

TECHNOLOGIES OF POWER, GOVERNMENTALITY AND OLYMPIC DISCOURSES: A FOUCAULDIAN ANALYSIS FOR UNDERSTANDING THE DISCURSIVE CONSTRUCTIONS OF THE OLYMPIC IDEOLOGY

Dikaia Chatziefstathiou

Department of Sport Science, Tourism and Leisure
Canterbury Christ Church University - UK

Ian Henry

Centre for Olympic Studies & Research
Loughborough University - UK

Abstract

This article discusses the process of construction of Olympic discourses during the early years of the modern Olympic Movement. It focuses on documents written by the founder of the Olympic Movement, Baron Pierre de Coubertin and adopts a Foucauldian analysis for understanding the discursive construction of the Olympic discourses. Thus our approach is more concerned with the constitution of knowledges and discourses rather than with the historical approach focusing on personalities, structures and context. Core to our discussion will be the Foucauldian bio-politics and neo-liberal governmentality which refer to socio-political contexts where power is decentred and members of society play an active role in their own self-regulation and self-government. The article will consider the use of the body as a regulatory force for the discursive constructions of classist and gendered discourses of the Olympic ideology.

Keywords: Olympism, Baron Pierre de Coubertin, Governmentality, Discourse Analysis, Foucauldian analysis

Introduction

In this paper we seek to understand the process of construction of discourse on Olympism and its evolving nature from the end of the 19th to the mid-20th century. This is to be undertaken principally through an analysis of the writings of Pierre de Coubertin. In

so doing we wish to move beyond the classic historical approach focusing on personalities, structures and context, to employ a Foucauldian approach which focuses on the constitution of knowledges, discourses, and thus de-centring the subject (In this sense we are as interested in how the developing discourse of Olympism constructs Coubertin, as in how Coubertin constructed the discourse).

Core to our discussion are the Foucauldian concepts of technologies of power and technologies of the self, and their interaction in what Foucault refers to as 'governmentality'. In Foucault's terms there are four types of technologies:

- (1) Technologies of production which permit us to produce, transform or manipulate things;
- (2) technologies of sign systems which permit us to use signs, meanings, symbols or signification;
- (3) technologies of power, which determine the conduct of individuals and submit them to certain ends or domination, an objectivising of the subject;
- (4) technologies of the self which permit individuals to effect by their own means or with the help of others a certain number of operations on their own bodies and souls, thoughts conduct, and way of being, so as to transform themselves in order to attain a certain state of happiness, purity, wisdom, perfection, or immortality.¹

Each type of technology "implies certain modes of training and modification of individuals, not only in the obvious sense of acquiring skills but also in the sense of acquiring certain attitudes." (p. 63). However it is the technologies of power / domination and self which together when internalised constitute the notion of governmentality, referring to socio-political contexts where power is decentred and where members of a society play an active role in their own self government. The interface between these technologies is thus our primary focus.

Olympism was developed in Coubertin's writings and speeches as a philosophy consciously intended as a set of rules or propositions not simply about sport and its governance but about how one's life should be led, and thus clearly relates to what Foucault describes in his characterisation of technologies of the self. We will argue that

Olympism as a philosophy is a means by which Coubertin attempts to resolve the ambiguities or tensions of his own position in a changing world (in class terms between aristocracy, the industrial bourgeoisie and working classes; in political terms between forms of neo-liberalism, socialism and conservatism; in international relations between internationalism or cosmopolitanism and nationalism; in epistemological terms between rationalism, empiricism and classicism; and in summary in terms of 'world view' between tradition and modernity). We will further argue though Coubertin's position is an attempt to resolve these tensions in an overt adoption of this philosophy, the increasingly dominant nature of Western sport and the position of the Olympic movement within it engenders a shift to governmentality such that oppositional groups, whether class, gender, or anti-imperialist in form are drawn into the reproduction of self through sporting technologies of self and domination.

Although governmentality may be evident in a range of societies or social contexts, much of the work of Foucault and of political theorists who have engaged with the term, focuses on governmentality in a neo-liberal, modernist context. Neo-liberal individualism is perhaps the dominant form of post-Enlightenment political ideology in the West which engenders a particular form of knowledge, with for example a predisposition to accept market mechanisms and a restricted remit for the state. This implies internalised and reflexive self-governing, and has implications for the way we conceptualise truth. As Dean² puts it, we govern ourselves (and others) on the basis of what we take to be true about who we are and how we should behave to achieve appropriate ends, but that also, how we govern ourselves and behave, generates ways of producing truth.

It is no coincidence that Olympism should emerge along with the maturing of neo-liberalism in a post-Enlightenment context in which new relations between classes,

genders, and nations (colonial and colonised; West and non-West; capitalist and socialist) were beginning to emerge. Olympism, we wish to argue, in effect operates as a source of governmentality in a post-colonial neo-liberal context. Olympism generates technologies of power “technologies imbued with aspirations for the shaping of conduct in the hope of producing certain desired effects and averting certain undesired ones”³ as well as technologies of the self, in which Olympism as an overt philosophy of behaviour, of how to proceed in life, provides a set of values, principles, behaviours which both instantiate and legitimate power from the micro inter-personal context, through meso-level contexts (the world of sport, or the Olympic world), and at the macro (societal) levels.

How then does Coubertin’s discourse about Olympism promote a world view which both enables/ constrains our ability to see the world in particular ways and which promotes the internalisation of behaviours which legitimate and foster this world view? To address this question the paper will consider the use of the body as a regulatory force for: a) an elitist and exclusionary in terms of social class discourse centred on the interests of the emerging industrial bourgeoisie, and b) a gendered discourse of the Olympic Movement as reflected in Coubertin’s links between nationalism and hegemonic masculinity.

Class Tensions and the Ideology of Olympism: Bourgeois, Socialist and Conservative Interests

Olympism was to play a role in incorporating the new neo-liberal class interests of the industrial bourgeoisie, while at the same time disciplining the emerging industrial working class to conform to neo-liberal ideas of a new world order. This was particularly important in the period following the First World War when working class resentment of the sacrifice of human life in pursuit of what was perceived by many as class based definitions of ‘national’ interest was at its height in the West.

The Socialist Challenge and the 'Workers' Olympics'

The Olympic movement's early engagement with worker-based movements reflects the concerns of Coubertin and the IOC to resist overt incorporation of worker interests into Olympic sport. The First World War resulted in the collapse of old empires and the emergence of new states, mostly in Eastern Europe. In 1917, after a series of revolutions, Russia became the first country in the world to form a Communist government⁴. In the late 1920s and 1930s, Europe suffered from increasing mass unemployment and poverty, which led to a mobilisation towards social change and re-ordering of the social classes, as the social elites eventually lost their power and privileges. In the context of these social changes, a new form of physical culture was developed that would serve the revolutionary purposes of the communists. The communist sport model aimed to introduce sport to all people and employed it for utilitarian purposes that would enhance public welfare. Moreover, it would help to increase national integrity and secure national unity of the citizens of the communist and authoritarian regimes⁵. From 1917 to 1939 a series of 'alternative Olympics' took place, mainly organised by the Soviets. Although the Soviet Union had participated in the 1912 Olympics, it was never invited subsequently to take part in any of the Olympic Games during the inter-war period. Nevertheless, the USSR organised many cultural sport events, occasionally on a scale even bigger than that of the Olympics⁶.

