
Xiaowei Yu

University of Windsor

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholar.uwindsor.ca/etd

Recommended Citation
https://scholar.uwindsor.ca/etd/7157
RETURN OF THE EASTERN GIANT: AN INVESTIGATION OF THE
PARTICIPATION OF THE PEOPLE’S REPUBLIC OF CHINA IN THE 1980
AND 1984 OLYMPIC GAMES

By

Xiaowei Yu

A Thesis
Submitted to the Faculty of Graduate Studies
through the Faculty of Human Kinetics
in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for
the Degree of Master of Human Kinetics at the
University of Windsor

Windsor, Ontario, Canada

2008

© 2008 Xiaowei Yu
NOTICE:
The author has granted a non-exclusive license allowing Library and Archives Canada to reproduce, publish, archive, preserve, conserve, communicate to the public by telecommunication or on the Internet, loan, distribute and sell theses worldwide, for commercial or non-commercial purposes, in microform, paper, electronic and/or any other formats.

The author retains copyright ownership and moral rights in this thesis. Neither the thesis nor substantial extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author’s permission.

In compliance with the Canadian Privacy Act some supporting forms may have been removed from this thesis.

While these forms may be included in the document page count, their removal does not represent any loss of content from the thesis.

AVIS:
L’auteur a accordé une licence non exclusive permettant à la Bibliothèque et Archives Canada de reproduire, publier, archiver, sauvegarder, conserver, transmettre au public par télécommunication ou par l’Internet, prêter, distribuer et vendre des thèses partout dans le monde, à des fins commerciales ou autres, sur support microforme, papier, électronique et/ou autres formats.

L’auteur conserve la propriété du droit d’auteur et des droits moraux qui protège cette thèse. Ni la thèse ni des extraits substantiels de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans son autorisation.

Conformément à la loi canadienne sur la protection de la vie privée, quelques formulaires secondaires ont été enlevés de cette thèse.

Bien que ces formulaires aient inclus dans la pagination, il n’y aura aucun contenu manquant.
Author’s Declaration of Originality

I hereby certify that I am the sole author of this thesis and that no part of this thesis has been published or submitted for publication.

I certify that, to the best of my knowledge, my thesis does not infringe upon anyone’s copyright nor violate any proprietary rights and that any ideas, techniques, quotations, or any other material from the work of other people included in my thesis, published or otherwise, are fully acknowledged in accordance with the standard referencing practices. Furthermore, to the extent that I have included copyrighted material that surpasses the bounds of fair dealing within the meaning of the Canada Copyright Act, I certify that I have obtained a written permission from the copyright owner(s) to include such material(s) in my thesis and have included copies of such copyright clearances to my appendix.

I declare that this is a true copy of my thesis, including any final revisions, as approved by my thesis committee and the Graduate Studies office, and that this thesis has not been submitted for a higher degree to any other University or Institution.
ABSTRACT

The Chinese Olympic Committee was recognized by the International Olympic Committee in November 1979. Following the reinstatement, between 1980 and 1984, the People’s Republic of China sent athletes to participate in the 1980 Lake Placid, the 1984 Sarajevo Winter Olympic Games, and the 1984 Los Angeles Olympic Games, while they boycotted the 1980 Moscow Olympic Games. This study investigated the Chinese participation in the Olympic Games and the development of Chinese national sport between 1980 and 1984, and attempts to respond to the question why the People’s Republic of China chose the 1984 Los Angeles Olympic Games instead of the 1980 Moscow Olympic Games as the debut of the Chinese athletes on the global sport stage. Conclusions were reached through an analysis of three primary data sources: media reports; organizational archives; and key actor interviews. The research revealed that between 1980 and 1984, Chinese national sport served the national interests of the People’s Republic of China and was deeply influenced by the changing international political environment. The government of the People’s Republic of China made the decision to participate in the 1984 Olympic Games as well as to boycott the 1980 Moscow Olympic Games in order to realize its diplomatic strategies and maximize its national interests.
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Chapter One

Introduction

Introductory Background

On the night of 8 August 2007, people gathered at Beijing Tiananmen Square to celebrate the one-year countdown to the Opening Ceremony of the Beijing 2008 Olympic Games. The most important component of the celebration that night was the distribution of the invitation letters to the National Olympic Committee (NOC) of Britain, Canada, Greece, Russia, and the People’s Republic of China (PRC) by Jacques Rogge, president of the International Olympic Committee (IOC). As an open expression of support, this was the first time in its history that the IOC had shifted the location of the invitation ceremony from Lausanne, the headquarters of the IOC, to a host city of the Olympic Games. In response to the IOC’s support, Liu Qi, president of the Beijing Organizing Committee for the Olympic Games (BOCOG), promised the IOC that Beijing would improve mutual respect and understanding throughout the world, disseminate Olympic knowledge in China, and promote the Olympic spirit. Similar to that of the former president Juan Antonio Samaranch, Jacques Rogge expressed great expectations for the Beijing 2008 Olympic Games.

A friendly and cooperative relationship between the IOC and the PRC has been developing throughout the 28 years since the IOC recognized the membership of the PRC’s Olympic Committee in 1979. In 1980, China sent a 28-athlete delegation to the Lake Placid Winter Olympic Games, which marked the first time that the PRC’s athletes competed in the Olympic arena following their return to the Olympic family. In 1981, Dr. He Zhenliang was elected to be the first IOC member from the PRC. In 1985, he was elected into the Executive Board of the IOC because of his significant work relative to the
Olympic Movement. Four years later, Dr. He Zhenliang was elected as a Vice-President of the IOC. Simultaneously, Chinese athletes achieved significant progress at the Olympic Games. The Chinese Olympic Committee (COC) sent a 225-athlete contingent to compete at the 1984 Los Angeles Olympic Games. Although their first Summer Olympic Games, the achievement (15 gold, 8 silver, and 9 bronze medals) showcased the Chinese athletes' potential strengths to the world. Following that, Chinese athletes have participated in all the Olympic Games. In particular, at the most recent Summer Olympic Games in Athens, the Chinese Olympic team celebrated their best-ever medal haul, finishing the Games in second place behind the United States Olympic team. In total, the Chinese Olympic teams have won 112 gold, 96 silver, and 78 bronze Olympic medals since their return (See Appendix I). In addition, the cooperative and collaborative relationship also saw Beijing, the capital of the PRC, bid twice for hosting the Olympic Games in both 1993 and 2001. Although the first bid was not successful, it was helpful to spread Olympic knowledge throughout China and enhance the development of the Olympic Movement in China. The second bid, however, saw Beijing secure the right to host the 2008 Summer Olympic Games at the 112th IOC Session in 2001.

Despite the recent success, and when compared with the positive relationship between the IOC and the PRC throughout much of the last three decades, what the relationship looked like prior to 1979 was a totally different picture. Following the brutal civil war (1947-1949) between the Chinese Communist Party (CCP) and Chinese Nationalists (Kuomintang), the former achieved victory in Mainland China and established the PRC; having been defeated, the latter retreated to Taiwan. Both parties proclaimed that they represented the exclusive regime over China thereby resulting in an
ongoing struggle of legal recognition on the international political stage. The struggle also extended into the sport domain, specifically, the issue of “two Chinas” in the IOC. Based on the attitudes of IOC President Avery Brundage in 1952, suggesting that political factors should not be involved in the Olympic Movement, the organization attempted to utilize the same formula that it had applied between West and East Germany and North and South Korea to resolve the “two Chinas” issue. Under his ideal solution, President Brundage suggested that the IOC should recognize both the PRC and Taiwan. Having been refused by both sides, neither Brundage nor the PRC government compromised their position and denounced each other in the late 1950s. In 1958, the PRC government announced that they would not cooperate with any organizations recognizing “two Chinas” thereby withdrawing from the IOC and all International Sport Federations (ISFs). Unable to participate in the Olympic Games, the Chinese athletes only competed with the athletes from newly independent African, Asian, and Latin American countries, as well as some communist countries during the 1960s. A shift in international relations during the 1970s led to a change in the relationship between the IOC and the PRC. Sino-USSR relations deteriorated at the beginning of the 1970s, while the PRC attempted to open a diplomatic door to the United States. President Brundage retired in 1972 and his successor, Lord Killanin, adopted a more flexible stance relative to the PRC than his predecessor. Combined, these factors resulted in both sides sitting together working on a resolution to the “two Chinas” issue. As a result, both sides compromised and the IOC recognized the PRC in 1979.

The relationship between the IOC and the PRC saw the separation in the 1950s, the confrontation in the 1960s, the negotiation in the 1970s, and the cooperation from the
1980s up to the present. This study will focus on the development of the Olympic Movement in China between 1979 and 1984, a critical transition period. To fully understand how the relations shifted during this period and the importance of the Olympic Games to the Chinese people, it is necessary for the researcher to introduce a broad historical context of the development of the Olympic Movement in China.

The Development of the Olympic Movement in China

Beginning with the Shang dynasty, it is generally accepted that ancient Chinese history has been recorded for a period spanning almost four thousand years. During this long history the Chinese people established a relatively advanced civilization. One of the most important contributions to the world was ancient Chinese philosophy, which as the legacy of humanity in general, benefits people even today. Confucian philosophy, advocating righteousness, loyalty, forgiveness, humanity, and tolerance, had significant influence on Chinese society. Considered as the basis of political, social, and moral structure, Confucianism helped Chinese emperors establish and maintain their feudal society. However, since Confucianism emphasized improvement of people’s mental and moral level instead of their physical bodies, Chinese rulers did not focus on the physical well being of their citizens. Furthermore, Chinese feudal rulers did not encourage people to improve their physical strength in order to maintain the stability of the regimes more easily. Due to the centralized and hierarchical social environment, specifically in the physical culture domain, the competitive nature of sport declined thereby halting the physical improvement of the Chinese people. The result saw Chinese traditional sports developed differently in styles and rules from modern western sports. Basically,
traditional Chinese sports, according to their styles and purposes, are classified into three
groups: military sports, such as martial arts, archery, and chariot races; medical sports,
such as Tai Chi, Yang Sheng (keeping fit), Qi Gong (breathing exercises), and massage;
and recreational games, such as Chess, kite flying, dragon boat racing, and Li- She
(shooting arrows as part of a ceremony or for amusement). Chinese traditional sports
were not competitive and were only played for military purposes, recreational purposes,
or entertainment.

Western modern sports were introduced into China as early as the 1840s
following the Opium War between the Chinese Qing government and the British
government. Two groups of people, the missionaries with the YMCA systems and the
returning Chinese students from the Occident, brought the western modern sports into
China. To enhance physical conditioning of the Chinese youth as well as military
soldiers, Chinese intellectuals and educationists identified western modern sports such as
gymnastics and athletics as an efficient and scientific approach thereby widely
introducing modern sports into new-style schools and military training schools that were
established between the 1860s and the 1890s. Students received training in athletics,
swimming, fencing, gymnastics, and skating in these schools. In 1890, the earliest sports
meet with track and field events was held at St. John’s College in Shanghai. Later, other
competitive sports, such as basketball and football, appeared in the YMCA schools in
Tianjin, Shanghai, Hong Kong, and other major cities in China by the end of the
nineteenth century. The introduction of western sports and modern physical education
into China was influential and successful. The awareness of the importance of western
sports for improving not only individual physique but also national strength broadly extended in China at the time.

By 1911, the year the Qing dynasty ended, there were more than twenty-one physical education training schools in China. With the quick development of modern sport in schools, large-scale public athletic meets became an important part of the education system in these schools as well as in the major cities. The first All-China Colleges and Schools League Games were held in Nanjing in October 1910, which was later identified as the First National Athletics Meeting. The event was successful and attracted numerous spectators. Each day, approximately 40,000 people rushed into the stadium to watch the games unfold. Between 1910 and 1920, Chinese athletes also participated in international sports competitions such as the first and second Far East Games. In 1915, the IOC formally invited China to participate in the Games of the VI Olympiad, although the Games were cancelled due to World War I. This invitation has been generally identified as the first contact between the IOC and the Chinese sport administration.

On 3 April 1922 the China National Amateur Athletic Federation (CNAAF) was established. Wang Zhengting (1882-1961), Chinese Foreign Minister and a high-ranking diplomat, was elected as its president. At the IOC sessions in Paris in July 1922, the CNAAF was formally recognized as the Chinese National Olympic Committee, and Wang Zhengting was assigned as the first Chinese IOC member. Two years later in 1924, the All-China (Amateur) Athletic Association (AAA), the first countrywide and Chinese-run sport organization, was established in Nanjing. This new organization took over all functions of the CNAAF. The executives were all Chinese and Wang Zhengting...
was elected as the first president of the AAA. The AAA was not recognized by the IOC until 1931. Although the AAA did not formally send athletes to the VIII Olympiad in Paris in 1924, three Chinese tennis players did participate in the tennis events as individual athletes. In 1928, the AAA only sent an observer, Mr. Song Ruhai (1890-1958), to the IX Olympiad due to lack of financial support. His attendance is identified as the first time the AAA formally sent an official to the Olympic Games. Song Ruhai’s impact in China was more significant than competing in the Olympic stadium because of the book he wrote, *I can compete: Records of Olympic Meetings*, published in 1930. His manuscript marked the first time that the word “Olympiad” was translated into Chinese. The translation, “Wo Neng Bi Ya,” means “I can compete!” in English. Song Ruhai was attracted by the athletes’ high performance, sportsmanship, the Olympic spirit, gender equality, and the Olympic effect on the local economy. His book describes the Olympic Games held in the Netherlands in their entirety, explains the Olympic ideals and spirits, illustrates various sport events and relevant rules, and asserts that the Chinese people definitely have the capabilities to compete with western opponents in the Olympic stadium. His book, the first of its kind to introduce the significance of the Olympic Games to ordinary Chinese people, quickly became very popular in China.

As Song Ruhai’s book ignited the desire of Chinese sport fans to see Chinese athletes compete at the Olympic Games, in September 1931, the Japanese army invaded three provinces in northeastern China and installed the exiled descendant of the deposed Qing emperor, Pu Yi (1906-1967), thereby establishing a “puppet” regime called Manchuguo. To obtain international recognition for Manchuguo and show its legitimacy, a Japanese official announced in May 1932 that Liu Changchun and Yu
Xiwei, both talented Chinese sprinters, would be representing Manchuguo when competing at the Los Angeles Olympic Games. Several days later, in response to the Japanese announcement, Liu Changchun made a statement in Tianjin that as a Chinese he would only compete for China and he would not represent Manchuguo at the Games of the X Olympiad. With a donation of $2,500 from a patriotic Chinese General, the COC for the first time formally sent an athlete, Liu Changchun, to compete at the Olympic Games. As the only Chinese representative, Liu Changchun arrived at Los Angeles on July 29, just one day before the Opening Ceremony of the Games. The following day, a small Chinese delegation including Liu Changchun, his coach and translator, and four Chinese sport officials who were in the United States, marched in the Los Angeles Coliseum during the Opening Ceremony. During the following days, Liu Changchun participated in two races, the 100-meter and 200-meter heats. Although he was quickly eliminated from both competitions because of the impact of the long trip on his conditioning and fatigue, this is considered the debut of Chinese athletes on the Olympic stage.

Four years later, for the 1936 Berlin Olympic Games, the COC selected sixty-nine athletes to compete in the following events: football; track and field; basketball; weightlifting; boxing; cycling; and martial arts demonstration. In addition, an observer group with 34 Chinese sports officials traveled with the athletes. Following a lengthy one-month journey at sea, the delegation arrived at Berlin on 23 July 1932. The delegation received an ovation from hundreds of overseas Chinese and Chinese students who were already in Germany. In contrast, during their stay in Berlin, many Chinese athletes felt "great discomfort" due to the racial policies of the Nazi hosts. Furthermore,
the generally poor performance of the Chinese athletes caused them to feel depressed and great shame. Only one athlete, Fu Baolu, passed the initial trials and advanced to the final.37 The poor performance at the Games also resulted in a debate between those who supported modern sports and those who supported a return to traditional sports. The opponents of western sport questioned the development of European sports and physical education in China, and contended that the Chinese should use traditional sports, such as Chinese martial arts and Chinese meditation, to improve body fitness and mental health. They used the 1932 and 1936 Olympic Games as typical examples to denounce the fruitless efforts made during the previous 15 years.38 On the other hand, the supporters of modern sports stated that it was not wise to deny the superiority of western sports, which clearly benefited western people and could also benefit Chinese people. The debate did not stop until Japanese troops invaded Beijing in July 1937 causing the eight-year Anti-Japanese War, which later became part of World War II.

Neither the debate before the Anti-Japanese-invasion war nor the tragedies during the war reduced the desire to develop Chinese modern sports among Chinese sport activists. With the government of the Republic of China retreating and settling the provisional capital in the western inland city of Chongqing, physical education and modern sports were imported into southwestern China. As a result, they became an important living style of local residents during wartime.39 In addition, following the development of the Chinese Communist Party (CCP), physical culture evolved quickly. Influenced heavily by the Soviet Union, the first communist sport organization, the Soviet Physical Culture and Sports Committee, was established in 1937 at Yan’an,40 leading to the first CCP Regional Games in 1940.41 The CCP developed Soviet-style
sports and emphasized mass sport thereby using physical activity as a means to achieve its military improvement.\textsuperscript{42}

Following World War II, encouraged by the great victory, the COC resolved in 1945 to apply to the IOC to host the XV Olympiad in 1952.\textsuperscript{43} However, the following four years saw China occupied with the struggle for sovereignty between the CCP and Kuomintang, which resulted in the Chinese Civil War (1946-1949).\textsuperscript{44} Despite the internal struggle, in 1948, the COC still sent a 33-athlete delegation to London to participate in the XIV Olympiad, though the delegation did not obtain sufficient financial support to finish the Games.\textsuperscript{45} The athletes competed in five events: track and field; basketball; soccer; swimming; and cycling. Predictably, the results were poor and no medals were achieved.

Following the Civil War between the CCP and Kuomintang, which ended in 1949, the PRC established their own regime throughout mainland China. The Kuomintang, defeated by the PRC, fled to Taiwan. China found itself divided into two parts: the Republic of China (ROC), located in Taiwan; and the People’s Republic of China (PRC), which controlled the entire Mainland China except Taiwan Island. Both proclaimed that they were the only legitimate government of China. This disagreement resulted in the “two Chinas” issue in the IOC. By 1950 the PRC established a country-wide sporting body, the All-China Sport Federation (ACSF).\textsuperscript{46} The ACSF took over all functions owned by the COC, which was located in Taiwan and was the only legal organization the IOC recognized at that time to represent China, even though it had no control of the country’s sport affairs. IOC President Edström (1870-1964) faced the dilemma of whether to accept both, only one of them, or neither. However, since Edström
was planning to retire in 1952, he chose to do nothing relative to this issue during the remainder of his presidency.\textsuperscript{47}

In June 1951, the COC in Taiwan received an invitation from the Helsinki Organization Committee of the Olympic Games.\textsuperscript{48} In February 1952, with the support of the Soviet Union, the ACSF decided to attend the Helsinki Olympic Games and argued that the ACSF should be the only sport organization to represent China, while the COC in Taiwan should not be allowed to attend.\textsuperscript{49} In response, the IOC stated that the ACSF could register a new membership but could not replace the membership of the COC in Taiwan, which obviously meant that the IOC would recognize two Olympic Committees for China.\textsuperscript{50} The ACSF immediately rejected the IOC’s decision and restated the exclusivity of the position of the ACSF.\textsuperscript{51} Facing this situation, in June 1952, only one month before the Helsinki Games, IOC President Edström announced that neither the PRC nor Taiwan would be allowed to participate in the Helsinki Olympic Games.\textsuperscript{52} Expectedly, both Beijing and Taiwan protested this decision. Given the protest from both sides of the Taiwan Strait, the IOC discussed the “two Chinas” issue in its session on 16 July 1952, only three days before the Opening Ceremony of the Games.\textsuperscript{53} The IOC provided its members with two choices: both Chinas would participate or neither would be allowed. The former choice was selected by 33 to 20 votes.\textsuperscript{54} Hearing the result and considering it a violation of the Olympic Charter, the Taiwan representative immediately announced that Taiwan would not attend the Helsinki Games. The ACSF in Beijing received the invitation on 18 July 1952, one day before the Opening Ceremony;\textsuperscript{55} the PRC government still sent a 40-athletes delegation to Helsinki. Based on Zhou Enlai (1898-1976), the Prime Minister of the PRC at the time, it was a great victory to see the
national flag in the Olympic Games, which had important political significance for the new regime. When the Chinese delegation finally arrived on July 29, most of the events had either finished or were in the final phase. Only one Chinese swimmer competed but did not qualify for the finals.

Following his retirement, Edström left the unsolved “two Chinas” issue to his successor, Avery Brundage (1887-1975). President Brundage advocated a resolution in 1954 by which both the PRC and Taiwan would be recognized. Based on Brundage’s idea, in 1954, the IOC voted by a margin of 23 to 21 to recognize the PRC as a legal member of the IOC, thus ensuring that they would be allowed to attend the 1956 Melbourne Olympic Games. As a result, the IOC recognized two committees in China, which violated the Olympic Charter, which stated only one committee would be recognized per nation. Once again, both the PRC and Taiwan protested. The Taiwan representative stated that Taiwan athletes would never compete with the athletes from the PRC; the PRC insisted that the Taiwan Olympic Committee must be expelled from the IOC. Despite the protest, both of them accepted the formal invitations of the 1956 Melbourne Olympic Games. The IOC ignored both protests and continued to use “Beijing-China” and “Taiwan-China” in documents to the Organizing Committee. There were negotiations between Brundage and the representatives from both the PRC and Taiwan, respectively. Since Brundage always insisted on using apolitical principles to solve political issues in the Olympic Movement, he failed to bring the two parties together. As a result, on 6 November 1956, the PRC Olympic Committee declared that due to the participation of Taiwan athletes in the Games, and in keeping with their “one China” policy, the PRC athletes would not attend the Melbourne Olympic Games.
Eventually only Taiwan athletes competed at the Games under the name of the Republic of China. Following the 1956 Olympic Games, to further protest, the PRC announced that they would not attend the Asian Games in Tokyo in 1958 because of the participation of the Taiwan delegation. Later, in August 1958, the PRC Olympic Committee formally withdrew from the IOC and all ISFs. The insistence and absolute inflexibility from both the IOC and the PRC resulted in a disconnection for 22 years. Following the withdrawal, the struggles about the name issue in the IOC between the PRC and Taiwan ceased. However, the “Two Chinas” issue was not over. In the following two decades, the three parts, the IOC, the PRC, and Taiwan did not give up any attempts to take advantage of sport in their political struggle.

Taiwan sports improved slowly in the 1950s due to the political struggles between the PRC and Taiwan regarding the name issue in the IOC. Since Taiwan did not control the sport affairs throughout Mainland China, the IOC decided in 1960 that Taiwan could no longer use the name with “China.” As a result, Taiwan athletes had to compete under the name of “Formosa-China” in the 1960 Rome Olympic Games, though the formally registered name for Taiwan at the time was the Olympic Committee of the Republic of China. Furthermore, the Taiwan delegation was denied visas for the 4th Asian Games by Indonesia in 1962 because of the intervention of the PRC. These facts showed that the ongoing political struggles negatively influenced sport development in Taiwan.

Despite difficulties, Taiwan athletes still achieved some success in international sports competitions. At the third Asian Games in Japan (1958), Taiwan athletes won 6 gold, 11 silver, and 17 bronze medals; at the fifth Asian Games in Bangkok (1966), the Taiwanese shooter Wu Daoyuan won 3 gold medals and 1 bronze medal. In particular,
an outstanding decathlon athlete from Taiwan, Yang Chuanguang (1933-2007), achieved great success during this period. He finished eighth in the decathlon at the 1956 Melbourne Olympic Games and won the gold medals at both the 2nd and the 3rd Asian Games. At the 1960 Rome Olympic Games, he competed against an American athlete, which has been identified as one of the greatest battles in Taiwan sport history. Despite winning seven out of ten events, the American player won in the shot, discus, and javelin, which helped him win the gold. Yang Chuangguang’s silver medal was the first Olympic medal that a Taiwan athlete achieved. Another famous Taiwan athlete was a female sprinter who also competed at the Rome Olympic Games. Ji Zheng, one of the greatest female Asian athletes of the twentieth century, set a series of world records including 100-meter, 100-yard, 200-meter, and 100-meter hurdle. She competed at three Olympic Games in 1960, 1964, and 1968, and won a bronze medal in the 80-meter hurdle in 1968. Her most brilliant achievements came in 1970 when she broke the world record 6 times and was elected the best athlete of the year.

