

# 國立體育大學 102 學年度研究所博士班入學考試試題

系所:體育研究所 組別:運動休閒管理組

科目:運動休閒管理學專業學科文獻評論 (本試題共 16 頁)

※注意: 1 答案一律寫在答案卷上, 否則不予計分

2 請核對試卷、准考證號碼與座位號碼三者是否相符。

3 試卷『彌封處』不得污損、破壞。

4 行動電話或呼叫器等通訊器材不得隨身攜帶, 並且關機。

5 請以中文作答。請橫書。

本卷共 100 分

This attached paper “**The role Arts and Culture in the Olympic Games From Olympic Arts Competitions to Cultural Olympiads**” was written by Dr. Beatriz Garcia, and published in *International Journal of Cultural Policy* (pp 361-376, vol 14, n 4): an outstanding academic journal which is now on the list of Social Science Citation Index (SSCI). Please refer the contents of this paper, then answer the following questions (可用中文答題):

1. What is the style of this paper? A quantitative or a qualitative oriented paper? In additions, what is the contribution of this paper to its readers? Please describe your opinion. (20%)
2. What are the changes of the Olympic cultural program historically? (15%)
3. What is your opinion related to the importance of a culture program within an Olympic Games? (10%)
4. What is the delimiting of the Olympic culture program that the author described in this paper? (20%)
5. Mainly, as the author of this paper mentioned, what are the managerial issues of the Olympic cultural program? (10%)
6. Please make a whole comment to “**The role Arts and Culture in the Olympic Games From Olympic Arts Competitions to Cultural Olympiads**”.(25%)

# **The role Arts and Culture in the Olympic Games From Olympic Arts Competitions to Cultural Olympiads<sup>1</sup>**

By Dr Beatriz Garcia<sup>2</sup>

Director, Impacts 08 – European Capital of Culture Research Programme  
School of Sociology and Social Policy, University of Liverpool

## **Introduction**

The Olympic Games is recognized worldwide as the largest sports mega-event – certainly the event attracting the largest amount of media coverage globally. As well as a sports event, the Olympics are a cultural phenomenon, with a history spanning more than 100 years and supported by a global network of organisations with an educational and intercultural remit that defines itself as a Movement and aspires to promote Olympism as a ‘philosophy of life’ headed by the International Olympic Committee. What is less known, is that the Games also incorporate 100 years of Olympic cultural and arts programming and that such experience is playing a growing role defining or contributing to respective Olympic host cities’ cultural policies, the production of local symbols and the reinforcement of cultural values. This paper provides a framework for understanding the functions and position of the Olympic cultural programme within the Games broader structure and its development over time.

After an introductory section reviewing the definition and assigned roles of the Olympic cultural programme according to official IOC guidelines, the paper presents a historical account of arts and cultural programming in the summer editions of the Games, from the initial conception by Pierre de Coubertin in 1906 up to the last implementations on occasion of the Sydney 2000, Athens 2004 and Beijing 2008 Games. The paper ends with a brief revision of the current challenges and prospects that the programme, now denominated Cultural Olympiad and spanning over four-years, holds within the Olympic Movement and future host cities such as London in the lead to 2012.

## ***Delimiting the notion of Olympic Cultural programme***

To understand the current definition and practical applications of the Olympic cultural programme, it is necessary to make some initial distinctions over the identification of the programme’s key components. This exercise is not straightforward as, to this day, there are no detailed guidelines about the role and main functions that Olympic Games cultural programme is supposed to fulfill. Instead, programmers must rely on a dynamic range of references that underline the importance of ‘culture’ within the Olympic Movement. Some of these references are specific, but they also extremely brief and, often, contradictory. They include the IOC official regulations in the Olympic Charter and Olympic Candidature guidelines, and the diverse practices of prior Olympic cities in the conceptualisation and

---

<sup>1</sup> This paper is based on research funded by the Olympic Studies Centre at the Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona (1999-2000), the International Olympic Committee, Lausanne (2001), the British Academy (2004-2008) and the Universities China Committee in London (2008). A different version of this paper has been published as: Garcia, B. (2008) ‘One hundred years of Cultural Programming within the Olympic Games. (1912-2012): Origins, evolution and projections’ in: *International Journal of Cultural Policy* (vol 14, n 4) (pp 361-376)

<sup>2</sup> Corresponding author: [email@beatrizgarcia.net](mailto:email@beatrizgarcia.net) ; [www.beatrizgarcia.net](http://www.beatrizgarcia.net)

Dr Beatriz García is Director of Impacts 08 – European Capital of Culture Research Programme, and Lecturer in Sociology at the University of Liverpool. She has been an academic advisor to the London 2012 Olympic culture and education team since the bid stage in 2004.

implementation of respective cultural festivals and exhibitions. A consequence of this situation is that there is no prescribed clarification over what might be included within an official Olympic cultural programme. Should it, for instance, include all elements of Olympic protocol, the Olympic education programme, the host city street celebrations and fan culture? Here, I place limits on this concept, thus providing a reasoned approach to delimiting the boundaries Olympic cultural programme in order to provide a robust model through which host cities can structure and focus their work.

### *Cultural Programme Versus Cultural Event*

A critical document in delimiting what one envisages as the Olympic cultural programme is the founding document of the Olympic Movement, the Olympic Charter. Examining the presence of cultural programming within this document highlights how the official cultural programme may be distinguished from the wider notion of the Games as a cultural event per se (Moragas 1992). The focus of this paper is the description and analysis of the first option, that is, the Olympic cultural programme or Cultural Olympiad understood as a component that represents only a section of the overall Olympic activities taking place prior to and during the staging of the Olympic Games. While a range of other cultural expressions emerge during an Olympic Games period, or Olympiad, such as locally organized celebrations within communities, these rich and important aspects of the Olympic experience are not dealt with here, since they tend to operate outside of – but often around – the organizational structure of the Olympic delivery organizations.

Up to 1999, the Olympic Charter reference to the cultural programme read as follows,

Rule 44: Cultural Programme

The OCOG [Organising Committee for the Olympic Games] must organise a programme of cultural events which shall be submitted to the IOC Executive Board for its prior approval.

This programme must serve to promote harmonious relations, mutual understanding and friendship among the participants and others attending the Olympic Games.

By-Law to Rule 44:

The Cultural Programme must include

- Cultural events organised in the Olympic Village and symbolising the universality and the diversity of human culture
- Other events with the same purpose held mainly in the host-city, with a certain number of seats being reserved free of charge for participants accredited by the IOC

The cultural programme must cover at least the entire period during which the Olympic Village is open.

