



ROUTLEDGE
HANDBOOKS



Handbook of the London 2012 Olympic and Paralympic Games

Volume One: Making the Games

Edited by Vassil Girginov

HANDBOOK OF THE LONDON 2012 OLYMPIC AND PARALYMPIC GAMES

The *Handbook of the London 2012 Olympic and Paralympic Games* is an authoritative and comprehensive account of the world's greatest sporting and cultural event. It tells the complete story of the 2012 Games from inception, through the successful bidding process and the planning and preparation phase, to delivery, the post-Games period and legacy. Written by a world-class team of international Olympic scholars, the book offers analysis of the full social, cultural, political, historical, economic and sporting context of the Games. From the political, commercial and structural complexities of organising an event on such a scale, to the sporting action that holds the attention of the world, this book illuminates every aspect of the 2012 Games, helping us to better understand the vital role that sport and culture play in contemporary global society.

The book is divided into two volumes. *Volume One: Making the Games*, examines the build-up to London 2012, covering key topics such as:

- the bidding process;
- planning and decision making;
- financing the Games;
- developing the infrastructure;
- engaging national and international governing bodies of sport;
- engaging the UK public;
- engaging a global public;
- developing a legacy programme;
- the Cultural Olympiad.

Richly illustrated with the personal accounts of key stakeholders, from sports administrators and politicians to athletes and spectators, and including essential data and evocative visual material, this book is essential reading for anybody with a personal or professional interest in the Olympic and Paralympic Games, global culture or the development of sport.

Vassil Girginov is Reader in Sport Management/Development at Brunel University, UK. He is a founding board member of the Bulgarian Olympic Academy and has been researching, teaching and working for the Olympics for 25 years. His research interests and publications (including six books) are in the field of the Olympic Movement, sport development and comparative management and policy analysis.

HANDBOOK OF THE LONDON 2012 OLYMPIC AND PARALYMPIC GAMES

Volume One: Making the Games

Edited by Vassil Girginov

First published 2013
by Routledge
2 Park Square, Milton Park, Abingdon, Oxon OX14 4RN

Simultaneously published in the USA and Canada
by Routledge
711 Third Avenue, New York, NY 10017

Routledge is an imprint of the Taylor & Francis Group, an informa business

© 2013 Vassil Girginov

The right of the editor to be identified as the author of the editorial material, and of the authors for their individual chapters, has been asserted in accordance with sections 77 and 78 of the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988.

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reprinted or reproduced or utilised in any form or by any electronic, mechanical, or other means, now known or hereafter invented, including photocopying and recording, or in any information storage or retrieval system, without permission in writing from the publishers.

Trademark notice: Product or corporate names may be trademarks or registered trademarks, and are used only for identification and explanation without intent to infringe.

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data

A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

Library of Congress Cataloging in Publication Data

Handbook of the London 2012 Olympic and Paralympic games : volume one : making the games / edited by Vassil Girginov.
p. cm.

Includes bibliographical references and index.

1. Olympic Games (30th : 2012 : London, England) 2. Paralympics (30th : 2012 : London, England) I. Girginov, Vassil, 1956–
GV7222012 .H36 2012
796.48–dc23
2012007405

ISBN: 978-0-415-67194-1 (hbk)

ISBN: 978-0-203-13251-7 (ebk)

Typeset in Bembo
by Wearset Ltd, Boldon, Tyne and Wear

CONTENTS

<i>List of illustrations</i>	viii
<i>Contributors</i>	x
<i>Acknowledgements</i>	xiv
1 Social, political, economic and operational context of the 2012 London Olympic and Paralympic Games: an introduction <i>Vassil Girginov</i>	 1
PART 1	
Bidding for the Games	15
2 From 1908 to 2012: continuity and change in London Olympic narratives <i>John Horne</i>	 17
3 Preparing and winning the London bid <i>Guy Masterman</i>	 29
PART 2	
Delivering the Games	43
4 Materializing the vision of a 2012 London Olympic Games <i>Gillian Evans</i>	 45
5 From a prehistoric village to an Olympic Park site: transforming East London <i>Andrew B. Powell</i>	 62

6	The Olympic laws and the contradictions of promoting and preserving the Olympic ideal <i>Mark James and Guy Osborn</i>	74
7	London 2012 legacy strategy: ambitions, promises and implementation plans <i>Mike Weed</i>	87
8	Securing the Games <i>Jon Coaffee and Pete Fussey</i>	99
9	Preparing Team GB for London 2012 <i>Dave Collins and Andrew Cruickshank</i>	114
10	Governance of the London 2012 Olympic and Paralympic Games <i>Vassil Girginov</i>	130
PART 3		
	Engaging the UK public	145
11	Involving East London communities: the evocative Olympic Games and the emergence of a prospective 'legacy' <i>Iain MacRury</i>	147
12	Regional involvement with the Olympic and Paralympic Games <i>Ian Jones</i>	161
13	Involving schools: Get Set – a model for a more open approach to Olympic education? <i>Charlie Tims</i>	174
14	Further and Higher Education involvement with the Olympic and Paralympic Games <i>Dikaia Chatziefstathiou</i>	185
15	The London 2012 Cultural Olympiad and torch relay <i>Beatriz Garcia</i>	199
16	Volunteering for the Games <i>Geoff Nichols</i>	215

PART 4	
Engaging sports	225
17 National Olympic and Paralympic governing bodies of sport involvement with the Games <i>Vassil Girginov and Nick Rowe</i>	227
18 Other sports providers and the Games <i>Mike Collins</i>	242
PART 5	
London 2012 and the world's participation	265
19 National elite sport policies in preparation for London 2012 <i>Barrie Houlihan, Jae-Woo Park and Mayumi Ya-Ya Yamamoto</i>	267
20 London 2012 and the global South – an exploration: a case study of India's Olympic sport <i>Boria Majumdar</i>	281
21 Beijing–London–Rio de Janeiro: a never-ending global competition <i>John R. Gold and Margaret M. Gold</i>	291
PART 6	
Conclusions	305
22 Making the 2012 London Games: taking stock and looking forward to celebrating the Games <i>Vassil Girginov</i>	307
<i>Index</i>	313

ILLUSTRATIONS

Tables

1.1	Main agencies and responsibilities in 2012 London Olympic and Paralympic Games	3
1.2	2012 London Olympic and Paralympic Games public sector funding package	4
3.1	Election of the 2012 Host City by the IOC Session, Singapore, 6 July 2005	41
5.1	Summary of cultural heritage investigations within the Olympic Park	63
7.1	The five legacy promises	90
9.1	Anonymized performance logistics plan for a World Junior Championships team	118–122
10.1	Key actors in the governance of London 2012 Olympic and Paralympic Games and their interests	136
11.1	Olympic community consultations	153
12.1	Regional examples of pre-Games training camps	164
12.2	“Legacy standard” requirements of Legacy Trust UK funded programmes	169
15.1	Cultural Olympiad, key programme components	207
15.2	Cultural Olympiad outcome framework (consultation paper)	208
17.1	Sport England funding for mass sport 2009–2013	229
17.2	UK Sport funding for elite Olympic and Paralympic sport 2009–2013	230
17.3	UK sports categorisation	231
17.4	NGBs’ area-specific strategies for leveraging the benefits of the Olympics	234
17.5	NGBs’ rating of the impact of the Olympics on their business development	234
17.6	NGBs’ involvement with Olympic-related programmes	237
17.7	NGBs’ main beneficiaries from the 2012 London Olympics	239
18.1	The regional context of London sport	244
18.2	Sports participation in London	246
18.3	LOCOG’s Inspire sport projects	248
18.4	Sport England grants in London, 2008–2009 to 2011–2012	249
18.5	Participation retention rates	251
18.6	Mayor of London’s PlaySport participation schemes	254–255

List of illustrations

18.7	PlaySport round two criteria, 2011	256
18.8	Host borough initiatives	258–259
19.1	Funding estimates and Olympic medal success 1992–2008	267
19.2	UK Sport talent identification schemes	273
19.3	The elite sports budget of the national treasury 2005–2010 (million won)	274
19.4	Budget for the National Project for the Improvement in High Performance Sport, 2008–2012	277
21.1	Chronology of bidding for Summer Olympic Games, 2008–2016	294
21.2	Key aspects of the successful bids, Summer Olympic Games, 2008–2016	295

Figures

5.1	A plan of the excavations and the built heritage assets within the Olympic Park, and selected trenches mentioned in the text	64
5.2	Excavations under way at Temple Mills (Trench 75)	71
6.1	Weymouth and Portland map	80
8.1	The initial perimeter security surrounding the Olympic park site in 2008	102
8.2	Upgraded perimeter security surrounding the Olympic park site in 2010	103
10.1	Global governance structure of the London 2012 Olympic and Paralympic Games	137
12.1	Regional priorities pre-, during and post-London 2012	168
12.2	An example of links between regions and legacy promises	171
14.1	Recurring common aims of educational legacy	188
15.1	Overview of cultural programmes	206
15.2	Cultural Olympiad and torch relay branding (printed with permission from London 2012)	211

CONTRIBUTORS

Dikaia Chatziefsthathiou is Reader in Olympic Studies and the Social Analysis of Sport at Canterbury Christ Church University, UK. She is a sociologist of sport and an expert in Olympic Studies, focusing on the ideology of Olympism and its values. Chatziefsthathiou is co-author of the book *Discourses of Olympism: From the Sorbonne 1894 to London 2012* (written with Ian Henry and published in 2012 by Palgrave).

