Historic evolution and urban planning typology of Olympic Villages

Francesc Muñoz

Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona

ceo UAB

Centre d'Estudis Olímpics
International Chair in Olympism
Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona

To refer to this document you can use the following reference:

Muñoz, Frances (1997): *Historic evolution and urban planning typology of Olympic Villages* [online article]. Barcelona: Centre d'Estudis Olímpics UAB. [Consulted: dd/mm/yy] <http://olympicstudies.uab.es/pdf/wp091_eng.pdf>

Original reference: Muñoz, Francesc (1997): "Historic evolution and urban planning typology of Olympic Villages", in Miquel de Moragas, Montserrat Llinés & Bruce Kidd (eds.): *Olympic Villages: A Hundred Years of Urban Planning and Shared Experiences: International Symposium on Olympic Villages, Lausanna 1996*. Lausanne: International Olympic Committee, pp. 27-51.

 [Date of publication: 1997]

"A miniature city, replete with modern conveniences and facilities, had arisen magically atop the hills, within eyesight of the great Olympic Stadium - atop the modern Mount Olympus, below which lay the modern Plains of Elis.

...A miniature world was here set up by itself, rigidly protected from the world outside."

(Los Angeles Organizing Committee, 1985:235).

Introduction

The range of urban transformations experienced by cities in the developed world throughout the 20th century has largely revolved around the celebration of urban mega-events. Universal Expositions and the Olympic Games are two obvious examples of these processes. With regards to Olympic urbanism in particular, the construction and subsequent re-use of the welcome and accommodation Villages represent a specific case of urban transformation with two options: the renovation of space already occupied and the creation of new urban territory.

Although the planning of Olympic residences should not be removed from overall Olympic intervention, the Villages - as specific urban items - have a specific urban entity offering several elements of comparison between some operations and others. The study of Olympic Villages throughout this century is the study of the history of ideas about how to develop the city, how to plan it and how to manage it. This relates to the planning principles because of the city vision they define, and to the subsequent evolution because of the process of urban integration they represent.

Seen from this angle, it is tempting to generalise. Similar urban actions are repeated in different historic and territorial contexts, and here lies another point of interest: the importance of a specific city, its urban "curriculum", as another characterising determiner of actions. It is this crossing-over of homogeneity/heterogeneity that best inspires the study of Olympic Villages: they can be understood on the one hand as elements of interaction, formally and physically, with certain pre-existing urban elements and, on the other, as specific examples of the tension between different city models.

This presentation draws its inspiration from these concepts to supply, first of all, a reference to the evolution of the "Olympic Village" throughout this century, placing emphasis on the discontinuities characterising the process[1]. Secondly, the analysis of the different levels of urbanistic dimension of Villages, paying special attention to three thematic areas: a) the aspects connected with the evolution of architectural ideas, from the different types of housing used to the various formal languages employed; b) the aspects referring to the evolution of town planning ideas, from the choice of city models to the conceptions of urban growth behind the operations executed. Finally, those aspects connected with the conception of the Villages as "urban items", from the city production processes which are part of their insertion in the post-Olympic urban context.

Origins and Evolution of the "Olympic Village"

The "emergency residential menu" at the first Olympic Games

Perhaps the first reference that should be made when talking about the origin of the "Olympic Village" concept is to Baron Pierre de Coubertin's ideas. The creation of a "modern Olympia" was openly put forward to groups of architects as early as 1910 by the Baron. Defined as an ensemble organised in different locations for Olympic sporting events, the "modern Olympia" was a territorial translation of Coubertin's ideas, inspired by internationalism and aspirations of world peace, both of which were characteristic of European *intelligentsia* thinking throughout the first half of this century (Gresleri, 1994: 165), and also inspired by the belief in sporting