*Source:* IOC 1999, pp. 68-69

This was the formal statement that guided the design of the Sydney 2000 Olympic cultural programme. These details do not offer any specific indication about what the Olympic cultural programme should include but indicate the main principles that the programme of ‘cultural events’ is supposed to promote. These principles are identified as: ‘harmonious relations’, ‘mutual understanding’, ‘friendship’, ‘universality’ and ‘diversity’ but they are not supported by any specific performance indicator. Consequently, throughout the years, respective Organising Committees for the Olympic Games

(OCOGs) have been free to propose an interpretation of these principles and to decide on the most appropriate way to implement them.

Complementing the Olympic Charter, another key document that offers an indication of key regulations and priorities for the delivery of an Olympic Games is the official IOC Candidature Procedure and Questionnaire that leads to the *Candidature File* or, informally named *Bid Books*, presented by any city aiming to host the Games. The Candidature Procedure and Questionnaire documents vary considerably from one Games to the next but, invariably, the section or chapter dedicated to outline the candidate's cultural programming requirements is the one most open to interpretation. Traditionally, the cultural programme has been presented as the final chapter within the so-called 'IOC Questionnaire' which outlines the key areas against which candidate cities must present proposals and evidence of capacity to deliver.<sup>3</sup> This chapter tends to introduce the notion of 'Olympism' or 'Olympic Values', where candidate cities are encouraged to outline their interpretation of such concepts. It is also a chapter that often requests outline proposals for the Olympic ceremonies and Olympic education programmes, though it is not always the case. In such instances, the Olympic ceremonies section is the only area supported by a Technical Manual with fixed specifications for protocol, while there is no such manual for the cultural or education programme. Furthermore, the chapter including references to the cultural programme is traditionally the only section within the Candidature Questionnaire that does not require accompanying guarantees, that is, it does not lead to legally binding commitments. This means that the cultural proposals and budgets suggested within the Bid documents may be changed after award of the Games. This is crucial to understanding why it can also be the more vulnerable component of the Games hosting process, when difficult budget decisions are being taken. Coming to terms with this trajectory is crucial for cultural programme organizers.

This absence of fixed requirements is accentuated when one considers that the 2004 and 2007 versions of the Olympic Charter have abbreviated the Rule – also stripping from it the bye-laws – to the following:

The OCOG shall organise a programme of cultural events which must cover at least the entire period during which the Olympic Village is open. Such programme shall be submitted to the IOC Executive Board for its prior approval (IOC 2004, 2007: Olympic Charter, Rule 40).

The recent abbreviation to the Rule suggests that, from an official regulation point of view, rather than expanding its area of influence and integration within the Olympic hosting process, the cultural programme may become more marginal. The latest version of the Olympic Candidature Questionnaire has also eliminated 'Culture' as a separate section, instead incorporating it within a more generic reference to the IOC's aspiration for 'The Olympic Games Experience' (IOC 2008: 10). Interestingly, this move may provide an opportunity for better integration of the cultural programme within other Games components.

As we will see in the following section, the possibility of the cultural programme becoming marginalized from an IOC guideline point of view is in stark contrast with the growing aspirations and rhetoric of Olympic host cities, which see the cultural programme as a central platform through which to maximise local distinctiveness, representation and ownership. However, without the support of the IOC and appropriate international regulations sustained from one edition into the next, particularly in terms

---

<sup>3</sup> In the Candidature Questionnaire published for the 2000 Olympic Games candidates, the cultural programme requirements were presented as 'Theme 14: Cultural Programme and Youth Camp' (IOC 1992). Following editions of the Questionnaire have presented it as 'Theme 11: Olympism and Culture' (IOC 1995) a title which has been maintained up to 2004, such as was the case for the 2012 Olympic Games Candidature Questionnaire, 'Theme 17: Olympism and Culture' (IOC 2004).

of monitoring and evaluation, it is unlikely that the cultural programme can grow and reach its full potential. This is because, without a stable framework and explicit requirements for the support of the Games global partners (sponsors and media in particular), the cultural programme tends to become a local affair, disconnected from the Games global projection and poorly documented for the reference of future hosts.

### *Characteristics of an Olympic Cultural Programme*

Of course, opportunities also arise from the brevity and ambiguity of the IOC official definitions and guidelines. For instance, one might argue that a richer cultural programme ensues from this and that it would be philosophically highly problematic for the IOC to impose stricter guidelines on the content of a programme that is supposed to reflect the unique cultural values and identity of the Games local host. Representatives of the IOC Cultural Commission<sup>4</sup> in the lead up to 2000 have argued that it is not convenient to offer too tight a framework for the implementation of Olympic cultural activities, as it would constrain the richness and diversity of expressions that respective Games hosts can provide (IOC 2000). Indeed, the lack of a concrete definition has allowed a great freedom of action and interpretation and has contributed to incite ambitious cultural bid proposals. Nevertheless, this has also been the source of remarkable discontinuities in respective OCOG's commitment to develop the programme, especially with regards to budgeting and resource allocation. For this reason, understanding the Olympic cultural programme in a historical or sociological sense requires an assessment of the main characteristics and components of prior Olympic editions – ie. the agendas and actions of differing OCOGs – and the accounts of researchers presenting data on each Games' cultural activities. This paper infers from previous Games what we might treat as the main components and characteristics of the official cultural programme.

A fundamental characteristic that stands out in Olympic documents and related research is the identification of the Olympic cultural programme with an 'arts' festival rather than a broader cultural celebration incorporating interpretations of culture as a way of life in its more anthropological sense. In this line, the terms culture and arts and, occasionally, fine arts, have been used interchangeably in most of the reviewed literature.<sup>5</sup> Gold and Revill (2007) are perhaps one of the few notable exceptions, as they note how, in recent editions of the Games, particularly from Barcelona 1992 onwards, the ambitions of the Olympic cultural programme have been merging more and more closely with the wider economic and social agendas of host cities and governments, thus combining their artistic aspirations with other dimensions such as identity building, attracting tourism and contributing to urban regeneration. This has not been a continuum though, as is discussed later on in the paper.