Jon Coaffee is Professor of Spatial Planning and Urban Resilience in the Centre for Urban and Regional Studies at the University of Birmingham. His research focuses on the social and economic future of cities and the interplay of physical and socio-political aspects of urban resilience. Coaffee is author of a number of monographs on terrorism and urban risk, most notably *Sustaining and Securing the Olympic City: Reconfiguring London for 2012 and beyond* (Ashgate, 2011) and *Terrorism, Risk and the Global City – Towards urban resilience* (Ashgate, 2009).

Dave Collins is Professor and Director of the Institute of Coaching and Performance at the University of Central Lancashire. He is also Director of Grey Matters Performance Consultancy (www.gm4p.com). He researches in all aspects of performance, including the development of expertise in performers, coaches and support staff, and optimising systems for performance and talent development. As Performance Director for UK Athletics, he led the team for over three years, which covered the period of the Beijing Olympics. Dave has published widely, including an edited text *Performance Psychology: A Practitioner's Guide*, with Angela Button and Hugh Richards (Elsevier, 2011).

Mike Collins is Visiting Professor at the Faculty of Applied Science at the University of Gloucestershire. He specialises in sports development, sport and social capital and sport and religion. He edited *Examining Sport Development* (Routledge, 2010).

Andrew Cruickshank is a researcher at the University of Central Lancashire. He specialises in the field of culture change in elite sport performance teams. Andrew has been researching the critical success factors, mechanisms and challenges of this process as undertaken by Olympic sport performance directors and professional sports team managers. He is co-author of *Multidirectional Management: Exploring the challenges of performance in the World Class Programme environment* (Reflective Practice, 2012).

Gillian Evans is Lecturer in Social Anthropology at the University of Manchester. She specialises in the field of urban anthropology, particularly focusing on social class and the effects of post-industrial change in London. Gillian is author of *London's Olympic Legacy* (Macmillan Palgrave, forthcoming), which is a monograph based on three years' ethnographic research at the Olympic Park Legacy Company.

Pete Fussey is Senior Lecturer in Criminology at the University of Essex. He specialises in the areas of crime, security, counter-terrorism, surveillance and the city. Fussey is co-author of *Sustaining and Securing the Olympic City: Reconfiguring London for 2012 and beyond* (Ashgate, 2011) and co-editor of *Terrorism and the Olympics: Lessons for 2012 and beyond* (Routledge, 2010).

Beatriz Garcia is Head of Research at the Institute of Cultural Capital and director of Impacts 08 – European Capital of Culture Research Programme at the University of Liverpool. She has led research on the Olympic Games since 1999, undertaking data collection at eight Olympic Games editions so far (Barcelona, Sydney, Salt Lake City, Athens, Torino, Beijing, Vancouver and London) and has been involved as academic advisor on culture and education to the London 2012 team since the bid stage. She is the author of *The Olympic Games and Cultural Policy* and *The Olympics. The Basics*, both published by Routledge in 2012.

Vassil Girginov is Reader in Sport Management/Development at Brunel University. Vassil is an Executive Editor of Routledge Online Studies on the Olympic and Paralympic Games (<http://www.routledgeonlinestudies.com/>). His research interests, publications and industry experience are in the field of the Olympic Movement, sport development and comparative management and policy analysis. Vassil's most recent books as editor include *Sport Management Cultures* (Routledge, 2011), *The Olympics: A critical reader* (Routledge, 2010) and *Management of Sports Development* (Elsevier, 2008).

John R. Gold is Professor of Urban Historical Geography in the School of Social Sciences and Law at Oxford Brookes University, and is a member of the University's Institute for Historical and Cultural Research. A frequent radio and television broadcaster, he is the author or editor of 17 books, published and in press, on architectural and cultural subjects. The most recent are *Olympic Cities: City agendas, planning, and the world's games, 1896–2016* (edited with Margaret Gold, Routledge, 2011) and the four-volume set on *The Making of Olympic Cities* for Routledge's Major Works series (2012).

Margaret M. Gold is Senior Lecturer in Arts and Heritage Management at London Metropolitan Business School, London Metropolitan University. Her research interests cover festivals, museum and heritage management, and the relationship between large events and their host cities. Her most recent publication is *The Making of Olympic Cities*, a four-volume collection of readings in Routledge's Major Works series (2012).

John Horne is currently Professor of Sport and Sociology and Director of the International Research Institute for Sport Studies in the School of Sport, Tourism and the Outdoors at the University of Central Lancashire, Preston, UK. His research interests include sports mega-events, social movements and sport, and sport and globalisation. John Horne is the co-author of *Understanding the Olympics* (with G. Whannel, Routledge, 2012) and *Understanding Sport: A socio-cultural analysis* (with A. Tomlinson, G. Whannel and K. Woodward, Routledge, 2012).

Barrie Houlihan is Professor of Sport Policy at Loughborough University and Visiting Professor at the Norwegian School of Sport Sciences. His research is in the field of sport policy. His most recent publications include the *Routledge Handbook of Sport Development* (edited with Mick Green, 2011) and *British Sport Policy* (with Iain Lindsey, Routledge, 2012).

Mark James is Reader in Law at the University of Salford, Manchester, UK. He researches in the field of sport and the law, with particular specialisation on the Olympic Games and spectator regulation at football matches. Mark is the author of *Sports Law* (Palgrave, 2010) and co-editor of the *Entertainment and Sports Law Journal*.

Ian Jones is Associate Dean for Sport at Bournemouth University. He specialises in the areas of research methods and sport fandom. He is co-author of *Qualitative Research in Sport and Physical Activity* (Sage, 2012).

Iain MacRury is Professor and Associate Dean, School of Arts and Digital Industries at the University of East London and Director of the London East Research Institute. He has contributed to a number of Olympic legacy evaluation projects, for organisations including the Department of Communities and Local Government, OECD, the London Assembly and the IOC's LOCOG, as well as the ESRC-funded Olympic Games Impact Study (OGI) for 2012. He is co-editor of *Olympic Cities: 2012 and the remaking of London* (Ashgate, 2009).

Boria Majumdar is Senior Research Fellow at the University of Central Lancashire and Adjunct Professor at Monash University Melbourne. He specialises in the history of South Asian sport and has written extensively about the politics of sport in South Asia and the diaspora. Boria Majumdar is author of *Olympics: The India story* (with Nalin Mehta, second edition, HarperCollins, 2012).

Guy Masterman is Chair of the Academy of Sport and Physical Activity and Head of the Department of Sport at Sheffield Hallam University. He is also an International Professor at the Russian International Olympic University, Moscow/Sochi and the Universidade Nove de Julho (UNINOVE), São Paulo. His research interests are in the areas of sport event planning and legacies, sports marketing communications and in particular sport sponsorship. A third edition of his market-leading *Strategic Sports Event Management* is due for publication in March 2014.

Geoff Nichols is a Senior Lecturer in Sheffield University Management School. His area of expertise is volunteers in sport and he has published widely in peer-reviewed journals. Geoff is also Chair of the Sport Volunteer Research Network, with recent works including how and why Manchester Event Volunteers generated a volunteering legacy from the 2002 Commonwealth Games and a European Year of Volunteering project on developing good practice for sports clubs recruiting volunteers from outside their clubs.

Guy Osborn is Professor of Law at the University of Westminster, London, UK. He researches in the field of law and sport, with a particular specialisation in the Olympic Games and more generally the intersection between law and popular culture. He is co-author of *Film and the Law* (Hart, 2010), joint editor of the Routledge Research Monograph series, *Studies in Law, Society and Popular Culture*, and a founding editor of the *Entertainment and Sports Law Journal*.

Jae-Woo Park is Lecturer on Sport Policy and Sociology at Hanyang University and a member of the Sport for All Subcommittee of the Korea Sports Council. His research interest lies in sport policy and its socio-cultural analysis.

