Harvey, Jean, John Horne, Parissa Safai, Simon Darnell, and Sébastien Courchesne-O'Neill.
"Rights Movements and Sport." *Sport and Social Movements: From the Local to the Global*.
London: Bloomsbury Academic, 2014. 67–92. *Bloomsbury Collections*. Web. 26 Apr. 2023.
<<http://dx.doi.org/10.5040/9781472544995.ch-004>>.

Downloaded from Bloomsbury Collections, www.bloomsburycollections.com, 26 April 2023,
03:11 UTC.

Copyright © Jean Harvey, John Horne, Parissa Safai, Simon Darnell & Sébastien Courchesne-O'Neill 2014. You may share this work for non-commercial purposes only, provided you give attribution to the copyright holder and the publisher, and provide a link to the Creative Commons licence.

Rights Movements and Sport

This chapter investigates three social movements – anti-racist and civil rights, disability rights, and LGBT rights – that have been and are associated with sport, as well as some of the institutional structures, organizations and ideologies that frame and govern human rights issues. It primarily considers the impact of rights movements on sport and the influence of sport on rights movements. While the number of researchers exploring the connections between sport and human rights has been growing in the past 15 years (Donnelly 2008; Giulianotti 2006; Jarvie 2006; Jarvie and Thornton 2012; Kidd and Donnelly 2000), and some of these authors have tried to argue that sport is a human right, the *social movements* involved with rights and sport have not been analysed in much detail in previous writing. Here, we will explore both commonalities and differences between key social movements involved with rights, their relationship to sport and sports' relevance to them.

In keeping with our overall focus in this book, the approach taken is both transnational and intersectional. In this manner, we can explore the way in which different social movements have learnt, borrowed from and developed in both the national and the international context of other social movements. As Thörn (2007, p. 898) notes, one of the major findings of social movement research (e.g. Tarrow 1998, pp 176–95 and Della Porta and Diani 2006, pp. 186–8) has been that ‘the mobilization of contemporary social movements always draws upon previously existing movement networks’. As noted in previous chapters, social movements can be seen to go through a series of phases in their development – formation and problem identification, activism in search of solutions and dealing with the aftermath of new policies and practices that emerge as a result (Winter 2003, p. 33; Blumer 1971). We therefore adopt a broadly social historical approach to rights movements and sport in this chapter.

Rights are seen as inherently political and contingent – taking institutional, legal and discursive forms. Many different struggles in varied social, economic, political and ideological contexts have been wrapped up under the phrase ‘human rights’. Movements identified in other chapters in this book – concerned with workers’ rights, women’s rights, peace, and the environment as well as specifically those involved in human rights campaigns – all, at different times and in different places, have involved struggles over civil, political, economic, social and cultural rights. The relationship of the campaigns to sport is sometimes

organic, emerging from within sport, and sometimes more superficial, developing outside of sport. It is interesting to note that the development of the concept of human rights shares some of the tensions that underpinned the history of the formation of modern sport, including the Olympic movement, in the second half of the nineteenth century (particularly that between internationalism and nationalism). Yet, no *a priori* assumption that sport can be a force for human good is supported by the historical evidence, as over the past 150 years sport has been responsible for many exclusionary practices and barriers that have in turn prompted negotiations and resistance (Donnelly 2008; Kidd and Donnelly 2000). The chapter illustrates the attempts of social scientists to develop an understanding of these movements, as well as engage with their struggles, and thus demonstrate the intersections with other social movements in sport and global society.

In the next section, we briefly outline some of the forms of human rights, and the accompanying institutions and legislation that operate at a national and international level. The focus of the social movements we look at here is around social justice, social equity and social development. Then, we discuss the historical development and connections between three rights movements – anti-racism and the civil rights movement, the disability rights movement and the LGBT rights movement – and consider different campaigns in sport associated with them. The chapter concludes with a brief discussion of future developments for rights movements and sport.

Human rights as a dominant discourse

David Harvey (2012, p. 3) suggests that, ‘we live in an era when ideals of human rights have moved centre stage both politically and ethically’. Why is that? What are human rights? How did the discourse develop? One view of the formation of human rights discourse is that it is an ‘invented tradition’ (Hunt 2007) stemming from the print culture of the eighteenth century which enabled a new sensibility and sensitivity to suffering to be communicated to the reading public, especially through the novel. Rather than focus on the formal reasoning of philosophical texts, it is possible that the creation of an awareness of wider humanity came about through the power of the imagination that aroused sympathy for oppression (Blackburn 2011). Hence broadly speaking concerns for human rights refer to concerns about injustice, discrimination and exploitation – or consciousness of humanity (Robertson 1992) – and the desire for a better world.

Human rights, however, have a contested history because, although ‘NGOS working for human rights are not new’ (Freeman 2011, p. 167), as Samuel Moyn (2010, p. 20) puts it, the history of the core values of human rights is ‘one

of construction rather than discovery and contingency rather than necessity'. Moyn argues against the dominant, elite-focused interpretation of the ancestry of the human rights emancipatory movement and instead suggests that the discourse of human rights only became predominant in the past 30 years – since 1977 in fact – because it provided an alternative to other failed 'utopian' projects and grand narratives. Moyn poses the question whether the relationship to previous 'human universalisms' should be seen as one of continuity or as rupture. Earlier claims to the 'rights of man' were the basis for the construction of the nation-state, whereas contemporary human rights discourse tends to be the basis for a critique of state repression and corporate exploitation.

It is valuable to be reminded that there are fluid boundaries around the concept of human rights, which means that at different moments in time and in different places, the term has been understood and acted upon quite differently. Social movements are seen as central in two different approaches to the development of human rights and law: 'global constitutionalism' and 'subaltern cosmopolitanism' (Nash 2012, p. 798). The former approach suggests that there is one, 'top down', human rights movement creating international laws that protect human rights and the latter one suggests that there are multiple 'bottom up' movements 'and law for progressive human rights' (ibid). The former tends to consider legislative and political elites as leading the way for social change, while the latter focuses on the role of marginalized groups. In this chapter, while we adopt the second approach, it is useful to briefly outline some of the institutions that have been developed to provide the institutional framework for international human rights law and some of the organizations that have developed to engage with this framework (for an excellent overview of the different dimensions of human rights see Freeman 2011).

Human rights institutionalized

In 1950, the UN agreed that one day – 10 December – would be set aside to mark the adoption of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR) 2 years previously. While this is only an advisory celebration day (meaning that UN member nations can recognize, or not, the day as they wish), it signalled the formal introduction of human rights into international discussion. In the past 30 years especially human rights law has developed along with commissions, and legislation. For example, in the United Kingdom, the European Union, Canada and Australia, as well as in the UN, various bodies exist to promote human rights – the Equality and Human Rights Commission (EHRC), the European Convention on Human Rights, the Canadian Human Rights Commission and the Australian Human Rights Commission, respectively. Altogether there are 69 national human rights institutions (NHRI) accredited to the International Coordinating Committee of National institutions for the Promotion and Protection of Human Rights (ICC).