On the other side of the Taiwan Strait, sport development in the PRC saw a different scenario. During the 1950s, the Soviet model of sport training and physical education was imparted throughout Mainland China. Based on these models, the State Physical Education and Sports Commission (the Sport Ministry) was founded in Beijing in 1952, whose function was to administer and implement national sport policies and physical education programs. Basically, Chinese national sport development included two branches, the elite sport system and the mass sport system. The objectives of PRC sport at that time were: develop and maintain good health; promote development of the socialist economy; and enhance relationships with other countries.
Following the withdrawal from the IOC in 1958, the PRC sport administration realized that they needed to be accepted by more nations thereby attaining more international support. Based on this objective, the PRC government and the sport administration paid more attention to the third world countries in Asia, Africa, and Latin America and made significant efforts to build good relationships with them. The Games of the Newly Emerging Forces (GANEFO) was the most typical example with which the PRC tried to expand their international influence by providing financial aid to third world countries in the domain of sport. The original idea of GANEFO emerged after the IOC’s suspension of Indonesia, the host of the 4th Asian Games. The IOC instituted the penalty because Indonesia, influenced by the PRC, prevented Taiwan, the legal members of the Asian Games Federation, from participating in the 4th Asian Games. By 1962 Indonesian President Sukarno was looking for international support to strengthen his power, which was similar to the situation faced by the PRC during the same period. The two countries quickly formed a relationship and planned a new Games, the GANEFO. Based on the announcement of the Sport Ministry of Indonesia, GANEFO was created for countries that resisted imperialists and colonists and would replace the Olympic Games that served the same western imperialists and colonists. Intended as a direct challenge to the Olympic Movement, the IOC immediately protested and declared no recognition for the Games. The PRC showed great interest in the GANEFO and provided Indonesia with US$18 million plus the transportation cost of all the delegations. Given that both Indonesia and the PRC saw the Olympic Games as a political tool helping western countries to dominate the world, the GANEFO was envisioned to become a political tool helping the newly independent countries to lead a new world.
The first GANEFO was held in Jakarta in November 1963. Although the GANEFO was held in Indonesia, the PRC played an important role in financial, diplomatic, and organizational support to ensure the Games were staged. More than 2,200 athletes from 48 countries and regions competed throughout the games. To avoid being barred from the IOC, most of the participating countries such as the Soviet Union sent young athletes or student athletes to the Games.81 The PRC sent a delegation with 328 athletes, officials and coaches, won 66 gold, 56 silver, and 46 bronze medals, and broke two world records.82 This was the first time that PRC athletes competed in an international sport event following its withdrawal from the IOC. Yet despite the competition, the games saw significant political interference. For example, during a Badminton match, the PRC sport minister ordered an athlete to lose the game to the Indonesia opponent at a point when the PRC athlete had a prominent lead in the match. The PRC athlete had to intentionally make many mistakes thereby losing the game.83

Following the Games, a 36-member-country GANEFO Congress was established. The congress scheduled GANEFO II in 1967 in Cairo, Egypt.84 Moreover, and with the PRC’s assistance, the Asian GANEFO was held in Cambodia in 1966, the same time the 5th Asian Games were held in Bangkok, Thailand.85 More than 2,000 athletes from 17 Asian countries competed at the Games. The PRC athletes won 113 gold, 59 silver, and 36 bronze medals and broke two world records.86 Although the staging of the GANEFO did strengthen the influence of the PRC throughout the third world countries and offer a great stage to showcase its progress in sport in the 1960s, the GANEFO II was not held due to financial issues. Almost at the same time, the PRC tumbled into the turmoil of the Cultural Revolution in 1966. The GANEFO soon disappeared silently because the main
proponent, the PRC, found itself in the center of an emerging political storm. The Cultural Revolution terminated all development in Mainland China and caused fanatic class struggles along with political persecutions. The PRC tried to use sport to enhance its political influence in the world but Chinese sport, like many other institutions that had developed, was destroyed by the political storm that accompanied the Cultural Revolution during the 1960s.

When it came to the 1970s, international relations such as Sino-USSR and Sino-US relations changed significantly. The military border clash between Chinese troops and Soviet troops broke out at Zhenbao Island in 1969, which accelerated the deterioration of Sino-USSR relations. In response, the PRC leadership attempted to improve their relationship with the United States. By doing this, it was believed that this would reduce the threat from the Soviet Union thereby balancing the strength among the three countries. Thus, the PRC government sent a series of rapprochement signals to the United States at the beginning of the 1970s. "Ping-Pong diplomacy" was one of these attempts. In March 1971, the PRC table tennis team was invited by Japan to compete at the World Table Tennis Championship. During the event, the American team was invited by the Chinese delegation to visit China after the games. The American team accepted the invitation and went to China in April 1971. Following what was considered a successful visit, the Chinese team was invited immediately to the United States. The diplomatic door between the United States and the PRC was opened unexpectedly by sport. The visits between the government officials of both countries occurred right after the table-tennis teams visit. "Ping-Pong diplomacy" also paved the way for the PRC's admission into the
In October 1971 the U.N. recognized the PRC, expelled Taiwan from the Security Council and gave the seat to the PRC. The PRC’s reinstatement by the U.N. provided the IOC with a welcome precedent. In addition, the situation also changed within the membership of the IOC. Some IOC members visited China in 1971 and raised the question of the PRC’s status at the IOC Session in September 1971. The suggestion was made following the session: all National Olympic Committees (NOCs) were welcomed as long as they conformed to the IOC rules. The suggestion signaled an attitude change among the IOC members regarding the China issue. In 1972, Lord Killanin took over the presidency of the IOC. With work experience in China and a different management style than Brundage, Lord Killanin worked to solve the “two Chinas” issue as soon as possible. In September 1972 the Asian Games Federation recognized the PRC’s membership and revoked Taiwan’s membership. This decision can be attributed to the significant efforts of the PRC, Iran, and Japan. Iran, the host of the 7th Asian Games, expressed a desire to invite the PRC athletes to attend. The Japanese Olympic Committee also persuaded ISFs and NOCs to recognize the PRC’s membership. In November 1973 with a vote of 38 to 13, the PRC was admitted and Taiwan was expelled in the Asian Games Council, which meant the PRC would replace Taiwan and attend the 7th Asian Games. Taiwan lost its qualification to compete at the Asian Games until the 1990 Beijing Asian Games. Although the Taiwan representatives protested both in the Asian Games Council and the IOC, the decisions did not change in either of them.

The Chinese delegation competed successfully at the Asian Games in 1974. They won 32 gold, 44 silver, and 26 bronze medals, ranking them second place on the tally
right behind the Japanese delegation. Following the success in Iran, the PRC formally applied for recognition at the IOC Session in Lausanne on 9 April 1975, although still with the condition that the Taiwan membership should be revoked. Following highly heated discussions, in May 1975 a decision was made: the information that was used to decide the PRC’s recognition would be insufficient until an IOC delegation visited China. The visit of President Killanin did not happen until 1977. Given the unsolved situation, the “two Chinas” issue erupted again during the 1976 Montreal Olympic Games. The Canadian government had followed a “One-China” policy following the PRC return to the U.N. When Beijing asked the Canadians to block the Taiwan delegation from competing at the Games in Montreal, Canadian Prime Minister Trudeau agreed and refused entry to the Taiwanese. The IOC and the United States protested, while the Canadian government refused to change its stance. Lord Killanin chose to negotiate with the Canadians rather than cancel or move the Games from Montreal. Finally, both Trudeau and Lord Killanin compromised, announcing that Taiwan athletes could compete but under the name of Taiwan. Although Taiwan and the United States protested the decision and threatened that they would withdraw from the Games, the Canadian government refused to change their final decision. Eventually, the United States delegation competed as scheduled, while the Taiwan delegation boycotted, which resulted in no Chinese athletes at the 1976 Montreal Olympic Games.

By the end of 1976 the Cultural Revolution, an unprecedented disaster in China, came to its end. With new leaders of the PRC taking over in 1978, the PRC began to carry out economic reform and more flexible international diplomatic strategies. Accompanied by a Japanese IOC member, Lord Killanin visited China in 1977, but no
breakthrough occurred during this visit.\textsuperscript{107} Further, Lord Killanin assigned a threemember committee to visit both China and Taiwan to collect relevant information for the IOC members and IOC Executive Board.\textsuperscript{108} More importantly, Juan Antonio Samaranch, the successor of Lord Killanin, suggested that the PRC should be recognized and the NOC of Taiwan should be asked to change the name, based on his visit to China in 1978 during which he felt the importance of this vast country to the Olympic movement.\textsuperscript{109}

Despite the fact that Lord Killanin failed to hold a meeting between the PRC and Taiwan representatives at the IOC session in Montevideo in April 1979, some signs of compromise began to appear in the session.\textsuperscript{110} He Zhengliang, a PRC representative, stated in the session that Taiwan athletes should have the right to compete at the Olympic Games as long as they are under the name of the Chinese Taipei Olympic Committee.\textsuperscript{111}

Following the heated discussion, the recognition of the PRC was approved by a vote of 36 to 30. The PRC acquired the name of the Chinese Olympic Committee (COC); and Taiwan would not be allowed to use the same name.\textsuperscript{112} The issue of "Two Chinas" was finally settled in November 1979 with a postal vote of all IOC members. It was decided that the PRC's Olympic Committee would use the name of the Chinese Olympic Committee in its relations with the IOC and the ISFs with the flag and anthem of the PRC; the Chinese Taipei Olympic Committee should use a different flag and anthem from those used at the time.\textsuperscript{113} Although the Taiwanese representative protested the decision and the government even boycotted the 1980 Lake Placid Winter Olympic Games, the IOC's final resolution regarding the China issue has not been changed up to the present.
The Significance and the Purpose of the Study

Chinese athletes have increasingly improved their performance in international competition. As a country with one of the fastest growing economies in the world, combined with the fact that Beijing hosted the 2008 Summer Olympiad, the Olympic Movement in China has seen significant attention academically by both Chinese and western scholars. Scholarly works have made a significant contribution to the academy within those disciplines investigating the Olympic Movement in China and Chinese sport development. These include, but are not limited to, national sport policies in China, Olympic economy in China, the interaction between politics and sport in an Olympic context, and domestic social alteration in China influenced by staging the 2008 Olympiad.

As another discipline contributing to Chinese Olympic studies, the history of the Olympic Movement in China and the development of modern sport in China have also attracted the attention of scholars. The research works that have been done in these areas mainly cover two periods: the first is when western sport and modern physical education were introduced into China following the Opium War in 1840 to the time when Chinese Olympic Committee of the People’s Republic of China was recognized by the IOC in 1979; the second is from the Chinese athletes’ first appearance representing the COC at the 1984 Los Angeles Olympic Games to present. During these two periods, now exceeding one hundred years, we have seen attention given to the first Chinese athlete who competed in an Olympiad, the poor performance of Chinese athletes at the 1932 Los Angeles Olympiad through the 1948 London Olympiad, the “two Chinas” issue including
the emergence of the issue, the struggle between China and Taiwan and the final solution in 1979, and the successful performance of Chinese athletes at recent Olympiads.

As one reviews these works, placing them on a chronological continuum, it becomes obvious that there is a period, from 1980 to 1984, during which few studies have focused their attention. Despite the fact that the COC was formally recognized by the IOC in 1979, they did not attend the 1980 Moscow Olympiad, deciding to boycott the Games thereby adopting the position advocated by the United States. At the time the relationship between the IOC and the PRC was vulnerable and sensitive. The COC sent a small delegation to Lake Placid to attend the 1980 Winter Olympic Games, although their attendance has not been identified as the "official" debut due, in part, to the poor performance of the Chinese athletes. Although most of the countries from the communism camp boycotted the 1984 Los Angeles Olympiad, Chinese athletes attended, achieving excellent performances and thereby establishing a solid foundation upon which to build their future progress in the Olympic Games.

What, why, and how it happened during this five-year period between 1980 and 1984, an area where few previous works have focused, are the focus of this research study. To address the void, this study will investigate the historical facts regarding the development of the Olympic Movement and its sport policies in China during these five years. Moreover, this research will examine the shift in Chinese international relations especially with the Soviet Union and the United States. For both Chinese sport and other social domains, this shift connected the rivalry period with western nations from the 1950s to the 1970s to the period of the post 1980s during which the economic reform and opening policies were implemented within China. It is the hope that this research
initiative will provide greater clarity and understanding of the development of the Olympic Movement in China during this period. Furthermore, it is the intent of the investigator as someone who, until recently, lived in China that the outcome of this research endeavour benefit scholars both inside China and the west by developing an objective perspective regarding Chinese Olympic history so readers can better examine and predict the ongoing development of the Olympic Movement in China.

This study will focus on politics and international relations with a specific focus on the Olympic Movement in China during the period from the reinstatement of the COC by the IOC in November 1979 to the time the decision was made to participate in the Los Angeles Olympic Games in 1984. Specifically, the researcher will investigate the PRC government’s reform of the national sport policies and the shifting attitudes related to the Olympic Movement in China between 1980 and 1984. Moreover, the factors both foreign and domestic that caused the shift will be examined. The purposes of this research are: (1) to investigate the development of the Olympic Movement in China following the COC’s recognition by the IOC until its debut in the 1984 Summer Olympic Games; (2) to examine why the COC identified the Los Angeles Olympic Games to herald their return to the Olympic stage thus bypassing the Moscow Olympic Games; and (3) to examine how the decisions regarding both the boycott of the 1980 Olympic Games and attendance at the 1984 Olympic Games were made.

The Research Questions and the Hypotheses

The Research Question of this Master’s thesis project is as follows:
Why did the People's Republic of China choose the 1984 Los Angeles Summer Olympic Games instead of the 1980 Moscow Summer Olympic Games as the debut of the Chinese athletes on the global sport stage?

To satisfy this research objective and develop a contextual understanding of the topic area, four sub-questions were addressed. These include:

1. How did the relationship between the Soviet Union and the People's Republic of China evolve between the 1950s and the 1970s?

2. How did the relationship between the United States and the People's Republic of China evolve between the 1950s and the 1970s?

3. What were the political, ideological, and domestic sport realities in the People's Republic of China that affected the decisions regarding participation in Moscow and Los Angeles Olympiads between the second half of the 1970s and the beginning of the 1980s?

4. How were the decisions regarding both the boycott for the Moscow Olympic Games in 1980 and participation in the Los Angeles Olympic Games in 1984 made by the People's Republic of China government?

Reviewing relevant works and responding to the research questions listed above, as a guide to the study, three main hypotheses have been identified as follows:

**H1:** The PRC boycotted the 1980 Moscow Olympic Games and participated in the 1984 Los Angeles Olympic Games because Sino-Soviet Union Relations were getting worse during the 1960s and the 1970s; the boycott was the consequence of the deteriorated Sino-USSR Relations.

**H2:** The PRC boycotted the 1980 Moscow Olympic Games and participated in the 1984 Los Angeles Olympic Games because Sino-US Relations significantly improved during the 1970s; the participation was intended as a signal to express the PRC's positive attitude toward this relationship.

**H3:** The PRC boycotted the 1980 Moscow Olympic Games and participated in the 1984 Los Angeles Olympic Games because when the COC was reinstated by the IOC in 1979, Chinese athletes' overall sport performance were not high enough to compete with world standards players; to achieve and maintain national glory, the PRC did not want to risk a poor performance at the Summer Olympic Games in 1980.
Endnotes


2. Ibid.

3. Ibid.

4. Lijuan Liang, *He Zhengliang and the Road of the Five Rings* (Beijing: World Knowledge Publishing House, 2005). Based on the Author, following Sydney won to host the 2000 Olympic Games in 1993, the President Samaranch said that Sydney was the best choice. Later, he admitted he exaggerated the comment on Sydney. Also he commented that it would be better if Beijing were chosen. In 1997, when the President Samaranch visited Shanghai for the eighth Chinese National Games, he talked to He Zhenliang, the Chinese vice-President of the IOC, that the IOC made a historical mistake since they did not give the host right of the 2000 Olympic Games to Beijing and, he hoped that he could be able to correct this mistake during his presidency.


13. The causes of the Opium War in 1840 were controversial. The government of Qing dynasty (1644-1912 A.D.) argued that the British traded significant illegal goods while smuggling the opium poppy, something the government saw as bad to Chinese citizens’ health and the nation’s strength. The British government, however, complained that there were too many restrictions on trade with the Chinese, which reduced the profits that the British businessmen gained. Whatever the controversies were, the truth was that the Chinese were defeated and forced to sign the inequitable treaty with the British. Based on the treaty, five Chinese ports were opened for foreign trade; in addition to this, Hong Kong was ceded to Great Britain. Further, like a chain reaction, other imperialist nations did the same thing to this weak, but vast country as “cutting up a melon.” Having experienced these failures, the Chinese people realized that they were not the strong and powerful nation they had come to believe; on the contrary, they were one of the weakest nations in the world.


20. Ibid.


23. Andrew D. Morris, *Marrow of the Nation: A History of Sport and Physical Culture in Republican China* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2004), pp. 77-99. According to the author, although the president was Chinese, the CNAFF established in 1922 was actually dominated by the YMCA administration in Beijing. The YMCA in China were the organizers of most of the sport events held in China during the first two decades of the nineteenth century. With the Anti-imperialist Movement developing across China, Chinese athletes and sport and physical education leaders did not want to be controlled by foreigners any more.


30. John A. Harrison, *China Since 1800* (New York: HARCOURT, BRACE & WORLD, INC., 1967), p. 165. Pei, Dongguang. "'A Question of Names': The Two Chinas Issue and the People’s Republic of China in the Modern Olympic Movement." (Master diss., University of Western Ontario, 1995), pp. 36-37. Although there were numerous protest, demonstrations, boycotts, and strikes across China to urge the Chinese government to declare war on Japan, the authorities of the Republic of China were slow to react to Japan’s invasion and failed to send troops to repel the Japanese invaders.


35. Andrew D. Morris, “‘I Can Compete!’ China in the Olympic Games, 1932 and 1936.” Journal of Sport History 26, no. 3 (Fall 1999), p. 553.

36. Ibid., p. 556.


38. Counted since the establishment of the Republic of China in 1911.


40. Ibid., p. 233.


42. Andrew D. Morris, Marrow of the Nation: A History of Sport and Physical Culture in Republican China (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2004), p. 233.

43. Ibid., p. 234.


30

236-237. Dongguang Pei, "'A Question of Names': The Two Chinas Issue and the People's Republic of China in the Modern Olympic Movement." (Master diss., University of Western Ontario, 1995), p. 41. According to the authors, the delegation did not have enough money to travel back, and the government did not want to provide financial support either. Eventually, the delegation had to ask the local Chinese community in Berlin for fundraising for the return trip tickets.


52. Ibid.


54. Ibid.

55. Ibid.


61. Ibid., p. 74.

62. Ibid.


64. Susan Brownell, “Globalization is not a Dinner Party: He Zhengliang and China’s 30-Year Struggle for Recognition by the International Olympic Committee” (Paper presented at the conference on globalization and sport in historical context, University of California, San Diego, March, 2005), pp. 11-14. Dongguang Pei, “‘A Question of Names’: The Two Chinas Issue and the People’s Republic of China in the Modern Olympic Movement.” (Master diss., University of Western Ontario, 1995), pp. 77-79. In both the Pei and Brownell’s work, the authors listed the letters between Brundage and Dong Shouyi, the Chinese IOC member at that time, who accused each other and did not compromise for each other, which directly led to the break up between the IOC and the PRC in August 1958. Liang, Lijuan. He Zhengliang and the Road of the Five Rings (Beijing: World Knowledge Publishing House, 2005). According to the author, following the reinstatement of Chinese Olympic Committee in the IOC, the Chinese athletes’ first debut was at the 1980 Lake Placid Winter Olympic Games. Thus, it comes to 22 years for the separation.


69. Ibid., p. 348.


72. Ibid.


75. Ibid.


80. Ibid.


85. Ibid. It was strategically timed to compete with the IOC-sanctioned 5th Asian Games.

86. Ibid.

87. Ibid., p. 333.


93. Ibid.

94. Susan Brownell, “Globalization is not a Dinner Party: He Zhengliang and China’s 30-Year Struggle for Recognition by the International Olympic Committee” (Paper presented at the conference on globalization and sport in historical context, University of California, San Diego, March, 2005), p. 22. According to the author, in 1936, Lord Killanin had been sent as a journalist to Nanjing and Shanghai China.

95. Ibid., p. 22.

96. Ibid., pp. 21-23.


104. Ibid.

105. Ibid.


108. Ibid., pp. 24-25.

109. Ibid., p. 27.


Zhengliang and China’s 30-Year Struggle for Recognition by the International Olympic Committee” (Paper presented at the conference on globalization and sport in historical context, University of California, San Diego, March, 2005), pp. 28-30.

112. Ibid.


Chapter Two

Literature Review

The response to the research question consists of a range of historical facts, including the Olympic Movement during the Cold War period (especially from the establishment of the PRC in 1949 to the beginning of the 1980s), international relations around the PRC, and the PRC’s domestic circumstances after Mao’s era. To establish a substantial foundation and provide a relevant background for this research initiative, four sections of literature are categorized and reviewed: (1) The Cold War and the Olympic Movement; (2) Sino-Soviet Relations, 1950s - 1970s; (3) Sino-American Relations, 1950s - 1970s; and (4) Domestic reform after Mao’s era. Each of the identified sections is germane to this research initiative.

The Cold War and the Olympic Movement

Following the celebration of victory of World War II in 1945, Berlin was separated and controlled by the Soviet Union and the western allies. The west side of the city was occupied by the United States of America (USA), Britain, and French troops, while the east side was occupied by troops from the Soviet Union. The split in Berlin symbolized the development of a bi-polar world. The two superpowers, the Soviet Union and the USA, gradually confronted each other and ultimately aggravated into a position of relentless hostility, which has been characterized as the Cold War and lasted for the next four decades. Unlike a conventional battle, the Cold War expressed a state of hostility, extreme unfriendliness, political pressure and threats, and military rivalry between those countries aligned with the Soviet Union and those aligned with the USA.
due to the different ideologies held up by both sides following World War II. Simply stated, this was a confrontation between the communist and capitalist. The governments of the Soviet Union and most of the eastern European countries espoused Communism and the fact that it would replace Capitalism throughout the world, while the USA and most of the western European countries believed in Capitalism by which democracy and liberty would develop. The bi-polar situation was the mainstream all over the world during the Cold War period. Each side alleged what they believed in was right and superior, whereas what the other side believed in was unquestionably wrong and inferior. Rather than a real war involving conventional combat in a battlefield, the rivalries penetrated into every aspect of society, including but not limited to, culture, education, the media, military, and science. Consequentially, these rivalries served national interest of each of the two superpowers.

Throughout this period, sport, as a critical component of society, was not separated from the rivalry between the two superpowers but instead a quite important means used by both sides. If sport can be described as a political weapon, the Olympic Games provided the biggest battlefields in which this weapon could be used. Although the IOC alleged that politics had nothing to do with sport and the IOC would never tolerate any political interference, it was inevitable that the Olympic Games during the Cold War era were always used as a political stage on which the two superpowers attempted to show their superiority at all cost. The significance of the Olympic Games was distorted by the rivalry between those representing communism and capitalism. Athletes, the media, and even spectators from both sides, were used to realize the respective political purpose. Issues such as drug abuse, military personnel and
professional athletes, and boycott and political intervention, filled international sport, which violated the Olympic Movement during the Cold War period. According to Guttmann, the rivalry in sport between the USA and the Soviet Union was one of the most dramatic aspects of the modern Olympic Games from 1952 when the Soviet Union first participated in the Olympic Games to the 1988 Seoul Olympic Games, which is recognized as the last Olympiad staged during the Cold War era. Guttmann stated that there was a generally accepted perception that the Olympic Games were an extension of politics by other means. In addition, on the Soviet side, athletic triumphs over the capitalist nations became an officially recognized goal and each victory by Soviet athletes was heralded as a sign of ideological superiority, while on the other side, Guttmann did not think it became an official goal, even though athletes from western countries who won over their Soviet competitors were highly praised.

