

Full Evaluation of Whether or Not  
Democratic Countries Should Participate  
in the 2008 China Beijing Olympics

Evaluation Completed by the Foundation for  
Democratic Political Advancement (May 23, 2008)

Purpose: Determine based on the better interest of the people of democratic countries, whether or not democratic countries should participate in the 2008 China Beijing Olympics. (Note, there is no attempt whatsoever by the FDPA to single out China based on its human rights issues. Rather, the FDPA is evaluating a contentious issue: Olympic games versus basic human rights.)

This determination is an outside perspective to give the citizens and politicians of democratic countries, and the outside world, an evaluated, informed perspective on the 2008 China Beijing Olympics.

The views in this study are the views of the FDPA. Also, the evaluation and final determination is an example of public decision-making (and government decision-making in terms of methodology) in Evaluative Democracy.

The FDPA and its members are in no way affiliated with any of the relevant parties in this study.

The study is an independent assessment of the 2008 China Beijing Olympics by a Kootenay volunteer group of citizens and based on objectivity and transparency.

### **Key Definitions:**

**Democratic countries:** governments of the people, by the people, for the people. Also, governments which uphold basic human rights, within limits, both domestically and internationally.

Examples of democratic countries: Finland, Denmark, Sweden, and New Zealand. (All four countries ranked top 4 in world rankings for civil liberties, democracy, and non-corruption. Source: [world.audit.org](http://world.audit.org))

Examples of non-democratic countries: the United States for its two-party hierarchical political system based on influence and/or manipulation, and the U.S. human rights issues like the invasion of Iraq and Afghanistan, and the Guantanamo Bay detention camp.

**Basic human rights:** freedom of expression, culture, religion, self-determination, and self-preservation (within limits of more reasonable laws.)

**Chinese human rights issues:** Chinese direct and indirect implication in civil liberty abuses in Tibet, Taiwan, Mongolia (i.e. Uighar Muslims), Sudan/Darfur, and Burma, suppression of Falun Gong and other Chinese religious groups, internal political suppression of anti-communist individuals and groups such as Li Zhi, imprisoned in 2003 for eight years for organizing a Chinese Democratic party, overall internal civil liberty limitations like weak women and rural rights, and invasion of individual privacy, internal legal system human rights problems like lack of due process, and internal legislative human rights problems like the One-Child and Capital punishment policies.

### **Methodology for Evaluation of Whether or Not Democratic Countries Should Participate in the China Beijing Olympics:**

Overall: Establish the basic priority of democratic countries in terms of human rights, and use that basic priority to evaluate whether or not democratic countries should participate in the 2008 China Beijing Olympics.

The basic priority of democratic countries:

Uphold the values of freedom of expression, religion, culture, self-determination, and self-preservation.

Two basic positions will be evaluated: (1) democratic countries participation in the China Beijing Olympic games, and (2)

democratic countries non-participation in the China Beijing Olympic games.

**Sections for Evaluation:**

1. Is China based on its human rights issues worthy of hosting the Olympics?

Chinese human rights (Tibet, Taiwan, Uighar Muslims, social suppression, Sudan/Darfur, Burma)

Purpose of Olympics: “peace, social betterment” through international world-class sport competition. (Bruce Kidd, ‘The Olympic movement is primarily about peace.’ April 21, 2008, The Times of India)

(Score 1-40)

2. Do foreign countries have a right to interfere in Chinese internal matters?

(Based on Chinese internal matters, do foreign countries have right to determine if they want to participate in the China Beijing games?)

(Score: 1-10)

3. Does trade with China override basic human rights?

(Score: 1-10)

4. Are the Olympics devoid of politics?

(Score: 1-10)

5. Should athlete rights override basic human rights?

(Score: 1-10)

Corollary:

6. Consequences of full participation of democratic countries in China Beijing Olympics in terms of Chinese human rights.

(Score: 1-10)

7. Consequences of Chinese pardon of human rights prisoners and democratic countries full participation in the China Beijing Olympics in terms of human rights.

(Score 1-10)

8. Consequences of full boycott by democratic countries of the China Beijing Olympics in terms of Chinese human rights.

(Score: 1-10)

9. Consequences of boycott by democratic countries of China Beijing opening ceremony in terms of Chinese human rights.

(Score: 1-10)

10. Other forms of action by democratic countries against China such as sanctions, trade restriction, military action, individual athlete boycott, and public boycott.

(Score: 1-10)

Evaluate the areas for evaluation based on comparative soundness in terms of the established basic priority of democratic countries.

Each section is weighted in terms of relevancy to the evaluation—upholding the values of freedom of expression, culture, religion, self-determination, and self-preservation.

The section on the worthiness of China to hold the Olympics is given 50% weight of the total scores for the main evaluation, because the issue of worthiness in terms of human rights is the central issue of the evaluation.

