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WHEN SPORTS STAND AGAINST HUMAN RIGHTS: REGULATING RESTRICTIONS ON ATHLETE SPEECH IN THE GLOBAL SPORTS ARENA
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Even after the International Olympic Committee’s quick and harsh response to the “black power salute” in the 1968 Olympic Games—posing that the apolitical Olympic Games were not a suitable venue for domestic political statements—athletes continued using their platform to protest human rights violations. Should such conduct be allowed? Are athletes entitled to display their political opinions on the field? Or should athletic organizations be allowed to regulate their athletes’ protests and political speech in the arena? On the one hand, freedom of speech is a fundamental human right. On the other, sports have a long history of remaining apolitical—limiting political expression during games through formal contracts, regulations, and longstanding traditions. While international athletic organizations may have reason to remain politically neutral, this paper recommends that political speech relating to internationally agreed upon, core human rights values should be the exception.
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I. INTRODUCTION

“Sport[ing] events are not just competitions; they are platforms for social interaction and the promotion of many ideals such as respect, fair play, integrity, tolerance and solidarity.”

Technological advances continue to increase our quick, efficient, and continuous access to information. In the world of sports, media coverage is so pervasive that billions across the world can view each goal, touchdown, home run, and slam-dunk. Needless to say, the global sports arena provides a powerful communication forum—one that can be used to raise awareness about essential human rights issues.

The past few decades are replete with instances of such use. In 1967, famed boxer Mohammad Ali made his statement when he refused to fight in Vietnam. Several black athletes, including basketball star Kareem Abdul-Jabbar, later joined his campaign. During that same year, Harry Edwards, a prominent black activist from the University of California, Berkeley, created the “Olympic Project for Human Rights” to protest racial segregation. A few years later, U.S. Olympic athletes


5. See id.

wore “Olympic Project for Human Rights” badges during the iconic “black power salute” at the 1968 Mexico City Olympic Games.7

Sports organizations, however, have been less than supportive of their athletes’ free expression. The International Olympic Committee (“IOC”), for example, reacted swiftly and harshly to the 1968 black power salute, immediately suspending the involved athletes.8 This raises the question: Should athletic organizations be allowed to regulate their athletes’ speech, or should athletes be entitled to express their opinions on the field? On the one hand, sport has a long history of remaining apolitical, limiting expression during games through formal contracts, regulations, and longstanding traditions.9 On the other hand, freedom of speech is a fundamental human right.10

This article concludes that sports organizations should allow athletes to convey human-rights-related messages on the field. Part II overviews the international community’s recognition of free speech as a fundamental human right. Part III observes that although the sports arena presents a unique and powerful platform for raising awareness and promoting change, athletes are often restricted from such use. Part IV reasons that although large sports organizations are already bound by international law, albeit indirectly, they should be directly bound by it because of their tremendous political influence. Building upon that, Part V concludes that athletic organizations must not restrict athletes’ exercise and promotion of such rights.

II. FREEDOM OF EXPRESSION AS A HUMAN RIGHT

It is a fairly new belief that all persons, by virtue of their humanity, are entitled to certain human rights.11 While this concept existed


previously in many cultures’ documents and traditions, it took the barbarities of “World War II to propel [it] onto the global stage and into the global conscience.” Nazi Germany’s extermination “of over six million Jews, Sinti and Romani (gypsies), homosexuals, and persons with disabilities horrified the world” and lead it to form the United Nations (“U.N.”). This marked the beginning of a new human rights movement, one that emphasized the dignity of the individual. The movement picked up steam with the international community’s adoption of key documents codifying essential human rights. Two of those documents are the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (“UDHR”) and the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (“ICCPR”).

Both the UDHR and the ICCPR recognize freedom of expression as a human right. The UDHR defines the right to freedom of expression unambiguously: “Everyone has the right to freedom of opinion and expression; this right includes freedom to hold opinions without interference and to seek, receive and impart information and ideas through any media and regardless of frontiers.” Similarly, article 19(2) of the ICCPR provides: “Everyone shall have the right to freedom of expression; this right shall include freedom to seek, receive and impart information and ideas of all kinds, regardless of frontiers, either orally, in writing or in print, in the form of art, or through any other media of his choice.”