As such, with a few exceptions, the Olympic cultural programme has been operationalized, mainly, as an arts programme or arts festival. This interpretation is justified, firstly, because it was the notion of a fine arts showcase that prompted the founder of the Modern Olympic Games, Baron Pierre de Coubertin, to advocate for the inclusion of a cultural programme to bring an 'aesthetic setting' to the sporting competitions (IOC 1997)<sup>6</sup> or, as noted by Gold and Revill,

[to] take up the ethos of the *panegyris* from the [Greek] classical festival – a festive assembly in which the entire people came together to participate in religious rites, sporting competitions and artistic performance. (2007: 59)

---

<sup>4</sup> This is the body that preceded the current IOC 'Culture and Education Commission'.

<sup>5</sup> Arguel 1994, Brown 1996, Burnosky 1994, Durry 1986, Gold and Revil 2007, Good 1998, Guevara 1992, Levitt 1990, Masterton 1973, Messing 1997, Monreal 1997, Petersen 1989, Stevenson 1997, Subiros 1992, Stanton 2000.

<sup>6</sup> See more details in the next section: *A brief history of the Olympic Cultural Programme*.

Secondly, it is appropriate to make this claim because the principle of artistic expression has inspired most cultural programmes since the first time they were implemented in 1912 (Stanton 2000). The interpretation of Pierre de Coubertin's conception of Olympic cultural activity as a collection of fine arts expressions, and the review of the recent history of Olympic cultural/arts festivals suggests that, up to the Sydney 2000 Games edition, the notion of Olympic cultural programme referred mainly to the organisation of an arts programme composed by cultural activities or events belonging to the following categories:<sup>7</sup>

- literature (poetry, plays, novels, philosophical theses, historical reviews)
- music (orchestral music, operas, folklore, pop, rock or other sorts of traditional and contemporary musical expression)
- theatre (from classical theatre to contemporary physical theatre and a wide range of stage performances)
- dance (from classical ballet, to folkloric and contemporary dance)
- visual arts (painting, sculpture, decorative arts, photography and public art expressions)
- architecture and city decorations
- cinema and other contemporary audiovisual expressions.

This view of cultural programming as a compartmentalised range of traditionally established artforms is brought under question in an era of creative and cultural industries, particularly in the lead up to the London 2012 Olympic Games. Nevertheless, a focus on arts programming has been the dominant approach and delivery model for most Olympic Games cultural programmers up until Beijing 2008, as explored in the section below.

### ***A Brief History of the Olympic Cultural Programme***

The nature and scope of the Olympic cultural programme has changed dramatically over time. While there has been a continuous insistence on its fundamental importance to the Olympic experience, its nature and functions have been questioned since the beginning of the Modern Olympic Games. Today, the programme remains one of the least regulated (and most misinterpreted) dimensions of the Games celebration at the same time as being one of the areas with greatest potential for growth and provision of added value to the notion of Olympism.

#### *Origins: The ideal role of cultural events in the Olympic Games*

The principle of holding an arts festival in parallel with the celebration of sporting competitions is embedded in the foundations of the Olympic Movement. Hanna (1999) describes that in the Ancient Games, 'athletes, philosophers, scholars, poets, musicians, sculptors and high-profile leaders displayed their talents, in what Coubertin called the spirit of Olympism' (p. 109). Olympism was often defined by Coubertin as the simultaneous training of the human body and the cultivation of the intellect and spirit, together viewed as manifestations of the harmoniously educated man. Upon this basis, Coubertin's dream was to create an environment in modern society where artists and athletes could again be mutually inspired. From this, it can be concluded that Coubertin brought the Olympic Games back to life hoping to develop an internationally recognised marriage between art and sport. In support of this ambition, the Olympic Charter establishes that 'blending sport with culture and education' is a fundamental principle of Olympism (IOC 2007: 11).

---

<sup>7</sup> While I hold to the idea that this interpretation prevails, it is important to note an added dimension of protocol, ritual and classicist ideals around the Olympic aesthetic experience that has developed in parallel to the narrower definition of the official Olympic cultural programme as a collection of arts exhibitions or festivals. (See MacAloon 1984a, 1984b).

Coubertin's ability to coordinate and attract the attention of critical decision makers around the world led to the re-birth of the Games in 1896 – Athens – and to their continuation in 1900 – Paris – and 1904 – St Louis. Nevertheless, none of these Games incorporated arts activities alongside the sporting events. To change these circumstances, Coubertin convened a 'Consultative conference on Art, Letters and Sport' at the *Comedie Française* in Paris, 1906. He invited artists, writers and sports experts to discuss how the arts could be integrated into the Modern Olympic Games. The invitation stated that the purpose of the meeting was to study 'to what extent and in what form the arts and letters could take part in the celebration of modern Olympic Games and become associated, in general, with the practice of sports, in order to profit from them and ennoble them' (Carl Diem Institute 1966: 16). As a result of the conference and in order to ensure a clear association of the arts with sports, Coubertin established an arts competition, which became part of every Olympic Games celebration (Coubertin, cited in IOC 1997: 92). This competition was called the 'Pentathlon of Muses' and would involve the awarding of medals in the categories of sculpture, painting, music, literature and architecture.

The organisation of the first 'Pentathlon of Muses' was designated to a special commission set up by the Olympic Organising Committee of the host-city staging the first Games after the Conference, London 1908. Nevertheless, time constraints and disagreement over the programme contents led to its cancellation at the last minute (Burnosky 1994: 21-22, Petersen 1989). Consequently, the idea of an Olympic arts competition was not implemented until the Stockholm Games in 1912.

#### *Evolution of the Olympic cultural programme: from competitions to exhibitions and Cultural Olympiads*

From 1912 in Stockholm until 1948 in London, arts competitions were organised in parallel to the sporting competitions, and artists, like athletes, competed and won gold, silver and bronze medals (Good 1998, Stanton 2000). However, regulations and contest parameters changed considerably due to difficulties in defining the different competition sections and disagreement in defining the most appropriate subject for the works presented. Over the years, the competition's sections changed from the five areas composing the 'Pentathlon of Muses' to a long list of sub-categories. Moreover, the appropriate theme for Olympic artworks was also controversial, as it was discussed whether or not to restrict the entries to works inspired in or portraying sports activities. Initially, it was compulsory to present a sporting theme, but this proved difficult and limiting in areas other than architecture or design for sports buildings (Burnosky 1994: 23). Also problematic was the non-universal or localised nature of the arts competitions, as most judges and competitors were European and it was very rare that non-western artists were awarded a medal (Burnosky 1994, Hanna 1999, Good 1998). Other problems were related to transport difficulties, inconsistent support from respective OCOGs and many limitations resulting from the regulation of amateurism in the Olympic Movement.<sup>8</sup> The latter implied that, as in the case of athletes at the time, the participation of professional artists could not be accepted. In an arts context this was particularly problematic because all artists were considered professional in their devotion to their vocation (Hanna 1999: 108, referring to an IOC document from the 44th IOC Session in Rome, 1949).