Soviet leaders only sent a small observer group to the 1948 Olympic Games in London to see whether Soviet athletes would be successful if they were to take part in the 1952 Games. For the Soviet Union, they had to secure victory because any failure would discredit the country. As a Soviet spokesman expressed, “Each new victory provides irrefutable proof of the superiority of Soviet culture over the decaying culture of the capitalist states.” Success during the Games was a must and each victory served the national interest of the Soviet Union. Following a 40-year absence from the Olympic Movement, Soviet athletes re-entered the Olympic community at the 1952 Helsinki Olympic Games. Compared to the influences and interventions from the superpowers, the apolitical characteristics of the Olympic Games was weak. Avery Brundage, President of the IOC at the time, commented prior to the 1952 Olympic Games that “since for the
first time these games will provide a direct comparison between our boys and girls and those from Communism world, it is essential that we send our best and strongest team to the Olympic Games.”

The comment expressed that even IOC President Avery Brundage had ideologically separated the nations into two camps. Consequentially, the 1952 Olympic Games saw the Cold War extend itself onto the sport field and the political factors and motives became the main driving force for the competition between the Soviet Union bloc and the USA led western countries.

According to Guttmann, although a point system was not approved by the IOC, it is generally agreed that the USA won the competition at the 1952 and 1968 Summer Olympic Games while the Soviet Union won the remainder between 1952 and 1976. When it comes to the Winter Olympic Games, the Soviet Union made its debut at the 1956 Winter Olympic Games in Cortina, achieving first place in the medal count; since then they finished in first place at all the Winter Olympic Games between 1956 and 1976, except for 1968 when Norway defeated them.

In addition to the direct competitions between the two superpowers, there were indirect confrontations between the two different ideological camps. The “two Germanys” issue was a typical example. The IOC fully recognized the Federal Republic of Germany (FRG, West Germany) in 1951 following its establishment in 1949. Since East Germany was not a independent state at the time, it was not recognized by the IOC until 1955, the year following the Soviet Union’s release of East Germany from its status as the Soviet Zone in Germany. Although the IOC hoped the athletes from East Germany would join the existing German team, East German officials refused to do so. As a result, the athletes competing for the German Olympic team during the Games in
Helsinki were all from West Germany. Thus, East German athletes did not compete in the Olympic Games in 1952.

Although the IOC provisionally recognized the NOC of East Germany in 1955 thereby creating two NOCs in Germany, their significant effort saw a joint team participating in the Olympic Games in 1956. The joint team used the black-red-gold flag of Weimar Republic with the Olympic rings as their flag and the last movement of Beethoven’s 9th Symphony as the anthems when they entered the Opening Ceremony. Although East Germany had modified their national flags by the 1960 Olympic Games in Rome, the IOC-designed flags for the joint team did not change. The joint team lasted for three Olympiads between 1956 and 1964. Although Avery Brundage stated that the IOC had made significant strides on reunifying Germany on the sport field, which politicians had failed to achieve, the joint team did not last beyond the 1964 Olympic Games.

Strongly influenced by the two superpowers during the 1960s, both Germanys continued to ask for the separation of Olympic teams. East Germany wanted to be recognized formally by the IOC, while West Germany was also beginning to ask for a separate team. In addition, twenty out of twenty-four ISFs demanded separated teams for the two German regions during the 1960s. The International Amateur Athletic Federation (IAAF) allowed separated German teams to participate in the European Championships in 1966. The IOC, in 1965, agreed by a large majority that East Germany would create their own Olympic team for the 1968 Olympic Games.

In addition to the competition between the two superpowers and the issue of the “two Germanys,” there were many other conflicts caused by the Cold War at the Olympic
Games. At the 1956 Melbourne Olympic Games, Switzerland, Spain and the Netherlands did not attend to protest the invasion in Hungary by Soviet troops; while Egypt, Iraq and Lebanon did not attend to protest the invasion in Egypt by Israeli troops. Prior to the 1964 Tokyo Olympic Games, the South African Olympic team was banned from the Games because of its domestic apartheid policy. At the 1968 Mexico Olympic Games, the American Sprinters, Tommie Smith and John Carlos, protested the policy of their government while on the Podium to support the American Civil Rights Movement at the time. The 1972 Munich Olympic Games saw Israeli athletes seized and eventually killed by Palestinian terrorists due to the religious and political conflicts between the two sides. Twenty-six nations boycotted the 1976 Montreal Olympic Games, due to the fact that New Zealand had been allowed to participate in the Games even though its rugby team competed with South Africa. Although not all aforementioned events can be directly attributed to the Cold War, it was quite obvious that the Olympic Games were used as an efficient means by which people could protest and punish enemies or support partners who were engaged in a political struggle. It was undeniable that political functions became new features of the Olympic Games during the Cold War era, which could be used by any nations who attempted to express political attitudes in the Olympic arena.

The PRC re-entered the Olympic community at the beginning of the 1980s, the same time the boycotts at the Moscow and Los Angeles Olympic Games happened, which were seen as a direct confrontation between the two superpowers. To appropriately cope with the boycotts, the Chinese Government considered not only the factors in the sport domain, but also the factors in the international political domain, especially their
relations with the two superpowers. Therefore, it is necessary to establish an understanding of Sino-Soviet Relations and Sino-American Relations from 1950s to 1970s.

Sino-Soviet Relations, 1950s - 1970s

Following the victory over Hitlerite Germany in May 1945, the Soviet Union had transferred a significant portion of its military forces to the Far East and, on 8 August 1945, the Soviet government declared a state of war with Japan. Although there is still no conclusion regarding which was the final cause of the Japanese militarists' surrender, the United States' Atomic bombs dropped at Hiroshima and Nagasaki, or the involvement of the Soviet Union into the war against Japan, by doing the latter the Soviet Union fulfilled the promise they made at the Yalta Conference that they would help liberate China thereby removing the armed forces from the Japanese. Soviet Troops swiftly entered China from the north and overwhelmingly destroyed the Guandong Army, the Japanese troops who were stationed in northeast China, in less than twenty days. Given that Soviet troops occupied the northeast part of China following the formal surrender of Japan by its Emperor in August 1945, the Soviet Union took advantage of the occupation to negotiate with both the Chinese Communist Party (CCP) and the Chinese Nationalist (Kuomintang) in order to achieve its maximum benefits in China. The Soviet Union signed the Treaty of Friendships and Union with the Kuomintang in August 1945 by which the Soviet Union expressed that they would provide the Kuomintang rather than the CCP with direct assistance to restore the country. Following the Civil War between the CCP and the Kuomintang which broke out in 1947, the Soviet Union realized that the
Kuomintang had become an agent of the USA, which would breach its benefit in China. Moreover, it soon became obvious that the CCP would win.\textsuperscript{35} As a result, the Soviet Union changed its strategy and provided aid to the CCP at the end of the 1940s. The CCP understood that it desperately needed support from the international communist community for its new regime. Therefore, when the PRC was established in October 1949, Sino-Soviet Relations were cooperative and supportive.

Shortly after the establishment of the PRC, the Soviet Union formally recognized the new regime. Sequentially, during the following decade, the Soviet Union gave the PRC all possible military, technical, and financial help. According to Sheng, the Soviet Union thought if socialism was victorious in China and other communism countries, then victory of socialism throughout the world would be virtually secured.\textsuperscript{36} Moreover, the Soviet Union needed support from communist China to become the leader of world Communism.\textsuperscript{37} In addition, from the Soviet perspective, supporting the PRC could create an eastern defense to confront Kuomintang, the agent of the USA, because the USA had already created military forces in Japan. From the Chinese perspective, Mao Zedong, the first leader of the PRC, understood the value of Soviet support in their ongoing struggle for power and the effort to consolidate the new regime.\textsuperscript{38} In Mao Zedong's work, \textit{On People's Democratic Dictatorship}, he stated that there were only two routes the Chinese people could choose, imperialism or socialism; there was no other way to go. The Chinese people, he argued, must select one of them. Based on the situation in China at the time, the Chinese people selected socialism thereby following the Soviet Union.\textsuperscript{39}

The new Treaty of Friendship, Alliance and Mutual Assistance between the Soviet Union and the PRC was signed in February 1950. The Treaty outlined the return of
the Chinese-Changchun railway to the PRC by the end of 1952 and the withdrawal of
Soviet troops from Northeast China by 1955.\textsuperscript{40} In addition, control of Port Lv Shun and
Port Da Lian were returned at the same time.\textsuperscript{41} To assist with the restoration of China, the
Soviet Union granted the PRC government a credit in the sum of $300 million over a
two-year period (1950-1954). Meanwhile, the Soviet Union would deliver the PRC
equipment and materials for electric stations, metallurgical and machine building plants,
coal mines, rail and road transportation, and other branches of economy in China.\textsuperscript{42}
Commenting on the Treaty, Mao Zedong said it was not only a tremendous help in
building the new China, but also a strong guarantee in the struggle against aggression and
for the preservation of peace and security in the Far East and throughout the world.\textsuperscript{43}
Both Russian and Chinese scholars accept that the significance of the Treaty was highly
important for the PRC to reconstruct the country.\textsuperscript{44}

The Korean War broke out in June 1950 when troops from North Korea began a
military attack on South Korea. Although the North Korean leader received permission
from both the Soviet Union and the PRC prior to the war, the PRC government did not
receive any specific information on the war until it broke out.\textsuperscript{45} Considering the
relationship between the Soviet Union and North Korea and the border threat brought by
the US-led multi-nation troops, Mao Zedong decided to provide North Korea with
military aids in October 1950, although he was reluctant to send military troops to
Korea.\textsuperscript{46} Throughout the war (1950 – 1953), there was close military collaboration
between the PRC and the Soviet Union. Since the Soviet Union could not become
involved in the war directly, it provided the Chinese army with a continuous supply of
weapons, ammunition, fuel, food, and medicine. Soviet advisors, including military
leaders, were sent to Korea; and the Soviet Air Forces wearing Chinese military uniforms participated in the defense over the China-Korea border. With the existing alliance, during the first half of 1950s, the PRC helped the Soviet Union to fulfill the promise it made to support North Korea and, the Soviet Union supported the PRC militarily not only during the Korean War but also in its ongoing national defense.

The Moscow-Beijing alliance during the first half of 1950s was largely created by two iron-hand leaders, Mao Zedong and Joseph Stalin (1879-1953). The friendly relationship between the two countries did not change immediately following the death of Stalin in 1953. Five days after the death of Stalin, Pravda, the official newspaper of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, released a picture showing Stalin, Mao Zedong, and Georgi Malenkov (1902-1988) together. It expressed that the Soviet Union would continue most of the policies with the PRC established during the Stalin era. However, several months later, the leadership within the party changed dramatically. Nikita Khrushchev replaced Malenkov, becoming the successor of Stalin. Despite Khrushchev’s revision of the national policies of the Soviet Union, Sino-Soviet Relations was maintained between 1953 and 1958. Li Fuchun, Chairman of China’s State Planning Commission, when commenting on the First Five-Year Plan for Development of the National Economy of the PRC (1953-1957), indicated that Soviet aid played an important part to enable the Chinese people to carry out restoration work on a large scale with high speed and on an advanced technical level. It is generally accepted by scholars that during the Five-year Plan Sino-Soviet Relations had reached its peak and then it decreased dramatically.
In February 1956, Khrushchev denounced Stalin at the Twentieth Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. Khrushchev's anti-Stalin speech brought out the path of de-Stalinisation, which could not be accepted by the CCP leaders, in particular, Mao Zedong. The CCP did not think it was necessary and correct that the Soviet Union should reevaluate Stalin. Further, the CCP was unwilling to accept Khrushchev’s reforms relative to both its foreign and domestic policies. In Mao Zedong’s view, the Soviet Union was turning revisionist in a way that deviated from the course of the International Communism movement. Mao Zedong criticized Khrushchev’s reforms indirectly in 1957, which led to the argument between the two parties increasing quickly. In the summer of 1958, Khrushchev suggested that the Soviet Union should build a long wave radio station in China and combine its fleet with the Chinese navy. The CCP refused his suggestion, categorizing them as an attempted violation of Chinese sovereignty. Also in 1958, the Sino-Soviet disagreement on the “Great Leap Forward (GLF)” initiated by Mao Zedong increased the misunderstanding. It was Mao Zedong’ opinion that China had already achieved enough power to develop independently and could catch up with their “elder brother,” the Soviet Union, possibly even surpass them with the GLF. The Soviet Union doubted that the GLF was the correct method that socialist countries should follow. Khrushchev publicly criticized the CCP in respect to the GLF and the different foreign and domestic policies in 1959. In response to the criticism, Mao Zedong stated that Khrushchev was not a real Marxist and his naïve policies regarding international and domestic relations would lead international Communism in the wrong direction. Following Mao Zedong’s statement, Khrushchev complained that the PRC was aggressive and always ready to fight. Sequentially, numerous debates on policy and
ideology from both sides started at the beginning of the 1960s. No one compromised and both parties tried their best to convince the other. The Sino-Soviet alliance saw itself pushed toward a dangerous edge.

The dispute between the two parties expanded from a debate limited to ideological values to one of national policy, involving issues of economic and technical cooperation. As a result, Sino-Soviet Relations finally shifted from cooperation to confrontation. The Soviet Union recalled more than 10,000 advisers and experts from China and stopped all aid projects and economic cooperation contracts in China at the beginning of the 1960s. Khrushchev attempted twice to organize an international meeting of the world Communist parties to isolate the PRC. The Soviet Union’s policy of sanction and isolation to the PRC led to a period of hardship for three years in China between 1960 and 1962.

In October 1964, Khrushchev was replaced by his successor, Leonid Brezhnev (1906-1982). The dissension between the two parties did not disappear with the end of the Khrushchev era but extended to military conflict during the Brezhnev era. In 1964, the PRC stopped the talks with the Soviet Union because a drunken Soviet Marshal instigated a coup d'état to the Chinese delegation. In 1965, Brezhnev formally announced the split between the two parties. One year later, the Cultural Revolution broke out in China. One of the most important features of the Cultural Revolution was anti-Soviet revisionist. At this time, the Soviet Union was not seen as the “Elder Brother” of the Chinese people but the vicious enemy who was the most significant threat to the PRC in the region. As a result, the second half of the 1960s saw the Sino-Soviet border became increasingly tense. A number of small-scale skirmishes occurred at
various places along the borders. The PRC claimed that there were a total of 4,189 border incidents prior to the serious clash of March 1969. According to Goldstein, the clash on the Ussuri River in 1969 between the PRC and the Soviet Union was initiated by PRC.

In March 1969, Chinese forces ambushed Soviet troops on ZhenBao Island, one of the larger islands along the Ussuri River. Soviet casualties numbered thirty-one dead and fourteen wounded in the two-hour battle, a death total far higher than any previous skirmish. Following the ZhenBao Island clash, Sino-Soviet Relations became extremely tense throughout the 1970s. Along the Sino-Soviet and Sino-Mongolian borders, the Soviet Union increased its military equipment and stationed up to one million troops. They also deployed short-range missiles along the borders; based on Yang, during the 1970s, one third of the total Soviet missiles were deployed along the Sino-Soviet and Sino-Mongolian borders.

Throughout the Brezhnev era, Sino-Soviet Relations can be identified as hostile, tense, and full of confrontation. During the 1970s, the PRC realized that the threat from the Soviet Union had dramatically increased, resulting in the PRC government desperately seeking a way out of what they considered an unsafe situation.

Sino-American Relations, 1950s - 1970s

The development of Sino-American Relations between the 1950s and 1970s was opposite to the relationship between the PRC and the Soviet Union. Influenced by the international diplomatic policies of the Soviet Union and the ideological divarication with western countries, in the 1950s and 1960s the PRC adopted an essentially hostile relationship with most of the western countries. When it came to the 1970s, the PRC
abandoned its hostile foreign policy toward the West and started to develop economic, cultural, educational, scientific, and diplomatic ties with the USA, certain European countries, and Japan.\textsuperscript{68} On the other hand, the USA considered the PRC as a threat from the Far East in the 1950s and 1960s. With the collapse of the Sino-Soviet alliance at the end of the 1960s, the USA felt that it was the right time to develop a relationship with the PRC thereby further threatening the Soviet Union from the Far East.

When the Kuomintang fled to Taiwan and occupied the island to continue their reign following the Chinese Civil War, Taiwan Island became a front line through which not only the CCP and the Kuomintang but also the two superpowers engaged in military conflicts, political propaganda, and espionage. The PRC, militarily supported by the Soviet Union, wanted to liberate Taiwan while the Kuomintang, with secured military, economic and diplomatic support from the USA in the 1950s, vowed to recover mainland China.\textsuperscript{69} The USA fully supported the Kuomintang during the Civil War in China. However, they were disappointed by their defeat and thought that further support of the Kuomintang would be fruitless. Meanwhile, the “lean on one side” attitude during the war caused hostility from the CCP and pushed the CCP toward the Soviet Union.\textsuperscript{70} As a result, the USA shifted their position to neutral at the beginning of the 1950s. First, the US government avoided directly denouncing the CCP and its new regime.\textsuperscript{71} Second, they expressed that they would disengage and finally abandon the alliance with Kuomintang.\textsuperscript{72} Furthermore, the US government utilized the media to propagate the diminished Sino-Soviet alliance thereby hoping the PRC would alienate itself from the Soviet Union.\textsuperscript{73} In February 1950, although the Sino-Soviet Alliance was signed, the United States still expressed that they would not intervene in the Taiwan issue.\textsuperscript{74}
The turning point of Sino-American Relations was the Korean War in 1950. Although the Korean War was not initiated by the PRC or the United States, it resulted in the two countries being hostile to each other for the next two decades. The leader of North Korea at the time, Kim Il-Sung (1912-1994), initiated the war by crossing the 38 parallel into South Korea at dawn on 25 June 1950. The leaders of the PRC were not notified of the invasion by the Soviet Union or North Korea, receiving the news from an article in an European newspaper. In 1950, Mao Zedong was of the opinion that the unification of China, that is, the “liberation” of Taiwan, was the most urgent action instead of assisting the invasion by North Korea. However, the involvement of the USA changed Mao Zedong’s mind. Although Korea was not the most probable attack target, the US government was ready for a swift reaction to any attacks coming from Communist countries. Two days later on 27 June 1950, President Truman ordered the United States Seventh Fleet to defend Taiwan against attack by Communist forces from the PRC, which was considered a serious threat to the United States Forces in the Pacific area. Truman also announced that the status of Taiwan must be re-evaluated thereby involving the US government once again in the civil war in China. In response, the PRC publicly denounced Truman’s action.

Responding to the incursion of North Korea troops, the United Nations (UN) made the decision of military intervention in Korea. In September 1950, the UN troops who were primarily US Marines, started the amphibious operation at Inchon, a seaside city at South Korea. Following the successful landing, they counterattacked the North Korea troops and drove them back to the 38 Parallel. On 7 October 1950 the US troops crossed the 38 Parallel and kept going towards the north. In response, the PRC’s troops
entered North Korea on October 19 and the first battle between the PRC and the USA broke out on October 25. The following three years saw both sides engage each other bitterly around the 38 Parallel and both had serious casualties. The cease-fire agreement was finally signed by both sides in July 1953. Meanwhile, a demilitarized zone was created, which has now separated North and South Korea for more than 50 years.

Despite the cease-fire agreement, the conflict between the PRC and the USA was not over. The Taiwan Strait crisis broke out in 1954 when PRC troops bombarded Jinmen Island to protest the USA’s intervention. In 1955, during the Indochina War, though the PRC and the USA did not fight directly, both sides supported the agents in Vietnam to fight at battlefield. Entering the 1960s, the USA found itself in the Vietnam War, which lasted until the beginning of the 1970s. During the war, the PRC government fully aided North Vietnam in its struggle against the USA. During the 1950s and 1960s, the USA considered the PRC an adversary, imposing a full economic blockade against the PRC and creating a series of military bases around the PRC. However, when Sino-Soviet Relations deteriorated at the beginning of the 1960s, the PRC started to find ways to communicate with the USA in an effort to reduce the pressure from the Soviet Union.

To successfully navigate between the superpowers, the PRC had to balance their attitudes, opinions, policies, and even ideology. As early as the mid-1950s, the PRC tried to break through the tense relations with the USA. Following the Korean War and the Taiwan Strait crisis, the PRC leaders realized that hostile bilateral relations with the USA should be changed in order to give PRC domestic reconstruction efforts a chance. Continuous wartime during the past five decades had damaged the country severely. Thus, the PRC attempted to initiate direct dialogue with the USA following the Korean War.
During the African-Asian Conference, which was also called the Bandung Conference in Indonesia in April 1955, Zhou Enlai, the Premier of the PRC, announced that the PRC would like to talk with the US government on how to ease the intense situation in the Far East, especially the situation at the Taiwan Strait. Mediated by the Indian and British governments, the USA responded in July 1955 indicating that both sides could have an ambassadorial talk in the near future. The first Sino-American ambassadorial level meeting was held in Geneva on 1 August 1955, providing the officials from both countries an opportunity to understand each other. Talks provided a channel by which both sides could explore various possibilities of breaking the deadlock, exchange views on focused issues, and schedule future private meetings. The talks lasted until 1970 and totaled 136 during the 15 year period.

During the initial meeting in 1955, both sides agreed that civilians from the two countries were entitled to return to their respective countries. They did not come to an agreement on the second proposal. The PRC did not agree to renounce the use of force to achieve political purpose because they believed that the USA was attempting to limit their ability for reunification of China. Neither the PRC nor the USA compromised on the issue of the Taiwan Strait, thereby leading to a deadlock and the cessation of talks until 1958 when the Taiwan Strait crisis broke out again. Both sides were unwilling to accept the proposal of the other side, thus ensuring that no progress would be achieved. Although neither side had significant expectations for the talks, they still wanted to engage in a dialogue to seek any possible resolutions to the crisis rather than involving themselves in a war over the Taiwan Strait. In 1962, when the Kuomintang in Taiwan attempted to launch a counterattack on Mainland China, the two countries attained an
agreement that both sides would stop the war over the Taiwan Strait. Although the talks maintained a channel for communication between the two countries, the hostile relationship between the two did not subside during the 1960s. Furthermore, the involvement of American Forces in Vietnam as early as the mid-1960s led to considerable concern in the PRC, which resulted in Sino-America Relations becoming more complicated.

Following the long involvement in the Vietnam War, many American scholars started to re-think the USA's foreign policy, especially with Communist countries such as the PRC and the Soviet Union. Meanwhile, the existing rivalry between the two superpowers saw the Soviet Union become strong by carrying out its expanding policies from eastern Europe to the Far East, while the USA was weakened due to the burden of the Vietnam War. The US government attempted to finish the war by recalling its troops from Southeast Asia thereby concentrating on the challenge from the Soviet Union. At the same time, a series of bloody clashes along the Sino-Soviet border in 1969 indicated that the previously strong Sino-Soviet alliance no longer existed. The PRC, now isolated, desperately sought a way out of the situation in which they faced the Soviet Union's military challenges from the north and the USA's threat from the south. Therefore, when it came to the 1970s, the PRC was willing to form new relationship with the USA to cope with the Soviet threat while the USA was trying to salvage a political victory against the Soviet Union in Vietnam by associating itself with the PRC. Under these circumstances, both sides sought the same political goal and had the same national enemy, the Soviet Union. The PRC government and the Nixon administration both grasped this opportunity at the correct time.
The first step toward re-establishing Sino-American Relations was the proposal the PRC government made to ask the USA to resume ambassadorial-level talks on 26 November 1968. The USA accepted the proposal three days later. The PRC made the second step toward rapprochement with the USA on 19 February 1969 by proposing an assessment of the international situation. The assessment concluded that the Sino-Soviet contradiction was greater than that between the PRC and the USA. It also suggested that Sino-American talks should resume to end the current stalemate as quickly as possible.

In July 1969, the USA canceled certain trade sanctions against China and relaxed limitations on travel to China. Later in January 1970, the Sino-American ambassadorial talks resumed. During this period, President Nixon also signaled his interest to improve relations with China through France, Pakistan, and Romania, while the PRC leaders positively improved its relations with Japan, west European countries, and all the Third World countries, in order to oppose the Soviet Union. In 1971, the table-tennis teams from both the PRC and the USA visited each other thereby opening new relations between the two countries. Then, later in the year, the Secretary of State, Henry Kissinger secretly visited China. Partially influenced by improving relations with the USA, the PRC reinstated its legal position in the UN. In February 1972, President Nixon visited China and the first Sino-American summit was held.

