinese National Olympic Committee ... moved to Taipei. In due time another Olympic Committee was organized in Peking and ... was recognized by the International Olympic Committee, ... After its recognition this Peking Olympic Committee made repeated demands for jurisdiction over sport in Taiwan. This was always firmly denied by the International Olympic Committee, because this Peking Committee could not possibly exert any authority over sport in Taiwan at this time. (IOC, 1959a, p.63)

The Two Chinas Question is undoubtedly a conundrum caused by political interference, which was unwelcomed at the IOC. The IOC in principle was politics-unfriendly through all its history.

The International Olympic Committee was founded in June 1894, two years after Pierre de Coubertin announced his plan to bring the Olympic Games, which had not been celebrated for fifteen centuries, back to the modern world. It is the “supreme authority of the Olympic Movement” (IOC, 2014b). The IOC’s affairs are decided by IOC members, who are individuals representing the Olympic Movement in their respective countries and sport federations. The National Olympic Committees (NOCs) all over the world send teams of their respective countries and regions to participate in the Olympic Games. The NOCs are non-governmental organizations.

The Olympic Charter is the constitution of the Olympic Movement. It has been rephrased and updated over time, but it remains a fundamental principle of the Olympic Movement that no discrimination should be made based on politics. A resolution passed in



1946 reaffirmed that the IOC was devoted to excluding any political and commercial interference (IOC, 1950). Accordingly, the NOCs are required to be independent and autonomous and avoid political, commercial and religious interference (IOC, 1950). These principles and regulations were the IOC's guidelines when dealing with the Two Chinas Question.

This chapter analyzes the IOC's role and behavior when solving the Two Chinas Question. The IOC played a complex role during the process—it was the promoter of the Olympic Movement and the protector of the athletes but also an additional rival to both the PRC and the ROC. It was also a failed mediator. The decision-making mechanisms of the IOC influenced the path in which the IOC approached the problem. Also, to the IOC's disappointment, “no politics” was not realistic—political influence always existed.

It is important, though, to clarify “politics” before moving forward. In addition to the government-related activities and external pressures that the IOC faces, it is acknowledged that the IOC's organizational characteristics result in organizational politics and power dynamics (Hill, 1992, pp.56-69). However, this thesis mainly studies politics in the narrower sense. Unless specified, “politics” in this thesis refers to unilateral actions and bilateral or multilateral interactions in which at least one party involved is a governmental organization or representative.

### **3.2 THE IOC'S ROLE WHEN SOLVING THE TWO CHINAS QUESTION**

The IOC's mission and role has been explicitly revealed in a total of 16 items in the Olympic Charter in force as of December, 2014 (IOC, 2014a). Its content has been updated and enriched over the years, but these items can be divided into six categories, (a) promoting good sport governance, (b) celebrating the Olympic Games, (c) anti-doping, (d) protecting sport and sport practitioners, (e) promoting *sport for all* and for the future, and

(f) promoting peace. Among them, (a) (d) can be applied to this case. Although in the long term, the resolution may help promote peace across the Taiwan Strait, the IOC did not alleviate the tension between the PRC and the ROC or prevent a war, so (f) does not count.

Nonetheless, the written role and mission doesn't cover all the actual roles that the IOC played during the game for IOC recognition. On occasion, the IOC was the rival of both the PRC and the ROC. More importantly, it is undeniable that the IOC provided good offices between the two parties involved, though the attempts of mediation ended up a failure. Therefore, the four major roles that the IOC played through the twenty-eight-year process were: (1) the authority and promoter of the Olympic Movement, (2) a rival of both the PRC and the ROC, (3) mediator, and (4) the protector of athletes.

### **3.2.1 The Authority and Promoter of the Olympic Movement and Protector of Athletes**

To promote the Olympic Movement is one of the IOC's primary missions in all kinds of international activities, sport-related or not. The high reputation and popularity of the Olympic Movement gave the IOC global influence. A seat on the IOC, the supreme authority of the Olympic Movement, would not only guarantee the right to participate and the potential to host the Olympic Games, but also was perceived by both the PRC and the ROC as sound proof of their respective regimes' status as the sole legitimate government of China. However, the IOC's focus was disparate from those of the PRC and the ROC—the IOC prioritized the mission to involve more people in sports and strived to make efforts to protect the rights of the youth in both the PRC and the ROC to participate in the Olympic Games.

The IOC was indeed the authority of the Olympic Movement and arguably of the international sport community, too. It can be proved by the sheer fact that the IOC, which comprised around one hundred members on behalf of the Olympic Movement rather than

of themselves or their countries,<sup>9</sup> could decide whether a huge nation with a population of six hundred million<sup>10</sup> was qualified to have a seat so that its delegation could participate in the Olympic Games. It faced challenges but successfully sabotaged the initiative of many developing countries in the 1960s to establish the Games of New Emerging Forces. After over a century, it remains one of the most influential and powerful international sport organizations. International sport governing bodies, such as FIFA and the IAAF,<sup>11</sup> must follow IOC regulations so that they can stay in the Olympic Games to promote their respective sports. Likewise, national sport governing bodies (NGBs) must follow IOC regulations so that they can guarantee that their respective athletes can qualify for the Olympic Games. For countries where the government organizes and closely monitors almost all sport activities and greatly value athletic performance in the Olympic Games, such as the PRC and the DPRK, it means that the government must operate them as regulated by the IOC and recognize the cause of the IOC.

Promoting the Olympic Movement was definitely one of the major concerns of the IOC, if not the only one, during the two Chinas' battle for exclusive recognition. The IOC claimed to be "only concerned with putting its house in order independently of all political consideration" so that it could pursue its "main purpose ... to guide and serve Olympic sport in order to foster among the youth of the world the physical effort and the moral values which constitute the basis of amateur sport" (IOC, 1959b, p. 32). The quotation is excerpted from the reply titled *The Chinese Problem* from the IOC to American official and public reaction towards IOC's request that "the Olympic Committee of Nationalist

---

<sup>9</sup> Theoretically. It is of course unlikely that the IOC members are capable of making decisions completely uninfluenced by their native countries (say, the culture in which they were brought up in).

<sup>10</sup> The population of China was six hundred million in the 1950s, and by the time the Chinese Olympic Committee was reinstated in the IOC, it had increase to a billion.

<sup>11</sup> FIFA, Fédération Internationale de Football Association, is the international governing body of football. IAAF, International Association of Athletics Federations, is the international governing body of track and field athletics.

China” (the NOC of the ROC) change its name in 1959. It is worth notice that the PRC withdrew from IOC-directed international sport activities one year earlier. Thus the requested name change left the IOC without even a nominal NOC for mainland China.<sup>12</sup> The IOC’s resolution in 1959 came into being not only based on the fact that the ROC government has lost governance over mainland China, but also because that the IOC intended to make room for a real NOC that could represent the grand territory over which Taiwan’s Olympic Committee did not have jurisdiction.

The IOC indeed wanted to promote the Olympic Movement to the entire territory of the world’s most populated and third largest country. As early as 1952, the IOC made an exception to invite the ACSF to attend the Helsinki Olympic Games when it wasn’t even a recognized NOC.<sup>13</sup> The IOC went on to recognize both the ACSF and the CNAAF in the Mexico City Session in 1954 so that both parties could legitimately send athletes to participate in the Olympic Games. However, the issue had tremendous political significance for both the PRC and the ROC and it couldn’t be solved by the IOC’s goodwill only.

After the GANEFO, which was co-led by China and other developing countries, eventually collapsed, and the PRC’s involvement in Asian sport community greatly expanded, China again sought to solve the problem of the Two Chinas Question in the IOC. The IOC was more proactive than it used to be, too. Lord Killanin (1973), in his closing speech given at the 1973 Olympic Congress, clearly articulated that “we want China”, but “If there are problems we will face them round a table and not by pressure.” How athletes from Taiwan, over whom the PRC’s Olympic Committee did not have effective control, could participate in the Olympic Games after the PRC’s Olympic Committee was

---

<sup>12</sup> As long as the National Olympic Committee of ROC remained in the IOC, PRC’s NOC would not reenter despite the proposed name change at that time.

recognized was a question that the IOC was determined to solve. When the Chinese Olympic Committee was finally voted to have a seat in the IOC with the problem of the status of the Chinese Taipei Olympic Committee properly solved, Mohamed Mzali, the then vice president of the IOC, when interviewed by *Xinhua* News Agency (1979), commented that “the Nagoya Resolution made China return to the Olympic Movement so that representatives of 1 billion Chinese people would be able to participate in the Olympic Games. Then, the Olympic spirit finally literally reached all corners of the world.”

This may raise a question, though, regarding whether it was fair to ostracize the PRC with a billion population for the ROC with a much-smaller 8 million population. This question can be explained with several reasons. First, although the IOC practiced the utilitarian idea of “sports for all goods,” it was fairly deontological when the issue was sport participation itself. As much as the IOC hoped to involve the PRC, the PRC was not more important than Taiwan because of its greater population. In addition, with the PRC recognized by most countries in the world, once the IOC expelled the ROC completely from the Olympic Movement, Taiwanese athletes would technically be shut out permanently, too.<sup>14</sup> The best option might be to seek both parties’ co-existence within the Olympic Movement while retaining the less powerful one.