---
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Freedom of expression is more than just a human right; it is an essential tool for maintaining a properly functioning representative democracy.\textsuperscript{21} Both the U.N. Human Rights Council and the U.N. General Assembly consider freedom of expression as “one of the essential foundations of a democratic society and one of the basic conditions for its progress and development.”\textsuperscript{22} The General Assembly describes freedom of expression as a touchstone of all other freedoms.\textsuperscript{23} Freedom of expression is essential to the enjoyment of many other fundamental rights,\textsuperscript{24} as it allows individuals and groups to protest violations of those rights.

As with any other liberty, however, the right to free expression is not absolute. Both the UDHR and ICCPR recognize that the administration of this right may require certain restrictions.\textsuperscript{25} Article 19 paragraph 3 of the ICCPR provides that the right to freedom of expression “may therefore be subject to certain restrictions . . . as are provided by law and are necessary” for the “respect of the rights or reputations of others” or for “the protection of national security[,] . . . public order[,] . . . public health or morals.”\textsuperscript{26}

Even so, these restrictions have their limits. In its General Comment number 34, the U.N. Human Rights Committee narrowed the scope of paragraph 3’s allowable restrictions. First, it explained that restrictions not mentioned in that paragraph are strictly prohibited.\textsuperscript{27} Second, it clarified that restrictions that are imposed must be “directly


\textsuperscript{22} Id.

\textsuperscript{23} G.A. Res. 59(I) (Dec 14, 1946).


\textsuperscript{25} Human Rights Comm., Gen. Comment No34, ¶ 21, U.N. Doc. CCPR/C/GC34 (Sept12, 2011); ICCPR, \textit{supra} note 17, art. 19, ¶ 3.

\textsuperscript{26} ICCPR, \textit{supra} note 17, art. 19, ¶ 3.

related to the specific need on which they are predicated.” Laws creating those restrictions “must be formulated with sufficient precision to enable an individual to regulate his or her conduct accordingly and . . . must be made accessible to the public.” Additionally, the “law[s] may not confer unfettered discretion for the restriction of freedom of expression on those charged with [their] execution.”

Moreover, restrictive laws must “be proportionate to the interest to be protected.” For example, the interest in allowing public and political debate holds particularly high value. As a result, laws restricting this right would likely need to be narrower in scope than, say, for commercially-driven expression. This “principle of proportionality” applies both to “the law that frames the restrictions [and to] . . . the administrative and judicial authorities . . . applying the law.”

Athletic Organizations’ Restrictions on Athletes’ Use of Sports Arenas to Convey Political Messages

Despite recognizing and using the global sports arena as a unique and powerful forum, many athletic organizations prohibit athletes from doing so themselves.

III. SPORTS ARENAS PROVIDE A KEY PLATFORM FOR PUBLIC EXPRESSION

Because of their widespread media coverage, sports arenas provide a powerful forum for the communication of ideas: “[h]alf the world’s population watched coverage of the Olympic Games Rio 2016.” Similarly, 3.2 billion people around the world watched the 2014 Fédération Internationale de Football Association (“FIFA”) World

---

28. Id. (citation omitted).
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34. See How Do We Know that Rio 2016 Was a Success, INT’L OLYMPIC COMMITTEE (Dec. 6, 2016), http://www.olympic.org/news/how-do-we-know-that-rio-2016-was-a-success [https://perma.cc/FVX6-MH59].
As a result, sports arenas—and the athletes that play in them—are uniquely situated to connect with people across nations, cultures, religions, and economic classes.

Professor Genevieve Lakier of the University of Chicago School of Law explains that spectator sports are a uniquely powerful medium for communicating messages because of the aura of authenticity that games possess as competitions. The fact that what audiences see when they watch a sports game is the genuine struggle of the competitors to win, rather than a scripted simulacrum of that struggle, gives sport an aura of authenticity that narrative art, no matter how gripping, cannot match.

But sports arenas are more than just potential fora for the dissemination of ideas; according to Lakier, they are by default expressive environments:

The explicit orientation of spectator sports toward an audience establishes a strong presumption that something expressive is taking place. After all, why else would individuals address an audience if they did not wish to thereby communicate a message of some sort? And why would the audience pay good money to watch them if they received no messages from the act?

Even the U.N. recognizes sports’ influential power. Between 1993 and 2008, the U.N. General Assembly adopted twelve resolutions supporting the IOC and Olympic Movement, acknowledging “the critical role of sports in society.” Eight of those resolutions are entitled, “Building a peaceful and better world through sports and the Olympic ideal”; the other four are entitled “Sport as a means to promote


37. Id. at 1116.

education, health, peace and development.”

