

Sport as a Tool of Building Political Alliances: The Case of the Games of New Emerging Forces (GANEFo)

Introduction

The political role of sport is obvious these days, despite idealistic claims of international sports governing bodies that sport and politics are separate. Nationalism has been present in modern sport from the moment it began to gain popularity. As a consequence, governments began to try to use sport to achieve political objectives. In the Cold War period, the Soviet Union and the United States used sport as a tool to further their rival ideologies, while many African countries isolate the South African regime on the international stage. On the other hand, sport is also used by states as a means of achieving more positive goals in international relations. An example of sport being used as a means of rapprochement between hostile countries is the well-known “ping pong” diplomacy between the U.S. and communist China. In a quite similar manner, sport may be used to deepen political cooperation between states, or even to build political alliances.

This article aims to investigate positive sports diplomacy directed at building political alliances, which is a relatively new field of research. The subject will be analysed in the light of a case study concerning the Games of New Emerging Forces. This sports event is usually seen as an example of resistance by some countries to the domination of the International Olympic Committee over international sport, but this research examines the issue from the perspective of establishing and strengthening the political alliance between the non-aligned countries. The Games of New Emerging Forces (GANEFo) were the result of an idea to use sport to create a forum of cooperation and draw

nations closer together. There are also views that the initiative was designed to shape the alliance between China and Indonesia, or that it was a Chinese attempt to strengthen its sphere of influence in the developing world.

The research aims to establish whether the GANEFO were in fact an attempt to create a political alliance, and possibly to define the leading country in that alliance. An attempt to assess this initiative in regards to its objectives will also be made. The investigation will also test the hypothesis that the GANEFO were the simultaneous result of independent sports diplomacies pursued by Beijing and Jakarta.

The Genesis and Concept of the GANEFO

The circumstances of the organisation of the first Games of New Emerging Forces (also called the GANEFO I) are closely related to the Asian Games that were hosted by Indonesia in 1962. The government of Indonesia refused to allow athletes from Taiwan and Israel, who were willing to compete in the event, to enter the country. Both states had been invited to participate in the Asian Games, but reactions by the PRC and some Arab states prompted Indonesia's refusal to issue visas to athletes from those countries.¹ It is also raised speculation that Indonesia's president Ahmed Sukarno was hoping to receive financial support from Middle Eastern countries and China, which he would later use to fulfil his ambition of uniting the non-aligned states.² Even though the visa issue was nothing new in international sport, particularly concerning Israeli citizens, the International Olympic Committee reacted particularly sternly and suspended the Indonesian National Olympic Committee in February 1963, on the grounds that it had not protested against its government's discriminatory policy. The suspension was approved by the IOC by five votes, and was open-ended,³ but was to be lifted if Indonesia assured the IOC that such a situation would not happen again.⁴ In response, Indonesia withdrew from the International Olympic Committee.

¹ F. Hong, X. Xiaozheng, "Communist China: Sport, Politics and Diplomacy," *International Journal of the History of Sport*, vol. 19, no. 2, 2002, pp. 327–328.

² C. Little, "Games of New Emerging Forces," in: J. Nauright, C. Parrish (eds.), *Sports around the World: History, Culture and Practice*, ABC Clío, 2012, p. 223.

³ R. Field, *The Olympic Movement's Response to the Challenge of Emerging Nationalism in Sport: An Historical Reconsideration of GANEFO*, University of Manitoba, 2011, p. 5.

⁴ E.T. Pauker, "GANEFO I: Sports and Politics in Djakarta," *Asian Survey*, vol. 5, no. 4, 1965, p. 173.

The IOC justified its decision by claiming that both the Committee and international sports federations were wholly against any attempts to use politics, race or religion as a tool to manipulate sport, particularly in regard to preventing the free movement of athletes and officials between IOC states.⁵ The determined and severe reaction of the International Olympic Committee was explained in various ways. It appeared legitimate, but previous examples of discrimination against athletes from Israel and Taiwan did not result in such a fierce reaction. The Asian Games were held under the auspices of the IOC, and this might have played a role, as could the fact that this was not the first time that Indonesia had refused entry to athletes of particular nations. It is also claimed that Indonesia's relatively low standing in international sport (compared, for example, to France or the U.S.) might have influenced the Committee.⁶ According to David Miller, the IOC's tough attitude might also have stemmed from earlier events in Jakarta, where a crowd attacked the Indian embassy and a hotel at which Indian IOC member Guru Dutt Sondhi was staying. India was supporting the potential withdrawal of IOC patronage of the Asian Games.⁷ Demonstrations took place after Sondhi publically criticised Indonesia for not allowing Taiwanese and Israeli athletes to compete in the event,⁸ and Sondhi had to leave Indonesia in a hurry.⁹ All in all, a situation that appeared marginal led to important and significant results.