### **3.2.2 The Additional Rival of Both PRC and ROC**

While the IOC was all about the Olympic Movement, both the PRC and the ROC had their respective goals beyond simply joining in the Olympic Movement. They

---

<sup>14</sup> There are two situations: (1) if Taiwan remains a de facto independent country, China would prevent Taiwan from regaining a seat in the IOC in the future, and it would be nearly impossible for Taiwanese athletes to join the Chinese sport teams. (2) Even if China and Taiwan “reunited,” Taiwan would be another Special Administrative Region, like Hong Kong and Macau and organize its own team to participate in international sport events. Hong Kong is able to send its own team to these events because it was recognized by the IOC when it was still a colony of the UK, but Macau, a former colony of Portugal which hadn’t got an NOC recognized by the IOC, was not able to participate in the Olympic Games as a part of China. It is likely that Taiwan be treated in the same way as Macau was.

considered the efforts they had made for the seat sports diplomacy, which served high politics. The IOC's indifference to their purpose beyond sport made the supreme authority of the Olympic Movement another rival of both parties (in addition to each other).

The PRC had been proclaiming to be the only legitimate representative of China since the Communist Party seized mainland China, but was not recognized by half of the countries in the world, especially the Western world. The two reasons for its initial involvement in the Olympic Games were that the Soviet Union needed participation of more Communist countries to exhibit the superiority of Communism, and that the PRC was eager to replace the ROC in the international society. However, they were not the IOC's concern. Lacking pragmatism and flexibility, the ideologically idealistic Communist China considered itself victimized by a Western-affiliated and -manipulated IOC. In his letter exchange with Brundage, Dong attacked the then IOC President for his "reactionary acts" and for being a "faithful menial of the U.S. imperialists" (Brownell, 2005). An official at the State Sport Commission at that time, Dong's wording definitely represented the official opinion of the Chinese government. What's more, since Brundage was defending the decisions of the IOC, the IOC was also perceived as a reactionary international organization to denounce, which not only declined the will of the Chinese people to participate in the Olympic Games, but also attempted to internationally sabotage the fruit of the Chinese Communist revolution. ACSF officially withdrew from the IOC in 1958 in protest to the fabrication of two Chinas in the international sport community.

If the tension out of which the withdrawal took place was not severe enough to be rivalry, the establishment of the short-lived GANEFO was absolutely a war declaration from the PRC to the IOC. The GANEFO Movement began because of the PRC, gained full political and financial support from the PRC, and was led by the PRC while dwindling down. Its history introduced in Chapter 2, the GANEFO was anti-Olympics in its nature.

The PRC, the biggest patron of the GANEFO, explicitly aimed at countering the IOC in all aspects, especially at the non-politicization principle of the Olympic Movement (Pauker, 1965; Connolly, 2012).

The IOC fought back immediately. No IOC-recognized NOCs were allowed to send teams to the GANEFO, so most other participants of the GANEFO only sent non-Olympic caliber athletes. The PRC, its NOC an outcast from the IOC, and Indonesia, the founder of the Games, were the only ones which barely had anything to lose.<sup>15</sup> In consequence, the biggest supporter and sponsor of the GANEFO ended up with the best athletic performance as well. However, other participants' tepid attitude toward the Games and instable political situation in the "New Emerging Forces" withered the GANEFO, and the beginning of the Cultural Revolution completely absorbed the PRC and eventually gave the diseasing newborn GANEFO the last strike. The years of the GANEFO witnessed the PRC demonstrate power and gain prestige among the Third World, but it did not help solve the problem of two Chinas (Lutan & Fan, 2005). Not until years later, when the Cultural Revolution drew near to its end, did the PRC, having replaced the ROC as the widely recognized China, commence the rapprochement with the IOC.

The ROC behaved even more dramatically in the long rally with the IOC. Having lost most of the Chinese territory and retreated to Taiwan, whose status is still undecided today, the Nationalist regime, partly because of the support and recognition of the US and other major Western countries, did not downplay its claim to be the sole legitimate Chinese government. Nor was the idea of an independent Taiwan really shaped at that time. Consequently, when the IOC issued an invitation to the NOCs of both the PRC and the ROC, the latter reacted intensely. From then on, every time the IOC attempted to include

---

<sup>15</sup> "Barely" is used here because Indonesia, despite its fury against the IOC, didn't go completely against the IOC and even tried to participate in the 1964 Tokyo Olympic Games.

the PRC, even without agreeing to expel the ROC's Olympic Committee, the ROC always firmly denounced the decisions or attempts of the IOC by declaring a withdrawal, threatening to withdraw, or boycotting the Olympic Games. Between the founding of the PRC in 1949 and its NOC's reinstatement into the Olympic Movement in 1979, the ROC boycotted the 1952 Helsinki Olympic Games and 1976 Montreal Olympic Games. When entering the stadium at the opening ceremony of the 1960 Rome Olympics, Taiwanese athletes protested the name change by exhibiting banners with political demonstration, "UNDER PROTEST" (Lord Killanin, 1983, p.103). In protest to the Nagoya Resolution, the ROC continued to boycott the 1980 Lake Placid Winter Olympic Games and the 1980 Moscow Olympic Games,<sup>16</sup> until the name change was finally accepted and Taiwanese athletes participated in the 1984 Los Angeles Olympic Games for the first time under the name of Chinese Taipei. After the IOC's dual recognition in 1954, the President of the ROC's Olympic Committee immediately held a press conference and announced the ROC's exit from the Olympic Movement, weeping (Liang, 2007, p.40). However, the announcements or threats of withdrawal had never really come true until 1976.

The ROC, through the Taiwanese IOC member, Henry Hsu, also filed lawsuits against the IOC in Swiss court in 1979, appealing to nullify the Nagoya Resolution, only to get rejected (Pound, 2012). It also filed a lawsuit against the Lake Placid Olympic Games Organizing Committee in US court, protesting against the change of name, flag and anthem as the premise of Taiwan's participation in the 1980 Winter Olympic Games. The state trial supported Taiwan's claim but the decision was overturned after cross-appeal (Liang, 2007, p.188). The IOC won all legal battles.

---

<sup>16</sup> More accurately, the Taiwanese athletes arrived at the US for the Olympic Games, but got denied entry because of their adherence to "Republic of China" as the team name.



Therefore, the IOC's rivalry with the ROC was different from that with the PRC. The PRC's NOC was not recognized by the IOC until 1979. It had nothing to lose. Branding itself as the leader of the developing countries and the loyal member of the Communist bloc, the PRC went as far as forming the GANEFO in attempt to sabotage the Olympic Movement. Its action was driven by both Communist ideology and pragmatic political consideration. The ROC, having just lost control of the mainland China, on the contrary, had to do whatever it would take to overwhelm the PRC in the international community. The seat of the ROC's Olympic Committee in the IOC was perceived by the ROC as a matter of survival, especially after it was replaced by the PRC in the United Nations in 1971. Its allies not interested in mixing sports with politics,<sup>17</sup> the ROC had to struggle mostly on its own in this game. It played the victim card and resorted to legal means, and even turned its only IOC member against the IOC—while all three parties were hard-liners, the ROC was also a dramatic player. Interestingly, although the PRC and the ROC themselves were the real opponents, they showed commensurate intransigence when it came to political issues, or issues they considered political. However, they failed to overwhelm the IOC—the latter successfully smothered the newborn GANEFO, and won the three lawsuits in Switzerland and the United States.

### **3.2.3 Mediator**

The IOC's position in this process and its role as the promoter of the Olympic Movement made it inevitable for the IOC to provide good offices between the PRC and the ROC. Successful as it was in combatting the challenges and threats from both, the IOC was not a good mediator between the two confronting parties, in terms of the outcome after

---

<sup>17</sup> This statement may be more credible if it goes as “not interested mixing sports with the politics not related to themselves,” because the United States immediately led a boycott of the 1980 Moscow Olympic Games after the solution of the Two Chinas Question.

all endeavors. The major reason was that the IOC, unwilling to solve the political dispute and lacking the power to terminate it completely, wanted only to solve the sport problem, especially the Olympic Games participation, but both the PRC and the ROC politicized every issue that could be and placed national interest ahead of the sport rights of their people—they could not know better.

Neither the PRC nor the ROC would meet and talk with the other, so the initial talks were purely bilateral between the IOC and either the PRC or the ROC. Before the withdrawal from the IOC and most international sport federations in 1958, the PRC sent an official delegation to the IOC sessions and joint meetings of the Executive Board and the NOCs in Paris, Athens, and Rome, etc. The ROC also had delegates, but both avoided meeting each other. Even though the ROC physically sat out, the PRC could not tolerate that the ROC's name was on the IOC's official roster and made its debut in the IOC meetings a series of protests, which were considered political by the IOC members. In the meanwhile, the Taiwanese IOC member, Hsiang-His Kung never showed up in IOC sessions, and the pro-ROC IOC member, Cheng-Ting Wang, seldom did. The President of ROC's Olympic Committee attended and made a report in the 1954 Session, but was also considered politically biased because he was not an IOC member (Fan & Xiong, 2003, p.261).