Also, the main evaluation will be totaled to determine whether or not democratic countries should participate in the China Beijing Olympics.

The corollary, which focuses on the impact of different actions, is also evaluated based on the established basic priority of democratic countries. The results for each section of the corollary will be compared to each other, and to the results from the main evaluation section.

The results from the main evaluation and corollary should be supportive of each other.

Note, the evaluation will hinge on the pros and cons of democratic countries participating in the China Beijing Olympics or not participating in the China Beijing Olympics, and based on the basic priority of freedom of expression, culture, religion, self-determination, and self-preservation. The scores from each section will be added up to give an overall assessment of the action/non-action of democratic countries to the 2008 China Beijing Olympics.

**Information sources:**

Media articles and analysis of China, Tibet, Taiwanese/Chinese relations, Ughar Muslims/Chinese relations, Chinese social suppression, Burma, and Sudan.

Government and NGO statements/views of the state of Chinese human rights.

Articles on the history of Taiwanese/Chinese relations, Tibet/Chinese relations, history of Tibet, and human rights in China.

Evaluation took place at the Kimberley Public Library on May 22, 2008.

Evaluation committee comprised of Stephen Garvey, BA, MA, CEO of the FDPA, Simon Brown retired Chartered Accountant and member of the FDPA, Hilary Brown adult education facilitator, instructor, and associate of the FDPA, Colin McKenzie, retired engineer, college instructor, and an advisor for the FDPA, and Dr. Karly Macon, BA, MA, DVM, and observer of the FDPA. Also, Kerstin Renner, from the Kootenay News acted as an observer of the evaluation committee.

---

## Evaluation Sections:

1. Is China based on its human rights issues worthy of hosting the Olympics?

(Score 1-10)

### Arguments for Worthy of Hosting (Participation):

1. No country is devoid of human right issues. For example, the United States invasion of Iraq and Afghanistan, and the Guantanamo Bay detention camp.

2. The United States and Russia, despite their human rights issues, have been allowed to host the Olympics, so why not China?

3. Chinese human rights issues similar to world powers.

4. China won IOC bid for Olympics, and therefore it followed proper protocol and procedure, and there was equal opportunity.

5. China upon winning the IOC bid promised improvement on human rights issues.

6. China is a growing world power.

7. China has the resources and money to host the Olympics.

### Arguments for Unworthy of Hosting (Non-participation):

1. The Chinese human rights issues in Tibet, Taiwan, Burma, Sudan etc., are inconsistent with the Olympics defined by peace and social harmony.

2. China's human rights issues are worse than most countries.

3. China consistently suppresses freedom of speech, religion, culture, political opponents, women etc.,

4. China still authoritarian and suppresses democracy.

5. China's legal system, treatment of minorities and women, and torture practices, for instance, are not in sync with the Olympic values.

6. Views of Amnesty International, for example, are ignored by China.

Score:

Worthy of Olympics (16/40)

Unworthy of Olympics (28/40)

Rationale: China's human rights issues outweighed China's material, structural, and financial capabilities to host the Olympics.

2. Do foreign countries have a right to interfere in Chinese internal matters?

(Score: 1-10)

Arguments for non-interference (Participation):

1. China determines its own laws. Also, it has jurisdiction over its land, and it is a sovereign nation.

2. China part of international covenants and agreements which acknowledges its sovereignty such as the United Nations and World Trade Organization.

3. As member of the UN Security council has power to veto.

Arguments for interference (Non-participation):

1. China is not absolute or God over its land, and therefore there is room for interference.

2. Other countries and organizations may have a moral obligation to interfere in China due its severe human rights issues.

3. Foreign pressure and persuasion on China already going on.

Score:

Non-interference 3.6/10

Interference 6.4/10

Rationale: Moral obligation to interfere and non-absoluteness of China's sovereignty outweighed China's sovereignty.

3. Does trade with China override basic human rights?

(Score: 1-10)

Arguments for trade (Participation):

1. Medical imports and export revenue, for example, are tied to human rights. In other words, money generated from trade and consumer goods can help elevate human rights.

2. Standard of living influenced, generally, by trade.

3. Benefit of many to suffering of few.

4. Open window/exert some pressure of human rights/trade does not go ahead of politics.

Arguments for basic human rights (Non-participation):

1. Basic human rights basis for civility. To deny human rights through trade weakens moral structure/civility of society.

2. Inherent separation between human rights and trade.

3. Trade can foster worse human rights situations.

Score:

Trade 5.2/10

Basic human rights 4.8/10

Rationale:

Division between human rights and trade, and trade can foster both better or worse human rights.

