Dear Friend:

On January 30, 1968, the International Olympic Committee will meet in Grenoble, France. At that time the I.O.C. will decide whether or not the Republic of South Africa will be allowed back into the 1968 Olympics, from which she was expelled in 1964 because of her policies of racial discrimination in sports.

South Africa is continuing this policy of race discrimination, despite her "New Sports Policy" to send a racially mixed team to the Olympics. The participants on this team, however, will be chosen only after racially segregated trials. It is obvious that South African non-white sportsmen, who are subjected to inferior athletic facilities, will not be given an equal opportunity to play in the Games. South Africa is simply trying to gain an easy reentrance into the international sports arena. Dennis Brutus, President of the South African Non-Racial Olympic Committee, said about South Africa's "New Sports Policy": "Two points must be recognized: one, that there have been changes vis-a-vis the outside world, and secondly, that these changes do not affect the racial structure of South African sport in any way."

If the I.O.C. decides to allow South Africa back into the Olympic competition, it will be a coup for white South Africa which has launched a vigorous campaign to perpetuate a new international image of racial harmony and progress. We believe that South Africa's attempt must be stopped. The I.O.C., which has already evidenced sympathy for South Africa's case, must know that Americans who are concerned about apartheid in any form will not accept the "New Sports Policy"!

Enclosed is a background paper which examines more thoroughly the history of South Africa and the Olympics, and details the "New Sports Policy". The time is short before the Grenoble meeting. It is important that all Americans express their opinions both to the U.S. Olympic Committee and to Mr. Avery Brundage, the American who presides over the International Olympic Committee. We ask you therefore to urge them not to equivocate on the principle of non-racialism in sports.

Act now by writing, telegraphing, calling or visiting:

Mr. Douglas F. Roby, The U.S. Olympic Committee
57 Park Avenue, New York, New York

Mr. Avery Brundage, President of the I.O.C.
Hotel LaSalle
10 North LaSalle Street
Chicago, Illinois

Sincerely,

George M. House
Executive Director

Encl.
THE PROBLEM: International sport could prove to be an Achilles heel of the white supremacist confidence in South Africa. If the country is barred from the 1968 Olympic Games in Mexico City, as it was excluded from the 1964 Tokyo Games, a severe jolt would be administered to South Africa's whole white community. This stems from the fact that South Africa is a country bristling with competitive sports fever, and it is no exaggeration to say that the goal of reinstatement into the Olympics has become a significant political issue as well. Since the 1964 decision to expel South Africa from the Olympic Games because of her policies of racial discrimination, the country has become increasingly, although by no means totally, ostracized in the international sports world. But last April, in an attempt to gain readmittance into the Olympics, Prime Minister B.J. Vorster made a speech before South Africa's all-white Parliament describing a "New Sports Policy". The debate within South Africa about this policy concerning some modifications of the rigid policy of apartheid as applied to sports has captured the headlines of newspapers for nearly a year.

What will be the result of this fervor in South African and international sports circles? Will any of the "new policies" force South Africa to adhere to Olympic principles and rules barring racial discrimination? Or will the International Olympic Committee accept South Africa's modifications and allow her back into the Olympics in 1968?

SOUTH AFRICAN SPORTS POLICY: AT HOME AND ABROAD. On the domestic level the consistent South African sports policy has involved the practical separation of sportsmen and spectators on the basis of race. Each sport (i.e. football, rugby) has a white national controlling body, which consists of representatives from each of South Africa's four provinces and is recognized on the international level as well. The national non-white organization for each parallel sport is offered only indirect representation in the white organization, equivalent to one-quarter vote of the white representation. In order to be represented at the national level, the non-white body must form separate associations for each of the racial groups (African, Colored, Asian). The South African Olympic Games Association (SAOGA) which is South Africa's controlling body at the Olympics, denies affiliation to groups which do not adhere to this form of "separate development".

No law forbids interracial sports events, except in boxing and wrestling, but the dominant white bodies which control each sport have made it clear that there will be no integration of athletics within South Africa. A host of administrative measures on both the governmental and municipal levels effectively confine non-white sportsmen to grossly inadequate and inferior facilities in the geographic area into which each racial group is restricted according to South African apartheid legislation. In addition spectators at sporting events are separated along racial lines, and non-whites must receive special permission to attend white athletic events.

On the international level the fundamental question of racial discrimination in the South African sports system has been discussed by the autonomous governing body of the Olympics, the International Olympics Committee (IOC), since 1959.
Although power politics and factional pressures have impinged upon the decisions and moves of the IOC, the basic question was and still is, whether or not South Africa adheres to the Olympic Charter. The Charter includes these basic principles:

**Principle 1:** No discrimination is allowed against any country or person on grounds of race, religion or political affiliation.

**Clause 25:** National Olympic Committees must be completely independent and autonomous and in a position to resist all political, religious or commercial pressures.