In similar fashion, the European Union amended its constitution in 2007 to recognize sports as a “social and educational function.”

In 2001, the U.N. enshrined its recognition of sports as an agent for social progress by establishing the Office on Sport for Development and Peace. Then, in 2013, the U.N. declared April 6th the “International Day of Sport for Development and Peace.” During that same year, the U.N. Human Rights Council recognized “sport[s] as a universal language that contributes to educating people on the values of respect, diversity, tolerance, and fairness and as a means to combat all forms of discrimination and promote social inclusion for all.”

But sports can do more than just facilitate social progress; sporting events can also expose countries’ human rights violations and compel their compliance with international law. For example, U.N. Secretary-General Boutros Boutros-Ghali suggested that banning countries from the Olympic Games could be a powerful tool for the international community to show its disapproval of those countries’ human rights violations. Such a ban has already been credited with changing South Africa’s oppressive apartheid regime. Similarly, the 2008 Beijing Olympics and 2014 Sochi Games highlighted their host countries’

39. Id.
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human rights violations. In Beijing, Human Rights Watch observed state abuses such as the “harassment and restriction of foreign media,” the removal of “undesirables” from the city of Beijing, and “[t]he silencing of Chinese citizens who express[ed] concerns about Olympic-related rights abuses.” In Sochi, Amnesty International reported state issues such as “homophobic legislation” and the detainment of individuals engaged in peaceful protest.

A. Despite Doing So Themselves, Athletic Organizations Prohibit Athletes from Communicating Their Messages on the Field

Major athletic organizations recognize the global sports arena’s enormous potential as a forum for promoting human rights issues. For example, in 2006, FIFA launched its “Say No to Racism” campaign. During that campaign, the organization prominently displayed “Say No to Racism” banners during pre-match formalities. Similarly, “[s]ince 2009, the NFL has dressed up its fields, sidelines and players in pink every October to raise awareness and funds for breast cancer screenings and education in conjunction with the American Cancer Society.” The league also sells “Breast Cancer Awareness Gear on its website.”

While organizations engage in such public expression as a whole, many of them prohibit athletes from doing so as individuals. Article 50 section 2 of the Olympic Charter provides that “[n]o kind of demonstration or political, religious or racial propaganda is permitted in
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any Olympic sites, venues or other areas."55 Often, contracts place specific restrictions on what athletes can say and do in public.56 The Union of European Football Associations (“UEFA”) and FIFA prohibit any kind of political, religious, or personal slogans on a player’s basic equipment.57 U.S. organizations, such as the NFL, have similar rules preventing athletes from conveying political messages on their uniforms or equipment.58

Moreover, sports organizations appear to impose these restrictions subjectively, exposing athletes to a broad risk of sanctions for even minor transgressions.59 For example, in 2016, FIFA fined the English Football Association 45,000 Swiss francs because their members displayed “poppies”—a symbol of National Armistice Day—during the World Cup qualifier against Scotland.60 Similarly, Scottish and Irish clubs were fined for flying the Palestinian flag in stadiums.61 During the Sochi Games, the IOC even reprimanded athletes for placing small


stickers on their helmets in memory of deceased freestyle skier Sarah Burke, calling the gesture political.\(^{62}\)

**IV. MAJOR ATHLETIC ORGANIZATIONS’ DUTIES UNDER INTERNATIONAL LAW**

Non-Governmental Organizations ("NGOs"), athletic organizations included, are growing more and more powerful in the global political arena.\(^{63}\) As a result, certain large NGOs, like the IOC, possess the necessary traits for "legal personality."\(^{64}\) Accordingly, international law—which currently only applies to governmental bodies—should also apply to these NGOs.

**A. NGOs Play an Increasing Role in the Formation of International Law**

When it comes to the formation and enforcement of international law, NGOs play an increasingly significant role. For example, the International Committee of the Red Cross ("ICRC"), a Swiss entity ascribed legal authority by the 1949 Geneva Conventions, influences and promotes international humanitarian law.\(^{65}\) For example, in 2005, the ICRC published a 5,000 page report identifying 161 rules that serve as current customary international law.\(^{66}\)

---


The global community itself recognizes NGOs’ real and distinct power. In its charter, the U.N. expressly acknowledges NGOs as legitimate sources for consultation in their areas of competency. A 1998 U.N. General Assembly resolution explicitly recognized NGOs’ contribution to promoting human rights. The U.N. Committee Against Torture recognizes NGOs as valuable sources for information-gathering and report-writing; it allows the direct submission of these reports to the committee for consideration. The committee also meets with NGOs and National Human Rights Agencies three times a year, even before meeting with state representatives.