Andrew B. Powell has wide-ranging experience as a field archaeologist, having started his career in 1987 working for the Museum of London. In 1991 he joined Wessex Archaeology, where he is now a Senior Archaeologist specialising in post-excavation analysis and publication. He has had major roles in the excavation and publication of a number of large infrastructure projects, and is currently a principal author for the monograph on the London 2012 Olympic Park excavations.

Nick Rowe joined the Great Britain Sports Council research team in 1983. From 2009 until June 2012 he was Strategic Lead for Research and Evaluation at Sport England where he played a leading role in designing and delivering the Active People Survey. He was the lead author on the Sport England Strategy document 'The Framework for Sport in England'. He has been influential in international research initiating and for 5 years co-directing the COMPASS project and Chairing the Council of Europe Research Expert Group on Young People Sport and Ethics. He is now a freelance researcher in sport and public policy.

Charlie Tims is a freelance researcher and associate of the think tank Demos. He writes about learning, cultural policy and young people. Charlie's latest publications include *An Anatomy of Youth* (with Celia Hannon, 2010) and *The Biggest Learning Opportunity on Earth* (2007).

Mike Weed is Professor of Sport in Society and Director of the Centre for Sport, Physical Education and Activity Research (SPEAR) at Canterbury Christ Church University. He specialises in all aspects of the relationship between sport and tourism, but particularly in the implications of hosting the Olympic and Paralympic Games. He is author of *Olympic Tourism* (Elsevier, 2008) and Editor of the *Journal of Sport and Tourism* (Routledge).

Mayumi Ya-Ya Yamamoto worked for the World Anti-Doping Agency and now works for the Japan Anti-Doping Agency. She is also a visiting researcher at the Centre for Olympic Studies and Research at Loughborough University. Her research interests lie in the development of sport policy, elite sport and anti-doping in particular, and also in international relations and sport. She contributed to the *Routledge Handbook of Sport Development* and has published in the *International Journal of Sport Policy and Politics*.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Writing the *Handbook of the 2012 London Olympic and Paralympic Games* has been a long journey full of uplifting and frustrating experiences. I have no doubts that it was worth the effort as a great deal more has been learned as a result. I would like to record my appreciative thanks to a number of people I came across on this journey, without whom this project would not have been possible.

I am very grateful to Simon Whitmore from Routledge for his belief in this project, patience and great professionalism; to all contributors to this volume for their enthusiasm and insightful accounts and to several LOCOG officials for their helpful comments on earlier drafts of this collection.

Vassil Girginov
25 April 2012
London

Note on cover images

Cover images for both volumes of the *Handbook of the London 2012 Olympic and Paralympic Games* provided by Art at the Edge (sculptures by Tony Evans, represented by Turner Fine Arts, photographed by Jenny Scott). Art at the Edge CIC is a social enterprise raising funds through art projects to support disadvantaged and disabled young people. Their project 'Sculpture And Sport: A Celebration For 2012' involved over 50 artists whose work was exhibited during the run-up to the Games in 2012 in a variety of venues such as corporate offices, museums, libraries, shopping malls, art galleries and public spaces (see www.artattheedge.org).

1

SOCIAL, POLITICAL, ECONOMIC AND OPERATIONAL CONTEXT OF THE 2012 LONDON OLYMPIC AND PARALYMPIC GAMES

An introduction

Vassil Girginov

On 27 July 2012 in front of a multimillion global television audience, as is customary for all Summer Games, the head of the British state Her Majesty the Queen will solemnly pronounce the words, “I declare open the Games of London 2012 celebrating the XXX Olympiad of the modern era” (IOC, 2007, p. 103). The declaration marks the start of the world’s greatest sporting festival, the social, political and economic significance of which goes well beyond that of a mere competition in jumping higher, running faster and pushing stronger. This is because the main purpose of the Olympic and Paralympic Games is to celebrate human excellence irrespective of ethnicity, colour, ability, faith and gender. The Games also celebrates the end of an Olympiad, a four-year period, during which policy makers, sport officials, athletes, volunteers, scientists, educators and journalists around the world have been making efforts to improve the overall conditions that make excellence possible.

The modern Olympic Games was conceived in 1894 by Pierre de Coubertin as a developmental project, which uses sport for the betterment of the world. In particular, the Games was envisaged as a tool to draw the attention of the political class to the importance of young people’s physical and moral development and to promote respect, mutual understanding and peace. The ontological limitations of Coubertin’s philosophical ideal underpinning Olympism have been variously challenged and continue to generate debates today. This has led some commentators to refer to Coubertin as “a second rate thinker, but a first class marketer” (Seagrave, 2011). The growth of the Olympic Games and what it stands for seems to have proved this observation right. Yet, despite political and economic turmoil and controversy, the Olympic Games remains one of the very few cultural phenomena, if not the only one, that has been celebrated globally for over 116 years.

London 2012 differs from the 26 previous editions of the Games in three key aspects. First, it has set a historical precedent in that the host country’s government has made a commitment to use the Olympic Games to affect social change on a mass scale and to deliver a range of legacies not just for London but for the whole of the UK (DCMS, 2007, 2008, 2009). The UK government has made its ambitions very clear: “Our mission for 2012 is to inspire people to get

involved and to change the way they live their lives” (DCMS, 2007, p. 1). In particular, the Games was to be used as a catalyst for the regeneration of long-neglected East London, which is one of the most deprived areas in the UK. A second major departure for London compared to previous Games has been the government’s specific plan to utilise the Paralympic Games to introduce a sea change in public attitudes towards disability. As the first of its kind policy document *London 2012: A Legacy for Disabled People. Setting New Standards, Changing Perceptions* declares, “Our aim is to influence the attitudes and perceptions of people to change the way they think about disabled people” (DCMS, 2009, p. 2). This policy is in sharp contrast with the reality during the 1908 London Games, when the UK government promoted a policy of segregation between able-bodied and disabled people both in general and in sport in particular (Stevens, 1995). A third major feature of London 2012 has been its efforts to rationalise the most intangible aspect of the Olympic idea – its inspirational power. To assist with this aim, a new non-commercial programme and an “Inspire” mark was created to promote grassroots projects across sustainability, education, volunteering, business, sport or culture that have been directly inspired by the Games (www.london2012.com/inspire-programme).

London 2012 is the most ambitious project in the history of the Olympic Games in terms of both its scope and level of change, as, in order to be implemented successfully, it has to address not only people’s attitudes and behaviours but also deeply rooted social structures and relations. According to Seb Coe, Chair of the London Organising Committee of the Olympic Games and Paralympic Games (LOCOG), “the success of the Games will be measured in six Ss: (i) Sport must be vibrant and compelling, to inspire young people; (ii) Streets must be festive and buzzing, with a party atmosphere; (iii) Screens: large screens at Live Sites must be places where people can celebrate together; (iv) Stadia must be full of excited and passionate fans; (v) Service must be helpful with polite, friendly and well-informed volunteers; (vi) Sustainability must produce long-lasting social, economic, environmental and sporting benefits” (LOCOG, 2011, p. 8). Such visions of the Games greatly extend Coubertin’s prophecies in terms of scope, level of detail and impact.

Staging the Games provides a rare opportunity to reflect and report on the extent to which the event’s symbolic and material potential has been used to affect social change in the host city and country. The Games also provides a great learning opportunity as every aspect of its organisation – from venue and operations planning, to security and legacy – has been scrutinised by politicians, media, academics, various social movements, community groups and future organisers. Thus, the Games yields empirical insights and has the power to inform planning considerations and to shape future course of action.

The two-volume collection on the 2012 London Games is the first attempt to unpack a single edition of the Games, from inception to celebration and legacies, using a multiple-perspective approach. The original plan for this collection was to be endorsed by the Organising Committee of the Games as a licensed product, in order to allow a small group of researchers access to key officials and documentation, thus offering a greater breadth and depth of analysis. However, for a number of reasons this plan did not materialise and had to be reconsidered some three months before the publication of the first volume.

Naturally, the scale of the London Games, including a workforce of around 6,000 paid staff, up to 70,000 volunteers, around 100,000 paid contractors, 15,000 athletes and officials, 21,000 media personnel, 37 competition venues, 500,000 spectators per day, a public budget of £9.3 billion and an operational budget of £2 billion, represents a huge undertaking not only for LOCOG but for the whole country as well. Table 1.1 shows the main agencies involved in the making of the London 2012 Games and their responsibilities, while table 1.2 shows the public funding provided. Public sources of funding include Central Government – £6,248 billion (67 per cent), London – £875 million (10 per cent) and National Lottery – £2,175 billion (23 per cent).