Many researchers suggest that the Games of New Emerging Forces led directly to the conflict between Indonesia and the IOC, the suspension of Indonesia NOC, and its ultimate withdrawal from the Olympic Movement. However, the situation appears to be more complicated. After Indonesia's withdrawal from the Olympic Movement, the country's ministry of sport announced the organisation of a new sports event in which "imperialists and colonists" would not participate, under the name GANEFO. The event was predominantly for states from Asia, Africa, and Latin America, along with the

⁵ R. Espy, *The Politics of the Olympic Games: With Epilogue, 1976-1980*, University of California Press, 1981, p. 80; F. Hong, X. Xiaozheng, "Communist China: Sport, Politics and Diplomacy," in: J.A. Mangan, F. Hong (eds.), *Sport in Asian Society: Past and Present*, Routledge, 2003, p. 328.

⁶ R. Espy, *op. cit.*, p. 80.

⁷ D. Miller, *Historia igrzysk olimpijskich i MKOl. Od Aten do Pekinu 1894–2008*, Rebis, 2008, p. 192.

⁸ R. Lutan, F. Hong, "The Politicization of Sport: GANEFO—A Case Study," in: F. Hong (ed.), *Sport, Nationalism and Orientalism: The Asian Games*, Routledge, 2007, p. 28.

⁹ E.T. Pauker, *op. cit.*, p. 172.

communist countries. Indonesia also claimed that it was time for the newly emerging countries to revolt, in order to destroy the spirit and structure of an international sports movement it described as being directed by “imperialist and colonists.”¹⁰ Ahmed Sukarno, often described as a founder of the GANEFO, said the event was directed against the old order,¹¹ personified by the IOC. The GANEFO, he argued, were needed for the emerging powers.¹² However, according to R. Lutan and F. Hong, the idea for the Games of New Emerging Forces was already being floated in September 1962, in response to Sondhi’s criticism.¹³ According to this view, the GANEFO would have been held regardless of the conflict between Indonesia and the IOC, which only accelerated developments.

The Indonesian Perspective

The GANEFO preparatory conference was held in Jakarta in April 1963, shortly after Indonesia withdrew from the IOC. Representatives of China, Cambodia, Guinea, Indonesia, Iraq, Mali, Pakistan, North Vietnam, the United Arab Emirates and the Soviet Union participated, while observers were sent by Ceylon and Yugoslavia. The participants discussed and agreed upon the GANEFO’s objectives. The event was to be based on the spirit of the Bandung Conference, and on Olympic ideals. It was also stated that the GANEFO aimed to develop sports in the participating countries, and to cement friendly relations among them.¹⁴ Fostering self-awareness of the participating nations was also raised.¹⁵ It was decided that the new event was, like the Olympic Games, to be held once every four years, beginning in 1963. Unlike the Olympics, the GANEFO were to be politically relevant not only in practice, but also according to the design. As Sukarno said, “sport has something to do with politics. And Indonesia now proposes to mix sport with

¹⁰ F. Hong, X. Xiaozheng, “Communist China: Sport, Politics and Diplomacy,” in: J.A. Mangan, *op. cit.*, pp. 328–329.

¹¹ A.E. Senn, *Power, Politics and the Olympic Games: A History of Power Brokers, Events, and Controversies That Shaped the Games*, Taylor and Francis, 1999, p. 130.

¹² S. Creak, “Representing True Laos in Post-Colonial Southeast Asia: Regional Dynamics in the Globalization of Sport,” in: K. Bromber, B. Krawietz, S. Maguire (eds.), *Sport Across Asia: Politics, Cultures and Identities*, Routledge, 2013, p. 109.

¹³ R. Lutan, F. Hong, *op. cit.*, pp. 28, 30.

¹⁴ R. Espy, *op. cit.*, pp. 80–81, F. Hong, X. Xiaozheng, “Communist China: Sport, Politics and Diplomacy,” in: J.A. Mangan, *op. cit.*, p. 329.

¹⁵ U.U. Paetzold, “The Music in Pencak Silat Arts Tournaments Is Gone—A Critical Discussion of the Changes in the Performance Culture,” in: U.U. Paetzold, P.H. Mason (eds.), *The Fighting Art of Pencak Silat and Its Music: From Southeast Asian Village to Global Movement*, Brill, 2016, p. 101.

politics.”¹⁶ It was planned that, after the event, a conference should be held, in order to cement the political unity of the participating countries.¹⁷ These official objectives speak for themselves and justify analysis of this sports event from the perspective of political alliance building.