In 1917, the USSR organised the Central Asian Games in Tashkent in which 3,000 athletes took part, a significantly larger number than that of the athletes participating in the 1920 Olympics in Belgium⁷. The importance of this event lay in the fact that in these games for the first time some of the Russian ex-colonies were summoned together, despite their linguistic, religious and cultural differences. Three years later, in 1920, the USSR celebrated the third anniversary of the 1917 'October revolution' with a mass demonstration of the Bolshevik storming of the Winter Palace involving 18,000 athletes. This event was termed a 'pre-Olympics' as a reference to the 1920 Olympics in which the USSR was not invited to take part. In 1925 and 1928 the Soviets organised the 'Spartakiad Games', a very successful event that combined sport competitions and cultural manifestations. They have been described as a 'ritualised Marxist

demonstration against the hypocrisy of the bourgeois Olympics with their apparent discrimination against working class athletes'⁸. In 1932, the last Spartakiad Games prior to the World War II were held in Moscow. It has been suggested that those Games were held in this year to mark an ideological opposition to the 1932 Olympic Games in Los Angeles⁹.

Coubertin often asserted in his writings that the changes in the social order, after the end of the War, had not had a major impact on the structure of the Olympic Movement.

Olympism passed through the Great War without even a shake. I am confident it would not prove less solid in case of social troubles. At any rate, the corporative tendencies of our times are by no means anti-Olympic. I noted with pleasure the workmen's acceptance of Olympic principles and spirit.¹⁰

Although he acknowledges that the 'Workers' Olympiads' had achieved remarkable success, he emphasises their weaknesses centred upon the internal conflicts between the socialist and communist organisations, which led to the change of the name of their events.

It was in the early days of their revival that they [i.e. the Olympic Games] ran the greatest risks; at present, the sap flows too strongly for it ever to dry up. The 1914-1918 war did not shake them: the social revolution did not affect them either. It is interesting to note, moreover, that alongside the 'capitalist' organisation there is already a 'proletarian' organisation. 'Workers' Olympiads' have been held at regular intervals and not without success. At the time of writing, a gigantic stadium is, I am told, being built in Moscow, where the next are to be held. They are even said to be going to take advantage of the occasion to change the name of this athletic meeting, which-if this were the case-would be infantile and only serve to emphasise an only too frequent failing of revolutionaries the world over: when so many institutions need radical renovation, they limit themselves merely to changing the name: what are needed are deeds not words.¹¹

The division between the socialist and communist organisations over the leadership and aims of the worker sport movement mounted after the formation of the communist International Association of Red Sports and Gymnastics (better known as Red Sport International – RSI) in Moscow in 1921, as a branch of the Communist International or *Comintern*. Until then, the Lucerne Sport International (LSI – a branch of the Bureau of the Socialist International) had led the worker movement, trying to develop it as a strong independent movement within capitalist society. Thus, the socialists were not trying to make their sport movement into an active

revolutionary force. Under the socialist leadership, three 'Workers' Olympics' were held (Prague 1925, Frankfurt 1925, Antwerp 1937). Nonetheless, the communists wished to organise international sport as a political vehicle of the class struggle, considering that it was not sufficient merely to organise a worker movement within the capitalist order. So they organised the Soviet Spartakiads and banned all their members (RSI) from any activities and contacts with the LSI. Although the two worker sport movements came together again in 1936, Krüger¹² argues that these internal conflicts of the worker movements, together with the over-politicisation of the worker sport and the under-representation of these events in the media led to the diminishing of their popularity among the working classes.

Thus the events of the inter-war era, the burgeoning of worker and communist movements, and the position taken by Coubertin and the IOC in relation to them reflect a move away from the early nationalist concerns with France and her military prowess, towards a (still gendered) position congruent with the interests of Western capitalism, which was often paraded under the banner of internationalism.

Bourgeois Class Interests and Olympism

While Coubertin did not openly admit that strong socialist and workers movements might threaten the existence of the 'bourgeois' Games, his concerns were obvious, but were not restricted to the role of working class interests. Indeed he had explicit concerns in relation to bourgeois interests.

A country is not truly sporting until the day when the greater part of its citizens feels personal need for sport [...]. And it is for the adult overtaxed and exhausted by modern life that sport constitutes an essential counterbalance, an almost infallible means of recovery, a discipline that nothing can replace. Now what facilities do our organisations provide for him in this respect? [...] What gymnasium - free or almost free - is open to him? [...] That is the reason why I wish to see a revival in an extended and modernised form of the municipal gymnasium of antiquity. [...] *And let the 'bourgeois' look out for the establishment of which I am speaking could well be built one day at their expense by the proletariat, which is already organizing Workers' Olympic Games in which the sporting spirit is superior to theirs.*¹³

The above quotation is taken from an open letter to Frantz-Reichel, who was Coubertin's close collaborator in France and had served as Secretary General of the 1924 Olympic Games.

Coubertin in this letter warns Frantz-Reichel that, if sport were not to be democratised by establishing institutions such as the public gymnasium, the worker movement would undertake such a project, threatening the existence of the 'bourgeois' Olympic sport movement. Such concerns also explain why Coubertin, in his speeches of that period, was keen to promote the principle of social equality and advocates sport for all.

This new era demands such a change [i.e. federations to adopt a more 'tolerant' policy in matters about class]. For a long time, the renewed interest in athleticism during the nineteenth century was merely an occasional pastime for rich and semi-idle youth. Our Committee has fought more than anyone to make it a habitual pleasure of the youth of the lower middle class. Now it must be made fully accessible to proletarian adolescents. All sports for all people, that is the new goal to which we must devote our energies, a goal that is not in the least impracticable. The recent war was won by the western powers thanks to a "sacred union", based on the conviction that the two-fold stakes of the fight were the political freedom of States, and the social equality of individuals. If we were to forget the second goal after achieving the first, civilisation would run the risk of exploding like a boiler without a safety valve.¹⁴

This message, with minor amendments, is also included in Coubertin's Olympic Memoirs.

It also implies recognition of the vital fact, strongly contested until quite recently, that sport is not a luxury pastime, an activity for the leisured few, nor merely a form of muscular compensation for brain work. For every man, woman and child, it offers an opportunity for self-improvement quite independent of profession or position in life. It is the apurage of all, equally and to the same degree, and nothing can replace it.¹⁵

In similar vein, he condemns the uniformity caused by industrialisation, of which one product is the working class itself, and emphasises Olympism's social and democratic character.

Olympism refuses to accept the existence of a deluxe education reserved for the wealthy classes, no shred of which should be handed out to the working classes. It refuses to condense art into pills that everyone will take at set hours and to establish timetables of thought along the lines of railways schedules. Olympism is a destroyer of dividing walls. It calls for air and light for all. It advocates a broad-based athletic education accessible to all, trimmed with manly courage and the spirit of chivalry, blended with aesthetic and literary demonstrations, and serving as an engine for national life and as a basis for civic life. That is its ideal program. Now can it be achieved?¹⁶

The Workers' Olympiads were opposed to the exclusionary values of elitism, racism and sexism, which tended to make sport inaccessible for working-class athletes.

The IOC Games were criticised for being the preserve of the sons of the rich and privileged through the rules of amateurism and the ‘aristocratic-cum-bourgeois-dominated national Olympic committees’, as well as the IOC itself¹⁷. Coubertin, in order to safeguard the severely scrutinised ‘bourgeois’ Olympic Movement, initiated a new, more democratic, popular and inclusive programme.