The Olympic Games inevitably aspires to deliver social change on a mass scale, cutting across the interests of numerous stakeholders. Similar to any developmental project, London 2012 poses critical questions concerning what has been done in the name of the Games, for whom, at what cost and to what effect? These are complex and difficult issues that require equally complex investigations. Much of the complexity involved in staging the Games and delivering its promise stems from historically established structures and relations that shape current actions. Other issues arise from constantly changing economic and political environments. The speed of change has been such that some chapters in this volume had to be updated several times in the first couple of weeks after being written. It is the purpose of this introductory chapter, therefore, to offer an overview of the changing social, political and economic context of the 2012 Games,

Table 1.1 Main agencies and responsibilities in 2012 London Olympic and Paralympic Games

<i>Agency</i>	<i>Responsibilities</i>
Government Olympic Executive The GOE is a section within the Department for Culture, Media and Sport (DCMS).	Oversees the London 2012 project on behalf of the government, ensuring that it is delivered on time, within budget, represents value for public money and benefits the whole of the UK.
The Olympic Board An interim public / voluntary / private body, co-chaired by the Secretary of State for Culture, the Olympics, Media and Sport and the Mayor of London. Other members are the BOA Chairman and the Chair of LOCOG.	Coordinating the successful delivery of the Games and its legacy.
The London Organising Committee of the Olympic Games and Paralympic Games LOCOG is a private company.	Staging the London 2012 Games; reports to the International Olympic Committee (IOC) and the International Paralympic Committee (IPC).
Olympic Delivery Authority The ODA is a non-departmental public body.	Building the permanent venues and infrastructure needed for the Games.
The Mayor of London Elected public official / public body.	Leads on delivering the legacy of the London 2012 Games for London and ensuring that people across the capital benefit from London's role as the host city.
Olympic Park Legacy Company The OPLC is a not-for-profit company.	Long-term planning, development, management and maintenance of the Olympic Park and its facilities after the Games.
London Development Agency The LDA is a non-departmental public body.	Delivering and maximising the long-term sustainable benefits of the London 2012 Games for London's communities and economy.
British Olympic Association A voluntary organisation (The National Olympic Committee for Great Britain and Northern Ireland).	Selection, preparation and management of Team GB at every Games, including the London 2012 Olympics.
British Paralympic Association A registered charity (the National Paralympic Committee for Great Britain and Northern Ireland).	Selection, preparation and management of the British Paralympic team at each Paralympic Games and raising the money to meet the costs that this entails.

Source: (DCMS, 2011, p. 2).

as well as of its operational context, in order to set the scene for the rest of the chapters to follow in this and in the second volume. Moreover, after 1908 and 1948, this is the third time London will have hosted this event, which allows for some useful parallels.

London won the right to host the Games of the XXX Olympiad on 5 July 2005, just a couple of months after the general election which saw the Labour Party winning a historic third term in office. However, the election was won with a small majority of 66 seats, which was down from 160 seats in the previous parliament, and a popular vote of 35.2 per cent, the lowest of any majority government in British history. A critical issue for this election result, by the then Prime Minister's own admission, was the British invasion of Iraq in 2003, which had divided the country. As chapters 2 and 10 in this volume demonstrate, the three previous unsuccessful British Olympic bids, by Birmingham (1992) and Manchester (1996, 2000), never enjoyed wholehearted political support from the government, which made a hard and forthcoming political commitment to the 2012 bid. The two main concerns for the government backing of an Olympic bid were the public cost of the Games and guarantees for success. Eventually the UK government support and the personal involvement of the then prime minister Tony Blair proved critical for the success of the bid, but political reservations about this project have always existed.

The progress of the London 2012 project has taken place against a rapidly deteriorating economic climate. In 2005, when the bid was won, the UK budget deficit stood at £17,405 billion, or 36 per cent of the country's gross domestic product (GDP), which quickly rose to £20,469 billion at the start of the collapse of the housing market and the banking crisis in 2008. The Labour Party lost the 2010 general election and a Conservative–Liberal Democrat coalition government came into power. The new government inherited a massive net debt of £966.8 billion, or 62.6 per cent of GDP (*Guardian*, 2010). In December 2011 the unemployment rate had reached 8.3 per cent – the highest level since 1994 (ONS, 2011). Most worrying has been the fact that, of those people out of work, a record high of 1.027 million were young people aged 16–24, or the very people whose lives the London Olympics was set to transform. Interestingly, there are striking similarities in the government's ambitions and the economic conditions surrounding the 1908 and 2012 London Games.

In 1908–1909 Britain pioneered the launch of the modern welfare state by instituting workers' compensation, old-age pensions, health insurance and the world's first compulsory

Table 1.2 2012 London Olympic and Paralympic Games public sector funding package

<i>Item</i>	<i>£ million</i>
ODA	7,321
LOCOG Park Operations	67
Policing and wider security	475
Venue security	282
Paralympic Games	95
Funding available to LOCOG	63
City operations	22.5
Other operational provisions	63.5
Look of London	32
Elite and community sport	290
Contingency	587
Total	9,298

Source: (DCMS, 2011, p. 30).

system of unemployment insurance (Orloff and Skocpol, 1984). Yet in 1908 the UK was in recession, and although the Games was a modest operation with 23 participating nations, 2,035 athletes and a budget of £136,000, the event enjoyed virtually no public funding (Girginov and Hills, 2008). Similar to 2012, the unemployment among trades unionists reached 9.5 per cent in October 1908, with an annual level of 8.6 per cent, the highest on record for 23 years (Stewart, 1995). Both the 1908 Liberal and the 2012 coalition governments faced tough choices. In the injudicious words of the 1908 Chancellor of the Exchequer, David Lloyd George, “I have got to rob somebody’s hen roost next year. I am on the look-out which will be the easiest to get and where I shall be least punished, and where I shall get the most eggs...” (cited in Offer, 1983, p. 120).

A central measure in the proposed solution to the recession in 1908 was an unprecedented increase of taxation, most of which was designed to fall upon the wealthy. In contrast, the 2012 “austerity budget” of Chancellor George Osborne envisages a much greater socialisation of the economic burden, but is similar to 1908 massive cuts in education, art and science. A total of £4.7 billion in 2009–10 alone was cut from the budgets of English local authorities, which are major sport and culture services providers; and although deprived areas received larger central grant sums, they – and those in Inner London in particular – were worst hit. As a TASC (2011, p. 4) report concluded, “overall, those on the lowest income were hardest hit by the measured budgetary changes”. East London was at the heart of the notion of social change both in 1908 and 2012. It is worth mentioning that the Fifth Congress of the Russian Social Democratic Labour Party in 1907, attended by Lenin and Stalin, was held in Hoxton church in Hackney (Offer, 1983), one of the five host Olympic boroughs and still one of the most deprived areas of the UK.

Using the London 2012 Games to deliver government promises for social change presents significant political challenges and stretches the core message of Olympism beyond its original intention. Pierre de Coubertin (1936, p. 34) envisaged Olympism as a social reform or a foundation “*which will have no value or force unless it is firmly based on the principles of a completely new type of education*” (emphasis in original). Coubertin, therefore, sought to use sport to promote new values to drive social transformation by stressing the intrinsic benefits of sport or the joy found in physical exertion (i.e. “sport for sport’s sake”), while current government policies have been very much about stressing sport’s external benefits to society (i.e. “sport for good”, DCMS, 2002, 2007, 2008).

Charging sport with a range of political, social and economic functions, and using it as a tool to address long-standing political issues, has not been unproblematic. This is partly because England is the second most unequal of the 23 world’s richest societies, where inequality directly correlates with lower levels of sport provision and participation (Collins, 2010). The UNICEF Report Card, which provides a comprehensive assessment of the living standard and well-being of children and young people in 21 nations of the industrialised world, puts the UK at the bottom of the list. According to UNICEF, “*The true measure of a nation’s standing is how well it attends to its children – their health and safety, their material security, their education and socialization, and their sense of being loved, valued, and included in the families and societies into which they are born*” (UNICEF, 2007, p. 1). Social exclusion of young people has been a major concern of a number of successive governments. In quantitative terms, 17 per cent of UK children were living in absolute poverty in 2009–10, but as an Institute for Fiscal Studies report predicts, by 2012–13 this will rise to 21.8 per cent (Jin, Joyce, Phillips and Sibieta, 2011).

Social inequalities have been particularly acute in East London. The five host boroughs (i.e. Greenwich, Hackney, Newham, Tower Hamlets and Waltham Forest) are home to 1.25 million people, approximately a sixth of London’s total population. East London is also hugely culturally

diverse with 42 per cent of the population being non-white. Young people in the five boroughs have suffered particularly from issues such as unemployment (35 per cent), violent crime, overcrowded conditions (between 18 per cent and 38 per cent of households), low educational attainment and obesity (one in four children, HBSU, 2009). The five boroughs' Strategic Regeneration Framework envisages the Games as an opportunity to reverse those negative trends so that within 20 years the communities hosting the 2012 Games will have the same social and economic chances as their neighbours across London (HBSU, 2009).