These formal institutions have developed since the UDHR was adopted in 1948. The UDHR comprises statements concerning 30 basic human rights. It begins with the statement that ‘recognition of the inherent dignity and of the equal and inalienable rights of all members of the human family is the foundation of freedom, justice and peace in the world’ (United Nations 1948/2012). It then continues to declare that it is ‘the common standard of achievement for all peoples and nations’ (United Nations 1948/2012). In the past 64 years since then international human rights law has developed more than 60 instruments, consisting of treaties, conventions and covenants agreed by the UN, that *can be* legally binding on states and comprise the international standard of human rights: ‘can be’ legally binding because core documents have to be signed and ratified for them to be influential within the boundaries of the nation states that make up the UN. While there are nine core international human rights treaties, the United Kingdom, Canada and Australia have only ratified seven of them and the United States only six (Amnesty International 2012, pp. 394–5). The treaties include civil and political rights (International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR), adopted by the UN in 1966); economic, social and cultural rights (International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR) 1966); torture (Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment (CAT) 1984); discrimination against women (Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women (CEDAW in 1979, see Chapter 3); racial discrimination (International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination (CERD) 1965); children (Convention on the Rights of the Child (CRC) 1989); and disabled people (International Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (CRPD) 2006). Conventions relating to the treatment of migrant workers and their families (International Convention on the Protection of the Rights of All Migrant Workers and Members of Their Families (CMW) 1990) and enforced disappearance (International Convention for the Protection of All Persons from Enforced Disappearance (CED) 2006) have neither been signed nor been ratified by the United States, the United Kingdom, Canada or Australia. The United States has signed but not ratified the CRC. In addition to treaties and conventions, various human rights instruments – such as principles and guidelines relating to older persons and declarations relating to indigenous peoples – exist which are also not legally binding unless specifically adopted by a national government. While currently at the UN, older people and LGBT persons do not have any core treaties covering their rights, in other parts of the world, such as the European Union, a Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union agreed to in 2010 does include articles on non-discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation and the rights of the elderly.

Complementary to the instruments, committees and conventions, the UN has a series of special procedures it can call upon (including the position of Special Rapporteur, representative or independent expert) to monitor and

attempt to enforce the promotion of human rights around the world. There are 31 country-specific (e.g. Somalia, Sudan and Haiti) and eight theme-specific special procedures (covering, for example, adequate housing, violence against women and education). The Human Rights Council is an intergovernmental body of 47 nation states and the UN High Commissioner for Human Rights has their office in Geneva, Switzerland.

Human rights organized

In addition to these formal human rights institutions, bodies and positions, and possibly comprising the more public face of human rights as part of a global, transnational, *social movement*, are international non-governmental organizations (INGOs) that monitor, promote and seek to protect human rights, the most well known of which are Amnesty International (AI), and Human (formerly Helsinki) Rights Watch (HRW). Human rights organizations such as AI and HRW arguably led the internationalization of social movements (Tilly 2004, p. 115). They monitored human rights abuses across the world, published regular human rights ratings, reported on these abuses and intervened to call for sanctions from major states and international authorities on human rights abuses. They provided 'templates, certification, connections and advise to claimants' (Tilly 2004, p. 115). According to Tilly (2004, p. 115), movements of 'self-styled indigenous peoples across the world benefitted substantially from identification of themselves as participants in a worldwide cause'. Nonetheless, as Therborn (2011, p. 2) suggests, while human rights began to emerge as a serious issue in the 1960s, mainly thanks to the formation of groups such as AI, they only reached the 'geopolitical mainstream' in the 1970s:

The Western powers had them inserted in the Helsinki Accord of 1975, recognizing the post-Second World War borders of Europe, crucial to Poles and most other East Europeans, communist or anti-communist. In the Americas, human rights also became a key issue in the second half of the 1970s. In Latin America they became a defence in defeat, after all attempts at progressive social change (outside Cuba) had been crushed by military dictatorships. In the USA there was, for once, a positive resonance during the Carter administration. The completely unforeseen unlocking of Cold War diplomacy and US recognition of human rights in the Americas made human rights irremovable from the international political agenda, accepted in violation by the Reagan and the two Bush administrations.

Different movements, campaigns and coalitions therefore constitute the field of human rights. We agree with Stammers (2009, p. 160) that it is important to acknowledge the pre-institutional, non-legal forms that existed prior to human rights law and institutions as well as the role that social movement praxis plays in shaping intellectual developments around human rights.

The different categories of rights tend to collect around civil and political rights, to do with equality of involvement in the civil life of a nation including

the right to vote in elections, and economic, social and cultural rights, relating to unequal treatment based upon discrimination that prevents the full engagement of groups in society. Echoing Moyn above, sport scholar Susan Brownell (2012, p. 315) notes: ‘human rights are not pre-given moral truths, they are constructions’. The formal apparatus of human rights and the social movements that espouse and promote human rights transnationally are constantly engaged in this work of construction in what is referred to as ‘global civil society’ (cf., Giulianotti and Brownell 2012, p. 200). What makes human rights complex is that they are both transnational and *intersectional* – that is the different minorities and groups involved in separate struggles over rights draw inspiration from the activities of other groups acting inside and outside the boundaries of their nation states. The human rights movement, therefore, has no single identity or opponent as such, although in common with other social movements the broad goal would be to transform the core values, orientations and structures of a society – what Touraine refers to as its ‘historicity’ – in favour of a more just, non-discriminatory and equitable social condition. As Fraser (1997, pp. 69–98) argues, social movements are ‘subaltern counter-public spheres’, where oppositional interpretations of identities, interests and needs are debated, discussed and formulated.

Making sense of rights movements and sport

As noted earlier, the number of researchers exploring the connections between sport and human rights has grown in the past 15 years. Despite expressing some critical reservations about the connection between sport and human rights, including the worst excesses of naïve evangelicalism associated with belief in the inherent goodness of sport, Giulianotti (2006, p. 75) states sport ‘provides perhaps the most culturally popular medium through which senses of moral obligation towards absolute strangers might be communicated through imagined belonging’. Kidd and Donnelly (2000) have argued that democracy and liberation central to human rights will not be achieved without the realization of human rights in sport and physical education. The growth and development of *social movements* connecting the struggle for rights with sport is discussed next.

The politics of ‘race’ and sport: The American civil rights movement and the anti-apartheid movement

The focus in the following section is specifically on the anti-racist and civil rights movement in North America and the anti-apartheid movement, indicative of the ‘anti-discrimination’ and ‘anti-racism’ struggles identified by Harvey and Houle (1994, pp. 348–9).

The American civil rights movement

Between 1950 and 1980, the aim of the Civil Rights Movement (CRM) in the United States was equality before the law. Equality meant the assertion of the rights of minorities – in this case African-Americans – to equal treatment and justice and claims for the empowerment of them as a socially excluded group. The two main foci of the struggle were desegregation (an end to the form of apartheid or separate development) that had continued after the abolition of slavery in the nineteenth century in the southern states and enfranchisement (securing equal voting rights for African-Americans). The civil rights movement in the United States coincided with struggles for self-determination and rights in countries around the world that had achieved independence from colonial rule, yet were looking to align neither with the American-dominated capitalist world nor with the Soviet-led Communist bloc. The so-called ‘Third World’ became an ideology of ‘counterhegemonic political movements’ that developed in the mid-1950s (Gitersos 2011). During the 1950s and for most of the 1960s, the campaign involved civil resistance and social criticism through non-violent forms of activism, including such actions as boycotts, demonstrations and marches. Later in the 1960s, civil unrest and armed rebellion occurred. As the movement attempted to develop positive perceptions of self and pride in group identity – to move consciousness from a group in itself to a group for itself – it also produced such slogans as ‘black is beautiful’.