Lord Killanin showed more willingness and resolution to proactively solve the Two Chinas Question after he succeeded Brundage as the IOC President even though the PRC, undergoing the Cultural Revolution and extremely politically radical, was rather passive and aloof. Lord Killanin proposed three-party round talks twice. The first time was when he visited Beijing in 1977, but Beijing considered it politically wrong to even simply attend an IOC meeting, let alone negotiate with the “Chiang clique” from Taiwan (Liang, 2007, p.143). Two years later, when the less-radical PRC finally agreed to direct dialogues in

1979, Taiwan refused (Liang, 2007, p.166). Meanwhile, Lord Killanin also authorized three IOC members, Lance Cross, Alexandru Spierco and Roy Bridge, to form a China commission to look into the problem. Beijing first required that they should not enter China under the name of China commission,<sup>18</sup> and then opposed that the IOC members continue to visit Taiwan.

In the end, Lord Killanin, determined to solve the problem, gave up the IOC's neutral position, and sided with Beijing. Abandoning the mediator role was not unreasonable. The PRC had replaced the ROC as the sole representative in the United Nations for years—the fact was acknowledged among the IOC members as well and gave the PRC the upper hand—but reluctant as the IOC was to exclude the Taiwanese athletes from the Olympic Movement, the ROC side was unyieldingly clinging to the “one-China policy,” where it ironically converged with the PRC. The more widely recognized the PRC was, the less conducive the ROC's stance was for the IOC to solve the problem and to save its own seat in the Olympic Movement. Soon the ROC consented to dual recognition. The IOC's deviation from the neutral mediator role actually contributed to the eventual Resolution—the Chinese Olympic Committee from the PRC got in, and the ROC's Olympic Committee boycotted the Olympic Games after the name change request but finally accepted its fate.

As the supreme authority of the Olympic Movement, the IOC wanted to solve the Two Chinas Question as much within the realm of sport as possible. However, this issue was considered by both the PRC and the ROC a hardcore political issue, which was beyond the IOC's control. Nor was it the IOC's responsibility to reconcile the hostility and incompatibility of the two battling regimes. Therefore, it is understandable that the IOC

---

<sup>18</sup> Non-interference with internal affairs has always been one of the PRC's principles for foreign policy. The PRC would not yield state sovereignty even nominally to “foreign power.”

was not a successful mediator and gave up the role. In addition, thanks to the zero-flexibility of both the PRC and the ROC, the politically neutral IOC became a rival for both Chinese government. Then the IOC surrendered its non-politics principle, examined the factual world politics, and stood with the PRC—the totally disadvantaged ROC had to choose the only option it was offered for survival. The Chinese Olympic Committee was recognized, the Taiwanese athletes' right to participate in the Olympic Games was successfully protected (though not without risks)—the problem was solved.

### **3.3 DECISION-MAKING AND INDIVIDUAL POWER**

The IOC decisions are ultimately made through the vote of the IOC members, who are individuals that represent the Olympic Movement worldwide. It is clearly stated in Item 16.1.4 in the Olympic Charter (IOC, 2014a) that,

Members of the IOC represent and promote the interests of the IOC and of the Olympic Movement in their countries and in the organisations of the Olympic Movement in which they serve. (p. 33)

This item decides that, theoretically, the IOC members vote for the sake of the Olympic Movement only, and an IOC resolution reflects the will of the majority of the individual IOC members. However, as the IOC member scatter all over the world, and are convened only for the IOC sessions annually, the Executive Board, which consists of fifteen IOC members,<sup>19</sup> can be convened by the President or upon the request of the majority and discuss critical or emergent affairs. As aforementioned, the draft of the Nagoya Resolution was the product of the Executive Board meeting in Nagoya, Japan, and the following vote among the IOC member was conducted by mail. With regard to the

---

<sup>19</sup> The Executive Board consists of the President, four Vice Presidents, and ten selected IOC members.

battle of the PRC and the ROC, the power of individuals played an important role, and largely set the rules of the game.

### **3.3.1 The IOC Members**

At the beginning, to the PRC and its delegates' disappointment, the IOC members from the Communist countries didn't represent their home countries' stance well enough, while those from the western countries didn't deviate far enough from theirs. In a word, almost nobody wanted to (western) or, even if they wanted to, dared to (Communist bloc) talk about politics. Despite the disparate views on sport-politics relations, the IOC members were willing to recognize the PRC's NOC—as aforementioned, more than half of the IOC members attending the 1953 Mexico City Session voted in favor of the ACSF's recognition—but they didn't want to see Taiwanese athletes excluded from the Olympic Movement, especially when the Communist government didn't have *de facto* jurisdiction over Taiwan.

An IOC member as an individual owned more freedom than a governmental representative. For governments and their representatives, if they established diplomatic relations with the PRC, they must recognize that there was but one China and that Taiwan was part of China, and revoke the established official relation, if any, with the Nationalist government in Taiwan. But theoretically an IOC member didn't have such an obligation to cater to the political interests of a certain country because of its bold and radical political assertions, even if they were recognized by the member's home country.

The fact that the IOC members voted as individuals, however, also meant that they could be persuaded, especially by their fellow members. This is true with the Two Chinas Question case, especially in the 1970s—some IOC members played significant roles as individual messengers and mediators, such as Spierco from Romania, Tsuneyoshi from

Japan, Prince Gholam from Iran, and Juan Antonio Samaranch from Spain, etc. It was also partly because the PRC began to understand the decision-making mechanisms within the IOC. It learned to use the help of pro-PRC IOC members to deliver messages and gather information. These IOC members also helped soften the PRC's position and persuaded the PRC to make compromise.

In addition, Henry Hsu from Taiwan was named IOC member in 1970, which rendered the whole situation a deadlock (Lord Killanin, 1983, pp.103-104). Even though he was never in the Executive Board, he remained loyal to the Nationalist government of the ROC in Taiwan. He was an even more significant figure when the ROC sued the IOC in a local court in Lausanne, because only a member of an organization could sue the organization according to Swiss law. Even though the ROC didn't win the lawsuit, it is another case where individual power overwhelmed state power within the IOC.

### **3.3.2 The Executive Board**

The Executive Board of the IOC not only set the agenda of the IOC sessions, but also met more frequently to discuss IOC issues. Thus, the subjects are most sufficiently talked about and debated over within the Executive Board. Moreover, five of the fifteen members of the Executive Board are the President and the Vice Presidents, and the other ten are elected by all members. They have either higher status and thus greater influence, or higher reputation, or both within the IOC and can be the game changer. In this case, all progress was made in the Executive Board meetings,

- Lord Killanin presented his trip to Beijing in the 1977 Executive Board meeting.
- The China Commission was formed in the 1978 Executive Board meeting.

- Representatives from both the PRC and the ROC respectively made representations at the Executive Meeting in Lausanne, Switzerland, March 1979, and at the Executive Meeting during the Montevideo Session in April.
- A new resolution favoring the PRC was drafted by a working group authorized by the Executive Board meeting in San Juan in June 1979. No consensus was reached.
- The draft resolution was unanimously agreed upon in the Executive Board meeting in Nagoya in October 1979. The resolution passed the postal vote by IOC members.

The direct communication between the IOC and either the PRC's or the ROC's delegation was made through the Executive Board meeting. The development went back and forth—but it was obvious that the objection within the Executive Board impeded the process more than that outside the Board. As long as the Board reached consensus on a resolution on the Two Chinas Question, the resolution passed. But if there was not unanimity within the Board, no substantial progress could be achieved. Besides, the Executive Board also balanced the President's personal view, especially when the President went too far with it—this function was better served during Lord Killanin's terms (Lord Killanin, 1983, pp.103-107).

### **3.3.3 The President(s)**

It is noticeable that the Presidents had enormous influence throughout the IOC. With regard to the Two Chinas Question, the President's attitude directly influenced, if not decided, the trajectory of the question's development. It is acknowledged that the resolution was more contingent on the PRC's and the ROC's willingness to make concessions, but the IOC did present two disparate positions when dealing with the PRC. Brundage's IOC was driven to be an idealistic sport utopia, detached from world politics but destined to enter a deadlock, when clashing with the radical PRC. Lord Killanin's IOC

was more pragmatic, and of course, deliberately surrendered a smattering of the non-politicization principle for the desired outcome.