4. Are the Olympics devoid of politics?

(Score: 1-10)

Arguments for Olympics devoid of politics (Participation):

1. Olympics fundamentally about sports. No politics.

2. The International Olympic Committee is an independent, apolitical body.

Arguments for Olympics not devoid of politics (Non-participation):

1. Because the Olympics showcase countries, it cannot help from being political.
2. Financial and fringe benefits of Olympics bring in politics.

Score:

Non-political 0.8/10

Political 9.2/10

Rationale:

Theoretically the Olympics is apolitical, but it cannot be achieved practically.

5. Should athlete rights override basic human rights?  
(Score: 1-10)

Arguments for athlete rights (Participation):

1. Because Olympics is every four years, athletes should not be denied.
2. Because athletes train for years, they should not be denied.
3. Athlete participation in Olympics is not directly complicit with human rights issues.

4. Athletes can choose whether or not to participate due to ethical reasons.

Arguments for basic human rights (Non-participation):

1. Athletes are supporting China as a host of the Olympics.
2. Athletes are cogs in the system, and thereby empowering, condoning China.
3. Value of human life is more important than athletic achievement.

Score:

Athlete rights 6.6/10

Basic human rights 3.4/10

Rationale: Athletes compete at the Olympics regardless of where they take place. In contrast, basic human rights are paramount to the moral structure of society and the world.

## Totals for the Evaluation Section

1. Is China based on its human rights issues worthy of hosting the Olympics?

Worthy of hosting 16/40 (40%)

Unworthy of hosting 28/40 (70%)

2. Do foreign countries have a right to interfere in Chinese internal matters?

Non-interference 3.6/10 (36%)

Interference 6.4/10 (64%)

3. Does trade with China override basic human rights?

Trade 5.2/10 (52%)

Basic human rights 4.8/10 (48%)

4. Are the Olympics devoid of politics?

Non-political 0.8/10 (8%)

Political 9.2/10 (92%)

5. Should athlete rights override basic human rights?

Athlete rights 6.6/10 (66%)

Basic human rights 3.4/10 (34%)

Corollary:

**Basis for evaluations:** upholding the values of freedom of expression, culture, religion, self-determination, and self-preservation.

6. Consequence of full participation of democratic countries in the China Beijing Olympics.

(Score: 1-10)

Arguments for positive consequences of full participation on basic human rights:

1. Full participation would allow full benefits of intercultural understanding which stem from the Olympics.

2. Full participation creates basis for dialogue.

Arguments for negative consequences of full participation on basic human rights:

1. Full participation would endorse, support China as host of the Olympics.

Score:

Positive consequences of full participation 7.6/10

Negative consequences of full participation 2.4/10

Rationale:

Participation creates dialogue, intercultural understanding which would be denied otherwise.

7. Consequences of Chinese pardon of human rights prisoners and democratic countries full participation on the China Beijing Olympics.  
(Score 1-10)

Arguments of positive consequences of Chinese pardon and full participation by democratic countries in China Beijing Olympics on basic human rights:

1. China has made concrete advance on its human rights issues.
2. Participation promotes dialogue and intercultural understanding.

Arguments of negative consequences of Chinese pardon and full participation by democratic countries in China Beijing Olympics on basic human rights:

1. China has made concrete advances in major human rights issues like Tibet, Burma, Sudan, Taiwan, and women and minority rights.
2. Small concessions on human rights issues can legitimize significant human rights issues.

Score:

Positive consequences of pardon 9.2/10

Negative consequences of pardon 0.8/10

Rationale:

China makes concrete advance on Chinese human rights issues, and there are communication benefits of participation.

8. Consequence of full boycott by democratic countries of the China Beijing Olympics.

(Score: 1-10)

Arguments of positive consequences of full boycott on basic human rights:

1. A full boycott would be a moral/ethical by democratic countries for basic human rights.
2. A full boycott would show that China and the Olympics are not above basic human rights.

Arguments of negative consequences of full boycott on basic human rights:

1. A full boycott does nothing to deal with China's human rights issues.
2. A full boycott denies the benefits of intercultural understanding and dialogue.

Score:

Positive consequences of full boycott 2.6/10

Negative consequences of full boycott 7.4/10

Rationale:

Full boycott denies intercultural understanding and dialogue, and it does nothing to deal directly with China's human rights issues.

9. Consequence of boycott by democratic countries of China Beijing opening ceremony.

(Score: 1-10)

Arguments of positive consequences of boycott of opening ceremony on basic human rights:

1. A boycott of the opening ceremony represents a stand against China's human rights issues.

Arguments of negative consequences of boycott of opening ceremony on basic human rights:

1. A boycott of the opening ceremony, a limited aspect of the Olympics, would

2. A boycott of the opening ceremony does nothing to deal with China's human rights issues.

Score:

Positive consequences of boycott of opening ceremony 8.4/10

Negative consequences of boycott of opening ceremony 1.6/10

Rationale:

A boycott of the opening ceremony makes stand against the China's human rights issues, without at the same time hurting the athletes involved in the Olympics.