---

[1] Here it is necessary to mention that, even though there are some references to Olympic Winter Games, the paper concentrates on Summer Villages. The Winter Villages are, on their own, a specific case of analysis. Firstly, the Winter Olympic Villages are in smaller cities, in mountainous areas, with urban dynamics which are less active than those of Olympic Summer Games host cities throughout this century. Secondly, by definition, and from a content point of view, the scope of the interventions is not as wide. Thirdly, design and structure criteria are different from those of Olympic Summer Games. An example of the latter is the prevalence of indoor urbanism, with a scarcer range of spaces to be planned. Finally, except for the interventions in Grenoble and the latest ones, Calgary and Lillehammer for example, the majority of Olympic Villages are characterised by the limited budget considerations of urban intervention.

activity and sports education as a means of achieving those absolute objectives.

From this point of view, Coubertin's proposal had a lot in common with other contemporary ones such as the "international city" conceived by the architect Ernest Hébrard as early as 1910[2]. If the latter was defined as the capital of peace and thought, Coubertin's Olympia could be defined as the capital of peace and sport.

In his description of the Olympic city, in addition to his descriptions of competition sites, Coubertin gives consideration to the need for a hotel for the group of people connected with the organisation of the sporting events requiring temporary accommodation. He also envisages, in a pamphlet published in the *Olympic Revue* addressing the people taking part in the International Architecture Competition (Paris, 1910), a space "nearby for a camp and a form of barracks to house the athletes during the Games" (Pierre de Coubertin, 1910).

Of course, during the first decades of the century, incipient Olympism had problems which required more urgent attention, like, for example, the definition of amateurism, the Games' regulations or the number of sports admitted for competition, rather than the idea of a waiting/cofraternisation space for the new "agons", which was not likely to be a topic of discussion at the conferences and meetings that took place during the first Olympic events.

On the other hand, though, it was clear to see that the concentration of delegation officials, athletes and visitors that the Games involved meant that the subject of accommodation had to be considered as question requiring some type of answer, above all bearing in mind the structure of some cities that still preserved a lot of their pre-industrial past.

Furthermore, at a time of when the Olympic Movement was relatively undefined, particularly where the different countries' budgets were concerned, problems like not knowing how many athletes were going to attend from the not insignificant number of delegations, or whether they were going to stay for the whole duration of the Games or not, only made the organising committee's job more complicated. They were obliged to classify their cities' hotels and negotiate special prices and priority for Olympic visitors. At the London Olympics in 1908, the majority of the teams did not stay for the whole fortnight of the Games (Organising Committee for the XIV Olympiad London 1948, 1951:378). The situation was characterised by almost constant complaints against the improvisation, partially offset by the gradual appearance of charts produced by the organisers of specific committees devoted to visitor accommodations[3].

The organisational difficulties, not just those encountered by the organising committee but by various countries too, with regard to sending their delegations meant that the ships used to transport them were used as accommodation for the length of their stay in the Olympic Games' host city. This was a cheaper and more immediate solution than negotiating with the organising city[4]. The Organising Committee, after realising that there was not enough hotel capacity to house the large number of visitors[5], had to implicate itself in the major job of territorial reconnaissance, of "surveying" the very city, in search of new spaces capable of being

---

[2] Hébrard's project included the idea that already abounded in European intellectual circles after the Hague Peace Conference (1899), where the creation of a permanent headquarters where intellectuals could gather to solve "... the conflicts generated with the new distribution of the world into areas of influence" (Gresleri, 1994: 164).

[3] The "Olympic Accommodation Committee" at the Stockholm Olympics in 1912, the "Room Committee" and the "Accommodation Office" at the Antwerp Olympics in 1920, and the "Room Section" within the organisation chart of the Amsterdam Olympics in 1928 are but a few examples.

[4] The problem of travelling expenses, maintenance, and accommodation for delegations and competitors will be one of the main topics of debate on the organisational aspects with regard to getting a more and more people to take part in the Olympics. One of the first solutions to be implemented was preferential treatment with the state transport companies of the organising country, as happened in Stockholm in 1912 and Antwerp in 1920. In both cases, the organising committees managed to secure a 50% discount on rail travel for officials and athletes, and free transport for sports equipment and the horses used in the equestrian events (Bergvall, 1913:26 and Verdych, 1920:14).

