

May 2016

Making a Difference: The Role of Global Sports Organizations

Shirmeen Ahmad
Eastern Illinois University

Follow this and additional works at: <http://thekeep.eiu.edu/eiupsr>

 Part of the [International Relations Commons](#), and the [Sports Sciences Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Ahmad, Shirmeen (2016) "Making a Difference: The Role of Global Sports Organizations," *The Eastern Illinois University Political Science Review*: Vol. 5 : Iss. 1 , Article 1.
Available at: <http://thekeep.eiu.edu/eiupsr/vol5/iss1/1>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by The Keep. It has been accepted for inclusion in The Eastern Illinois University Political Science Review by an authorized editor of The Keep. For more information, please contact tabruns@eiu.edu.

Making a Difference: The Role of Global Sports Organizations

Departmental Honors Thesis

By: Shirmeen Ahmad

Mentored By: Dr. Ryan Hendrickson

May 2016

Chapter 1:

Introduction: The Studied Literature of Global Sports Organizations, Current Theories, and Methods of Research

Global Sports Organizations provide more than just entertainment for millions of people around the world. Through the twentieth century and on, international sports have become intertwined with the politics of different states so that they not only represent their country as an athletic team, but act as international political actors also.

Much research has been done on these global sports organizations dealing with their purposes, agendas and effects. Positives and negatives of international sports as a whole and also as separate organizations are brought to light in different studies. The literature review will first focus on what has been found by other researchers on global sports organizations and then move into the International Olympic Committee (IOC) and the Fédération Internationale de Football Association (FIFA).

One of the reasons that sport has become so large is because of the amount of media attention it receives. Some research discovered the impact media has on sport and the importance of the close relationship between the two. Sport has been documented through many different mediums such as the radio, television, and written publications, and because of all this media a sport culture has been developed, whether it be in states that have developing economies or in states with advanced capitalistic economies. Either way, media is what dominates how the games and athletes are looked at in society. Boyle and Haynes (2009) argue that in recent decades this relationship has become an even tighter one. It has become completely interwoven so that major sporting events are now also being connected with business and politics. Rowe (2011) argues

that sport would not be as big as it is today if it were not for the media that has offered more globalization through its coverage, content, and the new technologies it uses that have led to new sport audiences.

Along with the media, others argue that commercialization is a big factor within any of the major international sporting events and has heightened their fame. The twentieth century is when this culture became apparent and commercial corporations gained access to a unique global culture that came about with the mega-events that are the major sporting events. Sponsorships, celebrity sports stars, and the broadcasting of sport to the world has made those companies thrive. The sports organizations themselves have gained authority even though they are private organizations but are now seen as monopolies that generate lots of revenue. Nauright and Ramfjord (2010) have written about countries themselves becoming international investors in different teams and influencing them with their marketing strategies and management. To many researchers, this is what the competitions are about now (Smart 2006, Forster 2006).

There is a disagreement among authors when it comes to how positive an influence global sports organizations have on modern social issues. Levermore (2008) says when everything else is failing, sport has been doing a good job of carrying out initiatives around the world. It is taking strides that other initiatives and plans have been unable to achieve. Some researchers argue this is true and focus on how sports is conquering social issues such as crime, health, violence, poverty, social inequality, human rights issues, and more. Countries want to accept that sports are doing good in the world and utilize them to continue on with the strides the organizations are starting to make with the belief that they can only make more progress, which others similarly argue (Jarvie 2013, Adams and Piekarczyk 2015).

The United Nations has joined in with these advancements by creating an advisor position in 2001 who works with the secretary-general. The UN in general has been contributing to the impact international sports are having by creating legislation and policies dealing with the global sports organizations (Beutler 2008). One of the ways they are working with them is through their 'Sport for Development and Peace' initiative. According to Darnell (2010) the ideology behind the initiative is that sport can be used as a development tool among states. However, what researchers who are focusing solely on this initiative have found is that it seems to be lacking on what it is trying to do and its overall effect (Lyras and Peachey 2011). Research shows that even with aid into low income and underdeveloped countries, there are still dangers, mostly because of the economic implication that comes with sport between the way commercialization seems to be taking over and how economic aid to social and human capital are failing. Coalter (2010) believes the United Nations is ignoring the negative impacts and contexts from this initiative, but it is vital that they do look for ways to bring solutions and aid to the areas that need it. Moreover, this group of researchers agrees that many people have the theory that sports are making a difference, but it is still yet to be seen (Kidd 2008).

But whether international sports are working or not, they are acting as foreign policy tools among states. Different national teams are acting as diplomats for the states as a whole. After World War I states started to see the potential sports had. The 1916 Olympic Games in Germany are a popular example used among many scholars highlighting this point, which was cancelled because of World War I. In 1936, Adolf Hitler wanted to make a point with his team and how powerful they were. There were some categories in which the United States beat them, but the German intention of the games was clear to all. The British also had to play with communist and fascist countries with different ideologies mingling. Governments have been

using sports as an instrument of diplomacy to spread their ideas around to one another and to have communication and negotiations during the games (Arnaud and Riordan 2013, Keys 2013).

What is missing in the literature is an analysis of governance inside the organizations—what areas and nations they have been communicating with, what their recent debates and votes have been about, and the policies they want to implement. Each organization has its own board and members that work to create the games and to make them even bigger mega-events each year, but more research is needed on these governing boards. Houlihan (2014), Hoye and Cuskelly (2007) have written about the make-up of the internal governing boards for various sports organizations by examining what their functions and policy processes from past years, but nothing has been done from right now to see what the recent activity among the boards and hot topic issues within them are, much of it is in historical context. These studies also show the opinions expressed by the organizations when it came to those historical events and whether they were on the same side of the nations or not, but it is still unknown how they function internally.

Research on the International Olympic Committee (IOC) shows more information on the policies the committee has been working with. One topic is anti-doping and how the IOC has tried to impose sanctions on doping through education, medical treatment, and also encouraging other organizations to enforce it. There was some progress with this at one point, but it started to stagnate (Hunt 2011, Verroken 2000). According to Baron et al. (2007), this policy has had no effect, instead athletes have found more ways to get around it and more powerful drugs to use. What is still questionable about this policy is what the organization is currently doing about the failures of their policy.

Another relevant issue today are policies regarding transgender and transsexual athletes. Lenskyj (2014) believes the attitude of the committee toward this issue is the same as Russian

President Vladimir Putin and Russia's attitude, meaning they are turning their back on it and not dealing with it. Glazer (2011) along with Cavanaugh and Sykes (2004) have agreed that there is still harassment and discriminations when it comes to these areas. Their research talks about what the implications have been on the committee's actions on this topic, but what they do not talk about is how the committee came up with certain decisions with these cases and what kinds of policies they are thinking about implementing because of it.

The Olympic committee has also attempted to look at environmental and sustainability aspects of their games. During the 2014 Winter Olympics in Russia, the IOC tried to mobilize a sustainability agenda but failed. When the winter games were hosted in Russia in 2014, the policies were ready to be acted upon but the governance arrangements were ineffective so they all fell short (Muller 2014). Many times, the weather has a big impact so the Olympic organizers need to make accommodations dealing with different factors such as transportation, the preparations of ceremonies, and the broadcasts as well as the environment itself to make sure they are not harming the area around them (Chappelet 2008, Ruttly et al. 2014). The organizers did leave a legacy years ago in the 1990s when they adopted some policies. At the Beijing Olympic Games, the IOC adopted some policies over traffic and saw that they did make a difference with the emissions coming from vehicles (Zhou et al. 2010).

But the question still remains as to what happened to those policies and agendas after those specific games were over and what the committee plans to do with them in the future. There are many areas where the IOC wants to intervene with its policies, but not much research can be found as to what social areas the members and the committee as a whole want to work with. The transgender issue is starting to be more and more relevant and there must be ways the IOC is trying to find all the solutions to the complaints people are presenting. An important part

to understanding those policies dealing with the diverse issues is to find out how the specifics of those policies were decided upon with the different issues each participating nation has.

Researchers have also concluded that many of the social changes the IOC tried to bring about failed. They have masked human rights abuses, did little to spur political change and have been controversial within the actual games and the relations they have with other governments (Hoberman 2008). Toohey (2008) researched the Sydney games in 2000 and found the games were more profitable for the elite sports themselves than in making any social impacts as was their intent. It just became additional tax costs to the people who went into the games. Any impact the 2000 games tried to make has been long gone.

Along with the failures, the Olympics games have become mega-events that have corruption attached to them. Because of the commercialization that follows the Olympics, the games have become bigger than they once were. Barney, Wenn, and Martyn (2002) have researched how the International Olympic Committee has gone from being in a bad financial state to becoming a “commercial leviathan.” The host state itself has now become the biggest entrepreneur to the point where it is hard to tell what is a public or private enterprise. During the 2014 Sochi games, the state had direct control over the companies so it was easy for them to control what those companies were doing and selling and the state made sure they all contributed to the “Russian greatness” (Muller 2011).

However, because of the revenue generated, countries actively compete to be the host city for the games so they can move on with redevelopment and infrastructure within their areas (Lenskyj 2008). Hill (1996) believes the games generate a lot of political interest because of how much a state can gain by hosting the games. He wonders if the games are necessary anymore. In the end, these cities want the power and the profits that come with the games. But this is what

researchers believe leads to corruption among the competitions. Along with all the commercialization, there has been a pro-Olympic bias in the media giving everyone only the great aspects of the Olympics and in the way host cities are chosen (Lenskyj 2000, Mason, Thibault, and Misener 2006).

Bribery scandals have also been a part of the IOC. One of the most prominent ones that many scholars have written more about is the 1998 scandal with the bid committee in Salt Lake City. Mallon (2000) says this scandal threatened the entire existence of the IOC. The main point the authors who have studied this scandal make is how the committee worked to create reforms after the incident and attain support from the media and the public in general (McKay, Hutchins, and Mikosza 2000, Wenn and Martyn 2006, McAloon 2011).

When looking at what research has been done over terrorism and the Olympics, the main topic that has been analyzed is security measures taken to prevent the possible terrorist threats and attacks that continue to exist. What has been a common theme among authors is most of the high profile threats are targeted at the Olympics. Two of the biggest threats were Black September against the Israeli team in the 1972 Munich games and the games in Atlanta in 1996. Some of the other attacks and threats that have been made are the 1986 games in Mexico. More recent ones are the 2010 Olympic sporting events in London, the 2008 events in Beijing and in Athens in 2004. All of these started with suicide bombings (Richards, Fussy, Silce 2010, Jennings 2012).

Researchers agree the attacks were easy to carry out because there was not a lot of security measures taken then. Recently, to counteract the possible terrorist threats and because there has been a lot of concern over them, the committee's organizers are working more under these high risk and political tensions. Unprecedented security measures are being taken, such as

the IOC asking NATO for help (Migdalovitz 2004). Some of those measures are at odds with the documents and practices usually used for governing modern states (Jennings 2013). There is a mixed call from the attendees also. Some are in favor of all the security measures while some feel all the measures do is provide distraction from the major sporting events (Taylor and Toohey 2007, Molnar 2015).

A lot more research can be found on the Fédération International de Football Association and in a variety of areas dealing with the global sports organizations. The amount of economic progress the World Cup brings into the host cities and countries has been explained by many people but with critiques. Specific case studies on the World Cup can be found explaining what the impact was overall for those games. In South Korea, tourism expanded and there was a big economic impact with the tourists who came specifically for the cup bringing in a lot of revenue. What Lee and Taylor (2005) questioned is whether the analysis and surveys were done right and what other kinds of methods can be used to find out more impacts with mega-events.

But even when the host city is hoping to gain not only a lot of money but also the ability to fix its infrastructure, create employment opportunities, and have any kind of tangible and intangible benefits, the impacts cannot be guaranteed. Much research has been done on the 2010 South Africa World Cup and it is seen that there was no significant impact on poverty reduction and even though the state's aim was to have big projects allowing for more foreign and domestic investments, South Africa along with other nations in the south are more weaker when it comes to developments than the north (Pillay and Bass 2008, Ferreira 2010, Steinbeck, Haferburg, Ley 2011). Similarly, Seitz (2012) examined the Brazilian football clubs and realized even though football is a major symbol in Brazil, the clubs are still struggling financially. He uses his article to examine why this is and how it can be improved. The main setbacks of commercialization are

misuse of European football, social and political role of football in Brazilian society, Brazilian business environment, and management of clubs and bodies.

The changes that did take place within the nations for the World Cup is considered to be its legacy, according to Preuss (2007). The changes all deal with infrastructure, knowledge, image networks, culture, all of which have an effect on tourism within the countries and especially the cities. The positive legacy is important for public authorities and FIFA as an organization also.

Some controversies exist over what resources have been used leading to these changes, but what has been found is that attendees will come from all over the world to be a part of the world cup no matter what the financial constraints are. Tourists come because they want to learn about the cities and because they are big fans. Their attendance becomes an advantage to nations because positive perceptions arise such as during the World Cup in Seoul when many Americans started to see South Korea, China, and Japan in a new light and giving these areas an image of a tourist destination (Kim and Chalip 2004, Kim and Morrison 2005).

Paralleling what has been found with the IOC, there is also research presented explaining how the impact of so much security in place for the cup is affecting the levels of enjoyment for the public who come to be the spectators in the crowds. But after the many terrorism incidents that have been seen all over the world, 9/11 being a huge one, more security measures have been taken with different tools from the organization and the governments. The mega-events have now become a signal for their secure environment and the adopted risk aversion strategies (Jennings and Lodge 2011, McMichael 2013). Security measures for future events have already been prepared for later years, but what Toohey, Taylor, and Lee (2003) also suggested is looking at other factors of why more security would be present such as the current conflicts occurring

among nations during the time periods of these competitions, which should also be taken into consideration.

Security issues are not the only areas where democratically elected private government regimes have been working with global sports organizations to exert their power and regulate what is happening in the nation and what will take place during any of the games held. FIFA is not different than any other organization and it has played a part in dealing with domestic issues since the mid-1800s. Along with just focusing domestically, FIFA also tries to see what issues it can hit internationally with the relationships it has with nations and those national governments, who consciously employ FIFA as a diplomacy tactic. This relationship promotes adaptations of policies and shows the leverage FIFA's governing body and other global sports organizations have inside states (Garcia and Meier 2013, Brooks 2014, Murray and Pigman 2014). South Africa's government and soccer administration used its hosting of the world cup for cultural diplomacy and it has been used global sports for its foreign policy which states "better South Africa, a better Africa, and a better world" (Ndlovu, 2010).

FIFA has also made decisions affecting the nations and the players that come from the nations. Menary (2007) questions the processes of welcoming the nations that are wanted to be a part of the federation and the ignored nations that have been forgotten. There are some reasons presented with this "forgetfulness" such as FIFA assuming those nations cannot compete as well as others or reasons of political expediency. Because of this, the nations that are not a part of the game created their own "Wild Cup" where they competed against one another. Inequalities between countries has been seen with the African countries and European countries also, where European nations were being chosen as hosts among other things. Darby (2002) argues that the strides South Africa has made with hosting the World Cup should continue to occur. During the

Australian games, there was anxiety of how multiculturalism was going to be handled with so much debate about it being redundant (Baker and Rowe 2012). When it comes to the athletes, it seems that the Europeans are the “elite athletes,” mostly from the countries of the United Kingdom, Germany, Italy, and Spain. Some athletes are also chosen according to their age (Maguire and Pearton 2000, Williams 2010).

There have also been corruption accusations aimed at FIFA just as there are with the other global sports organizations. The research written about the corruption parallels what was said for the International Olympic Committee, in fact some authors do comparative case studies between both to show the differences but mostly the similarities. Recently many corruption scandals are coming to light for FIFA, one of them deals with two members of the executive committee who accepted bribes for the upcoming 2018 World Cup and British newspapers calling them out for it (Blackshaw 2011). It is concluded there is a lack of transparency and accountability within the global sports’ governing bodies and that has led them to be associated with corruption, many of which have to do with FIFA itself. Years ago, the IOC tries to input reform processes, and now researchers are calling for FIFA to do the same even though they know it will not be easy (Jennings 2011, Pielke 2013).

There are some internal initiatives within the federation to better the sport and society but there is also some initiatives others think should be taken upon by them. Many of them have to do with the 2010 World Cup in South Africa where some authors believe more action should have and could have been taken. Richter et al. (2010) point toward the sex workers that were in place at the time. At the time, the main concern was the transmission of HIV. These authors felt more could have been done over this issue such as laws being put in place during the World Cup

period. Cornelissen (2011) examined the consequences and limitations on the cup at the time and found that little has been seen for the sport for development sector in the country.