In the 1950s and 1960s, the National Association for the Advancement of Coloured People (NAACP), Southern Christian Leadership Conference (SCLC), the Student Non-violent Coordinating Committee (SNCC) and Congress of Racial Equality (CORE) were the main organizations confronting so-called ‘Jim Crow’ laws at the local and state levels that barred African-Americans from classrooms, public conveniences, theatres, trains, buses as well as from juries and legislatures. In 1954, following a litigation strategy adopted by the NAACP, the US Supreme Court struck down the ‘separate but equal’ doctrine that formed the basis for state-sanctioned discrimination. This drew national and international attention to African-Americans’ situation and was enhanced by the development of the Cold War (Dudziak 2011). Arguably, American government officials, including such Presidents as Eisenhower and Kennedy, became more supportive of civil rights reforms than they might have been otherwise because of the centrality of race relation problems to international perceptions of the United States. Many leaders from within the African-American community rose to prominence during the Civil Rights era including Martin Luther King, Jr., Rosa Parks, Stokely Carmichael and Malcolm X. Civil rights activism included localized actions such as the refusal to accept segregated buses in Montgomery, Alabama by Rosa Parks, the subsequent black boycott of the bus companies in Montgomery when she was imprisoned, and sit-ins in segregated lunch counters, as well as more nationally significant

events such as the 200,000-person march on Washington in 1963 and the Selma to Montgomery march in 1965. Such actions did lead eventually to legislative change, such as the Voting Rights Act of 1965 and the Civil Rights Acts of 1964 and 1968 (Polenberg 1980, pp. 181–93).

The Lowndes County Freedom Organization (LCFO) was founded in Lowndes, Alabama, as a political party designed to help blacks resist oppression. Organized by the young civil rights leader, Stokely Carmichael of the SNCC, Lowndes residents launched an intensive effort to register blacks to vote in the County, using registration drives, demonstrations and political education classes. The plan was to get enough black people to register to vote to enable them to gain control of local government and thus redirect services towards them. The LCFO adopted the emblem of a black panther in contrast to the white rooster of the white-dominated Alabama Democratic Party, and this symbol was taken up as the name of another political party based in California – the Black Panther Party – formed in 1966 by Huey Newton and Bobby Seale. A different kind of politics began in the late 1960s, which endorsed uprisings underpinned by belief in theories of black nationalism and ‘black power’ espoused by Elijah Muhammad, Malcolm X and other pan-African leaders who took the view that reforms were not sufficient to alter the lives of African-Americans. Civil rights reforms were seen as insufficient as blacks still suffered from forms of oppression. The assassinations of Malcolm X and Martin Luther King plus in-fighting within the organizations led to a decline in protest activity after the 1960s (Van Deburg 1992). The aims of the civil rights movement turned to defending gains and strengthening enforcement mechanisms.

Consideration of the relationship between the CRM to sport demonstrates, following Hartmann (1996, p. 549), what can be considered as ‘the ambiguities, paradoxes and contradictions’ of the relationships between culture, political power and social change. We follow Hartmann (2003, 1996) in looking at the 1968 African American Olympic protest movement underpinned by the ‘Olympic Project for Human Rights’ (OPHR). The dominant image of this protest took place at the 1968 Mexico City Olympic Games. Political gestures during the Olympic Games and the use of the events to promote political ideologies had been part of them since their inception (Triesman 1984; Horne and Whannel 2012, pp. 109–45). What was distinctive about 1968 was that athletes utilized a political gesture in opposition to the status quo in order to raise an issue without the support of the nation that they were representing.

On 16 October Tommie Smith won the 200-metre race in a world-record time of 19.83 seconds, with Australia’s Peter Norman coming second and the US’s John Carlos in third place. The two US athletes received their medals shoeless, Smith wore a black scarf and Carlos had his tracksuit top unzipped. All the three athletes wore Olympic Project for Human Rights (OPHR) badges. Both US athletes intended on bringing black gloves to the event, but Carlos

forgot his. It was Peter Norman who suggested Carlos wear Smith's left-handed glove, this being the reason behind him raising his left hand, as opposed to his right, differing from the traditional Black Power salute. When the US National Anthem 'The Star-Spangled Banner' played, Smith and Carlos delivered the salute with heads bowed, a gesture that became front-page news around the world. That such a relatively small gesture could create such a response paved the way to the Olympics becoming a major platform for the playing out of political theatre.

Smith and Carlos were members of a small group of elite athletes that sociologist Harry Edwards was hoping would help to develop a boycott of the 1968 Olympic Games, under the title of the OPHR (for more discussion see Hartmann 2003, pp. 29–103 especially; Waller et al. 2012; Zirin 2012). Those associated with the initiative at various times included basketball player Lew Alcindor (who later changed his name to Kareem Abdul Jabaar), Martin Luther King, Jr., Stokely Carmichael and Muhammad Ali (Edwards 1969). The OPHR was formed in the autumn of 1967 after a Black Power conference held in Newark, New Jersey, in the summer had urged that black athletes should boycott the 1968 Olympic Games. The idea that black Americans might boycott sports events, especially the Olympics, in order to draw attention to racial inequalities in the United States was not a new one; Hartmann (1996, pp. 563–4, n.2) lists several precursors earlier in the 1960s. As Hartmann suggests, however, what made the OPHR initiative distinctive was that it developed out of a student protest at San Jose State University and while it did not have any concrete demands initially attached to it, it was to draw attention to 'racial injustice' (Hartmann 1996, p. 552). In December 1967, a list of demands were made as follows: the removal of Avery Brundage from his office as President of the IOC; the exclusion of nations that were based on apartheid (South Africa and Southern Rhodesia) from all international sports events; the addition of black coaches and administrators to the United States Olympic Committee (USOC); the complete desegregation of the New York Athletic Club (NYAC), which held two of the most prestigious indoor track and field meetings; and the restoration of Muhammad Ali's titles and the right to box in the United States (Hartmann 1996, p. 553).

The fact that most of these demands were not met, at least in the case of the exclusion of apartheid regimes from international sport, not as a direct result of the threatened boycott, might be seen as a sign of failure. OPHR, however, seems to have mostly achieved smaller scale protests, and there were several of these in the build up to the 1968 Olympics. The February 1968 indoor meeting at NYAC was boycotted. Protests and meetings took place at 35 university campuses. The problem was that not enough of the 30–40 prospective African-American Olympians involved in the OPHR had a clear idea about what the statement about the situation of black Americans would entail. During the

Olympics, and before Smith and Carlos took to the winners' rostrum, Jimmy Hines won the 100 metres and refused to shake hands with Brundage during the medal ceremony. However, this and other small actions, including wearing black socks and armbands, 'were conveniently overlooked' (Hartmann 1996, p. 554).

Sport was considered by some of the civil rights movement and black activists as a place where they could develop a new and more forceful activism. Protest in sport was attractive because it was popular among the black population, had offered some blacks an avenue of opportunity and representation, was a place where expressions of discontent and the need for change were possible and was often portrayed in the media as an arena where discrimination did not feature (Hartmann 1996, pp. 560–1). However, Hartmann (1996, p. 559) suggests that the immediate response that Smith and Carlos received – expelled from the Olympic Village by USOC, permanently expelled from Olympic competition and sent back home to the United States – was later compounded by the controversy in the United States that their actions generated. For their critics, the problem was that they had defiled sport, a cultural form that was perceived as inherently all about racial justice and civil rights. This made it difficult for 'outsiders to racial injustice and discontent even to begin to understand, much less sympathize with, the protesters' collectivist grievances and concerns' (Hartmann 1996, p. 559). Moreover, the 1968 protest movement was controversial because it exposed 'the ways in which sport culture and liberal democratic ideology usually served (and serve) to legitimate a very particular, very interested and very individualistic vision of racial justice and civil rights' (Hartmann 1996, p. 561).

Hartmann is uncertain if his reading – that no tangible social progress resulted from the actions of Smith and Carlos or the OPHR – is a completely accurate one. Yet as he notes the 'salute' did keep issues surrounding the injustice of race on the agenda for many subsequent generations of activists, it did take place at a time when traditional forms of protest were becoming increasingly controlled, and through its transformation into an iconic image of popular culture, indicated a way in which black political struggle could remain part of social consciousness and contestation (Hartmann 1996, p. 563).