10. Consequence of other forms of action by democratic countries against China such as sanctions, trade restriction, military action, individual athlete boycott, and public boycott.

(Score: 1-10)

Arguments of positive consequences of other forms of action on basic human rights:

1. Other forms of actions represent powerful, direct measures against China's human rights issues.

Arguments of negative consequences of other forms of action on basic human rights:

1. Other forms of actions are both unlikely and unreliable, due to trade consequences, and lack of mass participation on part of public and athletes.

Score:

Positive consequences of other forms of actions 6.2/10

Negative consequences of other forms of actions 3.8/10

Rationale:

Other forms of actions both unlikely and unreliable, despite their directness (in the case of sanctions, trade restrictions and military action) in dealing with China's human rights issues.

## Totals for the Corollary:

### 6. Consequences of full participation of democratic countries in the China Beijing Olympics.

Positive consequences of full participation 7.6/10 (76%)

Negative consequences of full participation 2.4/10 (24%)

### 7. Consequences of Chinese pardon of human rights prisoners and democratic countries full participation in China Beijing Olympics.

Positive consequences of pardon 9.2/10 (92%)

Negative consequences of pardon 0.8/10 (8%)

### 8. Consequences of full boycott by democratic countries of the China Beijing Olympics.

Positive consequences of full boycott 2.6/10 (26%)

Negative consequences of full boycott 7.4/10 (74%)

### 9. Consequences of boycott by democratic countries of China Beijing opening ceremony.

Positive consequences of boycott of opening ceremony  
8.4/10 (84%)

Negative consequences of boycott of opening ceremony  
1.6/10 (16%)

10. Consequences of other forms of action by democratic countries against China such as sanctions, trade restriction, military action, individual athlete boycott, and public boycott.

Positive consequences of other forms of actions 6.2/10  
(62%)

Negative consequences of other forms of actions 3.8/10  
(38%)

## Should Democratic Countries Participate in the 2008 China Beijing Olympics?

Evaluation-Results	Max Score	Committee Scores			
		Part	Non-Part		
1 Worthy of Hosting	40	16.0	28.0	40%	70%
2 Right to Interfere	10	3.6	6.4	36%	64%
3 Trade override basic human rights	10	5.2	4.8	52%	48%
4 Olympics devoid of politics	10	0.8	9.2	8%	92%
5 Athlete rights override human rights	10	6.6	3.4	66%	34%
Totals	80	32.2	51.8		
Percent		40.3%	64.8%		
<b>Corollary</b>		Positive Impact	Negative Impact	% Positive	% Negative
6 Impact of participation	10	7.6	2.4	76%	24%
7 Impact of Chinese pardon	10	9.2	0.8	92%	8%
8 Impact of full boycott	10	2.6	7.4	26%	74%
9 Impact of boycott-opening ceremony	10	8.4	1.6	84%	16%
10 Other forms of action	10	6.2	3.8	62%	38%

“Part” refers to participation by democratic countries in the China Beijing Olympics (based on human rights).

“Non-part” refers to non-participation by democratic countries in the China Beijing Olympics (based on human rights).

## Analysis:

Based on human rights, trade, right to interfere, politics of Olympics, and athlete rights, China receives a score of 64.8% for democratic countries to not participate in the Olympics (and in contrast to 40.3% for democratic countries to participate in the Olympics). The scores are indicative of the severity of the China human rights issues.

Also, China receives a score of 70% for its unworthiness of hosting the Olympics, and democratic countries receive a score of 64% to interfere in China's internal matters. However, athlete rights preceded human rights 66% to 34%.

In the Corollary, a Chinese pardon and full participation received the highest score of 92%, followed by boycott opening ceremony at 84%, and full participation at 76%. Interestingly the idea of participation as opposed to non-participation scored higher in the evaluation, due to benefits of intercultural understanding and dialogue from participation.

From a policy standpoint, the American, Canadian, and European Union governments are in favor of full participation which is the third best evaluation option. Within European countries like France and Germany there has been talk of boycotting the opening ceremony which is the second best evaluation option.

The potential problem with the Chinese pardon is that there may be little motivation on the part of Chinese to act upon it, since democratic countries are in favor of participation over non-participation. Viz., if the Chinese government does not pardon human rights prisoners, based on the evaluation results democratic countries would still participate in the Olympics.

A key question which arises out of the evaluation is why the International Olympic Committee awarded the Olympics to China in the first instance, since the evaluation results show 70% to 40% that China is unworthy of hosting the Olympics. Now that China has been awarded the Olympics, democratic countries are forced at least logically to participate.