Even though these initiatives are picked out and written about, the actual policies within the governing board of FIFA have not been singled out and analyzed. There must be many steps the federation makes for the games it hosts, dealing with the programs the governing board wants to take into effect, and dealing with major issues that all of the other global sports organizations are figuring out also. Although, there are some authors who mention the governing body working on security issues and playing a role with national governments, the make-up of the board is not explained. Analyzing it will make it easier to understand the decisions made by them that are affecting people all over the world.

All in all, these three different global sports organizations have been studied by many scholars who have shed light on the overall impacts all global sports organizations have on nations and specifically what effects the International Olympic Committee and the Fédération International de Football Association have had concerning different issues such as terrorism, corruption, discrimination and communication between nations. Doing this literature review has given me more insight into what is missing when studying these global sports organizations, which is why the research I do will add to this literature focusing on descriptions of these organizations internally and the policies they have been working on.

Along with the gap found in the literature about global sports organizations, international relations theories can help guide my research because of how they speak to the relevance or irrelevance of INGOs. In general, there are two scholarly camps INGOs fall into. Some argue that they do have significance in international relations, which falls more into a constructivist

approach, and some say that they have little relevance in international relations, which falls under realist theory and emphasizes the primary of states.

Constructivists say INGOs have the power to influence state behavior and can be crucial in decision making within a state. Scholars have identified different factors that cause the influence. Cortell and Davis (1996) say the important factors that cause the norms and rules of the INGOs to be implemented are the strength of the regime type and structure as well as the legitimacy of the norm. Finnemore (1993) also shows how the norm made by INGOs can affect policy decisions made within states. Keck and Sikkink (1999) look at the different organizations, which they call networks, and analyze how the networks work and identify the conditions that make them successful. Their findings tell us that these networks challenge the traditional notions of sovereignty because of the new norms they make that are then recognized by the state.

But Mearsheimer (1994) and others make arguments about why these organizations do not matter in the grand scheme of things. Mearsheimer explains that INGOs have little impact on state behavior. He says institutionalists believe they will promote international peace but in his view there is little historical evidence that they have. When looking at IR through a realist lens, it can be seen that states are always going to be competing for power because survival is their primary concern. This competition causes states to become suspicious of one another and so they will act in their own interest even when working with INGOs. Therefore, states will hesitate to let INGOs take the role in creating policies and are less likely to follow them. Wong (2008) looks at the internal structure of human rights organizations and says it is important for them to have a strong centralization in order to make a difference. The agenda setter and the communication within the organization is vital, but not really seen. Checkel (2005) makes the

argument that institutions themselves are weak, especially the European ones and cannot shape national identity.

Liberalism is another theory that can be used to understand the role of global sports organizations. It argues that international institutions play a key role in cooperation among states. Keohane (1984) argues these institutions are the reason the world can still function with any dominant power. They do not become substitutes for world governments but act as cooperating mechanisms for states to use. Moravcsik (2010) believes the fundamental actors in international relations are individuals and private groups who all take action to promote different interests. Even though this camp goes beyond the scope of my study, it can provide other arguments as to why these global sports organizations are relevant.

Based upon what these two camps say, here is what I anticipate. Following what Mearsheimer says, states are going to be the ones who control the agenda in global sports organizations. The actors themselves will be using the organizations to get what they want out of them. Because of this, the chairs of these governing bodies will be acting for the states instead of being an independent actors who are driving his own agenda. Just as Wong says, INGOs already lack strong agenda setters and it will be no different when looking at this particular type of INGO. However, if the constructivist theory is correct, that any organization or individual can potentially help form new identities and generate new ideas that shape political agendas, I anticipate that global sports organizations would independently advance new ideas and proposals.

I will do my research by conducting a case study analysis of three cases. There are many benefits of using this methodology. It will allow me to understand the mechanisms that take place in different phenomena (Tsang 2014) because I will be studying the relationships between

the different independent and dependent variables that can lead to new patterns arising leading to generalizations and the formulation of new theories (Eisenhardt 1989, Bennett and Elman 2006). Because of the vast amount of information case study analysis provides and the cause and effect template it uses, claims that have already been made can also be proven falsifiable leading to proving a theory wrong (Fyvbjerg 2006). One of the biggest advantage case study analysis has is that it allows one to intensely examine a case because they are broken down leading to more insight about the (Lijphart 1971, George 1979).

I will be doing two comparative case studies between the International Olympic Committee, and the Federation International de Football Association. These organizations all represent some of the major international sports organizations in the world, and thus provide good opportunity for useful, comparative cases. I will limit my study to giving a description of them overall in terms of how democratic and representative they are with their governance structure and then focus more in depth into their major policy trends and primary policy agendas within the past four years. I have chosen this four year limitation from 2012-2016 in an effort to be as current as possible, while at the same time not neglecting recent policy proposals that have recently been in progress.

The reason I chose these organizations to conduct my studies is because they provide a variance with the sports they play, their size, and the members they have. While the International Olympic Committee has a multitude of events for all types of athletes to compete in, FIFA is a single sport event meaning the athletes are all part of one team. This is the main difference between the two. Nonetheless, both of them are some of the biggest global sports organizations in the world today. The amount of members that make them up represent different regions in the world and the audience they gain when it comes times for the Olympic Games or the World Cup

gives them the advantage of a wide reach. The different policies they work on have the power to reach different ends of the Earth, which makes these two good units of analysis because states can use this power for their own purposes.

Chapter 2:

Does the International Olympic Committee Matter in International Relations?

History of the International Olympic Committee/Olympic Movement

The Olympic Movement can be credited to Baron Pierre de Coubertin from France, whose aim was to revive the ancient Greek Olympic Games. The original Greek games aspired to find a hero who had the best athletic skills. Although the games would be held in honor of the ancient Greek gods, specifically Zeus, there was a tight competition among all the men. Everyone wanted to train and be the best in the games because they would then be regarded as the best in society and be given many honors such as ceremonies, dedicated odes, and their name being chiseled everywhere. According to Durant (1973), “No heroes were ever glorified as were the Olympic champions, not even victorious generals returning from war (p. 8).”

Baron de Coubertin wanted to bring this spirit back in the late 1800s in France after he had seen how little the country emphasized athletics. De Coubertin saw this philosophy of having physical education be a part of the curriculum as a way for students to enhance their physical abilities, discipline, courage and other positive values. The only thing closest to the Olympic Games were founded in 1850 by Dr. William Penny Brooks, a physician and teacher, who brought the games in a small town in Northern England. De Coubertin studied these games and also got some more inspiration from an Englishman, John Astley Cooper, who wrote in the magazine *Greater Britain* that the Anglo-Saxon Olympic games should also include fields such as science, technology, art, and sports (Barney, Wenn, and Martyn 2002).

In November 1892, de Coubertin took his idea of restoring the Olympic Games to the Athletic Sports Union in Paris. His priority, he publicly announced, was to have the international

sporting events be a tool for peace among nations. His presentation was not met with much success, but he worked to get more acceptance. In 1894, an international athletic congress was held in London with representatives from nations. Once again, de Coubertin and the congress pleaded the case of reviving the Olympic games to the national sports leaders and finally delegates from thirty-seven athletic unions representing nine countries, about two thousand participants overall, voted to restore the Olympic Games (Durant 1973). The Winter Olympic Games were added in 1924, and women officially started competing in the games in 1981.

Basis of Analysis

The IOC provides a lot of insight into whether Global Sports Organizations matter because of how many people it reaches. Along with the IOC itself, there are National Olympic Committees in all the member nations as well as Sports Federations. Between all of these, there are a lot of rules created and big decisions made such as where the games should be hosted, what sponsors are a part of the entire movement, and the rules put in place for the athletes. The committee itself makes big decisions that are compatible to what other international organizations are doing through policies.

The reason the IOC was selected for analysis is because of this ostensible influence. The committee's decisions impact a lot of people, from the workers at the bottom to the athletes themselves, as well as all the people watching the games. Therefore, all the policies created play some part in the world. But because there are many nations a part of the IOC, there is a good chance it is these actors trying to exert their influence and ideologies. Especially, since it can be argued the International Olympic Committee is one of the most prominent global sports organizations in the world today.

One of the most current actions taken by the IOC is the update of their transgender policy in the Olympic Charter, which allows trans athletes more rights to compete in the games and the categories they want to. These new guidelines came from the “Consensus Meeting on Sex Reassignment Hyperandrogenism” meeting in November 2015. The overall objective of the committee was to make sure there is still a guarantee of fair competition to all who want to compete and to make sure the guidelines do not undermine others such as the ones put in place by the World Anti-Doping Code and International Standards. With these new guidelines, athletes will not have to go through reassignment surgery followed by two years of hormone therapy to compete. Those who transition from female to male can compete in male categories without restrictions. Transitioning females have to be declared females and they have to prove their total testosterone level has been below ten nmol/L for at least twelve months.

(http://www.olympic.org/Documents/Commissions_PDFfiles/Medical_commission/2015-11_ioc_consensus_meeting_on_sex_reassignment_and_hyperandrogenism-en.pdf 2015).

I am doing my analysis on this policy because this issue is one of the latest major agenda items for the IOC and the issue is one of the most controversial in the world. Nations have their own stances on transgender rights. Some are for it while some are against. Some try their best not to acknowledge it and let events play out by themselves. Seeing the votes on this issue from all the IOC members will show whether they are following the stances of their nations or if the committee is autonomous and making its own decisions.

Analysis

Hypothesis #1-Are states controlling the agenda based on their views of the policy topics?

To test for the influence of an international sports organization in international relations, this thesis will utilize three hypotheses, which attempt to capture the major theories in international relations. The first hypothesis to be tested is the realist claim, that states are always the main players in international relations. If the realist claim is correct, we would anticipate that states control the agenda of global sports organizations. In this case, we would anticipate that states are going to use their influence over agenda items, such as the IOC's updates on the transgender policy. To test this hypothesis, I have chosen the nations in the Permanent 5 from the United Nations Security Council: the United States, France, the United Kingdom, China, and Russia to see whether they would agree with the policy or not. These states are beneficial to analyze because they have a lot of influence over the world. If they themselves are already doing things internally for transgender rights or advocating for groups that are trying to do things, then they would have been pushing for the new policy. However, if the state is not for LGBT rights, I anticipate that they would be trying to shut down the IOC's policy proposal.

First, we look at the United States. There is much proof that transgender rights are a priority in the United States. This can be seen from all the prominent figures endorsing the equal rights of all LGBT people. Vice President Joe Biden was the highest elected official to support gay marriage in 2012. In October 2015, he spoke at the Human Rights Campaign's annual dinner he endorsed transgender people serving in the military, which had been banned by the Pentagon. The Obama administration was considering when and how to lift this longstanding ban (Lederman 2015). Defense Secretary Ash Carter was also open to removing one of the last gender or sexuality based barriers in the military (Baldor 2015). The ban is supposed to be lifted in May 2016, which will also include a pilot program allowing leaves of absences for transgender troops who are still taking hormones or having surgery (Vanden Brook 2015).

Hillary Clinton, who has served as first lady from 1993-2001, a U.S. Senator from 2001 to 2009, to being the Secretary of State during the first Obama administration, is also opening up to supporting gay rights in the U.S. When she was a senator, Clinton said she believed marriage was a sacred bond between man and woman but she did agree that gay couples in civil unions should be given the same rights and privileges that every other American gets. In 2013, however, Clinton and former President Bill Clinton both announced their support for the overturning of the Defense of Marriage Act, which defined marriage as a union between a man and a woman. She said the LGBT community are full and equal citizens and deserve all rights such as marriage (Sherman 2015). Now running for president, Clinton has said she wants to end the discrimination against LGBT people and has placed this issue in the forefront of her campaign and is getting a lot of political and financial support from the LGBT community (Lerer 2015). This also shows how big of an impact the LGBT community is having on the public and how quickly the positions are changing of people on the issue in the United States.

Secretary of State John Kerry has issued press releases to the public speaking against acts of violence toward the transgender community. In November 2015, Kerry said the United States will work with transgender people to combat discriminatory laws and practices that attack the rights and safety of transgender people. The United States has also worked privately with other governments and civil society, public diplomacy, and foreign assistance. The Obama administration appointed a Special Envoy for the Human Rights of LGBT persons. Obama has made statements saying more work needs to be done globally to remove the threat of violence through the Global Equality Fund (Department of State 2014). Obama started his work in 2009 when he issued a memo to agencies that let partners in same sex relationships receive benefits that spouses of federal employees receive. This led to the Social Security Administration

lowering the requirements for changing one's sex on official government documents where all that is needed is a doctor's note proving the appropriate clinical treatment is underway (Eilperin 2015).

The U.S. Supreme Court also ruled to legalize same-sex marriage nationwide in June 2013, which caused many couples to rush to get marriage licenses in the states that once banned them from doing so (BBC.com 2015). The same year the Pentagon lifted its ban on transgender troops that brought a pilot program providing leaves of absences for transgender troops being treated with hormones and or having surgery (Vanden Brook 2015). Different states are also creating laws and policies that end discrimination to transgender people. All of these are examples of how the United States has already taken strides for the gay community and is working to create equality for transgender people. Therefore, it is likely they would vote for the updated IOC policy.

Another reason to come to this conclusion is how because of how highly the Obama administration looks upon the IOC. In 2009 both First Lady Michelle Obama and President Obama spoke to the committee in Copenhagen trying to get the bid for the 2016 summer games in Chicago. He is the first sitting U.S. president to lobby the IOC. During the address, Obama told the committee he believes in the mission of the Olympic and Paralympics and what the movement stands for. He said, "It brings us together, if only for a few weeks, face to face. It helps us understand each other just a little bit better. It reminds us that no matter how or where we differ, we all seek our own measure of happiness, and fulfillment, and pride in what we do" (whitehouse.gov 2009). If the United States thinks the IOC can have a big impact it seem likely that the United States would want the committee to take on issues it is also fighting for.

The United Kingdom is similar to the United States in the actions they have taken. The UK legalized same sex marriage after Queen Elizabeth II gave her royal stamp of approval in 2013. The Marriage Act allowed gay couples to get married in civil and religious ceremonies in the summer of 2014. Even before this, different laws were put into place such as civil partnership laws that allowed couples to legalize their relationships (Parry 2014). In 1999, the United Kingdom formalized a European Union decision when it passed the Sex Discrimination or Gender Reassignment Regulations that protected transgender people that have or are planning to go through gender reassignment to any stage of employment (hrc.org). The UK Public Sector Gender Equality Duty requires all public authorities to promote equality between all people and eliminate unlawful discrimination (Hammarberg 2009). Trans people in the UK have more rights than in other nations, such as being legally allowed to use whatever bathroom they feel the most comfortable in (theweek.co.uk 2015).

Prime Minister David Cameron has spoken for LGBT rights. He refuses to agree with the Democratic Unionist Party who oppose anything that relates to LGBT issues. In general, Cameron has been an advocate for gay rights for quite some time (BBC.com 2015). In 2015, Cameron pledged a Transgender Action Plan that deals with transgender abuse, gives guidance on gender assessment for tax purposes and supports transgender job seekers (Smith 2015). On the other hand, it is questionable on what side Defense Secretary Bill Hammond stands on the issue. In previous records, he has voted against gay rights and has also said these issues should not be discussed so much compared to all the other things needing to be worked out. Hammond also sent out orders to the foreign ambassadors telling them not to display the rainbow flag in the week leading up to London Pride because he felt nothing should replace the Union flag, even on special occasions (Allegretti 2015). Hammond seems to lean more toward the conservative side

on the transgender issue, but the statements he makes show he does not want to publicly share his views but is instead for all sides.

Still different committees in Parliament have been reviewing the previous acts to find the flaws in them to make sure they offer enough protection and whether certain processes are too expensive, bureaucratic, and medicalized such as the Equality Act of 2010, the Gender Recognition Act of 2004, and the recent Marriage Act of 2013. But the fact that these acts were created and all the actions taken by the United Kingdom shows that they would be doing more to push for transgender rights, like making sure organizations like the IOC are doing what they can on their end to promote transgender rights.