The Shanghai Communique was announced following the summit. It pledged that both countries should make efforts together to normalize bilateral relation and maintain security over the Asian-Pacific area. The Communiqué decreased the differences between the two countries and paved the road for further improvement. Based on the Communiqué, the cooperation regarding economics, education, sport and culture,
between the two countries was dramatically improved. In 1975, President Gerald Ford (1913-2006) visited the PRC and had a meeting with PRC Vice-Premier Deng Xiaoping (1904-1997). Despite President Ford’s visit, his administration did not take further steps to improve Sino-American Relations as there were significant differences on the issue of Taiwan. In 1978, President Jimmy Carter engaged in normalizing Sino-American relations, because the US government believed that it would be beneficial to its position relative to the rivalry with the Soviet Union. As a result, on 1 January 1979, the two countries established official diplomatic relations and announced the Joint Communiqué on the Sino-American diplomatic relation. The Sino-American relationship reached its peak at the end of the 1970s, thereby paving the road for further cooperation between the two countries in the future.

**Domestic Reform after the Mao Era**

Mao Zedong died on 9 September 1976. The PRC switched to a new stage of its development without the chaos that some might expect following his death. As an iron hand leader, Mao Zedong’s leadership significantly impacted the country. His successor, Hua Guofeng, followed Mao Zedong’s policies and ideology, suggesting that the PRC must be consistent with what Mao Zedong had established because all of his words and behaviours were right. Since Hua Guofeng had no political opinion and insufficient power to control the country, he had to sway between the two sides: revolutionists and capitalists, who had been struggling during Mao’s era. In October 1976, the capitalists within China convinced Hua Guofeng to arrest the leaders of the revolution movement, also known as the “Gang of Four,” who argued for the continuation of the Cultural
Revolution. Although the Cultural Revolution had ceased following the death of Mao Zedong in 1976, there were no political or economic reforms carried out until 1978 when Deng Xiaoping, the successor of Hua Guofeng, came into power.

Following twenty-seven years of totalitarian control, Mao Zedong's leadership left behind a country with the largest population and one of the lowest living standards in the world. It was broadly realized that the country needed a new leader with the capability to lead the Chinese people while improving the quality of life for everyone in the country. At the end of 1978, on the Third Plenum of the Eleventh Central Committee, Deng Xiaoping became the leader of the PRC, which was a turning point in China as it started to reevaluate the past and plan for the future. Deng Xiaoping initiated substantial restructuring of the CCP and state bureaucracy as well as large-scale economic reform throughout China. Rather than insisting that Mao Zedong's thoughts become the norm, Deng Xiaoping contended, "Practice is the only criterion of truth" and "Seek truth from facts." Such a statement was significant because it meant the CCP admitted that Mao Zedong was not completely right, which had not happened since the establishment of the PRC in 1949. Deng Xiaoping worked to alter the ideological foundation that the Chinese people believed and opened their minds to new ways of thinking. By doing so the Chinese people would be able to think and judge objectively. Freeing people's thoughts was considered the first step of the reform after Mao because free thoughts would inspire more reforms in other domains.

In 1978, when many people in China were still debating the class structure and politics, Deng Xiaoping stated that the economic reconstruction of the country was the most critical task of the time. He also emphasized that political structure and ideology
should serve the economic development of China. In keeping with Deng Xiaoping’s public statement, the CCP shifted its emphasis from class struggle to economic development.\textsuperscript{123} To make China a powerful country by the year 2000, a national strategic goal was set in 1978: the Four Modernization - agriculture, industry, science and technology, and national defense.\textsuperscript{124} To accomplish these goals, two national policies were made: economic reform and an open door policy for the state. In terms of the economic reform, according to Harding, in agriculture, individual families were assigned state production quotas and allowed control over the disposal of any produce over the assigned quota; in industry, the state enterprises were allowed to retain a share of their profits and independently sell the part of their output that exceeded mandatory state quotas.\textsuperscript{125} As a result, a semi-market economy was developed at the end of the 1970s.

Following the implementation of the economic reforms, Deng Xiaoping realized that the lack of investment would halt the development of the economy. Thus, he initiated the open door policy to attract foreign investment.\textsuperscript{126} To attract the investment from western countries, Deng Xiaoping improved the relationships with the USA, Japan, and some western European countries.\textsuperscript{127}

In addition to the reforms in the economic and foreign relations domain, at the end of the 1970s, the trend had spread into every field throughout China including sport. Following the aforementioned “Ping-Pong” diplomacy, the development of Chinese national sport did not improve until after the reform.\textsuperscript{128} In 1978, a well prepared PRC delegation attended the eighth Asian Games in Bangkok.\textsuperscript{129} This time the PRC challenged Japan’s dominant position in the Asian sport world. The Chinese athletes won 51 gold medals and finished the Games in second position right after Japan.\textsuperscript{130} Although the
performance of the Chinese athletes improved at the Bangkok Asian Games, the overall level of Asian sport was low comparing with the two superpowers (Appendix II).

Therefore, following the formal return of China to the Olympic Movement in October 1979, the reform of sport started in the PRC. The new sport policy, the Olympic strategy, was set: elite sport is the priority ensuring that the PRC would become a leader in sport by the end of the twentieth century.\textsuperscript{131} At the beginning of the 1980s, the sport administration system was reformed from a centralized structure into a multi-level and multi-channel system.\textsuperscript{132} Sequentially, selection and training systems correspondingly shifted. By carrying out these reforms, more elite athletes could be trained and swiftly delivered into national teams. Furthermore, sport science developed quickly, which resulted in the improved performance of Chinese elite athletes. These reforms did not show their effect until the 1982 Delhi Asian Games at which the Chinese athletes won 61 gold, 51 silver, and 41 bronze medals, placing first in total medals received.\textsuperscript{133} The breakthrough at the 1982 Asian Games built a solid foundation upon which the Chinese athletes' future participation at the Olympic Games would be based.
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Chapter Three

Methodology

Direction of the Study

The task of this research initiative is to investigate the development of the Olympic Movement in China from 1979 to 1984 and respond to the primary research question as to why the PRC sent the delegation to the 1984 Los Angeles Olympic Games rather than the 1980 Moscow Olympic Games. The author is attempting to portray a holistic and multidimensional description of the period identified, which is not only limited in the sport domain, but also extensively spread across the broader fields of international relations, the domestic actualities and the political functions of sport in China. Since the study involves numerous political analyses and discussions regarding international relations and ideological struggles during the Cold War era, the theoretical construct of social existence derived from Historical Materialism by Karl Marx has been utilized in shaping the direction of the study.¹

As one of the basic insights of Historical Materialism, it is argued that the history of human beings is not independent of the material conditions of existence. Thus, “it is not the consciousness of human beings that determines their existence, on the contrary, their social existence that determines their consciousness.”² When referring specifically to the Cold War era, the construct can be paraphrased to state that the ideologies and political structures dominating in different nations are determined by respective social realities including, but not limited to, social economics, stability, social wealth and prosperous level, and social norms and religious roots. These different ideologies partially resulted in political and military conflicts between the two superpowers as well
as their agent nations during the Cold War era, as each bloc sought to prove that their dominating ideology and political structure was better than their opponents. For the Soviet Union, the USA and the PRC, it can be argued that all the direct and indirect political and military conflicts and threats during the Cold War era were to protect their own ideologies and political interests thereby maintaining their dominance inside the respective nation and over the bloc. Under this philosophical direction, it can be concluded that during the Cold War era, material conditions and its objective existence determined ideologies; in turn, the dominated ideologies created driven forces and motives for the behaviours and actions in the political domain, economic domain, and even the sport domain. Therefore, due to sport’s political functions, the participating or boycotting of the Olympic Games were utilized as a means to not only protect their own ideology but also to attack opponents’ ideology thereby benefiting their own group interests.

As a socialist country, the PRC undoubtedly had a different ideology from that found in the USA. However, to prevent common threats from the Soviet Union, both countries created a cooperative relationship in the 1970s. On the other hand, although both were socialist countries, the PRC went a different route from the Soviet Union. Each side attempted, but failed, to convince the other to follow the ideologies stemming from their own existence. This divergence finally led to the two countries confronting each other during the 1970s. In addition, the PRC experienced significant social transformations from the end of the 1970s to the first half of the 1980s. Thus, in summarizing these unique situations, the PRC would have their own social existence, which, in turn, would ideologically differentiate them from other socialist countries, and
drive the PRC with an exclusive political understanding and motives to make different
decisions regarding the boycott of the Olympic Games in 1980 and the participation in
1984.

Although as a theoretical construct, the dialectic relation between existence and
consciousness from Historical Materialism guides the study, the author is not attempting
to paraphrase history with this theoretical construct. This dialectic relation acted as a
constructive guideline throughout the investigation, thereby keeping it on a consistent
path. Although it is understood and acknowledged that people cannot utilize theory to
fully explain history, this research initiative was informed by this theoretical construct.

Explanation of the Research Design

Having such characteristics as the understanding and discovery investigation goal,
small and nonrandom sample, researcher as primary instrument, and comprehensive and
holistic findings, this study is qualitative research. Two primary methods of data
collection, archival research and key actor interviews, were employed in this research
study. Moreover, certain secondary sources, such as academic journal articles,
newspapers, and historical books, both in English and Chinese, which provide a critical
background to this study, were also investigated during the data collection. All
information and historical facts associated with the Olympic Movement in China from
1979 to 1984 were explored through these methods. The findings and conclusion of this
research were placed in a broad historical and social context to see if they can support the
hypotheses of the study (identified in the Introduction).
The archival sources (primary sources) that have been utilized for this research are: (1) The Chinese National Sport Archives in the General Administration of Sport of China (Beijing, China); (2) The Chinese Olympic Committee Archives (Beijing, China); (3) The Archives in Beijing Sport University (Beijing, China); (4) China National Sport Museum (Beijing, China); (5) The States Archives Administration of the People’s Republic of China; and (6) The Los Angeles Amateur Athletic Foundation (http://www.aafla.org) (Appendix XI).

Face-to-face interviews with key actors who were involved in the decision-making process were conducted as another main method of data collection. The list of names identified can be found in Appendix III. The individuals include those who were in the position of responsibility at the Chinese Olympic Committee, the General Administration of Sport of China, and the All-China Sport Federation, along with other key actors related to the events and the decision-making at the time. Given the ongoing question-and-answer dialogue between researcher and respondent during face-to-face interviews, the interviews consisted of open-ended questions and structured questions thereby affording respondents an opportunity to provide information in a detailed and complete manner. The interview questionnaire is listed in Appendix IV. Since all the interviewees are Chinese, the Mandarin version of the questionnaire was also prepared and provided in Appendix V.

To enhance validity and reliability of the information collected from these sources, the concept of triangulation was applied among the primary sources, secondary sources, and information collected from the interviews. Triangulation refers to the use of more than one source of data to support findings and conclusions, which offers strategies
for reducing bias and strengthening the findings of qualitative research. The information derived from the respondents can be called historical narratives or storytelling, which could be different depending on the different views of the events, precision of people's memory, and the level and degree to which people could be involved in the events. Therefore, the information from the respondents is less reliable unless they can be crosschecked with other data sources. Furthermore, the primary and secondary sources also need to be crosschecked with other sources. Those who compile and maintain archives live or lived in different times; they could be in different countries with different ideologies and opinions; thus, the researcher utilized more than one source to cross verify the information thereby ensuring the validity and reliability of study.

**Limitations**

Since the two primary methods of data collection are archival research and key actor interviews, the limitations of this study were generally limited to these two areas. Given the characteristics of this research study, most of the archives that were needed in this investigation are preserved in China. Therefore, geographical factors, accessible factors, and translation factors, limited this research initiative. Moreover, all the key actors who were involved in the decision-making regarding the Olympic Movement in China in the years under investigation (1979-1984) either live or lived in China; thus, geographical factors, accessible factors, and timing factors also limited this study relative to key actor interviews.

As to the data collection during archival research, there are three aspects of limitations. First, the archives in respect to the development of the Olympic Movement in
China and the official records of the decision-making processes of participation in the Olympic Games in 1980 and 1984 were mostly held in the States Archives Administration of the People's Republic of China, the Chinese National Sport Archives Administration, the Archives of the General Administration of Sport, the National Sport Museum, and the China Sport University Archives administration. All these organizations, departments, and institutions are located in Beijing, China. Given that the author physically lives in North America combined with the limit on the time requirement for this research study, the distance limited sufficient and detailed investigation to some degree. Second, although the author did travel to these archives in China, a certain level of inaccessibility was experienced. The administration system of archives in China is under strict access controls. Chinese people who wish to browse and investigate any archives have to acquire certain permissions along with an eligible and officially accepted justification. Given the citizenship of the author, expectedly, the examination procedure and certifying process for obtaining access permission were more difficult and lengthy than that of Chinese citizens. Thus, it must be acknowledged that inaccessibility or semi-accessibility did have a negative affect on this investigation's progress. Third, all archives located in China were recorded in Chinese characters, whereas this research initiative has been produced and defended in English. Thus, numerous archives in Chinese as well as a large number of secondary academic sources were translated into English. Although Chinese, as the author's first language, was employed fluently, the author acknowledges that the possibility of inaccurate translation of expressions and meanings can be one of the main limitations to the study.
As to the data collection from the key actor interviews, geographic proximity factors are also one of the limitations due to the fact that all the key actors live or lived in China. In addition, there are three other aspects that, to some extent, influenced the data collected during the interview process. First, unfortunately, some of the key actors who were deeply involved in the development of the Olympic Movement in China from 1979 to 1984 have passed away. These individuals include: Zhong Shitong (1913-2001), the President of the China Olympic Committee (COC) from 1979 to 1985; Wang Meng (1920-2007), the Director of the General Administration of Sport of China between 1971 and 1974 and between 1977 and 1981; Rong Gaotang (1912-2006), the Secretary General of General Administration of Sport of China, from 1974 to 1981; and Song Zhong (1923-1989), the Secretary General of the COC from 1974 to 1980. These senior figures directly experienced China’s return to the Olympic Movement and were involved in the decisions to boycott the Moscow Olympic Games and participate in the Los Angeles Olympic Games. Naturally, their memories would have been quite precious to this study. Second, most of the key actors the author identified in Appendix III are currently in a high position in the Chinese sport system. Included among these are He Zhengliang and Lv Shengrong, the Chinese IOC members. Thus, given their tight time schedules for the coming Beijing Olympic Games, expectedly, it was difficult to make a connection and schedule an interview with them, especially when the Beijing Olympic Games was in its final preparation phase. Therefore, inaccessibility to the key figures represents another limitation to the study. Third, it must be understood that this was a very special period for the Beijing Olympic Games. The PRC government, Chinese Sport administration as well as the Chinese Olympic Committee regarded the successful staging of the Olympic
Games as a national priority. Therefore, any voices and actions that may diminish the spectacular importance of the Beijing Olympic Games would not be tolerated. Given that the interview questions included topics such as boycotts and sports' political functions, which could touch the sensitive nerves of the PRC government, it was possible that certain identified interviewees declined to be interviewed or respond incorrectly because of it. Under this situation, the data results may, to some degree, distort or deviate thereby exerting influence on the study and consequentially breaching the validity and reliability of the conclusions.

In addition, although the interview is undoubtedly the most common source of data in qualitative studies, given that the interviewees in this research were required to recall memories from a long time ago, it is inevitable that some of the responses may blur the facts or even be false. Although a cross check with other sources is an efficient way to enhance the reliability of the results, this kind of validation may not be possible due to the inaccessibility, which presented another limitations of this study.

**Delimitations**

Given the research questions presented in this study, a temporal boundary was established between 1980 and 1984, which means the investigation of the development of the Olympic Movement in China was delimited to this five-year period. Within this time range, only the events and historical facts that impacted the decision-making of the two Olympiads were considered.

Soviet troops invaded Afghanistan at the end of 1979 and, the former president of the USA, Jimmy Carter, advocated the boycott at the beginning of 1980. Later in April
1980, the PRC government formally announced the boycott of the Moscow Olympic Games. Thus, most of the response and the decision-making the PRC government and Chinese sport administration made were within the period between January and April in 1980. Therefore, the focus of the investigation relative to the 1980 Olympic Games was further delimited to this time period. In 1984, the PRC government announced that it would attend the 1984 Los Angeles Olympic Games prior to the Soviet Union's call for a boycott of the Games in May. Thus the focus of this investigation relative to the 1984 Olympic Games was further delimited to the period between May and July in 1984.

Although this study focuses on the descriptions of how the relative decisions were made, to investigate the thorough reasons for these decisions the development of Sino-Soviet Relations and Sino-American Relations during the Cold War era were introduced. Given that ideological differences and political rivalries were the primary issues during the Cold War era, the analysis of this section has been limited to the political realm. It is argued that these influenced the PRC government's decision-making regarding the Olympic Games at the beginning of the 1980s.
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Chapter Four

Findings

The following chapter examines what happened to Chinese national sport and the Olympic Movement in China during the five-year period (1980-1984). It is done by critically reviewing the PRC’s foreign relations (specifically with the Soviet Union and the United States) during that period, the development and the reform of Chinese national sport at the time, and the participation of China at the 1980 and 1984 Olympic Games. The chapter is chronologically divided into three sections: Section I: The First Year of the PRC’s Reinstatement, 1980; Section II: The Development of Chinese National Sport 1981-1983; and Section III: China’s Preparation for the Los Angeles Summer Olympic Games, 1984.

Section I: The First Year of the Reinstatement, 1980

On 1 January 1979, the PRC and the USA established formal diplomatic relations. On the same day they announced the Sino-US Joint Communiqué thereby ending their strained relationship which had endured for much of the past three decades and heralding a new era of cooperation. For the next few years, this new couple experienced what can be described as their “honeymoon” period. The two countries increasingly strengthened relations and developed multi-aspect cooperation agreements during the time. “The improvement on Sino-US relations following the normalization was significant,” American diplomat Henry Kissinger commented in 1980, “and the two countries would like to see more improvement and more cooperation in the future.” The improvement saw the number of official visits between the two governments increase dramatically. Chinese Vice-Premier Deng Xiaoping went to the USA in January 1979 as the guest of
President Jimmy Carter; and Vice-President Walter Mondale visited China in August. Not only were visits held between the leaders, but also at all levels of government. Among the other Chinese visitors to the USA were Vice-Premier Fang Yi who was in charge of science, technology, and education; Vice-Premier Kang Shien who was in charge of economic affairs; and the Ministers of the petroleum industry, metallurgical industry, and finance and foreign trade. American visitors to China included American Secretaries of finance, commerce, health, education and welfare; and the Senators and Representatives who built communications between the two countries for foreign affairs, military affairs, administration, finance, trade, education, and labour. High level and frequent visits produced cooperation in various fields. For example, an agreement on scientific and technological cooperation was signed by Deng Xiaoping and Jimmy Carter in 1979. In January 1980, Dr. Frank Press, the Science and Technology Advisor for the Carter administration, visited the Chinese Academy of Science in Beijing and signed the Report of the First Meeting of the Sino-US Joint Commission on Scientific Technological Co-operation. Moreover, the agreement on trade relations between the two countries came into force on 1 February 1980. Based on this Agreement, the two sides would “undertake to adopt all appropriate measures to create the most favourable conditions for strengthening, in all aspects, economic and trade relations between the two countries.” More significantly, the first formal talk between military leaders of the two countries was held in January 1980 following the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan. Both sides found a broad spectrum of identical views on the international situation and agreed that the Soviet pursuance of hegemonism and expansionism was the main threat to the world. Both sides expressed that they would take parallel actions on the basis of equality and mutual benefit
in order to safeguard world peace.\textsuperscript{9} As Chinese Vice-Premier Geng Biao commented, Sino-US relations should set a long-term strategic goal in order to make efforts together to counter the Soviet hegemonism and expansionism.\textsuperscript{10} All these events indicated that both countries, in 1980, tried to maintain a constructive relationship for their own national interests and security.

In contrast, Sino-Soviet relations in 1980 were tense due to consecutive border conflicts and the hostility between the two parties. Seeing the improving Sino-US relations, Soviet commentaries argued that China had begun to serve as an accomplice and junior partner in American imperialism’s global strategy.\textsuperscript{11} On the other hand, the Chinese media described Soviet soldiers as unwelcome invaders who intruded into Chinese territory and killed Chinese civilians.\textsuperscript{12} In addition, Soviet military forces infiltrated Indochina, a move that was considered a serious threat to the southern border of the PRC. In the view of the PRC, the Soviet Union was providing Vietnam with military and financial aid against China.\textsuperscript{13} On 3 April 1979 the Chinese Foreign Ministry informed the Soviet Union that the PRC government would not extend the Treaty of Friendship, Alliance and Mutual Assistance, which would expire on 11 April 1980.\textsuperscript{14} Following the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the PRC announced on 31 December 1979 that the government condemned the invasion and demanded that the Soviet authorities immediately stop their aggression and intervention in Afghanistan. They further demanded the withdrawal of their armed forces from that country.\textsuperscript{15} The announcement also stressed that Afghanistan was a neighbor of China, thus the Soviet armed invasion was seen as a considerable threat to the PRC’s national security.\textsuperscript{16} In January the PRC government praised the countries that took various
measures to impose sanctions against the Soviet Union and expressed that the aggressors must be punished. 17 PRC Vice-Premier Deng Xiaoping’s Address, based on the PRC’s perspective, fully described the Sino-Soviet-US triangle relationship during 1980. He stated that:

China’s view is consistent on the matter of global strategy. The Soviet Union is the main source of a turbulent international situation and a threat to peace and security. The policies of hegemonism and global expansionism pursued by the Soviet Union will not change because of one factor or another. All countries in the world should unite and deal seriously with the Soviet policy of global expansionism. China and the USA should do something in a down-to-earth way so as to defend world peace against Soviet hegemonism. 18

Despite the turbulent international environment surrounding the PRC in 1980, domestic reforms in various social aspects were carried out throughout China. Having suffered during the Cultural Revolution, the Chinese People, along with the government attempted to address the existing domestic difficulties and reconstruct the country under new leadership with new ideology. The sport domain was no exception. Following the COC’s reinstatement, the General Administration of Sport of China (GASC) shifted its working emphasis to the enhancement of the Chinese athletes’ performance in Olympic sport events. On 12 March 1980 the GASC approved an official document, The Suggestions on Re-Arrangement of Sport Events. 19 This document indicated that in 1980 Chinese elite athletes belonged to thirty organizations throughout China covering forty-three sports; among these, twenty-two were Olympic sports and twenty-one were not. Based on the document, officials noted that these twenty-two Olympic sports for which Chinese elite athletes trained could produce two-hundred and three Olympic gold medals. Among these Chinese elite athletes, 41.1 percent of them trained for only four sports: basketball, volleyball, soccer, and table tennis. However, these four sports could only
produce five Olympic gold medals (Table tennis was not the Olympic sports at the time). Thus, only 24.9 percent of the total complement of elite athletes in China trained for track and field, gymnastics, swimming, and weight-lifting, yet these four sports produced ninety-three Olympic gold medals, which was 45.8 percent of the total Olympic gold medals produced from the sports Chinese elite athletes engaged in. Based on the statistical data, it was suggested that the current arrangement of Chinese national sport and athletes at the time was not helpful and practical to the production of medals at the Olympic Games. It was also suggested that the GASC and the COC should immediately adjust the arrangement of national sports based on the guideline shown in the document in order to make them more specific and efficient to enhance athletic performance.

On 28 March 1980 the GASC approved another official document, *The Report on Facilitating National Athletic Performance*. In this document, the national goals for the next two Olympic Games were set: the position of the Chinese Olympic team must be in the top ten in the 1980 Moscow Olympic Games and top six in the 1984 Los Angeles Olympic Games. The report indicated that although it was “highly possible” not to participate in the Moscow Olympic Games, athletes must make enough preparations for certain equivalent international sport events held in 1980. In addition, the document also provided a scheme for reforming the national sport training system. A three-level training and athletes delivery system was suggested. This new system placed the national level at the top, provincial level in the middle, and spare-time sport training schools and regular middle schools as the basic foundation.

On 12 May 1980 an academic conference regarding sport science was held in Chengdu, China. The significant importance of science and technology on sport was
emphasized. According to a summary of the discussions and conclusions of the conference, sport science was neglected by both Chinese sport administration and coaches in the last three decades, which caused Chinese national sport to linger in a low level. The opinion, "Sport was not a scientific discipline," dominated the Chinese sport domain for a significant period. Therefore, Chinese sport scholars called on those within the sport training system to regard sport science as a guideline and a necessary means to achieve success. Applying new technology on sport, in their opinion, was the only way by which athletic performance could be enhanced and improved quickly. Following the conference, the Association of the Science of Physical Education and Athletics was established in 1980. Furthermore, a relationship between the Chinese Association of Sports Medicine and the American College of Sports Medicine (ACSM) was established in 1980. This new relationship saw a number of ACSM scholars travel to China for exchange activities.