---

<sup>8</sup> In the original conception of the Olympic Games, a key criteria for inclusion as an Olympic competitor was the need to be an amateur athlete, that is, not to be a full time professional and compete in sport for financial or commercial gain. This rule was also applied to the arts competition, and caused controversy as it became a challenge to attract artworks of the right quality if contributors could not be professional artists. Avery Brundage, was elected as IOC president in 1952 and was strongly opposed to any form of professionalism in the Olympic Games. His views prevailed during the lengthy revision of Olympic Arts Competitions formats and priorities that took place between 1949 and 1952 and led to their replacement by Arts Exhibitions from then onwards.

Hanna adds that perhaps most disappointing was the poor audience participation invoked by the arts competitions,

Cultural celebrations based on sport were increasingly irrelevant; people watch[ed] sport in real competitions, but their interest did not extend to sport in art. (Hanna 1999: 108).

This was a remarkable set-back to the promotion of Coubertin's ideals, as a major reason for holding cultural events alongside the sports competitions was to inspire discussion and the promotion of ideas among all Olympic participants and spectators. In this context, it is interesting to see that, in contrast with other host cities where Olympic arts manifestations had played a minor role, the so-called 'Nazi Games' of Berlin 1936 included a cultural festival of unprecedented dimensions for which, as indicated in the Berlin Games official report, an ambitious publicity campaign was created to ensure maximum recognition and participation.

Because of the slight interest which the general public had hitherto evidenced in the Olympic Art Competition and Exhibition, it was necessary to emphasise their cultural significance to the Olympic Games through numerous articles in the professional and daily publications as well as radio lectures. (The XIth Olympic Games Berlin 1936, Official Report cited in Good 1998: 19)

The Berlin 1936 Arts Competition and Exhibition was closely linked to the implementation of new and spectacular rituals such as the first modern Olympic torch relay, which have been seen by many as evidence of culture and the arts being used for propaganda purposes – in fact, the Berlin Arts Committee programme was chaired by a representative of the Reich Ministry of Propaganda (Berlin Organising Committee 1937). Large sculptures, new musical compositions and the production of the epic film masterpiece 'Olympia' by Leni Riefenstahl, became all memorable outcomes of the 1936 Olympic arts programme that have had an influence on arts programming within and outwith the Olympic Games ever since.

The 1940 and 1944 Olympic Games and related arts competitions were not held because of World War II. When the Games were re-established in London 1948, the Organising Committee succeeded in paralleling the sports with arts competitions. Remarkably, after the cultural programme ended, the British Fine Arts Committee that had been set up on occasion of the Games compiled a 'report of juror's suggestions for future arts contests' (p. 33). This was intended for use as a guide to organisers of future Olympic arts competitions. Good (1998: 20) explains that 'the recommendations included reducing the number of arts categories' and concluded that the 'interest in the exhibitions would be greater if they were more closely linked up with the Games themselves and if a more intensive press campaign had been organised' (*ibid*).

By 1950, the problems and difficulties noted above were perceived to be far greater than the benefits and achievements brought by the Olympic art competitions. To review the situation, an extended discussion process took place within the IOC from 1949 in Rome to 1952 in Helsinki. As a result of this controversial process, which involved a detailed assessment of the 'amateur' nature of Olympic contributions, it was decided that from 1952 on, the presence of the arts in the Olympics would take the form of cultural exhibitions and festivals instead of competitions.

The first official Olympic arts festival was held at the Melbourne 1956 Games. The festival was coordinated first by a Fine-Arts Subcommittee, elected in 1953 and then by a Festival Sub-Committee created in 1955. The festival had two major components: one of visual arts and literature, and another one of music and drama. Hanna (1999: 76) describes that 'exhibitions and festivals were staged simultaneously in the weeks leading up to and during the Games and featured local, national and

international artists and performers'. A special book on Australian arts was published after the Games, entitled 'The Arts Festival: a Guide to the Exhibition with Introductory Commentaries on the Arts in Australia'. The Official Report of the Melbourne Games concluded that 'the change from a competition to a Festival was widely welcomed, since the Festival provided a significant commentary on Australia's contribution to the Arts' (cited in Good 1998: 29).

However, after Melbourne, successive cities had very different approaches to the cultural component of the Games either in length, organisation, objectives or themes. Moreover, despite the changes, most Olympic arts committees faced similar problems to those found by organisers from 1912 to 1948. Good argues that the shift from competitions to exhibitions did not increase awareness about the art festivals because it did not study or analyse the 'management issues' that had been repeatedly raised in the official reports of prior Games (1998: 31). These problems might have been accentuated by the absence of an international cultural organisation comparable to the international sports federations in its ability to coordinate and support Olympic arts initiatives (Masterton cited in Good 1998: 30). Arguably, this absence is a major reason for why the evolution of the Games cultural programmes has been so variable and unstable since its origins. Indeed, recent attempts to address this gap have failed to fully materialise.

Despite these ongoing issues, successive host cities, particularly in 1968, Mexico, and subsequent cities from 1972 onwards, became increasingly ambitious in their treatment of the arts festivals, progressively aligning them with the 'growing arts agenda' that developed after the Second World War including an aspiration to address 'audience development, access, and inclusion' (Gold and Revill 2007: 73). This process has been even more evident in the 1980s and 1990s with the growth of urban cultural policy strategies and 'culture-led regeneration' initiatives within which major events and, indeed, the Olympic Games, have played a central role (see Garcia 2004a, 2004b; Gold and Revill 2007).

This process peaked with a further development in the concept of Olympic cultural programming, proposed in the Barcelona 1992 Bid documents and implemented for the first time by this city. Barcelona set a new precedent by establishing the model of the Cultural Olympiad, a programme for cultural celebrations that lasted the four years separating the previous Olympic Summer Games in Seoul 1988 from the Games to be hosted in the city in 1992. Guevara (1992) explains this ambitious decision by referring to the organisers' strategic intention to use the Games to improve the city's urban landscape and assist in its international projection far beyond the Games staging period. The four-year format has been sustained by all subsequent summer Olympic host cities, from Atlanta 1996 up to London 2012. This format has provided greater opportunities for developing local cultural policy initiatives but, notably, as discussed in the following section, it has also brought further challenges to organisers.