France has taken action on the national and international level. In 2012, France's Council of Ministers unanimously approved a program to combat violence and discrimination on the grounds of sexual orientation and gender identity (diplomatie.gouv.fr). Socialist Party Senator Michele Miller said transgender people have gotten a high frequency of harassment that needs to be addressed. Other senators agreed with her statement, which led to the passing vote. In 2010, France was also one of the first countries to remove transsexualism as being a mental illness proving the nation is moving in a more progressive direction. Even though there were still many improvements that could have been made such as more training for sex change surgeries, but the state does pay for gender reassignment surgeries (advocate.com 2010). President Francois Hollande also pledged during his campaign in 2012 to extend the right to marry and adopt for same sex couples (Smith-Spark 2012).

On the International level, France has been working with the United Nations and in 2008, they presented the Declaration on Human Rights, Sexual Orientation, and Gender Identity to the General Assembly that has been endorsed by 68 nations. It also organized a World Congress for

the same reason that was held in Paris in 2009. In the European level, France helped prepare a toolkit adopted by the European Union in 2010 that is designed to provide EU institutions and member states with operational tools that are used to promote and protect the fundamental human rights of LGBT people around the world (diplomatie.gouv.fr). Seeing all France has done, not only internally but throughout the world, suggests France would also be on the side of the IOC's updated transgender policy.

In China, social pressures to conform are strong from society and family members. Transgender people have been forced to deny their identities as they marry straight partners or engage in cooperative marriage where one partner is gay and the other is lesbian. The reason for this is a non-accepting regime and the lack of support from society. Right away people are taught to discriminate against LGBT people. Even Chinese textbooks are full of homophobic statements. Homophobia is described as a fact in the books and homosexuality is said to be a disorder (Rauhala 2015). The overall thought of Chinese society is that homosexuality and transgenderism are considered to be an idiopathic disease, which is what leads people to not accept others.

Homosexuality was illegal until 1997 and in 2001 it was taken off the list of mental illnesses (Fullerton 2015). But there are still no laws that exist that protect people from discrimination and same sex marriage is not recognized in China (Zhao 2016). The only incidents that can be seen where courts have gotten involved are to end commercial disputes such as one where a clinic was ordered to compensate a man who underwent gay conversion that was designed to shock him straight (Rauhala 2015). China has been in discussions about human rights issues under the United Nations Development Programme. But even then there are still

problems. Health insurance is a pressing issue for transgender people who are having or had surgery to change gender (Lu 2013).

Many personal statements and stories are starting to appear from people who are taking a charge. Terry Hui is one of the transgender people who has met acceptance from her family when she decided to bring out her identity at thirty-six years old. Even though, there are people who have been accepting transgender people. But there are still people who discriminate against her (Zhao 2016). Parents are also forming groups to be advocates for their children who are in the LGBT community. They have formed the group Parents, Families, and Friends of Lesbians and Gays in China. The group has written to National People's Congress to ask for a legalization of gay marriage, but have not heard back. (Chiu 2013). The amount of discrimination is starting to decrease in China, but nothing is being done on a political level for the LGBT community. The topic of homosexuality has been ignored by the National People's Congress and even when topics by different activist groups are brought up, there has never been enough support, which would be 30 votes, to allow the topics to become proposals (Speelman 2013).

Since the current president, Xi Jinping, has taken office the government has been targeting activists and their family members for speaking out against the government and their lack of fundamental rights such as the freedom of expression. The government has also detained groups that work to end discrimination (Targeted News Service 2015). When it comes to the IOC transgender policy update, the assumption would be that they would either be against it or just go with the votes of others, especially since they are not taking their own stance about the issue within the state.

Russia has openly targeted homosexuals. In general, Russia has been reining in Russian based advocacy groups. President Vladimir Putin is the main cause for this since his reelection in

2012. A Russian diplomat, Sergey Ryabokon, has been accused of playing a role in Putin's crackdown of foreign human rights. Ryabokon has emerged as a frontrunner for a top job overseeing the U.N.'s relations with civilian advocacy groups. This position serves as the primary gatekeeper for international advocacy groups such as those for gay rights that are allowed to access the U.N.'s premises. But the concern for his appointment is his history of suppressing advocacy groups in the past (Lynch 2016). Especially since Russia has tightened its controls on NGOs funded from abroad that threaten their constitutional order.

Russia also has laws against gay propaganda that came about in 2013, which ban the spreading of propaganda for non-traditional sexual relations (Al-Jazeera.com 2015). In January 2016, Russia's parliament held the first reading of another law that proposes jailing non-heterosexual people for public display of their orientation of gender identity (Tordesillas 2016). Even though Homosexuality was decriminalized in 1993, the LGBT community still remains hidden. Elina Klimova, founder of a Russian LGBT online community, was the latest person to be convicted from these laws in July 2015. Amendments also exist with these laws, such as the "Protecting Children from Information Harmful to Their Health and Development" that portray the LGBT community as hazardous to children (Gessen 2016).

Civilians have also been threatening and attacking LGBT communities. In November 2013, gunmen opened fire in a gay club in Moscow. The club had reportedly been attacked times before (Nichols 2013). Vigilant groups have also started appearing. Occupy Paedophilia uses social media to connect with gay men and lure them into traps. They abuse these men and humiliate them sharing all of this so they can get many views and likes. The gay propaganda laws allow these acts to happen leaving people of the LGBT community to feel neglected and isolated (Al-Jazeera.com 2014).

It is no secret Russia would not want laws or policies passed that are for the LGBT community. But how they feel about it on an international level is questionable. This questioning stems from Putin's comments during the Sochi 2014 Winter Olympics when he said homosexuals would be welcome. He also said Russia did not have a ban on non-traditional sexual relations but on the propaganda on them (BBC.com 2014). Putin declared gays should feel comfortable when coming to compete in the games as long as they leave the children and do not impose their views on them since the legislation is meant to protect them. Even after the IOC had received written assurance from the Russian government that the law would not be applied to visitors, the committee still asked for more clarification on points of uncertainty (Friedman 2014).

But even with Putin's statements, other nations had their own views on the games and the topic of LGBT rights was at the forefront. Obama said in a news conference that he was offended by the anti-gay legislation in Russia (Smith-Spark 2013). Obama also sent three openly gay athletes to the games with the U.S. Olympic delegation even though he did not attend the games himself. The year before the games nations across the world all furthered LGBT rights. The Defense of Marriage Act was struck down in the United States as well as the nations of Brazil, France, Britain New Zealand, and Uruguay all legalized gay marriage. Because all of the attention given to these rights, Sochi was also considered the "Gay Olympics" games (Friedman 2014). With all these things happening around the world and the remarks Putin made to ease the tension from the Sochi games, it is implied that Russia did not want to ruin its chances of hosting the games so he would vote in favor of the new transgender policy update.

After reviewing the stances of each of the Permanent 5 nations, we have the U.S., UK, and France as states that would definitely try to get organizations, the IOC being one of them, to

push for furthering these rights so they can reach at a bigger, international level. It would be to their advantage because it would show they have influence controlling a big global sports organization such as this one and it helps them achieve their goals internally and externally because of all the attention the IOC gets. Obama already stated before this policy was created that he knows the IOC can be impactful, and even though other states have not said outright much about the influence of the IOC or the importance of this policy, they might also feel the same way as Obama. It is still not known what side the government of China would have taken on the transgender issues because they have not done anything for the rights of their own people. But since they are saying silent on a national level, the assumption would be that they will also stay silent on the internationally and not be against the transgender update, at least publicly. The assumption would also be that Russia would vote for the update as well. The Sochi games proved the Olympics are not a platform Putin wants to use to push his position about LGBT rights. They were more interested in being the hosts of the games. Therefore, when it came time for the update, Russia would not have been pushing the IOC to do something. Even though Russia and China may have been indifferent toward the policy update, it looks like all of the Permanent 5 are trying to control the agenda and push this issue because at the end of the day they are all gaining benefits, whether it be to push these rights on a global level or get the chance to host the games or even just compete in them. This evidence does not follow what realism suggests since states are not trying to control the agenda.

Hypothesis #2-Is President Thomas Bach acting as a pawn of the states or does he act as an independent actor driving his own agenda?

The main leadership of the IOC is the president who is elected from the executive board. The current president is Thomas Bach from Germany who has been a member of the IOC since 1991. He has also been an Olympic champion with the German's foil team during the Montreal 1976 games. Before that, he served on different committees and boards that also dealt with athletics and was a part of the German National Olympic Committee. Normally, presidents have been athletes in the games before they rise up to work within the organization. The rest of the IOC is made up of the Session, which is the general body, and the executive board. The role of the president is to preside over the doings of the committee.

The question we ask is how influential the role of the IOC president is. If states are the ones controlling the agenda then either the president would be working with these states to push the decision of the IOC to go a certain way or they would be just hold the function of leading the meetings while the main decision-making process would rest on the delegates of the IOC who are representing their nation. Because we assume states do control the agenda of global states organizations, as realists maintain, we are expecting to find the president to have a small role. To test this, I looked at Bach and the ways he has been involved and advocating for the IOC and issues relating to the transgender policy update.

In early interviews with Bach when he was elected, we heard about how he was ready to move the organization forward. In one of his first interviews as president he says, "I want to lead the IOC according to my motto-unity in diversity. I want to be president for all of you. This means I will do my very best to balance well all the interests of the different stakeholders of the Olympic Movement (Santow 2013)." He also says later in the interview how he would lead with his own style and communicate with the members to push his ideas forward.

In 2014, the IOC approved the “Olympic Agenda 2020” reform package that came with forty policy change recommendations proposed by Bach. While this package included adding more sports into the 2020 Tokyo games and easier bidding process, it also included Principle 6 on nondiscrimination to include that rids the Olympics as free from any discrimination including sexual orientation (Olympic.org 2014). The passing of the reforms was unanimous among members and Bach himself was surprised at the speed of the approval, which ended a day ahead of time (sfgate.com 2014). This agenda is meant to be a strategic roadmap for the future of the Olympic Movement. These were the most sweeping changes since 1999 after the Salt Lake City Scandal.

Bach advocated for this package by saying “the time for change is now. The success of today only gives you the opportunity to drive the change tomorrow. If we do not challenge these challenges here and now we will be hit with them very soon” (chinadaily.com 2014). He has been rallying for this support since his election in September 2013. One of the points he makes is the power the IOC has because of its financial position and the amount of viewers around the world. So instead of being complacent, he came in wanting to make these changes to ensure the IOC was not just being complacent but by revamping the events and protecting the athletes and organization to ensure the respect for the IOC (Postmedia 2014).

This data suggests that Bach has taken an initiative since he came into office. His reform package was met with standing ovation and brought more reforms all around, including sexual orientation. His drive to make the IOC updated shows he has been working with others on a consistent basis to bring improvements. He has visited host cities and is working with all the actors involved. All of these lead to the conclusion that the IOC has strong leadership because of all the IOC is accomplishing with his actions and proposals. This finding goes against what we

assumed before. Because hypothesis 1 was correct, it is assumed there would be weak leadership in the IOC and that Bach would be working for the states only, because the states would be controlling the agenda and pushing their items forward and making sure everything works in their favor. But even though Bach is promoting the same rights as three of the five strong states in the permanent 5, the president is working just as hard as some of the member states to make decisions go in their favor and has had a significant influence, which also suggests some support for the constructivist claim

Hypothesis 3- Does the IOC work independently to advance new ideas and proposals?

The previous hypotheses follow the realist theory to find out if the IOC matters in international relations, but also lend some credence to constructivism. Another way we can test these claims is through the constructivist theory that says the IOC will not just be a pawn for states, but will instead be its own independent actor that creates new or different identities as well as its own ideas that shape the agenda for their own sake or for the sake of their primary functions. In this case, to promote athleticism through sports and making sure the games run smoothly in all areas.

The transgender policy update came from an internal committee within the IOC. The 2015 Consensus Meeting on Sex Reassignment and Hyperandrogenism was made up of an expert group called upon by the IOC Medical & Scientific Commission. This group also existed in 2003 when it made recommendations for the eligibility for athletes who have undergone sex reassignments. But even before that, the IOC has had groups within itself doing gender verification testing, mostly the IOC Medical and Scientific Commission. Testing became mandatory in 1968 because of the concerns that men were posing as women so women had to

undergo tests. Therefore, the initial method of testing started, which was having the athlete drop their underwear for physical and visual tests. But as technology advanced, scientific tests were taken where swabs collected chromosomes to find out whether the athlete had XX or XY chromosomes. What was not accounted for was genetic conditions or false positives or negatives that skewed the results. Therefore some athletes were put into the wrong categories. Some decided to feign injuries and quit, while others like Spanish hurdler Maria Jose Martinez-Patino took the ridicule so they could continue to compete (Slater 2015).

There was a period when the gender testing stopped until South African Castor Semanya was questioned on her gender by the International Association of Athletics Federations in 2009. The IAAF was the one who asked experts to come up with a plan for hyperandrogenism and worked with the IOC Medical Commission to determine the levels of testosterone that categorized an athlete as a male or a female. This led to new rules (Slater 2015). More testing methods were available during the 2012 London games, which is where the focus switched from testing DNA to testing levels of testosterone. According to the rules, the testing must be conducted from the IOC Medical Commission (Curley 2012).

The 2003 and 2015 Consensus Meeting on Sex Reassignment and Hyperandrogenism was an ad hoc committee made up of barristers, the chairmen, former chairmen and vice chairmen of the medical commission as well as professors from universities around the world who specialized somehow in sports or areas of science (Olympic.org 2015). When the news about the new guidelines came out to the public, it was this committee that spoke about it and were considered the experts by the media and states. Medical Director Dr. Richard Budgett was the one who said not many other federations have these transgender rules in places but this can help them gain the confidence to create them, just like they did (cbc.ca 2016). Joanna Harper, the

chief medical physicist, was one of the members on the committee who also happens to be Trans. In determining these new guidelines, Harper said her voice was vital (Zeigler 2016).

Throughout the history of gender verification testing, there has been an outside committee that is determining the testing and guidelines and not the general session or executive board itself. Even though the credit of implementing these guidelines goes to the IOC as a whole, it is still a separate committee that focused specifically on these issues. Seeing all it has done in the past shows the IOC has always wanted to continue moving forward with its policies so it is creating the new initiatives within itself and doing the research to make it happen. The constructivist theory holds true with this hypotheses because states are not the ones doing all the work in implementing these ideas.

Conclusion

After testing the three hypotheses, if states are controlling the agenda, whether there is weak or strong leadership of the organization, and if the organization is advancing new ideas and proposals independently, the conclusion would be that the IOC does matter. It is making a difference in the world and in most ways doing it independently.

The United States, France and the United Kingdom were three of the Permanent 5 that were also advancing transgender and LGBT rights within their own borders. Many of the members within their organizations have also spoken in support of these rights. Therefore, it can be concluded they would push this agenda item on the IOC. China and Russia showed signs of not taking a stance on the issue and there was no data showing they were against the IOC adopting these policies, so if the former three states pushed this item, they would not have tried to stop it.

Instead they would approve because it would be in the best interest of the state. So states could have been controlling the IOC's agenda on this issue.

But then we move on to test President Bach and see what he has been doing as President and for this issue. Bach pushed creating more guidelines and more human rights with his "Olympic Agenda 2020" reform package, which was met with acceptance all around. He also visited cities and laid out his goals to everyone. On the issue, he is taking the same stance as the Permanent 5, but from the initiatives and goals he has, he wants to further the Olympic Movement.

Lastly, we have the IOC medical and science commission creating the committee to look over these issue, which is separate from the IOC members. The transgender and gender testing issues have been looked at through time and modern guidelines and testing methods have been implemented. The committee itself is made up of outsiders who are not affiliated with the administrations of states. This means the IOC has its own independent body working on this issue and making sure the games can be run smoothly and athletes are all given their rights. Because of the continued productive work we see from Bach and the members of the Consensus Meeting on Sex Reassignment and Hyperandrogenism, we can see that the IOC does matter in international relations because of its continued advancement.

Chapter 3:

Does the Federation Internationale de Football Association matter in international relations?

History of the Federation Internationale de Football Association

The game of football has been played for centuries in places all around the world. The Chinese played Tsu-Chu during the Han Dynasty in the sixteenth century where players kicked a leather ball in the middle of two bamboo sticks. The Greeks played Episkyros and the Romans played Harpastum where players used their hands and feet to get the ball past boundary lines. Because there are so many traces of football throughout history, there has been no official time and place where the game originated (Lisi 2011). But the modern game of football became official when men from the British and Scottish teams came to Freemason's Tavern in London to create a Football Association for the sport in October 1863. Meetings after led to official guidelines being made to govern the way the sport would then officially be played (<http://www.thefa.com/about-football-association/history>).