Now, nothing is accomplished when only limited numbers are involved. That may have been sufficient before, but not now. The masses must be touched. In truth, in the name of what can the masses be excluded from Olympism? By virtue of what aristocratic decrees does there exist some link between physical beauty and the muscular power of a young man, between his perseverance in training and his desire to win, on the one hand, and on the other hand, the list of his forefathers or the contents of his wallet? Such contradictions in terms, which are unfounded in law, lived on after the social organisation that created them. It is morally right that it was an autocratic gesture based on an outburst of barbarous militarism that dealt them the deathblow. [...] Faced with a new world that must be ordered according to principles thought to be utopian until now, and that can now be applied, humanity must find all the strength it can in the heritage of the past in order to build its future. Olympism is one of those strengths.¹⁸

He also wished to introduce this ‘inclusive’ programme to the educational institutes, mainly universities, hoping that the principles of sport, if applied to all, would contribute to the maintenance of social peace, which had been shaky after the war.

But it is also useful to him [i.e. the university student] in carrying out the social task which will lie ahead of him in the new society [...] All forms of sport for everyone; That is not doubt a formula which is going to be criticized as madly utopian. I do not care. I have weighed and examined it for a long time; I know it is accurate and possible. The years and the strength which remain to me will be employed to ensure its triumph; it will be my contribution to those social reforms whose principle was the basis of the pact of sacred union during this long war and whose achievement will have to be honest and swift if we do not want civilisation to blow up like a boiler without a valve, University students, messengers of knowledge and imagination, will constitute the most active battalions in this great task; let us say if you wish that they will have to be us aviators. Now I have said, and I repeat, that sport by reason of its potent physical and moral effects will be an inestimable instrument in their hands for the establishment of social peace. They must therefore know how to handle it with tact and how to derive the maximum effect from it. *Popular Olympism is about to be born; let the students prepare to serve it.*¹⁹

As a response to the socialist challenge that the new social order and the worker movement had raised, Coubertin put forward the notion of ‘popular Olympism’. He emphasised the necessity of the existence of the Olympic Games as a product of popular culture that would

enhance the sense of collectiveness among the individuals of the modern society, increasing the chances of maintaining social peace and unity.

Let us look around us and see what are the general needs of the age. It seems that the primary effort is towards a more just distribution and remuneration of labour, then towards a better delimitation between the area of public services and that of private initiative, whose frontiers are drawn in a frequently vague and sometimes absurd fashion, and lastly towards an education within the range of all and no longer the monopoly of a small number. But all these reforms risk remaining sterile unless we succeed in creating a centre for popular spectacles and enjoyments in which a simple, clear and tangible idea can draw together not only people of all ages and all professions, but of all opinions and all situations.²⁰

His motto in the post-war era became 'all sports for all people', as part of an effort to establish more sports associations that would serve the interests of the general public. He also expressed the idea of establishing a 'popular university' for the education of all individuals, where members of the working class would be taught world history, science, philosophy, language and other topics.

I expect a great deal of the working class. It is possessed of splendid strengths, and seems to me to be capable of great things. Moreover are we not deluding ourselves a bit as far as that culture, of which we are so proud, is concerned? There is so much dross mixed in with the pure metal, so much incoherence, insipidness, hollow vanity, and thinly disguised pornography! Whatever the case may be, here is how the issue stands, as I see it. *There is not way to link the working class suddenly with high culture, as the previous age understood it. The working class must prepare its own inventory of high culture, so that if the temple that contains the accumulated wealth of civilisation should be entrusted to its care in the future, that temple will be respected and maintained. From this viewpoint, a plan for labour universities was devised [...]* "What?" you may say, "you want to teach all that to manual labourers? What foolishness! They have neither the time nor the taste for such studies." I know; I am familiar with this disdain and these people, when I planned to re-establish the Olympic Games, took me for a madman, too.²¹

Although Coubertin acknowledges that the working class should not be undermined in its efforts to establish its own culture, his statements are punctuated by paternalist references. He suggests that the 'high culture', as has been so far understood by the establishment, cannot be wholly embraced by the working class. The rationale for such a claim is made more explicit in the following:

Now we come to the third factor that guarantees the stability of athletic sovereignty. I am referring to the conquest of the masses that athletic organisations, as they have existed so far, have been unable to reach. How could they have? We are dealing with the self-baptized, the proletariat, in the pejorative sense of a social have-not. *The hour of proletarian revenge has sounded for; we must acknowledge nothing can be done from now on without it. It is the horde, and a horde overwhelms an elite that has not always remained worthy of its privileges. Yet the proletariat is not ready for its task at all. It has not been instructed.* No one has ever bothered to show it all the riches housed in the intellectual temple, a temple that now depends, in part, on that same proletariat for its very preservation. Above all no one has done anything to dispel the bitterness - no, let us speak frankly, let us use the words that are fitting - to soothe the intense anger, the accumulated hatred that form the disturbing substrate of the new foundations now being laid.²²

Coubertin seems to accept, if not to embrace, the new reality of greater rights and freedom for the proletariat. However, this acceptance is invariably tinged with a paternalism reflecting his aristocratic origins and their association with the political and social philosophy of traditional conservatives such as Edmund Burke²³. Coubertin emphasises that the proletariat is not capable of successfully carrying out its new role in society without the ‘guidance’ of social and educated elites. In similar vein, the establishment of the popular university may be seen as an attempt by liberal bourgeois and conservative interests – and by Coubertin in particular - to ‘instruct’ the proletariat by organising its education. It may be argued that, since the rising power of the proletariat could not be halted, initiatives such as the popular university could at least assist the establishment in maintaining some kind of indirect control over the proletariat. This reading is supported by the following quotation.

There was a confused sense that this war was not going to be like any other, and that, dominated by a new element - the unity of the world - this war was creating unexpected opportunities. Once it was over, accumulated rancour and cramped appetites would clash in a gigantic battle for the conquest of power. *Merely pushing the working class back into its previous status was not an option. The only choices open to discussion were to join forces with it or to submit to it.* Various opinions are in the process of being formed about these alternatives. Some, in light of the flaws in and the breakdown of society, its inability to reform itself, are attached to the idea of a new, more just society - and thereby a more Christian society. Others think that we have what it takes to rebuild, and that it is just a matter of time until that is apparent. *But in the near future, whether the working class is in full control of power or merely involved in the exercise of that power, the issue of preparing that class is just as essential.* Yet there is no such preparation. [...] From this viewpoint, a plan of labour universities was devised.²⁴

All the same, Coubertin, given the new social order, unquestionably made remarkable efforts to reform Olympism and transform it to reflect a more democratic and popular philosophy. This provided evidence that the Olympic Movement could develop sensitivity in social matters and that it could be flexible when this was needed²⁵. His stance in relation to working class politics on the one hand and bourgeois neo-liberalism on the other was one which reflects what Roger Scruton²⁶ describes as the classic traits of traditional conservatism, namely respect for tradition; acceptance of hierarchies (and the responsibilities that come with privilege); and allegiance to the system which has produced benefits for its members. His approach is one of seeking to avoid radical reform, of depoliticising culture (in this case sport) and of producing paternalistic cultural policies aimed at 'improving' the individual.

However, the situation was very different in relation to the inclusion of women in the Olympic Movement. Although, women's role in contemporary western society was gradually changing by the recognition of more rights (especially in the pre-war period women's right to vote had become a major issue for dispute), Coubertin continued to oppose the participation of women in the Olympic Games. As expected, women reacted to the sexist and exclusionary values of the Olympic Movement and organised their own athletic competitions. Thus, the inter-war period of the Olympic Movement experienced a further series of 'alternative' games, the so-called 'Women's Olympics' or 'Women's World Games' (as they were later re-named).

A Gendered Discourse of Olympism

Women's Exclusion

An element which is key to this discussion on which the paper focuses is the representation of Olympism as a **universal** ideal. The appeal of a deeply divided Olympic movement (excluding as it did, women, colonised entities, professionals etc.) was ironically its subscription to a unifying philosophy which would order the world in ways intended to be consistent with the dominant interests in the Olympic movement.