The Cultural Olympiad of Athens 2004 was given a prime position within the event hosting process, as the city celebrated the contribution of Greece and Greek heritage as the cradle of European civilization and the birthplace of the Olympic Games. The cultural programme was utilised as a platform to convey ancient Olympic values and claim ownership of the Games in ways not accessible to other Olympic hosts. This involved the promotion of the Olympic Truce<sup>9</sup> as a particularly important component of the Olympiad and the establishment of a Cultural Olympiad Foundation in 1998, with the aim of becoming a permanent institution to coordinate Olympic cultural programming in the same way that the IOC coordinates the sporting programme.<sup>10</sup> At the time of writing, ten years on from the establishment of this

---

<sup>9</sup> The 'Olympic Truce' is the principle of stopping all wars for the duration of the Olympic Games, a notion that was originally implemented during the Ancient Olympic Games to ensure the safe passage of all athletes. See:

<http://www.olympictruce.org/>

<sup>10</sup> See: <http://www.cultural-olympiad.org.gr/>

institution, the role of this foundation remains unclear, providing yet another indication of the persistent challenges embedded within the Olympic cultural programme tradition.

The Olympic programmes for Beijing 2008 and London 2012 also incorporate a Cultural Olympiad. In Beijing, this took the form of ‘Olympic Cultural Festivals’ taking place over a month each year from 2003 to 2008 – so, over a six year period (see Garcia 2008).<sup>11</sup> In London, the Cultural Olympiad started at the end of September 2008 and will involve a nation-wide programme of activities up to 2012.

### *Cultural programming at the Winter Games*

While this paper has focused predominantly on the Olympic Summer Games, it is important to note that there are crucial differences in cultural programming that arise within the Olympic Winter Games. While there is no space within this paper for a detailed assessment, it should be noted that the artistic programme of the Winter Games was not formally established until Cortina d’Ampezzo 1956. More extensive cultural programmes comparable to the Summer Games began with Grenoble 1968 (see Gold and Revill 2007), the same year that Mexico hosted the Summer Games and presented the most ambitious cultural programme of any Games edition up to that date.<sup>12</sup>

In the three most recent Winter Games – Salt Lake City 2002, Torino 2006 and Vancouver 2010 – it is evident that the ambition of host cities grows year upon year (see also Grant 2002; Müller, Messing and Preuss 2006). There are interesting nuances that allow for different kinds of programming, which have evolved since Nagano 1998. In particular, the rise of the ‘medals plaza’ as a distinct mixed-venue within the city centre offers a relevant point of reference. It is a space where medals are awarded to athletes, rather than in the mountains away from the city. This allows organizers to re-constitute the city space each evening around a hallmark event. Integral to this ceremony each night is the programming of a range of other cultural activities. For instance, in Torino and Salt Lake City, it was typical for medals ceremonies to be followed by feature performances by international singers and musicians. This is one clear example in which the Winter Games has affected the Olympic protocol in a way that is conducive to more effective festival programming. Also in Torino 2006, there were clear connections made between the OCOG and the host city, particularly through a Look of the City programme developed in parallel and in addition to the traditional ‘Look of the Games programme’ with a clear emphasis on the city’s cultural assets (see Garcia and Miah 2006). This expansion of the cultural dimensions of Olympic programming, further reinforces its centrality to local host ambitions.

### ***Current issues and projections for the Olympic Cultural Programme***

#### *Management and promotion of Olympic cultural programmes*

The dynamic nature of the Olympic cultural programme since its official start in 1908 is indicative of the radical differences shown by respective Games organising committees in their commitment towards the arts as a dimension of the Olympic hosting process. These differences are evident in the wide variations in terms of programming length, management structures, objectives, chosen themes and geographical spread of activities. This section provides an overview of each of these issues with an emphasis in the period that reveals the greatest growth in Olympic cultural programming ambitions, from 1968 to 2008.

---

<sup>11</sup> Also find the full programme at: <http://en.beijing2008.cn/culture/festivals/>

<sup>12</sup> See: Comité Organizador de los Juegos de la XIX Olimpiada 1969.

Over this period, the **length** of the festivals has varied throughout the years from three weeks (eg. Moscow 1980) to four years Olympiads from the summer editions of Barcelona 1992 onwards. As a middle term, the Mexico 1968 arts festival lasted one year, the Rome 1960 festival held exhibitions during six months and the Los Angeles 1984 Olympic Arts Festival lasted ten weeks. Interestingly, the duration of a Cultural Olympiad is not completely set either. Indeed, while one might expect that a host city cannot promote its Cultural Olympiad until the previous city has concluded its Games, there are no rules that indicate this. As such, Beijing 2008 began its Olympiad during 2003, before the Athens 2004 Games had even begun. Further, while Barcelona 1992, Atlanta 1996, Sydney 2000 and Athens 2004 presented activities distributed throughout each of the four years leading to the Games, in Beijing, the Olympiad involved a period of between one week to a month of activity every year between 2003 and 2008, mainly to commemorate the day of the Games award (García 2008).

The **management** of the cultural programmes has varied from a central management model to shared management, state management, private management and mixed management (Guevara 1992). *Central management* occurs when the cultural programme is the sole responsibility of the OCOG. This was the case in Mexico 1968, Munich 1972, Seoul 1988 and Sydney 2000. *Decentralised management* or *shared management* has occurred when the Olympic cultural responsibilities have been the obligation of the OCOG in partnership with other organisations either private or public. A representative case was Montreal 1976, where Canadian provinces were in charge of designing the arts programmes, while the OCOG's cultural department was in charge of the logistics. *State management* has occurred when the control of the cultural programme has been directly in hands of one or various public bodies. This was the model for the management, planning and production of the Moscow 1980 Games arts component as well as the Cultural Olympiad in Athens 2004, which was entirely managed via a special branch of the Hellenic Ministry of Culture. In contrast, the clearest example of *private management* has been Los Angeles 1984. On that occasion, the OCOG was established as a private company and its cultural department hired co-producer agencies to organise the arts events. This was also the case in Atlanta 1996. Finally, there have been some cases of *mixed management* such as in Barcelona 1992, where a special organisation for the cultural programme was created with name *Olimpiada Cultural SA* (OCSA). OCSA was at the same time separated and dependent upon the Olympic Organising Committee (COOB): on the one hand, it had an administrative committee composed of Public Administration representatives independent of the OCOG; on the other, the Major of Barcelona presided over the OCSA Board of Directors and was also President of COOB.