The two Presidents were so powerful within the organization that many turning points were related to their personal decisions. Avery Brundage pushed both parties so hard not to talk politics that it virtually became a non-starter for solving the Two Chinas Question during his presidency. After Taiwan's announcement of withdrawal from the Olympic Movement in 1954, Brundage put "Republic of China" back into the list of recognized NOCs, which officially had the Two Chinas Question internalized into international sport community. His ideal of apolitical sport enraged both parties and their sympathizers—the PRC couldn't tolerate the creation of two Chinas, criticized it as hypocrisy and withdrew in 1958, and the ROC's Olympic Committee was forced to change its name for the first time because the government did not have jurisdiction over mainland China anymore.<sup>20</sup> In addition, Henry Hsu from Taiwan became an IOC member solely because Brundage wanted him to—it was yet another privilege of the President: as a tradition, Executive Board members did not raise differing opinions from the president at the Session (Lord Killanin, 1983, pp.103-104).

Lord Killanin, on the contrary, showed his determination to solve the problem, once and for good. The IOC had been more proactive on having the NOC of the PRC recognized than the PRC itself until 1977. He personally paid a visit to Beijing and communicated with the Chinese officials when the IOC and the PRC still lacked formal interactions. He also led the IOC slightly off the non-politicization principle of the Olympic Movement, and took advantage of the world politics—the PRC's seat in the UN became a reference, and the Irish went as far as to design a plan in which a disadvantaged Taiwan would have

---

<sup>20</sup> The Taiwanese team was registered as Formosa China in the 1956 Melbourne Olympic Games, and competed as Taiwan in the 1960 Rome Olympic Games. Then it went on to compete as the Republic of China again in 1968 and 1972.



to accept the proposed name change and give up its flag and anthem. Lord Killanin was a successful pro-PRC strategist.

### **3.4 NON-POLITICIZATION AND POLITICAL INFLUENCE**

The different approaches that the two IOC Presidents respectively adopted to solve the Two Chinas Question and their respective outcomes illustrated the IOC's dilemma—the IOC was a conceptually apolitical sport organization, but without considering or taking advantage of world politics, it was improbable to reach its primary goal of promoting the Olympic Movement globally. Even though Avery Brundage might not have realized it or went to great lengths to eliminate it, politics always existed, and from the moment Lord Killanin inquired the United Nations about the international recognition of the PRC and the ROC, the IOC consciously deviated from political unbiasedness and eventually terminated the political issue by political means.

It has always been included in the first principle in the Olympic Charter that no discrimination is allowed based on politics or against a person's political affiliation. Keeping the Olympic Games from politics has also been listed as one of the IOC's missions. Hill (1992, p.31) argued that the IOC was not only unable to isolate itself from the influence of world politics, but also had greater political involvement than other sport organizations because of its higher public exposure. However, the political influence in the title of this section refers to proactive political involvement which influenced the IOC in decision-making rather than passive political involvement that was imposed to the IOC, such as the mutual boycotts of the United States and the USSR. This section is intended to analyze whether and how political was incorporated by the IOC in the solving process of the Two Chinas Question. The use of politics of the IOC, the Olympic Movement's supreme authority where politics was proscribed, is worth more examination than that of

the PRC and the ROC, two authoritarian governments whose colorization of their participation in the Olympic Movement was not unexpected.

### **3.4.1 IOC Members Were More than Individuals**

Although the IOC members are individual decision makers, they have their own political opinions and ideals. Even if an issue is not directly related to certain IOC members' political interests, they view it from a perspective that reflected the culture they were brought up in, the education they received, and political indoctrination from significant others and political authorities. That is, when the IOC needs to make a decision either related to political issues or with political implications, the IOC members' ballots indeed come from individuals, but are, at the same time, the end products of the formal and informal political education these individuals have received.

Moreover, a number of IOC members are or used to be governmental officials, or are *de facto* government representatives. This is especially true with the IOC members from authoritarian nations. Since the very beginning of the PRC's pursuit of IOC recognition, the IOC members from the Eastern Bloc were supporters, and Konstantin Andrianov, the IOC member from the Soviet Union and a Communist Party member, was literally tutoring the PRC delegation about conduct codes and protocols (mainly about talking less politics) in the 1955 IOC Session in Paris, France (Liang, 2007, pp.41-44). Spierco, the Romanian member of the three-person China commission, was forbidden by his government to visit Taiwan (Lord Killanin, 1983, p.105). On behalf of Taiwan's Olympic Committee, the Taiwanese IOC member, Henry Hsu, virtually sued the IOC, the organization which he was supposed to defend. What's worse, Taiwan's Olympic Committee was manipulated by the Nationalist Government, and the government directly instructed Hsu on the ROC's strategy (Lord Killanin, 1983, p.105; Huang & Wang, 2013). Not unexpectedly, Zhenliang

He, the first IOC member from the PRC and a Communist Party member, also followed the instructions from the CPC and the Chinese government after he was elected (Li, 2009, pp.82-89).

As the IOC President is the most influential figure within the organization, her/his political stance is also more influential. Brundage attempted to drive the IOC as far away from political issue as possible. On the Two Chinas Question, the strategy Brundage adopted was that the political dispute should not seek solution within a sport organization and the IOC only deals with sportsmen's participation in the Olympic Games—the PRC's explicitly political appeal was declined by the Executive Board members. Years later, when the PRC had withdrawn, the jurisdiction that the ROC's Olympic Committee claimed to own was put into question, and a name change was requested. That being said, Brundage was suspected to be pro-ROC by his successor, Lord Killanin, because of non-punishment against ROC's political demonstration in the 1960 Rome Olympic Games and the nomination of Henry Hsu for IOC member. On the contrary, Lord Killanin (1983, pp.101-109), in his memoir, provided the rationale for all his efforts to include the PRC, which was "the curious anomaly that the country with the world's largest population did not take part in the Olympic Games, and I wanted to change this." This view pushed him to lead the IOC to find a solution proactively.

### **3.4.2 External Liaisons**

Out Lord Killanin reached. The IOC had not have an official reference for political matters, but the inquiry about China's situation was sent to the United Nations. The UN's reply was in favor of the PRC, and was acknowledged by the IOC members. Likewise, although Julian Roosevelt was not related to the United States government, the IOC member from the U.S. consulted the status of the PRC and the ROC with the U.S. State

Department in 1979 after the U.S. and the PRC established diplomatic relation, and again, the reply was in favor of the PRC (IOC, 1979b). The politically neutral IOC finally took external political authorities' opinion into consideration instead of making judgment all by itself.

Lord Killanin also communicated with the PRC frequently, the other side mostly government officials. He visited Taiwan in 1978 and was enraged by the political obstructions exerted by the ROC side (Lord Killanin, 1983, p.105-106). He went so far as to communicate plans and tactics with the PRC side, hoping that Taiwan, if not accepting the request for name change, could be forced to withdraw from the IOC. The IOC members also have connections with external political bodies. Not only the aforementioned a few Asian and Eastern Bloc IOC members sided with the PRC, but the ROC also had sympathizers, such as Lance Cross and many other members from the Commonwealth. The Two Chinas Question came to an end at last but even Lord Killanin (1983, p.107) admitted in his memoir that the Olympic Movement made compromise.

### **3.5 CONCLUSION**

When Pierre de Coubertin established the IOC, he wished the Olympic Movement was politics-free. However, even though it was regulated that the competition was between individuals rather than between nations, athletes were organized and sent by NOCs. As the Olympic Movement gained publicity and influence, it naturally became a battlefield for sovereign nations. When the IOC was forced to be involved in the battles, it was confronted with a choice, whether to adhere to principles or to mingle with reality. Brundage chose the former, attempted to isolate the IOC from the vicissitudes of world politics and avoided to play a role in the game. However, the Olympic Movement lost the world's most populated country and gained an opponent, the GANEFO (though short-lived). Lord

Killanin chose the latter, helped the PRC return, and forced Taiwan's Olympic Committee to change name, but sacrificed the principles of the Olympic Movement. Which was supposed to be righteous way is a philosophical question, which is beyond the discussion in this thesis, but the latter helped the Olympic Movement win back China, which has been exploiting the political value of the Olympic Games till today. Olympic ideals are divine and desirable, but as Epsy (1981, p.163-164) argued, politics was an intrinsic part of international sport, which definitely included the Olympic Movement—this argument makes the compromise of Lord Killanin less pitiful.

Obviously, Brundage and Lord Killanin were the two most significant figures within the IOC with regard to the Two Chinas Question. The Presidents' attitude and personal view actually decided the IOC's approach to deal with the problem. Of course, the Presidents, despite their privilege, needed to earn the support of the Executive Board, which met more frequently than ordinary IOC members and discussed matters more deeply and thoroughly. Then it was all the IOC members' turn to vote on a draft resolution. They were individuals from all over the world. Some of them represented or were manipulated by their governments, but more stood more independently. The individual IOC members didn't have their governments' obligation: they didn't have to negate one of the "two Chinas" while recognizing the other, but their willingness to include both was unacceptable for both parties.