The GANEFO reference to the Bandung Conference is very important. The conference was held in Indonesia in 1955, and attended by representatives of African and Asian countries with the aim of establishing principles of cooperation within the Non-Aligned Movement. Indonesia's president Ahmed Sukarno and other initiators wanted the movement to foster these countries' freedom and defend against exploitation and suppression. The ideals of the GANEFO were to sustain this spirit. As the GANEFO charter stated, the new emerging forces would develop the community of nations, in the spirit of the 1955 Bandung Conference of Asian and African nations, which guaranteed respect to each national identity and sovereignty, enhanced friendship, and fostered cooperation towards lasting peace between nations and the brotherhood of man.¹⁸ The GANEFO were therefore meant to bring the countries of Asia, Africa and South America closer, by promoting economic and cultural cooperation within the developing world.¹⁹ They were also supposed to foster the development of sport in participating countries, and most of all to stimulate sports competition between their young people, in order to develop and consolidate friendly relations.²⁰ Such claims reflect typical objectives of public diplomacy, stimulating and fostering proximity and cooperation between nations through grassroots contacts, known as people to people diplomacy.

The GANEFO are often described as an act of solidarity of the developing world against “the imperialist oppressors.”²¹ Taking into consideration the motivation of Indonesia and Sukarno, offended by the decision of the IOC, it is hard not to agree with such a statement. The concept of the GANEFO is sometimes described as an attempt to produce an alternative to the Olympic

¹⁶ R. Roberts, J. Olson, *Winning Is the Only Thing: Sports in America since 1945*, Johns Hopkins University Press, 1992, p. 195.

¹⁷ R. Field, *op. cit.*, p. 9.

¹⁸ R. Lutan, F. Hong, *op. cit.*, p. 30.

¹⁹ M. Amara, “Olympic Sport and Internationalism Debates in the Arab-Muslim World,” in: H. Preuss, K. Liese (eds.), *Internationalism in the Olympic Movement: Idea and Reality between Nations, Cultures, and People*, VS Research, Wiesbaden, 2011, p. 42.

²⁰ R. Lutan, F. Hong, *op. cit.*, p. 30.

²¹ C. Brewster, K. Brewster, *Representing the Nations: Sport and Spectacle in Post-Revolutionary Mexico*, Routledge, 2010, p. 47.

system,²² which can also be associated with Sukarno's hopes of establishing a general new world order.²³ These concepts referred to a dichotomy between the old forces and the emerging forces, which, as Sukarno stated during the GANEFO Congress, included all new powers in the world which fought, struggled and worked for the new world.²⁴ Uniting the new emerging forces and stressing their presence on the world scene appears to have been the key motivation.²⁵ The new sports and political initiative was directed most of all against the West, which may be associated with Sukarno's personal hostility to colonialism and everything that it represents, while the international sports governing structures were seen as a tool in hands of the post-colonial West. The entire GANEFO concept was therefore deeply ideological as well.

The GANEFO were meant to combine sport and politics. According to Sukarno, they were to foster Indonesia's political aims, including world friendship and peace.²⁶ This and the other objectives described above suggest that the GANEFO may be perceived as an example of sports diplomacy directed at shaping a political alliance of non-aligned countries, which remained outside the Cold War conflict. Sport was meant to be a tool to support the establishment of this alliance, through a periodical event that was at the same time competition for mainstream of international sport.

Although the GANEFO were meant to represent the developing world, the organisers' attitude towards the communist bloc was generally positive, and the Soviet Union was engaged from the beginning.²⁷ In fact, Sukarno perceived socialist states as new emerging forces as well. The idea of "new forces" was not directly connected to particular countries, but to "forces" that could even be present within the former colonial empires. As a result of this attitude, the Netherlands, for example, participated in the GANEFO I. Such a "softened" approach to the issue stemmed partly from the lack of consent between the engaged countries about the political goals of the

²² A. Hietanen, "The New International Sports Order: An Appraisal," in: M. Ilmarinen (ed.), *Sport and International Understanding*, Springer-Verlag, 1984, p. 105.

²³ M.A. Garcia, *Secrets of the Olympic Ceremonies*, Myles A. Garcia, 2014, p. 162.

²⁴ R. Lutan, F. Hong, *op. cit.*, p. 28.

²⁵ R. Espy, *op. cit.*, p. 82.

²⁶ F. Hong, L. Zhouxiang, *The Politicisation of Sport in Modern China: Communists and Champions*, Routledge, 2013, p. 42.

²⁷ K. Young, K. Wamsley, *Global Olympic: Historical and Sociological Studies of the Modern Games*, Elsevier, 2005, p. 73; R. Boden, "Cold War Economics: Soviet Aid to Indonesia," *Journal of Cold War Studies*, vol. 10, no. 3, 2008, p. 118.

initiative.²⁸ On the other hand, the Soviet Union and its satellite states may have participated in the GANEFO only because they did not want to lose their connections with Asian and African countries. Still, European communist states kept their distance, for fear of losing their influence in the IOC.²⁹ Soviet involvement also revealed the bloc's will to facilitate the GANEFO message. For example, USSR officials proposed the inclusion of Olympic ideals, while China opposed such a stance.³⁰

From the Indonesian perspective, the GANEFO were important not only in building political alliances, but also for nation-branding. According to E. Pauker, by hosting the first GANEFO Indonesia showcased its capability to organise international sports events as an expression of resistance towards the imperialist West.³¹ This issue is associated with Sukarno's ambitions of becoming the leader of the whole non-aligned movement. By hosting this event, he was showing the developing world that he was able to oppose the West.