In terms of **core objectives**, one can identify five major and non-exclusive categories which have varying degrees of economic, political, social or cultural undertones: 1) acknowledgement of the city's artistic and cultural capacities, 2) improvement of the city cultural services or infrastructure, 3) showcase of the country's folklore cultural diversity, 4) international projection and 5) change of image (Guevara 1992; Garcia 2000). The first objective was paramount to Munich 1972 and Los Angeles 1984. Both cities were already linked to important cultural circuits and counted on the appropriate budget to present a great festival of international significance. Secondly, the aim of using the Games as an opportunity to *improve the city cultural services* is said to have been the major drive of the Barcelona 1992 Cultural Olympiad. The initiative to present a four year festival responded to this aim and intended the involvement of relevant sponsors and public bodies to have a long lasting impact on both national and international audiences. Thirdly, the showcase of the country's *folklore and cultural diversity*, was a fundamental factor in the design of the Mexico 1968, Montreal 1976 and Moscow 1980 cultural programmes. This was also the case for Beijing 2008 and is linked to a deeper political agenda of

national pride on the country's heritage.<sup>13</sup> At a fourth level, the aim to achieve an *international projection* was especially remarkable in Seoul 1988, Barcelona 1992, Sydney 2000 and Athens 2004. In the case of Seoul and Barcelona, the Games brought both cities the opportunity to be known worldwide. As such, they combined an emphasis on local inclusion and representation with ambitious international communication strategies for culture. Finally, the objective to achieve a *change of image* was key in the cultural agenda of cities such as Munich, Seoul and Beijing, all of them cities within countries with a prominent and controversial militaristic character in the past, aspiring to transform international stereotypes. In the approach to London 2012, additional aims that are emerging as core Cultural Olympiad aspirations are the growth of cultural as well as sporting *audiences and participation* and, in line with late developments in cultural policy definitions, the use of the cultural programmes to advance wider *urban regeneration* objectives that link to social as well as economic agendas (García 2004a, 2004b).

The **themes** of Olympic cultural programmes have traditionally responded to these five to six types of set objectives. As such, they have varied from strongly rooted national festivals to international festivals, and from a focus on popular events to a focus on high arts manifestations. For example, Mexico 1968 presented a year-long national and international festival while Montreal 1976 presented a small scale but highly popular spontaneous festival with a marked national character. In contrast, Los Angeles 1984 was a large-scale, well promoted festival focused on elite national and international events with few open-air popular manifestations. Seoul 1988 also presented some international elite artists but combined them with local popular events. Remarkably, Munich 1972 was paradigmatic in the configuration and production of the arts festivals because the festival was completely integrated within the Olympic sporting events. Munich understood the Games as a cultural event in itself and presented the arts manifestations in an open and spontaneous way. This was particularly evident in its so-called 'Avenue of Entertainment' which was composed of street theatre shows, mimes, clowns and acrobats (Burnosky 1994: 47) and incorporated performances focused on the interpretation of sports through art.

Additionally, since the creation of the Cultural Olympiad model, a common feature has been the design of **thematic festivals**, one for each year of the event. In Barcelona, the themes evolved from a 'Cultural gateway' in 1988, to the 'Year of Culture and Sport' in 1989, the 'Year of the Arts' in 1990, the 'Year of the Future' in 1991 and the 'Olympic Art Festival' in 1992. Atlanta also covered a wide range of subjects during the four years of festivals, arranged into two main themes: 'Southern Connections' at a national level, and 'International Connections'. Sydney offered a taste of the many and diverse Australian cultural communities through presenting an indigenous festival in 1997, a festival dedicated to multicultural groups and the waves of immigration in 1998, and international festivals in 1999 and year 2000. Finally, Athens reflected on major philosophical and humanistic principles by exploring the notions of 'Man and Space', 'Man and the Earth', 'Man and the Spirit' and 'Man and Man'.

Finally, another key operational dimension that has differed strongly from one Games edition to the next is the **geographical spread** of cultural activity. While most Olympic Games editions have concentrated their cultural programmes in the host city (mainly within central areas or, in some cases, within the Olympic park and related Olympic venues), since the establishment of the Cultural Olympiad, the ambition has been to involve communities beyond the host city to ensure that the Games are owned at a national level – and, sometimes, internationally. This has brought an additional challenge, as the more disperse the activity, the more difficult it has been to ensure that the programme is widely visible, recognised and leads to sustainable impacts and legacies – particularly from the perspective of media

---

<sup>13</sup> In particular, see Brownell (2008: 94) who, in response to the many inquiries into whether Beijing 2008 would change or reinforce China's politics, highlights that 'the more important symbolism will concern the place of Chinese culture and the Chinese nation in the modern world'.

coverage (García 2000, 2001, 2007). The first nation-wide cultural programme took place in Mexico 1968, with various attempts at following this trend taking place in the lead to Sydney 2000, Athens 2004 and, currently, London 2012. The latter has established an Olympic first by supporting the creation of twelve regional ‘Creative Programmers’ posts that are to coordinate and encourage Olympic cultural activity without depending directly on the Olympic Organising Committee for the Olympic Games.<sup>14</sup> All of these editions of the Games have also aspired to incorporate an international dimension, with artworks being presented across the five continents and, as noted below, increasing links with the Olympic Museum in Lausanne to showcase part of this activity within the IOC headquarters and thus increase chances to reach out to the Olympic Movement main global stakeholders.

### *Challenges and potential contributions by the International Olympic Committee*

Presently, the IOC maintains its commitment to ensure the survival of the concept of Olympic cultural programme as an event additional and complementary to the sports competitions. In 1994, this commitment was reflected in the opening of a renovated Olympic Museum in Lausanne, a venue that welcomes the display of a wide array of arts and cultural elements related to sport and the Olympic Movement and, increasingly, provides a space for exhibiting respective Olympic Games cultural and artistic proposals. Nevertheless, the marked transformations and variable nature of Olympic Arts Competitions, subsequent Olympic Arts Festivals and Cultural Olympiads seem to have affected the ability of Olympic organizers, global partners and local as well as international audiences to understand the function and purpose of a cultural programme as an integral dimension to the Olympic celebration.