[5] One exception was Paris, host to the 1924 Olympics, which had a good hotel infrastructure (Netherlands Olympic Committee, 1930:227).

transformed into temporary residences: schools fitted out with the army and the Red Cross' help[6], military camps or, taking the example of some of the visiting delegations, hiring ships as residences. What we could call "emergency residential menu" characterised the accommodation policies of the Olympic Games during the first two decades of this century[7].

However thereafter, the gradual regulation of most of the organisational aspects of the Olympic Games also included accommodation. So, in the conferences held just before the 1924 Olympiad in Paris, the idea of an "Olympic Village" appeared and, in fact, that is where the first discrete Village was tried out, where only a few of the athletes were housed[8]. The first attempt, a set of barracks in a free area near the Colombes stadium, with the addition of some services - post and telegraphs - which by then were standard equipment within incipient Olympic urbanism, in fact had very little to do with what was to be the first Olympic Village, built for Los Angeles'32. However, the idea of the barracks in Paris was the one envisaged by Coubertin in his explanation of the "Olympic city", as mentioned previously.

An obvious sign that the debate around solving the problem of accommodation by building a Village had initiated was the fact that four years after the prototype Village in Paris the Amsterdam Olympics Organising Committee considered building one, even though it ended up rejecting the idea as it was impossible to offer conveniences "...at a reasonable price" (Netherlands Olympic Committee, 1930:228).

The 1930 Berlin Congress and the first "inaugural" Villages
The financial criteria were precisely the factors that persuaded countries participating in the Los Angeles'32 Olympics to use a common Village for accommodation. The questions that Zack Farmer, Secretary General of the Organising Committee, had to answer at the Berlin congress sessions in 1930 were a clear example of the reservations that inspired the proposal[9]. The "Village of the universe" or the "Village of dreams", as it was presented at the IOC, was a way of solving the accommodation problem providing cash-strapped NOC housing and meals for just two dollars a day. It also promised to create desperately needed employment and profits for developers economising on some resources that had become scarce since the 1929 stock exchange crash[10], despite the major fortune on which William May Gardland's project was founded. William May Garland was a

---

[6] At the Antwerp Olympic Games in 1920, their help was a key element in the provision of bedding and cooking utensils. The camps set up by the British Army after the Armistice could not be used and the organising committee was only able to kit out municipal schools in a precarious way (Verdych, 1920:23).

[7] The Amsterdam Olympic Games in 1928 are a good example. After finding that the number of hotel beds was about 2,000 when in fact they estimated they would need around 5,000 going by the example of the previous Olympics organised in Paris, the committee visited industrial fairs in Leipzig and Cologne. However, the accommodation strategies could not be extrapolated as the number of visitors was similar each year, thus facilitating the forecasts, and also less time was spent in the city. In the end the Committee decided to arrange residences not only in the city of Amsterdam but also in the suburbs within a radius of 60km and therefore to use the port to hire up to 18 ships. A total of 48 hotels, 20 in Amsterdam and 28 in the suburbs, 12 guest-houses, 9 in Amsterdam, and 18 schools offered by the municipality were the mainstay of the city's residential supply. (Netherlands Olympic Committee, 1930:235).

[8] Perhaps one of the first antecedents was the house situated next to the stadium where the Swedish Committee put up its competitors during the athletic events at the Stockholm Olympic Games in 1912. The athletes were given board and lodging up to a month before the competitions began and through to their end. The Rowing Committee accommodated its athletes in the same way at Djurgärden. However, the fact that only Swedish athletes were accommodated means that this case cannot really be presented as a true Olympic Village.