Women were never originally seen as equal partners, nor indeed as any kind of partners, in Coubertin's view of modern sport, and consequently in his project to revive the Olympic Games. In his 'Ode to Sport', the centrality of the male athlete was obvious.

O Sport, you are Fecundity!

*You tend by straight and noble paths towards a more perfect race, blasting the seeds of sickness and righting the flaws, which threaten its needful soundness. And you quicken within the athlete the wish to see growing about him brisk and sturdy sons to follow him in the arena and in their turn bear off joyous laurels.*²⁷

Classism, sexism and racism were bound up with the organisations and the social structures of nineteenth century Europe. Based on the theory of 'separate spheres', the role of women was limited to issues concerning home whereas men dealt with the public affairs. Coubertin shared fully the sexist prejudices of his era which privileged (certain kinds of) male physique and male sociability in their conception of sport culture²⁸. He regularly stated his clear opposition to the prospect of allowing women to participate in the Olympic Games.

The question of allowing women to participate in the Olympic Games has not been settled. The answer cannot be negative merely on the grounds that that was the answer in antiquity; nor can it be affirmative solely because female competitors were admitted in swimming and tennis in 1908 and 1912. So it is clear that the debate remains open. It is good that too swift a decision has not been reached, and that this matter has dragged on. It will resolve itself quite naturally at the Congress of Paris, which will give the Olympiads their final form. Which way will it go? I am not a soothsayer, but for my own part I am not afraid of siding with the no vote. I feel that the Olympic Games must be reserved for men.²⁹

Coubertin, in his plans for the Games revival, had envisaged that they should be reserved for male athletes. In his efforts to justify this position he provided several reasons, summarised as follows: a) the organisational problems that would follow the inclusion of women due to the increased need for the establishment of separate sport associations and the staging of separate events during the Olympic Games, b) the inappropriateness of viewing women competing with each other in public sports competitions, and c) the limited physical abilities of women which made them 'incapable' of producing records in a highly competitive form of sport such as the Olympics. The first two of these arguments is evidenced in the following quotation:

First, in application of the well-known proverb depicted by Musset, "a door must be either open or closed". Can we allow women access to all Olympic events? No? Then why should some sports be open to them while the rest are not? Above all, what basis can one use to place the barrier between the events that are permitted, and those that are not? There are not just women tennis players and swimmers. There are women fencers, women riders and, in America, women rowers. In the future, perhaps, will there be women runners or even women football players? *Would such sports, played by women, constitute a sight to be recommended before the crowds that gather for an Olympiad? I do not think that any such claim can be made.* But there is another reason, a practical one. Would separate events be held for women, or would meets be held all together, without distinction as to sex, regardless of whether the competition is among individuals or teams? The second of these approaches would be logical, since the dogma of the equality of the sexes tends to expand. Yet this assumes the existence of co-ed clubs. There are hardly any such clubs now, with the exception of tennis and swimming. *Even with co-ed clubs, ninety-five times out of a hundred, elimination rounds favour the men.*³⁰

Even though the Games were reserved exclusively for the male athletes, at the 1900 Paris Olympic Games Charlotte Cooper became the first female modern Olympic victor. There were 1318 men and only 19 women at these Games (a figure which was reduced to eight in the St. Louis Games of 1904). These were females from privileged backgrounds who had the necessary funds and leisure time to enable their participation in socially acceptable sports. The most popular sport among those classes were archery, field sports, and later in the century, golf and tennis³¹. However, it should be noted that women in these Games performed in a few unofficial events, while the IOC banned women from participation in the Olympics in 1912³². It is obvious that Coubertin did not want to incorporate women's organised sport into the Games, and, for that reason, he often exaggerated the structural and bureaucratic issues that could arise. Another issue that concerned him deeply was the exposure of female physicality through the public contests. He referred to it several times in his life.

Although I would like competitions among boys to be more infrequent, I emphatically insist that the tradition continues. This form of athletic competitiveness is vital in athletic education, with all its risks and consequences. Add a female element, and the event becomes monstrous. The experience of Amsterdam seems to have justified my opposition to allowing women into the Olympic Games. On the whole, reaction so far has been hostile to repeating the spectacle that the women's events provided during the Ninth Olympiad. *If some women want to play football or box, let them, provided that the event takes place without spectators, because the spectators who flock to such competitions are not there to watch a sport.*"³³

In similar vein, some years later (1935), he returned to this point.

I personally do not approve of feminine participation in public competitions, which does not mean that women should not go in for a large number of sports, but I mean to say merely that they should not seek the limelight! In the Olympic Games, their particular role should be that of crowning the champions, as in the tournaments of olden times.³⁴

He was apparently influenced by the contemporary view of the concept of chivalry in the Middle Ages. As he described in one of his earlier writings, with reference to the English Dr. William Penny Brookes who had attempted to revive the institution of ancient athletics,

Yet in some ways antiquity was not enough for Dr. Brookes. It did not know of gallantry. So he drew on some chivalrous customs of the Middle Ages. He had the winner of the tournament bend his knee to receive the symbolic laurel from the hands of a lady.³⁵

In principle, sport offered cultural liberation for women in terms of the social constraints of the Victorian dress code and 'body culture'³⁶. However, even after World War I, when women had more freedom in many spheres of their lives, they were denied equality of access and opportunity in sport³⁷. The culturally appropriate behaviour for women demanded the female athletes to demonstrate the principles of modesty, dignity and morality, which defined behavioural and dress standards³⁸. In this rationale, Coubertin believed that public competition for women was inappropriate. Instead, a more suitable role for them would be to show their appreciation of the male athletes for their remarkable achievements.

There remains the other possibility, that of adding women's competitions alongside men's competitions in the sports declared open to women, a little female Olympiad alongside the great male Olympiad. What is the appeal of that? Organizers are already overworked, deadlines are already too short, the problems posed by housing and ranking are already formidable, costs are already excessive, and all that would have to be doubled! Who would want to take all that on? *In our view, this feminine semi-Olympiad is impractical, uninteresting, ungainly, and, I do not hesitate to add, improper. It is not in keeping with my concept of the Olympic Games, in which I believe that we have tried, and must continue to try, to put the following expression into practice: the solemn and periodic exaltation of male athleticism, based on internationalism, by means of fairness, in an artistic setting, with the applause of women as a reward.* This combination of the ancient ideal and the traditions

of chivalry is the only healthful and satisfactory one. It will impose itself on public opinion through its own strength.³⁹

In the above text, a third reason, explaining why Coubertin opposed women's participation in sport, is also evident. He argued that competitions solely organised for women would lack interest. This relates to his view that women's physical capabilities are limited to physical exercises, and thus women cannot perform successfully in competitive sport.

Let us not forget that the Olympic Games are not parades of physical exercises, but aim to raise, or at least maintain, records. Citius, altius, fortius. Faster, higher, stronger. That is the motto of the International Committee, and the fundamental reason for the existence of any form of Olympism. Whatever the athletic ambitions of women may be, women cannot claim to outdo men in running, fencing, equestrian events, etc. To bring the principle of the theoretical equality of the sexes into play here would be to indulge in a pointless demonstration bereft of meaning or impact.⁴⁰

In the nineteenth century, the emphasis was on graceful movement rather than strenuous competition, which was related to 'masculine' development and loss of 'femininity'. Moreover, a related fear was that strenuous sport competition would damage a young woman's health and make her unable to become a mother. In short, the criteria for women's physical activity were hygienic and aesthetic rather than athletic⁴¹. Besides, there was the common view that women were frail individuals who just could not cope with the physical exertion that was required in many of the events. Interestingly, Hargreaves⁴² notes that, when the IOC held a conference in 1925 to examine the 'issue' of sport and women, "its medical report was a reaffirmation of the popular nineteenth century theory of constitutional overstrain...urging caution about the type and amount of exercise...with a scientific justification limiting women's participation in track and field athletics during the following years".