As noted at the start of the paper, existing IOC regulations and guidelines emphasize that, to become an Olympic host city, it is compulsory to organise and promote a cultural programme acting in parallel to the sporting competitions and this is currently being articulated as core to the ‘Olympic experience’ (IOC 2008). However, none of these regulations, guidelines and recommendations seem to clarify which is the exact function that a cultural programme for the Games is expected to accomplish and how its success or failure can be evaluated or studied by the IOC after its implementation. This has led to a series of challenges and dysfunctions that are affecting the preparations of current Cultural Olympiads as much as they affected the Olympic cultural programs taking place throughout the last century.

One common challenge for Games organisers is the large **gap** between the eagerness of potential host cities to propose activities for the cultural Olympic programme at the bid stage and the ability of the chosen Olympic organising committee to implement them. In part due to the lack of specific criteria, performance indicators and legal guarantees, candidate cities tend to see the cultural programme as one of the areas allowing greater freedom of interpretation and an opportunity to present their most distinct and locally grounded initiatives at the bid stage. This situation has resulted in ever more ambitious cultural bid proposals that, at the time of Games hosting implementation, are precisely the first to suffer funding and general resource cuts, thus leading to cultural programmes that, for the most part, are condemned to fail their original vision (García 2009).

Further, Olympic cultural programmes, whether they have been organised by an independent institution or by a department within the OCOG, have had difficulties to **sustain their association** with other Olympic activities and benefit from the Games’ extensive promotional opportunities (García 2001). This is indicative of a potential conflict that prevents the integration of the cultural programme within the overall Olympic Games preparations. Ultimately, this suggests that, although the Olympic Movement aims to be a humanistic project encompassing sport, culture and education, the commercial imperatives

---

<sup>14</sup> See: <http://www.london2012.com/plans/culture/now-to-2012/getting-involved.php>

of the Olympic Games staging process have led to the absolute predominance of the competitive elite sport programme over cultural and educational activities. The prior statement is reflected in the operational structure of the OCOG, within which the team in charge of the cultural programme tends to operate almost independently to the rest of the organisation. This does not only provoke an understandable separation of the cultural programme from the departments in charge of sporting competitions, but also from the departments in charge of Olympic ceremonies, marketing, communications, media and institutional relations (Garcia 2001, 2007, 2009). This lack of cohesion of programmes and activities has led to an unnecessary duplicity of resources and to a lack of visibility for the Cultural Olympiad.

Finally, it is relevant to note the continuous and remarkable difficulties to **guarantee appropriate fundraising** for respective cultural programs. This may be a direct result of the way the current Olympic marketing strategies have been designed. None of the fundamental sources of Olympic revenue –the successful worldwide Olympic sponsorship programme (TOP) and the national sponsorship programs or the sales of television rights- include concrete references which favour investment in or coverage of Olympic cultural activities. In this context, considering the low status of the cultural programme when compared to such activities as the sporting competitions, the ceremonies and the torch relay, it is to be expected that Olympic sponsors will almost unanimously tend to invest in the latter areas rather than in a cultural programme. Further, the exclusivity principle lying behind all Olympic marketing arrangements has traditionally limited the possibility of attracting funders for cultural activity other than public entities (see García 2001, 2009).

All these considerations make a case for a better regulation of the cultural programme management and production system. More specifically, it calls for the creation of a more clearly defined IOC cultural policy that can protect and enhance such a relevant but misunderstood dimension of the Olympic Games. This policy should not impose limits on the creative freedom of the Olympic host city, but should help guarantee its applicability. For example, the policy should guarantee the commitment of the OCOG to the Olympic cultural programme or Cultural Olympiad when promises are made at the bid stage. It should encourage a better integration (if not a fusion) of cultural, educational and sporting activities within the Olympic delivery framework, especially through a more coordinated use of Olympic communication tools and, possibly, an improved interaction between the planned Cultural Olympiad and other programmes with strong symbolic significance such as the ceremonies, the torch relay or the Olympic education activities. Finally, it should facilitate the task of attracting appropriate funds to realise the programme. This may involve the inclusion of new clauses in the existing Olympic marketing and branding guidelines oriented towards the support of Olympic cultural programmes. As a first indication of a potential way forward, the IOC has approved a proposal by the London 2012 OCOG to test the notion of a parallel Games brand, not reliant on the use of the rings and not bound by TOP sponsor agreements. This parallel brand is an ‘Inspired by 2012’ mark that can be applied to appropriate cultural and educational activity and is currently being explored in the context of the London Cultural Olympiad.

Other recent initiatives developed under the auspices of the IOC and the Olympic Museum in Lausanne indicate that there might be some opportunities to better leverage the presence and relevance of Olympic cultural programmes in the near future. A good example has been the establishment of a regular ‘World Forum on Sport, Olympic Education and Culture’, currently in its fifth edition, which emerged out of the first international Forum on ‘The IOC and its Cultural Policy’ in March 2000. The 2000 Forum followed the decision to merge the previously existing IOC Olympic Cultural Commission with the Olympic Education Commission to give birth to the current Commission for Olympic Culture and

Education.<sup>15</sup> This joint Commission is supposed to assist in the enhancement of the role and visibility of cultural matters within the Olympic Movement. An additional measure has been the creation of the first executive post within the IOC with a cultural remit, namely, a part-time ‘OCOG liaison for Culture and Education’. The outcomes of these measures are still to be fully realised, but they embody a commitment to solve the contradictions behind the traditional ‘Olympic sport, culture and education’ discourse and may assist in generating new regulations to protect and promote the notion of Olympic cultural programming as an effective as well as inspirational dimension of the Games hosting process. Given the ongoing challenge of intercultural relations worldwide, and the privileged position of the Olympic Games as a global media phenomenon, the further advancement of cultural policies within the Olympic Movement and clarity as to the role of the Olympic cultural programme could be seen as one of the areas with greater potential to maximise the credibility and values of the Olympic Games as a progressive and globally meaningful cultural mega-event.