[9] Several members of the IOC initiated a discussion about the two possible solutions: the Olympic Village and the use of the city's hotels. The second possibility was shown to be more costly, bearing mind that there were only a small amount of hotels in Los Angeles (Minutes of the session held on 22nd May, 1930 - afternoon. Berlin congress. IOC). The women athletes ended up being accommodated in the Chapman Park Hotel near the city centre, so starting the tradition of separating the sexes in Olympic residences.

[10] The major economic and social crisis caused by the collapse of the stock exchange meant that there were 700,000 unemployed after the collapse in California alone, 350,000 of whom belonged to the counties of Los Angeles and Orange. In Los Angeles, 35,000 jobs were lost in the film industry, and the aviation and oil industries were in the same situation (Stump, 1990:383).

real state developer in Los Angeles and a true architect of the organisation of the Olympic Games[11].

Despite the mistrust of a Europe in economic crisis, the North American offer of accommodation, board and the use of local transport, in addition to a 20% discount on transatlantic tariffs and a 40% discount on state railways, all for just $2 a day, was hard to refuse[12].

The second Village that I term "inaugural" was the one built for the Berlin'36 Olympic Games. Even though the Los Angeles Village was a success, and the German Organising Committee did in fact have enough hotel capacity in the city, they thought about using the Döberitz military camp, about 14 km away from the Olympic facilities, for delegations requiring cheaper accommodation. At the IOC meeting in Vienna in 1933, most Olympic Committees manifested their interest in the construction of a Village (Organisations komittee für die XI Olympiade 1936, 1936:169), so the decision was taken to extend the area, used by the military until the Games, when it would be given over to accommodate athletes. Women, however, were accommodated separetely in the "Frisian House", very close to the Reichssportfield.

The Los Angeles and Berlin Villages inaugurated the model of what Olympic Villages were going to be like throughout the century in the same way as the "Olympic city" model and the set of sports facilities were defined before the break imposed by the Second World War[13]. In Giovanni Brandizzi's words, both cities gave rise to "prototypes" of what modern Olympic facilities were going to be like (Brandizzi, 1988:177). Similarly, the conception of the Olympic residence as something more than just a place for accommodation and the definition of functions far beyond strictly providing board and lodging was a feature of the first two Olympic Villages. The existence of several facilities for athletes, like training grounds, rest, recovery and leisure areas, fulfilled a vital role in the design structure and criteria, even though, as we shall see later, the first complications were only just beginning.

Besides the housing devoted to accommodation, dining rooms and the administrative office, the Los Angeles Village also included a hospital and an open-air theatre. The Berlin Village was rounded off with an indoor swimming pool, two gymnasia and a sports field. Other facilities and services contemplated with equal importance were those for the press, cleaning and food services, as well as for the restaurants and kitchens, communications and telephone network or for security - there were even plain-clothes policemen and private detectives in both Villages. After the difficult post-war years, other complex projects, such as physical structures and functional designs were not incorporated into Villages until the 60s.

Post-war Villages

After the Second World War, the organisation of the 1948 Olympics was passed on to London. As had already happened in the Games immediately after the First World War, held in Antwerp in 1920, the government's cooperation was essential in order to carry out a series of investments that were hard to meet at a time of city reconstruction and acute economic crisis, of which the housing and food supplies problems were clear proof. In a context dominated by the growing number of homeless and rationing, the organisation job of arranging the accommodation for the Olympic visitors became a pressing State concern[14].

---

[11] The one known as the "Garland Group" included thirty industrialists, oil pioneers, tourism developers and businessmen like, for example, the movie magnate Louis B. Mayer (Stump, 1983:375).

[12] The shipping companies reduced their prices for teams which had to cross the Atlantic or the Pacific. The state railways issued return tickets between New York and Los Angeles for the modicum price of $100. The total price for the countries furthest away was $500 per person when the normal price would have been around $2,000. Some teams, like the Cuban and Brazilian ones, even shipped sugar, tobacco and coffee with them, thus cutting their travelling expenses by selling their goods at ports in which they stopped over (Stump, 1990: 380 and 385.)