The anti-apartheid movement

Achieving human rights in sport includes both social democracy of sports participation characterized by access and opportunities for all persons, and the freedom within sport cultures for persons to participate in diverse ways. At the same time, Kidd and Donnelly (2000) argue human rights and sport are linked because of the opportunity that sport affords to advocate for the realization of universal rights, a political and strategic logic clearly evident in the best-known example of rights advocacy through sport, the boycott of South African sports

federations and national teams as a protest against the racist practices and policies that restricted sports participation for the non-White majority under the 'Apartheid' regime.

Apartheid – literally meaning 'apartness' in South African language Afrikaans – was the formalized version of a system of racial segregation and discrimination enforced by successive white South African governments between 1948 and 1991 (Omond 1985). Apartheid was in fact the consolidation of a system of discrimination and segregation that had existed in South Africa for most of the twentieth century. It created separate townships, work legislation, education regulations and sport systems for the minority white population and majority black population. As the system was being formalized during the 1950s protest movements against apartheid grew, both inside and outside South Africa, along with the arrest and banning of its critics. In 1960 a demonstration in Sharpeville against new pass laws restricting the movement of black South Africans ended with police shooting 69 people dead. A state of emergency was called with two main black organizations, the African National Congress (ANC) and Pan-Africanist Congress (PAC) banned and thousands of activists detained without trial. With the ANC and PAC moving underground the era of peaceful, non-violent, protest ended. It was shortly after this that Nelson Mandela, the leader of the ANC, was imprisoned for life. In the late 1960s and 1970s, a Black Consciousness movement developed in South Africa. This movement contributed to the Soweto uprising in June 1976 in protest against the compulsory use of the language of Afrikaans in black African schools. However, in September 1977, one of the leaders, Steve Biko, died while being detained by the police and all organizations associated with the Black Consciousness movement were banned (Omond 1985, p. 17). The South African apartheid regime was to last for another 14 years, but in that time sport-related boycotts and protests began to influence global public opinion.

In 1962, the South African Non-racial Olympic Committee (SAN-ROC) was launched with the aim of replacing the whites-only National Olympic Committee. As a later chairman of SAN-ROC, Sam Ramsamy (1984, p. 44) noted: 'South Africa's first participation in the Olympics was in London in 1908. Since then, it has participated in all the Games up to 1960. The South African National Olympic Committee was exclusively white right through to its final expulsion in May 1970. Blacks were never given the opportunities not the facilities to train for Olympic participation'. Black South Africans had protested their exclusion since the 1940s, but lobbying of the IOC for the exclusion of South Africa only began seriously in 1959. With no African member of the IOC, however, South Africa was allowed to compete in Rome in 1960, despite attempts to persuade the IOC president Avery Brundage to reconsider (Maraniss 2008, pp. 62–5). Both the anti-apartheid movement (AAM) and civil rights movement shared the non-violent strategy of 'boycott'

as an aspect of their movement. Internationally the AAM developed boycotts of food, products, economy, academic exchanges and eventually sport as part of the aim of bringing about change. Slogans such as 'No normal sport in an abnormal society' and 'No equal sport in an unequal society' were developed to focus public attention on the situation in apartheid South Africa.

In the late 1960s and early 1970s when cricket and rugby union – two team sports holding great popularity and significance for white male South African identity – were subject to protest, campaigns and boycotts, such as the 'Stop the 70 Tour' campaign against a tour of the United Kingdom by the South African rugby team and a subsequent tour by the SA cricket team was cancelled, it was recognized that sports isolation could have a significant effect on the position of South Africa in the international community. The AAM involved activists worldwide and was bolstered by the response to the call to undertake a 'third party' boycott of New Zealand, as that country had allowed a rugby tour of South Africa to go ahead in 1976. This led to 19 African countries withdrawing from the 1976 Montreal Olympics in protest at the inclusion of New Zealand. South Africa was also expelled from international athletics, swimming and association football (Ramsamy 1984, p. 50). Concerned that an African boycott would ruin the 1978 Commonwealth Games scheduled for Edmonton Canadian Prime Minister Pierre Trudeau initiated the writing of a statement on apartheid in sport. *The Commonwealth Statement on Apartheid in Sport*, widely known as the 'Gleneagles Agreement', institutionalized the Commonwealth's response to apartheid in June 1977, declaring that it was 'the urgent duty of each of their governments vigorously to combat the evil of apartheid by withholding any form of support for, and by taking every practical step to discourage contact or competition by their nationals with sporting organisations, teams or sportsmen from South Africa or from any other country where sports are organized on the basis of race, colour or ethnic origin' (Ramsamy 1982, p. 69). In December 1977, the General Assembly of the United Nations also adopted a declaration to isolate South Africa from international sport (Ramsamy 1982, p. 62).

Kidd and Donnelly (2000, p. 138) argue that the ensuing isolation of pro-Apartheid sports federations constituted 'powerful symbolic condemnation' that contributed to the fall of the regime. In turn, the end of apartheid offered an opportunity to mobilize sport as a tool for development, and therefore was a significant precursor to the emergence of Sport for Development and Peace (SDP) as a significant sector, insofar as it became reasonable and intelligible to argue that marginalized people (such as Black South Africans) possessed an inalienable right to participate in sport and physical activity (Kidd 2008, p. 374; on SDP see Darnell 2012). It is also important to note, however, that boycotts alone cannot transform societies (Booth 2004). On their own they can perhaps bring about limited reforms, since the pressures they exert are relatively insignificant in comparison with the concessions demanded.

Hartmann (2003) does not specifically compare the OPHR with the AAM strategy of boycott. Anti-racism certainly provides another thread of continuity in these two campaigns and suggests a contrary argument to Moyn's 'discontinuity thesis' about the history of human rights (Moyn 2010). Blackburn (2011, p. 135) argues that nineteenth-century campaigns for the abolition of slavery and the twentieth-century movements to end white rule in Africa and Jim Crow laws in the United States were aligned: 'the 'human rights' idea was taken up in different ways by the South Africa Freedom Charter, Kwame Nkrumah, Martin Luther King Jr., the Student Non-violent Coordinating Committee and the 1968 Olympic Project for Human Rights'. The family resemblance was their anti-racist approach to anti-colonialism and anti-imperialism. He continues, 'the struggle against apartheid South Africa was an icon of the anti-imperialist movement and surely had an absolute claim to the banner of human rights' (Blackburn 2011, p. 135).

Social movements learn from the prior and contemporary experience of other social movements. From the 1950s to the 1990s, the AAM realized the importance of the media to mobilize national and international opinion, grassroots activists and transnational bodies and corporations. Unlike the CRM, the AAM developed as 'informational capitalism' was coming to the fore (Castells 1996) and the struggle over the control of information, symbols and knowledge was becoming increasingly important. As Keck and Sikkink (1998, p. 16) suggest this requires 'the ability to quickly and credibly generate politically usable information and move it to where it has the most impact'. As well as involving movements from the Global South as well as from the North, a principal focus of the AAM as a NSM was therefore its emphasis on information politics (Thörn 2007). This was very much a feature of transnational as well as national campaigns aiming to put an end to racism in sport that began in the 1990s, such as 'Football Against Racism in Europe' (FARE), 'Let's Kick Racism Out of Football' and 'Kick it Out' in the United Kingdom.