Economic and social inequalities adversely affect sport participation and engagement with the Games in general. The worsening economic conditions hit sport as well, with community and school sport bearing the brunt of spending cuts. In justifying the 30 per cent and 27 per cent cut to Sport England (the agency charged with promoting grassroots participation) and UK Sport (the agency in charge of elite sport development) budgets respectively, the sports Minister Hugh Robertson eloquently put it: "Let's be clear, the country's deficit is so large the daily interest payments are the same as Sport England's annual budget. This hasn't been an easy process but it's the best possible result for sport under the circumstances" (Slater, 2010). However, the Olympic budget was protected and no cuts were made to the public funding package of £9,234 billion agreed in 2007. On the contrary, public support has increased by an extra £282 million to meet the rising security cost and some £41million for the opening and closing ceremonies (DCMS, 2011).

Similar to other countries, there has been a tension between elite and mass sport in the UK (DCMS, 2002, Collins, 2008, Houlihan and Green, 2008). This tension is indicative of the Olympic aspiration, which seeks to use sporting excellence to promote mass participation. However, in the UK support for community sport is often contingent on the success of elite athletes. As experience from the Sydney 2000 and Athens 2004 Games demonstrates, sports that failed to deliver their target quota of medals had their public funding cut by millions of pounds (Green, 2007). Moreover, at the beginning of the Olympic year, the performance management system underpinning the work of national governing bodies (NGBs) has been further reinforced by putting in place a tougher regime of "payment by results" with regard to delivering mass participation targets (DCMS, 2012). England also invests less in sport per capita – just £36 in 2002, compared to the "peer-group" average for the seven advanced economies of £59, with Finland and France providing £84 and £110 per capita (Collins, 2010, p. 302).

For most of the twentieth century Britain has not been a major contender on the Olympic stage, and the home victories achieved during the 1908 and 1948 Games were marred with controversies over judging and other irregularities (Matthews, 1980, Baker, 1994). However, over the past 20 years the UK has established a comprehensive elite sport system modelled on the best practices from Eastern Europe and Australia, which also actively identifies and employs some of the world's best administrators and coaches. As a result, Team GB (a brand name of the British Olympic team) has significantly improved its Olympic performances and moved from tenth position in the overall medal table in Sydney and Athens to fourth place, with 47 medals, in Beijing 2008. Team GB's achievements at the Winter Olympic Games have been much more modest with only one medal from both Vancouver 2010 (nineteenth place) and Turin 2006 (twenty-first place), but there is an expectation that the success in Beijing ought to be repeated in London, not least because of the home advantage.

Whether the country would be able to capitalise on the inspirational effect of the Games is hard to predict given the huge disparities in community sport participation. Across the five host boroughs participation rates vary between 8.38 per cent and 14.13 per cent, which are amongst the lowest for the country. Of most concern is the fact that, despite promotional efforts and the inspirational effect since the awarding of the Games in 2005, there has been a decline or no

change in sport participation among young people, in East London in particular (DCMS, 2012; Sport England, 2011).

The London 2012 Olympic Games is also very different from the two previous editions of the Games hosted by the city in 1908 and 1948. The White City site of the 1908 Games has long been transformed, and today perhaps its only link (sporting or otherwise) with the location of the 2012 Games, Stratford in East London, is that each is home to a branch of the modern shopping centre, Westfield. What seems to unite the 1948 and the 2012 Games is an expressed concern, albeit for very different reasons, with staging a sporting extravaganza amid times of austerity as well as a hope in the transformational potential of the Games. The post-Second World War Olympic Games in 1948 did not only go down in history as “the austerity Games”, but it also helped ensure the continuity of Olympic ideals and the triumph of hope over devastation. In 2012 athletes will not have to bring their own food and sleep in barracks, as did their predecessors in 1948. They will be welcomed to a purpose-built Olympic Village, with restaurants serving free food 24 hours a day.

There have been remarkable similarities in the ways that the UK governments of 1948 and 2012 have characterised the Games as a beacon of hope and a counterpoint to the prevailing public concerns with the social and economic hardships of the day. The London 1948 Games were considered a catalyst for “as soon as possible resumption of temporarily shelved traditional sporting events as a matter of major importance” (cited in Baker, 1994, p. 58). Similarly, in his 2012 New Year’s speech, Prime Minister David Cameron has pledged to use the global drama of the Games to help get Britain back on track: “The coming months will bring the global drama of the Olympics and the glory of the diamond jubilee. Cameras and TV channels around the planet will be recording these magnificent events. It gives us an extraordinary incentive to look outward, look onwards and to look our best: to feel pride in who we are and what – even in these testing times – we can achieve” (*Guardian*, 2012).

The relationship between the general public and the Olympic Games has also changed considerably. In 1948 the population of Britain was 47 million, of which less than a million (2 per cent) were from other countries. In 2012 the British population has reached 60 million, of which 4.02 million (6.6 per cent) are from other countries (Eurostat, 2010). The rising number of immigrants has pushed the issue of multiculturalism high up the social and political agenda. The London bid document and subsequent strategies have been very explicit about the inclusive character of the Games, and the need to celebrate the multicultural character of a city that is home to 200 ethnic communities speaking over 300 different languages. One of the implications of multiculturalism is that it makes it difficult to communicate such universalising messages to diverse communities with equal success.

Another particularly relevant issue concerns the consumption of the Games by the general public. As only a few people will get the opportunity to spectate the Games in person, the majority will have to settle for mediated experiences: watching the event on television or the Internet and reading about it in the press. In 1948, a quarter of all British homes had no mains electricity, let alone computers or mobile phones. Television only became commercial in the UK in 1955. In 2012 virtually every household has a television set and 77 per cent had Internet access; there were 17.6 million mobile phone Internet users in 2011, representing 45 per cent of total Internet users (ONS, 2011). Advances in technology have changed the way people experience and consume the Games, presenting both an opportunity and a challenge to its mission to inspire people to be more physically active. There were real concerns about the degree of public interest in the 1948 Games, and eventually a last-minute marketing push by the organisers helped to sell most of the tickets and generate much needed revenue. Ticket sales reflected a non-business approach where, as mandated by the IOC, 50 per cent were to be

distributed overseas and 50 per cent domestically. Interestingly, nearly 17 per cent of the domestic tickets were to be distributed by British NGBs of sport and only 33 per cent were available for applications by the general public (Baker, 1994). In contrast, LOCOG operates a computer-assisted ticketing software system, and some 15 months ahead of the Games, during a six-week window between 15 March and 26 April 2011, received applications from almost 2 million people for more than 22 million tickets. A further 116,000 people applied for 1.14 million Paralympic Games tickets between 9 September and 26 September 2011.

LOCOG needs to sell more than 10 million tickets to the Olympic and Paralympic Games, including 8 million to the British public. Of all the applications 95 per cent were from the UK, but the IOC rules stipulate that 12 per cent of the tickets should be allocated overseas. Some of the sports on the Olympic and Paralympic programme, such as handball, wrestling, volleyball and boccia, do not have any real tradition or media presence in the UK, which has created organisational and promotional challenges in finding qualified personnel to staff competitions and in selling those sports to the general public.

London 2012 has changed the relationship between the IOC and the cities and governments wishing to host the Olympic Games. It marks the first time the Olympic Games's explicit concern with social values has been backed by a concerted commitment by the host government to deliver a wider social agenda. The 2009 Olympic Congress expressed concerns over the commercialisation and spectacularisation of the Olympic Games and the need to uphold Olympic ideals (IOC, 2009). London has added its fair share to the commercialisation process by releasing over 500 different product lines in several categories, including memorabilia, home-ware, jewellery and clothing (LOCOG, 2011). Thus, ensuring that the power of the Games is utilised not only for commercial gain but to affect positive personal and social transformations has been a major achievement for the Olympic Movement. The current collection of two volumes discusses to what extent those visions for social change have been implemented by interrogating what has been done in the Olympic name, for whom, at what cost and to what effect.

The operational context of the Games is equally important, not only for understanding the scale and complexity of this project but for shaping the relations between host countries' public authorities and Olympic organisers. From an operational point of view, the delivery of the Games presents massive challenges, mainly for the following three reasons.