[13] The Reichssportfield of the Berlin Olympic Games could be considered as the first complex set of sporting scenarios and received the gold medal in the artistic competition in the town planning category (Wimmer, 1976:192).

[14] The situation with regard to the scarcity of food was such that the Government had initiated campaigns aimed at families to promote the rational use of products, giving priority to a subsistence diet on the basis of carbohydrates. Campaigns like the "Dig for Victory" worked on the basis of cultivating root vegetables in the typical city cottage gardens.

After various meetings with the Government, the Organising Committee finally rejected the possibility of building an Olympic Village[15].

In line with precedents set at previous Olympics, the solution adopted was to use available military facilities. Two RAF camps, Uxbridge and West Drayton, and one used up until then as a hospital for war patients and victims at Richmond Park, were converted into settlements, as were a series of schools in the county of Middlesex. Together with the three colleges in the Greater London Area which served as accommodation for women athletes, a total of 25 residences were finally arranged. This meant that transport to and from the training and competition sites, 61 in total if all the sports disciplines are taken into account, became a challenge (Baker, 1994: 110 and Exeter, 1973: 6). In all, the most serious problems were food for the athletes[16], political friction in the heart of the Labour Government, and between this same Government and the Conservative opposition during and after the organisation of the Olympics[17]. Despite the difficulties, the places of accommodation were equipped with various services like laundries, banks, cinemas and small shops. The installation of these amenities used up 22% of the Olympic budget.

As we have seen, the Olympic residence model idea differed substantially from what had been common practice at the Olympic Games held in the '30s. Despite that, putting this model into practice depended on the economic circumstances at any given moment. So, at the 1952 Olympics held in Helsinki, the first post-war Olympic Village was built, different to the two previous ones in that only the competitors in the athletics events were accommodated[18].

The competitors taking part in other events like rowing, shooting, equestrian events or wrestling were accommodated at different institutions, from universities to war invalid accommodation centres, whereas the women were housed in the city's nursing school, 1km away from the stadium.

The austerity of the approach characterised the Helsinki Olympic Village. As for the Village built in 1939 for the 1940 Olympic Games which were not held, the place chosen was the suburb of Käpylä, to the north of the city. The operation was also part of the social housing plans of the municipality[19].

Even though there were several facilities like restaurants, office quarters, training grounds and various services located in two nearby schools, such as dispensaries or a cinema, the design of the project was rather closer to the London'48 case, and was a far cry from the approach taken towards the two inaugural Villages.

The post-war difficulties which made the construction of a new Village problematic was also evident in Oslo,

---

[15] "No building programme could possibly have been entertained in a country with the immediate post-war housing and building problem of Great Britain in 1946 and 1947 (...) it became equally obvious that no one existing building or set of buildings could accommodate all competitors to be housed within the London area itself" (Organising Committee for the XIV Olympiad London 1948, 1951:143).

[16] Here it is worth mentioning that many delegations, like the one from the United States for example, provided supplementary food to its athletes, giving rise to the subsequent diplomatic tensions.

[17] An example was the Richmond Park camp. The neighbouring Conservative district of Kingston expected to be able to use the area to accommodate local homeless people just after the Games. The Ministry of Works, however, decided to hold onto the camp after its Olympic use and the problem ended up in Parliament (Baker, 1994: 111).

[18] In the words of the Organising Committee: "It is not in our opinion today possible to carry through the idea of Baron de Coubertin, that all athletes should be brougth together in an Olympic Village. With all extra buildings, stores, dining rooms, kitchens, etc. The organisers would have to build not a village, but a city...". *About the Olympic Games in 1952*. Report by the Chairman of the Organising Committee for the Helsinki Olympic Games, 1952. Erik von Frenckell, put this forward to the IOC members at the Rome session, April 1949 (Olympic Revue, issue 15, 1949:30-31).