Disability rights

The disability rights movement 'is informed not only by the experience of disabled people (sic), but by the civil rights movement, movements of African-American and other minority groups, the women's rights movement and by the current movement of gay and lesbian rights' (B. Robertson 1998, quoted in Winter 2003, p. 57). The relationship between the disability rights movement and different rights movements is brought out very sharply in this quotation. As we will also see with the LGBT rights movement, social movements learn from the experiences of and thus develop in the context of other movements. Disabled people's collective action thus fits very well with Touraine's conception of NSMs, that Oliver (1990, p. 113) described as 'culturally innovative in that they are part

of the underlying struggles for genuine participatory democracy, social equality and justice, which have arisen out of the crisis of industrial culture'. Winter (2003, p. 33) discusses the rise of the Disability Rights Movement (DRM) in the United States as a solution to a problem: the 'oppressive marginalization of persons with disabilities'. The aims of the DRM were to empower people with disabilities to take control of their lives and to influence social policies and practices. The overall aim was to replace oppression with empowerment and marginalization with full inclusion in society (Fleischer and Zames 2011). These are goals very similar to those of the CRM.

The DRM – as with other social movements – can be understood to pass through a series of phases. Winter suggests there are three main ones: first comes the 'definition of the problem' – in this case the personal and institutional oppression faced by people with disabilities. This led to the critique of the 'medical model of disability' that was seen to be a main part of the problem confronting disabled people. As Siebers 2008 (p. 3) explains, the medical model 'defines disability as an individual defect lodged in the person, a defect that must be cured or eliminated if the person is to achieve full capacity as a human being'. The critique of this model, and the alternative 'social model' of disability, involves seeing disability 'not as an individual defect but as the product of social injustice, one that requires not the cure or elimination of the defective person but significant changes in the social and built environment' (Siebers 2008, p. 3). The difference in perspective leads to being able to distinguish between impairment and disability, and between stigmatization and marginalization, when considering the position of disabled people in society.

The next phase in the life of a social movement is 'the solution' which is partly ideological and involved, in this case, the development of the 'social model of disability', but also leads to legislative and organizational changes. In the United States, for example, the history of efforts to bring about legislative solutions began in the 1950s with paralyzed military veterans and people with disabilities seeking greater accessibility. Such issues for people with disabilities became one of civil rights and not just help. In 1965, a national commission in the United States set out to study 'the problems involved in making all Federal buildings accessible to disabled citizens' (Winter 2003, p. 36). The DRM actively sought to develop and protect 'the integration and full inclusion of individuals with disabilities into the mainstream of American society' as expressed in federal law ('The Rehabilitation Act 1973' quoted in Winter 2003, p. 34). The beginning of disability activism in the United States is often located with students with quadriplegia at the University of California-Berkeley in the 1960s. Inspired by the civil rights movement, Ed Roberts and other disabled students began to campaign to live in 'regular' accommodation (rather than the infirmary where Roberts had been expected to live while studying). They argued for accessible housing, classrooms, public transport and pedestrian routes and founded the first Center for Independent Living (CIL) in 1972.

The third phase in the course of a social movement can be conceived as 'the aftermath'. This features the recognition that there is a need to maintain the gains made by legislative and other reforms, possibly by strengthening the means of ensuring meaningful compliance. The slogan 'Nothing about us, without us' began to be used in conjunction with disability activism to emphasize the idea that no policy should be decided by any representative without the full and direct participation of members of the group(s) affected by that policy (Charlton 2000). This phase of the social movement sees the further raising of consciousness of and about people with disabilities and a related number of increasing demands. To illustrate this, we briefly account for the development of the disability rights movement in the United Kingdom.

In the United Kingdom, the first campaigning organizations controlled by people with disabilities dated from the late nineteenth century – the British Deaf Association, 1890 and the National League for the Blind 1899. As Davis (1993, p. 287) notes, however, while these and many other organizations that developed in the United Kingdom over the course of the first 60 years of the twentieth century demonstrated, people with disabilities could run their own organizations, there was little 'cohesion between them'. Some sought charity, others challenged it, 'some wanted integration, others supported segregation; some were working for greater control by disabled people over their own lives, others were calling for more professional providers and other "experts"' (Davis 1993, p. 287). During this period, social injustice was seen as a problem for the individual disabled person (medical model) not the society in which it took place (social model).

The formation of the Union of the Physically Impaired Against Segregation (UPIAS) in the United Kingdom in 1972 came about partly as a result of a letter by Paul Hunt published in *The Guardian* newspaper, calling for a radical new disability organization to be formed. The UPIAS then published a document laying out the 'Fundamental Principles of Disability', espousing the social model of disability, which had been drafted by Vic Finkelstein. UPIAS formalized a critique of the medical model of disability, along with a rejection of a reliance on (well meaning) 'experts' to solve disabled people's problems for them. UPIAS adopted a definition of disability that clearly located it as a result of the social conditions which people with disabilities encounter and not their own personal impairments: 'the disadvantage or restriction of ability caused by a contemporary social organisation which takes little or no account of people who have physical impairment and thus excludes them from participation in the mainstream of social activities. Physical disability is therefore a particular form of social oppression' (cited in Davis 1993, p. 289).

The early 1970s were 'pivotal' for the DRM (Davis 1993, p. 288) and soon after many other solidarity groups connecting disabled people with different struggles were established in the United Kingdom (e.g. GEMMA, disabled

lesbians; Sisters Against Disablement, disabled women; and Disabled People Against Apartheid, in solidarity with black people in South Africa). UPIAS encouraged its members to have 'pride' in themselves, but also 'offered an incentive for the growing number of organisations to come together' in order to struggle for social change (Davis 1993, p. 289). The British Council of Organisations of Disabled People (BCODP), formed in 1981 from representatives of 16 groups controlled by disabled people, was the end result (and UPIAS was wound up in 1990). In December 1981, three representatives of BCODP attended the First World Congress of the Disabled Peoples' International (DPI) in Singapore (Davis 1993, p. 285). Within ten years, membership of BCODP had risen to over 80 different groups and the DPI had increased its scope to 70 national assemblies run by disabled people around the world (Davis 1993, p. 285).

How activists in different social movements in different societies translate their visions and goals into plausible rights claims varies. Some social movements do pursue changes to laws; some do not. The mobilization of law in the case of disabled rights social movement actors in the United States (and the United Kingdom) is not a distinctive strategy of all social movements but the product of a consensus that developed that legal alterations were needed to enhance the lives of disabled people (Vanhala 2011). Strategic litigation as a mobilization device works for some, but not all social groups, and at different times in their development (Vanhala 2011, p. 6). Social movement politics is thus bound up with social movement identity politics. Equally activist identities are bound up with different social movements as the following illustrates. Vic Finkelstein, co-founder of UPIAS, had been deported to the United Kingdom from his native South Africa for his support of the anti-apartheid movement in the 1960s. He had been in a wheelchair since 1954 when he broke his neck attempting to pole-vault. Following treatment and rehabilitation at the Stoke Mandeville hospital in Buckinghamshire in the United Kingdom, Finkelstein returned to South Africa and became a member of the Congress of Democrats, an organization for white people in the anti-apartheid Congress Alliance which provided covert support to banned groups. On coming to Britain as a refugee, he continued to have contact with the ANC but also began to meet politically active disabled people. As well as being prominent in setting up the BCODP and becoming its first chair, he was one of the British delegates to the First World Congress of the DPI in 1981.

Finkelstein's life thus linked two of the leading human rights movements of the past 50 years, but tragically this was a result of his accident in sport. What other connections are there between sport and disability rights activists? What has been the relationship between disability rights activism and major sports events for people with disabilities? Provision for disability sport, both for the physically disabled and for the learning disabled, has been limited in all nations until relatively recently. Sport for the physically disabled was

first developed after World War I and more fully after World War II, especially in the context of attempts to improve the lives of those with spinal injuries. Here we will briefly discuss the development of the Special Olympics and the Paralympic Games.