Despite the relatively short period of these reforms and adjustment in Chinese national sport, adequate improvement had been achieved during 1980. The achievements at various international competitions qualified Chinese athletes for a few events in the Moscow Olympic Games. The first gold medal at the World Gymnastics Championships (WGC) came from Ma Yanhong, a talented female gymnast who won the women's uneven bars event at the 20th WGC in the USA. During the competition, the Chinese women's and men's teams finished fourth and fifth respectively in the team events, qualifying them for the Moscow Olympic Games. In addition, the Chinese men's basketball team won the gold medal at the 10th Asian Men's Basketball Championship in Nagoya, Japan. It would represent Asia in the Moscow Olympic basketball finals. The
Chinese women’s volleyball team won the championship title at the 2nd Asian Women’s Volleyball Championships in Hong Kong. They also won the right to represent Asia in the volleyball finals at the Moscow Olympic Games. On some non-Olympic events, Chinese athletes also attained success in 1980. Han Jian, a famous Chinese badminton player, defeated the Indonesian world champion in February in Singapore. The Chinese table tennis team won eleven Championships during 1980. In total, Chinese athletes broke seven world records including one Olympic event (men’s 52 kg class weightlifting) during 1980.

Although the reform of China’s national sport system had started, the Chinese athletes’ level in many Olympic events was still below the world’s best, especially in some popular sports such as track and field and swimming. The events that the Chinese athletes were good at were some non-Olympic sports such as table tennis and badminton, which developed well during the last three decades and had mass participation throughout China. In contrast, events such as track and field were developing slowly in China. Based on the statistical data from the Information Center at the GASC, the performance of Chinese athletes was far below the world top level athletes in 1980. For example, in men’s discus, the best throw of the Chinese athletes was 57.58 m, while the world record was 71.16 m; in decathlon, the Chinese record was 7313 points while the world record was 8649 points; in men’s long jump, the Chinese record was 7.95 m while the world record was 8.9 m; in men’s 3000 m, the Chinese record was 8’14"9 while the world record was 7’32"1; in women’s javelin, the Chinese record was 59 m while the world record was 69.96 m; and in women’s 400 m, the Chinese record was 55"08 while the world record was 48"60 (Appendix VI). The reasons for the low performance level
were mainly because: (1) the government and sport administration did not emphasize those sports and neglected elite athletes training in those sports; (2) there was no advanced coaching in China and the training techniques were still significantly behind that found in other states; (3) sport science and technology were not applied to these events; and (4) there was not enough financial aid to update and renovate training facilities and equipment.\(^{37}\)

Another thing that caused the Chinese sport administration to acknowledge the low level of China's national sport system was the 1980 Lake Placid Winter Olympic Games.\(^{38}\) Following the COC's reinstatement in 1979, for the first time, the COC sent athletes to Lake Placid to participate in the 13\(^{th}\) Winter Olympic Games. The Chinese delegation consisted of 28 athletes who competed in speed skating, figure skating, cross-country skiing, and alpine skiing.\(^{39}\) Li Menghua, the Vice-President of the COC, commented that because this was the first time the PRC participated in the Olympic Games, it symbolized political significance.\(^{40}\) He also stated that the level and condition of Chinese winter sports were very low and the purpose of the participation was to learn from the world elite athletes and coaches.\(^{41}\) The result saw that there was not a single Chinese athlete in the position of top ten in any event. For example, in men's 1500 m speed skating, the Chinese athlete finished with 2'5''48 (no. 25) while the champion finished with 1'55''44; in the women's 1000 m speed skating, the Chinese athlete finished with 1'31''74 (no. 27) while the champion finished with 1'24''10.\(^{42}\) The significant gap shocked Chinese sport leaders who later admitted that they had emphasized the politics of sport more than the athletic performance of its athletes in the past.\(^{43}\) Influenced by the poor performance during 1980, the PRC government formally approved a report on the
working emphasis which sought to improve athletic performance submitted by the GASC. Based on the Report, the working emphasis of the GASC would shift to athletic performance and competitive sports especially those found in the Olympic Games. Although the strategic principles were approved in 1980, the GASC needed time to implement detailed projects and plans designed to bring the new strategies into effect. The PRC’s boycott of the 1980 Moscow Olympic Games gave the Chinese national sport system a chance to reform and improve its athletic performance.

The PRC government initially decided to send athletes to participate in the Moscow Olympic Games. According to Wang Dinghua, a senior secretary at the GASC at the time, the GASC notified all provincial sport administrations in November 1979 to make sufficient preparation for the 1980 Olympic Games. The GASC held the national sport working conference in Beijing in July 1979. The representatives stated at the conference that the GASC should adjust its national sport strategy as quick as possible in order to improve athletic performance to meet the level of the Olympic Games. The conference also determined that all provincial sport committees must select elite athletes and prepare them for the 1980 Olympic Games. Furthermore, the conference set the goals for the Chinese athletes in the coming Olympic Games: position in top ten; fifteen medals; and five gold medals. The outcome of the conference and the GASC confirmed that winning at the coming Olympic Games had the highest priority over Chinese national sport in the next couple of years. The Olympic Games became the primary focus of the GASC; all work, therefore, was to serve that task.

Even prior to the decision of the PRC's reinstatement by the IOC, the COC had started preparations for the Moscow Olympic Games in 1979. On 20 October 1979, Song
Zhong, the General Secretary of the COC, stated at a news conference held in Tokyo that all the sport organizations in China had made detailed preparation plans for the 1980 Olympic Games. The COC was reinstated by the IOC Executive Board in Nagoya, Japan, on 25 October 1979. The following day, Song Zhong stated again to the media that the COC would send athletes to both the Summer and Winter Olympic Games in 1980. At the beginning of November, the COC held a Committee meeting discussing the decision of the IOC Executive Board in respect to the COC's reinstatement. The Committee required that all Chinese sports organizations and elite athletes must make sufficient preparations immediately for the 1980 Olympic Games. On 26 November 1979, by a postal vote of 62 to 17, the Nagoya Decision was approved by all IOC members. The COC officially announced on 27 November 1979 that the PRC would attend both the 1980 Lake Placid Winter Olympic Games and 1980 Moscow Olympic Games. At a reception hosted by the GASC for the celebration of the IOC recognition on November 28, Deng Yingchao (1904-1992), a CCP leader, stated that although the athletic performance of China may not “shock” the world, the Chinese athletes should show Chinese sport spirit to the world at the 1980 [Moscow] Olympic Games. Based on the comments from Wang Dinghua, the decision of the PRC’s participation was made by the PRC government and the Ministry of Foreign Affair of the PRC rather than the GASC and the COC.

Soviet military force invaded Afghanistan on 27 December 1979. The PRC government released a quick response to this invasion. Shortly after the PRC government issued a statement strongly condemning the Soviet military invasion. It stated that the invasion violated all norms of international relations and caused a serious threat to peace
and security in Asia and the whole world. The PRC government firmly demanded the full withdrawal of Soviet military forces from Afghanistan. Despite this statement, the decision to participate in the Moscow Olympic Games remained unchanged. COC President Zhong Shitong (1913-2001) was interviewed by The China Sports News at the beginning of January in 1980, and stated that Chinese athletes had been preparing for the Moscow Olympic Games since last year and they were expecting to compete in Moscow. On January 15, the Carter administration announced a boycott of the Moscow Olympic Games with a deadline of February 20 for the full withdrawal of Soviet ground troops from Afghanistan. According to Xing and Zu, in January, president Carter also wrote a letter to Hua Guofeng, the Chairman of the CCP, to persuade the PRC to boycott the Moscow Olympic Games. Almost at the same time, the Soviet media reported that the PRC had established a military base in Xinjiang Uygur Autonomous Region in China to train Afghan insurgents and it also assisted the Afghan resistance against the Soviet Union. Although the report proved a rumor, Sino-Soviet talks were terminated by the PRC government on January 20, which was considered a retaliatory response to the Soviet Union. On January 24, COC Vice President Li Menghua stated at a press conference in Tokyo that the proposal to boycott the Moscow Olympic Games or change the venue was reasonable. However, he also stated,

The Chinese Olympic Committee is watching the developments concerning the boycott of the Summer Olympic Games and will take the stand of the majority of the Olympic committees of other countries.

According to Wang Dinghua, Li Menghua was criticized by the Ministry of Foreign Affair of the PRC when he went back to China due to the statement he made in Tokyo. Given that the Ministry of Foreign Affair had already made the decision that the PRC
would not attend the Moscow Olympic Games, Li Menghua’s Statement was not consistent with the final decision of the PRC government. Wang Meng (1920-2007), the supervisor of the GASC, explained to the Ministry of Foreign Affair that it was not Li Menghua’s fault, because prior to his trip to Japan, the GASC had not internally announced the boycott decision. The Li Menghua incident brought to light two facts regarding Chinese national sport in the 1980s: (1) important decisions about national sports were made by the government and the Ministry of Foreign Affair; and (2) the GASC and Chinese national sport served both the political and national interests of China.

On January 30, as the head of the Chinese delegation for the 1980 Winter Olympic Games, Li Menghua changed his statement in Lake Placid. He indicated at a press conference that due to the invasion of Afghanistan, Moscow was not an appropriate location to host the Olympic Games. This time his statement was consistent with what the Ministry of Foreign Affair would indicate two days later. On February 1, the Ministry of Foreign Affair of the PRC formally announced that as long as the Soviet Union continued occupying Afghanistan, it was clearly inappropriate to hold the 22nd Summer Olympic Games in Moscow. The announcement also suggested that the IOC should transfer or cancel the Games. Finally, the Ministry stated that if the IOC failed to make such a decision, the PRC government would ask the COC to seriously consider staying away from the 22nd Summer Olympic Games in Moscow. On the same day, the GASC made its official announcement in which the government decision regarding the Moscow Olympic Games was completely supported. On February 12, at the IOC session in Lake Placid, it was determined that the 22nd Olympic Games would remain in Moscow. Also,
the deadline of May 24 was set for all national Olympic committees to decide if they would attend the Moscow Olympic Games. The US government ignored the IOC’s deadline. On February 20, the American government announced that its athletes would not attend the Moscow Olympic Games because the Soviet Union did not remove its troops from Afghanistan prior to the established deadline of February 20. Almost two months later, the United States Olympic Committee (USOC) made the decision of boycott on April 12 responding to the government’s decision. In response to the USOC’s boycott decision, on April 21, Chinese premier Hua Guofeng announced that attending the Moscow Olympic Games was inappropriate. One day later, the COC held a plenary meeting to determine the status of their attendance. After some initial debate, the decision to boycott the Games was approved by all members. However, the COC also determined that Chinese athletes would still attend if the Olympic Games were held out of the Soviet Union. This decision was final, and unless the location was changed, Chinese athletes would not have the opportunities to compete with top-level athletes at the 1980 Olympic Games.

There are several reasons for China’s boycott of the Moscow Olympic Games. Based on the comments of Wu Shouzhang, the Vice-President of the COC in the 1980s, [in 1979] Soviet-supported Vietnam military forces put much stress on Chinese southern border and Soviet military forces threatened Chinese northern border for a long time, while the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan resulted in that Chinese western border was also directly threatened by Soviet military forces. Under this situation, China was besieged by the Soviet Union’s military forces. Therefore, the [PRC] government must take actions to break the siege. The boycott of Moscow Olympic Games was an efficient way to express our protest and attitude. He also stated that although the Chinese athletes were performing poorly at the time, they had a strong desire to compete for their country. Therefore, he denied that the boycott
was because of the Chinese athletes' low-level performance.\textsuperscript{79} Wang Dinghua has the same opinion in respect to this point. He argues that the possibility that China gave up the Moscow Olympic Games because of the poor athletic performance of its athletes did not exist.\textsuperscript{80} Additionally, Pei Dongguang, a professor of Olympic Studies at the Capital Institute of Physical Education, expressed the same opinion. He commented that prior to 1980 the Chinese athletes had not competed in the Olympic Games for a significant period and they had not achieved any Olympic medals. Attending the Olympic Games following the reinstatement symbolized more political meanings rather than the athletic meanings of Chinese national sport.\textsuperscript{81} Therefore, he stated, it is improbable that China’s boycott was due to the poor athletic performance of its athletes at the time.\textsuperscript{82} Pei Dongguang stated another possible reason for the boycott. Based on his comments, Sino-Soviet relations was not au pair; the Soviet Union always tried to dominate China while China resisted these efforts by the Soviet Union.\textsuperscript{83} The boycott expressed an attitude that the PRC government was not influenced or even controlled by the Soviet Union.\textsuperscript{84} Cui Lequan, the General Secretary of the Chinese Society of Sport History (CSSH), stated that between 1971 and 1979, the PRC government had been trying to improve the relationship with the USA. Following the normalization of Sino-US relations in 1979, a positive relationship had been dramatically developed. Both countries initiated a multi-aspect cooperation agreement between 1979 and 1980. The boycott expressed that the PRC government wanted to further develop Sino-US relations in the 1980s.\textsuperscript{85} In addition, taking the same actions as the USA could also attain the rapprochement from western countries, which was needed for the PRC’s restoration of international relations and domestic reconstruction.\textsuperscript{86} On the other hand, the Soviet Union invaded Afghanistan, a
neighbor of China, which seriously threatened the PRC’s national security. Furthermore, in January 1980, Soviet leader Leonid Brezhnev threatened that they might destroy the Chinese nuclear base so that the USA would have to maintain the cooperative relationship with the Soviet Union instead of protecting its “Chinese friends.” Therefore, for the PRC, to boycott or not was a simple choice with a clear cause and effect. Chinese Vice-Premier Deng Xiaoping publicly stated in 1980 that the enhanced relationship with the USA would become a long-term national strategy of the PRC; in addition, according to Deng Xiaoping, it was suggested that the USA, Japan, Western European countries, and the PRC should create an alliance against the Soviet Union in the 1980s.

**Section II: The Development of Chinese National Sport, 1981-1983**

The rapprochement and the cooperation between the PRC and the USA continued following President Ronald Reagan’s election and his administration’s move into the White House. On 16 March 1981 Secretary of State Haig stated on Sino-US relations that President Reagan visualized continued efforts to normalize the relationship with the PRC as this was considered a fundamental strategic reality and a strategic imperative. He also stated that it was of overriding importance to international stability and world peace. The PRC government agreed with Haig’s statement and continued improving the cooperation with the US government while denouncing the Soviet invasion. In addition to protesting Soviet hegemonism and global expansionism, the PRC government realized that the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan had an underlying economic purpose. The petroleum production in the Soviet Union had decreased since 1975. The Soviet Union,
it was argued, attempted to control the petroleum production in the Mid-East region while the invasion of Afghanistan was considered the first step of its ambition. The USA expressed the same concern: the Soviet invasion directly threatened its petroleum interests in the region. Under this situation and based on the same national interests, Sino-US economic relations quickly normalized between 1980 and 1981, a move that was considered vital in the fight against the Soviet Union’s global expansion. The US Congress approved the Sino-US trade agreement in 1980 thereby granting the PRC most-favoured-nation treatment. In September, the two countries signed agreements covering textile trade, maritime relations, and aviation relations. Total two-way trade increased in 1980 to almost five billion dollars, more than double the 1979 figures. In addition, cooperation with those in the oil industry was also initiated. Twenty-one American oil firms submitted bids to the China National Offshore Oil Corporation (CNOOC) for the right to explore petroleum on China’s southern continental shelf in 1982. As the PRC’s domestic working emphasis had shifted to economic construction since the beginning of the 1980s, the PRC’s foreign policy was thus placed in the service of the nation’s economic development. From the PRC’s perspective, it was stated that given the changed international environment, “the best way for a country to establish its influence in the world is not to bully its neighbours, but to turn itself into a more affluent and more democratic society by quick and high-quality economic development, sincere cooperation, and promoting international economic and cultural exchanges.”

Although Sino-US relations improved quickly at the beginning of the 1980s, the two countries still maintained respective independence ideologically and strategically. This independence resulted in the development of a number of tensions between the two
countries. In 1981, President Reagan approved the Taiwan Relations Act, continuing American sale of arms to Taiwan. He also suggested that American official relations with Taiwan might be established again. The PRC government protested and indicated that this was a retrogression and it violated the norms of international relations and encroached on the interests of the PRC. Foreign Minister Huang Hua announced on behalf of the PRC government that if the US government did not readjust their US-Taiwan relations, Sino-US diplomatic relations would be adversely affected. The dispute was not partially resolved until 17 August 1982 with the announcement of the US-PRC Joint Communique (also known as “8.17 Communique”). Both sides agreed that the US government would not seek to carry out a long-term policy of arms sales to Taiwan; and its arms sales to Taiwan would not exceed the level of those supplied during the years since the establishment of diplomatic relations between the PRC and the USA. In addition, the US government would seek to reduce its sales of arms to Taiwan.

Although the agreement was signed in 1982, the issue of arms sales to Taiwan was not completely solved in the 1980s. This issue made the PRC government further realize that in the 1980s the role of the USA in the world would still be one of the two superpowers and the PRC should temperately and cautiously develop bilateral cooperation with the US government.

In addition to the issue of arms sales to Taiwan, there were some sport-related issues that influenced the bilateral relations during those years including the Hu Na incident and the ARCO incident. Hu Na was a talented Chinese tennis player, who escaped from her team to the USA when a Chinese tennis team visited the country in July 1982. Later in April 1983, the US government granted political asylum to Hu Na.
There are many ways the US Immigration Service allows foreign citizens to attain permanent residence in the USA, but political asylum is the one that implies the individual has fled in fear of persecution. The PRC Ministry of Foreign Affairs immediately issued a strong protest over the US government’s decision and asserted that the decision would definitely impact the sport and cultural exchanges between the two countries. It was also suggested that as long as Hu Na came back to China, she would represent China at future international tennis events without any persecution. Later, the PRC government notified the US government that the decision would be accepted if it was not under the name of political asylum. However, the notice was ignored by the US government. Under this situation, the Chinese government proclaimed that the PRC would never give up its sovereignty and national dignity to maintain Sino-US relations. As a result, the Chinese government determined that a halt to all Sino-US sport and cultural exchanges would take place in 1983. In another incident, ARCO (Atlantic Richfield Company), a sponsor of the 1984 Los Angeles Olympic Games, used a Taiwan national flag on its float during the Rose Bowl parade on New Year’s Day, 1982. The PRC’s embassy protested to the Los Angeles Olympic Organizing Committee (LAOOC) who replied that they had nothing to do with the incident. Later, the PRC government called a halt to ARCO’s offshore drilling rights and kept the wells capped for several months until an appropriate apology was issued by ARCO.

Despite these incidents, the majority of the cooperation between the two countries was going well during the period. However, following these diplomatic incidents, the PRC’s foreign policy became more independent and mutually beneficial than in 1980. The PRC government declared its stance as a non-alignment country. Toward the Soviet
Union, the PRC reduced its hostility and expressed an appropriate positive attitude to initiate a bilateral dialogue, while toward the USA, it reduced the passion and developed concrete and practical cooperation agreements. In the middle of the two superpowers, the PRC began to search for a balance to achieve its maximum national interests. In respect to the PRC’s changed foreign policy to both the Soviet Union and the USA during the period, in 1984, Steven Golstein stated,

[The PRC] would deal with each country as the merits of the situation required, condemning those acts which it found objectionable and supporting those positions with which China was in agreement, but always seeking to maintain some dialogue to improve bilateral relations,...the tactic was specifically named ‘equidistance’.¹¹⁶

The changed foreign policy served the PRC’s domestic transformation. During this period, PRC leaders had already shifted its working emphasis to economic development (Appendix VII.). They attempted to provide the domestic reforms while achieving a peaceful and supportive international environment.¹¹⁷

Deeply influenced by politics, Chinese national sport was significantly reformed under the changing international environment. Although the political functions of Chinese national sport would not change during the reforms, the old slogan, "friendship first, competition second," was no longer used. Instead, new ones, such as “break out of Asia, advance into the world,” and “achieve glory for the motherland,” expressed the emerging Chinese ambition of winning in international sports competitions.¹¹⁸ Rather than using sport as a weapon to attack its political enemies, the PRC government gave Chinese national sport new meanings: winning in international sports competitions in order to reflect a positive national image and enhance international status.¹¹⁹ As a result, the “Olympic Strategy,” as the major goal of Chinese national sport, was determined at the beginning of the 1980s. It emphasized that the highest priority of Chinese national
sport was to win the Olympic gold medal. There were two branches of Chinese sports: national competitive sports and mass sports. The former required enhancing elite athletic performance while the latter required popularizing modern sports to citizens. According to this Olympic Strategy, enhancing elite athletic performance was the emphasis of the two. This required the whole country, including national sport organizations, provincial sport organizations, and grass roots sport units to work collectively, to achieve Olympic gold medals. This goal was at the foundation of the national strategy of China sport. Based on this principle, the Whole Nation System (Ju Guo Ti Zhi) was reformed and intensified to administer and regulate Chinese national sport.

The Whole Nation System was a nationwide sport system with the same goals (Olympic gold medals), consistent administration, state controlled sport resources (human resources and facility resources), and state and provincial financial support. As an independent, closed, and vertical system, the Whole Nation System was led by the GASC who supervised the provincial sports organizations. In each province, the provincial sport administration supervised all grass roots sports units and sport training schools within the province. In all sport training schools, elementary schools, and middle schools, potential young athletes were systematically selected and trained. Through multi-level tryouts, a few were selected for provincial professional sport teams and continued training for higher levels. Finally, a few young athletes from all the provincial training teams were selected to become national team players who would represent the country by competing in the Olympic Games and other international sports competitions. Basically, there were four sub-systems in the Whole Nation System: (1) sport administration system; (2)
training system; (3) competition system; and (4) financial system. Moreover, there were still some auxiliary systems including the athletes' education system, anti-doping system, training base system, and the information and technology system, which assisted and ensured the whole system was running well.

Following the reinstatement by the IOC, the GASC reformed the Whole Nation System in order to further fit the Olympic Games and pursue the goal of Chinese national sport under the Olympic Strategy. First, the competition system was intensified. National competitions were increased both in quantity and quality. The GASC pointed out that competition was an efficient way to enhance training conditions and accumulate empirical experiences for international competitions. Second, in the training system, the sport events were re-arranged to resemble those in the Olympic Games. According to the GASC, during the preparation of the 5th Chinese National Games held in September 1983, the organizers received a request from the GASC that the sport events should be consistent with the Olympic sport events. This readjustment saw many new sport events developed at the beginning of the 1980s and more financial support added to the system throughout China. In addition, the GASC realized that the education level of Chinese elite athletes should be improved as soon as possible because most of them terminated their normal education during adolescence. The GASC emphasized in its report that the low education level of elite athletes had become obstacles for them to improve their athletic performance. Thus, providing them with higher education was an urgent task. To enhance athletic performance, sport science and new technology were also stressed by the GASC. During the 1980s, more than 20 new sport research institutes were established in China. Academic journals such as *Science of Physical Education*
and Athletics and China Sport Medicine were established. As a closed system, the enhanced investment increased the burden on Chinese national sport. However, for its new political meanings, Chinese national sport received aid from the government without hesitation. With the full support of the government, the improvement in Chinese national sport was significant during this period (Appendix VIII).

The GASC allocated more attention to the sport events that the Chinese athletes were not good at and in which there were many gold medals produced in the Olympic Games such as Track and Field. As a result, the Chinese athletes won eleven gold medals and broke four Asian records at the 4th Asian Athletic Championship in Tokyo in June 1981. Following the participation in the World University Games one month later, despite the Chinese athletes winning the men’s triple jump gold medal and the silver medal in men’s long jump and high jump, Rong Gaotang, a Chinese sport leader, expressed his concern when he was interviewed by the People’s Radio Station in August. He stated that there was still a big difference between Chinese athletes and the world’s elite athletes and a long-term goal should be set for track and field, swimming and gymnastics. He also suggested that as the basis of national sports, the training facilities throughout China should be updated as soon as possible. His opinion on athletics in China was supported later by PRC Vice-Premier Yang Jingren who encouraged sport practitioners to improve Chinese athletic performance at all cost. In addition to the track and field events, during this three-year period, the Chinese women’s volleyball team won the gold medal at the 3rd World Cup in 1981 and the Championship at the World Women’s Volleyball Championship in 1982. The Chinese table tennis team won all seven gold medals at the 36th World Table Tennis Championships in 1981 and six
out of seven gold medals at the 37th World Table Tennis Championships in 1983. Moreover, both Chinese men and women's gymnastic teams finished the competitions with the top three position at the 21st World Championships in 1981. One year later, in December 1982, Li Ning won the all-around gold medal and five out of six gold medals of individual events at the 6th World Gymnastics Cup. Li Ning became the first gymnast in the world to win six gold medals in one major international competition. Led by Li Ning, in October 1983, the Chinese gymnastic team won the men's team champion at the 22nd World Gymnastic Championship.