[19] The furniture was obtained by borrowing form the city's hospital stock and the municipal old people's home, still being built at that time (Organising Committee for the XV Olympiad Helsinki 1952, 1955:93).

where prior to the construction of two small Villages at the 1952 Olympic Winter Games held in Oslo, the Organising Committee considered using the city's existing hotels and schools and even tried to persuade several delegations to use the old ship-hotel system, commonplace at the first Olympic competitions, in view of the good harbour facilities the city had[20].

It was in Melbourne at the Melbourne'56 Olympic Games that the Organising Committee first took advantage of the city's university facilities near the stadium to accommodate the athletes, proposing "...one or more subsidiary Villages..." at municipal state schools[21]. However, one year later, the Committee decided to build an Olympic Village in the suburb of Heidelberg and an additional one for the participants in the rowing and canoeing events with interest-free funding provided by the Government from the "Commonwealth-State Housing Scheme"[22]. As for Helsinki, the operation was deliberated within a state housing programme, and it increased the number of houses available by 841. They were detached with a small garden, typical of the suburbs where they were located.

On the other hand, the participants in the equestrian events, held in Stockholm because of the quarantine problems for animals, were accommodated in the facilities of the Karlberg Military Academy and in Nasby Castle, the headquarters of the Swedish Naval School.

Urban Villages, from Rome'60 to Atlanta'96
Martin Wimmer defines the Olympic Village of the Rome'60 Olympic Games as "the first modern residential quarter" (Wimmer, 1976: 202). Clearly, the Rome Olympiad represented a clear break from the previous competitions from an Olympic urbanism point of view. For the first time ever, there was a regional conception of the urban mass, and behind the location and installation of Olympic facilities, there was a project for the territorial expansion of the city, of colonisation by the city.

So these were the first Games where the primacy of the stadium as a key element in urbanistic intervention gave way to a whole urbanistic programme with varied results, which included the Olympic Village, designed more as a residential area rather than a solution to the temporary accommodation of athletes. This feature became commonplace in later Games.

In fact, the Olympics themselves underwent major changes in the second half of this century, experiencing a process of globalisation on an international scale, with the commercialisation of their content. This process runs parallel to the evolution of western societies which, stuck in the process of economic development, more or less vertiginous depending on the case, experienced major economic and social mutations during those decades: the consolidation of the production system and mass consumption, the appearance of the leisure culture with two very clear activities: tourism and sport. This brought about changes that were equally as important for cities. The affirmation of "sports leisure" as the object of mass consumption, in which extremely varied peoples could participate, could be translated into the growing importance of planning the so-called "services" and "facilities", seen as yet another "function" that the urban machine had to incorporate in terms of the evolution of town planning. In this context, it goes without saying that the role of the increasingly worldly Olympic Games would play a key role in the export and globalisation of sports consumption by people on the one hand, and on the other in the more generalised planning of areas designated for sports, as yet another district in city development, either by consolidating the existing fabrics or by articulating new territory.

Olympic urbanism would thus be incorporated on many occasions into ambitious urban development programmes and architecture would equally serve the project, guaranteeing the functionality of the facilities and

---

[20]*Preparations for the Olympic Winter Games, Oslo 1952*. Report by the Chairman of the Organising Committee for the Olympic Games. O. Ditlev-Simonsen, put forward to the IOC members at the Rome session, April 1949 (*Olympic Revue*, issue 16, 1949: 16).

[21] Report on the Melbourne Olympic Games, 1956, put forward by Mr. Lewis Luxton to the IOC members, July 1952 (Olympic Revue, issue 34-35, 1952: 25).

[22] Report to the International Olympic Committee by the Organising Committee for the XVIth Olympiad, Melbourne, 1956 (*Olympic Revue*, issue 41, 1953: 20).

of spectacle as an added value. These contents characterised the Olympic operations of the 60s and 70s, from Rome to Montreal. An expansive urbanism on some occasions and a land-use modifying one on others, as we shall see later, would determine both qualitatively and quantitatively the typology of interventions, their locations and their format.