The Chinese Perspective

Indonesia is usually seen as the main initiator of the GANEFO, but communist China was also involved, albeit from the back row. This country also had its political objectives concerning the GANEFO. This applies to its conflict with international sports governing bodies, particularly the International Olympic Committee, and with Taiwan. The PRC withdrew from international sport after it was unable to have Taiwan thrown out. It was also in China's interests to build an alliance with the non-aligned countries, but for different reasons than Indonesia.

There are claims that it was communist China, rather than Indonesia, which was behind the GANEFO. This country was clearly interested in creating competition to the Olympic Movement, but at the same time, according to some authors, the Chinese preferred to lead from behind so they allowed Sukarno to use the idea.³² After Indonesia was banned from the Olympic Movement, one of the Chinese sports magazines reported on

²⁸ E.T. Pauker, *op. cit.*, pp. 175–176.

²⁹ A. Schuman, *The Politics of Socialist Athletics in the People's Republic of China, 1949–1966*, doctoral dissertation, University of California, December 2014, p. 306.

³⁰ Z. Quingmin, "Sports Diplomacy: The Chinese Experience and Perspectives," *The Hague Journal of Diplomacy*, vol. 8, no. 3/4, 2013, p. 219.

³¹ E.T. Pauker, *op. cit.*, p. 177.

³² R. Espy, *op. cit.*, p. 81; R. Roberts, J. Olson, *op. cit.*, p. 195.

the concept of GANEFO. It was said that Indonesian public opinion was supportive of proposals for an African-Asian Games and the establishment of a sports organisation, because it would show the unity of the developing world in its struggle against imperialism and colonialism.³³ China's prime minister Zhou Enlai also praised the GANEFO concept, writing in a letter that it was sustaining the national dignity of Indonesia and other African and Asian nations.³⁴ China supported the organisation of the event financially as well, reportedly covering between 35% and 50% of the costs of international exchange associated with the GANEFO.³⁵ Evidently, even if China did not initiate the event, it was heavily involved from the beginning.

The motivation for China's engagement in GANEFO was similar to that of Indonesia. It wanted to build a political alliance in the developing world, but as leader of the coalition. According to Xu Guoqi, China's aim regarding the Games of New Emerging Forces was to raise its own international status.³⁶ The event was meant to give China an opportunity to unite the developing world by shaping solidarity with states in Africa, Asia and Latin America.³⁷ This was to give China a leading role among the emerging powers, in order to enhance its general political position, which would then allow it to compete with the two Cold War alliances. As Chinese sports minister He Long stated, "international sports exchanges have promoted mutual understanding and friendship between the peoples of China and many foreign countries."³⁸ China's ambition to lead the developing world was visible during preparations for the games, while the event itself was taking place, and afterward. For example, during a meeting of the Council of the GANEFO Federation in Beijing in 1965, He Long stated on behalf of the Chinese government, that "no matter what may happen in the world, the Chinese people will never shirk their international duty of aiding and supporting the peoples of the world in their revolutionary struggle against imperialism. We are determined to unite with all anti-imperialist peoples and carry forward to the end our revolutionary struggle against the imperialists

³³ *Ibidem*.

³⁴ A. Schuman, "Elite Competitive Sport in the People's Republic of China 1958–1966: The Games of the New Emerging Forces (GANEFO)," *Journal of Sport History*, vol. 40, no. 2, p. 267.

³⁵ A.E. Senn, *op. cit.*, p. 131.

³⁶ G. Xu, *Olympic Dreams: China and Sports 1895–2008*, Harvard University Press, 2008, p. 51.

³⁷ A. Schuman, "Elite Competitive Sport...", *op. cit.*, p. 260.

³⁸ F. Hong, L. Zhouxiang, *op. cit.*, p. 45.

headed by the United States and their lackeys.”³⁹ The speech obviously stressed the anti-imperialist attitude, but also revealed a desire to lead such an “anti-imperialist campaign.”