The Chinese badminton team won four gold medals in the badminton tournament of the 1st World Games in 1981 and won the men's team Champion at the 12th World Badminton Championships in 1982. In particular, Chinese athletes made their breakthrough at the 9th Asian Games staging in New Delhi in November 1982. The GASC sent a 445-athlete delegation to compete in all the events except boxing, golf, equestrian sports, and women's field hockey. Surpassing the Japanese delegation, the Chinese delegation for the first time finished the Games in the top position by winning sixty-one gold, fifty-one silver, and forty-one bronze medals.

The frequency of the Chinese athletes' participation in international competitions was significantly increased during this period. These frequent competitions also saw the Chinese athletes compete with athletes from the countries seldom seen in the previous decade. In October 1982, a Chinese sport delegation led by He Zhenliang, a Chinese IOC member, visited the German Democratic Republic renewing bilateral sport communications following a nineteen-year termination. A Chinese gymnastic team went to Moscow to compete at the Moscow International Gymnastic Invitational Tournament in March 1982 and won one gold, three silver, and two bronze medals. In
August 1983, the GASC invited the national champion football (soccer) team of the Soviet Union to China. This was the first Soviet sport team to visit China in the 1980s. The sport communications with the eastern European countries indicated a change in Chinese national sport strategy during the period. In sum, between 1981 and 1983, Chinese athletes participated in more than 158 international competitions (the ones in which more than three countries participated) and achieved more than 710 gold medals. Among these competitions, Chinese athletes won 77 world champions and broke 36 world records (Appendix IX). These efforts were made for one goal, the production of Olympic medals – the ultimate goal of Chinese national sport. Specifically, the target was to achieve more Olympic medals during the Los Angeles Olympic Games in the following year, 1984.

**Section III: China’s Preparation for the Los Angeles Olympic Games, 1984**

In 1984, to serve its domestic economic development, which was considered the most important task of the country, the PRC government continued carrying out its balanced and mutually beneficial foreign policy initiated at the beginning of the 1980s, especially as it related to the two superpowers. It was believed that the domestic economy could be enhanced with a secure international political environment. Thus, it was argued, the PRC would attain more international economic assistance. The PRC emphasized that “relations with both the USA and the Soviet Union would be developed on a strictly bilateral basis and not with an eye towards threatening or frightening the third part of the triangle.” As the PRC was in the middle of the two superpowers, they did not have a very close relationship with either of them. On one hand, the Taiwan issue was an
obstacle blocking enhanced relations between the PRC and the USA. The divarication on the issue resulted in the inconsistency that made it impossible for the two countries to create an environment that fostered mutual trust. On the other hand, the border threats from the Soviet Union and its Vietnamese ally were still the main national security concerns with which the PRC had to be very careful. Although the Sino-Soviet talks had resumed in 1982, the PRC government was still cautious with what it considered a dangerous neighbour. In particular, in April 1984, continuous military conflicts broke out along the Sino-Vietnamese border. The PRC government condemned the Vietnamese invading its neighbour (Kampuchea) and sent a strong signal to the Soviet Union not to utilize Vietnam as a military base to threaten the PRC. As an ally of Vietnam, on 9 May 1984 Soviet leaders postponed their visit to Beijing, which was four days before the PRC government formally announced that they would attend the 1984 Los Angeles Olympic Games and nine days after president Reagan formally visited the PRC. In a summary in 1984, Goldstein stated,

...throughout 1984 China was performing a delicate balancing act: developing enough of a strategic relationship with the US to give Soviet military planners second thoughts and keeping the Sino-US economic relationship growing even while convincing Moscow that it was interested in better relations and was not taking sides in the global Soviet-American confrontation.

Despite these international situations, to revive its economy, the PRC had been developing international relations under its independent foreign policy during the five-year period. Specifically, this principle was also applied in the sport domain to improve the relationships with the IOC and International Sport Federations (ISFs) during the same period. As early as 1980, several months after its recognition by the IOC, the COC gave up its right and announced that it would boycott the 1980 Moscow Olympic Games. In a
letter to the COC in March 1980, IOC President Lord Killanin expressed his
disappointment by stating that from his personal point of view he would have
considerable reservations in proceeding with the candidature of a new member of the IOC
if the COC did not participate in the Moscow Olympic Games. His successor, Juan
Antonio Samaranch, did not express the same reservations although he made great efforts
to help with the recognition of the COC. According to Wei Jizhong, a representative of
the Chinese delegation to the 83rd IOC Session in Moscow in July 1980, prior to the
election of the new IOC president, Samaranch asked the Chinese representative to help
him in the election as he did a lot to help the COC in its reinstatement. On 16 July
1980 Samaranch became the new president of the IOC.

Following becoming the president, Samaranch immediately worked on the “Two
Chinas” issue. Because the Chinese Taipei Olympic Committee did not agree with the
IOC’s solution made in 1979, and as Samaranch promised, he continued to seek a final
resolution for both Taiwan and the PRC. Samaranch promised the Taiwanese IOC
member that the Chinese Taipei Olympic Committee would be treated the same as any
other national Olympic committees if they accepted the IOC’s resolution regarding the
name, national flags, and anthems for both the PRC and Taiwan Olympic Committees.
Based on this promise, a formal agreement between the IOC and the Chinese Taipei
Olympic Committee was signed in March 1981. The effort saw the “Two Chinas”
issue ultimately settled to the satisfaction of all three parties. Meanwhile, Samaranch
created and maintained a good relationship between the IOC and the PRC during the
early part of the 1980s. Invited by the COC, Samaranch visited Beijing in March 1982 to
meet Deng Xiaoping, leader of the PRC. During the meeting, Samaranch said, “I have
always been a friend of your great country and shall remain so in the future." The COC praised Samaranch for his great contribution to the international Olympic Movement and awarded him a Chinese Sport Honorary Medal. Lord Killanin was also invited to visit by the PRC in May of the same year. Deng Xiaoping accorded him a warm greeting of the kind reserved for old friends. The visit gave Lord Killanin the opportunity to witness the great strides made by the PRC in their provision of sports installations and training facilities. In September 1983, Samaranch visited China again to attend the 5th Chinese National Games in Shanghai. During this visit, Samaranch presented a silver medal of the Olympic Order to Rong Gaotang (1912-2006), an extraordinary Chinese sport leader, in recognition of his contributions to Chinese sport. This marked the first time a Chinese sport leader was awarded such an honour from the IOC. In January 1984, Li Menghua, the supervisor of the GASC was invited by Samaranch to visit the headquarters of the IOC in Lausanne. Li Menghua formally met Samaranch in Lausanne and exchanged opinions on the development of the Olympic Movement in China. Following the visit, the IOC issued an official announcement on Li Menghua’s visit and agreed to sponsor the Beijing International Marathon events in 1984 and 1985. In September 1984, Samaranch visited China for the third time and bestowed another silver medal to Zhong Shitong (1913-2001), the former President of the COC. During this visit, Samaranch and his wife were invited to stand along with the senior Chinese leaders on the balcony of Tiananmen to watch the Chinese National Day Parade. This was intended to express the importance of the relationship that had developed between the IOC and the PRC.
In addition, following Samaranch’s recommendation and arrangement, He Zhenliang, a Chinese sport leader, was elected as the first Chinese IOC member in October 1981. Given that the COC submitted its candidate list on 23 February 1980, the election was supposed to be held at the IOC General Session in Moscow in July 1980. However, as the PRC announced its boycott decision in April, Samaranch thought it was impossible for He Zhengliang to be elected in Moscow in July. Thus, based on Samaranch’s suggestion, the IOC Executive Board determined that the election would be postponed until the General Session in Baden-Baden in 1981 thereby ensuring He Zhenliang would be elected successfully. Expectedly, He Zhenliang and six other candidates were elected at the Baden-Baden in 1981.

Prior to being elected as an IOC member, He Zhenliang had represented the PRC and confronted the IOC on the issue of “Two Chinas” with tenacity. In contrast, as an IOC member, He Zhenliang changed from a rival to a partner cooperating with the IOC to develop the Olympic Movement in China. In 1983, He Zhenliang suggested that the IOC should pay more attention to mass sports because elite sport that the IOC always emphasized would lose its basis without the support from mass sports. Samaranch accepted his advice and organized the Sport for All Commission and He Zhenliang was assigned the task of Vice-Chairmen of the Commission. In 1984, He Zhenliang noticed that Asian and African representation in the IOC was much less than that of the representation from Western countries. He stated that balancing the IOC membership from all the member nations would benefit the IOC thereby improving its globalization and enhancing the development of the Olympic Movement in those developing countries. Samaranch also accepted his suggestion and absorbed a Japanese athlete as a
member of the IOC Athletes’ Commission in 1984. Given his good relationship with Samaranch and many other IOC members, combined with his excellent working record, He Zhenliang was nominated as a member of Executive Board and elected in 1985. Following Samaranch’s suggestion, the IOC added an additional seat for Vice-President (from three to four) in 1988. Later in 1989, He Zhenliang was nominated to be a Vice-President by a group of IOC members led by Kevan Gosper, an Australian IOC member, and successfully elected to be the fourth IOC Vice-President. His rapid ascension from IOC member to member of the Executive Board, and then the Vice-President was unprecedented in the history of the IOC. He Zhenliang’s success was called “He’s triple jump” in the media. Yet, it must be acknowledged that “He’s triple jump” would not have happened without the help of Samaranch and other IOC members who worked to build a good relationship with the PRC.

When it came to the 1980s, China increasingly participated in international sport activities and many IOC members and countries showed their cooperative attitudes towards China. For example, in 1984, Chinese athletes participated in 38 international sports competitions and 625 bilateral sports communications with more than 70 countries around the world. In particular, in March 1984, the COC formally submitted the application to the Olympic Council of Asia (OCA) to host the 11th Asian Games, which was fully supported by Samaranch. The support received was not only because of He Zhenliang’s relationship with those in the IOC, but also because the PRC expressed a more positive and flexible attitude toward the international community. Because of this significant shift, Chinese national sport further showcased its performance in 1984.
Luan Jujie, a talented female fencer, won the championship in the Foil Fencing event at the World Fencing Championship in the Federal Republic of Germany in February 1984. This was the first world championship for a Chinese athlete in 1984. In April, Chinese athletes participated in a series of Asian sports competitions. The Chinese Judo team won three silver and three bronze medals at the 5th Asian Judo Championships in Kuwait; the Chinese swimming team won nineteen gold, nine silver, and two bronze medals at the 2nd Asian Swimming Championships in Seoul. In May, Yan Hong and Xu Yongjiu broke the world record of the women’s 5 KM Road Walking events in Norway. And also in May, the Chinese Badminton squad won the Champion of women’s team and the silver medal of men’s team at the Badminton World Cup in Malaysia. In June, Zhu Jianhua, a Chinese high jumper, set a new world record of 2.39m at an international athletic competition in Germany. This was the third time he broke the world record during the previous twelve month period. In addition to those adult sports competitions, Chinese youth athletes also participated in international sport events, which indicated that the GASC had allocated more attention to young athletes’ training for future Olympic Games. The Chinese youth basketball squad won the women’s championship and the men’s silver medal at the 8th Asian Youth Basketball Championship in April. One month later, the Chinese youth weightlifting team won five silver and one bronze medal at the 10th World Youth Weightlifting Championships in Italy. In July, the Chinese youth wrestling team won two gold medals at the World Youth Wrestling Championships in the USA. However, in the winter sport events, Chinese athletes were unable to achieve a breakthrough during the year. In February, the COC sent a thirty-seven-athlete delegation to participate in the 14th Winter Olympic Games in
Sarajevo. The results saw that there was no one close to top forty in each of the events that Chinese athletes competed. The poor performance in the Winter Olympic Games did not negatively influence Chinese enthusiasm for their national sports at the time. The attention and effort of the PRC, the GASC, the COC, and the Chinese athletes were focused on the coming Summer Olympic Games in Los Angeles.

As early as November 1980, the COC had already expressed that the Chinese athletes would participate in the 1984 Los Angeles Olympic Games. During an interview by China Sport News, Zhong Shitong, the president of the COC, stated that the greatest efforts would be made for the 1984 and 1988 Olympic Games, which was the emphasis of the tasks of the COC and all Chinese athletes. During Samaranch’s visit to Beijing in March 1982, Deng Xiaoping told Samaranch that the Chinese athletes would participate in the Los Angeles Olympic Games as long as the USA would not treat Taiwan as an independent nation. Even during the Hu Na incident in April 1983, the PRC government and the COC did not change their decision as it related to their participation. As the response to the Hu Na incident, the PRC government immediately called a halt to all Sino-US sports and cultural communications including their participation in the LAOOC’s pre-Olympic events. According to Ueberroth, the LAOOC sent a telex to Zhong Shitong explaining that the LAOOC did not agree with the US government decision and hoped the COC would reconsider and send their athletes to the USA. Zhong Shitong replied that the COC would not, but he assured Ueberroth that the Hu Na incident would not affect the COC’s participation in 1984. On 25 September 1983 the GASC held a conference in Shanghai discussing the detailed preparation for the 1984 Olympic Games. Later in December, the GASC publicly announced that Chinese
athletes would participate in the Los Angeles Olympic Games. They also stated that the COC would send a delegation with more than 300 athletes competing in more than 15 events. This would mark the biggest delegation ever in Chinese sport history. One day later, the COC held the conference in Beijing emphasizing intensified training during the winter months for the coming Olympic Games. As preparations continued, a group of COC officials, led by COC Vice-President Chen Xian, visited Los Angeles in January 1984. In a public statement in the USA, Chen Xian promised that the COC would send a 300-athlete delegation to the Games to strengthen understanding and friendship of different countries, thus protecting world peace as well as lending impetus to the improvement of international sport.

Although the word “boycott” was never used in Soviet statements regarding the 1984 Olympic Games, the idea of non-participation was initiated prior to 1984. According to Ueberroth, Soviet concern regarding participation in the Los Angeles Olympic Games existed in 1982 when he first met Sergei Pavlov, the president of the Soviet Union Olympic Committee, in Moscow. Pavlov stated that he could not imagine how Soviet athlete could attend the Los Angeles Games when at the hockey finals in Lake Placid the Americans kept chanting kill the Russians. When Marat Gramov replaced Pavlov in February 1983, Gramov complained that Soviet requests regarding landing Aeroflot charter planes and docking a Soviet cruise ship in the Los Angeles’ harbor were being postponed by the US government. On 8 May 1984 the Soviet Union announced that their athletes would not participate in the Los Angeles Olympic Games because of fears of athletes’ safety. They also claimed that there would be 100 countries
following their decision. According to Ueberroth, the PRC was on the top of the Soviet list.

On May 10, the LAOOC immediately decided to send a small delegation to Beijing to discuss the PRC's participation with Chinese sport leaders. The delegation was welcomed enthusiastically by the Chinese sports ministers and the GASC. During the three day meeting, both sides signed an agreement stating that the PRC would still send its sport delegation to Los Angeles as originally planned. According to Ueberroth, the PRC announcement on May 12 gave LAOOC their first public victory over the Soviets. This was not only a victory for LAOOC, Ueberroth stated, the participation of the PRC in 1984 was also a turning point of his life.

The COC was true to its word. On 17 May, the COC formally announced in Beijing that the Chinese sport delegation for the Los Angeles Olympic Games had been created. On 16 July 1984 the 325-athlete Chinese sport delegation arrived at Los Angeles where fifty-two years ago only one Chinese athlete had competed in the 10th Olympic Games. During the following two weeks, Chinese athletes shocked the world by achieving 15 gold, 8 silver, and 9 bronze medals and finishing the Games in the fourth position on the unofficial medal tally.
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Chapter Five

Conclusion

The development of Chinese national sport was intertwined with the PRC’s state politics and foreign policies between 1980 and 1984. More specifically, Chinese national sport served PRC politics thus the former was directed by the latter. Therefore, it can be argued that when Chinese athletes competed in international sport events, sports served the PRC’s foreign policy. This relationship between Chinese national sport and its politics had been consistent since the PRC was established in 1949, though the political purposes varied during the different periods as the international geopolitical environment changed. In the 1950s, prior to its withdrawal from the IOC, the PRC considered Chinese national sport a weapon with which they struggled with Taiwanese authorities in the international sport arena. In 1952, although the Chinese sport delegation only competed in one swimming event, the government was satisfied with the result because they had hoisted their national flag at the Helsinki Olympic Games. In 1956, the PRC refused to participate in the Melbourne Olympic Games because the IOC allowed the Taiwanese athletes to compete, a violation of the PRC’s “one China” policy. The PRC withdrew from the IOC in 1958 for similar reasons. In the 1960s, due to the conflict between the IOC and the PRC, the latter once again utilized its national sport as a weapon in its struggle with the IOC. The PRC sponsored and organized the GANEFO in 1963 and the Asian GANEFO in 1966. During the 1970s, the PRC made efforts to improve the bilateral relationship with the USA as well as other Western countries. Chinese national sport was again used, but this time as a diplomatic tool, assisting the government in its efforts to emerge from its isolation.
As Cui Lequan stated, "for different historical stages, the PRC applied relevant strategies and tactics to Chinese national sport so that it could produce maximum energy serving the PRC's state interests. For example, in regard to the Moscow and the Los Angeles Olympic Games, the strategies were definitely different." The difference originated from the shifting international environment between 1980 and 1984. During this period, the rivalry between the two superpowers intensified and became one of the most dangerous crises threatening the whole world. International sport was not immune to the crisis, especially as it related to the Olympic Games. As Kéba M'Baye, an IOC member in Senegal, stated in 1980, "The danger which threatens Olympism has two sources: money and politics – two devils which have invaded, dominated, and debased everything these days, and sport is no exception." The ability of the international Olympic Movement to respond was seriously challenged when compared with the influence of the two superpowers throughout the world. Faced with the political turmoil of the boycott of the Moscow and Los Angeles Olympic Games from the two superpowers in 1980 and 1984, the IOC could do little but unsuccessful diplomacy and ineffective reiteration of the apolitical characteristic of the Olympic Games. At the beginning of the 1980s, the Olympic Games were anything but apolitical; politics consumed the Games and adversely affected it. Both the Soviet Union and the USA utilized the Olympic Games to express their national power and superiority. However, propaganda can often be a double-edged sword. The 1980 Moscow Olympic Games were boycotted as a diplomatic response to the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan while the Soviet Union was trying to use it as a propaganda to showcase their advanced communist society. Four years later, the Soviet Union responded by boycotting the Los Angeles
Olympic Games under the guise of security. The Olympic Games became an efficient political weapon in the rivalry between the two superpowers at the beginning of the 1980s, and the IOC found itself unprepared to respond to the situation at the time.

Surrounded by the complicated international environment, one dominated by the intense rivalry between the two superpowers, the PRC sought its own foreign strategies to protect the sovereignty of China and develop its national powers. The Sino-Soviet alliance built in the early 1950s deteriorated in the 1960s due to emerging controversies on the ideological level. At the beginning of the 1960s, the Soviet Union terminated its aid projects in China and recalled its advisors and experts working in China. The PRC did not back down under the increased political pressure and criticized the Soviet revisionism. On the other side, Sino-US relations were virtually non-existent in the 1950s due to the Korean War (1950-1953) and the US government's Taiwan policy. Although the ceasefire agreement on the Korean War was signed in 1953, the two countries remained adversaries and the military confrontations on the Korean Peninsula continued. Meanwhile, the PRC government strongly protested the US military intervention at Taiwan Strait that resulted in the first Taiwan Strait Crisis in 1954 and another in 1958. These incidents adversely affected Sino-US relations throughout the 1950s. Seeking to restore a limited relationship, the PRC and the USA initiated a bilateral dialogue in the 1960s. The talks between the two countries were intermittent and depended on the changing situations in the Taiwan Strait as well as the international political situations throughout the world.

Beginning in the early 1970s, Sino-Soviet border conflicts significantly increased, with both sides having casualties during the military clashes. As a result, the relationship
between the two countries further deteriorated, evidenced by intensified military outposts situated along the border. The Soviet Union stationed up to one million troops and deployed one-third of its total missiles inventory along the Sino-Soviet and Sino-Mongolian borders. In response, the PRC further adjusted its diplomatic strategies expressing the rapprochement to the US government. Thus, they moved to associate themselves with one superpower in an effort to resist the other. To accomplish this goal, Chinese national sport once again was used as a political tool, although this time to build a bridge to unite two countries. "Ping-Pong diplomacy" was the bridge that united these two countries in 1971. Utilizing table-tennis as a precursor to diplomatic talks, the two countries soon initiated diplomatic visits. Senior government officials from both sides visited each other exchanging opinions on various issues regarding international politics, Sino-US relations, and more importantly, the attitudes toward the Soviet Union. Although the political and ideological differences still existed, the two governments now considered the Soviet Union as their common enemy. Based on this commonalty, the PRC continued improving Sino-US relations during the second half of the 1970s, which remained unchanged even following Mao Zedong's death in 1976 and the transformation of the PRC's leadership in 1978. As a result, Sino-US relations made great strides in 1979; the two countries established diplomatic relations and initiated a number of bilateral cooperation agreements. Furthermore, while visiting Beijing in 1980 US Vice-President Walter Mondale expressed that mutual security interests should be shared by the USA and the PRC. His statement suggested that the US government had tilted its evenhanded policy toward the Soviet Union and the PRC to the PRC side at the time.
As Sino-US relations improved, Sino-Soviet relations further deteriorated during the same period. In addition to increasing military threats at the PRC's northern border, the Soviet Union also allied themselves with Vietnam thereby creating a threat at the PRC's southern border by the end of the 1970s. Moreover, Soviet military forces invaded Afghanistan in December 1979. This action was seen as a serious threat to the national security of the PRC by the government. Based on Wu Shouzhang, the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan would besiege China from the west; meanwhile, the Soviet Union would achieve its purpose of expansion in Asia thereby isolating China. This perspective was generally accepted by the PRC government, the PRC media, and Chinese scholars. Facing possible isolation, the PRC government took steps to fight back against its dangerous neighbour to protect national security.

Following the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan, to some degree, the PRC government was more anxious than the US government to seek out an efficient way to punish the Soviet Union, at least, to delay Soviet military expansion in Asia. For the USA, the Soviet invasion threatened its energy base in the Middle East, while for the PRC, the threat was directly on its national security. On 3 January 1980, Huang Hua, the minister of the PRC Foreign Affair Ministry, stated that the Soviet Union was challenging the whole world and all the countries who loved peace should unify to resist Soviet expansionism. The announcement expressed the PRC's deep concern over the Soviet invasion and the expectation that more countries join the anti-Soviet group. The PRC understood that it needed supporters standing at its side if it was to be successful. Thus, when Jimmy Carter suggested the possible punishment to the Soviet Union, the boycott of the Moscow Olympic Games, the PRC government followed without hesitation.
Although the COC had been reinstated by the IOC only three months earlier, the PRC still determined to follow the USA and boycott the Moscow Olympic Games in January 1980. Once again, Chinese national sport was to serve the national interests of the PRC. Therefore, national sport in China was sacrificed when necessary to secure the government’s interests. From a perspective of state politics, this sacrifice brought a positive effect during the following months in 1980. Although the motives for the two countries were not the same, both the PRC and the USA would like to have the Soviet Union punished. The US government appreciated the PRC’s decision. In response, Jimmy Carter made two decisions at the end of January on the transfer of technical equipment to the PRC. One allowed the PRC further access to American dual-use (both military and civilian use) technology. The other permitted American firms to export non-lethal military equipment to the PRC.\textsuperscript{11} Sequentially, the Secretary of Defense, Harold Brown, visited China in February, marking the first high-level military contact between the two countries in last thirty years. Three months later, both sides took another step on their way toward military cooperation when PRC Vice-Premier Geng Biao visited Washington, D.C. During the visit, the Pentagon announced a further easing of USA export restrictions on military-related equipment to the PRC.\textsuperscript{12} This relationship was further enhanced following the meeting between Jimmy Carter and PRC Premier Hua Guofeng in Tokyo in July. The US government cleared more than 400 export licenses to the PRC covering equipment ranging from helicopters and flight simulation equipment to aerial cameras and long-range radar installations.\textsuperscript{13} The Soviet invasion of Afghanistan accelerated the cooperation between the USA and the PRC. However, if the PRC did not follow Jimmy Carter’s suggestion regarding the boycott of the Moscow Olympic Games,
it is clear that the development of Sino-US bilateral military cooperation would have been harmed.