The issue that came about with the Football Association was that as the sport was starting to become popular all over the world with national teams being created, the new teams would have to be approved by England, and the association of Wales, Ireland, and Scotland to be a part of the association. If rejected, the national teams were not able to compete in the Football Association Cup created in 1871. It was Robert Guerin from the French national team and FIFA's first president who refused to keep waiting. So he wrote to other nations in Europe asking them to work with him to create an overall umbrella organization (<http://www.fifa.com/about-fifa/who-we-are/history/>).

In May 1904, seven nations, including France, Sweden, Switzerland, Spain, Belgium, Denmark, and the Netherlands signed the foundation act. Official statutes for the organization were determined along with the agreements that all national federations would recognize one another and that clubs and players were not allowed to play simultaneously for different federations. FIFA then became a part of the International Football Association Board that is the guardian of the laws of the game in 1906. Until 1909, when South Africa joined FIFA, the organization was made up of only European nations. Argentina and Chile joined in 1912 and the United States joined in 1913 (<http://www.fifa.com/about-fifa/who-we-are/history/>).

According to Glanville (1973), the parents of the World Cup were two Frenchmen named Jules Rimet, who became president of FIFA for 34 years, and Henri Delauney who was a part of running the French Federation, who led the organization to being in charge of the World Cups. In 1926, both men proposed a competition that could be played by all national associations since the federation had not been in charge of hosting any big tournaments since it was created. They also understood that amateurs and professionals played the sport so they opened it up to everyone. The members of FIFA all agreed to this because the Olympics did not allow all the best football players in the world to compete. Also agreed on by the members in 1928 was the decision to hold the cup every four years, which would begin in 1930. The World Cup did not occur during the years of the 1938 and 1950 because of World War II, but after it resumed it became one of the biggest sporting events in terms of members and the amount of people who watch it (Lisi 2011).

Basis of Analysis

Just like the International Olympic Committee, FIFA is another Global Sports Organization whose matches leading to the World Cup are watched all over the world. It is considered to be the biggest single-sporting competition. According to the organization, there is an estimated 715 million people who watched the final match of the World Cup in 2006 held in Germany. The 2010 matches in South Africa had a sum total of more than 3 million spectators at the stadium throughout the 64 matches, proving there is a wide reach of the federation, which suggests that there is a lot of people that can be influenced from its actions and decisions.

(<http://www.fifa.com/worldcup/news/y=2011/m=7/news=almost-half-the-world-tuned-home-watch-2010-fifa-world-cup-south-africat-1473143.html> 2011).

In addition to the popularity of the finals held during for the World Cup, there is also the Confederations Cup. Before it was held every two years, in 2005 it got changed to every four years, so that it is played the year before the World Cup in the same host site so that it can be the test trial so that it is ready for the major event. The host is able to make sure the organization is well planned out and ready and ticket sales are tested to see how the audience will favor the upcoming World Cup (Stevenson 2009). This event provides another outlet for the federation to reach people on a bigger scale with the things that it is currently working on. But the benefit of studying this global sports organization other than just because of the reach it has, is that it is a single sport event, which makes it different than the IOC and it has a different internal structure with its committees than the IOC does. This different structure can lead to a different outcome of the way states utilize it or if they even try to control it.

FIFA strives to be all about football all over the world. Its primary objective is to improve or develop the game of football globally and for all people. The federation is constantly

trying to promote the game because it believes there are unifying, educational, humanitarian, and cultural values that can be spread through programs, especially among the youth (FIFA.com). One of the current projects FIFA has been working on is creating a working relationship with the Palestinian Football Association and Israel Football Association through the FIFA Monitoring Committee Israel-Palestine, which met for the first time in August 2015. This committee came into existence because of tensions that exist between the two associations, especially about the movements of the Palestinian players. Palestinian football players have struggled to go over order such as in 2007 when Israel blocked 17 members of the Palestinian national team exit visas that would allow them to play in the World Cup qualifying match in Singapore. They were forced to forfeit the game. Sometimes the Palestinians are unable to get the donated equipment they need to carry out their matches (Rasgon 2015). The main goal of this committee is to create a working timetable and applications to allow the free movement of Palestinians in terms of football, especially along Gaza and the West Bank (jpost.com 2015). Different tensions between the two associations have risen such as Palestine and Israel calling for a ban or suspension of the Israel Football Association that was brought up the FIFA Congress.

I will be analyzing this issue within FIFA because of the continued tensions that exist between Palestine and Israel that have also been a controversy among nations since some support Palestine and others support Israel. In more specific terms, some states actually recognize Palestine as a sovereign state while others see it as an occupied territory of Israel. Other international organizations such as the United Nations have also been dealing with a way to be a buffer for both nations but FIFA has an additional goal—to find a way for Palestinian players to be able to play football and be a part of the federation. This analysis will provide me with insight because it gives me an outlook on whether states are trying to control the federation to work in

their favor for outcomes of the Israel and Palestine tensions or if the federation is acting independently in trying to achieve their goal.

Analysis

Hypothesis 1-Are states controlling the agenda based on their views of the topic of the project?

Just like we looked at the realist theory claim that states are going to utilize global sports organizations to further their agenda within the IOC, I will be looking to see if this is true with FIFA. My first hypothesis anticipates that states are going to be using their influence to have the federation lean in their direction when trying to create negotiations in Israel and Palestine. This might mean they will try to get FIFA to help solve land issues that continue to be a problem or that they are trying to get one side to come out stronger than the other because of the allies these states are in. An example of this would be the United States trying to get the negotiations leaned in Israel's favor because of the longtime alliance they have with the nation as well as the investment they have placed in Israel through all the aid given.

I will test this hypothesis by analyzing the United States, United Kingdom, France, China, and Russia from the Permanent 5 of the U.N. Security Council again to create consistency with my analysis of the IOC and because of the influence they have. If these organizations have taken a stance on Israel/Palestine relations over whether interference from outside actors should aid in the solution of the tensions, then they will be pushing FIFA to also work on this project. But if they do not agree with what the outcome of the project may be or if they are on a certain state's side and can see this being a disadvantage to that state then they will be against FIFA working on it.

We first look at the United States who has been a strong supporter of Israel and has also been active in working on behalf of the tensions of Israel and Palestine. In terms of foreign aid, the United States has given the most to Israel than any other nation after World War II, mostly in military assistance, making them also the strongest ally to the United States in the Middle East. The civilian aid started in 1949 when Israel had just become a state and was in economic distress. The amount of aid at that time was \$100 million. Military aid was given for the first time in 1962 and today the total amount of foreign aid given is over \$100 billion (Bassok 2014). The past two U.S. presidents have increased the amount of aid through a memorandum of understanding. George W. Bush signed this memorandum in 2007 that called for incremental yearly increases in military aid given to the Israel (Jacobson 2012). Obama has also promised money to Israel to expand on Bush's memorandum. In February 2016, Obama's administration offered current Israel President Benjamin Netanyahu guarantees to top funding from the State Department and Pentagon accounts for the next decade. The only thing is that Israel will not be able to get plus-ups from the budget except in emergency cases (Opall-Rome 2016). In terms of favoring either Palestine or Israel, the United States has always leaned more toward Israel.

The United States also has the American Israel Public Affairs Committee that works to strengthen and promote the relationship between Israel and the United States, which AIPAC argues allows the security of both states to be stronger (<http://www.aipac.org/about/mission>). The committee was known to be one of the most powerful lobby organizations in the United States, but its power level has gone down since the 2000s for different reasons such as some believing it is a threat to national interests (en.alalam.ir 2014). Some of the recent issues with the committee deal with Obama's hesitancy on adding new nuclear sanctions on Iran. In 2014, AIPAC was in the midst of trying to override a veto on a bill that would add new sanctions on

Iran, but with many democratic senators backing Obama and his veto, the committee was put in a difficult position of having to keep fighting for the bill while they were losing face or finding a way to negotiate (Haaretz.com 2014). There have also been questions raised over the amount of support Obama has for AIPAC and Israel with the position he took on Iran and his desire to delay any attack made by AIPAC until after the elections.

One of the reasons Obama is having less and less support of Israel could be that his administration has been more integrated in the tensions of Palestine and Israel than just providing aid to Israel's spending needs. Although the United States does not recognize Palestine as a sovereign state, a 2013 Department of State press release said Obama started the process of trying to get negotiations to occur between the two states by visiting cities of both of them and then inviting them over the White House to continue the conversation. He also put Secretary of State John Kerry in charge of overseeing the start of a negotiation (state.gov 2013). The Obama administration has been pushing for a two-state solution and even as Obama is getting ready for his term to end. He still has faith that a solution can occur and that it is vital for longtime security for Israel and as a democratic and Jewish state and to create peace between Israel and Palestine (greaterkashmir.com 2015). Obama has even said there is too much tension between the two states that the only solution is having a two-state solution, but other states will not be able to do it for them (Benari 2016). Even though Obama has faith that a solution can occur, Israel has lost a lot of credibility with the White House since it refuses to negotiate (Savir 2015).

Vice President Joe Biden has also been advocating for a two-state solution as he met with the Palestinian president and Israeli president separately reiterating the support the United States is giving behind the solution. In the press releases that talk about his visits, the difference in the relationship the United States has with them can be seen. When talking to Palestine, Biden was

more formal to Palestine talking about the attack that had happened to an American student in Jaffa, a city of Israel and spoke only of the solution (whitehouse.gov 2016). However, when Biden was talking to Israel, he made sure to mention the great security relationship that is between them and the United States while also talking about more regional issues (whitehouse.gov 2016). Whether these were deliberate reports wanting to be given to the public, or an almost word for word explanation, they show Biden reminding not only Israel but the public who would be able to see the press release that there is a relationship there.

Between Biden, Obama, and the rest of Congress, it would seem that the United States is more open to moving in different directions with Israel and Palestine. The statements made by the leaders lead to the conclusion that no one wants to completely drop Israel as an ally, in fact it seems like they want to keep them as close as possible, but so that the United States can carry out their agenda such as with Iran. Even though there is not much evidence as to what the United States' opinion is on FIFA working with the two states' soccer teams, I would still conclude that they would be on board with the FIFA initiative to try and create peace because it would lead to some sort of progress, especially since there has been no success on the United States' end and Obama's term is almost up. There is also no public evidence that the United States has tried to prevent FIFA from moving in this direction, which also supports the idea that the United States is at least tacitly backing FIFA's effort.

The United Kingdom differs from the United States because in a way it recognizes Palestine as a state. On October 2014, the UK Parliament voted unilaterally in favor of Palestine's statehood. The votes cast were 274 for recognition and 12 against (Wright 2014). The Labour Party backed the proposal, which was a compelling reason as to why so many voted in favor for it. The chairman of the Foreign Affairs Select Committee Richard Ottaway was a

member who voted for the recognition of Palestine because he felt he could no longer back up Israel after the recent actions they had been taking in Gaza (Wright 2014). In 2014, Israel attacked Gaza that was a 50 day conflict where over 2,000 Palestinians were killed and about 180 Israeli soldiers were killed (BBC.com 2015). But there is a condition attached to the recognition. The UK's Middle East Minister Tobias Ellwood said they will reserve the right to recognize Palestine when it was important for the peace process, meaning the UK would only recognize it when it deemed absolutely necessary. This would mostly be when the two-state solution would be discussed and negotiated over even though many MPs have spoken about the importance for this recognition. There has also been speculation on whether the decision was made because other European nations were recognizing Palestine (BBC.com 2014).

Prime Minister David Cameron has been quite pro-Israel during his term. Previous prime ministers such as Gordon Brown and Tony Blair were also supporters of Israel, but Cameron has taken more action than just talking about his support. He got a change in legislation that allowed arrest warrants to be issued against Israelis suspected of war crimes. He has also been one state leader who is pushed for more sanctions on Iran. Most of these actions, however, have been done through a low profile with not much attention being given (Pfeffer 2015). Cameron does have somewhat of a Jewish background and he said he feels a connection to Israel. He has also reinforced the relations the UK and Israel have, especially dealing with trade and business (Teller 2014). Recently though, Cameron has called out Israel and told them to stop building illegal houses on East Jerusalem that is supposed to be Palestinian territory. Cameron said the UK is a supporter of Israel, but not their illegal settlements (Piggott 2016).

The similarity the UK has with the United States is that they both promote the two state solution between Israel and Palestine and have tried to negotiate with both states encouraging

peace talks. The UK Ambassador to the United Nations Security Council spoke to the council explaining how a two-state solution is the only way to end all kinds of conflict. He added that it is the only way we can see a safe and secure Israel next to sovereign state and that the UK will continue to work on this “urgent priority” (gov.uk 2015). Cameron has told Israel President Binyamin Netanyahu the only possible way to achieve peace and lasting security for Israel would be through this two-state solution. He was planning on using this conversation to put pressure on Netanyahu. Cameron and many of the other MPs believe if a two-state solution is not achieved, there will only be one state and that will lead to an even more disastrous outcome for all involved (Perraudin 2015).

Based on this data, I would conclude that the UK would want to use FIFA to push through with their peace talks and negotiations about the soccer teams because more is being achieved that way than what any other state is able to achieve. Just like the United States, UK Parliament members are still trying to keep Israel close by putting conditions on the legislation that would recognize Palestine and Cameron himself is trying to make sure Israel knows they are a big ally to the UK. But nonetheless, they have been working toward a two-state situation, which Israel does not want. So to save their relationship, they would be pushing FIFA to take action over the issue so a solution can be made not hurting them. And again, like in the case with the United States, there is no open evidence of public opposition from the United Kingdom to FIFA’s actions.

France and Israel also have a history together. Their relationship began in the mid-1950s when they were both of mutual interest to one another. France wanted to crush a rebellion in Algeria just as Israel wanted to combat radical Arab nationalism. Israel was a big customer to France for arms. For the next couple of decades the alliance grew stronger through military

cooperation and cultural exchanges. When Charles De Gaulle became the French president in 1959, he championed the Israeli leaders and he recognized the Jewish national state, which he said was deserved for all that the Jewish had endured (Bass 2010). Most of France backed Israel during the Suez Campaign in 1956 at a time of decolonization and in 1967 during the Israeli-Arab Six Day War. But France's alliance was diminishing with Israel after the latter conflict with De Gaulle. He was disappointed at the Israelis for getting in the war that he put an arms embargo from France to the Middle East (Neff 1999). In the 1980s the Arab conflict also became more impactful in France because of the hostages, assassinations, and attacks in France coming from the Lebanese to Jewish people in the country. This caused the people of France to take sides since there were prevalent Jewish and Arab communities within the nation (Benraad 2014). This change in relationship means France has a weaker tie with Israel than the United States and UK.

France is also advocating for a two-state solution, which is shown through the sides it is taking. On March 2016, France criticized Israel's decision to violate international law and take land on the West Bank. French Foreign Ministry spokesperson Romain Nadal said France was concerned about the decision because it shows Israel going against any negotiations for a two-state solution (Reuters 2016). On the French Diplomatic pages, there are statements saying France supports both Israel and Palestine and the only solution it believes will be productive is an "independent, viable, and democratic state living in peace and security alongside Israel" (Diplomatie.gouv.fr 2016). The French lower house National Assembly already symbolically voted 339-151 in favor of recognizing Palestine as a sovereign state against Israel's wishes (AFP and Ahren 2014).

French Foreign Minister Laurent Fabius also presented a resolution to the United Nations Security Council in 2015 that outlining negotiations and ways for Israel to leave the occupied

territories of Palestine (Lauria 2015). The resolution calls for both Palestine and Israel to reach an agreement within 18 months, otherwise France has set up an ultimatum. If negotiations are not set up in the set time, France will officially recognize Palestine as a state (Ravid 2015). Fabius also met with Palestinian Foreign Minister Riad al-Malki a couple of months after the resolution was proposed to discuss strengthening the ties between the two and also to prepare for the first French-Palestinian intergovernmental seminar. Although there was no mention of the resolution, Israel still feared that France was taking the side of Palestine and instead of just creating negotiations, they wanted to push for the recognition of Palestine as a sovereign state (McHugh 2015).

But even before the resolution was proposed, French President Francois Hollande has spoken out for the peace agreements between Israel and Palestine saying Jerusalem should be a joint capital of the two. On top of saying that during his conversation with Netanyahu, Hollande also emphasized that he was hoping for closer ties between France and Israel, especially in terms of the cooperation of high-tech French and Israeli universities. Hollande has also met with Palestinian leadership reiterating that the building of Israeli settlements should be stopped (Ravid and Khoury 2013). In April 2016, the latest news was that Hollande said an international conference, which would be initiated by France, is the best way to tackle the conflict and bring peace (Reuters 2016). Hollande has been pushing for this conference since 2014 when parliament voted to recognize Palestine, but a date had not been set yet (timesofisrael.com 2014). Palestine President Mahmoud Abbas fully backed Hollande's proposal because they were tired from suffering under Israel's policies (timesofisrael 2016).