This all suggests that both China and Indonesia were engaging in the Games of New Emerging Forces in order to build a political alliance of the non-aligned states, but under their own leadership. In this light, cooperation could have been difficult, but it proved very smooth and effective. It is even claimed that a sport-based alliance between these countries was developed,⁴⁰ and GANEFO was its harbinger.⁴¹ Generally, friendship between Indonesia and China was emphasised throughout the event. China was supporting Indonesian anti-Western propaganda, for example when Chinese media reported the atmosphere of harmony, friendship and unity that dominated during the games.⁴² Apart from that, the final badminton match between China and Indonesia (where it is a national pastime) became a sort of a “diplomatic game.” When the Chinese player took the lead, he was instantly instructed by the Chinese delegation to lose.⁴³ This was typical of China’s sports diplomacy at the time, which was used to create a positive climate for rapprochement between states. From the other side, the Chinese were welcomed very warmly by the Indonesian hosts. Sino-Indonesian cooperation constituted a second dimension of the political alliance through the GANEFO, alongside uniting the developing world. It is hard to say definitively whether the two countries were more interested in leading the emerging forces or in mutual cooperation, but it may appear that the closeness between China and Indonesia, highly visible during the GANEFO I, was rather a tool of achieving the ultimate goal of a political alliance.

China’s engagement in the GANEFO also appears to have been designed to develop a positive international image through sporting prowess.

³⁹ G. Xu, *op. cit.*, pp. 53–54, F. Hong, X. Xiaozheng, “Communist China: Sport, Politics and Diplomacy,” *International Journal of the History of Sport*, vol. 19, no. 2, 2002, p. 327.

⁴⁰ A. Beacom, *International Diplomacy and the Olympic Movement: The New Mediators*, Palgrave Macmillan, 2012, p. 116.

⁴¹ I. Henry, M. Al-Tauqi, “Evaluating Alternative Theoretical Perspectives on Sports Policy,” in: I. Henry *et al.* (eds.), *Transnational and Comparative Research in Sport: Globalisation, Governance and Sport Policy*, Routledge, 2007, p. 53.

⁴² S. Cornelissen, “Resolving ‘the South Africa Problem’: Transnational Activism, Ideology and Race in the Olympic Movement, 1960–91,” in: S. Cornelissen, A. Grundlingh (eds.), *Sport Past and Present in South Africa: (Trans)forming the Nation*, Routledge, 2012, p. 165; Z. Quingmin, *op. cit.*, p. 219.

⁴³ F. Hong, L. Zhouxiang, *op. cit.*, p. 43.

Throughout the event, the Chinese athletes performed very well and won the most medals,⁴⁴ thus presenting their country as a leader of the global revolution.⁴⁵ Owing to the GANEFO, China gained an opportunity to demonstrate its power and influence in the region.⁴⁶

The Organisation of the GANEFO

The first Games of New Emerging Forces were held in Jakarta in November 1963. The main slogan of the event was “Onward. No retreat.”⁴⁷ Its symbolism drew on the Olympic Games, for example there was a GANEFO torch relay which began in Java, and the event had its own flag and anthem. Most of the competitions were in Olympic disciplines, but others such as tennis, table tennis and badminton, yet to be adopted by the Olympics, were also included.⁴⁸ Indeed, it might be surprising that there were so many references to the Olympic Games at an event that was designed to express opposition to the Olympic Movement.

It remains unclear how many athletes and from how many countries competed in the GANEFO I. Available data suggest that there were between 2,000 and 3,000 participants, representing between 47 and 55 countries.⁴⁹ They included Palestine, which was not recognised by the IOC until 1995, an act which could itself be interpreted as symbolic of opposition towards the Olympic Movement.⁵⁰

The Games of New Emerging Forces were a cultural as well as sports event. There were exhibitions of handcrafts and art from participating countries, as well as cultural events for the athletes, sightseeing, and a rally. All those activities were examples of people to people diplomacy, designed to create friendship between nations. Sukarno referred to this goal during his meeting with the Indonesian national team before the event. Moreover, he organised parties for the guest teams. Throughout the games, athletes had

⁴⁴ E.T. Pauker, “GANEFO I. Sports and Politics in Djakarta,” RAND, July 1964, pp. 21–22, www.rand.org.

⁴⁵ N. Griffin, *Ping-Pong Diplomacy: The Secret History behind the Game That Changed the World*, Skyhorse Publishing, 2014, p. 134.

⁴⁶ F. Hong, L. Zhouxiang, *op. cit.*, p. 43.

⁴⁷ A. Schuman, *The Politics of...*, *op. cit.*, pp. 304–305.

⁴⁸ E.T. Pauker, “GANEFO I: Sports and Politics in Djakarta,” *Asian Survey...*, *op. cit.*, p. 172.

⁴⁹ A.E. Senn, *op. cit.*, p. 132, G. Jarvie, *Sport, Culture and Society: An Introduction*, Routledge, 2006, p. 352; G. Modelski (ed.), *The New Emerging Forces: Documents on the Ideology of Indonesian Foreign Policy*, Australian National University, 1963 p. 87.