Following the US Presidential elections, Reagan’s administration took office in January 1981. Although Reagan reassessed the Taiwan issue during his election campaign and claimed that the relationship with Taiwan should be improved, Sino-US relations were not seriously affected but largely maintained at a normal level during the next few years. Facing the PRC’s concern regarding Reagan’s opinion toward Taiwan, US Secretary of State Haig, in March 1981, stressed the significance of the strategic basis of the relationship between the USA and the PRC. Despite the emphasis, the USA still implemented its project of arms sales to Taiwan in late 1981. The two governments initiated a series of discussions aimed at finding a possible solution to the issue. The result saw the Third Sino-US Joint Communiqué signed in the middle of 1982. With compromises from both sides, the two governments temporarily reached a deal on the Taiwan issue in order to continue existing bilateral cooperation. Both sides did not want to lose the strategic basis of the relationship, namely, anti-Soviet military expansion. Although the US government agreed to gradually decrease arms sales to Taiwan in the following years, this issue made the PRC leaders realize that there were still significant obstacles between the two countries. As a significant warning, the crisis surrounding the sale of arms to Taiwan between 1981 and 1982 alarmed the PRC, and ensured that it would be cautious when developing its relationships with the two superpowers in the future. Any extreme relationship between the PRC and either of the superpowers was deemed inappropriate and even dangerous by the government. Compared to the two superpowers, the PRC was relatively weak, especially in areas such as the economy,
industry, technology, and national defense. Due to the gap in national power and the changing international environment at the time, the PRC realized that they should exercise extreme caution when improving the relationship with the USA too quickly while ignoring the relationship with the Soviet Union, and vice versa.

When Sino-US relations cooled because of the US government’s decision to sell arms to Taiwan between 1981 and 1983, there was a significant shift in the PRC’s attitudes toward the Soviet Union. Although the PRC government and its media continued to criticize the Soviet expansion and emphasized that the Soviet threats on the PRC’s national security still existed, they also emphasized that the Soviet Union was experiencing domestic difficulties that constrained its foreign policies. The PRC stressed that Soviet domestic difficulties were caused by its continuous military buildup and expansion in Asia and Europe; when the Soviet Union tore down other innocent countries they also tore down themselves. In the PRC’s media, the reports regarding the Soviet economic problems and the hard life of Soviet people increased significantly, which were usually accompanied by the comment that stopping expansion was the only way to solve their domestic problems. In addition, in 1982, there were some signs of improvement on the bilateral relationships between the two countries. The PRC attempted to modify its long-standing posture of rigid hostility toward the Soviet Union. Once again, Chinese athletes became the diplomatic precursor to open a door between the two countries. A Chinese gymnastic team participated in an international event in Moscow in March 1982. The Chinese media emphatically reported that the Chinese athletes had friendly conversations with their Soviet counterparts. Meanwhile, the Soviet government sent its leading Chinese specialists to the PRC for a private visit. Several months later, another
Soviet delegation, the Soviet-Chinese Friendship Association, made an unofficial visit to Beijing. More significantly, in connection to the celebrations around New Year of 1982, Zhao Jin, the director of the Radio Beijing, broadcast New Year Greetings to the Soviet people. In the greetings, he said, “Dear friend, allow me... to warmly congratulate you on the New Year and wish you lots of happiness, good health and success in your work...we hope that in next year our relations and friendship will be consolidated even more.” All these events indicated that both countries tried to improve the bilateral relations and reduce the hostility. As a result, the Sino-Soviet border negotiations resumed in 1982, which had been suspended following the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan in 1979.

Through the changes that the PRC made regarding the relationships with the two superpowers, it is believed that the PRC’s foreign policies became more realistic and practical between 1981 and 1983. The reason for this change was that for domestic restoration and reconstruction, the PRC shifted its working emphasis from the previous class struggle to economic development. A peaceful international political environment would be helpful and beneficial for the economic restoration within the PRC.

The PRC determined in 1982 that economic construction would become the center of all tasks throughout the country. It was believed by the PRC leaders that enhancing the economy was the only way to increase national power thereby positioning China as a strong country in the world. A series of economic reforms and readjustments were initiated beginning in 1982. The major theme in economic reforms was coined in a slogan proposed by PRC Premier Zhao Ziyang: “Opening to the outside world and invigorating the domestic economy.” Based on this principle, and in addition the constructive relationships with the two superpowers, the PRC also tried to build good
relationships with other countries all over the world. By 1984, there were more than one hundred and twenty countries in the world with established diplomatic relations with the PRC. With the communications with these countries, especially in the economic domain, the PRC further realized that international politics must be maintained in a cooperative environment in order to accomplish the central task of the country, the development of its domestic economy. Therefore, rather than resisting and attacking, achieving mutual national interests became the strategic basis of the PRC’s foreign policies. The years between 1982 and 1984 saw significant efforts by the PRC to pursue its diplomatic and national economic goals.

During this period, to serve the new strategic basis of the PRC’s foreign policies and the central task of the country, the vision, the mission, and the operational principles of Chinese national sport was endued with new functions. Pursuing gold medals in the Olympic Games became the top goal and the only mission for Chinese national sport.\textsuperscript{20} The vision for Chinese national sport was that the PRC would become a strong country in the sport domain at the end of twentieth century.\textsuperscript{21} Based on this vision, Chinese national sport was no longer a political means to improve existing relationships or foster new friendships between the PRC and the other countries; it became a strong weapon to showcase the PRC’s national powers and its positive international image.

Dominating over Chinese national sport between the 1950s and the 1970s, the slogan “friendship first, competition second” was quite popular among the Chinese people. At the time, the PRC manipulated sport competitions with other countries as a practical means to please opponents so that it could obtain its diplomatic purposes. The result saw the Chinese athletes in some international sport competitions intentionally lose
games to satisfy the opponents' government. Such actions violated sportsmanship, impeded the development of Chinese national sport and frustrated individual athletes' enthusiasm. Re-entering the United Nations and the IOC in the 1970s and reforming its national policy at the beginning of the 1980s, the PRC shifted both foreign and domestic strategies and opened its door to the international community. Simultaneously, the PRC government's attitudes regarding sport gradually changed. Different voices from the "friendship first, competition second" strategy started to emerge. Semi-official criticism pointed out that political sport provided no advantage to the development of Chinese national sport. Instead, it was argued, it sabotaged sport dangerously. Increasing emphasis was put into the importance of winning gold medals. In 1980, right before the Lake Placid Winter Olympic Games, *China Sport News*, the most influential sport newspaper in China, published an editorial which contended that to win competitions and achieve glory for the country, Chinese athletes must win friends as well as gold medals. Furthermore, according to the editorial, to achieve respect, Chinese athletes must first win gold medals and achieve world standards so that they were able to compete on a global scale. In contrast, it was suggested, if they merely took part in competitions but were incapable to win gold medals, national glory and dignity would be adversely affected.22

Guided by this new shift in Chinese national sport and restricted by the fiscal limitations of the sport budget, the GASC initiated the national sport policy called “Ju Guo Ti Zhi (the Whole Nation System),” which was explained as “whole country support for the elite sport system.”23 The system originated in the Soviet Union in the 1950s, was stopped during the Cultural Revolution in China (1966-1976), and developed again in the 1980s. In the system, the management was centralized thereby securing financial and
human resource support that was delivered throughout the whole country. Based on this system, young athletes in athletic training schools throughout China would be well trained and, those with potential would be chosen for the national teams. The only purpose of the well-trained young athletes was to be selected to compete for the country. Although it had nothing to do with mass sport and it could not enhance the average physical condition of the Chinese people, the system could absorb all potential young athletes throughout the country into the elite sport system and effectively cultivate them in a relatively short period of time. The system was reformed and intensified between 1980 and 1984. Since Chinese athletes did not attend the 1980 Moscow Olympic Games, the effectiveness and the positive results of the system appeared for the first time at the 1984 Los Angeles Olympic Games. The Chinese athletes achieved great performance at the Los Angeles Olympic Games (Appendix I) encouraging the GASC to ratify the system and further affirm the Olympic Strategy in 1985. The GASC emphasized that elite sports was the priority throughout the country and the main task of the Whole Nation System was to win Olympic medals. The "Ju Guo Ti Zhi" was perfectly aligned with the PRC's Olympic Strategy.

Although to express its clear political attitude, the PRC boycotted the 1980 Olympic Games, it was timely to utilize the enhanced national sport to accomplish its different political purpose in 1984. Despite the difference, the two decisions regarding the boycott and the participation had their significant meanings, respectively. The PRC's boycott of the Moscow Olympic Games enhanced the bilateral relationship with the USA. By doing this, the two countries achieved respective national interests. The USA took advantage of the boycott to further isolate the Soviet Union from not only Western
countries, but also the countries all over the world, which brought the USA an ascendant position in the superpowers' rivalry during the Cold War.\textsuperscript{25} The boycott was an opportunity by which the PRC improved its relationships with Western countries and allowed them the opportunity to express that they also opposed the Soviet Union's expansion.\textsuperscript{26} More importantly, the PRC was largely relieved from the emerging Soviet military threat. First, the PRC was no longer alone in its resistance of the Soviet Union; it united itself with the USA and other Western countries against the Soviet Union. Second, the PRC signed military cooperation agreements with the USA to enhance its military technology thereby intensifying its national security. In contrast, the PRC determined to participate in the 1984 Los Angeles Olympic Games without any hesitations because it provided the PRC with an excellent opportunity to enhance its international status and national pride. Even following hearing the announcement that the Soviet Union would not attend the Games, the PRC remained consistent with its decision. As Ueberroth said, following the Soviet Union and Eastern bloc's absence, China's participation saved the Los Angeles Olympic Games.\textsuperscript{27} This time, the PRC utilized participating in the Olympic Games instead of boycotting to improve the relationship with the USA. It also made use of this opportunity to showcase its positive global visibility to the world, especially those in the Western countries, which helped the PRC achieve the credits to establish trusted relationships. The PRC believed that the trusted relationships with Western countries would produce more cooperation and investment from these countries to support its domestic development, which was the most important task of the PRC.

The absence of the Soviet Union and other communist countries provided another opportunity for the PRC, one that would see Chinese athletes claim more gold medals at
the Olympic Games. This was important for both the Chinese sport administration and the Chinese people to restore their confidence for the future development of Chinese national sport. Based on Zhao Yu’s statistical investigation, in some events in which the Chinese athletes achieved gold medals at the Los Angeles Olympic Games in 1984, the performance of athletes at the alternative Friendship Games staged by the Soviet Union were better than that of the 1984 Olympic Games. Therefore, he concluded, if the Soviet Union and Eastern bloc countries had competed in Los Angeles, the amount of the gold medals the Chinese athletes could achieve would be far less than what they actually got at the time (Appendix X). However, in 1984, few people in China realized the difference and doubted the great breakthrough that the Chinese athletes had achieved. The whole country was excited and encouraged by the brilliant achievement of Chinese national sport. The national glory kindled by the breakthrough in the Olympic Games filled the country with a clear sense of national pride. As a milestone of Chinese national sport, the participation in the 1984 Los Angeles Olympic Games and the breakthrough the Chinese athletes made deeply influenced the Chinese people and intensified the confidence on their way to build up their country, which was more significant than its other meanings and effects.

Comparing the facts of the PRC’s participation in the Olympic Games between 1980 and 1984, there were different international environments, different domestic realities, different motives, and different decisions. However, the purposes of the PRC’s two decisions were clearly political and served its national interests, despite the fact the two decisions were completely opposite. The PRC made the different decisions depending on what social realities they were facing at different periods. These decisions
were consistent with the theoretical construct of social existence derived from Historical Materialism, which identified that social existence of human beings determined their social consciousness; in turn, social consciousness would determine behaviours, actions, and decisions of human beings. The Soviet invasion of Afghanistan further threatened the PRC's national security pushing the PRC to the position expressed by the USA in order to protect itself. The decision of the boycott in 1980 was caused by the political situation surrounding the PRC at the time. Four years later, the PRC needed a peaceful international environment and trusted relationship with Western countries to assist its domestic economic development. Thus, the decision of the participation in 1984 was caused by the PRC's desire for a positive image and recognition in the world. The different actualities between 1980 and 1984 led to the PRC's two decisions. Therefore, it is argued that the findings throughout this research supported the theoretical construct of social existence.

The Response to the Research Questions

The research question stated in Chapter One was the original motive for this research endeavour; and to provide a contextual understanding of the topic while supporting the conclusions, four sub-questions were developed. Throughout the entirety of this document, these questions were answered by the researcher. In the following section, the response to the questions is listed based on both the literature reviewed and the findings discussed above.

With regard to the first two sub-questions, Sino-Soviet relations and Sino-US relations between the 1950s and 1970s, opposite paths of development for the two were
shown. As the first country in the world to establish a diplomatic relationship with the PRC, the Soviet Union provided the new regime with significant assistance during the first half of the 1950s. The alliance between the two countries was built at the same time. During the second half of the 1950s, different opinions on ideological level appeared between the two countries. Later, controversies on both domestic and international strategies developed. During the second half of the 1960s, these controversies and the emerging disagreement between the two governments evolved into criticism and confrontation. At the end of the 1960s, the Sino-Soviet border clashes broke out. Both countries intensified their military outposts on the border during the beginning of the 1970s. The tense and hostile bilateral relations lasted throughout the 1970s. On the other side, given the military confrontations throughout the Korean War between 1950 and 1953, both the USA and the PRC saw each other as enemies. Bilateral relations between the two countries did not develop until the second half of the 1950s. Although both sides engaged in dialogue and maintained basic channels of communication, the Taiwan Strait issue remained an obstacle between the two governments. Sino-US relations did not have a breakthrough until the beginning of the 1970s. Following the PRC returning to the UN in 1971, the bilateral relationships between the PRC and the USA improved significantly. Both governmental and non-official communications between the two countries increased during the 1970s. In 1979, the two countries established diplomatic relations and spent one year accomplishing the normalization of multi-dimensions. Therefore, between the 1950s and 1970s, in summary, the Soviet Union and the PRC shifted their relationship from friends to enemies, while the USA and the PRC shifted their relationship from
enemies to friends, though the term “friends” here is replete with political purposes and national interests.

With regard to the third sub-question, there were several factors that affected the two decisions regarding the participation in the Olympic Games between 1980 and 1984. The Soviet invasion of Afghanistan was the most significant factor that resulted in the PRC’s decision to boycott the Games in 1980. The invasion seriously threatened the PRC’s national security by besieging the PRC along its west border, while the Soviet military forces had already threatened its north and south border during the 1970s. The PRC had to merge its interests with those of other countries to resist Soviet expansion. Thus, the PRC grasped the opportunity of the boycott in 1980 to associate with the USA and most other Western countries against the Soviet Union. In addition, between 1980 and 1984, the significant domestic reforms in various areas happened throughout China. Rather than political struggles, economic reconstruction was put in the center of the country’s tasks. All other tasks were to serve this central task at the time, and international relations and national sport were no exception. The PRC shifted its foreign policies based on the mutually beneficial principle in order to create a peaceful and cooperative environment that was beneficial to its domestic economic development. Moreover, the PRC improved its national sport performance as quickly as possible to win in international events so that it could gain a positive image and national glory thereby encouraging the Chinese people to reconstruct their country with more confidence.

With regard to the forth sub-question, according to the interviews, both the Chinese sport officials and Chinese sport scholars stated that neither the GASC nor the COC made the decisions regarding the participations in the two Olympic Games.
Although the interviewees did not provide detailed information about the decision-maker(s), all of them believed that the decision of the boycott of the Moscow Olympic Games was made by the PRC government and the Ministry of Foreign Affair in January 1980; the decision to participate in the 1984 Los Angeles Olympic Games was made by the same decision-maker(s) as early as March 1982. Due to the fact that the archives of Chinese national sport in the GASC and the Ministry of Foreign Affair of the PRC are not open to either the public or academic use, more detailed information about the decision making procedure was not available to the researcher.

Therefore, with regard to the research question, based on the responses of the four sub-questions, five primary reasons have been identified to explain why the PRC choose the 1984 Los Angeles Olympic Games instead of the 1980 Moscow Olympic Games as the debut of the Chinese athletes on the global sport stage: (1) the deteriorated Sino-Soviet bilateral relations in the 1970s; (2) the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan in 1979; (3) the increasing improvement of Sino-US bilateral relations at the beginning of the 1980s; (4) the peaceful and cooperative international environment the PRC needed for its economic reform and reconstruction beginning in the early 1980s; and (5) the achievements at the Olympic Games the PRC needed to attain a positive international image and national glory.

The Discussion regarding the Hypotheses

Based on an initial review of the literature and in response to the research questions provided prior to the investigation, the researcher stated three main hypotheses (Chapter One). Following the discussion of the findings and the response to the research
questions above, it is argued that H1 is the first item of the primary reasons noted above to explain the research question and H2 is the third item noted above (p.146). Therefore, H1 and H2 are fully supported and confirmed by the findings.

With regard to H3, throughout the whole investigation, there was insufficient evidence to confirm the hypothesis. Although Chinese athletes’ overall performance was low following their reinstatement by the IOC in 1979, the evidence is not sufficient to prove that the PRC decided not to send athletes to the 1980 Moscow Olympic Games because they did not want to risk a poor performance in 1980. According to Wu Shouzhang, the Chinese sport administration and Chinese athletes started to prepare for the 1980 Olympic Games immediately after their reinstatement; thus, he argues, it was impossible that the boycott was because of the concern of the poor athletic performance.\textsuperscript{33} Wang Dinghua also stated that the boycott of the Moscow Olympic Games was not about sport but national politics.\textsuperscript{34} He denied the government’s concern regarding the low level performance [in 1980].\textsuperscript{35} Pei Dongguang indicated that if the hypothesis was correct, it would not be consistent with the PRC’s experience at the Olympic Games in the 1950s.\textsuperscript{36} At the 1952 Helsinki Olympic Games, Chinese athletes arrived at Finland when the Games were almost over. PRC Premier Zhou Enlai expressed that the most important thing was to hoist the PRC’s flag in Helsinki. Thus, showing the PRC’s political status in the Olympic Games was more significant than showing its athletic performance at the time. In addition, Chinese athletes had never achieved any medals at the Olympic Games prior to 1980; and the Olympic Strategy had not been clarified as the top goal of Chinese national sport at the time. Therefore, in 1980, the PRC did not care about the excellence of athletic performance, which was a significant
concern in 1984. Furthermore, the researcher did not find any written evidence expressing the PRC’s concern about poor athletic performance at the 1980 Olympic Games that potentially influenced the decision of the boycott in 1980. Therefore, H3 is not confirmed by the findings.

Final Thoughts

Politics adversely affected the International Olympic Movement at the beginning of the 1980s. In addition to the PRC’s boycott, the USA’s boycott in 1980 and the Soviet Union’s retaliatory boycott in 1984 breached the Olympic Movement’s philosophy at the time. The three countries’ governments took advantage of the Olympic Games to attain their different national interests. They showed little concern for sport, the athletes, and the Olympic Games, which were each used as political weapons. In these three countries, national interests had the highest priority, and sport could be sacrificed whenever necessary.

Therefore, from purely a political perspective, the decisions made by PRC were correct. In 1980, the PRC’s boycott expressed its standpoint that was consistent with the US government thereby capitalizing on an opportunity to quickly improve their relationships with the USA. Meanwhile, by boycotting the Moscow Olympic Games, the PRC condemned the Soviet expansionism and protected its national security with more support from both the USA and Western countries. In 1984, the PRC’s participation created a more supportive and cooperative international environment for its domestic economic development. Moreover, it was a perfect opportunity to achieve its goals because of absence of the athletes from the Soviet-bloc. The Chinese athletes won more
gold medals and significantly intensified the national glory and confidence of both the Chinese people and the PRC government.

On the other hand, from a sport perspective, the decision to boycott the Olympic Games was wrong. After only three months of recognition by the IOC, the PRC chose to boycott the Olympic Games. No matter how many reasons they stated to justify the boycott, they lacked the basic respect due the Olympic Movement and the Olympic spirit. Furthermore, due to the boycott, Chinese athletes as well as those who could not compete in the Olympic Games once again became the victims of an international political struggle. The athletes’ expression of sportsmanship was submerged by the continuous political conflicts and confrontations during the period.

Future Research

A number of areas for future study presented themselves throughout this research. Given the limited literature in respect to the development of Chinese national sport during this period and the decision-making process related to these two Olympic Games has developed, further research on these topics is necessary. The partial reason for the lack of study on Chinese national sport during this period is that both western and Chinese scholars have limited access to the materials and references for this period. Furthermore, it is clear that the existing knowledge and information base for this topic is limited. Beyond these limitations, certain important questions remain unanswered, which are in need of further investigation. For example, who was (were) the real decision maker(s) of the boycott in 1980? Given that the situations at the time were complicated, what was (were) the major factor(s) that resulted in the final decision in 1980? Given the fact that
Li Menghua was criticized due to the speech he made in Japan in January 1980 regarding the attitude of the PRC’s participation, when was the decision made in 1980? What was the procedure of the decision-making? Since there was no hard evidence throughout the whole investigation, was the concern of the poor athletic performance a factor that resulted in the boycott decision in 1980? All these questions should be answered in future research as, or if, more archives of Chinese national sport are open to the public.

This study concentrated on the political factors, especially those related to Sino-Soviet and Sino-US relations, which affected the PRC’s decisions on both the 1980 and 1984 Olympic Games as well as the development of Chinese national sport between 1980 and 1984. The period also saw the critical economic reform and readjustment throughout the PRC. The economic shift at the time deeply influenced the PRC political structure, Chinese society, and the Chinese people. There were also numerous significant events in the economic domain that influenced the development of sport in the PRC. Therefore, future research will be needed to take into account the economic factors during the period, which are also significant.

Between 1980 and 1984, the GASC carried out a series of reforms, readjustment, and rearrangement for the future development of Chinese national sport. These efforts did work at the time, as the Chinese athletes’ performance improved quickly. Because of the excellent achievement in the 1984 Olympic Games, the GASC then determined to maintain these new policies and rules. However, the further development of Chinese national sport proved that the reforms had their limitations and, to some degree, could not meet the emerging requirements in the sport domain. Future research will need to compare the differences between the development of Chinese national sport during the
period prior to the 1984 Olympic Games and the period following it thereby explaining why the reforms made between 1980 and 1984 had their limitations.
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**APPENDIX I**

*Summary of the PRC's Athletic Achievement in the Olympic Games since 1984*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Venue</th>
<th>Athletes</th>
<th>Gold</th>
<th>Silver</th>
<th>Bronze</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1984</td>
<td>23rd</td>
<td>Los Angeles (USA)</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988</td>
<td>24th</td>
<td>Seoul (South Korea)</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>25th</td>
<td>Barcelona (Spain)</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>26th</td>
<td>Atlanta (USA)</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>27th</td>
<td>Sydney (Australia)</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>28th</td>
<td>Athens (Greece)</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>29th</td>
<td>Beijing (PRC)</td>
<td>639</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>106</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX II

Achievement Comparison between Japan and the Two Superpowers between 1960 and 1976.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Host</th>
<th>Nation</th>
<th>Gold</th>
<th>Silver</th>
<th>Bronze</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1960 Rome</td>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>Soviet Union</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1964 Japan</td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>Soviet Union</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1968 Mexico</td>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>Soviet Union</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972 Munich</td>
<td>Munich</td>
<td>Soviet Union</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976 Montreal</td>
<td>Montreal</td>
<td>Soviet Union</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX III

List of Planned Interviewees

Cui Lequan: General Secretary of the Chinese Society of Sport History

He Zhengling: COC president (1989-1994), member of the IOC (unavailable)

Li Menghua: COC president (1986-1988) ( unavailable )

Lu Shengrong: Member of the IOC ( unavailable )

Pei Dongguang: Professor of Olympic Studies at the Beijing Capital Institute of Physical Education

Wang Dinghua: Senior secretary of the GASC

Wei Jizhong: Vice president of the COC ( unavailable )

Wu Shouzhang: Vice president of the COC
APPENDIX IV

Interview Questionnaire (English Version)

Return of the Eastern Giant: An Investigation of the Participation of the People’s Republic of China in the 1980 and 1984 Olympic Games

A research study in partial fulfillment of a Masters Degree in Human Kinetics at the University of Windsor

Subject Profile:

Name: _______________________________ Title: _______________________________
Address: _______________________________________________________________________
Telephone #: (____) ___________________________________________________________________
E-mail Address: ___________________________________________________________________
Interview Date: ___________ Time Started: ______ AM/PM Completed: ______ AM/PM

Briefing Paragraph:

What will follow is approximately a 1 hour interview. Please note that you have the right to refuse to answer any of the questions. As stated in previous communication, your confidentiality will not be guaranteed as it is your input and authority that this study relies on.