The IOC didn't sit in the headquarters in Lausanne and make members vote. In the 1960s, it fought back when the radical PRC and suspended Indonesia founded a rivaling Games and smothered the infant GANEFO. In the 1970s, the IOC became more constructive and pragmatic and tried to offer good offices for the PRC and the ROC. However, even though both parties had explicit political interests to seek, they refused to pay by making compromise. Meanwhile, the Two Chinas Question gradually cleared up in

the international society and the situation favored China. The IOC, under Lord Killanin's leadership, favored the more widely recognized PRC, and successfully forced Taiwan's Olympic Committee to change its name—athletes from both mainland China and Taiwan could participate in the Olympic Games. Thus, the Two Chinas Question was solved in the Olympic Movement. By then, the IOC had played the role of the promoter of the Olympic Movement, the protector of athletes, the rival of the PRC and the ROC, and the mediator. It was not an unfair deal to surrender a plethora of the non-politicization principle, which had not been completely observed anyways, to reach the goal of including the world's largest population group into the Olympic Movement and gain more influence worldwide.

## **Chapter 4: The Olympic Movement: More a Winner than a Victim**

The political involvement of the IOC and the Olympic Movement, mostly of a passive nature, dates back as early as the 1930s, when Nazi Germany exhibited its state power and presumed superiority by hosting the 1936 Berlin Olympic Games (Keys, 2006). After WWII, the Olympic Movement and Olympism were victimized or claimed to be by the Cold War spillover, East Germany's organized doping scandal, the USA and the USSR's mutual boycott, and, most recently, China's massive human rights abuse. The battle between the PRC and the ROC for the exclusive right to represent China in the Olympic Movement was no exception—not only was the IOC dragged into the swirl of political disputes, but it also had to solve this political matter within the sport field by political means.

Before the 1970s, the IOC went to great lengths to shun the forced obligation of judging the two battling parties. Well-intended and idealistic as the IOC and the then President, Avery Brundage, might be, the IOC enraged both and their supporters and was widely criticized. Whether or not the purity of Olympism protected still unknown, the Olympic Movement was denied entry into the world's most populated nation for almost three decades. By no means was the perseverance implausible, but as many have observed, it is impossible that the Olympic Movement, born and burgeoning in the human society, part with world politics (Epsy, 1981; Hill, 1992; Keys, 2006).

In the 1970s, the IOC, with a proactive President, adopted a pragmatic approach to solve the problem within the decade. As Lord Killanin admitted, the Olympic Movement surrendered its principle. Politics surely eroded Olympism. Yet the Olympic Movement finally covered almost all the inhabited lands in this planet, impacted most of the world population, and, more importantly, succeeded in retaining the athletes both from mainland

China and Taiwan within its realm. The political obstructions the ROC authority created were cleared, and the NOC in Taiwan ceased to purport to preside over all China's sports activities, which it actually had not done for decades. The PRC's NOC, now Chinese Olympic Committee, was recognized, and the PRC authority made a "concession impossible" and allowed Taiwan's Olympic Committee to stay in the IOC and have the same status *de jure* as its own.<sup>21</sup>

Therefore, throughout the twenty-eight years' politicized battle in sport, the Olympic Movement and its supreme authority, the IOC, was undoubtedly a big winner. The IOC even made extra-sport contribution: "the Olympic Formula" enabled the *de facto* autonomous but diplomatically derecognized Taiwan to participate in international events and organizations under the name of Chinese Taipei (Chan, 2002). The IOC was made the winner because of both the organizational characteristics and the world political climate.

#### **4.1 AUTONOMY KEPT THE OLYMPIC MOVEMENT AT BAY**

The IOC was such "a self-electing, self-regulating body, consisting on the whole of individuals," that corruption and bribery scandals were finally exposed at the turn of century (Hill, 1992, p.56). MacAloon (2011) argues, however, if not for its autonomous and non-intergovernmental characteristics, the organization would not survive the Cold War. Likewise, it is the IOC's autonomy based on the Olympic Charter and individual members that kept the IOC as far as possible from the threats and attempted hijacking, especially the political ones. Fairly covering almost all aspects of the Olympic Movement governance, the Olympic Charter was the basis for autonomy and the constitution of the Olympic realm. The IOC members, representative of the Olympic Movement rather than

---

<sup>21</sup> The PRC, of course, interprets differently and claims that the Chinese Taipei Olympic Committee is subordinate to the Chinese Olympic Committee.



of their own countries, were the guardians of the movement's independence and unbiasedness.

If the IOC members had been government delegates, debates and votes themselves would have become political races despite the non-politicization principle. The IOC members would have taken the views of their respective governments and voted according to governmental instructions—the IOC would have been paralyzed, the Olympic Movement completely kidnapped by political agenda. It would have been extremely unlikely that non-politicization principle be practiced if governments had been directly involved. The short-lived GANEFO, which was founded under the slogan that sports and politics were inseparable, was a proof that an intergovernmental sport organization could not survive political disputes. Thanks to total autonomy, the IOC did not become a total battlefield where all nations could fight overtly for political interests.

The IOC members were repulsed by the PRC and the ROC's attempted manipulation over the autonomous organization. When both did so, the seemingly more aggressive party had to accept arrested development. The treatment only worsened when the President felt this way. The political obstructions the ROC created expedited Lord Killanin's deviation from neutrality, and it was even more so when the PRC's ignorance of the Olympism infuriated Brundage.

Avery Brundage was extremely firm that sports had nothing to do with politics. According to the commonly held view of sport-politics relation above, his insistence and endeavor might seem naive, as argued by Espy (1981, pp.175-198). But it was not. It was necessary for the IOC to keep sports from political infringement. Absolute as he sounded, Brundage had done exactly what his seemingly more realistic successor, Lord Killanin, asserted—sport cannot shun politics completely, but it is necessary to protect sport from political exploitation (IOC, 1974, pp.572-574). What's more, the inevitable entanglements

of sports with politics only made it more urgent to check the political powers' use of them and to prevent the avoidable ones. The non-politicization principle was so well-received that talking politics explicitly, both from the PRC and the ROC, was unwelcomed and resented. Even the IOC member from the USSR, who was pro-China, had to check the harshness and pungency of the PRC delegation's political proclamation. One educated guess is that, for the Soviet Union's long-term goal of a political nature, Konstatin Andrianov, the member from the USSR, had to observe the IOC rules so that he was not isolated by the majority. Also it was the USSR's hope that the PRC's NOC could be recognized earlier by downplaying political proclamation, as a result of which the Communist Bloc could be stronger within the Olympic Movement. That is, in pursuit of political outcomes, the Soviet member must obey and enforce the IOC regulation to secure the nation's participation above all.

The solution of the Two Chinas Question became stagnant in Brundage's terms, but just because of the deadlock, the PRC realized the incompatibility of the PRC's explicit political purpose and the IOC's sport-oriented stance. In the 1970s, instead of assertively preaching the position of the PRC government and overtly attempting to subvert the IOC's authority, the PRC adopted a less aggressive approach to solve the IOC seat problem. The PRC's sport officials approached and persuaded a number of IOC members one by one. It was not an easy step. The IOC members were not governmental representatives and did not have the duty to carry out governmental policies, as a result of which, it was not of much use to influence their opinions through their respective governments, despite the PRC's intransigent opposition against two Chinas in any diplomatic relation. On the contrary, many IOC members, out of responsibility to protect the Olympic Movement and sport practitioners, sought a feasible way to retain Taiwanese athletes while favoring

Beijing's seat. It was during the interactions with the IOC members that the PRC began to consider the alternatives of expelling Taiwan and finally made compromise.

#### **4.2 DEUS EX MACHINA: THE IOC EMBRACED FLEXIBILITY**

Although the rationale given above renders Brundage's unbending attitude reasonable and even plausible from an idealist perspective, the Olympic Movement did not benefit directly from the IOC taking a hard line. Correspondingly, in spite of the admitted surrender of the Olympism, nothing substantial did the IOC lose with Lord Killanin's pragmatic path. Rather, the Olympic Movement won over China, and retained Taiwan. Thus, it is legitimate to interpret the IOC's compromise as its embrace with flexibility, the key to the Two Chinas Question.

##### **4.2.1 Seeking a Fourth-Party Authority: The United Nations**

Lord Killanin's starting point was not a political one. He deemed that the anomaly that the world's largest population group was not in the Olympic Movement should be changed. Although he personally doubted the PRC's claimed jurisdiction over Taiwan, recognized both Chinese governments, and hated to have political agenda involved in his organization, he was determined to solve the problem (Lord Killanin, 1983, pp.101-109). Official consultation was made with the United Nation for the status of the PRC and the ROC—the IOC sought the most reliable and unbiased external authority available for reference.<sup>22</sup> When both parties were exerting political pressure to the IOC, the IOC chose to let the fourth-party authority judge—that could be the political solution to the political dispute, and the IOC could be the solution user rather than the solution maker.

---

<sup>22</sup> Avery Brundage used to refer to recognition in the UN, too, but it was in his letter communication with IOC members rather than an official inquiry.