First, once awarded the Games, the city of London has entered into a tripartite legally binding contract with the IOC, the UK government and the British Olympic Association (BOA). This contract creates LOCOG, which is a private company limited by guarantee and responsible for delivering all Games-time operations, including planning, funding, preparation and staging. LOCOG has no shareholders; it is underwritten by the government, and is accountable to its stakeholders, the Secretary of State for Culture, Olympics, Media, and Sport (DCMS), the Mayor of London and the BOA, under the terms of the host-city contract. LOCOG also enjoys a special financial status, as it is exempted from Corporation Tax (currently at 20 per cent) by virtue of section 65 (2) of the Finance Act 2006. It is, however, registered for and charges VAT on ticket and merchandise sales. In addition, LOCOG's operations have been subjected to an unprecedented level of public, civil activist, scholarly and media scrutiny, including regular parliamentary control, dedicated web platforms such as "more than the games" (www.morethanthegames.co.uk) and research and media reports. The heightened level of scrutiny coupled with the non-negotiable deadlines of the event (LOCOG has only one chance to get it right) requires very sophisticated and efficient planning and operational strategies and inevitably increases the risk of mistakes. As an organisation, LOCOG has a fixed lifespan from 2005 until early 2013 and has had to be created from scratch. The IOC knowledge transfer programme,

designed to rescue OCOGs from having to reinvent the wheel every two years, supplied LOCOG with over 30 technical manuals on various aspects of the Games, as the newly created LOCOG had inherited limited know-how from 2008 Beijing and 2004 Athens organisers. However, general procedures described in technical manuals need to be adapted in the host country and LOCOG had to stay alert to discovering the best way of doing Olympic business in the UK. In addition, new people have replaced many members of the bid team to form the core of LOCOG, inevitably creating gaps in institutional memory and skill sets.

Second, LOCOG is an atypical organisation, not only because it exists for a limited period of about seven years but also because it gradually evolves in size and functions. Most business and not-for-profit organisations naturally strive for homeostasis or a state of stability, and this is central to their survival. LOCOG somehow defies this logic, growing in size at a rate of approximately 100 people per month in 2010 alone. In March 2011, some 15 months before the start of the Games, the organisation had 1,162 full-time staff compared to 510 in March 2010; but this number is set to increase to nearly 6,000 people during the Games, plus some 70,000 volunteers (LOCOG, 2011). LOCOG's life-cycle is set clearly and includes three distinct phases: planning, implementation and winding up. Its organisational structure and functions also change accordingly, and move from departmental to venue-based, functional orientations. These constant internal transformations, coupled with a very short period for staff induction and learning, create a challenging and dynamic operational environment, which places huge demands on performance, targets, efficiency, knowledge transfer, human resources and financial and risk management.

Third, to deliver the Games successfully, LOCOG has to rely on the partnership of a number of public, private and voluntary organisations, as well as more than 200 national Olympic committees (NOCs), 170 national Paralympic committees, 26 international sport federations and 20 international paralympic sport federations participating in London 2012, and to manage those relations effectively. Overall, the Organising Committee deals with some 150 different agencies within the UK. To that end, LOCOG has established a revenue target of around £2 billion to cover the operational cost of the Games. The operational budget is made up from contributions from the IOC, including \$376 million from its worldwide sponsorship programme and a further \$675 million from broadcasting rights. This contribution, however, comes with a number of requirements concerning the contractual and ethical commitments of global Olympic sponsors and broadcasters as well as IOC's own requirements to Games organisers. Furthermore, LOCOG needs to manage a procurement programme worth £1 billion, involving some 75,000 Games contracts across eight different sectors. In addition to that, the organisation has developed 44 domestic commercial partnerships, which have helped raise £700 million in sponsorship. The other two main sources of revenue include £500 million in ticket sales and £86 million in merchandise. In addition to working closely with the city of London and the Metropolitan Police, LOCOG depends heavily on the collaboration of a number of state departments, including, among others: the Department of Transport; the Department of Culture, Media and Sport; the Home Office; the Department of Health; and the NHS. Without the Organising Committee of the Olympic Games, it would be hard to think of any organisation – commercial or otherwise – which, without a track record in any field, appears on the public and business scene and is entrusted with managing massive public and private investments and the aspirations of millions of people.

Structure of the book

Since the two previous Games in 1908 and 1948, which were awarded to London without a bid, staging an Olympics has become a much more complex, competitive and expensive process in the last 40 years. In the case of London 2012 the process evolved over some 30 years and it

was important for this collection to capture the key stages, actors and strategies involved in the making of the Games. The first volume of the *Handbook of the London 2012 Olympic and Paralympic Games – Making the Games* – is organised in six interrelated parts.

Part one engages with the bidding process and contains two contributions. First, John Horne interrogates the continuity and change in London Olympic narratives. London is the only city in the world that has hosted three Games (in 1908, 1948 and 2012), and Horne's account presents an understanding about how the city's interpretation of the Olympics has changed over time and why. Second, Guy Masterman offers an examination of the political, strategic and tactical issues and decisions involved in putting together and winning the London bid by drawing on first-hand accounts of the key figures involved.

Part two deals with the delivery of the Games as a complex process involving political negotiations, massive logistics and governance issues. In chapter 4, Gillian Evans provides a fascinating account of the deliberations and struggles that have led to choosing East London as a main site for the Games. She shows the importance of vision and introduces the dedicated people who have made the Olympic project for East London a reality, despite the odds. Chapter 5, by Andrew Powell, traces the physical and social transformations of the Olympic site over the centuries. It documents the role of archaeology in establishing the history of this part of East London. It is also a little-known fact that LOCOG and the ODA (Olympic Delivery Authority) have a contractual obligation to finance the excavation works and to document and publish the results of this work before construction of Olympic venues can start. In chapter 6, Mark James and Guy Osborn submit to scrutiny the dedicated Olympic legislation that has been passed by the British Parliament in 2006. The Olympic law of the host country is crucial for the success of the Games as it guarantees the lawful commercial exploitation of Olympic insignia, which is largely responsible for generating the operational revenue of the Games. However, as the authors demonstrate, the assumptions and application of law can also create tensions and controversies. Chapter 7 engages with the central pillar of the London Games – its proposed legacies. Mike Weed analyses the ambitions, promises and implementation plans that together represent the legacy strategies of two successive UK governments. He considers the extent to which the development of legacy strategy has been concerned with demonstrating what legacies have been achieved rather than with actually delivering them, and asks whether the British public will ever know whether the £9.3 billion Games budget has been a successful legacy investment. Chapter 8, by Jon Coaffee and Pete Fussey, engages with security, which has been an emerging issue concerning mega-events. The authors not only comment on the security planning for the Games but widen their analysis by considering issues of policing, surveillance, democratisation and governance. They propose that the emerging blueprint for would-be host cities of mega sporting events incorporates a strong element of both urban rejuvenation and securitisation, which are increasingly being combined into security designs and master plans. In chapter 9, Dave Collins and Andrew Cruickshank discuss the policy, strategic and tactical issues involved in preparing the host country Olympic team for the Games. The authors specifically consider the managerial challenge of setting, enhancing and maintaining the performance culture needed to ensure that the success achieved by Team GB at the 2008 Beijing Games is repeated in London. In chapter 10, Vassil Girginov examines the governance of the London Games as a central issue of modern politics surrounding mega-events. In particular, the author discusses the nature of the exchange between the British state and society in making the Games, the governance arrangements that have been put in place to ensure consensus amongst the stakeholders and the massive work to steer collective efforts towards the agreed goals, as well as the governance dilemmas faced by the UK government and LOCOG.

Part three focuses on the engagement of the UK public with the Games and demonstrates the scope of the efforts exerted and related issues in involving a range of diverse sectors, such as local communities, schools and universities, regional authorities, volunteers and sport governing bodies. Chapter 11, by Iain MacRury, charts community engagement in East London and explores how and where the debate agenda about what the Games can do for those communities has developed, as well as its long-term implications for them. Ian Jones, in chapter 12, looks at the involvement of different English regions with the Olympic and Paralympic Games by exploring the various strategies employed to capitalise on the opportunities presented by the Games and some of the specific issues that are being addressed in different regions. In chapter 13, Charlie Tims scrutinises the key features of the educational programme of the London Games, designed to reach out to every school and pupil. He considers whether the model of transaction at the heart of the programme – free tickets in exchange for Olympic engagement – could have reduced the value of the Games to schools. Chapter 14, by Dikaia Chatziefstathiou, takes a closer look at London 2012 visions and practices in relation to further and higher education as they have been developed in the run-up to the Games. In chapter 15, Beatriz Garcia considers a range of managerial, funding and promotional innovations in the context of the Cultural Olympiad that have created opportunities to maximise access to and engagement with Games-related activity throughout the country. She also draws attention to some important challenges in terms of synergy of vision, communications and Games association, as well as the opportunities that point at the ongoing struggle to position the Cultural Olympiad as a core dimension of the Olympic and Paralympic experience. Geoff Nichols, in chapter 16, examines the strategy for volunteers at the Games by analysing the key programmes that have been implemented by LOCOG and the implications for managing volunteers.