## References

- Arguel, M. (1994) ‘Sport, Olympism and Art’ in: CNOSF (Ed) *For a Humanism of Sport*, CNOSF and Editions Revue EP, Paris, pp. 179-186
- Berlin Organising Committee for the Olympic Games (1937) *The XIth Olympic Games Berlin 1936 Official Report*, Vol.2
- Brown, D. A. (1996) ‘Consultative Conference on Sport, Arts and Letters. Revisiting the discourses of art, beauty, and sport from the 1906 Consultative Conference for the Arts, Literature and Sport’ in: *Olympika*, 1996 pp. 1-24.
- Brownell, S. (2008) *Beijing's Games: What the Olympics Mean to China*, Rowman and Littlefield.
- Burnosky, R.L. (1994) *The history of the arts in the Olympic Games*, (MA Thesis) The American University, Washington DC
- Carl Diem Institute (Eds) (1966) *Pierre de Coubertin, The Olympic Idea: Discourses and Essays*, Editions Internationales Olympia, Lausanne
- Comité Organizador de los Juegos de la XIX Olimpiada (1969) *Olimpiada Cultural*, Mexico: Comision Nacional de Cultura Fisica y Deporte.
- Durry, J., (1986) ‘Sports Olympism and the Fine Arts’, *Report of the Twenty Sixth Session of the International Olympic Academy*, International Olympic Committee, Lausanne
- García, B. (2008) ‘Beijing cultural festivals... bigger but not always better’, in: *Beijing 2008 – Academic Views of the Event*, Centre for Olympic Studies, Barcelona, September [online]
- García, B. (2000) ‘Comparative analysis of the Barcelona’92 and Sydney 2000 Cultural Olympiad’ in: *5<sup>th</sup> International Symposium for Olympic Research. Bridging three centuries: Intellectual Crossroads and the Modern Olympic Movement*, University of Western Ontario, London, pp. 153-158
- García, B. (2001) ‘Enhancing Sports Marketing through Cultural and Arts Programmes. Lessons from the Sydney 2000 Olympic Arts Festivals’ in: *Sports Management Review*, 4(2), pp. 193-220
- García, B. (2004a) ‘Cultural Policy in European Cities: Lessons from Experience, Prospects for the Future’ in: *Local Economy*, 19(4), pp. 312-326
- García, B. (2004b) ‘Urban Regeneration, Arts Programming and Major events: Glasgow 1990, Sydney 2000 and Barcelona 2004’ in: *International Journal of Cultural Policy*, 10(1), pp. 103-118
- García, B. (2007) ‘Living the multicultural Olympic city. Cultural policy and planning in the Sydney 2000 Olympic Summer Games’, in: Gold, J.R. & Gold, M.M. (Eds) *Olympic Cities: Urban planning, city agendas and the World's Games, 1896 to the present*, London: Routledge (pp. 237-264)
- García, B. (2009, in press) *The Olympic Games and Cultural Policy*, Routledge.
- García, B. and Miah, A. (2006) ‘Ever decreasing circles. The profile of culture at the Olympics’ in: *Locum Destination Review*, 18, pp. 60- 63

---

<sup>15</sup> See: Olympic Cultural Commission website: <http://www.olympic.org/ioc/f/org/culteduc/>

- Gold, M. and Revill, G. (2007) 'The Cultural Olympiads: Reviving the Panegyris' in: Gold, J.R. & Gold, M.M. (Eds) *Olympic Cities: Urban planning, city agendas and the World's Games, 1896 to the present*, London: Routledge, pp. 59-83
- Good, D. (1998). *The Olympic Games' Cultural Olympiad: Identity and management*. (MA Thesis) The American University, Washington DC
- Good, D. (1999) 'The Cultural Olympiad' in: Cashman, R. & Hughes, A. (Eds) *Staging the Olympics. The event and its impact*, Centre for Olympic Studies, UNSW, Sydney
- Grant, R.T. (2002) 'Artists & Athletes: A Perspective on the 2002 Olympic Arts Festival,' *The Sport Journal*, 5 (1)
- Guevara, T. (1992) *Análisis comparativo del programa cultural olímpico desde México '68 hasta Barcelona '92, como base para su realización en Puerto Rico '2004*, Centre for Olympic Studies, Autonomous University of Barcelona
- Hanna, M. (1999). *Reconciliation in Olympism, The Sydney 200 Olympic Games and Australia's Indigenous people*. Walla Walla Press, University of New South Wales, Sydney
- IOC (1992) *Olympic Host City Candidature Guidelines, Theme 17*
- IOC (1995) *Olympic Host City Candidature Guidelines, Theme 11*
- IOC (1997) *Olympic memories. By Pierre de Coubertin*
- IOC (1999) *Olympic Charter*
- IOC (2000) *Cultural Commission Meetings. Verbal Proceedings*
- IOC (2004) *2012 Candidature Procedure and Questionnaire*
- IOC (2004) *Olympic Charter*
- IOC (2007) *Olympic Charter*
- IOC (2008) *Candidature Acceptance Procedure. Games of the XXXI Olympiad in 2016*
- Levitt, S. H., (1990) 'The 1984 Olympic Arts Festival: Theatre' (PhD Thesis), University of California Davis.
- MacAloon, J. (1984a) *Rite, Drama, Festival, Spectacle: Rehearsals toward a theory of cultural performance*, Institute for the Study of Human Issues, Philadelphia
- MacAloon, J. (1984b) *This Great Symbol*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Masterton, D. W. (1973) 'The Contribution of the Fine Arts to the Olympic Games' in: *Proceedings of the International Olympic Academy*, pp. 200-213
- Messing, M. (1997) 'The Cultural Olympiads of Barcelona and Atlanta from German Tourists' point of view' in: *Coubertin et l'Olympisme. Questions pour l'avenir*, (17-20 Sep) CIPC, Le Havre
- Monreal, L. (1997) 'Sport, Olympisme et Culture' in: *Coubertin et l'Olympisme. Questions pour l'avenir*, Comité International Pierre de Coubertin, Le Havre
- Moragas, M. (1992) *Cultura, símbols i Jocs Olímpics, Generalitat de Catalunya*, Centre d'Investigació en Comunicació, Barcelona
- Muller, N., Messing, M. and Preuss, H. (Eds) (2006) *From Chamonix to Turin. The Winter Games in the Scope of Olympic Research*. Kassel: Agon Sportverlag.
- Petersen, A. (1989) 'The Olympic art competitions 1912-1948', *Sport Science Review*, pp. 44-51
- Stanton, R. (2000) *The forgotten Olympic Art Competitions. The story of the Olympic Art Competitions of the 20th century*, Trafford, Victoria
- Stevenson, D. (1997) 'Olympic Arts: Sydney 2000 and the Cultural Olympiad' in: *International Review for the sociology of Sport*, 32(3), pp. 227-238
- Subirós, J. (1992): 'The Cultural Olympiad: objectives, programme and development', en M. Ladrón de Guevara; M. Bardají (eds): *Olympic Games, media and cultural exchanges: the experience of the last four summer Olympic Games*. Barcelona: Centre d'Estudis Olímpics i de l'Esport, p. 84-86