However, the political solution outside the IOC did not cover the sport field. It was not a perfect one—Taiwanese people, still governed by an independent government greatly derecognized by the international community, were isolated from global issues (Lee, 1999). The PRC's Olympic Committee, *de facto* affiliated to the government, tried to claim jurisdiction over sport activities in Taiwan, trying to erase the name of the ROC or Taiwan from the non-intergovernmental but influential IOC, while the ROC's Olympic Committee, whose tie with the government was no less strong, took advantage of the IOC's non-intergovernmental feature, attempting to make the ROC survive the diplomatic isolation and suppression from the PRC. Therefore, the seat replacement in the United Nations did not end the political battle in the IOC—only a permanent solution of Taiwan's status would help, but that was extremely unlikely (not even now). It would be a shame if the diplomatic isolation extended to the Olympic Movement. Compromise was made for the second time, and the IOC gained more flexibility on this issue.

#### **4.2.2 The IOC Became a Player in the Political Game**

Both the stagnancy in the Brundage era and the passive attitude of both parties proved over and over that the PRC and the ROC had politicized the Two Chinas Question in the IOC so much that they not only refused to put politics aside, but also colorized any effort of the IOC to divorce the Olympic Movement and political infringement. The IOC had no choice but to proactively engage in this matter, since Lord Killanin aimed to settle the dispute in the short term. It picked up the player role, which had been tossed over by the other two parties for a long time, and began to play the game instead of shunning.

The IOC was such a good player that the outcome, the Nagoya Resolution, was hardly a political one. Although Espy (1981, p.188) sided with New York State Supreme Court Judge Norman Harvey and agreed that the IOC had made a political decision, the

decision did not generate direct and substantial influence in world politics, nor was the IOC involved in derivative political disputes. The IOC adopted a political means in exchange for the non-political result. For example, in the Communist China's saying, the Chinese commission's investigation, visit to Taiwan, or even its existence, was an unwelcomed intervention with the nation's internal affairs. This case again proved the inevitability of professing politics—the sport governance on both sides was so political that the Commission mingled with government officials and deviated from political neutrality. In Liang's (2007) biography of Zhenliang He, the China commission and the PRC agreed upon several common points as follows,

- 1) There is only one China in the world, and that is the People's Republic of China.
- 2) Taiwan is a part of China, and the Taiwan problem is China's internal affair.
- 3) It is unreasonable that the Chinese people are not represented in the roc.
- 4) China's right to representation in the roc ought to be quickly resolved. (p.153)

Politics obviously came ahead of sport in the agreement. If this is the case with the political-balanced China commission, any activity in which Lord Killanin was directly involved could only be more in favor of the PRC, since his position was reasonably biased. He kept frequent and close communication with the PRC side and exchanged opinions on strategy with Beijing's sport officials to either force the ROC's Olympic Committee to change its name or quit. Nonetheless, the flexibility was not shown throughout the Olympic Movement history but rather when it was critical for the Olympic Movement's development or even survival.

The incident at the 1976 Montreal Olympic Games was a typical product of the IOC's apolitical autonomy and increased flexibility. Only a decade earlier, the Indonesian Olympic Committee was suspended by the IOC for declining Taiwanese and Israeli athletes' participation in the Asian Games because of Communist China and the Arabic

nations' objection, but the IOC, after a long-time confrontation with the Canadian government, made the compromise first and proposed the name change of the ROC's team. Throughout the process, the IOC faced criticism from all over the world, but was adamant that the Canadian government should not infringe the integrity of the Olympic Movement with its political consideration.<sup>23</sup> When the deadlock was about to virtually affect the Olympic Games, the IOC made compromise and proposed name change of the ROC's delegation to guarantee the participation of Taiwanese athletes. Participation was the IOC's bottom line. The ROC's boycott was expected, but it was rather the ROC's decision—the IOC had no liability for the athletes' forced withdrawal. It was obvious that the flexibility the IOC had gained was that Taiwan could be sacrificed in this game.

A comparison can be drawn. When the IOC attempted to circumvent any political means to end the dispute, it ended up clashing with harsh political backlash. However, when the IOC took a political approach to work on this issue, the final resolution was barely of a political nature. In this case, the IOC lacked the ability to eliminate politicization but was capable of minimizing the consequence of politicization by proactively doing politics. Meanwhile, the organizational characteristics and abundant resources helped reduce the negative impact of the IOC's political involvement and uphold the principles to the maximum.

#### **4.3 WORLD POLITICS: CATALYTIC BUT NOT DECISIVE**

It is not coincidental that the change of the PRC's and the ROC's positions and dispositions during the battle was largely in correspondence with that of their international statuses. As aforementioned, the United Nations' recognition of the PRC boosted Lord Killanin's motivation to make a change. The change in the Sino-U.S. relation, more than

---

<sup>23</sup> It was a bigger conundrum for the Canadian government. The ROC's participation was even more unnegotiable for the Canadian government than for the IOC.

merely influencing the opinions of the IOC members from the USA, was expected by Lord Killanin to be conducive to the solution (Liang, 2007, p.141). Even Brundage referred to the UN's recognition, though informally and personally, in his letter exchange with Dong in defense of the IOC's disposition (IOC, 1979a). Better relations between the PRC and other nations also contributed to better understanding, if not acceptance, of its "all or nothing" standpoint. Many realized the ridiculousness of the PRC being excluded from the Olympic Movement, and a few IOC members, especially those who had close relationship with their respective governments, began to voice in favor of the PRC. Interestingly, the PRC also used sports as instrument to ameliorate relations with many other countries, such as Japan and the United States, etc. (Xu, 2008, pp.117-163).

Nevertheless, the IOC was not much influenced, at least not acutely, by the vicissitudes in world politics. The primary and long-lasting divergence was the IOC's willingness to include both NOCs from China, though "but one China" was proclaimed by both parties and supports by their allies in the Cold War. The IOC's insistence eventually paid off and the fruit has survived the globally prevailing "one-China policy," thanks to the PRC's growth into one of the world's super powers. While Taiwanese people are still excluded from the United Nations, Taiwanese athletes can be organized by a self-governing, independent regional NOC and participate in the Olympic Games, as long as they do not bring up explicit political appeals—it is perfectly in line with the Olympic spirits. In terms of inclusiveness, the Nagoya Resolution was unprecedented.

That ROC seemingly took the upper hand in the 1950s was mainly because of Beijing's extreme aggressiveness rather than because of the world political environment. Beijing's criticism of the IOC as the executor of the American and Western imperialism was radically biased, but the IOC was indeed Eurocentric, especially West-Eurocentric, which has been easily proved (Hietanen, 1982). Had it been significantly influenced by

world politics, the IOC would have coalesced with the Western bloc and fully supported the ROC. However, the IOC, on the contrary, regulated that the jurisdiction of the ROC's NOC did not go beyond Taiwan and surrounding islands and requested name change (IOC, 1959a). The IOC was criticized by governments and media for this resolution, but firmly defended its decision (IOC, 1959b).

Therefore, the world politics was undoubtedly a predictor of the trend of the two Chinas' battle within the IOC, but the IOC avoided embracing the politicians' decisions. Eurocentric as it was, the IOC did not stand with the Western bloc or blindly support the ROC's proclamation. The Olympic Movement could have welcomed and accepted the NOC from a less-radical, less-assertive PRC, had there been one. After the PRC triumphed in world politics, the IOC, though eager for reinstating Beijing's Olympic Committee, endeavored to retain the Taiwanese athletes. Again, it is the IOC's organizational characteristics that helped balance the effect of global political trend and keep out the severest part, though not all, of political race's brutality.

#### **4.4 THE SWITCH: BEFORE AND AFTER THE PRC RETURNED THE UN**

The reinstatement of the PRC and the expulsion of the ROC in the UN did not directly affect the IOC's decision. However, the balance of power in the three-party struggle indeed was shifted. The ROC was still the weakest party and only got even weaker, having lost worldwide diplomatic recognition. The major shift took place in the bilateral interaction between the IOC and the PRC—both expected rapprochement, the PRC had more interests at stake.

Although it continued claiming to be the sole legitimate representative of China and asked for expelling Taiwan, Beijing's purpose changed. Before its withdrawal in 1958, and even during the years of the GANEFO, Beijing's goal was to earn global diplomatic



recognition—when it was impossible to join world-wide intergovernmental organizations, especially the United Nations, Beijing turned to influential non-government organizations, such as the IOC (Yu, 2008). The PRC had nothing to lose, but the IOC’s recognition of its Olympic Committee could have been a win for Beijing. In comparison, the Olympic Movement risked losing the world’s biggest population group, and it did. It is also the case when the GANEFO was formed to challenge and undermine the IOC’s supremacy.

After 1971, however, the PRC replaced the ROC as the much more recognized China. Beijing realized the tremendous negative impact of the ostracism from the Olympic Movement, in which Taiwan’s Olympic Committee was the only NOC from China. Had Beijing not solved the problem, it could have suffered more than the ostracism in sport—just like what Beijing intended to do two decades ago, Taiwan could politicize its participation in the IOC and remain a threat to Beijing’s legitimacy. On the contrary, having lost mainland China long before, the worst case for the IOC was rather recognizing the PRC and losing Taiwan—the Olympic principles would be compromised, but the Olympic Movement would actually expand.