The operations of the last two decades, on the other hand, provided contrasting examples such as the insertion of Olympic urbanism into the regulated planning of five-year plans in Moscow's case, the re-use of already-existing facilities in Los Angeles's case, the urban renovation and metamorphosis in Seoul's and Barcelona's case, and the super-concentration of Atlanta's Olympic ring.

With regard to Olympic Villages in particular, throughout this period they have become indispensable and symbolically necessary elements, forming part of the Olympic programme with the same degree of importance as the traditionally most representative facilities, like the main stadium. In the last 25 years of this century, the Villages have become truly complex installations requiring specific management and a lot of human resources. On the basis of the operation and the set of facilities which, as prototypes, defined the Villages created before the Second World War, the Villages of the last four decades of this century have introduced an important change: their dual function, as accommodation for athletes during the Games and as residential facilities after them, with differing degrees of success, depending on the case, within the context of the city. It is this content that definitively inserts the Villages as important elements not only within Olympic urbanism but also within town planning.

Rome'60, Tokyo'64 and Mexico'68. Olympic Villages and metropolitan growth

As for other Olympic interventions, the three Olympic Villages built in the 60s fall within different urban contexts with the common denominator of the emerging metropolitan structures of several cities expanding on a regional scale. The Games provided the perfect opportunity to undertake urban development operations in such a way that the investment in infrastructures, like roads and motorways, was greater than for previous Games. The Olympic Villages built were focused then, especially in Rome and Mexico, as residential fabric expansion operations.

In the first case, at Campo Paroli, on the northern periphery of the city, a total of 33 buildings with between 1 and 5 storeys were built, totalling 1,348 flats. The largest investment though was in the road network connecting the residential zone to the sports venues and the city centre, occupying 75% of the land used in the operation (Organising Committee for the XVII Olympiad, 1960:90). Thirty-three different companies participated in the urbanisation and construction works of the different facilities: reception offices, ten restaurants and all sorts of services from shops to open-air cinemas. In addition, for the first time ever, the topic of leisure at the Village was programmed with the creation of the "Social and Recreation Office", in an effort to "...try and create an atmosphere of relaxation and entertainment for the guests who had decided to spend their free time in the Village".[23]

In the second case, the Mexican Government took a whole range of initiatives to connect a series of territories where growth was expected, locating the different sports complexes and the two Olympic Villages on the southern periphery of the city: the "Miguel Hidalgo" Village, where the athletes and journalists were accommodated, and the "Narciso Mendoza" Village, better known as "Villa Coapa", where the judges and participating entertainment teams were accommodated. The latter participated in a wide programme of cultural events, one of the innovations for the Olympics in 1968. Both complexes were made up of large mass-housing blocks, the common practice of social housing policies at that time. In the first Village, there was a total of 24 buildings with between 6 and 8 storeys and a total of 904 flats. In the second, houses and small, 4-storey flats were built, with a total of 686 flats/houses. The Villages built in Mexico marked the peak of the complications involved with regard to design, structure and functions that had begun with the inaugural Villages.

The city of Tokyo, even though it had many points in common with earlier Villages, offered interesting alternatives with regard to the metropolitan dimension and its relationship with the Olympic interventions.

---

[23] Since the Los Angeles'32 Olympic Games, when there was a demonstration of rodeos as part of the leisure activities, recreation has been taken into account as an organisational requirement, though not planned.

The city had transport connection problems that were inherent to rapid metropolitan growth, translated into the concentration of people and industrial complexes in specific zones of the metropolitan area. Attempts were made to improve the transportation infrastructures with these Games, taking advantage of the decisions taken about the location of the sports facilities. As a result, the facilities were spread out, although 13 out of 30 venues were able to be brought together in the Meiji Olympic Park, the Yoyogi Sports Centre and the Sports Centre at the Komazawa Sports Park (Organising Committee of the Games of the XVIII Olympiad Tokyo 1964, 1966:114).