It is obvious that South Africa and its Olympic Association contravened these elements of the Olympic Charter (simply by sending all white teams to the Olympics) although it was not until 1963 that a decision was made by the IOC to refuse South Africa participation in the Olympics. The history behind that decision is:

1959 - The issue of racial discrimination in South African sport was raised at an IOC meeting. An internationally-backed organization, the Campaign Against Race Discrimination in Sport, called on the IOC to implement the fundamental non-discrimination principle of the Olympics and urged it to permit only teams which comply with the Charter to play at the 1960 Olympics. The South African Sports Association (SASA), founded within South Africa, organized a fight for the removal of color bars in sports and coordinated the efforts of non-racial bodies in their effort to gain international recognition in lieu of the all white SACGA. Mr. Reg Honey, South Africa's sole member of the IOC assured the Committee that although some SACGA's affiliates had color bars, that the South African Olympic Games Association itself did not practice racial discrimination. The IOC asked him to watch for signs of discrimination in the selection of Olympic teams.

1960 - SACGA sent a circular to all nations participating in the Olympics assuring them that not one Non-European sportsman in South Africa was up to international athletic standards. At a Rome meeting of the IOC, the South African Sports Association submitted a detailed report on SACGA's practice of racial discrimination. A SASA representative tried to attend the meeting but the South African authorities refused him a passport.

1962 - At its meeting in Moscow, the IOC formally took note of discriminatory practices in South African sport and warned that "if the policy of racial discrimination by their government in this respect does not change before our session in October, 1963, the IOC will be obliged to suspend SACGA." The IOC's new attitude was primarily due to the work of a new group, the South African Non-Racial Olympic Committee (SANROC), which was not formed until all attempts by non-white sportsmen to become members of SACGA had been denied. The group was constantly harassed by officials in South Africa.

1963 - Mr. Fred Braun, President of SACGA, informed the IOC at several meetings in Baden-Baden and Innsbruck that SACGA was forced to form separate associations and to organize separate sports competitions because of the policy of the South African Government; the argument being that sports administrators could not meddle in politics and had to accept the laws and customs of their country.
By this admission though, SACGA implied that it repudiated Clause 25 of the Olympic Charter. The IOC said that South Africa must accept the spirit of the Code and in particular Principle 1 and Rule 24, which states that sportsmen active in the Olympic movement must refrain from working politically.

1964 - The IOC kept extending the deadline for South Africa's compliance from December 31, 1963 until the summer of 1964, but finally in August of that year, it declared that South Africa could not participate in the Tokyo Games. SANROC also succeeded in having all-white Table Tennis Union suspended from international games and a non-racial Board recognized instead; and the suspension of the all-white South African Football Association from the World Cup.

**WHAT IS SOUTH AFRICA'S NEW SPORTS POLICY?** For several months, hints of an imminent change in the sports policy of South Africa was intimated by the new Prime Minister, Vorster, members of his cabinet and the press. The long awaited statement on mixed sport was delivered by the Prime Minister on April 11, 1967, and although deliberately vague in its implications, four points can be summarized.

1. Inside South Africa there would be no mixed sporting events and on this point there could be "no compromise, negotiations or abandonment of principles."

2. Non-whites would be able to compete at the Olympic Games as part of the South African team. The various racial groups would select their own competitors, and there would be a liaison between the various racial groups under the auspices of SACGA in the selection of the final South African team. The plan basically involved conducting separate trials for white and non-whites with the final selection being made by a multi-racial committee (with a white Chairman) on the basis of the athletes' merits. The team would then go to the Olympics under one South African flag.

3. International tournaments, such as the Canada Cup (golf) and Davis Cup (tennis), could be held in South Africa, and South Africa would not dictate what the composition of their teams should be. Mr. Frank Waring, Minister of Sport and Tourism, stated, "We leave it to the good judgement of the sports administrators invited to South Africa."

4. Finally, South Africa expected that other countries would not dictate to her the nature of South Africa's sports policy.

The close interrelation between the question of sports and government policy was revealed when Mr. Vorster stated that he wished it understood that if politicians interfered in the matter of interracial teams with the intention of harming relations between countries or between groups within South Africa, he would not hesitate taking preventive measures. While it is obvious that the Prime Minister, in conjunction with his broader plans for a South African public relations campaign, is willing to open the door a crack, he is not initiating a new, more liberal policy. Rather, he is trying to keep one step ahead of worldwide condemnation by attempting to create a more palatable image of South Africa.

What has been the critical reaction to Vorster's "New Sports Policy"? A typical
response of the African press has been:

South Africa should not be readmitted to the Games because the racially mixed team the authorities planned to send to the Mexico City Games would not be selected after mixed competitions. The very fact that separate competition would be held for Coloureds and Whites in different places before teams were selected showed how false was this alleged liberalisation in sport. (Ethiopian Herald, August 10, 1967).