Can the young women I have mentioned before, with justified cruelty, acquire a moral sense through sports, too? I do not believe so. Physical education, athletic physical culture, yes. That is excellent for young girls, for women. But the ruggedness of male exertion, the basis of athletic education when prudently but resolutely applied, is much to be dreaded when it comes to the female. That ruggedness is achieved physically only when nerves are stretched beyond their normal capacity, and morally only when the most precious feminine characteristics are nullified. Female heroism is no phantom. I would even say, more directly, that it is just as common and perhaps even more admirable than male heroism.⁴³

Here Coubertin is again concerned with the issue of preserving the characteristics of women's femininity, which could be distorted through sport. He always emphasised that "the Olympic Games were established to exalt the individual male athlete, whose existence is necessary for the muscular activity of the group, and whose prowess is necessary to maintain the general competitiveness of all"⁴⁴. Although Coubertin had no objections to women's involvement in physical activity per se, he felt strongly that women should not take part in competitive sport. He always made it clear that "the true Olympic hero is the individual male adult"⁴⁵. Interestingly, Coubertin emphasised that women could also demonstrate a kind of heroism through remarkable achievements, but not in the domain of competitive sport. Evidence of what constituted his perceived 'female heroism' is the following:

A record. A Swedish woman, Mrs. Wersall, had all six of her sons taking part in the Games in one way or another, the youngest as boy scouts enrolled to help in maintaining order and carrying messages. How true to ancient ideals! The IOC awarded her the Olympic medal.⁴⁶

Thus, women were only to be valued for bringing into life Olympic male champions rather than for their own sporting accomplishments. Women's response to this exclusionary attitude was similar to that of the working-class and socialist organisations discussed earlier, namely they formed their own international association. Women from different countries who were interested in sport formed the *Fédération Sportive Féminine Internationale* (FSFI) in October 31, 1921, under the leadership of Alice Miliat, and the Women's Amateur Athletics Association (WAAA) was formed in Britain in 1922. It is also worth mentioning that women's participation in sport was encouraged in the national and international socialist sport movement and in the SWSI Workers' Olympics discussed above⁴⁷. This group organised a separate female sporting contest, the first 'Women's Olympics', held in 1922 in Monte Carlo, with 300 competitors⁴⁸. However, subsequent to their success and the continued antagonism of the IOC to their proposed term 'Women's Olympics', the event was renamed and the FSFI staged the Women's World Games in 1926, 1930 and 1934⁴⁹.

Sigfrid Edstrøm, founder-president of the International Amateur Athletic Federation (IAAF) (1912) and influential member of the IOC's executive board, in response to the pressure

caused by the organisation of the 'Women's Olympics' very close to the Olympic Games, voted in 1924 to sanction women's track and field events but not to advocate their inclusion in the Olympic Games. Finally, after hard negotiations between Edstrøm and Milliat, it was agreed that the FSFI would drop the word 'Olympic' in reference to their sport contests, but in return the IAAF agreed to leave the FSFI in control of women's sport⁵⁰. Just as with the worker movement, women's movement faced internal conflicts because some women wanted women's sport to follow a pattern based more on cooperation, which would be different from that of male competitive sport. Nevertheless, with the success of the 'Women's World Games', the IOC accepted the recommendation of the IAAF to permit the admission of women to a restricted number of athletic events at the Games (on April 5, 1926).

All the same, Coubertin never changed his mind about the participation of women in the Olympic Games, "as to the admission of women to the Games, I remain strongly against it. It was against my will that they were admitted to a growing number of competitions"⁵¹. Even after the successful organisation of the SFSI successful events in 1922, 1926, 1930 and 1934, his views remained the same, as opposed to the shift he initiated toward the democratisation of Olympism after the analogous rise of the socialist and worker's movements that were discussed above. His writings around this period provide evidence of this refusal to change his views.

Likewise, I continue to think that association with women's athleticism is bad, and that such athleticism should be excluded from the Olympic program - that the Olympiads were restored for the rare and solemn glorification of the individual male athlete. I believe that team sports are out of place in Olympiads, unless they compete in associated tournaments held outside the "Altis" (to use the ancient distinction), in other words, outside the sacred enclosure.⁵²

The Olympic Games were originally part of Coubertin's envisaged social reform based on a new form of education, in which male sport education would be given priority. The absence of grammar or hygiene from the reformed education reflects his ideas about replacing some aspects of academic discipline with a competitive form of sport. Thus, this form of education

based on modern competitive sport, and the Anglo-Saxon model of athleticism, would apply only to the male students who were thought to be physically capable of the rigour of competitive sport.

*The average Frenchman's infuriating sense of logic made my friends reproach me: you are working for the adolescent, for the boy...what are you planning to do for the child, for the girl?... Nothing at all, was my answer. They are not going to advance my cause. The reform that I am aiming at is not in the interests of grammar or hygiene. It is a social reform or rather it is the foundation of a new era that I can see coming and which will have no value or force unless it is firmly based on the principle of a completely new type of education.*⁵³

As Chatziefstathiou has also stated elsewhere⁵⁴, in the discourse of the Olympic Movement Coubertin clearly used social reform based on physical education as a vehicle for producing a strong male persona, with a nationalist and militarist connotation. It is a paradox that Olympism which claimed a commitment to cosmopolitanism and internationalism should also be seen as a response to the military needs of that era. Thus it may be argued that Coubertin's discourse about Olympism promoted the internalisation of behaviours in fostering and legitimating Olympism upon the grounds of the worldviews of universalism and humanism, while reacting to, and seeking to incorporate, competing ideologies and epistemologies, sexist and militarist in orientation.

Military Defence and Imperialistic Expansion

Coubertin's negative views about the participation of women in the Olympic Games may be seen as a corollary of the original plans and initial rationale for his social reform. Formed in the context of the aftermath of France's defeat in the Franco-Prussian War, his initial concern was that physical exercise (in the form of the Anglo-Saxon model of modern sport) should produce a generation of men, a stronger nation, and thus arrest the decline of France as an imperial power. Even though with the socio-political changes which took place, particularly as a consequence of the First World War's nationalistic

focus may have changed, his position in respect of gender and women's role in the Olympic movement, remained a core belief until the end of his life.

Related to technologies of domination was the use of the body as a disciplinary force to train and produce male leaders who would undertake the imperialistic labours of the 19th and early 20th centuries. The masculinising practice of sport was seen as an appropriate vehicle to produce 'Muscular Christians' who would be appropriate servants and officials of the British Empire. The discourses associated with Muscular Christianity reciprocally shaped the gendered Olympic notion of sportsmanship which emphasised fair play, modesty and the following of rules underpinned by competitive spirit and the pursuit of excellence. The famous English Public Schools were essentially centred on the ideology of athleticism, which emerged in the late Victorian and Edwardian eras. After 1850 the image of English public schoolboy had regained its status in the circles of middle and upper middle class clientele due to innovatory reforms, substantially associated with newly developed athletic fields. The pupils of these schools were prepared for their dynamic roles in the British Empire in the late nineteenth century⁵⁵. Athleticism was practised, predominantly by the settlers (at least in the early years) throughout the Britain's empire. Horton⁵⁶ argues that the cult of Athleticism coupled with the ideology of Muscular Christianity relentlessly infused the British Games culture into the culture of its colonies. It has even been suggested that "Victorians were determined to civilise the rest of the world, and an integral feature of that process as they understood it was to disseminate the gospel of athleticism which had triumphed so spectacularly at home in the third quarter of the nineteenth century"⁵⁷. Coubertin remarks with admiration that physical activity moulded the individuals in Britain and gave them a collective identity.