Part four specifically addresses the engagement of UK sports with London 2012. This is a very important yet under-investigated issue, which can yield valuable insights into the role of national governing bodies of sport (NGBs) in delivering Olympic visions. The Olympic Games presents unique opportunities for sport organisations in the host country to raise public awareness, showcase their work and build organisational capacities. In chapter 17, Vassil Girginov and Nick Rowe discuss the perceptions and involvement of a wide range of Olympic and non-Olympic UK NGBs with the London Games. The authors demonstrate that different NGBs have variously engaged with the Games. NGBs' involvement has been tactical rather than strategic, and has yielded limited organisational learning and capacity-building gains. Mike Collins, in chapter 18, looks at the role of local authorities, LOCOG and the Mayor of London programmes designed to ensure greater involvement with the Games and to deliver sport participation legacies. Collins raises a number of important points about the political vulnerability of sport participation legacies and challenges many assumptions about the positive correlation between the Games and participation in sport.

Part five makes an attempt to examine the world's engagement with the London Games. The Olympic Games presents a great opportunity, not only for promotion of the host country but for more than 200 participating nations around the world to assert their identities, to show their sporting and cultural prowess and perhaps, more importantly, to sustain their national sport systems. In chapter 19, Barrie Houlihan, Jae Woo Park and Mayumi Ya-Ya Yamamoto analyse the national elite sport policies of the UK, South Korea and Japan, and those countries' preparation for London. The authors provide a fascinating comparison of the elite sport policies in the three countries and outline a number of common trends, including an acceleration in the public funding of elite sport, a greater level of specialisation achieved by focusing on a limited number of sports with the potential to deliver medals and success, and the ever-rising cost of an Olympic

medal. Chapter 20, by Boria Majumdar, scrutinises the relationship between Indian Olympic strategy, national prestige and London 2012. Majumdar argues that building upon the foundation created at the 2010 Commonwealth Games in Delhi and the Asian Games at Guangzhou, London 2012 is an opportunity for India's athletes to occupy centre-stage after years of administrative apathy and neglect. A success in London will give an unprecedented fillip to Indian Olympic sport. Conversely, a failure will result in more years of neglect and unfulfilled plans. In chapter 21, John Gold and Margaret Gold examine how hosting the Olympic Games has come to be widely regarded as the most significant prize on offer in the never-ending contest between the world's leading cities for prestige and investment. They interrogate three successive Olympic host cities – Beijing 2008, London 2012 and Rio de Janeiro 2016 – and reflect on the ever-changing nature of the competitive process and highlight the way that the local agendas have developed and been traded off against the stated preferences and implicit predilections of the Olympic Movement.

Part six provides the conclusions for volume one – *Making the London 2012 Games*. In chapter 22, Vassil Girginov summarises the main lessons from the previous five parts and outlines the overall context, political and organisational approaches and current and prospective legacies of the 2012 London Olympic and Paralympic Games. It is argued that London 2012 has made an unprecedented promise – to put to a comprehensive test the aspirations of Olympism in Britain through an equally unprecedented public contract. There has been conflicting evidence as to what portion of the Olympic aspiration has been achieved, but documenting the making of the Games has helped to reveal the complex tapestry of personal and organisational interests and political and economic arrangements involved in the Olympic and Paralympic Games.

References

- Baker, N. (1994). Olympics or Tests: The Disposition of the British Sporting Public, 1948. *Sporting Traditions*, 11 (1), pp. 57–74.
- HBSU. (2009). *Olympic and Paralympic Legacy: Strategic Regeneration Framework*. London: HBSU.
- Collins, M. (ed.). (2010). *Examining Sports Development*. London: Routledge.
- Collins, M. (2008). Public Policies on Sports Development: Can Mass and Elite Sport Hold Together? In V. Girginov (ed.). *Management of Sports Development*. Oxford: Elsevier, pp. 59–89.
- de Coubertin, P. (1936). The Unfinished Symphony. *Olympic Review*, 99–100 (January–February 1976), pp. 32–34.
- DCMS (Department of Culture, Media & Sport). (2012). *Creating a Sporting Habit for Life. A New Youth Sport Strategy*. London: DCMS.
- DCMS. (2011). *Government Olympic Executive London 2012 Olympic and Paralympic Games Annual Report, February 2011*. London: DCMS.
- DCMS. (2010). *London 2012 Olympic and Paralympic Games Annual Report, February 2010*. London: DCMS.
- DCMS. (2009). *London 2012: A Legacy for Disabled People: Setting New Standards, Changing Perceptions*. London: DCMS.
- DCMS. (2008). *Before, During and After: Making the Most of the London 2012 Games*. London: DCMS.
- DCMS. (2007). *Our Promise for 2012: How the UK will Benefit from the Olympic and Paralympic Games*. London: DCMS.
- DCMS. (2002). *Game Plan*. London: DCMS.
- Eurostat. (2010). *Eurostat News Release 129/2010*, 7 September 2010. Brussels: Eurostat.
- Girginov, V. and Hills, L. (2009). The Political Process of Constructing Sustainable London Olympics Sports Development Legacy. *International Journal of Sport Policy*, 1 (2), pp. 161–181.
- Girginov, V. and Hills, L. (2008). A Sustainable Sports Legacy: Creating a Link between the London Olympics and Sports Participation. *The International Journal of the History of Sport*, 25 (14), pp. 2091–2117.
- Green, M. (2007). Olympic Glory or Grassroots Development?: Sport Policy Priorities in Australia, Canada and the United Kingdom, 1960–2006. *International Journal of the History of Sport*, 24 (7), 921–953.

- Guardian*. (2012). David Cameron's New Year Message. Retrieved from www.guardian.co.uk/politics/2012/jan/02/david-cameron-new-year-message1, 20 January 2012.
- Guardian*. (2010). Deficit, National Debt and Government Borrowing – How has it Changed since 1946? Retrieved from www.guardian.co.uk/news/datablog/2010/oct/18/deficit-debt-government-borrowing-data, 20 January 2012.
- HBSU. (2009). *Olympic and Paralympic Legacy: Strategic Regeneration Framework*. London: HBSU.
- Horne, J. and Whannel, G. (2011). *Understanding the Olympics*. London: Routledge.
- Houlihan, B. and Green, M. (eds). 2008. *Comparative Elite Sport Development: Systems, Structures and Public Policy*. Oxford: Butterworth-Heinemann.
- IOC. (2009). *Twelfth Olympic Congress: The Olympic Movement in Society*. Lausanne: IOC.
- IOC. (2007). *Olympic Charter*. Lausanne: IOC.
- Jin, W., Joyce, R., Phillips, D. and Sibieta, L. (2011). *Poverty and Inequality in the UK: 2011*. London: IFS.
- LOCOG. (2011). *One Year to Go. Annual Report 2010–2011*. London: LOCOG.
- Matthews, G. (1980). The Controversial Olympic Games of 1908 as viewed by the *New York Times* and *The Times of London*. *Journal of Sport History*, 7 (2), pp. 40–53.
- Offer, A. (1983). Empire and Social Reform: British Overseas Investment and Domestic Politics, 1908–1914. *The Historical Journal*, 26 (March), pp. 119–138.
- ONS. (2011). *Internet Access – Households and Individuals*. London: ONS.
- Orloff, A. and Skocpol, T. (1984). Why Not Equal Protection? Explaining the Politics of Public Social Spending in Britain, 1900–1911, and the United States, 1880s–1920. *American Sociological Review*, 49 (6), pp. 726–750.
- Seagrave, J. (2011). Coubertin Aesthetic Ideal. Lecture presented at the Eighteenth International Seminar on Olympic Studies for Postgraduate Students. Olympia, Greece, 14 September 2011.
- Slater, M. (2010). Community and School Sport Bears Brunt of Spending Cuts. *Guardian*, 20 October 2010. Retrieved from http://news.bbc.co.uk/sport1/hi/front_page/9111865.stm, 20 January 2012.
- Sport England. (2011). *Active People Survey Results – 2011*. London: Sport England.
- Stevens, A. (1995). Changing Attitudes to Disabled People in the Scout Association in Britain (1908–62): A Contribution to a History of Disability. *Disability & Society*, 10 (3), pp. 90–95.
- Stewart, J. (1995). Children, Parents and the State: The Children Act. *Children and Society*, 9 (1), pp. 90–99.
- TASC. (2011). *Winners and Losers Budget 2012*. London: TASC.
- Tomlinson, A. (2004). *Olympic Survivals: The Olympic Games as a Global Phenomenon*. In Allison, L. (ed.). *Global Politics of Sport (Sport in the Global Society)*. London: Routledge, pp. 46–62.
- UNICEF. (2007). *Child Poverty in Perspective: An Overview of Child Well-Being in Rich Countries. A Comprehensive Assessment of the Lives and Well-Being of Children and Adolescents in the Economically Advanced Nations*. Florence: UNICEF Innocenti Research Centre Report Card 7.