⁵⁰ M. Amara, *Sport, Politics and Society in the Arab World*, Palgrave Macmillan, 2012, p. 8.

informal contact, which was one of the elements of promoting understanding and friendship between nations. This was used not only by the Indonesian hosts, but also by the Chinese,⁵¹ and is a key issue in the analysis of sports and public diplomacy pursued through the GANEFO. If the event's main goal was to build a political alliance of the non-aligned countries, creating closeness and solidarity between respective nations at the grassroots level appeared to be a tool to achieve this.

The Response of the International Olympic Committee

The International Olympic Committee responded one month before the GANEFO. It did not exclude the possibility that athletes who competed in the GANEFO could be disqualified from the Olympic Games in Tokyo in 1964. Technically, such disqualifications would be imposed by international sports federations, which would suspend the athletes for participating in an unapproved event. Additionally, international federations in athletics (IAAF) and swimming (FINA) did not recognise the communist People's Republic of China and Democratic Republic of Vietnam. Athletes who competed in the same event as participants from those countries could have been banned not only from the Olympics, but also from all other mainstream sports events.⁵² Such a response cast doubt on GANEFO's potential success.

In fact, the IOC's response marginalised the GANEFO. Approximately 20% of participants were from China or Indonesia, while most of the teams sent no more than five or six athletes. Countries such as the Soviet Union, Czechoslovakia, Poland, France and East Germany sent only unofficial teams that did not include first rate athletes, for fear of IOC reprisals.⁵³ Moreover, the communist states competed as either sports federations or youth organisations,⁵⁴ and it is estimated that a third of all teams participating in the GANEFO were local or unofficial.⁵⁵ It appeared that the International Olympic Committee had succeeded in reducing the risk of another

⁵¹ E.T. Pauker, "GANEFO I: Sports and Politics in Djakarta," *Asian Survey...*, *op. cit.*, pp. 172, 182; R. Kropke, "International Sport and the Social Sciences," *Quest*, vol. 22, no. 1, June 1974, p. 28.

⁵² A.E. Senn, *op. cit.*, p. 131; R. Field, *op. cit.*, pp. 15–16; K. Seon-Jong, *Sport and Politics in the Republic of Korea*, doctoral dissertation, University of Surrey, 1999, p. 158.

⁵³ R. Roberts, J. Olson, *op. cit.*, p. 195–196.

⁵⁴ A. Pasko, *Sport wyczynowy w polityce państwa 1944–1989*, Avalon, 2012, p. 231.

⁵⁵ E.T. Pauker, "GANEFO I: Sports and Politics in Djakarta," *Asian Survey...*, *op. cit.*, p. 175,

international sports movement being established and potentially threatening its own power.

Nevertheless, while the GANEFO failed from the sports perspective, some organising and participating countries described it as a great success, mostly because of the number of participants.⁵⁶ Chinese propaganda appeared to be particularly active in this respect, with newspapers reporting that the event had been a “brilliant epoch-making event in the history of international sports,” and that “in contrast to the imperialist-controlled Olympic Games, the GANEFO has no discriminatory rules or regulations.”⁵⁷ China appreciated the political significance of the event as well. Its leaders are understood to have perceived it as one of the most effective diplomatic missions in the 1960s, because it helped this newly-established communist state to receive support and build its position in the developing world.⁵⁸ Thus, lack of success in the sports sense did not mean the complete failure of the GANEFO’s political dimension, at least according to formal statements.

The Continuation of the GANEFO

Although the GANEFO I failed as a sports event, this did not end the idea of developing an alternative to the Olympic Movement and a political alliance of the non-aligned countries. Two days after the event, the Conference of the New Emerging Forces (CONEFO) was organised,⁵⁹ and two weeks later representatives of 36 countries met at the first meeting of the GANEFO Council and decided to establish the GANEFO Federation.⁶⁰ The CONEFO was particularly important from the diplomatic perspective, as, according to ambitious plans, it was intended as an alternative to the United Nations. CONEFO was also meant to institutionalise the GANEFO and to ensure the event’s continuity.⁶¹ This political dimension of cooperation between developing world countries was the second element of building the

⁵⁶ G. Arum Yudarwati, “Indonesia,” in: T. Watson (ed.), *Asian Perspectives on the Development of Public Relations: Other Voices*, Palgrave Pivot, 2014, p. 53.

⁵⁷ R. Roberts, J. Olson, *op. cit.*, pp. 195–196.

⁵⁸ F. Hong, L. Zhouxiang, “Politics, First, Competition Second: Sport and China’s Foreign Diplomacy in the 1960s and 1970s,” in: H.L. Dichter, A.L. Johns, *Diplomatic Games: Sport, Statecraft, and International Relations since 1945*, University Press of Kentucky, 2014, p. 396.

⁵⁹ E.T. Pauker, “GANEFO I: Sports and Politics in Djakarta,” *Asian Survey...*, *op. cit.*, p. 176.

⁶⁰ R. Lutan, F. Hong, *op. cit.*, p. 31.