Then there are the colonies, that career of expatriation so well suited to the English, who bring their "old England" with them wherever they go. Whether they are "squatters" in New Zealand or planters in America, they are better off for having received such a strong physical and moral education in their schools. Muscles and character are objects of urgent necessity in such circumstances. Although the main cause for our own colonial impotence lies with our deplorable system of succession, it seems to me that education also plays its part.⁵⁸

Coubertin believed that England owed its strength and colonial power to the Muscular Christianity ethos and its strong physical culture.

To the merits of this [English] education we may ascribe a large share in the prodigious and powerful extension of the British Empire in Queen Victoria's reign. It is worthy to note that the beginning of this marvellous progress and development dates from the same time which saw the school reforms of the United Kingdom in 1840. In these reforms physical games and sports hold, we may say, the most prominent place: The muscles are made to do the work of a moral education. It is the application according to modern requirements of one of the most characteristic principles of Grecian civilisation: To make the muscles be chief factor in the work of moral education. In France, on the contrary, physical inertion was considered till recent times an indispensable assistant to the perfecting of intellectual powers. Games were supposed to destroy study. Regarding the development of the character of the youth, the axiom, that a close connection exists between the force of will and the strength of the body never entered anybody's mind.⁵⁹

Coubertin's interest in revitalising French society was very strong. It is clear from this text that in physical activity, as practised by the Muscular Christians in England, Coubertin saw a 'tool' for maintaining and expanding imperialistic power. As Lucas⁶⁰ argues:

Baron Pierre de Coubertin was convinced that the sport-centred English public school system of the late 19th century was the rock upon which the vast and majestic British Empire rested. In the recondite scholarship of Dr. Arnold and in the ensuing trend toward manly sport at Rugby and in England, Coubertin saw a catharsis, not only for the English, but also for the Frenchmen and eventually all mankind.

Lucas' point is re-affirmed, when one reads the following text from Coubertin's speech addressed to the *Greek Liberal Club of Lausanne* (1918):

It was left to the great Englishman Thomas Arnold to take up the Greek work at the point where a hostile fate had interrupted it, and to clothe it in an educational form adapted to modern conditions. The world had forgotten how organised sport can create moral and social strength, and thereby plays a direct part in a nation's destinies; had so far forgotten it that the spread of Arnold's doctrines and example first in England and then throughout the British Empire was an almost unconscious process. Rugby School may thus be truly considered as the starting-point of the British revival.⁶¹

Coubertin has often associated sport with the strengthening of national vigour. He believed that athletics could “be used to strengthen peace or prepare for war” and that the victory of a nation was often due to its athletic virility⁶².

At fixed periods all the other manifestations of national life grouped themselves around a considered athleticism [...] Thus when the Persian peril threatened Hellenism between 500 and 449 B.C. unexpected armies and navies barred the way to the ambitions of Darius and Xerxes and the greed of their advisers. There had been hesitation before the massive forces of the adversary; more than one city was inclined to submit to the ultimatum. Athens rose up. Victory proved it right. Now if many centuries later - for history has eloquent turnings and sometimes repeats itself strangely - an English general [Wellington] was able to say that the battle of Waterloo had been won on the playing-fields of Eton, how much more accurate still is it to proclaim that the glory of Marathon and Salamis was forged in the precincts of the Greek Gymnasium.⁶³

Coubertin was convinced that Thomas Arnold’s methods at Rugby School and the British sport ethic taught in their private elite schools had been responsible for Britain’s success as a world super power in the nineteenth century, and therefore that it should be exported to France⁶⁴. Thereafter, one of his major tasks was to persuade the French to introduce physical education in schools based on the classical values of the Greek gymnasium. Coubertin believed that if France would emulate this system, then the nation’s former glory days could be revived. In 1919, after the end of the First World War and the victory of the *Entente* Powers, Coubertin argued that France owed to a great extent its regained strength to the educational reforms based on Arnold’s model of sport ethic.

This is the kind of sport [the English sport], which I had in mind thirty years ago when I made a pact with Jules Simon for the reinvigoration of France. The conviction of the septuagenarian philosopher was no less ardent than my own, and events have fulfilled our hopes. A manlier and broader education soon begot results as fruitful as those whose benefits the England of Thomas Arnold had reaped some time before. In vain did Frenchmen blinded by party spirit undertake the sorry task of portraying to the outside world a decadence, which existed only within themselves. History will delineate the rising curve which enabled the Republic to write in forty years the most admirable of colonial epics and to guide youth through the dangers of pacifism and freedom pushed to extreme limits right up to that 1914 mobilisation which will remain one of the finest spectacles which Democracy has given the world.⁶⁵

Coubertin speaks with satisfaction about the new situation in France, which is attributed to the new educational system. He refers to his long-term efforts in this direction together with Jules Simon, Minister of Public Instruction from 1870 to 1879 and President of the Committee for the Propagation of Physical Education. Being relieved that France survived the First World War, and most importantly that France appeared stronger than Germany in the post-Franco-Prussian period, Coubertin could not hide his enthusiasm for such results. The value of physical education was emphasised as a principal factor for this national empowerment.

Recent events have resulted in entirely new circumstances. Sports are on the front lines of the forces that brought about victory. It is to sports that we owe the magnificent innovations that made it possible for England and the United States to transport unexpected armies to the theatre of war. It is thanks to them that the valiant Sokols covered their homelands with laurels, even before the borders were set and freedom assured. It is through sports that France, as heroic as in 1870 but infinitely stronger, was able to raise a powerful rampart of muscle against the invasion. After helping train incomparable soldiers, athleticism also helped sustain their zeal and console them in their suffering. They played foot- ball, they fenced, and they boxed right up by the front lines and far from them, as well, in the sad prisoners' camps. Public opinion is aware of these things, and appreciates them. Well-deserved enthusiasm will guarantee the value of physical education, and proclaim the triumph of sports.⁶⁶

As evident in his early writings, Coubertin was at first interested in revitalising French society merely from a nationalistic perspective. His patriotism and faith in the Third Republic prevailed, hence his devotion to social cohesion and the need for social reform. However, in an era that witnessed a remarkable proliferation of trans-national movements and organisations for the sake of world peace and reconciliation, Coubertin's international interests transcended his limited nationalist scope. Coubertin's strategy for reconciling his nationalist and internationalist interests was the revival of modern Olympic Games. This constituted both a response to the cosmopolitan trends of his era but also an attempt to promote sport "as the virile formula on which the health of the State can be founded"⁶⁷

Physical culture used for the purposes of military training is an excellent example of a disciplinary technology of domination. In a Foucauldian analysis, physical culture is analysed as a positive exercise of disciplinary power, producing individualising bodies of knowledge that may connect to broader power networks and political agendas. In the case of military training,

this relates to producing competent males serving and defending their national sovereignty but also the imperialist interests of a colonial power, or a group of western colonial powers. Thus it can be claimed that Coubertin saw physical culture as a disciplinary technology of domination, in the interests of economic productivity and the maintenance of social order in the French state. That is, he was keen to introduce the French male youth into the discipline of physical culture not solely interested in the optimisation of physical skills and abilities of young men, but the optimisation of the productive individual, which constitutes a healthy unit in a productive society. These specific bodily capacities, produced through organised forms of knowledge and (military) training would then directly benefit the production and reproduction of power of France in the international scene. Moreover, his emphasis on the individual reflects how Coubertin sought to internalise behaviours promoting a conservative world view in gendered and political terms, preserving aspects of the old order (male / imperial domination) while advocating elements of the new (cosmopolitan internationalism).