Within South Africa, an opposition paper, The Rand Daily Mail, commented on April 13, "They (the rest of the world) will look behind what they call a façade and complain that in spite of this latest concession to international feeling, South Africa at home still maintains a rigid color bar," and Alan Paton asserted, "Mr. Vorster's announced new policy was no breakthrough at all...and Mr. Vorster has made it clear that South African non-whites will never be allowed to play against whites on the sports fields of this country... The intention of the Prime Minister is to limit participation by non-whites as strictly as he can. He is only doing this because of outside pressure." (Sunday Express, April 16, 1967).

WILL SOUTH AFRICA BE READMITTED INTO THE OLYMPICS? In 1963/1964 the campaign to remove South Africa from the Olympics roster was successful. At that time the South African Government’s policy was an obvious abuse of the Olympic rules, and it would not tolerate criticism or interference with its policy. In the words of General H.B. Klopper, ex-President of SACGA, "South Africa could not retaliate if the IOC wanted to make South African sport a political issue. We have got a way of life in this country we cannot change it because some people want us to." (London Times, Oct. 22, 1964). SACGA was required by the IOC to give assurances that all South Africans would be considered for selection to the Olympic team and to state its opposition to racial discrimination in sport, as defined by the Olympic code. Even at that time white officials had developed a plan to consider non-whites who accepted racial separation and belonged to satellite bodies affiliated to SACGA eligible for consideration to the South African Olympic Team. 

But they were not ready to declare their opposition to racial discrimination. The reasons that the IOC placed these demands on South Africa and which eventually led to her expulsion from the Games are difficult to estimate. But it was probably due to the diligent work of SACGA and SAN-ROC in presenting evidence of discrimination to the IOC; the fact that the African and Asian nations adopted a strong position, and the very significant decisiveness of the Socialist countries in opposing South Africa’s continued participation. A further contributing factor was a series of campaigns which had been conducted in specific sports, such as cricket and soccer, which were represented at the Olympics, and of course less tangible factors such as the political climate in South Africa and personalities on the IOC itself involved in the decision-making process. In summary, South Africa’s attitude was one of total non-compliance with the IOC’s requests, based probably both on principle and the mistaken belief that the IOC would not act.

But now, four (4) years later, South Africa is the aggressor, trying to slip back into the Olympic family by making a few minor concessions in the realm of sports, primarily on the international level. After P.M. Vorster’s speech, Mr. Fred Braun submitted a report to the IOC at its meeting in Tehran in May, 1967. It was decided at that meeting that a three man commission would investigate amateur sport in South Africa during a ten day visit in September. Members of the commission included: Sir Adetokumbo Ademola, Chief Justice of Nigeria, Mr. Reginald Alexander, President of the Kenyan Olympic Association, and Lord Killanin, an Irish peer. A binding decision concerning South Africa’s status (next page)
will be made, primarily on the basis of this commission's report, at an IOC meeting in Grenoble to be held February 1, 1968. Although the commission members have remained fairly tight-lipped about their impressions of the South African sports situation, there are indications that there is a good possibility that the IOC will accept the minor changes announced by South Africa and readmit her to the 1968 Olympics.

On what basis will the IOC change its 1964 decision to expel South Africa? It appears that South Africa and her allies have launched a campaign for readmission on the basis of the new selection plan for Olympic participants as described above. This plan, which still involves segregated competition, is South Africa's new concession to the Olympic principle. South Africa has also launched a program of sports exchanges and coaching visits with various western European and Commonwealth nations, as well as conducting a general and seemingly effective public relations campaign in an attempt to secure more international friends.

SOUTH AFRICA MUST BE STOPPED FROM GETTING BACK INTO THE OLYMPICS - HOW?

Because racial separation still dictates the sports system in South Africa, it would be hypocritical to allow South Africa back into the Games. Certain international and national bodies have taken a stand against readmittance including the Supreme Council for Sport in Africa which (in December, 1967) declared that if South Africa is readmitted, African states would withdraw from the ICC. The International Football Association (FIFA) has also asserted that the South African proposal to send alternate all-white and non-white teams to world soccer tournaments would not remove the objection which led to South Africa's suspension from FIFA in the first place. Finally American sportsmen have mobilized behind a move to prevent South Africa's readmission into the Olympics, as evidenced in a protest letter, initiated by Jackie Robinson circulated in April and May of 1967 before the Tehran meeting. More recently there has been concern among black American athletes with the racial situation in the United States and the decision by some of them to boycott the 1968 Games.

The time is now to express your opinion about South Africa's attempt to return to the Olympics. Write, cable, call the following Americans directly involved with the final IOC decision:

Mr. Douglas F. Roby, President, The United States Olympic Committee, 57 Park Avenue, New York, New York.

Mr. Avery Brundage, President of the International Olympic Committee, Hotel LaSalle, 10 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Illinois.

* * * * * * * *