**B. Major NGOs Should Be Ascribed Legal Personality**

While legal personality—recognition as an equal international-community member—has traditionally been restricted to sovereign states, modern international-law theories suggest non-state actors should be included as well. And while the idea of separating legal personality from the territorial boundaries of sovereign states may seem “far-reaching,” certain NGOs already possess many of the traits necessary for global recognition, including their direct or indirect influence in areas of international law and their power to enter into relationships

---


68. U.N. Charter art. 71 (providing that “[t]he Economic and Social Council may make suitable arrangements for consultation with non-governmental organizations which are concerned with matters within its competence”)

69. G.A. Res. 53/144, art. 16, 18 (Mar. 8, 1999).
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with other recognized members of the international community, including nation states.  

The IOC is a prime example of an NGO that meets the legal-personality criteria.  

Established in 1894 and headquartered in the city of Lausanne, Switzerland, the IOC is recognized as the highest authority in sports. It has been described as “the nerve centre of a rapidly developing corporate monolith, commanding an extraordinary budget,” and generating revenues in the hundreds of millions. As a recognized and legitimate international personality, the IOC has the ability to exert tremendous influence over sovereign states, forcing them to comply with its rules and regulations. The IOC’s influence was highlighted during the Helsinki Accords, where dozens of European nations recognized the Olympic Charter as effectively having the same authority as international customary law.  

Additionally, the IOC has the capacity to enter into relations with states and other organizations, a criterion international law scholar Malcolm Shaw argues is a significant element of legal-personality recognition. Much like state ambassadors, IOC members act as formal IOC representatives when engaging with national governments. These governments enter into formal agreements with the IOC whereby they agree to abide by the IOC's rules and regulations and comply with

76. See Ettinger, supra note 64, at 102.

77. Id. at 102–03.


80. See Ettinger, supra note 64, at 115.

81. Ettinger, supra note 64, at 104–05.


customary international law. States that ignore the Olympic Charter’s rules face suspension from future international events.

Like state-actors, the IOC also has a formal relationship with the U.N. Both organizations are officially committed to working together to better the world through sport. In fact, the concept of the “Olympic truce” is considered in the framework of the UN Charter. More importantly, the U.N. General Assembly granted the IOC international observer status based on its contributions in furtherance of U.N. Millennium goals. This gave the IOC the same legal status as the International Committee of the Red Cross, the International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies, and the Inter-Parliamentary Union, affirming the IOC’s unique status as a key member in the international community.

Furthermore, the IOC works on a wide range of issues with international agencies, including the U.N. Educational, Scientific, and

84. Ettinger, supra note 64, at 104.

85. For example, in 2010, the IOC suspended Kuwait’s National Olympic Committee because of “political interference by the government in the Kuwaiti sports movement,” thereby impeding the movement’s ability to comply with the Olympic Charter The IOC Suspends the NOC of Kuwait, INT’L OLYMPIC COMMITTEE (Jan. 4, 2010) https://www.olympic.org/news/the-ioc-suspends-the-noc-of-kuwait [http://perma.cc/N8RY-PPFJ].


Cultural Organization (UNESCO); the U.N. International Children’s Emergency Fund (UNICEF); the U.N. Programme on HIV/AIDS (UNAIDS); the U.N. Environment Programme (UNEP); the World Health Organization (WHO); the World Food Programme (WFP); and the U.N. High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR). The relationship goes both ways: as of 2009, the United Nations now plays a role in the Olympic Games.  

C. International Law Should Apply to NGOs Directly

NGOs are already bound by international law, albeit indirectly. States, as parties to human rights conventions, bear an affirmative obligation to protect human rights within their boundaries. Article 10 of the European Convention on Human Rights (“ECHR”) requires that states “take action to prevent the freedom of expression of a private individual from being infringed.” As such, states must ensure that all private entities operating within their territory, NGOs included, comply with these human rights laws too. International court decisions interpreting the ECHR have confirmed this obligation. Thus, not only must states avoid interfering with their citizens’ free expression, but they must also prevent others within their state from doing the same. It follows, then, that states must ensure that athletic organizations within
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99. Id. at 260–61; see also ECHR, Dink v. Turkey, 14 September 2010, application nos2668/07, 6102/08, 30079/08, 7072/09 and 7124/09, para. 106 and 137 (holding that the Turkish government violated Article 10 of the ECHR by failing to prevent the assassination of an outspoken Turkish reporter of Armenian descent, even though authorities knew of the assassination plot).