France's current relationship with Israel, though it has more history than the United States and UK, has been somewhat balanced compared to its relationship with Palestine. Since

there is a wide population of Arab people in France, it makes sense that they would be divided on supporting Israel or Palestine based on the constituents the leaders would want to please. So right away it can be assumed that France would support FIFA as they tried to get both of the states to get along. France has also taken action to not only show it would support the two state solution, but it has already taken the initiative to get something in place to make it happen, like the UN resolution with an ultimatum so that at least one will back down. In fact, a lot of the actions France has taken parallel what FIFA is doing. The Federation is getting the two states to sit down and come up with an agreement with the main goal being to let Palestinian football team move across borders. France has been advocating for Israel to get out of occupied areas and it wants to promote peace talks as Hollande is doing with his proposed conference. Therefore, just like the United States and UK, the conclusion can be drawn that France would also be pushing FIFA to take action especially since there has not been any data found to contradict it.

Although it has now taken more of a neutral stance on the issue, China once gave their unconditional support to Palestine. Leaders such as Mao Zedong and Deng Xiaoping openly called Palestine an old friend of China and provided them with funds and arms, especially when it was under the rule of Yasser Arafat. This support helped Palestine gain a footing in the third world since China was the first non-Arab state to recognize the Palestine Liberation Organization. To keep the loyalty, China did not officially create diplomatic relations with Israel until 1992. This happened because Xiaoping saw Israel as a means to gain defense technology, and around 1980 they started recognizing Israel as having a right to security and existence. Once they created these relations, China switched over to the neutral side instead of fully supporting Palestine's plight (Chunshan 2014). One of the reasons China had such a tight relationship with

Palestine could be because China felt they were both victims of imperialism and capitalism (Assl 2011).

Even though their relationship has seen changes, China still communicates with Palestine and wants to keep its beneficial relationship. In 2005, the Chinese Premier Wen Jiabao said both states should work their cooperation on trade, technology, and economy so that it is stronger than from before. China has aided Palestine in creating more infrastructure that has helped the economy. Jiabao also said China would be willing to play a constructive role in promoting the peace process in the Middle East (xinhuanet.com 2005). Before that, the China's vice president at the time, Hu Jintao, reaffirmed that China has been a strong supporter of Palestine. Jintao also said he appreciates the strategic stance of the Palestine Liberation Organization and the peace talks and dialogue they are having in trying to reach a solution. President Abbas responded to this saying they were grateful for all that China has done for them (xinhuanet.com 1999). Palestinian leaders have made their visits continuously to China to talk about ways they can partner on things and also talk about peace settlements that can be achieved in the Middle East such as in 2010 when Chinese President Hu held talks with Abbas in Shanghai. During this conversation, Hu said China would fully back Palestine up and through aid and support. He also mentioned ways they could be beneficial together (BBC.com 2010). This data shows China has kept an open communication with Palestine and has been trying to reiterate the importance Palestine holds for them.

In the past two decades, China has also moved toward pushing for more than peace talks, but also for the two-state solution the United States, UK, and France have been advocating for. In 2013, a statement was released by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs for the People's Republic of China that gave the statements of Foreign Wang Yi when he visited Palestine. Yi reiterated that

Palestine was a good friend of China's and they always had their support. He added the only way for a solution to occur would be through peace talks and not war because war never achieved anything. According to him, the end solution needed to be a separate state for Palestine (States News 2013). Yi also spoke with Netanyahu starting off by speaking of the string technological relationship they have with one another and then moving on to say he hopes Israel will make the right decision (State News Service 2013). Wu Sike, China's special Middle East envoy, has also been exchanging China's views with other foreign ministers in the Conference on Cooperation among East Asian Countries. He explained to the other foreign ministers how a better relationship between Israel and Palestine would ensure more capacity build up for Palestine and help out its economy (States News Service 2014). The Middle East envoy position in place in itself is a way China shows it wants these peace talks to lead to a solution. Sike who was replaced by Ambassador Gong Xiaosheng, held his representative role to Palestine and Israel as his top priority (Tiezzi 2014).

In terms of reaching out, China has taken more of an effort to conduct conversations and stay on good terms with Palestine. Many peace talks and reiterations of the long history of friendship between both states proves this to be true. At the same time, China is also making sure the relationship it has with Israel is on good terms. After analyzing the data that goes over the conversations held between leaders and in general what China has said about the issue, it seems that China wants to be in the situation so it can be seen as doing something just as other states are. Work has been done with the special envoy but nonetheless, the data suggests China is only doing as much as it can to stay involved. This makes it a perfect reason for China to push an organization like FIFA to get head and initiate projects dealing with this because it means they

would not have to. There is no data found on the exact thoughts of China and FIFA's actions with the issue.

Like China, Russia has started to gain stronger relations with Israel, but the difference is that it continues to back the Palestinian Authority instead of taking a neutral stance. Russia has offered diplomatic and rhetorical support and there have been many encounters between Putin and Abbas when talking about keep the close ties (Saunders 2014). There have also been instances when Putin has publicly said Russia will support Palestine. Speaking to the Arab League Summit in 2015, Putin spoke out against foreign interventions in other nations and said Russia could help them by being a diplomatic channel. He also told the summit that Palestine has a right to establish an independent state with East Jerusalem as the capital (Withnall 2015).

In September 2015, Abbas and Netanyahu both visited Moscow to discuss the current events in the Middle East, the specific regional issues and the attacks by Israelis to Islamic and Christian holy sites with Putin and other Russian officials such as Prime Minister Dmitry Medvedev. Russia was one of the only states to speak with the two leaders at the time when other events were happening in the Middle East such as the Syrian conflict. Even the United States had not made it a point to continue the peace negotiations. This action by the Russians symbolized to the Palestinians that Russia was ready to be a key player in the Middle East due to their dissatisfaction of what other states are doing (Abu Amer 2015).

But there are also many reasons for Russia to be on Israel's side such as preferring strong regime types, the bilateral trade relationship they have growing, and the pursuit they have to halt terrorism even if it means sacrificing civil liberties (Saunders 2014). And even though it has openly said it would support Palestine in decisions, Russia is still on good terms with Israel. In a recent meeting in 2016, Putin said their main goal was to strengthen relationships between

Russia and Israel to prevent mishap. Also in discussion was the coordination of both states' armies so that they are ready to make measures in terms of areas that need security (timesofisrael.com 2016). Many other conversations Russia had with Israel in the past years are over military issues. In September 2015, Netanyahu talked to Putin about the deployment of Moscow's forces to Syria and the threat it was bringing to Israel. Moscow has been one of the biggest aids to Syria, which has led to some negative relations between Russia and Israel (Dolsten 2015).

Compared to other states, Russia is more active in current times in regards to the issue. Other states have started to reduce the amount of pushing they are doing in trying to achieve the peace negotiations. The other big difference with Russia is that it is fully backing up Palestine on issues. Even though there are times when Putin is cordial to Israeli leaders and proclaims they have both had successful conversations over issues, there are still tensions between the two. Most of their conversations also focus mainly on only the military. Since Russia is also trying to bring peace to Israel and Palestine, the conclusion can be made that they would also want an organization like FIFA to do something. And since other powerful states like the ones in the P5 are trying to do something, Russia would also want to get involved either for its own agenda purposes or to make sure one side wins over the other. There is also no data to disapprove Russia's opinion on FIFA's actions.

In conclusion, the Permanent 5 would be working with FIFA on this issue as they all in some way have tried to create a productive process that allows Israel and Palestine to not only negotiate, but come together to have some sort of peace talks. The main goal from all of them is a two-state solution where there will be no more occupied territories but a separate sovereign state for both Israel and Palestine. Because FIFA is also put into the situation of having to create

a working relationship between the two, it can be inferred from the data that other states would take advantage of the situation and also use that as the way to make something happen. Different leaders have grown weary of the constant conflict with no solution looming in the near future such as Obama and the United States, while others are now taking more initiative to do something such as Putin and Russia. Overall, these states would want to be involved with anything that is trying to work on the Israel and Palestine conflict.

Hypothesis #2 -Is the FIFA president acting as a pawn of the states or as an independent actor driving his own agenda?

So far in the history of FIFA there have been nine presidents who have taken office. The main responsibilities of the president are to implement the decisions made by Congress and the Executive Committee, supervise the work of the general secretariat, and keep up relations with FIFA and the different confederations, members, political bodies, and other international organizations. In addition to that, the president presides over the Congress and Executive Committee and is the one who proposes the appointment of removal of the secretary general (FIFA.com 2015). The presidents get elected for four year terms by the associations that are represented at the overall FIFA Congress. The nominations are submitted to the General Secretariat before the opening day of congress and the vote is taken through a secret ballot. The winner is decided with a two-thirds vote (FIFA 2003).

With this hypothesis we want to see how active the president of FIFA has been throughout the duration of actions taken by the federation on the issue. If they are the ones who led the peace talks to occur then that could mean the president is acting of his own accord but it can also be taken as the other leaders pushing him to do so. If the president has had a good

connection with the different states who want to solve the issue then he will also be more likely to follow what they are saying and helping the ones who are fighting for a two-state solution. Because our first hypothesis is that states will be the ones controlling the agenda that would mean the president is more likely to follow what they want and only take those actions they would approve of.

The FIFA Monitoring Committee Israel-Palestine was started during the term of President Sepp Blatter. But since then, Blatter has been kicked out of FIFA for corruption and succeeded by Gianni Infantino. Blatter had been in office since 1998 and won four elected terms to serve, but he was asked to step down in 2015 and then suspended from football for six years for breaching ethic guidelines (BBC.com 2016). Since Blatter came into office there have been charges made toward him such as bribery when he first got elected in 1998. He has also been accused of financial mismanagement and giving tens of millions of dollars as kickbacks to executives in commercial deals in 2002, and then he was accused of bid rigging during the decision of the 2018 and 2022 World Cups. Even as he passed through these accusations, the crimes kept coming, which eventually led to him resigning and criminal proceedings leading to his suspension (nytimes.com 2015). The main charge they looked at when he was in the criminal proceedings was over a disloyal payment of 1.3 million pounds to Frenchman Michel Platini who was getting ready to succeed him (Evans and Rumsby 2015).

But before he resigned, Blatter worked to get the committee into being and into action. Although Blatter did not run the meetings of the committee, he was a communicator to Israel and Palestine who helped lead the process to peace talks and negotiations for both the Israel and Palestine football teams. He visited both states and started the mediation process that got both of them talking. When Blatter was in Palestine and Israel, he met with not only the football

authorities, but also the political authorities. In a press release from the federation about his visits, Blatter said they all discussed how “football should unite, not divide” and “As FIFA president, I do not see that the suspension of an association is a solution.” He also laid out a plan that gave an idea of what FIFA would be doing such as having a regular exchange with the Palestinian and Israeli authorities and creating a tax exemption on football donations for the benefit of growing football in the region (<http://www.fifa.com/about-fifa/news/y=2015/m=5/news=fifa-president-blatter-concludes-visit-to-israeli-and-palestinian-auth-2607075.html> 2015). Throughout these different meetings, he made it a point to emphasize soccer and the impact it can have with issues such as these. Blatter even recommended a peace match between both national teams during the Congress when Palestine proposed the suspension of Israel from FIFA (theguardian.com 2015).

Because this is a recent issue that has been picked up within the past couple of years, and Blatter was not able to see it through, it is hard to really tell what his motivations between pursuing this issue was. He does mention multiple times that he believes soccer can be utilized for more than just a competition and has visited both Israel and Palestine multiple times to go over agreements and ways to achieve peace. Being president for almost five terms also shows his dedication to move the federation forward, but with all the corruption that was occurring around the president, the argument can be made that Blatter was more involved because he wanted to save face and show that he was being interactive and continuing to be proactive with things. Compared to President Bach of the IOC who put legislation and reform packages in place that caused a movement to occur, Blatter has only been speaking and advocating on behalf of the issue. This can be solidified when taking into account the fact that he only picked up the issue after it was brought to the federation. Therefore, the conclusion for this hypothesis would be that

Blatter is being controlled by the states because he wants to be on good terms with them and did what it takes to be seen in the positive light for as long as he could.

Hypothesis #3- Does FIFA work independently to advance new ideas and proposals?

With the past two hypotheses, we found different reasons to believe that different states would be controlling the federation to make sure it is working on this issue and doing what it can to get more peace talks to occur between Israel and Palestine. But what still needs to be taken into consideration is the constructivist perspective to see if FIFA is acting on its own to pursue policies and the actions it wants to make happen. In this specific case, we will see if there is anything done independently on FIFA's end toward the Israel and Palestine conflict.

There is a specific entity within FIFA that is looking at the issue of Palestinian and Israeli soccer. It is called the FIFA Monitoring Committee Israel-Palestine. The committee is comprised of representatives from the Israel and Palestine Football Associations. One of the main goals of this committee is to make sure there is an easier way for the movement of Palestinian football. The 65th FIFA Congress approved the creation of the committee and it is chaired by Tokyo Sexwale, the former South African government minister, who has held different positions within FIFA and also in other associations such as the Nelson Mandela Foundation, and Global Watch. Sexwale has said that he knows the task of finding resolutions with Israel and Palestine is a difficult task, but he will do his best to approach it with sensitivity and circumspection (FIFA.com 2015).

The committee was created after Palestine submitted a bid to suspend Israel from FIFA because of them not allowing the movement of Palestinian players and equipment in the Gaza Strip and West Bank. Israel claimed they were doing this because of security reasons. Palestine

also opposed Israel from competing in the Israeli championships that consisted of five clubs in the West Bank region. There were many Palestinian protestors at FIFA's annual Congress when the proposal was discussed. However, the bid for suspension was dropped during the Congress meeting and instead it was decided with a 90 percent voted on a proposal to monitor soccer related activities in the region. The motion for the suspension was brought up by Palestinian Football Association leader Jibril Rajoub who also called for a UN review of Israel soccer being played in occupied territories, which was shut down by the other members (Zeitchik 2015). Rajoub said he dropped the suspension because of the tensions he was hearing from other members. He said "A lot of colleagues who I respect and appreciate explained to me how it is painful for them to hear in this family about the issue of suspension" (quoted in Al-Jazeera 2015).

Ofer Eini, Rajoub's Israeli counterpart, said he was glad the suspensions had been withdrawn. He addressed Rajoub saying he hoped the politics could be dealt with by the politicians and that they could join together to bring the best soccer out that will hopefully lead to peace between the two states. He said he hoped that soccer would be a uniting element, and not a dividing one. (Rudoren 2015). But there can be ulterior motives behind the issues Rajoub brought up to FIFA. Rajoub also holds the title as head of the Supreme Council for Sport and Youth Affairs in Palestine and during his tenure in this position, he has launched a struggle against Israel to many other international sporting institutions. His different actions have ended the good relations he had with Israel as he would join them before to converse over agreements and arrangements (Eldar 2015). The people of Palestine themselves were unhappy with Rajoub's agreement to rescind the proposal for suspension since they had spent a long time mobilizing to

make that motion. Different activists even asked for him to dismiss. Abbas said he would not tolerate Rajoub defending the decision he made during the FIFA Congress (Wiegmann 2015).

The FIFA Monitoring Committee Israel-Palestine is an independent body created by the FIFA Congress showing that the federation acted in response to an arising issue within the federation. However, analyzing the reasoning behind the creation of the committee brings about a different picture when trying to figure out if FIFA acts independently. Not much had been done in the past over the continuing conflicts of Palestine and Israel football conflicts. Instead it took a drastic proposal to get them to take action. When the suspension of Israel was brought to the table, everyone was reluctant to move forward with the wishes of Rajoub and Palestine, and so the FIFA Monitoring Committee proved to be a solution to the problem presented in front of them. FIFA saw a reason for the committee to be created and seem to be passionate for getting a productive outcome from it, but this committee also seems to be state driven. In particular, it seems to be Palestine driving this since Rajoub keeps bringing complaints about the actions of Israel to other organizations and since there are people in Palestine counting on his voice to be a movement for the Palestinian teams.