PART 1

Bidding for the Games

2

FROM 1908 TO 2012

Continuity and change in London Olympic narratives

John Horne

Introduction: London and the Olympic Games¹

On 6 July 2005, on a humid night in Singapore, the IOC was about to announce the result of a two-year battle between candidate cities to stage the Olympic and Paralympic Games. It was 7.46 p.m., and just after midday in London. The envelope was opened, and IOC President Jacques Rogge announced the winner. In the final round of voting, London had beaten Paris by 54 votes to 50. For much of the long race Paris had been a strong favourite, with the book-makers' odds favouring Paris right to the end, but the IOC had voted, and now London was to stage the 2012 Olympic and Paralympic Games. How this came to pass has been subject to much scrutiny since, but one insider, the director of communications for the London 2012 bid, Mike Lee, considered that a defining feature of Sebastian Coe's speech in Singapore was that its narrative was 'more about the Olympic movement than about London' (Lee, 2006, p. 183). By stressing both the importance of 'legacy', a discursively polysemic notion that emerged in IOC circles following the onslaught against its integrity in the 1990s about a set of (largely vague) benefits left behind after the sports mega-event has ended, and the potential role of London as a global media centre to help 'the IOC transmit the call for more young people to take up sport' (Lee, 2006, p. 183), the London bid team were able to win over the required number of delegates with a script in which 'London', 'Englishness/Britishness', 'sport', 'the world' and the future of 'Olympism' could be brought together.

In this chapter I want to consider in broad-brush fashion how these elements – London, Englishness, sport, the world and Olympism – have been constructed in narratives associated with the three London Olympic Games over time. The London Olympic narratives have been constructed over a period of some 100 years by both participant (e.g. government and Olympic officials) and non-participant (e.g. the media and historians) narrators, whose perspectives tell the story through the use of certain consistent features of communication. The focus of this chapter is neither to document the bid process in detail nor account for all the individuals or organisations involved in the building and organising of the Games (both of which are dealt with elsewhere in this collection), but to offer reflections on the framing and promotion of the *dominant narratives*, or stories, about the Games, and in passing to exemplify two themes in Roche (2000). First, he notes the ways in which international expositions and other mega-events reflect the development of capitalism, nationalism and imperialism. Second, he regards

them as important focal points in the emergence of an international dimension in modern public culture. Clearly there is a potential contradiction here, indeed a contradiction manifest in the person of Baron Pierre de Coubertin, whose life project was the establishment of the modern Olympic Games. De Coubertin was a committed internationalist who inscribed internationalism into the founding documents, practices and rituals of the Olympic Games. He was also a patriot who was concerned about the poor physical state and indiscipline of French youth, and worried about the decline of his country and its eclipse by the rising power of Germany. The tension between nationalism and internationalism continues to be a significant feature of the Olympic Games.

Mega-events are rarely simply the realisation of a clear blueprint from a commanding designer; rather they are the outcome of competing intentions, interests, preoccupations and strategies. Hence different contemporary and historical narratives also reflect back on them. Where mega-events are concerned, a study of the relationships between national politicians, local politicians, sports administrators, builders, architects and town planners is often instructive. Another of the most striking features of mega-events – in the UK and I suspect elsewhere – is how rarely they utilise the sites of previous events, almost as if they wanted to avoid taking on the ideological detritus of a former conjuncture. In 1908 the London Olympic Games had close links with and shared a site with the Franco-British Exhibition (or Trade Fair) in Shepherd's Bush, West London. The 1924 British Empire Exhibition shunned the option of the White City site from 1908, and established itself at Wembley Park, North-West London. In 1934 the Empire Games used the stadium and a newly constructed Empire Pool at Wembley, yet used White City for athletics. In 1948 the hastily arranged and financially pressed London Olympic Games did utilise the Wembley site originally constructed for the Empire Exhibition of 1924, but just three years later, in 1951, the Festival of Britain rejected both Wembley and White City and based its major attractions in Battersea Park and on the South Bank in Central London. The Millennium Dome, rejecting all other available options, was built on a derelict industrial site in North Greenwich. In many cases the sites subsequently suffered years of decline, neglect and decay. The White City stadium was demolished in 1985 and there is no easily visible memorial proclaiming its moment of glory as 'The Great Stadium' of the 1908 Olympic Games. The original Wembley Stadium has been demolished but rebuilt and reborn, and the Empire Pool survives, renamed Wembley Arena and recently renovated. The rest of the site has been crumbling for years, and is only now undergoing substantial redevelopment. Very few traces of the Festival of Britain remain. But, after the 2012 Games for which facilities are currently under construction around Stratford in East London, a vast privately owned shopping mall, alongside the Olympic Park, will also become the beneficiary of the massive public investment in infrastructure.

I focus in the next three sections on narratives about the three London Olympic Games of 1908, 1948 and 2012, but have also included mention of the 1924 British Empire Exhibition, the stadium of which was subsequently used for the 1948 Olympic Games.

The Olympic Games of 1908

The story of 1908 has been told extensively in several books, including the official record, overviews and books and articles published during the centenary in 2008 and since (Cook, 1909; Mallon and Buchanan, 2000; Baker, 2008; Jenkins, 2008; Kent, 2008; Llewellyn, 2011; Polley 2011). The basic outline is as follows. The 1908 Games were staged at short notice, in conjunction with a trade fair, and led to the construction of the first purpose-built Olympic stadium (intended to be a temporary structure, it lasted until 1985). The appointment of British officials

and judges led to some contested moments over disqualifications and equipment used, but the British athletes won their greatest ever haul of gold medals and topped the medal 'table' for the first and only time.

The 1904 IOC session in London awarded the Games of 1908 to Rome. In 1906 the host designate withdrew. This was attributed to the impact of the Vesuvius eruption, but in fact the Italian prime minister was opposed to the project and prevented funding, which he wanted to spend on other projects like the Simplon Tunnel (Mallon and Buchanan, 2000). English Lord Desborough put forward London as the alternative and this was accepted. It was clear that no government funding would be available for building a main stadium, but the organisers of the Franco-British Exhibition, scheduled to run from April to October 1908, agreed to build the stadium complete with running and cycling tracks and a swimming pool, in return for 75 per cent of the gate receipts.

The Franco-British Exhibition had its roots in late nineteenth-century diplomacy. The decline of France after Napoleon, the end of the period of Franco-British wars, the French defeat by the Prussians in 1870 and the formation of Germany in 1871, with its growing power and ambition, meant that France had to forge alliances with Britain. The Entente Cordiale was signed in 1904, and the Franco-British Exhibition in 1908 was planned to celebrate it. The exhibition eventually attracted 8 million visitors, and only included the goods and produce of Britain, France and their respective colonies. The British Empire at this point still commanded one-quarter of the world's land, and one-quarter of the world's population. The British navy was twice the size of the next largest (Mallon and Buchanan, 2000). Founded on the imperatives of trade and diplomacy, the Franco-British Exhibition was structured around an imperial ideology of civilisation, brought to savage peoples, for their betterment. Like previous such events, it combined displays of technological mastery with educative, rational recreation and popular amusement.

The stadium was projected to cost £44,000 but some estimates suggest the real figure may have been a lot higher. The British Exhibition organisers also agreed to give £2,000 to the British Olympic Association, but this was later increased to £20,000 (Mallon and Buchanan, 2000, p. 4). It appears that the organisers were prepared to accept a loss on the stadium in return for the benefits of bringing extra visitors to the Exhibition, and of course they retained the use of the stadium after the Games. The BOA made £6,000 and the Franco-British Exhibition £18,000 from gate receipts (Mallon and Buchanan, 2000, p. 5). Although the Exhibition was prompted by diplomacy, its key organising figure was a showman and promoter, Imre Kiralfy (see Horne and Whannel, 2012, pp. 94–96).

The first initiative towards the Exhibition came from the French Chamber of Commerce and the Lord Mayor of London, the objective being for France and England to display their industrial achievements. Kiralfy was commissioned to create it. Initial costs were raised through donations and any profits were intended to go to 'some public purpose' (Knight, 1978, p. 1). The 140-acre site was eight times larger than that for the Great Exhibition of 1851, and '...it contained 20 superb palaces and 120 Exhibition buildings' (Knight, 1978, pp. 1–3). On the opening day there were 123,000 visitors, and the caterers, J. Lyons and Co., planned for feeding 100,000 people per day (Knight, 1978, p. 4).

The site featured elaborate white-walled palaces and waterways, and the central court had a lake and illuminated fountains. Orientalism was a dominant stylistic motif, with rickshaw drivers brought to London from Asia to work on the site. There was a distinct contrast between the elements of rational recreation and hedonism. At one pole was the London County Council exhibit of municipal works, and at the other the showmanship of Kiralfy. The latter is illustrated by the many attractions on the site, which by the time of the Japan Exhibition held two years