Beijing had an even wider edge in the first round but made no progress, but the final outcome was that Beijing made compromise and the Olympic Movement retained Taiwan at the end of the second round. One of the reasons, of course, is the obstinacy of both parties—the PRC attached enormous political significance to the status of “the only China” in the Olympic Movement, while the IOC was indifferent to Beijing’s political considerations. Retrospectively, the PRC could have taken a milder position and sought evolutionary change after admission—after all, the dual recognition of the Chinese Olympic Committee and the Chinese Taipei Olympic Committee almost three decades later was no better. Unfortunately, it is unlikely even if history was rerun, since Beijing still considers its intransigence righteous and critical. Another reason is the PRC’s lack of

understanding of the Olympic Movement and misuse of strategy. All the requests from the Communist government and from individuals on behalf of the government, especially the IOC member, Dong, added up to the impression of Red China's invasion. The IOC could have communicated with the Beijing better and got better understanding of the PRC's standpoint, had Beijing downplayed or understated the government's stake. In addition, Brundage's influence cannot be ignored because of his retention of Taiwan's Olympic Committee. Other motives put aside, his insistence of non-politicization was justifiable, and Taiwanese athletes were saved from the highly-likely long-lasting, if not permanent, political ostracism.

## Chapter 5 Conclusion

This thesis interprets the solution of the Two Chinas Question from the perspective of the IOC, which hardly exists in the literature in Olympic studies. It contributes to a better understanding of the organizational behavior of the IOC faced with inevitable political disputes. Despite his efforts to stand neutral, the background of the researcher, a Chinese native, may influence his interpretation of events. The researcher includes as many literature and resources in Chinese language as possible, but acknowledges the inaccessibility of official documents from the PRC and the ROC.

The history is an open book—the twenty-eight years' battle between the PRC and ROC, including the IOC's role and actions can be interpreted from different perspectives. The IOC was the promoter of the Olympic Movement, the protector of athletes and was forced into rivalry with both the PRC and the ROC. Besides, unfortunately, the attempt to be a mediator was not successful. It is arguable whether the IOC could have done better. For sure, many details exposed the IOC's lack of knowledge of the China problem. Brundage mistakenly thought Taiwan had only been part of Japan (Fan & Xiong, 2002).<sup>24</sup> Lord Killanin, considered by the Chinese government a friend of Chinese people, could not spell Shouyi Dong's name right for even just once (Lord Killanin, 1983, pp.101-108). However, the moves that the IOC took through the years were generally justifiable and appropriate.

The IOC and the Olympic Movement were seldom the center of the study in the existing literature—they are either considered a less significant party or portrayed as the

---

<sup>24</sup> Taiwan was indeed a Japanese colony before the end of World War II. But before Japanese occupation, Taiwan was part of the Qing Dynasty, whose territory went even beyond the current territory of the People's Republic of China. It is yet disputable whether or not Taiwan is a part of China, but it is undeniable that Taiwan used to be part of a monarchy together with mainland China.

victim who paid dearly for its naivety and quixotism. It is not the whole truth. This thesis argues that the IOC upheld its non-politicization principle, which suffered minimum harm, while showing certain flexibility. The flexibility refers to the willingness to make concession and professing politics. The adherence to principles was self-evident during Brundage's presidency and not understated during Lord Killanin's. Indeed, the latter was more pragmatic on the Two Chinas Question and proactively played the game for desired outcome, but it is the pragmatism that allowed the IOC to minimize external political infringement and maintain the inclusiveness of the Olympic Movement. Ironically, playing the political game turned out to be the key to end political interference. Unlike what many believe, this thesis deems the Nagoya Resolution to be a hardly political solution, because it did not have substantial political influence or generate further political disputes. Therefore, compromise made by the Olympic Movement can be justified by the situation and the eventual result.

The compromise was not made in vain. Mainland China, where the world's largest population group resided, returned to the Olympic Movement, while the Taiwanese people could still participate independently. Considering this fact, the Olympic Movement was the biggest winner among the three parties of the battle. The IOC and the Olympic Movement gained expansion and lost a smattering of integrity—and whether the loss matters is arguable. First, as many argue, sport and politics do mix. It is the reality that the IOC must face, notwithstanding the no-politics principle of the Olympic Movement. The political nature of the Two Chinas Question cannot be ignored. Solution desired, the IOC had to face and profess politics, as a result of which, the problem was put to an end. Secondly, since the Olympic ideals are a vision to be pursued, the loss is not a real loss. Moreover, it turned out that the blatant criticizers, including the USA, the Soviet Union, and the PRC,

have imposed more political interference, which only makes the IOC one of the most politically neutral and innocent party within the Olympic Movement.

In comparison, the PRC and the ROC suffered much more loss. The ROC's Olympic Committee kept its membership but had to change its name, flag and anthem, which were political presence of the Nationalist government. Despite the reinstatement of its NOC and the ban on the ROC's political presence, the PRC had to accept the reality of dual recognition, a less explicit version of "two Chinas," in the Olympic Movement. Neither the PRC government nor the Chinese Olympic Committee has been able to profess jurisdiction over sport activities in Taiwan so far. What they lost or failed to achieve was exactly what they fought the politicized battle for.

The Olympic Movement also survived the bold challenger in the 1960s, the GANEFO, which was tremendously supported and sponsored by the PRC. It was partly because of the IOC's ban on the NOCs' participation, which made the level of the competitions in the GANEFO much lower than Olympic level. The GANEFO's quick death proved the unreliability of politicizing sports—both unfavorable domestic situations and international frictions brought negative impact on the celebration of sport events. The PRC enjoyed political gains from supporting the GANEFO, but could not move forward to change the international sport order.

The IOC's autonomy was the fundamental reason that the IOC survived the Cold War and eventually solved the Two Chinas Question with minimum political exploitation. The IOC members might have connection with their respective governments, but most were able to vote as individuals who did not completely honor the brutality of inter-governmental diplomacy—this non-intergovernmental and apolitical decision-making mechanism was considered reactionary and hypocritical by many, including the PRC and Indonesia during the GANEFO Movement, but helped the Olympic Movement stand firm

and survive relentless exploitation of super powers and international conflicts. Among all the IOC members, the presidents were the most important figures. They had enough power to set the agenda, influence the members' opinions, and shape the IOC's position. This point is made especially evident by the different dispositions that Brundage and Lord Killanin held respectively. Both presidents, their respective motives imperfect but justifiable, made efforts to seek the optimal solution to the Two Chinas Question and save the Olympic Movement from perilous jeopardy. The Executive Board was where thorough and deep discussions were made over the matter and where possible solutions were generated and put forward. The Executive Board members also balanced the IOC's position when the Presidents went too far with their personal opinions.

Meanwhile, the acknowledgement of the IOC's efforts and achievements doesn't cover the problems that lied within the IOC, some of which hindered the solution. First and foremost, politics always existed. Even though the organizational characteristics balanced political influence, politics was present, consciously or not, in every member's views and decision-making, not to mention the inevitable organizational politics. In addition, the IOC's struggle for independence from world politics distanced the organization from new political happenings and trends, which was a double-edged blade—it helped the IOC delay, if not completely block, instant political interference with the Olympic Movement, but also created difficulty for effectively communication between the IOC and governments. The IOC has made improvement on this issue. The over-empowerment of the IOC President was another problem that emerged. But it is a puzzle that is unlikely to be solved. Nor is restriction on presidential power surely a better way. Both Brundage and Lord Killanin exerted personal influence over the decision-making at a certain point of time and faced harsh criticism. However, further derivative problems might have emerged had they not

done so. Other problems, such as Eurocentrism and corruption, have also been pointed out or exposed during the later years.

Shortcomings admitted, the IOC's good will was undisputed. Lord Killanin expressed the exhilaration he felt when he saw the delegates from both Chinese Olympic Committees were talking casually during an IOC Session before long after the Nagoya Resolution. Another contribution of the IOC, and most probably an inadvertent one, was the creation of a way in which Taiwanese people could participated in international affairs not of a political nature. The Chinese Taipei Olympic Committee and Ching-Kuo Wu, the current IOC member from Chinese Taipei, were elated when Beijing won the bid for the 2008 Olympic Games. The PRC also celebrated the breakthrough when Chinese Taipei won its first Olympic gold medal in the 2004 Athens Games. Behind all the excitement and celebrations, the IOC's efforts should not be ignored and deserve more attention from scholars.

Ironically, another three decades after the Nagoya Resolution passed, another debate over China's human rights issue emerged prior to the 2008 Beijing Olympic Games. The Chinese government and the IOC switched their position. The IOC and other countries urged the Chinese government to improve the domestic human rights condition, while the Chinese government insisted that sport should not be mixed with politics. This position switch, along with the reasons behind and the impact forward, is worth studying. More researches given, it is expectable to map out the intricate and thorough network of the relation between sport and world politics, which covers all major levels of sport activities—the Olympic Movement, non-Olympic sports, and massive sports—and includes as many actors as possible—governments, international organizations, multinational corporations, and individuals, etc. It hopefully will help interpret sport-politics dynamics and maintain the integrity of sport, especially from political infringement, while pursuing *sport for all*.