Conclusion

When testing these three hypotheses, it was found that FIFA was not the main driver in creating the monitoring committee that brought the politicians and members of the Israel Football Association and the Palestine Football Association together to talk about solutions to their ongoing conflicts. The idea of the committee was approved by the FIFA Congress and it is run with other members of FIFA, but when looking at whether states would be the main drivers,

the strength of the leadership within the federation and how independently FIFA acted, the main conclusion would be that states are the ones driving the INGO.

When looking at the actions of the Permanent 5, we see that through the years, especially the past couple, they have been diligently working on trying to get Israel and Palestine to negotiate so there can be peace in that part of the Middle East. The United States and United Kingdom have been some of Israel's main supporters but even they have moved back to try and get some sort of compromise made instead of Israel dominating. The findings from hypothesis three, which states that other states are driving the global sports organization instead of it acting independently, gives us insight into the first hypothesis. These bigger states are responding to the actions and outbursts from smaller states. Palestine would be the smaller state in this situation and it is using FIFA as its forum to generate a response from the P5.

The second hypothesis showed the leadership of FIFA was also acting in a reactive way to the proposal of banning Israel from FIFA that Palestine brought forward. It was after the proposal that Blatter took action and met with the leaders with both Israel and Palestine and persuaded Palestine to be more open to the different situations. His leadership was acting when states' pressures built up instead of being proactive to the situation. The federation was also acting in a proactive way when it created the FIFA Monitoring Committee Israel Palestine because of the proposal from a state. These findings suggest that IOs make a difference because as in this instance they can become a forum for states to utilize when they are wanting different actions to be taken. FIFA was a forum that gave FIFA a big voice and led the world to pay more attention to their issues. Though it was not examined in detail here, it is also clear that non-state actors, e.g. Palestinians, used the forum to advance an issue, which at minimum, indicates the relevance of an international organization.

Chapter 4:

Conclusion: Global Sports Organizations do Matter in International Relations

Different theories exist as to whether international non-governmental organizations matter in the realm of International Relations. Most of the research done on the subject falls in between two camps: the realists who believe states are the only ones in control and all outside actors fit into the agendas of states and the constructivists who believe INGOs can stand on their own and make a difference in the grand scheme of things. Some of the biggest realists such as Mearshemier (1994) and Checkel (2005) see these organizations as weak because of the difficulty they have in shaping state behavior. To theorists in this camp, INGOs exist, but only play a role to a certain extent. On the other end, constructivists believe INGOs are crucial in driving state behavior. The norms they set influence the different states policies created as Finnemore (1993) analyzes and as Cortell and Davis (1996) explain, the stronger the organization is, the more impact it is going to have.

These two camps focus on the overarching realm of INGOs, but there are many types to be considered when studying the functions and the impact these INGOs can have. Global Sports Organizations are a type of organization that have their own place in international relations. Not only do they create policies that impact each state who is a part of the organization, but they also provide the entertainment and a different form of competition among states. These organizations have also been studied extensively as a whole and individually. But what the existing literature does not focus on is the internal governing bodies within these sports organizations and the influence their decisions have on states.

The research conducted in this study focused on the question of whether global sports organizations matter as constructivists would believe or if the realists are correct in saying states are the ones that control the organizations. To answer this question, two case studies were done focusing on two of the biggest global sports organizations, the International Olympic Committee and the Federation Internationale de Football Association. Both of these organizations have a wide reach to states all over the world, so their actions affect lots of people. Therefore, they were the best to analyze because the decisions and actions made from their governing bodies could create the norms states will adopt or can be taken advantage of by the states so they can each push what they want forward. The main policy analyzed with the IOC was the new transgender update that allowed athletes to compete even without undergoing surgery. The main policy for FIFA was the FIFA Monitoring Committee Israel and Palestine that was created to get teams from both Israel and Palestine to negotiate with one another.

Three hypotheses were developed to answer the question following the realist theory that INGOs do not matter. Each one was a different section for the chapters that all led to the main conclusion. The first hypothesis says states will be controlling the agenda. To find out if this was true, the Permanent 5 from the United Nations were analyzed to see where they stood on the issue and whether they were controlling what the IOC and FIFA were doing as members. The second hypothesis analyzed the leadership because the assumption was that there would be weak leadership from the president since states would be the main actors. The third hypothesis follows the constructivist views to see if the organizations acted independently to push their initiatives forward. News articles and press releases were analyzed for the data that led to the conclusions.

There were limitations to this study. Even though there was evidence that proved how the states felt about the specific policies due to what different leaders said and what actions

paralleled the policies created within the different states, there was still missing data. What would make the conclusions stronger would be the actual opinions of the states for the IOC's transgender policy update and the creation of FIFA's monitoring committee that would prove the conclusions correct. Data of the actual voting behavior of the states over the specific policies within the organizations would have also solidified the conclusions. Doing another case study of a different global sports organization could have also led to more findings. Nonetheless, mixed evidence was found from the two case studies conducted and they both lead to the overall conclusion that global sports organizations do matter and states have a big influence over them.

Analyzing the United States, United Kingdom, France, China, and Russia for the first hypothesis allowed us to see the positions of some of the most powerful states on the issue of transgender rights and the conflict between Israel and Palestine. For the transgender rights, there was a mix of opinions among the states. While the United States, UK, and France were already advocating for LGBT rights through their policies and addresses made by leaders, China was quiet about the issue even when its people were wanting something to be done from the lack of rights. Russia was openly advocating against these rights with their anti-propaganda of non-traditional sexual relations. But we didn't see Russia pushing their views forward against the actions of the IOC, which it would be doing if it was trying to control the agenda. And because they did not say anything against the policy update, it shows they were not trying to control the IOC's agenda or to even just get involved.

The 2014 Sochi Winter Games were the biggest evidence proving the IOC does matter. Even though these games now have the connotation of being the "Gay Olympics," Putin kept saying transgender people were allowed in the games. His request was that they stay away from the children. President Obama responded by sending Transgender athletes with the United States

Olympic team. Russia's insistence for the games to continue with them as the host nation shows the influence a committee has on a state. Russia knew what it meant to be a host city and of the advantages that would come from being host. The Olympics also became a forum for states to express their views on different topics such as this at the 2014 games, which was what Obama was doing when he retaliated against the ideologies of Russia. As constructivists would say, the IOC is influencing a norm to grow further globally, which can be seen happening from the responses states are having as a result of the overall decisions the IOC made.

This same pattern can be seen with FIFA and the monitoring committee it created for Israel and Palestine conflicts. Each state had in some way tried to insist peace talks between the two states who had been in conflict with one another for years. Although the United States and UK have openly said they would side with Israel and Russia said it would choose the side of Palestine, in current times their main goal has moved from being aid to these states to being a facilitator that will lead to a two-state solution because according to the P5, that would be the only productive solution for these ongoing conflicts. Because they are trying to advocate what FIFA has been since the starting of the committee, the main conclusion would be that they would be the ones behind the scenes driving the issue. However, when analyzing the creation of the committee we see it was the reaction to a proposed action within FIFA and not these states advocating for it. So once again, the organization was used as a forum to advance new norms into place.

When it came to the president of these organizations, they both drew different conclusions in terms of the strength of their leadership. Bach from the IOC can be analyzed as a strong leader who was actively advocating for this policy that would progress the organization. When he initiated the "Olympic Agenda 2020" reform package, he called for sexual orientation

rights amongst others. His package was met with standing ovation and passed more quickly than anyone anticipated. He also stayed active by visiting other nations and making sure the committee knew the influence they had all over the world. This strong leadership meant the IOC was working on its own accord in trying to create policies that would mean something and touch all areas from states to athletes to national committees and more.

President Blatter from FIFA was not as active as Bach. He visited Palestine and Israel to talk to them about soccer and its potential of having them work together. But Blatter picked up the issue in response to Palestine's proposal to suspend Israel from FIFA. Instead of taking a proactive role on this issue and making sure both teams were cooperating, Blatter had to exert his leadership when things were taken drastically. Also taken into account, is that Blatter was under corruption allegations as this was happening and in order to make himself look good, he could have been getting involved in the conversations. Compared to Bach, Blatter had weak leadership for this issue and that means he could have been used by the states, who would be taking advantage of his situation, to get closer to a solution.

What really solidifies the proof that global sports organizations do matter is the third hypothesis that proves states can act independently to carry out their missions. The IOC transgender policy update came from an internal committee that was called upon by the IOC Medical and Scientific Commission. It was comprised of experts over transgender issues. But even more than just this committee that had the responsibility of bringing the IOC up to date, the IOC has always done gender testing on its own. There are people within the committee that have been in charge of conducting the tests. Through the years, the methods of testing have also changed. States are not the ones in controlling how these guidelines are handled, it is the IOC that has shown its constant action over these kinds of issues.

The FIFA Monitoring Committee Israel-Palestine is also an independent body created within FIFA by the 65th Congress. But unlike the IOC that has shown it is constantly working on their issue, FIFA's committee is a response to a drastic proposal that could cause more conflicts for it internally. When Palestine came in wanting to suspend Israel, a majority of the other states knew there was something else that would need to be done to counteract the proposal. In this instance, Palestine is a state that is controlling the organization because of the advantage it put itself in with the proposal. Therefore, the realist theory could be proved correct, however, the constructivist approach makes more sense. FIFA is the forum being used to push the new norm into place because of the overarching influence it has. FIFA is the body making things happen like the peace talks between the leaders of Palestine and Israel that individual states were unable to do.

Overall, global sports organizations do matter because they play an influential role in advancing developing norms amongst different states. And even though states still have the potential to utilize them, the overarching influence of these organizations is what causes any of the actions or decisions individual states push to be impactful.

References

- “2015FIFAStatutesEN_Neutral.pdf.” http://www.fifa.com/mm/Document/AFFederation/Generic/02/58/14/48/2015FIFAStatutesEN_Neutral.pdf (May 1, 2016).
- “Abbas in Paris: ‘Suffocating’ Palestinians Back France Peace Push.” 2016. *The Times of Israel*. <http://www.timesofisrael.com/abbas-in-paris-suffocating-palestinians-back-france-peace-push/> (May 1, 2016).
- Abu Amer, Adnan. 2015. “Abbas Turns to Russia.” *Al-Monitor: The Pulse of the Middle East*. <http://www.al-monitor.com/pulse/originals/2015/09/abbas-visit-russia-support-conflict-israel-palestine.html> (May 1, 2016).
- Andrew, and Mark Piekarz. 2015. “Sport Events and Human Rights: Positive Promotion or Negative Erosion?” *Journal of Policy Research in Tourism, Leisure and Events* 0(0): 1–17.
- AFP and Raphael Ahren. 2014. “French Parliament Votes to Recognize Palestinian State.” *The Times of Israel*. <http://www.timesofisrael.com/french-parliament-votes-to-recognize-palestinian-state/> (May 1, 2016).
- Allegretti, Aubrey. 2015. “Ministers Clash over ‘Pride’ Flag Flown From Government Buildings.” *The Huffington Post UK*. http://www.huffingtonpost.co.uk/2015/06/22/pride-flag-matthew-hancock-philip-hammond_n_7634458.html (April 29, 2016).
- “Almost Half the World Tuned in at Home to Watch 2010 FIFA World Cup South Africa™. 2011.” *FIFA.com*. <http://www.fifa.com/worldcup/news/y=2011/m=7/news=almost-half-the-world-tuned-home-watch-2010-fifa-world-cup-south-africat-1473143.html> (May 1, 2016).
- Arnaud, Pierre, and Professor Jim Riordan. 2013. *Sport and International Politics: Impact of Fascism and Communism on Sport*. Routledge.
- Assl, Nima Khorrami. 2011. “Palestine UN Bid: Where Does China Stand?” *Al-Jazeera*. <http://www.aljazeera.com/indepth/opinion/2011/09/2011928163950390354.html> (May 1, 2016).
- “Background Briefing on Israeli-Palestinian Peace Talks.” 2013. *U.S. Department of State*. The Office of Website Management, Bureau of Public Affairs. <http://www.state.gov/r/pa/prs/ps/2013/07/212564.htm> (May 1, 2016).
- Baker, Stephanie Alice, and David Rowe. 2012. “Mediating Mega Events and Manufacturing Multiculturalism: The Cultural Politics of the World Game in Australia.” *Journal of Sociology*: 1440783312451782.
- Baldor, Lolita C. 2015. “Pentagon Announces Plan Aimed at Lifting Transgender Ban.” *The Big Story*. <http://bigstory.ap.org/article/67db24e3b2604c39b20c4b7f7e5bcbf7/apnewsbreak-pentagon-readying-plan-lift-transgender-ban> (April 29, 2016).

- Barney, R. K., Wenn, S. R., & Martyn, S. G. (2002). *The International Olympic Committee and the Rise of Olympic Commercialism*. University of Utah Press.
- Baron et al. 2007. "Doping in Sports and its Spread to At-Risk Populations: An International Review." *World Psychiatry*. 6(2): 54-59.
- Bass, Gary J. 2010. "When Israel and France Broke Up." *The New York Times*. <http://www.nytimes.com/2010/04/01/opinion/01bass.html>(May 1, 2016).
- Bassok, Moti. 2014. "Hellfire in Perspective U.S. Military Aid to Israel Exceeds \$100 Billion." *Haaretz*.<http://www.haaretz.com/israel-news/.premium-1.611001>(May 1, 2016).
- Benaad, Myriam. 2014. "France's Fascination with Israel and Palestine." http://www.ecfr.eu/article/commentary_frances_fascination_with_israel_and_palestine290(May 1, 2016).
- Benari, Elad. 2016. "Obama: Israeli-PA Conflict Won't Be Resolved during My Tenure." *Arutz Sheva*.<http://www.israelnationalnews.com/News/News.aspx/209824>(May 1, 2016).
- Bennett, A., & Elman, C. 2006. "Qualitative research: Recent developments in case study methods." *Annu. Rev. Polit. Sci.*, 9, 455-476.
- Beutler, Ingrid. 2008. "Sport Serving Development and Peace: Achieving the Goals of the United Nations through Sport." *Sport in Society* 11(4): 359-69.
- Blackshaw, Ian. 2011. "Kick Corruption out of Football!" *The International Sports Law Journal* (1-2): 137.
- Boyle, Raymond, and Richard Haynes. 2009. *Power Play: Sport, the Media and Popular Culture*. Edinburgh University Press.
- Brooks, Kenneth. 2014. "Soccer & Politics."
- Cavanagh, Sheila L., and Heather Sykes. 2006. "Transsexual Bodies at the Olympics: The International Olympic Committee's Policy on Transsexual Athletes at the 2004 Athens Summer Games." *Body & Society* 12(3): 75-102.
- Chappelet, Jean-Loup. 2008. "Olympic Environmental Concerns as a Legacy of the Winter Games." *The International Journal of the History of Sport* 25(14): 1884-1902.
- Checkel, J. T. 2005. "International institutions and socialization in Europe: Introduction and framework." *International organization*, 59(04), 801-826.
- "China supports middle-east peace process." 1999. *Xinhua News Agency*. www.lexisnexis.com/hottopic/inacademic (May 1, 2016).
- "China to enhance economic cooperation with Palestine: premier." 2005. *Xinhua General News Service*. www.lexisnexis.com/hottopic/inacademic (May 1, 2016).
- Chiu, Joanna. 2013. "Parents of gay children seek support". *South China Morning Post*, Retrieved from www.lexisnexis.com/hottopic/inacademic (April 30, 2016).