Concluding remarks

In undertaking this analysis we have been concerned to argue that Coubertin's promotion of Olympism incorporates both technologies of self and of power / domination. But what of the notion of technologies of power and of the comingling of these technologies in the concept of governmentality?

While technologies of the self take shape in Coubertin's rhetoric, we would argue that it is in the development of Olympism in organisational form that technologies of power / domination take effect. First of all domination is achieved by the process of successful incorporation or defeat of oppositional elements by the Olympic movement: the women's sports movement, the Workers' movement, the Communist Bloc, and slightly later towards the end of Coubertin's life, the newly liberated nations of the beginnings of the post-colonial era. Secondly domination was also achieved in the ability of Olympic sport to maintain and strengthen its position as the reference point for what

constitutes sport. Technologies of power were evidenced in the fact that individuals, teams and nations participated (and continue to participate) in a clearly Western, commercialised and largely masculinist form of activity which reproduces the cultural of the powerful in the activities of the dominated.

Finally, we would argue that while Coubertin through his rhetoric and political influence promoted a particular role for Olympism and sport in a particular world view, this philosophy of Olympism has in a sense also served to defined Coubertin. He is characterised as a ‘visionary’, and he was of course a purveyor of tradition, an (invented) form of Hellenic tradition, but also a modern form of Anglo-Saxon tradition⁶⁸. The history of Olympism casts him as a key actor in the interstitial moments of class and ideology formation in the late 19th and early 20th centuries bridging in the cultural domain, the modernity of western industrial capitalism and the traditional conservatism of aristocratic, paternalistic leadership. Olympism as a philosophy of ‘universalism’ thus casts Coubertin as both elitist and exclusionary and as a universalist promoting a cultural movement which has been able in some respects to transcend divisions in a world of increasingly fragmented identities. The fact that men and women, nations of various political persuasions, Olympic and Paralympic athletes continue to participate in a single (relatively) unified domain, tends to define his legacy in terms of promoting social and cultural stability, and inclusion despite the clearly elitist and exclusionary origins of much of his advocacy.

Endnotes

-
- ¹ M. Foucault, L. H. Martin, *et al*, *Technologies of the self: a seminar with Michel Foucault* (London, Tavistock, 1988)
- ² M. Dean, *Governmentality: Power and Rule in Modern Society* (London: Sage, 1999)
- ³ N. Rose, *Powers of Freedom: reframing political thought* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), p.52.
- ⁴ C. Culpin, *Making History: World History from 1914 to the Present* (London: Collins, 1996)
- ⁵ J. Riordan, "The Impact of Communism on Sport". In: J. RIORDAN and A. KRÜGER, eds, *The International Politics of Sport in the 20th Century* (London: Taylor and Francis, 1999), pp. 48-66.
- ⁶ Roche (2000).
- ⁷ Riordan (1999); Roche (2000)
- ⁸ Riordan (1999).
- ⁹ Roche (2000)
- ¹⁰ Coubertin 1928c: lines 53 – 56
- ¹¹ P. de Coubertin, "Legends" (1997), in: N. MÜLLER, ed, *Pierre de Coubertin 1863-1937 - Olympism: Selected Writing*. (Lausanne: International Olympic Committee, 2000), pp. 747-749 (lines 32 – 43)
- ¹² A. Krüger, "The Unfinished Symphony: A History of the Olympic Games from Coubertin to Samaranch". In: J. RIORDAN and A. KRÜGER, eds, *The International Politics of Sport in the 20th Century* (London: Taylor and Francis, 1999), pp. 3-27.
- ¹³ P. de Coubertin, "The Truth About Sport: The Ideas of Pierre de Coubertin. An Open Letter to Frantz-Reichel" (1927), in: N. MÜLLER, ed, *Pierre de Coubertin 1863-1937 - Olympism: Selected Writing*. (Lausanne: International Olympic Committee, 2000), pp. 235-236 (lines 62-78, emphasis added)
- ¹⁴ Coubertin, "Letter To The Members Of The International Olympic Committee (January, 1919)", lines 110 – 120)
- ¹⁵ Coubertin, "Legends" (1997), lines 89 – 98
- ¹⁶ P. de Coubertin, "Olympic Letter III: Olympism And Education" (1918), in: N. MÜLLER, ed, *Pierre de Coubertin 1863-1937 - Olympism: Selected Writing*. (Lausanne: International Olympic Committee, 2000), pp. 547-548 (lines 18 – 29)
- ¹⁷ Krüger (1999), p. 109; Roche (2000)
- ¹⁸ P. de Coubertin, "The Twenty-Fifth Anniversary of the Proclamation of the Olympic Games" (1919), in: N. MÜLLER, ed, *Pierre de Coubertin 1863-1937 - Olympism: Selected Writing*. (Lausanne: International Olympic Committee, 2000), pp. 551-553 (lines 49 – 55)
- ¹⁹ P. de Coubertin, "Olympic Letter XI: The Sporting Spirit of Students" (1919), in: N. MÜLLER, ed, *Pierre de Coubertin 1863-1937 - Olympism: Selected Writing*. (Lausanne: International Olympic Committee, 2000), pp. 172-173 (lines: 5 – 25, authors' emphasis)
- ²⁰ P. de Coubertin, "Olympic Letter VI: Panem et Circenses" (1918), in: N. MÜLLER, ed, *Pierre de Coubertin 1863-1937 - Olympism: Selected Writing*. (Lausanne: International Olympic Committee, 2000), p. 220 (lines 5 – 13)
- ²¹ P. de Coubertin, "Between Two Battles. From Olympism to the Popular University" (1922), in: N. MÜLLER, ed, *Pierre de Coubertin 1863-1937 - Olympism: Selected Writing*. (Lausanne: International Olympic Committee, 2000), pp. 203-209 (lines 215 – 230, emphasis added)
- ²² P. de Coubertin, "Address Delivered at Antwerp City Hall in August" (1920), in: N. MÜLLER, ed, *Pierre de Coubertin 1863-1937 - Olympism: Selected Writing*. (Lausanne: International Olympic Committee, 2000), pp. 222-226 (lines 164 – 188, emphasis added)
- ²³ E. Burke, and C. Cruise O'Brien, *Reflections on the Revolution in France* (London, Penguin, 1969)
- ²⁴ Coubertin, "Between Two Battles. From Olympism to the Popular University" (1922), lines 167 - 204, emphasis added
- ²⁵ D. Chatziefstathiou, "'All Sports for All People': The Socialist Challenge, Coubertin and the Ideology of 'Popular' Olympism", *Kinesiologia Slovenica*, 12(2) (2006) pp. 13-22
- ²⁶ R. Scruton, *The Meaning of Conservatism* (London, Macmillan, 1980)
- ²⁷ P. de Coubertin, "Ode to Sport" (1912), in: N. MÜLLER, ed, *Pierre de Coubertin 1863-1937 - Olympism: Selected Writings* (Lausanne: International Olympic Committee, 2000), pp. 629-30 (lines: 34-38, emphasis added)
- ²⁸ A. Guttmann, *The Olympics: A history of the modern games* (Urbana, IL, 1992); J. Hargreaves, *Sporting Females: critical issues in the history and sociology of women's sports* (London: Routledge, 1994)