⁶¹ E.T. Pauker, “GANEFO I: Sports and Politics in Djakarta,” *Asian Survey...*, *op. cit.*, pp. 179–180.

alliance, alongside shaping positive attitudes between nations through sport. In this case, the goal was to create a forum at which decision-makers from respective countries would meet.

The next Olympic Summer Games were scheduled for 1964. For the first time, they were to be held in Asia, with Tokyo as host city. This prompted the International Olympic Committee to propose recognising the Indonesian National Olympic Committee once again, so that the country would be allowed to compete in the Olympics. The only condition was that the Indonesian NOC should apologise and pledge that it would abide by the Olympic principles. It did so in June 1964, and was quickly recognised by the IOC.⁶² However, there was another problem concerning the participation of Indonesia and North Korea in the Tokyo Olympics. As has been noted, most countries did not send their best athletes to the Games of New Emerging Forces for fear of disqualification by the IOC. Most disqualifications were later lifted, apart from those imposed by the IAAF and FINA. Because of this, 17 athletes, 11 from Indonesia and six from North Korea, arrived in Tokyo but were not allowed to enter the Olympic Village. The impasse ended one day before the opening of the Olympics, when both countries withdrew.⁶³ This was further proof of the IOC's victory over the GANEFO, despite the eventual recognition of the Indonesian NOC. What is more, it was the actions of the international sports federations, not the IOC, that led to the withdrawal of Indonesian and North Korean athletes. Apparently, the IOC perceived the GANEFO as a threat. It was even speculated that the GANEFO were among the reasons why Mexico City was elected to host the 1968 Olympics,⁶⁴ despite bids from Detroit and Lyon.⁶⁵ Mexico City was the only candidate not associated with the Western bloc, thus safer from the IOC's perspective.

The Asian GANEFO

The second Games of New Emerging Forces were to be held in 1967 in Cairo, four years after the GANEFO I, while Beijing was chosen as an alternative location. Earlier, in September 1965, a meeting of the GANEFO Council was held in the Chinese capital, at which 39 delegations decided

⁶² R. Espy, *op. cit.*, pp. 82–83.

⁶³ J. Slater, "Tokyo 1964," in: J.E. Findling, K.D. Pelle (eds.), *Encyclopedia of the Modern Olympic Movement*, Greenwood, 2004, pp. 168–169.

⁶⁴ C. Brewster, "Changing Impressions of Mexico for the 1968 Games," *Bulletin of Latin American Research*, March 2010, vol. 29, p. 27.

⁶⁵ C. Brewster, K. Brewster, *op. cit.*, p. 46.

to broaden the scope of the event. An Asian Committee was created, and it was decided that an Asian GANEFO would be organised in Cambodia in 1966. The Asian Games of New Emerging Forces were also directed against the Olympic Movement, as was apparent by the clash of dates between this new event and the IOC-affiliated Asian Games.⁶⁶ The Asian GANEFO were strongly supported by communist China, which provided financial aid and helped to build sports venues and train referees. China also led the Asian GANEFO Committee,⁶⁷ which reveals Beijing's deep engagement in the whole GANEFO idea and supports the hypothesis that its motivation was to build a political alliance under its own leadership. Without such motivation, it would not have been reasonable for China to lend such strong support to the organisation of sports event in another country.

Despite ambitious plans, the GANEFO idea began to lose momentum. This was highly visible in 1965, when Cairo withdrew as GANEFO II host. Officials of the United Arab Republic were expecting China to finance the construction of a stadium, but their request was denied. The event was then moved to Beijing.⁶⁸ It may be assumed that Egypt's expectations were the result of China's earlier generosity concerning GANEFO, but it appears that the Chinese approach had changed by that time.

The Asian GANEFO were scheduled before the planned GANEFO II. They were held in November and December 1966 in Phnom Penh in Cambodia, at the same time as the Asian Games in Bangkok. Some 2,000 athletes from 15 countries participated in the event, although some authors claim there were 17 participating countries. The event was very similar to the GANEFO I in three respects. Communist China dominated in the sporting aspect,⁶⁹ the event was declared a great success by its organisers, and international sports federations again threatened to disqualify athletes who participated. This happened to North Korean track and field athletes, who were not allowed to compete in the Olympic Games in Mexico City.⁷⁰ As a result, even Indonesia,

⁶⁶ R. Espy, *op. cit.*, p. 109.

⁶⁷ F. Hong, X. Xiaozheng, "Communist China: Sport, Politics and Diplomacy," *International Journal...*, *op. cit.*, p. 331.

⁶⁸ *Ibidem*.

⁶⁹ F. Hong, X. Xiaozheng, "Communist China: Sport, Politics and Diplomacy," in: J.A. Mangan..., *op. cit.*, p. 331; G. Jarvie, *op. cit.*, p. 352; R. Lutan, F. Hong, *op. cit.*, p. 33.