## **List of Abbreviations**

ACSF	All China Sports Federation, the
CNAAF	Chinese National Amateur Athletics Federation, the
CPC	Communist Party of China, the
DPRK	Democratic People's Republic of Korea, the
FIFA	Fédération Internationale de Football Association
GANEFO	Games of the New Emerging Forces, the
IAAF	International Association of Athletics Federations, the
IOC	International Olympic Committee, the
NGB	National Sport Governing Body
NGO	Non-Governmental (International) Organization
NOC	National Olympic Committee
PRC	People's Republic of China, the
ROC	Republic of China (Taiwan), the
UN	United Nations, the
US/USA	United States of America, the
USSR	Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the
WWII	Second World War, the



## Bibliography

- Bairner, A., & Hwang, D. (2010). Representing Taiwan: International Sport, Ethnicity and National Identity in the Republic of China. *International Review for the Sociology of Sport*, 46, 231–248.
- Brownell, S. (2005, March). Globalization is not a Dinner Party: He Zhenliang and China's 30-Year Struggle for Recognition by the International Olympic Committee. Paper presented at the Conference on Globalization and Sport in Historical Context, UCSD. San Diego, CA.
- Cha, V. D. (2009). *Beyond the Final Score: The Politics of Sport in Asia*. New York, NY: Columbia University Press.
- Chan, G. (1985). The "Two-Chinas" Problem and the Olympic Formula. *Pacific Affairs*, 58, 473-490.
- Chan, G. (2002). From the 'Olympic Formula' to the Beijing Games: Towards Greater Integration across the Taiwan Strait? *Cambridge Review of International Affairs*, 15, 141-148.
- Connolly, C. A. (2012). The Politics of the Games of the New Emerging Forces (GANEF0). *The International Journal of the History of Sport*, 29, 1311-1324.
- Espy, R. (1981). *The Politics of the Olympic Games: With an Epilogue, 1976-1980*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

- Fan, H., & Xiong, X. (2003). Communist China: Sport, Politics and Diplomacy. In Mangan, J. A. & Fan, H. (Eds.), *Sport in Asian Society: Past and Present* (pp.258-276). London, U.K.: Frank Cass Publishers.
- Fengshuo de Guoshi, Jinxiu de Qiancheng (Achievements Aplenty Signify a Bright Future). (1963, November 23). *Renmin Ribao*, p. 4.
- Hietanen, A. (1982). Towards a New International Sports Order? *Current Research on Peace and Violence*, 5, 159-175.
- Hill, C. R. (1992). *Olympic Politics*. Manchester, U.K.: Manchester University Press.
- Huang, Y., & Wang, C. (2013). Chinese Question in the Olympic Movement: From the Perspective of Taiwan. *The International Journal of the History of Sport*, 30, 2052-2068.
- International Olympic Committee. (1950). *The International Olympic Committee and the Modern Olympic Games*. Lausanne, Switzerland. Retrieved from [http://www.olympic.org/Documents/Olympic%20Charter/Olympic\\_Charter\\_through\\_time/1950-Olympic\\_Charter.pdf](http://www.olympic.org/Documents/Olympic%20Charter/Olympic_Charter_through_time/1950-Olympic_Charter.pdf)
- International Olympic Committee. (1959a). About the Chinese Problem (Taiwan). *Bulletin du Comité International Olympique*, 67, 63.
- International Olympic Committee. (1959b). The Chinese Problem. *Bulletin du Comité International Olympique*, 68, 32-35.

International Olympic Committee. (1959c). Extract of the minutes of the 55th session of the International Olympic Committee in Munich (Haus des Sportes) May 25th to May 28th 1959. *Bulletin du Comité International Olympique*, 67, 74-86.

International Olympic Committee. (1960a). Extract Minutes of the 56th Session of the International Olympic Committee San Francisco (Hotel St Francis) February 15th and 16th, 1960. *Bulletin du Comité International Olympique*, 70, 47-54.

International Olympic Committee. (1960b). Extracts of the minutes of the 57th Session of the International Olympic Committee in Rome - Hotel Excelsior - August 22d to August 23d 1960. *Bulletin du Comité International Olympique*, 72, 61-69.

International Olympic Committee. (1963a). Meeting of the Executive Board of the International Olympic Committee with the Delegates of the International Federations February 8th, 1963, Hôtel de la Paix, Lausanne. *Bulletin du Comité International Olympique*, 82, 56-57.

International Olympic Committee. (1963b). Minutes of the Conference of the Executive Board of the International Olympic Committee with the Delegates of the International Federation Lausanne - Hôtel de la Paix - February 8th 1963. *Bulletin du Comité International Olympique*, 82, 53-56.

International Olympic Committee. (1964). Minutes of the 60th Session of the International Olympic Committee Baden-Baden Kurhaus October 14th-20th 1963. *Bulletin du Comité International Olympique*, 85, 68-73.

- International Olympic Committee. (1973). Concerning China. *Olympic Review*, 66-67, 171-174.
- International Olympic Committee. (1974). Speech by Lord Killanin, President of the IOC. *Olympic Review*, 85-86, 572-574.
- International Olympic Committee. (1979a). China: Memorandum from the President Lord Killanin approved by the Executive Board. *Olympic Review*, 145, 627-629.
- International Olympic Committee. (1979b). Minutes of the Meeting of the I.O.C. Executive Board, Nagoya, 23rd, 24th and 25th, October 1979. Lausanne, Switzerland: The IOC Historical Archives Section.
- International Olympic Committee. (2014a). *Olympic Charter*. Switzerland, Lausanne. Retrieved from [http://www.olympic.org/Documents/olympic\\_charter\\_en.pdf](http://www.olympic.org/Documents/olympic_charter_en.pdf)
- International Olympic Committee. (2014b). The organization. Retrieved from <http://www.olympic.org/about-ioc-institution>
- Jacobs, B. (1980). Taiwan 1979: "Normalcy" after "Normalization". *Asian Survey*, 20, 84-93.
- Kanin, D. B. (1981). *A Political History of the Olympic Games* (Westview Replica ed.). Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Keys, B. (2006). *Globalizing Sport: National Rivalry and International Community in the 1930s*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

- Lee, T. (1999). Understanding Taiwan: Bridging the Perception Gap. *Foreign Affairs*, 78, 9-14.
- Li, J. (2009). He Zhengliang: Wo Weiyi Qiqiu de Shi Geiwo Gongdao he Anning (He Zhenliang: All I Want is Justice and Peace). *Sanlian Shenghuo Zhoukan*, 553, 82-89.
- Liang, L. (2007). *He Zhenliang and China's Olympic Dream*. Beijing, China: Foreign Language Press.
- Liang Ren-Guey v. Lake Placid 1980 Olympic Games, Inc. No. 50-80, slip op. at 1-2 (Sup. Ct., Essex Cty., 1980)
- Lord Killanin. (1983). *My Olympic Years*. New York, NY: William Morrow and Company, Inc.
- Lutan, R., & Fan, H. (2005). The Politicization of Sport: GANEFO—A Case Study. *Sport in Society: Cultures, Commerce, Media, Politics*, 8, 425-439.
- MacAloon, J. J. (2011). Scandal and governance: inside and outside the IOC 2000 Commission. *Sport in Society*, 14, 292–308.
- Pauker, E. T. (1965). Ganefo I: Sports and Politics in Djakarta. *Asian Survey*, 5, pp. 171-185.
- Pound, R. W. (2012). Side-Swiped: the IOC and the China Issue at the 1976 Montreal Olympic Games. *Journal of Olympic History*, 20, 34-51.

- Xinhua News Agency. (1966, December 7). Diyijie Yazhou Xinyunhui Shengli Bimu (The 1<sup>st</sup> GANEFO Closes Successfully). *Renmin Ribao*, pp. 1, 4.
- Xinhua News Agency. (1979, November 27). Wo Zai Guoji Aowehui Hefa Quanli Dedao Huifu. *Renmin Ribao*, p. 1, 6.
- Xinhua News Agency. (1979, November 28). Guoji'aowehui Fuzhuxi Muzali Fabiao Tanhua: Shiyiren de Zhongguo Huidao Aolinpike Yundong, Aolinpike Jingshen Jiang Chongxin Puji Quanshijie (Statement by IOC Vice President Mzali: China Returns to the Olympic Movement, Olympic Spirits Will Influence the Whole World Again). *Renmin Ribao*, p. 6.
- Xu, G. (2008). *Olympic Dreams: China and Sports, 1896-2008*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Yu, J. (2008). China's Foreign Policy in Sport: The Primacy of National Security and Territorial Integrity Concerning the Taiwan Question. *The China Quarterly*, 194, 294-308.

## **Vita**

Y Andrew Hao was born in June, 1991, in Fushun, China. He received his LL.B. in International Politics from Fudan University in Shanghai, China. He is the Women's Tennis Team manager at the Intercollegiate Athletics Department of the University of Texas at Austin.

Email: [andrewhao@gmail.com](mailto:andrewhao@gmail.com)

This thesis was typed by the author.