- Chunshan, Mu. 2014. "Why China Must Pay Attention to the Israel-Palestine Conflict." *The Diplomat*. <http://thediplomat.com/2014/07/why-china-must-pay-attention-to-the-israel-palestine-conflict/> (May 1, 2016).
- "Claim: Obama Threatened to Shoot Down IAF Iran Strike. 2014. *ALALAM*.
"<http://en.alalam.ir/news/1681618> (May 1, 2016).
- Coalter, Fred. 2010. "The Politics of Sport-for-Development: Limited Focus Programmes and Broad Gauge Problems?" *International Review for the Sociology of Sport* 45(3): 295–314.
- Cornelissen, Scarlett. 2011. "More than a Sporting Chance? Appraising the Sport for Development Legacy of the 2010 FIFA World Cup." *Third World Quarterly* 32(3): 503–29.
- Cortell, Andrew P., and James W. Davis. 1996. "How Do International Institutions Matter? The Domestic Impact of International Rules and Norms." *International Studies Quarterly* 40(4): 451–78.
- Curley, Ann J. 2012. "Expert: Gender Testing 'Imperfect' for Female Athletes - CNN.com." *CNN*. <http://www.cnn.com/2012/08/08/health/athletes-gender-testing/index.html>(April 30, 2016).
- Darby, Paul. 2002. *Africa, Football, and FIFA: Politics, Colonialism, and Resistance*. Psychology Press.
- Darnell, Simon C., and others. 2010. "Power, Politics and 'sport for Development and Peace': Investigating the Utility of Sport for International Development." *Sociology of sport journal* 27(1): 54–75.
- "David Cameron Says He Will Never Validate DUP Policy on Gay Rights and LGBT Issues." 2015. *BBC News*. <http://www.bbc.com/news/uk-northern-ireland-32420577>(April 29, 2016).
- Department Of State. The Office of Website Management, Bureau of Public Affairs. 2014. "Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, and Transgender Human Rights Issues." *U.S. Department of State*.
- Dolsten, Josefin. 2015. "Netanyahu Heading to Russia to Warn of Syria Aid Threats." *The Times of Israel*. <http://www.timesofisrael.com/netanyahu-heading-to-russia-to-warn-of-syria-aid-threats/> (May 1, 2016).
- Durant, John. 1973. *Highlights of the Olympics : From Ancient Times to the Present*. [4th ed., rev and enl.]. New York: Hastings House.
- Eilperin, Juliet. 2015. "Obama's Quiet Transgender Revolution." *Washington Post*. https://www.washingtonpost.com/politics/obamas-quiet-transgender-revolution/2015/11/30/6879527e-95e4-11e5-b5e4-279b4501e8a6_story.html. (April 29, 2016).
- Eisenhardt, K. M. 1989. "Building theories from case study research." *Academy of management review*, 14(4), 532-550.

- Eldar, Shlomi. 2015. "Is Palestinian Soccer Head Playing a Political Game?" *Al-Monitor*. <http://www.al-monitor.com/pulse/originals/2015/08/israel-palestine-soccer-rajoub-provocation-players-entry.html#> (May 1, 2016).
- Evans, Martin and Ben Rumsby. 2015. "Fifa Corruption Scandal: Sepp Blatter Questioned over Payment to Michel Platini." <http://www.telegraph.co.uk/sport/football/sepp-blatter/11892504/Fifa-corruption-scandal-Sepp-Blatter-questioned-over-payment-to-Michel-Platini.html> (May 1, 2016).
- Ferreira, Sanette. 2011. "South African Tourism Road to Economic Recovery: 2010 Fifa Soccer World Cup as Vehicle." *Tourism Review International* 15(1-2): 91–106.
- "FIFA Pleased with Israel-Palestinian Progress." 2015. *The Jerusalem Post / JPost.com*. <http://www.jpost.com/Breaking-News/FIFA-pleased-with-Israel-Palestine-progress-419882> (May 1, 2016).
- "FIFA President Blatter Concludes Visit to Israeli and Palestinian Authorities." 2015. *FIFA.com*. <http://www.fifa.com/about-fifa/news/y=2015/m=5/news=fifa-president-blatter-concludes-visit-to-israeli-and-palestinian-auth-2607075.html> (May 1, 2016).
- "Fifa President Sepp Blatter Proposes Israel v Palestine 'peace Match.'" 2015. *The Guardian*. <http://www.theguardian.com/football/2015/may/19/fifa-sepp-blatter-israel-palestine-peace-match> (May 1, 2016).
- "Fifa Presidential Election: Gianni Infantino Succeeds Sepp Blatter." 2016. *BBC Sport*. <http://www.bbc.com/sport/football/35673743> (May 1, 2016).
- Finnemore, Martha. 1993. "International Organizations as Teachers of Norms: The United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization and Science Policy." *International Organization* 47(04): 565–97.
- Flyvbjerg, B. 2006. "Five Misunderstandings about Case-Study Research." *Qualitative inquiry*, 12(2), 219-245.
- Forster, John. 2006. "Global Sports Organisations and Their Governance." *Corporate Governance: The international journal of business in society* 6(1): 72–83.
- "France Calls for International Israeli-Palestinian Peace Conference." 2014. *The Times of Israel*. <http://www.timesofisrael.com/france-calls-for-international-israeli-palestinian-peace-conference/> (May 1, 2016).
- Friedman, Uri. 2014. "How Sochi Became the Gay Olympics." *The Atlantic*. <http://www.theatlantic.com/international/archive/2014/01/how-sochi-became-the-gay-olympics/283398/> (April 30, 2016).
- Fullerton, Jamie. 2015. "China's Attitude toward Homosexuality Is Beginning to Shift, with Parents Leading the Way." *VICE News*. <https://news.vice.com/article/chinas-attitude-toward-homosexuality-is-beginning-to-shift-with-parents-leading-the-way> (April 30, 2016).
- Garcia, Borja, and Henk-Erik Meier. 2013. "Keeping Private Governance Private: Is FIFA Blackmailing National Governments?"

- George, A., & Bennett, A. 1979. *Case studies and theory development*. Free Press.
- “Germany, France Criticise Israel for Seizing West Bank Land.” 2016. *Reuters UK*.<http://uk.reuters.com/article/uk-israel-palestinians-france-idUKKCN0WI1LM> (May 1, 2016).
- Gessen, Masha. 2016. “For Putin’s Censors, Only Suicide Is Worse than Homosexuality.” *The Intercept*.<https://theintercept.com/2016/02/19/for-russia-censors-only-suicide-is-worse-than-homosexuality/> (April 30, 2016).
- Glazer, Samantha. 2011–2012. “Sporting Chance: Litigation Sexism Out of the Olympic Intersex Policy.” *Journal of Law and Policy* 20: 545.
- Glanville, Brian. 1973. *History of the Soccer World Cup*. [1st American ed.]. New York: Collier Books.
- Hammarberg, Thomas. 2009. “The Transgender Rights Deficit.” *The Guardian*.<http://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2009/sep/05/transgender-human-rights-europe> (April 30, 2016).
- Hill, Christopher R. 1996. *Olympic Politics*. Manchester University Press.
- “History of FIFA - Foundation.” *FIFA.com*. <http://www.fifa.com/about-fifa/who-we-are/history/index.html> (May 1, 2016).
- Hoberman, John. 2008. “Think Again: The Olympics.” *Foreign Policy* (167): 22–28.
- “Hollande: International Summit Best Way to Tackle Israeli-Palestinian Conflict.” 2016. *The Jerusalem Post | JPost.com*. <http://www.jpost.com/Arab-Israeli-Conflict/Hollande-International-summit-best-way-to-tackle-Israeli-Palestinian-conflict-451360> (May 1, 2016).
- Houlihan, Barrie. 2014. *The Government and Politics of Sport (RLE Sports Studies)*. Routledge.
- “How Do You Become President of FIFA? 2003.” *FIFA.com*. <http://www.fifa.com/news/y=2003/m=4/news=how-you-become-president-fifa-86843.html> (May 1, 2016).
- Hoye, Russell, and Graham Cuskelly. 2007. *Sport Governance*. Routledge.
- Hunt, Thomas M. 2011. *Drug Games: The International Olympic Committee and the Politics of Doping, 1960–2008*. University of Texas Press.
- “IOC Relaxes Guidelines on Transgender Athletes.” 2016. <http://www.cbc.ca/sports/olympics/generic/ioc-transgender-athletes-guidlines-1.3417794> (April 30, 2016).
- “International Laws Protecting Transgender Workers.” Human Rights Campaign.<http://www.hrc.org/resources/international-laws-protecting-transgender-workers/> (April 30, 2016).
- “Israel/Palestine: 10 Keys to Understand France’s Position.” 2016. *France Diplomatie : Ministry of Foreign Affairs and International Development*.

- <http://www.diplomatie.gouv.fr/en/country-files/israel-palestinian-territories/peace-process/article/israel-palestine-10-keys-to> (May 1, 2016).
- “Israeli 2014 Gaza War Actions Lawful, Report Says.” 2015. *BBC News*. <http://www.bbc.com/news/world-middle-east-33128955> (May 1, 2016).
- Jacobson, Louis. 2012. “Provide \$30 Billion over 10 Years to Israel.” *PolitiFact*. <http://www.politifact.com/truth-o-meter/promises/obameter/promise/133/provide-30-billion-over-10-years-to-israel/> (May 1, 2016).
- Jarvie, Grant. 2013. *Sport, Culture and Society: An Introduction, Second Edition*. Routledge.
- Jennings, Will, and Martin Lodge. 2011. “Governing Mega-Events: Tools of Security Risk Management for the FIFA 2006 World Cup in Germany and London 2012 Olympic Games.” *Government and Opposition* 46(02): 192–222.
- Jennings, Will. 2010. “Governing the Games in an Age of Uncertainty: The Olympics and Organisational Responses to Risk.” In *Terrorism and the Olympics: Major Event Security and Lessons for the Future*, eds. Anthony Richards, Pete Fussey, and Andrew Silke. Routledge, 135–62.
- Jennings, Andrew. 2011. “Investigating Corruption in Corporate Sport: The IOC and FIFA.” *International Review for the Sociology of Sport*: 1012690211408845.
- Jennings, Will. 2013. “Governing the Games: High Politics, Risk and Mega-Events: Governing the Games.” *Political Studies Review* 11(1): 2–14.
- Keck, Margaret E., and Kathryn Sikkink. 1999. “Transnational Advocacy Networks in International and Regional Politics.” *International Social Science Journal* 51(159): 89–101.
- Keohane, Robert. 1984. *After Hegemony: Cooperation and Discord in the World Political Economy*. Princeton University Press.
- Keys, Barbara J. 2013. *Globalizing Sport*. Harvard University Press.
- Kidd, Bruce. 2008. “A New Social Movement: Sport for Development and Peace.” *Sport in Society* 11(4): 370–80.
- Kim, Nam-Su, and Laurence Chalip. 2004. “Why Travel to the FIFA World Cup? Effects of Motives, Background, Interest, and Constraints.” *Tourism Management* 25(6): 695–707.
- Kim, Samuel Seongseop, and Alastair M. Morrison. 2005. “Change of Images of South Korea among Foreign Tourists after the 2002 FIFA World Cup.” *Tourism Management* 26(2): 233–47.
- Lauria, Joe. 2015. “France to Launch Push for U.N. Resolution on Israeli-Palestinian Conflict.” *Wall Street Journal*. <http://www.wsj.com/articles/france-to-launch-push-for-u-n-resolution-on-israeli-palestinian-conflict-1427469530> (May 1, 2016).

- Lederman, Josh. 2015. "Biden Backs Transgender Military Service as US Weighs Policy." *Associated Press*. <http://www.military.com/daily-news/2015/10/05/biden-backs-transgender-military-service-as-us-weighs-policy.html> (April 29, 2016).
- Lee, Choong-Ki, and Tracy Taylor. 2005. "Critical Reflections on the Economic Impact Assessment of a Mega-Event: The Case of 2002 FIFA World Cup." *Tourism Management* 26(4): 595–603.
- Lenskyj, Helen Jefferson. 2000. *Inside the Olympic Industry: Power, Politics, and Activism*. SUNY Press.
- Lenskyj, Helen Jefferson. 2008. *Olympic Industry Resistance: Challenging Olympic Power and Propaganda*. SUNY Press.
- Lenskyj, Helen Jefferson. 2014. *Sexual Diversity and the Sochi 2014 Olympics: No More Rainbows*. Springer.
- Lerer, Lisa. 2015. "Hillary Clinton Promotes Gay Rights As Pillar Of 2016 Bid." 2015–400. *The Huffington Post*. http://www.huffingtonpost.com/entry/hillary-clinton-gay-rights_us_561133d8e4b0af3706e11be0 (April 29, 2016).
- Levermore, Roger. 2008. "Sport a New Engine of Development?" *Progress in Development Studies* 8(2): 183–90.
- Lijphart, A. 1971. "Comparative politics and the comparative method." *American political science review*, 65(03), 682-693.
- Lisi, Clemente Angelo. 2011. *A History of the World Cup, 1930-2010* /. Updated ed. Lanham, Md. : Scarecrow Press.
- Lu, Chen. 2013. "On the Edge." *Global Times*. <http://www.globaltimes.cn/content/826053.shtml> (April 30, 2016).
- Lynch, Colum. 2016. "Russian Accused of Silencing Activists Is Considered for Top U.N. Post Dealing with NGOs." *Foreign Policy*. <https://foreignpolicy.com/2016/02/15/u-s-claims-russian-official-that-helped-silence-american-ngos-is-up-for-top-u-n-ngo-job/> (April 30, 2016).
- Lyras, Alexis, and Jon Welty Peachey. 2011. "Integrating Sport-for-Development Theory and Praxis." *Sport Management Review* 14(4): 311–26.
- MacAloon, John J. 2011. "Scandal and Governance: Inside and Outside the IOC 2000 Commission." *Sport in Society* 14(3): 292–308.
- Maguire, J., and R. Pearton. 2000. "The Impact of Elite Labour Migration on the Identification, Selection and Development of European Soccer Players." *Journal of Sports Sciences* 18(9): 759–69.
- Mallon, B. (2000). "The Olympic bribery scandal." *Journal of Olympic history*, 8(2), 11-27
- Mason, D. S., Thibault, L., & Misener, L. (2006). "An agency theory perspective on corruption in sport: The case of the International Olympic Committee." *Journal of Sport Management*, 20(1), 52.

- McHugh, Jess. 2015. "Israel-Palestine Conflict: French UN Security Council Resolution off The Table In Favor Of Palestinian Statehood?" 2015. *International Business Times*. <http://www.ibtimes.com/israel-palestine-conflict-french-un-security-council-resolution-table-favor-2059816> (May 1, 2016).
- McKay, J., Hutchins, B., & Mikosza, J. (2000). "Shame and Scandal in the Family." *Olympika*, 25-48.
- McMichael, Christopher. 2013. "Sporting Mega-Events and South-to-South Security Exchanges: A Comparative Study of South Africa and Brazil." *The Hague Journal of Diplomacy* 8(3-4): 313-32.
- Mearsheimer, John J. 1994. "The False Promise of International Institutions." *International Security* 19(3): 5-49.
- Menary, Steve. 2007. *Outcasts! The Lands That FIFA Forgot - 1st Edition*. Know The Score.
- Migdalovitz, Carol. 2004. *Greece: Threat of Terrorism and Security at the Olympics*.
- Molnar, Adam. 2015. "The Geo-Historical Legacies of Urban Security Governance and the Vancouver 2010 Olympics." *The Geographical Journal* 181(3): 235-41.
- Moravcsik, Andrew. 1997. "Taking Preferences Seriously: A Liberal Theory of International Politics." *International Organizations* 51(4): 513-53.
- "MPs Back Palestinian Statehood alongside Israel." 2014. *BBC News*. <http://www.bbc.com/news/uk-politics-29596822> (May 1, 2016).
- Müller, Martin. 2014. "(Im-)Mobile Policies: Why Sustainability Went Wrong in the 2014 Olympics in Sochi." *European Urban and Regional Studies*: 0969776414523801.
- Müller, Martin. 2011. "State Dirigisme in Megaprojects: Governing the 2014 Winter Olympics in Sochi." *Environment and Planning A* 43(9): 2091-2108.
- Murray, Stuart, and Geoffrey Allen Pigman. 2014. "Mapping the Relationship between International Sport and Diplomacy." *Sport in Society* 17(9): 1098-1118.
- Nauright, John, and John Ramfjord. 2010. "Who Owns England's Game? American Professional Sporting Influences and Foreign Ownership in the Premier League." *Soccer & Society* 11(4): 428-41.
- Ndlovu, Sifiso Mxolisi. 2010. "Sports as Cultural Diplomacy: The 2010 FIFA World Cup in South Africa's Foreign Policy." *Soccer & Society* 11(1-2): 144-53.
- Neff, Donald. 1999. "De Gaulle Calls Jews Domineering, Israel an Expansionist State." *WRMEA*. <http://www.wrmea.org/1999-october-november/de-gaulle-calls-jews-domineering-israel-an-expansionist-state.html> (May 1, 2016).
- "Netanyahu Hails 'very Successful' Meeting with Putin." *The Times of Israel*. <http://www.timesofisrael.com/netanyahu-hails-very-successful-meeting-with-putin/> (May 1, 2016).