- ²⁹ P. de Coubertin, "The Women at The Olympic Games" (1912), in: N. MÜLLER, ed, *Pierre de Coubertin 1863-1937 - Olympism: Selected Writings* (Lausanne: International Olympic Committee, 2000), pp. 711-713 (lines: 1 – 8, emphasis added)
- ³⁰ Ibid, lines 13 – 29, emphasis added
- ³¹ K. Toohey and A. Veal, *The Olympic Games: A Social Science Perspective* (London: CAB International, 2000)
- ³² J. Hargreaves (1994)
- ³³ P. de Coubertin, "Educational Use of Athletic Activity" (1928), in: N. MÜLLER, ed, *Pierre de Coubertin 1863-1937 - Olympism: Selected Writings* (Lausanne: International Olympic Committee, 2000), pp. 184-194 (lines: 172 – 180, emphasis added)
- ³⁴ P. de Coubertin, "The Philosophic Foundation of Modern Olympism" (1935), in: N. MÜLLER, ed, *Pierre de Coubertin 1863-1937 - Olympism: Selected Writings* (Lausanne: International Olympic Committee, 2000), pp. pp. 580-583 (lines: 242 – 258, emphasis added)
- ³⁵ P. de Coubertin, "The Olympic games at Much Wenlock _ A page from the history of athletics: What do you make of Much Wenlock?" (1890), in N. MÜLLER, ed, *Pierre de Coubertin 1863-1937 - Olympism: Selected Writings* (Lausanne: International Olympic Committee, 2000), pp. 281-6 (lines 108 – 111)
- ³⁶ M. Roche, *Mega-events and modernity: Olympics, expos and the growth of global culture* (London, 2000).
- ³⁷ S. Birrell and C. Cole, *Women, Sport and Culture* (Champaign Illinois: Human Kinetics, 1994)
- ³⁸ Toohey and Veal (2000)
- ³⁹ Coubertin, "The Women at The Olympic Games" (1912), lines 37 – 56, emphasis added)
- ⁴⁰ Coubertin, "The Women at The Olympic Games" (1912), lines 29-36
- ⁴¹ Guttmann (1992)
- ⁴² Hargreaves (1994), p. 213.
- ⁴³ Coubertin 1928b: lines 158 – 168, emphasis added
- ⁴⁴ P. de Coubertin, "The Olympic Games and Gymnastics" (1931), in: N. MÜLLER, ed, *Pierre de Coubertin 1863-1937 - Olympism: Selected Writings* (Lausanne: International Olympic Committee, 2000), pp. 716-718 (lines: 75 – 78, emphasis added)
- ⁴⁵ P. de Coubertin, "Message to the Olympia-Berlin Runners" (1936), in N. MÜLLER, ed, *Pierre de Coubertin 1863-1937 - Olympism: Selected Writings* (Lausanne: International Olympic Committee, 2000), pp. 578-579 (line 43).
- ⁴⁶ P. de Coubertin, "The Fifth Olympiad (Stockholm 1912), in: N. MÜLLER, ed, *Pierre de Coubertin 1863-1937 - Olympism: Selected Writings* (Lausanne: International Olympic Committee, 2000), pp. pp. 435-441 (lines: 398 – 404)
- ⁴⁷ Roche (2000).
- ⁴⁸ Toohey and Veal (2000)
- ⁴⁹ Guttmann (1992); Roche (2000); Toohey and Veal (2000)
- ⁵⁰ Guttmann (1992)
- ⁵¹ P. de Coubertin, "Message To All Athletes And Participants Meeting At Amsterdam For The Ninth Olympiad (1928), in: N. MÜLLER, ed, *Pierre de Coubertin 1863-1937 - Olympism: Selected Writings* (Lausanne: International Olympic Committee, 2000), pp. 603-604 (lines: 50 - 52)
- ⁵² P. de Coubertin, "Forty Years Of Olympism" (1934), in: N. MÜLLER, ed, *Pierre de Coubertin 1863-1937 - Olympism: Selected Writings* (Lausanne: International Olympic Committee, 2000), pp. 742-746 (lines: 136 – 142)
- ⁵³ P. de Coubertin, "The Unfinished Symphony" (1976), in: N. MÜLLER, ed, *Pierre de Coubertin 1863-1937 - Olympism: Selected Writings* (Lausanne: International Olympic Committee, 2000), pp. 751-753 (lines: 125 – 131, emphasis added)
- ⁵⁴ D. Chatziefstathiou, "Reading Baron Pierre de Coubertin: Issues of Race and Gender", *The Journal of Sport Literature: Aethlon*, Issue 25.2, 2008 forthcoming
- ⁵⁵ J.A. Mangan and C. Hickey, "Globalization, the Games Ethic and Imperialism: Further Aspects on the Diffusion of an Ideal". In: J.A. MANGAN, ed, *Europe, Sport World: Shaping Global Societies* (London: Frank Cass, 2001)
- ⁵⁶ P.A. Horton, "Complex Creolization: The Evolution of Modern Sport in Singapore". In: J.A.MANGAN, ed, *Europe, Sport World. Shaping Global Societies* (London: Frank Cass, 2001)
- ⁵⁷ cited in Mangan and Hickey (2001), p. 106.
- ⁵⁸ P. de Coubertin, "English Education" (1887), in: N. MÜLLER, ed, *Pierre de Coubertin 1863-1937 - Olympism: Selected Writing*. (Lausanne: International Olympic Committee, 2000), pp. 105-120 (lines: 539 - 555)

⁵⁹ P. de Coubertin, "English Education" (1896), in: N. MÜLLER, ed, *Pierre de Coubertin 1863-1937 - Olympism: Selected Writing*. (Lausanne: International Olympic Committee, 2000), pp. 308-311 (lines: 31 – 45)

⁶⁰ J. Lucas, *The Modern Olympic Games* (London: Thomas Yoseloff Ltd., 1980)

⁶¹ P. de Coubertin, "What we can ask of sport: Address given to the Greek Liberal Club of Lausanne, 24 February 1918", in: N. MÜLLER, ed, *Pierre de Coubertin 1863-1937 - Olympism: Selected Writing*. (Lausanne: International Olympic Committee, 2000), pp. 269-277 (lines 143 –151)

⁶² P. de Coubertin, "The Conquest of Greece" (1997), in: N. MÜLLER, ed, *Pierre de Coubertin 1863-1937 - Olympism: Selected Writing*. (Lausanne: International Olympic Committee, 2000), pp. 322

⁶³ Coubertin, "What we can ask of sport: Address given to the Greek Liberal Club of Lausanne, 24 February 1918", lines 63 – 78

⁶⁴ Lucas (1980); C. Hill, *Olympic politics* (Manchester, 1992), p. 26; Guttmann (1992); Toohey and Veal (2000).

⁶⁵ Coubertin, "What we can ask of sport: Address given to the Greek Liberal Club of Lausanne, 24 February 1918", lines 170 - 191

⁶⁶ P. de Coubertin, "Letter To The Members Of The International Olympic Committee (January, 1919)", in: N. MÜLLER, ed, *Pierre de Coubertin 1863-1937 - Olympism: Selected Writing*. (Lausanne: International Olympic Committee, 2000), pp. 737-741 (lines 77 – 97)

⁶⁷ P. de Coubertin, "Athletic Education" (1889), in: N. MÜLLER, ed, *Pierre de Coubertin 1863-1937 - Olympism: Selected Writing*. (Lausanne: International Olympic Committee, 2000), pp. 121- 133 (lines 28-29)

⁶⁸ D. Chatziefstathiou and I.P. Henry "Hellenism and Olympism: Pierre de Coubertin and the Greek challenge to the early Olympic movement", *Sport in History*, 27(1) (2007), pp. 24-43.