The idea of sport as a means for improving the health, self-esteem and general well-being of those with learning disabilities was not taken up until the founding of the 'Special Olympics' movement in the United States in the 1960s (Barton 2009; <http://www.specialolympics.org>, [accessed 4 October 2012]). The purpose of the Special Olympics movement was 'to provide sporting opportunities for the learning disabled regardless of ability or age with an emphasis on participation rather than excellence' (Barton et al. 2011, p. 12). Eunice Kennedy Shriver, from the influential American Kennedy family and former director of the Kennedy Foundation, established summer camps (which she called 'Camp Shriver') for people with learning disabilities in 1962. The staging of the first international (World) Special Olympics took place in Chicago in 1968 when Shriver pledged that the Special Olympics would offer people with intellectual disabilities everywhere 'the chance to play, the chance to compete and the chance to grow' (http://www.specialolympics.org/eunice_kennedy_shriver_biography.aspx, [accessed 4 October 2012]).

In 1971, the United States Olympic Committee (USOC) gave the Special Olympics organization official approval to use the name 'Olympics' in the United States, and in 1988 the IOC also endorsed use of the name worldwide. Organized through clubs taking part in national and international competitions the Special Olympics is based on recognizable Olympic formats such as opening and closing ceremonies, the awarding of gold, silver and bronze medals, host cities and a four yearly cycle of the major international events. At the time of writing, for example, the next Special Olympics World Winter Games will be held in PyeongChang, South Korea, from 29 January 2013 to 6 February 2013, and the next Special Olympics World Summer Games will be held in Los Angeles, California, in July 2015 (<http://www.specialolympics.org>, [accessed 4 October 2012]).

In 2004, the Special Olympics received support through legislation for the first time in the United States, when the 'Special Olympics Sport and Empowerment Act' was ratified. This gave \$US15 million every year for the next 5 years to Special Olympics programmes. During a visit to the Special Olympics World Winter Games in Boise, Idaho, in 2009, US Vice President Joe Biden stated that special needs advocacy was 'a civil rights movement'. In 1986, the UN launched 'The International Year of the Special Olympics' and the Special Olympics has continued to develop beyond the United States. In the United Kingdom, for example, Special Olympics Great Britain was formally established in 1978 and was first represented by athletes in the 1979 International Special Olympics. Following Eunice Shriver's death in 2009, her son Tim Shriver has since become CEO and chairman of the Special Olympics

board. As Special Olympics International, the Special Olympics currently has a presence in over 200 countries (<http://www.specialolympics.org>, [accessed 4 October 2012]). It is interesting to contrast this 'movement' with the key developments and evolution of the Paralympic Games.

Unlike the Special Olympics for the learning disabled, the Paralympic Games, which includes some events for the learning impaired, has become a component part of the Olympic Games mega-event spectacle. Howe (2008, pp. 15–37) describes three stages in the development of sport for the disabled that lead to this situation. As we have noted, sport provision was initially designed to aid in the *rehabilitation* of war wounded service personnel, and thus reintroduction into productive (working) life (Anderson 2003). This certainly was the main impetus behind Dr Ludwig Guttmann's, a German Jewish neurologist, establishment of a National Spinal Injuries Unit at the Ministry of Pensions Hospital in Stoke Mandeville in the United Kingdom in 1943. The second phase in the development of sport for the disabled developed from this in terms of the recognition that *participation* in sport could be beneficial to disabled people in wider terms than simply their employability could be. Athletes in different impairment groups – those with spinal cord injuries, the visually impaired, the hearing impaired, cerebral palsy and amputees – became organized through the International Organization of Sport for the Disabled (IOSD). The IOSD introduced a systematic classification system to create equal conditions for athletes to compete with these different impairments.

The third phase in the development of sport and the disabled involves the development of *high-performance achievement* sport, organized through the International Paralympic Committee (IPC), which was first established in September 1989. It was from this time on that Howe (2008, p. 16) suggests we can talk about a 'Paralympic Movement' as the forming of the IPC brought together a number of different organizations that had previously represented sport for the various impairment groups. The story of this development in sport for disabled people can be found in several sources (see for example Bailey 2008; Brittain 2008, 2010 and 2012; and Howe 2008). The term 'paralympic' is now understood to refer to the fact that sports events for disabled people take place alongside (or 'para') the Olympic Games. Initially it was considered that the word combined 'paraplegic' and Olympic, but this was not accurate as people with disabilities other than paraplegia participated in the Paralympic Games. The history of international sports events for the disabled can be charted back to the day in July 1948 when the Stoke Mandeville Games began at the same time as the London Olympic Games of that year were commencing 35 miles away. Use of the name 'Mandeville' by the local organizers for one of the two mascots for the London Olympic and Paralympic Games of 2012 tried to reinforce this 64-year inheritance (Brittain 2012). However, the first generally recognized Paralympic Games was held in Rome in 1960. It was here for the first time that

the Paralympic events used some of the same locations as the Olympic Games. Formal recognition and use of the term by the IOC, however, did not occur until the Seoul Olympics in 1988. The roots of ‘paralympism’ as a concept underpinning the development of sport for the disabled are thus embedded in the history of both the rehabilitative and the participatory models, but truly became focused on *high-performance* sport after 1988. As Howe (2008, p. 19) remarks, ‘Guttmann’s lasting legacy is the fact that physical activity and sport are widely acknowledged to be central to contemporary rehabilitation for traumatic and congenital impairments’.

In 2012, the Paralympic Games Opening and Closing Ceremonies were spectacular, and drew attention to the diversity of human kind and even featured performances referring to the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. But what is the connection between this and other major international sports events for disabled athletes and the disabled majority? Some journalists suggest that the 2012 Paralympic effect has had a positive impact and the number of enquiries from people with disabilities in the United Kingdom to get involved in sport has grown (Walker and Holman 2012). Others suggest that there is no significant impact on the lives of ‘ordinary’ disabled people (Brindle 2012; Muir 2012). At the time of writing, it is still too early to tell if a positive impact will be sustained or if there is the sports infrastructure in place to support an increase in demand from people with disabilities. What is clear is that the disability rights movement has been wary of and somewhat distanced from the sport for disabled ‘movements’ during the past 50 plus years. Why is that? We want to suggest three reasons.

First, disability sport relies upon medical classification and evaluation on the basis of impairment in order to create the different classes of sport, whether it is participatory or competitive. As we have seen, the disability rights movement developed a major critique of the medical model of disability, and thus it may not have wanted to engage fully with practices that rely so much on such forms of medical scrutiny and classification. Second, another aspect of the politics of the disability rights movement has been to develop organizations that avoid paternalistic relationships between the able-bodied and the disabled. Yet the main organizations for sport for the disabled, including the SO, the IPC and the IOSD, can be seen as expert-led – rather than collective and self-organized bodies – that in some ways treat athletes as ‘charity cases’ (Howe 2008, p. 36). This links to the third reason why the disability rights movement and the main international sports for disabled movements have not shared common ground. The practice of high-performance sport is not an inclusive activity. As Howe (2008, p. 34) puts it, both the Olympic and Paralympic Games ‘exclude the (dis)abled or, to put it another way, “those who can’t”’. Sport, particularly high-performance sport, is fundamentally underpinned by the ‘ideology of ability’. This entails a view that ability is the marker of being truly human (Siebers

2008, see Chapter 9). Siebers (2008, p. 178) argues instead that ‘human-rights discourse will never break free from the ideology of ability until it includes disability as a defining characteristic of human beings’.