- Nichols, James. 2013. "Russia's LGBT Community Rattled after Gunmen open Fire on Popular Gay Club." 2013–500. *The Huffington Post*. http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2013/11/18/russia-gay-club-shooting_n_4296064.html (April 30, 2016).
- "Olympics Reform Package Passes Unanimously." 2014. *SFGate*. <http://www.sfgate.com/sports/article/Olympics-reform-package-passes-unanimously-5943711.php> (April 30, 2016).
- Opall-Rome, Barbra. 2016. "Obama Offers Israel New 10-Year Aid Package, But There's a Catch." *Defense News*. <http://www.defensenews.com/story/defense/international/mideast-africa/2016/02/13/obama-israel-aid-package-netanyahu-iran/80265988/> (May 1, 2016).
- "Our Mission | AIPAC.org." <http://www.aipac.org/about/mission> (May 1, 2016).
- "Palestinians Drop Bid to Have FIFA Suspend Israel. 2015. *Al-Jazeera*. <http://www.aljazeera.com/news/2015/05/palestinians-drop-bid-fifa-suspend-israel-expel-150529134416773.html> (May 1, 2016).
- Perraudin, Frances. 2015. "Lasting Peace in Israel Requires Two-State Solution, Says Cameron." *The Guardian*. <http://www.theguardian.com/world/2015/mar/23/two-state-israel-palestine-peace-binyamin-netanyahu-david-cameron> (May 1, 2016).
- Pfeffer, Anshel. 2015. "Is David Cameron the Most pro-Israel British PM Ever?" *Haaretz*. <http://www.haaretz.com/israel-news/.premium-1.653847> (May 1, 2016).
- Pielke Jr., Roger. 2013. "How Can FIFA Be Held Accountable?" *Sport Management Review* 16(3): 255–67.
- Piggott, Mark. 2016. "David Cameron Slams Illegal Israeli Settlements in East Jerusalem as 'Genuinely Shocking.'" 2016. *International Business Times UK*. <http://www.ibtimes.co.uk/david-cameron-slams-illegal-israeli-settlements-east-jerusalem-genuinely-shocking-1545834> (May 1, 2016).
- Pillay, Udes, and Orli Bass. 2008. "Mega-Events as a Response to Poverty Reduction: The 2010 FIFA World Cup and Its Urban Development Implications." *Urban Forum* 19(3): 329–46.
- "Philip Hammond Says Voters 'Angry' At Gay Marriage." 2013. *The Huffington Post UK*. http://www.huffingtonpost.co.uk/2013/05/17/gay-marriage-philip-hammond_n_3291000.html (April 29, 2016).
- Preuss, Holger. 2007. "FIFA World Cup 2006 and Its Legacy on Tourism." In *Trends and Issues in Global Tourism 2007*, eds. Roland Conrady and Martin Buck. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 83–102.
- "Putin: Russia Must 'cleanse' Itself of Gays, but No Need to Fear in Sochi." 2014. *Al-Jazeera*. <http://america.aljazeera.com/articles/2014/1/19/putin-russia-mustcleanseitselfofgays.html> (April 30, 2016).
- Rasgon, Adam. 2015. "Israeli, Palestinian Officials Score a Goal on FIFA Agreement - Al-Monitor: The Pulse of the Middle East." 2015. *Al-Monitor*. <http://www.al->

- monitor.com/pulse/originals/2015/12/palestinian-football-teams-movement-israel-fifa.html (May 1, 2016).
- Rauhala Emily. 2015. "Court to Hear China's First Transgender Labor Discrimination Case." *Washington Post*.
<https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/worldviews/wp/2016/04/10/court-to-hear-chinas-first-transgender-labor-discrimination-case/> (April 30, 2016).
- Ravid, Barak. 2015. "Report: French UN Resolution Sets 18-Month Deadline for Israeli-Palestinian Deal." *Haaretz*.<http://www.haaretz.com/israel-news/.premium-1.657435> (May 1, 2016).
- Ravid, Barak, and Jack Khoury. 2013. "Hollande: Jerusalem Should Be Capital of Israel and Palestine." *Haaretz*.<http://www.haaretz.com/israel-news/.premium-1.558794> (May 1, 2016).
- "Readout of Vice President Biden's Meeting with Former Israeli President Shimon Peres." 2016. *whitehouse.gov*. <https://www.whitehouse.gov/the-press-office/2016/03/08/readout-vice-president-bidens-meeting-former-israeli-president-shimon> (May 1, 2016).
- "Readout of Vice President Biden's Meeting with Palestinian Authority President Mahmoud Abbas." 2016. *whitehouse.gov*. <https://www.whitehouse.gov/the-press-office/2016/03/10/readout-vice-president-bidens-meeting-palestinian-authority-president> (May 1, 2016).
- "Remarks By the President and the First Lady to the International Olympic Committee." 2009. *whitehouse.gov*. <https://www.whitehouse.gov/the-press-office/remarks-president-and-first-lady-international-olympic-committee> (April 29, 2016).
- Richards, Anthony, Pete Fussey, and Andrew Silke. 2010. *Terrorism and the Olympics: Major Event Security and Lessons for the Future*. Routledge.
- Richter, Marlise L. et al. 2010. "Sex Work and the 2010 FIFA World Cup: Time for Public Health Imperatives to Prevail." *Globalization and Health* 6: 1.
- Rowe, David. 2011. *Global Media Sport: Flows, Forms and Futures*. A&C Black.
- "Russia's LGBT Victimized by 'gay propaganda' law." 2015. *Al Jazeera*.
<http://www.aljazeera.com/indepth/features/2015/09/russia-lgbt-victimised-gay-propaganda-law-150914082614488.html> (April 30, 2016).
- Rudoren, Jodi. 2015. "Palestinian Soccer Association Drops Effort to Suspend Israel from FIFA." *The New York Times*.
<http://www.nytimes.com/2015/05/30/world/middleeast/palestine-palestinian-fa-soccer-israel-fifa.html> (May 2, 2016).
- Rutty, M., D. Scott, R. Steiger, and P. Johnson. 2015. "Weather Risk Management at the Olympic Winter Games." *Current Issues in Tourism* 18(10): 931-46.
- Santow, Simon. 2013. "New Olympics Boss Vows to Sort out 'Gay Prejudice Row' before Sochi." 1000. <http://www.abc.net.au/worldtoday/content/2013/s3846152.htm>(April 30, 2016).

- Saunders, Paul J. "Russia Balances Relations with Israelis, Palestinians." 2014. *Al-Monitor: The Pulse of the Middle East*. 2014. *Al-Monitor*. <http://www.al-monitor.com/pulse/originals/2014/11/russia-israel-palestinians.html>(May 1, 2016).
- Savir, Uri. 2015. "Is US Disengaging from Israeli-Palestinian Conflict? - Al-Monitor: The Pulse of the Middle East." 2015. *Al-Monitor*. <http://www.al-monitor.com/pulse/originals/2015/05/obama-us-doctrine-disengagement-mahmoud-abbas-netanyahu.html> (May 1, 2016).
- Seitz, Oliver Kawase. 2012. "Made in Brasil : Placing the Football Industry in the Brazilian Environment." Ph.D. University of Liverpool.
- "Sexual Orientation and Gender Identity." France Diplomatie :: Ministry of Foreign Affairs and International Development.<http://www.diplomatie.gouv.fr/en/french-foreign-policy/human-rights/sexual-orientation-and-gender/> (April 30, 2016).
- Sherman, Amy. 2015. "Hillary Clinton's Changing Position on Same-Sex Marriage." *politifact*. <http://www.politifact.com/truth-o-meter/statements/2015/jun/17/hillary-clinton/hillary-clinton-change-position-same-sex-marriage/> (April 29, 2016).
- Slater, Matt. 2015. *BBC*. "Sport & Gender: A History of Bad Science & 'Biological Racism.'" *BBC Sport*. <http://www.bbc.com/sport/athletics/29446276> (April 30, 2016).
- Speelman, Tabitha. 2013. "Tiptoeing Out of the Closet: The History and Future of LGBT Rights in China." *The Atlantic*.<http://www.theatlantic.com/china/archive/2013/08/tiptoeing-out-of-the-closet-the-history-and-future-of-lgbt-rights-in-china/278869/>(April 30, 2016).
- Smart, Barry. 2007. "Not Playing around: Global Capitalism, Modern Sport and Consumer Culture." *Global Networks* 7(2): 113–34.
- Smith, Lydia. 2015. "Election 2015: Which Parties Score Best on LGBT Rights?" 2015. *International Business Times UK*.<http://www.ibtimes.co.uk/election-2015-which-parties-score-best-lgbt-rights-1499774> (April 29, 2016).
- Smith-Spark, Laura. 2012. "French Ministers Back Draft Bill on Same-Sex Marriage." *CNN*.<http://www.cnn.com/2012/11/07/world/europe/france-marriage-rights/index.html>(April 30, 2016).
- Smith-Spark, Laura. 2013. "Why Russia's Sochi Olympics Are Now a Battleground for Gay Rights - CNN.com." *CNN*.<http://www.cnn.com/2013/08/10/world/europe/russia-gay-rights-controversy/index.html>(April 30, 2016).
- "Sochi 2014: Gay Rights Protests Target Russia's Games." *BBC News*. <http://www.bbc.com/news/world-europe-26043872> (April 30, 2016).
- "Special Envoy of China on Middle East Issue Wu Sike: Palestine-Israel Peace Talks and Palestine's Capacity Build-Up Should be Promoted Simultaneously." 2014. *State News Service*.<http://www.lexisnexis.com/hottopics/lnacademic/?verb=sr&csi=8399&stp=fr&sr=+china%20and%20palestine> (May 1, 2016).

- Steinbrink, Malte, Christoph Haferburg, and Astrid Ley. 2011. "Festivalisation and Urban Renewal in the Global South: Socio-Spatial Consequences of the 2010 FIFA World Cup." *South African Geographical Journal* 93(1): 15–28.
- Stevenson, Jonathan. 2009. "What Is the Confederations Cup?" 2009. *BBC*. <http://news.bbc.co.uk/sport2/hi/football/internationals/8088226.stm> (May 1, 2016).
- Taylor, Tracy, and Kristine Toohey. 2007. "Perceptions of Terrorism Threats at the 2004 Olympic Games: Implications for Sport Events." *Journal of Sport & Tourism* 12(2): 99–114.
- Teller, Neville. 2014. "Cameron, the UK and Israel." *The Jerusalem Post / JPost.com*. <http://www.jpost.com/Experts/Cameron-the-UK-and-Israel-345607> (May 1, 2016).
- Tiezzi, Shannon. 2014. "China Appoints New Special Envoy to the Middle East." *The Diplomat*. <http://thediplomat.com/2014/09/china-appoints-new-special-envoy-to-the-middle-east/> (May 1, 2016).
- "Time for Change is Now: IOC President Bach." 2014. *China Daily USA*. http://usa.chinadaily.com.cn/sports/2014-12/08/content_19041800.htm (April 30, 2016).
- "The History of the FA." *www.thefa.com*. <http://www.thefa.com/about-football-association/history?c=1> (May 1, 2016).
- "The Rise and Fall of Sepp Blatter." 2015. *The New York Times*. <http://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2015/05/27/sports/soccer/sepp-blatter-fifa-timeline.html> (May 1, 2016).
- "Tokyo Sexwale to Lead FIFA Monitoring Committee for Israel and Palestine." 2015. *FIFA.com*. <http://www.fifa.com/governance/news/y=2015/m=6/news=tokyo-sexwale-to-lead-fifa-monitoring-committee-for-israel-and-palesti-2647011.html> (May 1, 2016).
- Toohey, Kristine. 2008. "The Sydney Olympics: Striving for Legacies – Overcoming Short-Term Disappointments and Long-Term Deficiencies." *The International Journal of the History of Sport* 25(14): 1953–71.
- Toohey, Kristine, Tracy Taylor, and Choong-Ki Lee. 2003. "The FIFA World Cup 2002: The Effects of Terrorism on Sport Tourists." *Journal of Sport & Tourism* 8(3): 186–96.
- Tordesillas, Ellice. 2016. "Iris House, Amnesty International Talk LGBTQ+ Rights in Russia." *Concordiensis*. <http://www.concordy.com/world/2016/02/iris-house-amnesty-international-talk-lgbtq-rights-in-russia/> (April 30, 2016).
- "Transgender Bathroom Laws Provoke Protest." 2015. *The Week UK*. <http://www.theweek.co.uk/62891/transgender-bathroom-laws-provoke-protest> (April 29, 2016).
- "Transgender Victory in France." 2010. <http://www.advocate.com/news/daily-news/2010/03/02/transgender-victory-france> (April 30, 2016).

- Tsang, E. W. 2014. "Generalizing from research findings: The merits of case studies." *International Journal of Management Reviews*, 16(4), 369-383.
- "Two-State Solution 'Vital' for Peace between Israel, Palestine: Obama. 2015. *Greater Kashmir*." <http://www.greaterkashmir.com/news/world/two-state-solution-vital-for-peace-between-israel-palestine-obama/186430.html> (May 1, 2016).
- "US Supreme Court Rules Gay Marriage Is Legal Nationwide." 2015. *BBC News*. <http://www.bbc.com/news/world-us-canada-33290341> (April 29, 2016).
- Vanden Brook, Tom. 2015. "Military Transgender Ban Set to End next May." *USA TODAY*. <http://www.usatoday.com/story/news/nation/2015/08/25/military-transgender-ban-set-end-next-may/32345385/> (April 29, 2016).
- Verroken, Michele. 2000. "Drug Use and Abuse in Sport." *Best Practice & Research Clinical Endocrinology & Metabolism* 14(1): 1–23.
- "Wang Yi: The Only Way Out for Palestine Issues to Achieve Independence of Palestine, To Establish Palestinian State and Peaceful Co-existence of Palestine and Israel." 2013. *States News Service*. www.lexisnexis.com/hottopics/lnacademic (May 30, 2016).
- Wenn, Stephen R., and Scott G. Martyn. 2006. "'Tough Love': Richard Pound, David D'Alessandro, and the Salt Lake City Olympics Bid Scandal." *Sport in History* 26(1): 64–90.
- "'We Remain Convinced That a Negotiated Two-State Solution Is the Only Way to Resolve the Conflict.' 2015. GOV.UK. " <https://www.gov.uk/government/speeches/we-remain-convinced-that-a-negotiated-two-state-solution-is-the-only-way-to-resolve-the-conflict> (May 1, 2016).
- Wiegmann, Arnd. 2015. "Jibril Rajoub in Hot Water with Arab States after FIFA Vote." *I24news*. <http://www.i24news.tv/en/news/sport/73905-150606-jibril-rajoub-unwelcome-in-various-arab-states-after-fifa-vote> (May 1, 2016).
- "Will AIPAC-Obama Sanctions Clash Dent pro-Israel Lobby's Clout?" 2014. *Haaretz*. <http://www.haaretz.com/jewish/news/1.569900> (May 1, 2016).
- Williams, J. H. 2010. "Relative Age Effect in Youth Soccer: Analysis of the FIFA U17 World Cup Competition." *Scandinavian Journal of Medicine & Science in Sports* 20(3): 502–8.
- Withnall, Adam. 2015. "Vladimir Putin Says He'll Fight for the Right of Palestinians to Their Own State." 2015. *The Independent*. <http://www.independent.co.uk/news/world/middle-east/vladimir-putin-says-russia-will-fight-for-the-right-of-palestinians-to-their-own-state-10141902.html> (May 1, 2016).
- Wong, Wendy H. 2008. *Centralizing Principles: How Amnesty International Shaped Human Rights Politics Through Its Transnational Network*. 2008. ProQuest.
- Wright, Oliver. 2014. "MPs Take Historic Decision to Recognise Palestinian State." 2014. *The Independent*. <http://www.independent.co.uk/news/uk/politics/palestine-vote-mps-take-historic-decision-to-recognise-palestinian-state-9792485.html> (May 1, 2016).

- Zeigler, Cyd. 2016. "Exclusive: Read the Olympics' New Transgender Guidelines That Will Not Mandate Surgery." *Outsports*.<http://www.outsports.com/2016/1/21/10812404/transgender-ioc-policy-new-olympics>(April 30, 2016).
- Zeitchik, Steven. "FIFA to Monitor Israeli, Palestinian Soccer; Bid to Suspend Israel Dropped." 2015. *latimes.com*.<http://www.latimes.com/world/europe/la-fg-fifa-mideast-soccer-israel-suspension-motion-20150529-story.html> (May 1, 2016).
- Zhao, Shirley. 2016. "Speaking out against Society's Age-Old Injustice." *South China Morning Post*.<http://www.scmp.com/news/hong-kong/education-community/article/1915110/speaking-out-against-societys-age-old-injustice> (April 30, 2016).
- Zhou, Yu et al. 2010. "The Impact of Transportation Control Measures on Emission Reductions during the 2008 Olympic Games in Beijing, China." *Atmospheric Environment* 44(3): 285–93.