⁷⁰ B. Bridges, *The Two Koreas and the Politics of Global Sport*, Global Oriental, 2012, p. 54.

where Sukarno was overthrown in 1965, sent only 57 athletes to Cambodia, simultaneously sending a team to the Asian Games.⁷¹

The GANEFO idea continued to decline. Communist China, at the time of the Cultural Revolution, withdrew as GANEFO II host in 1966,⁷² leading to the ultimate collapse of the whole initiative. The developing world countries decided to move their attention to the Olympic Games, which in fact they also tried to use for political and diplomatic purposes.⁷³ African states were particularly active in this field, especially when they used the threat of boycott. Countries of the developing world did occasionally attempt to challenge the Olympic Movement, for example in 1976 when Algeria and Cuba led a bid to take control of the Olympic Movement via UNESCO, but such activity was also associated with the communist bloc⁷⁴ and much more modest than the GANEFO.

The GANEFO probably failed for several reasons. The fall of Sukarno was one of them, as the new authorities in Indonesia focused on restoring the economy rather than organising sports events. What is more, relations between China and Indonesia deteriorated, which led to diplomatic relations being broken in 1965.⁷⁵ The Cultural Revolution in China is also believed to have had a negative effect on the GANEFO⁷⁶ The “counterstrike” by the International Olympic Committee and sports federations also played a vital role in marginalising the GANEFO, and eventually the whole idea of a political alliance. It is also believed that allowing athletes who competed in the GANEFO to participate in IOC-affiliated events was a mistake.⁷⁷ Of these the political reasons concerning the change of attitudes of China and Indonesia and the conflict between these countries appear to have had most impact of the demise of the GANEFO, as it is impossible to build an alliance without its centre.

⁷¹ R. Espy, *op. cit.*, pp. 109–110.

⁷² R. Lutan, F. Hong, *op. cit.*, p. 34.

⁷³ J. Horne, G. Whannel, *Understanding the Olympics*, Routledge, 2012, p. 123.

⁷⁴ B. Keys, “International Relations,” in: S.W. Pope, J. Nauright (eds.), *Routledge Companion to Sports History*, Routledge, 2010, p. 252; “ABC: Soviets, UNESCO tried Olympic takeover,” *Chicago Tribune*, 29 December 1987, section 4, p. 7.

⁷⁵ Z. Quingmin, *op. cit.*, p. 219; R. Lutan, F. Hong, *op. cit.*, p. 33.

⁷⁶ S. Brownell, “‘Sport and Politics don’t mix’: China’s relationship with the IOC during the Cold War,” in: S. Wagg, D.L. Andrews (eds.), *East Plays West: Sport and the Cold War*, Routledge, 2007, p. 264.

⁷⁷ D. Chatziefstathiou, I.P. Henry, *Dicourses of Olympism: From Sorbonne 1984 to London 2012*, Basingstoke, 2012, p. 50.

Conclusion

This research has confirmed that the Games of New Emerging Forces were primarily an attempt to build a political alliance between the non-aligned countries, as a third geopolitical bloc alongside the West and the Soviet sphere. The whole initiative was based on an ideological framework that was purely anti-Western, and to some extent open to communism.

It is difficult to define the main centre of this proposed alliance, as it was being developed simultaneously by communist China and Indonesia (a hypothesis confirmed by this paper). Both wished to lead the developing world, but this theoretical contradiction did not cause a conflict between them, at least until 1965. On the contrary, cooperation between them was very successful and full of positive gestures. Some authors have even claimed that the GANEFO was in fact meant to shape a Sino-Indonesian alliance, while others back the view that their closeness was simply a tool of furthering the goal of each, that is, of becoming the leader of the non-aligned countries.

It has also been observed that establishing a political alliance through the Games of New Emerging Forces was attempted in two ways. The first encompassed shaping closeness and solidarity between the engaged nations at a grassroots level, typical for public diplomacy. This was executed by various exchanges during the GANEFO. The other way included political cooperation between the countries that participated in the event, by creating a forum that was institutionalised by the Conference of the New Emerging Forces.

The Games of New Emerging Forces failed from both the sports and the political perspectives, and were eventually abandoned by China and Indonesia. It appears that political aspect was the most important reason for this failure, particularly the new approaches by China and Indonesia, and the conflict between them.

The developments around the GANEFO strongly resemble a power struggle typical for the Cold War period, but in this case it was between the developing world and international sport, the latter personified by the International Olympic Committee and international sports federations, which the GANEFO founders associated with the West. The Games of New Emerging Forces were obviously targeted against the Olympic Movement, which responded decisively and succeeded in marginalising the new initiative. The International Olympic Committee and other international sports governing

bodies not only acted as fully-fledged players in international relations, but also appear to have succeeded in their conflict against a state-run initiative.

Acknowledgements

This research was financed by the National Science Centre, Poland, within the framework of project number 2015/19/D/HS5/00513.