LGBT rights

Private, consensual, same-sex relationships are illegal in over 70 countries, with punishment ranging from imprisonment to death. The struggle for rights for people with different sexual orientations is ongoing (Baird 2004). Even the umbrella term used to describe these rights has frequently altered to try and better capture the focus of the movement. This section will use the relatively short and well-known acronym, LGBT, standing for Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual and Transsexual persons, while recognizing that longer alternatives exist that embrace more of the diversity of sexual orientations and gender identities (see Symons 2010, pp. 260–3 and p. 264 fn.1 for a discussion of sex, gender and sexuality terminology).

As we noted earlier, acknowledgement of LGBT rights is a part of the European Union (EU) Fundamental (Human) Rights Charter; but attempts are still being made to get them accepted at the UN and among many of the governments that form part of the Commonwealth. Dr Navanethem (‘Navi’) Pillay, UN High Commissioner for Human Rights, wrote in 2012 that ‘the case for extending the same rights for lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender (LGBT) persons as those enjoyed by everyone else is neither radical nor complicated’ (in UN HRC 2012, p. 7). Yet the UN does not have a core treaty or convention on sexual orientation. Dr Pillay (UN HRC 2012, p. 7) argues that the case for extending rights to LGBT persons rests on the two pillars of international human rights law: equality and non-discrimination. Homophobic attitudes plus lack of legal protection from discrimination create conditions oppressive to LGBT persons. In 2011 the UN Human Rights Council (HRC) adopted a resolution expressing grave concern at violence and discrimination meted out to individuals based on their sexual orientation and gender identity. Although not legally binding on UN member states, the publication *Born Free and Equal. Sexual Orientation and Gender Identity in International Human Rights Law* (UN HRC 2012) set out legal obligations that states have towards LGBT people. These obligations were based on five main issues of concern that the UN HRC uncovered after it conducted a universal periodic review of the records of all UN states. The obligations identified by the UN HRC (2012, p. 13) were protection from homophobia and transphobic violence; prevention of the torture and cruel treatment of LGBT persons; repeal of laws criminalizing homosexuality; prohibition of discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation and gender identity; and safeguarding of freedom of expression for LGBT people.

The UN HRC review followed shortly after the publication of two documents concerning LGBT rights in the 2000s: the 'Declaration of Montreal' that was made during the International Conference on LGBT Human Rights of the first World Outgames in Montreal in 2006 (<http://www.declarationofmontreal.org/declaration/> [accessed 8 October 2012]); and the Yogyakarta Principles on the Application of International Human Rights Law in Relation to Sexual Orientation and Gender Identity that were agreed after a meeting of international human rights law experts in the same year (<http://www.yogyakartaprinciples.org> [accessed 8 October 2012]). Yet as Joke Swiebel, one of the main drafters of the Declaration of Montreal, argues deeper engagement with LGBT organizations at the UN has 'been blocked by the cultural and religious values of some of the organization's main actors' (Swiebel 2009, p. 20). She attributes the relative success in getting sexual orientation and the rights of LGBT persons 'on the agenda' at the EU, but not at the UN, to a number of factors relating to the strategies adopted and the institutions involved.

The organisers of the International Conference on LGBT Human Rights of the 1st World Outgames sought to fill this gap by drafting the 'Declaration of Montreal' (Swiebel 2009, p. 28) that summarized the main demands of the international LGBT movement at the time, but also 'tried to illustrate that, by defining LGBT issues as human rights issues, the very concept of human rights had to change; that concept should no longer be allowed to reinforce the traditional, male-dominated, heteronormative vision of the world' (Swiebel 2009, p. 28). This was done by aligning the demands of the LGBT movement with those of the women's' movement: "our right to control our bodies and choose how we wish to live . . . (and) . . . to challenge the rigidity of the fixed roles allocated to women and men and the dominance of heterosexual male norms and interests" (quoted in Swiebel 2009, p. 28). The Declaration proposed the creation of a UN convention on the elimination of all forms of discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation and gender identity and has been adopted by several municipal authorities around the world, including the Montreal borough of Ville-Marie. In addition, it was adopted by one of Canada's three major political parties, the New Democratic Party (NDP), in August 2006. It is important to note, however, that the convention has no binding legal status. International developments thus have coincided with domestic cultural and policy change. In Canada, for example, the rights focus of the LGBT movement and ready acceptance of the Declaration of Montreal can part be attributed to the much earlier adoption of a Charter of Rights and Freedom in 1982, which brought about a 'rights revolution' in Canada (Smith 1999).

The politics of challenging the privileging of heterosexuality (or heteronormativity), at the core of the LGBT movement, have developed over time. Although there had been homophile organizations earlier in the twentieth century, and 'Gay is good' as a slogan was developed in the early 1960s, the

Gay Liberation Front (GLF) developed after incidents at the Stonewall Inn in Greenwich Village, New York, in June 1969 when gay and lesbians converged to protest against police tactics surrounding this 'gay' bar. In the late 1960s and early 1970s, the gay liberation movement adopted a collectivist ideology that sought to challenge the social structures of oppression rather than focus on rights alone, that was perceived as a more individualistic ideology at the time (Kollman and Waites 2009, p. 4). The GLF was short-lived but it was emulated internationally. As Kollman and Waites note 'since the emergence of gay liberation movements in Western countries in the late 1960s and early 1970s LGBT organizations have framed their demands in terms of equality and/or liberation, but human rights discourses did not become central to national and international debates over gender and sexuality until the early 1990s' (2009, p. 2).

In the early 1990s, the LGBT movements took a 'human rights' turn – although LGBT rights were absent from previous conceptions of human rights and this is 'suggestive of the absence of LGBT people from previous conceptions of the human' (Kollman and Waites 2009, p. 2). The human rights 'turn' owed much to the strengthening of transnational LGBT networks. The International Lesbian and Gay Association (ILGA), established in 1978, had remained a loose affiliation of disparate national groups until the 1990s when it created six regional groups covering all the continents. Another prominent LGBT human rights NGO, the International Gay and Lesbian Human Rights Commission, was created by United States and Russian LGBT activists. Alongside AI and HRW, these made up a more influential global network of human rights LGBT campaigners (Kollman and Waites 2009, p. 4).

Griffin (2012) outlines and identifies the key moments in the development of a 'LGBT sports equality movement', especially in the United States, since that time in the mid-1970s. For example, 6 years after the Stonewall riots, former NFL player Dave Kopay came out. As she notes, before 1975, 'the cultural social consensus was that being LGBT was sinful, sick and immoral and publicly identifying oneself as LGBT invited ridicule and discrimination' (Griffin 2012, p. 2). Sexual prejudice and heterosexism have been and remain pervasive in many areas of sport. Yet there is a different environment than three decades ago. Campaigns against homophobia have taken place and continue to increasingly do so, in sport, although the few male athletes who have come out have usually done so at or towards the end of their careers, like NFL's David Kopay, NBA's John Amaechi and Rugby Union's Gareth Thomas. NBA centre, Jason Collins, was the main exception to this when he came out in a feature article in *Sports Illustrated* in April 2013 (<http://sportsillustrated.cnn.com/magazine/news/20130429/jason-collins-gay-nba-player/> [last accessed 13 May 2013]). In the professional football (soccer) leagues in Europe, there have (at the time of writing) only been three male

players who have publicly self-identified as gay – the late Justin Fashanu, who played for various teams in England between 1978 and 1997, Robbie Rogers, who came out after leaving Leeds United in January 2013 and Anton Hysén in Sweden (Barkham 2011, McRae 2013). Caudwell (2011) provides a valuable analysis of the way that football fans in England produce homophobia within the spaces of football stadia. She demonstrates the normalization of homophobic chanting and homophobic gesticulation, and suggests that it is dominant ideas surrounding gay men's sexual activity, penetrative sex and men's bodies, which are central to these articulations of homophobia. She notes the ways that 'The Justin Campaign' – an 'anti-homophobia in football' project established in Brighton, United Kingdom, on 2 May 2008 – has sought to make the tragic death of Justin Fashanu (in May 1998) visible and his plight as a young gay black player.