100. Faut, supra note 96, at 259–60.
their territory do not violate athletes’ human rights, including their right to free expression.\textsuperscript{101}

As influential and powerful members of the international community, however, large NGOs themselves should be bound by international law. In apparent support of this notion, some international-law scholars have ceased endorsing states as the sole subjects of human rights obligations; their attention has shifted largely towards NGOs who already play an important role in the international legal community.\textsuperscript{102} These NGOs—trade unions, church groups, and other non-state actors—have stopped relying on governments to regulate transnational corporations’ behavior and sanction international law violations.\textsuperscript{103} Instead, these organizations themselves have begun enforcing compliance by mobilizing public opinion and exerting direct pressure on companies and international organizations.\textsuperscript{104} And because they can express opinions that public officials may be unable or unwilling to express, these non-state actors can serve as a voice for politically-oppressed minority groups.\textsuperscript{105}

Moreover, the UDHR’s Preamble addresses “individuals” without distinguishing between public and private actors.\textsuperscript{106} This seems to imply that the declaration’s rules bind state and non-state actors alike. Thus, just as states owe an affirmative obligation to protect human rights within their boundaries,\textsuperscript{107} the Preamble’s broad language is consistent with NGOs—like the IOC—being held to that same standard. NGOs seem to have already assumed this responsibility. In 2015,

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{101} See generally Faut, \textit{supra} note 96, at 261.
\item \textsuperscript{102} See August Reinisch, \textit{The Changing International Legal Framework for Dealing with Non-State Actors, in NON-STATE ACTORS AND HUMAN RIGHTS} 75 (Philip Alston ed., 2005).
\item \textsuperscript{103} \textit{Id.}
\item \textsuperscript{104} \textit{Id.}
\item \textsuperscript{105} LUNG-CHU CHEN, AN INTRODUCTION TO CONTEMPORARY INTERNATIONAL LAW 82–83 (3rd ed., Oxford Univ. Press 2016).
\item \textsuperscript{106} G.A. Res. 217 (III) A, \textit{Universal Declaration of Human Rights} (Dec. 10, 1948) [hereinafter UDHR] (stating in its preamble that “[e]very individual and every organ of society shall strive by teaching and education to promote respect for these rights and freedoms”).
\item \textsuperscript{107} Human Rights Comm., Gen. Comment No. 34, ¶ 7, \textit{U.N. Doc. CCPR/C/GC34} (Sept. 12, 2011).
\end{itemize}
leading human rights NGOs established the Sport and Rights Alliance ("SRA") to ensure human rights rules are respected, particularly during large sporting events.\textsuperscript{108} The SRA consults with the decision-makers of large international athletic events to ensure they run their events in a manner respectful of human rights.\textsuperscript{109} For example, in 2015 the SRA called upon the European Olympic Committee to compel Azerbaijan to release unjustly imprisoned journalists and human rights activists prior to the European Games’ opening ceremony.\textsuperscript{110}

\textbf{D. Athletic Organizations’ Must Allow Their Athletes Free Expression}

International law, whether applied directly to the organizations themselves or indirectly through sovereign states’ obligations, prohibits NGOs—such as athletic organizations—from restricting free expression. Thus, the IOC’s ban on demonstrations or propaganda,\textsuperscript{111} the UEFA and FIFA’s prohibition on uniform or equipment slogans,\textsuperscript{112} and similar policies by the NFL\textsuperscript{113} violate the UDHR and ICCPR.\textsuperscript{114} The SRA has been no help in this regard: its progress has been limited to addressing labor rights, anti-corruption measures,\textsuperscript{115} and the arbitrary

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{109} See \textit{id}.
\item \textsuperscript{110} See \textit{id}.
\item \textsuperscript{111} Olympic Charter, supra note 83, at 91.
\item \textsuperscript{114} UDHR, supra note 106, art. 19 (provid. ing that “[e]veryone has the right to freedom of opinion and expression”); International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights art19, ¶ 2, Dec19, 1966, 999 U.N.T.S171 [hereinafter ICCPR] (provid. ing that “[e]veryone shall have the right to freedom of expression”).
\end{itemize}
detention of opposition members;\textsuperscript{116} it has yet to adequately address freedom of expression violations.\textsuperscript{117}