Briefing Checklist:
Right to Refuse
Informed

Please answer YES or NO to the following statements.

1. I ______________________ (subject name) consent to participate in this interview.
Signed Consent Received: ___________________________ Verbal Consent: ________________________
Yes No Yes No

2. I give consent for this interview to be audio recorded.
Consent to Audio Record: ____________________________
Yes No

3. I would like to review a transcription of this interview material.
Review of Transcript requested: ______________________
Yes No
Questionnaire Outline:

General Information

1. Why did the national sport policy of the PRC shift strategically during the 1970s?

   • Was the shift influenced externally by the international political situation?

   i. If yes, describe the international political environment at the time.
      Probe: Sino-Soviet Union relations
      Sino-US relations
      Relationship change between the IOC and the PRC

   • Was the shift influenced internally by the domestic social realities within China?

   i. If yes, describe the domestic environment at that time.
      Probe: End of the Culture Revolution
      Politics & Economics reform after Mao
      End of the “Gang of Four”

2. Describe the communications and competitions of Chinese national sport with other countries during the second half of the 1970s?

   • If you group the countries as “Western countries,” “Soviet Union and Eastern European countries,” and “Asian-African-Latin American countries,” which of these did Chinese national sport teams contact most frequently?

   i. Based on your response, do you think there is any difference from the facts prior to the 1970s?

   1. If yes, why were they different?

Reinstatement

3. Describe the preparation of the Chinese national sport for the COC’s reinstatement by the IOC in 1979?
4. Describe the major issues that Chinese national sport was facing when the Chinese Olympic Committee (COC) was recognized by the IOC in 1979?

5. To respond to the reinstatement, what were the decisions and resolutions regarding the Chinese national sport implemented to improve Chinese athletes’ performance?

6. How did the national sport policy change in China following the reinstatement in 1979?

The 1980 Olympic Games

7. Following the reinstatement in 1979, were there any long-term plans, goals, or strategies of participation in future Olympic Games including the 1980 Lake Placid Winter Olympic Games and the 1980 Moscow Olympic Games?

- If yes, describe it.
  Probe: When/Who made it

- If no, why?

8. Did the COC initially consider participation in the 1980 Moscow Olympic Games?

- If yes,
  i. What was the initial plan for the 1980 Moscow Olympic Games?
  ii. When did it make?
iii. Who were involved in this plan making?

iv. How did the COC and the Chinese athletes prepare for the Moscow Olympic Games?

- If no, what caused the absence?

9. What was the PRC's response when they heard the advocacy of the boycott of the Moscow Olympic Games led by the United States in the beginning of 1980?

10. Why did not the COC send delegation to the Moscow Olympic Games in 1980?

- What were the reasons that finally led to the decision?

- When was the decision made?

- How long did it take to make this decision?

- Who were involved in this decision-making?

- Were there any opposed opinions?

i. If yes, describe the situation

11. Describe the international responses especially from the IOC, the Soviet Union, and the United States following the non-participation decision was released by the COC?

12. Were there any potential relation between participation in the Lake Placid Winter Olympic Games and non-participation in the Moscow Olympic Games in 1980?
13. How did this decision affect the relationship between the PRC and the Soviet Union both in sport domain and political domain at that time?  
   Probe: Any event happened between two countries following the decision

14. How did this decision affect the relationship between the PRC and the United States both in sport domain and political domain at that time?  
   Probe: Any event happened between two countries following the decision

The 1984 Los Angeles Olympic Games

15. How did the national sport policy shift in China from 1980 to 1984?

   - What reforms regarding the Chinese national sport were implemented to improve athletes' performance during the period?

16. Describe the communications and competitions of Chinese national sport with other countries from 1980 to 1984?

   - If you group the countries as "Western countries," "Soviet Union and Eastern European countries," and "Asian-African-Latin American countries," which of these did Chinese national sport teams contact most frequently?

     i. Based on your response, do you think there is any difference from the facts prior to 1980?

17. In contrast to the international level, describe the sport performance level of the Chinese athletes prior to the 1984 Los Angeles Olympic Games?
18. What was the goal set for the Chinese athletes prior to the 1984 Los Angeles Olympic Games?

19. What was the COC's initial response when they heard the boycott of the Los Angeles Olympic Games led by the Soviet Unions and followed by most of socialist countries?

20. Despite most of the socialist countries boycotted the 1984 Los Angeles Olympic Games, the COC sent a 225-athlete contingent to compete, describe how the COC made this decision?

- What factors were considered?

- When was the decision made?

- How long did the decision made?

- Who were involved in this decision-making?

- Were there any opposed opinions?
  i. If yes, describe it.

Conclusion

21. Is there anything that relates to the development of Olympic Movement in China from 1980 to 1984 that you feel I did not touch on that you would care to comment on?
Thank you for your time. It is greatly appreciated.

(* * * If participant requested opportunity to review transcript, read the following * * *)

Over the next few weeks I will transcribe this interview and forward you a copy for your review and approval. Following completion of your review, please email or mail your approval, edits, comments, and any other information that you feel pertinent to this study.
APPENDIX V

Interview Questionnaire (Chinese Version)

巨人的回归: 关于中国参与1980年和1984年奥运会的调查报告

加拿大温莎大学人类运动学系体育管理专业硕士毕业论文

被采访人基本信息:
姓名: ___________________________ 职位: ___________________________
地址: __________________________________________________________________
电话: ( ) __________________________________________________________________
电子邮件 __________________________________________________________________
采访日期: ___________________________ 开始时间: __________ AM/PM 完成时间: __________ AM/PM

简要介绍:
以下是用时大约一小时的问卷采访。请注意：您有权拒绝回答如下任何一个问题。
本次采访的全部目的都是为了完成本论文的学术研究。

拒绝权声明
已经告知 拒绝权 □

请回答下列问题:
1. 我，_________________________（被采访人姓名），同意参加本次采访。
   书面同意: □ 口头同意: □
   是 □ 否 □ 是 □ 否 □

2. 我同意本次采访可以被录音。
   同意录音?: 是 □ 否 □

3. 我要得到本次采访结果的整理副本。
   需要副本?: 是 □ 否 □
问卷提纲:

基本信息

1. 我国国家体育政策在70年代做了哪些战略性调整？

2. 我国国家体育政策为何在70年代做出调整？

   a. 这些调整是否受到国际政治局势的影响？

      i. 若是，请描述当时的国际政治环境。

         请着重在：中苏关系，中美关系，
         以及我国与国际奥委会的关系变化

   b. 这些调整是否受到国内社会现状和变化的影响？

      i. 若是，请描述当时的国内环境。

         请着重在：文革结束，粉碎四人帮，改革开放

3. 请谈谈70年代后半期我国的国际体育交流情况？

   a. 假如我们把与我国有体育交流的国家分类为欧美国家，苏联，东欧国家，及亚非拉国家，请您谈谈我们和哪些国家的体育交往最密切？

      i. 根据你的介绍，您认为当时的情况与70年代以前的情况是否一致？
1. 若不是，为什么会有这些差别？

关于恢复国际奥委会席位

4. 请谈谈我国体育界为此做了哪些准备？
   着重点：国家体育系统的组织结构，高水平体育人才培训系统，国际关系

5. 请您介绍在回国回国际奥委会前后，我国体育面临的主要问题？

6. 请您介绍在回国回国际奥委会后，为提高我国运动员的竞技水平，体育界做了哪些改革？

7. 请您介绍在回国回国际奥委会后，国家体育政策是如何改变的？

80年奥运会

8. 请您介绍在回国回国际奥委会后，我国有没有设定国家体育的近期计划和长期战略规划，以及参与莫斯科夏季和普莱西德湖冬季奥运会的计划？
   a. 若有，请简要介绍。
      (何时，哪些部门和人员参与制定)

   • 若没有，请谈谈原因
9. 中国奥委会最初是否准备参加莫斯科奥运会？

a. 若是，
   i. 最初的参加计划是什么？
   ii. 此计划是何时制定的？
   iii. 哪些部门和个人参与了这项计划的制定？
   iv. 中国奥委会以及我国运动员是如何为此作准备的？

b. 若没有，原因又是什么？

10. 获悉美国号召抵制莫斯科奥运会后，我国作出反应的过程是怎样的？

11. 为什么我国最终没有派体育代表团前往莫斯科？

a. 什么是导致我国没有参加的主要原因？

b. 决策是什么时候制定的？

c. 作出此项决策用了多少时间？

d. 哪些部门和个人参与了决策的制定？
e. 决策制定期间，有反对的意见吗？

i. 若有，请简单介绍当时的情况和决策过程

12. 请简要介绍我国作出不参加的决定后国际上对此的反应，尤其是国际奥委会，苏联，以及美国？

13. 在参加普拉西德湖冬奥会和不参加莫斯科奥运会的决定之间有潜在的联系吗？

a. 若有，请简要介绍

14. 在体育领域以及政治领域，不参加的决定在当时是如何影响我国和苏联的关系的？

（决策公布后，苏联方面如何表态和作为）

15. 在体育领域以及政治领域，不参加的决定在当时是如何影响我国和美国的关系的？（决策公布后，美国方面如何表态和作为）

84 年洛杉矶奥运会

16. 在 80 年到 84 年期间我国国家体育政策有了哪些变革？

a. 具体讲，我国施行了哪些改革措施来提高我国运动员的竞技水平？

17. 请介绍在 80 年到 84 年间我国国际体育交流情况？
a. 假如我们把与我国有体育交流的国家分为欧美国家，苏联，东欧国家，及亚非拉国家，请您谈谈在此期间我们和哪些国家的体育交往最密切？

i. 您认为此阶段的交流情况是否与 70 年代有所不同？

1. 若有，区别是什么？

18. 与同期国际水平相比，您认为我国运动员的水平在 80 年代初期是怎样的？

19. 84 年奥运会前，我国为运动员制定的具体目标是什么？

20. 获悉苏联及一些东欧社会主义国家决定不参加 84 年洛杉矶奥运会后，我国作出了怎样的反应？

21. 尽管多数社会主义国家没有参加 84 年洛杉矶奥运会，我国还是派出了 225 名运动员组成的代表团，请介绍这样的决策是如何作出的？

a. 作出决策时考虑到了什么因素？

b. 决策是什么时候制定的？

c. 作出此项决策用了多少时间？
d. 哪些部门和个人参与了决策的制定？

e. 决策制定期间，有反对的意见吗？

i. 若有，请简单介绍当时的情况和决策过程

结论

22. 请问在您看来，是否有些关于此时期的我国奥运发展和竞技体育的重要内容，在以上问题中没有涉及？能否予以补充？

非常感谢您珍贵的信息和积极的配合！

(** 对于需要采访内容副本的受访者，请参阅以下内容 **)

所有本次采访内容，我将在未来几周内整理归纳，之后将用电子邮件形式反馈给您，以求得您的批准意见和使用授权。再次感谢您的合作！
## APPENDIX VI

**Comparison of Performance in Track and Field between Chinese Top Level and World Top Level (1980)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100m</td>
<td><strong>China</strong> 10&quot;53</td>
<td><strong>World</strong> 9&quot;95</td>
<td><strong>Difference</strong> 0&quot;58</td>
<td><strong>China</strong> 11&quot;89</td>
<td><strong>World</strong> 10&quot;87</td>
<td><strong>Difference</strong> 1&quot;02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200m</td>
<td>21&quot;3</td>
<td>19&quot;72</td>
<td>1&quot;58</td>
<td>24&quot;41</td>
<td>21&quot;71</td>
<td>2&quot;7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>400m</td>
<td>47&quot;94</td>
<td>43&quot;86</td>
<td>4&quot;07</td>
<td>55&quot;08</td>
<td>48&quot;6</td>
<td>6&quot;48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>800m</td>
<td>1'49&quot;9'9'9</td>
<td>1'42&quot;4'4</td>
<td>7&quot;5</td>
<td>2'6&quot;6</td>
<td>1'53&quot;3'3</td>
<td>13&quot;1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1500m</td>
<td>3'46&quot;2</td>
<td>3'31&quot;4</td>
<td>14&quot;8</td>
<td>4'22&quot;4</td>
<td>3'55&quot;</td>
<td>27&quot;4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3000m</td>
<td>8'14&quot;9</td>
<td>7'32&quot;1</td>
<td>42&quot;8</td>
<td>9'25&quot;2</td>
<td>8'32&quot;1</td>
<td>53&quot;1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5000m</td>
<td>14'03&quot;2</td>
<td>13'08&quot;4</td>
<td>54&quot;8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marathon</td>
<td>2:16'57&quot;4</td>
<td>2:22'24&quot;</td>
<td>14'33&quot;4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110m (M)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110m (F) Hurdle</td>
<td>14&quot;10</td>
<td>13&quot;</td>
<td>1&quot;10</td>
<td>13&quot;68</td>
<td>12&quot;36</td>
<td>1&quot;32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>400m Hurdle</td>
<td>51&quot;36</td>
<td>47&quot;13</td>
<td>4&quot;23</td>
<td>59&quot;33</td>
<td>54&quot;28</td>
<td>5&quot;05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3000m Steeplechase</td>
<td>8'47&quot;1</td>
<td>8'05&quot;4</td>
<td>41&quot;7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Jump</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>1.92</td>
<td>2.01</td>
<td>0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long Jump</td>
<td>7.95</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>6.64</td>
<td>7.09</td>
<td>0.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Triple Jump</td>
<td>17.02</td>
<td>17.89</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pole Vault</td>
<td>5.43</td>
<td>5.79</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shot Put</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>22.15</td>
<td>4.55</td>
<td>17.74</td>
<td>22.45</td>
<td>4.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discus</td>
<td>57.58</td>
<td>71.16</td>
<td>13.58</td>
<td>61.8</td>
<td>71.8</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Javelin</td>
<td>89.14</td>
<td>96.7</td>
<td>7.56</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>69.96</td>
<td>10.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hammer Throw</td>
<td>65.9</td>
<td>81.8</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decathlon</td>
<td>7313</td>
<td>8649</td>
<td>1336</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pentathlon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4248</td>
<td>5083</td>
<td>835</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data Source:  
APPENDIX VII
Chronology of Major Events during the Economic Readjustment, 1980-84

1980

January: Decision to raise wages of workers and staff.
February: Sino-America Agreement on Trade Relations signed.
April: Li Renjun reports on the economic plan for 1980.
China joins the International Monetary Fund (IMF).
State Statistical Bureau Communiqué on 1980.
May: China joins the World Bank.
August: Adoption of Regulations for the Guangdong Special Economic Zones (SEZ).
Work Conference on employment.
(Reports 17 billion yuan deficit.)
Yao Yilin reports on economic results in 1979 and plans for 1980 and 1981.
Zhao Ziyang assumes premiership.
September: Tax Laws for joint ventures promulgated.
State Council Communiqué on improving the Agricultural Responsibility Scheme.
December: Interim Regulations on foreign exchange control published.

1981

January: A new internal exchange rate adopted allowing enterprises to convert foreign exchange at a higher rate than the official rate.
Further attempt to suspend Japanese contracts valued at US$2.6 billion.
February: Yao Yilin announces a second, drastic stage in the Readjustment with a new plan for 1981 that involved a 40 per cent reduction in investment.
March: IMF provides 4-5 billion SDR loan to support the Readjustment.
State Planning Committee Report on diversifying the economy.
April: IMF provides a further US$381 million loan for balance of payments support.
Chen Yun's Instruction that plan and market regulation be combined and reformulated to make "plan the core, and markets the supplement."
Recentralization of control over exports by Ministry of Foreign Trade.
July: Regulations to democratize enterprise organization.
September: Minister of Foreign Trade Li Jiang sacked.
October: New package of Japanese financial support to solve problems arising from project cancellations.
December: Zhao Ziyang announces extension of the Readjustment period for five years beyond 1981, and his principles for future economic development in China.

1982

January: Publication of Regulations governing joint off-shore oil exploration and development.
February: Campaign to popularize rural responsibility systems.

China International Trust and Investment Corporation (CITIC) announces policy of seeking external funds for investment in renovation.

Campaign against economic crimes begins.


April: Campaign to popularize rural responsibility systems.

China International Trust and Investment Corporation (CITIC) announces policy of seeking external funds for investment in renovation.

Campaign against economic crimes begins.


April: Wang Bingqian reports on estimates for 1982 budget.

May: Zhao Ziyang visits Japan.

June: Wan Li affirms the three principles for conducting international economic relations.

July: Third national population census begins.

1983

January: CCP Central Committee's "Document No. 1, 1983" on all aspects of rural policy circulated to cadres.

March: MOFERT sends representatives to Guangzhou, Shanghai, Dalian and Tianjin to strengthen central supervision.

April: SSB Communiqué for 1982.

Ministry of Finance announces new tax rules to encourage joint ventures.

CCP Central Committee's "Document No. 1, 1983" published.


Yao Yilin reports on the 1982 economic plan and targets for 1983.

July: State Council approves new rules for foreign exchange control affecting joint and foreign enterprises.

September: Revision of joint venture income tax rules to encourage investment.

October: Western diplomats report estimates of 4,000 executions in China in two months for economic and other crimes.

November: U.S. 3M Corporation allowed to establish the first wholly foreign-owned subsidiary in China.

1984

January: CCP Central Committee's "Document No. 1, 1984" on rural policy circulated to cadres.

March: U.S. and China agree on double taxation rules.

May: Song Ping reports on the economic plan for 1983 and the targets for 1984.


Zhao Ziyang's Report on Government Work calls for continuing reforms in enterprise reorganization, planning and foreign trade.

June: Central Committee publishes "Document No. 1, 1984."

Data Source: The China Quarterly, no. 100 (December 1984), pp. vi-viii.
APPENDIX VIII

A Chronology of Major Events of China Sport, 1980-84

1980

January: National sport working conference was held in Beijing. The main points of the conference were on adapting the shift of national economics and new era following the participation in the Olympic Games, improving of Chinese national sport as well as people’s general health, and making the sport serving the four modernization.

*Football World* was published by Chinese Football Association.

February: Chinese sport delegation attended the 13th Winter Olympic Games held at Lake Placid, NY, USA. This was the debut of Chinese athletes at the Winter Olympic Games.

April: COC announced that the Chinese athletes would not participate in the Moscow Olympic Games.

GASC, Ministry of Financial, Ministry of Labor, and Ministry of Culture issued the notice on the utilization of sport facilities.

June: GASC held a conference discussing theories of sport.

1981

February: GASC held the working conference for provincial and autonomous regional sport directors.

Chinese university athletes participated in the 10th Winter Universiade held at Spain.

March: IOC announced that Taiwan Olympic Committee agreed to change the title to Chinese Taipei Olympic Committee.

June: Chinese athletes won 11 gold medals at Asian Athletic Championship.

July: Chinese university athletes participated in the 11th Summer Universiade held at Romania.

August: GASC held a propaganda conference at Qin Huang Dao.

September: National minority sport conference was held at Beijing.

*Sport Science* was established.
October: GASC and COC held a conference at Beijing regarding the sport communications between Taiwan and China.

1982
January: Encyclopedia of China: Sport was issued

March: Sport division of National Committee of Chinese People’s Political Consultative Conference was established and had the first meeting; Director’s name was Gaotang Rong.

April: GASC issued a notice: developing track and field throughout the country.

June: GASC held a conference of Sport directors of Province, City, and Autonomous Region.

July: China Sport Science Society held a conference at Yantai.

Chinese Journal of Sports Medicine was established.

August: GASC issued National Sport and Exercise Guidelines with the permission from State Council.

November: GASC, Ministry of Culture, and Chinese Communist Youth League held a nation rural sport conference.

Chinese Sport delegation attended the 9th Asian Games at India, with 144 member nations attended, and finished with the first position.

1983
February: GASC held a national sport conference at Beijing.

April: National Senior Sport Association was established.

May: International table tennis association held a conference at Tokyo and accepted Chinese Taibei table tennis association as a member.

GASC issued a notice: advice for further improving school sport.

June: National sport antique held a conference at Zhengzhou, Henan province.

September: Samaranch, President of the IOC, awarded an Olympic silver medal to Gaotang Rong.

October: Members and athlete representatives of Disability Sports in China held a conference in Tianjin and established the Chinese Association of Disability Sports in.
**1984**

*January:* GASC held a working conference for sport directors from provinces, city, and autonomous regions.

*March:* GASC announced that Feather ball, a Chinese traditional sport, became an official sport event.

GASC announced a notice regarding the regulations for sport news in the media.

*June:* GASC, All China Federation of Trade Unions, Chinese Communist Youth League, State of Women Association, and PLA held a conference and issued a notice regarding the development of mass swimming activity.

*July:* The State Council approved that National Youth Sport Games would be held every four years.

Chinese Sport delegation won 15 golden medals, 8 silver medals, and 9 bronze medals at the 23rd Olympic Games and won the fourth position on the tally.

*August:* GASC issued a notice on reducing the violations in the stadiums.

GASC held a conference regarding the national sport strategies and reformations.

*October:* The PRC government announced a notice on further development of sport.

*China Fishing* was established

*December:* GASC revised the National Record Monitoring System and The Athletes Grades System and planned to implement on Jan 1st 1985.

---

Data Sources:
APPENDIX IX

Achievement of Chinese National Sport, 1980-1984

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>International Competitions</th>
<th>Gold Medals Achieved</th>
<th>World Champions</th>
<th>World Records</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1982</td>
<td>30¹</td>
<td>415</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1983</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1984</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data Source:

*China’s Sport Year Book, 1985*, eds., Policy Research Department of the GASC, pp. 188-190.

n/a: data is not available

¹ The amount of international competitions for 1982 is an approximate value, based on director of the GASC, Li Menghua’s Speech at 1982 National Sport Working Conference.
APPENDIX X

Comparison of the Performance between the Chinese Winners at Los Angeles Olympic Games and the Winners at the Friendship Games in Moscow (1984)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chinese Olympians</th>
<th>Events</th>
<th>Records</th>
<th>Records of Friendship Games at the same events</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Zhou Jihong</td>
<td>Women's 10 m Diving</td>
<td>435.51 pts</td>
<td>483.18 pts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Li Ning</td>
<td>Men's Floor Exercise</td>
<td>19.925 pts</td>
<td>Lower</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Li Ning</td>
<td>Pommel Horse</td>
<td>19.950 pts</td>
<td>Lower</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Li Ning</td>
<td>Still Rings</td>
<td>19.850 pts</td>
<td>19.975 pts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lou Yun</td>
<td>Men's Vault</td>
<td>19.950 pts</td>
<td>Lower</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ma Yanhong</td>
<td>Uneven Bars</td>
<td>19.950 pts</td>
<td>20 pts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volleyball</td>
<td>Women's team</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Li Yuwei</td>
<td>Men's 50 m Running</td>
<td>587</td>
<td>592</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Target</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xu Haifeng</td>
<td>Men's 50 m Pistol</td>
<td>566</td>
<td>578</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wu Xiaoxuan</td>
<td>Women's 50 m Standard Rifle</td>
<td>581</td>
<td>583</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zeng Guoqiang</td>
<td>Men's 52 kg Class</td>
<td>235 kg</td>
<td>252.5 kg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Weightlifting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wu Shude</td>
<td>Men's 56 kg Class</td>
<td>267.5 kg</td>
<td>297.5 kg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chen Weiqiang</td>
<td>Men's 60 kg Class</td>
<td>285.5 kg</td>
<td>322.5 kg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yao Jingyuan</td>
<td>Men's 67.5 kg Class</td>
<td>320 kg</td>
<td>337.5 kg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luan Jujie</td>
<td>Women's Foil Fencing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data source:
1. The Official Website of the Chinese Olympic Committee
APPENDIX XI

List of the Planned Archival Sources

1. Beijing Capital Library
2. Beijing National Library
3. The Library in Beijing Sport University
4. The Chinese National Sport Archives in the General Administration of Sport of China (Located at China National Sport Museum) (Archives cannot be accessed)
5. The States Archives Administration of the People’s Republic of China (Archives cannot be accessed)
6. The Los Angeles Amateur Athletic Foundation (http://www.aafla.org)
7. The Chinese Olympic Committee Archives (Archives cannot be accessed)
8. The Library at Beijing Capital Institute of Physical Education
9. The Information Center at the General Administration of Sport of China
10. The Library at the China Sport Publications Corporation
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