Unlike the disability rights movement and its relationship to major international sports events for disabled people, Symons (2010, p. 241) stresses the importance of other social movements emanating from civil rights, second-wave feminism and gay liberation movements of the 1960s and 1970s in Western societies for the formation of the Gay Games in 1982. For example, the founder of the Gay Games, Dr Tom Waddell, shifted politics 'from Republican to radical left in the 1960s' (Symons 2010, p. 15) informed by his experience as an Olympic decathlon athlete, the OPHR at the 1968 Mexico City Olympic Games and later his work with the Black Panther movement (Symons 2010, p. 241). The Gay Games iterations and issues have included since then the use of competitive sport by the organisers to maintain LGBT sport and normalize LGBT sexualities, as well as its financial viability based on emulating the Olympic Games through such means as the use of corporate sponsorship (Lenskyj 2005).

In its early stages, Waddell and others organizing the Gay Games mobilized dominant sport ideologies that position the body in sport as both normal and healthy to counter the pathologizing of LGBT sexualities (Caudwell 2012). Symons (2010, pp. 41–4 and pp. 70–71) captures this well in the subheadings to Chapters 3 and 4 of her book: 'we are normal' and 'we are healthy'. Both Gay Games I (1982) and Gay Games II (1986) took place in the context of the attempt to launch a Gay 'Olympic' Games and HIV/AIDS in the 1980s. But as with other major international sport events, political, economic and ideological conflicts and tensions underpin their development. Unlike the Special Olympics, the USOC would not allow Waddell to use the word 'Olympic' in the title of 'his' event and so the name Gay Games developed. The Gay Games moved away from North America for the first time in 1998 and 2002 (to Amsterdam and Sydney respectively) but issues around tolerance and acceptance and financial sustainability continued to underpin them. In 1994, Gay Games IV reached 'a watershed . . . organisers maximized the significance and resources of New York as one of the leading commercial, media, fashion and political centres of

the world. The emphasis on celebrity, big and brash events and commercial success was certainly centre stage' (Symons 2010, p. 146).

Internal fissures over participation, competition, finance and using the event to promote cultural, political and social rights agendas lead to the creation of two major international sports events for LGBT people in 2006. Symons (2010, pp. 217–40) discusses in detail the split that developed in the Gay Games movement resulting from a breakdown in contract negotiations between the Federation of the Gay Games (FGG) and the organizers for what was going to the seventh Gay Games in Montreal in 2006. Montreal had won the right to host the seventh Gay Games with a mixed programme of sport, culture and human rights. The FGG wanted a more focused GG with sport at the centre and less emphasis on culture and human rights (Symons 2010, p. 12). The Montreal 2006 organizers and FGG disagreed, and the latter awarded the Gay Games VII to Chicago instead. A rival international gay and lesbian sports association – the Gay and Lesbian International Sports Association (GLISA) – was developed and the 1st World Outgames were held in Montreal just 2 weeks after Gay Games VII were held in Chicago in 2006. The Outgames attracted substantially fewer sports participants than it had originally estimated including 'lower attendance of US athletes who previously made up over 40 per cent of people at a Gay Games' (Symons 2010, p. 239).

Montreal 2006 also created a significant financial deficit for the organisers, which tarnished the reputation of the inaugural event, although the conference that preceded it made a major input into LGBT international politics as we have already seen with the Declaration of Montreal launched at the largest ever conference for LGBT human rights. As the director of the 2nd World Outgames, held in Copenhagen in 2009, Utte Elbaek said "We want to . . . put the focus on human rights" (Eriksen 2009, p. 24). The boards of both GLISA and FGG met in Montreal in May 2012 to try to establish a single quadrennial event, but were unable to reach agreement, so the next events in their respective competitions will take place in 2013 and 2017, and 2014 and 2018. The 3rd World Outgames will be held in Antwerp in Belgium in summer 2013 and Gay Games IX in Cleveland in 2014.

Symons (2010, p. 245) identifies various tensions at the heart of the rationale for the Gay Games. The Gay Games provides a space for LGBT persons to enjoy and achieve in sport in a welcoming and supportive environment. But this potentially goes against the goal of integrating LGBT persons into wider society, by providing a ghettoized space, leaving homophobia and homophobic practices in sport and elsewhere in society untouched. Another of the tensions involves the contrast between the mainstreaming and transformative aspects of the Gay Games sports programme. Mainstreaming or sanctioning 'proves that lesbian and gay sports are conducted in strict accordance with the norms of sport' (Pronger 2000, p. 232). However, the norms of sport are often

heterosexist and 'two-sexed' that does not neatly fit 'the more fluid and diverse sexed and gendered lives of LGBTIQ peoples' (Symons 2010, p. 245); hence some people, who are transgendered, would be excluded. Rules surrounding drug taking also create problems for those members of the LGBT community who require drugs for serious medical conditions, such as transsexuals undergoing sex reassignment therapy. The distinction between the drive for professionalization and the community orientation of the Gay Games created a division within the LGBT sports movement and a 'massive smorgasbord of programme offerings to participate in, watch and be part of' (Symons 2010, p. 245). While some critics question the progressiveness of the development of the Gay Games (e.g. Davidson *f/c*), nonetheless as Symons (2010, p. 247) concludes, 'In a largely homophobic and heterosexist world the staging of the Gay Games, the implementation of progressive participation policies and the development of an extensive international lesbian and gay sports movement have been significant achievements'.

Conclusion

For the CRM/anti-racism, disability rights and LGBT rights movements, political developments in the 1950s and 1960s gave rise to a range of similar strategies in the struggle for rights: non-violent protests and boycotts as a strategy to shame and embarrass their oppressors, as well as mass marches and demonstrations, were part of the weaponry used in the struggles. Equally issues of mainstreaming, gaining legitimacy and transformation underpin all three social movements involved with rights and sport (Symons 2010): mainstreaming and becoming part of the existing sport system carried the cost of entering into structures that were racist, disabilist and/or homophobic. Yet, to gain legitimacy, athletes had to participate to a certain extent in mainstream sport and abide by the official regulations and only then might progressive transformation take place within sport. With respect to 'race', the overt barriers may appear to be down but the struggle against discriminatory and inequitable treatment against people of colour continues in more subtle ways. With disability, there is greater acceptance of the abilities of athletes with disabilities (the inclusion of double-amputee South African athlete Oscar Pistorius in two track events in the 2012 Summer Olympics marked a new era for athletes with disabilities) but disability sport raises issues around the use of new technology to enhance predominantly exclusive and excluding, high-performance, sport. In the case of LGBT rights, sexual orientation, gender identity and homosexuality continue to be highly regulated in many societies. The three movements thus share political tensions stemming from the choices of seeking reform or revolution, mainstreaming or transformation, and assimilation or separatism.

This chapter has considered the *rights movements* as a plurality of different campaigns, protests and demonstrations not all bearing the label ‘human rights’. ‘Human rights’, as with ‘movement’, gains greatest clarity after a campaign or protest has happened, while at its core is ‘the idea of protecting individuals (and perhaps groups) from *the abuse of power*’ (Freeman 2011, p. 201). Equally it needs to be noted that no teleological end point is reached in this story. That is, there is no (inevitable) happy ending. The movement against the apartheid regime in South Africa remains the only major example of a successful human rights campaign involving sport, although the build-up to the Olympic and Paralympic Games in Beijing in the summer of 2008 offers a valuable example of a more recent concentration of social movement activity concerning human rights in a sports context (Brownell 2012; Kidd 2010; Rowe 2012; Worden 2008).