To be fair, athletic organizations face a tough choice. While, as explained above, these organizations must comply with international law, they also bear an interest in “maintaining the independence (and ‘purity’) of sport.”\textsuperscript{118} The broadcast of strong political messages at games could hinder their ability to draw together people with starkly different views and opinions.\textsuperscript{119} Without this ability, these organizations could face heavy financial loss from decreased fandom. Such a decrease could also diminish these organizations’ platform for broadcasting the positive messages they already communicate, such as FIFA’s campaign against racism\textsuperscript{120} and the NFL’s quest for breast cancer awareness.\textsuperscript{121}

Perhaps the solution lies somewhere in the middle. A theoretical difference could exist between purely political gestures and ones that relate to human rights issues. To maintain their general political objectivity, sports organizations could continue to prohibit purely domestic political gestures,\textsuperscript{122} such as flying a banner in support of a preferred presidential candidate. At the same time, they could allow athletes to express support for human rights, such as racial equality.\textsuperscript{123}


\textsuperscript{117} See Sports and Rights Alliance, supra note 108.

\textsuperscript{118} See Maurice, supra note 59.

\textsuperscript{119} See id.


In this context, it is possible for an athlete to discuss fundamental rights addressed in international instruments, like the right to life, the right to be free from discrimination, the right to health, and the right to education, among others. However, expression that clearly advertises a political or religious stance can be prohibited because of the different nature of sport activities.

A huge challenge is defining “political statements.” The lack of clear criteria of what constitutes a political statement allows for subjective interpretation of statutes and regulations. The UN Special Rapporteur on the Promotion and Protection of the Right to Freedom of Opinion and Expression points out how governments treat “words as weapons.”

By adopting ambiguous laws, government officials maintain unfair discretion. This idea is also relevant when it comes to athletic organizations. Confusion as to what constitutes a political statement creates a barrier to effective public oversight. And this, coupled with the fact that IOC Executive Board decisions are final with regards to “disqualification or withdrawal of accreditation,” places athletes’ fates in the hands of the Executive Board’s unfettered discretion.

By limiting these restrictions accordingly, sports organizations would afford athletes the same right available to celebrities in the film, television, and music industries: the right to use their platform to highlight injustices and to communicate their beliefs on human rights.

124. See UDHR, supra note 106.
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issues without fear of repercussion. Additionally, by only restricting purely political messages, which are often highly-charged hot topics, sports organizations would likely be complying with the ICCPR’s allowance for restrictions necessary “[f]or respect of the rights or reputations of others” and “[f]or the protection of national security or of public order.”

IV. CONCLUSION

By virtue of their global platform at sporting events, athletes hold tremendous potential to promote human rights values. International law guarantees their right to do so, and whether applied to them directly, or indirectly through the states within which they reside, athletic organizations, too, are bound to uphold this guarantee. Nevertheless, athletic organizations continue to restrict their athletes’ freedom of speech in contravention of international law.

Despite these restrictions and the risk of penalties, athletes continue to use their platform to promote human rights. In 2012, several NBA stars wore hooded sweatshirts to stand in solidarity with Trayvon Martin’s family, an unarmed black teenager fatally shot by a neighborhood crime-watch volunteer. That same year, professional


130. ICCPR, supra note 114, art. 19, ¶ 3.
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133. See supra Part IV.

134. See supra Part III.

soccer player Anton Ferdinand refused to shake the hand of John Terry, a player who had previously made racial slurs on the field. In 2014, several NBA and NFL players protested racism and police shootings of unarmed African Americans by wearing shirts displaying the phrase “I Can’t Breathe,” and posing on the field with the “hands up don’t shoot” gesture. To this day, some players continue to refuse to stand during the U.S. National Anthem to protest racial inequality.

Instead of restricting their rights, athletic organizations should encourage athletes to use their “influence and experience as role models,” and to be leaders who contribute to “promoting peace and human understanding through sport.” The promotion of human rights should remain politically neutral. And if athletic organizations want something to take issue with, let it be the fact that more than fifty years after Muhammad Ali forfeited his boxing title to stand against racism, we still need to call attention to these same human-rights violations today.