The problems of transport defined the Games and influenced the Olympic Villages' operation, which was the subject of rather haphazard planning. After the negotiations with the United States Army, the Washington Heights area in Yoyogi was chosen, an area used to accommodate military personnel stationed in Tokyo after the Second World War. The idea was to use the already-existing housing. The construction of the National Gymnasium and the concession of a total of 8.25 hectares before and 2.31 hectares after the Games to the Japan Broadcasting Corporation cut the area for the Yoyogi Village down to 66 hectares, making the installation of training grounds difficult (Organising Committee of the Games of the XVIII Olympiad Tokyo 1964, 1966:282).

Taking into account the large distances between the Yoyogi Village and other competition sites, and envisaging the problems involved in transporting the athletes, the decision was taken to build two additional Villages in two hotels. However, despite the investment made to improve the roads, it was necessary to build two new Villages, making use of hotels and hostels, near the canoeing and cycling competition venues in April 1964.

Munich'72 and Montreal'76. Olympic Villages and urban land-use modification
Unlike the previous examples, a feature of Villages in the 70s was that they formed part of land-use modifying, and centrally-located Olympic urbanism. In Rome, Tokyo and Mexico, the Olympic operations fell within the regional urban area and sought its articulation, whereas Munich and Montreal were two initiatives that reinforced the very centre of the city[24], with avant-garde architecture as supporting urbanism. Concentrated Olympic complexes represent a unique urban phenomenon where by a specific urban element with a new use is inserted, rather than expanding the existing territory of a city or developing its suburbs.

In Munich, the "Oberwiesenfeld" Olympic complex was situated just 4 km from the city centre[25]. Within the complex, the Olympic Village was formed by a set of heterogeneous buildings that could accommodate up to 12,000 inhabitants in flats differing in size and number of bedrooms. The Village was divided into the residential zone and the international zone, with the "International Centre" and the "International Park", where the Village's logistic and leisure services were concentrated. The different ways of separating traffic from pedestrians and the introduction of a pneumatic rubbish collection system were two new elements incorporated into the design and infrastructure of the Village (Organisations Komittee für die Spiele Die XX Olympiade München 1972, 1974:138 and 194).

Apart from the sports facilities and road improvements for both access routes and the road network itself, there was a high level of investment in the city, like the "Olympic" underground line with a station in the Village, and one-off operations of urban renovation in certain areas which were pedestrianised (Wimmer, 1976: 197).

The Montreal Olympic Village was also built in the central Olympic complex, some 800 metres away, on a 34-hectare site. The initial proposal to build a temporary Village consisting of two-storey pre-fab buildings was rejected and a decision was taken to build a set of 4 large semi-pyramidal buildings some 19 storeys high where

---

[24] It should be said, however, that in Montreal's case, even though a defined central Olympic complex did exist, including the stadium, the Olympic pool, the velodrome and the Olympic Village, other Olympic facilities were located in radii of between 3 and 10 km from the Village. On the other hand, the first Olympic Village project put forward by the city and rejected by the IOC in June 1973, envisaged the construction of five buildings at different distances from the stadium in order to create neighbourhoods integrated into the municipal housing plans (Organising Committee of the Games of the XXI Olympiad Montreal 1976, 1978:94).

[25] The other sports nucleus was the city of Kiel, which was the venue for the yachting events, where another small Olympic Village was installed within the new Olympic Centre (Wimmer, 1976: 203).

the offices and maintenance quarters would be located on the first couple of floors, with the remainder being used for accommodation[26]. As for Munich, the space was divided into a residential zone and an international zone where the special attention paid to security conditions, after the events at the Munich Games marked the Village's operation.

Those taking part in the yachting events held in Kingston, some 290 km away from the city, were accommodated in the facilities provided by Queen's University. For the equestrian events, held in Bromont, a small village comprising 52 units was built.

The Villages of the last two decades. Town planning and urban renovation vs. "ephemerality"
Unlike the two previous groups, the Villages built in the 80s and 90s consist of an extremely heterogeneous set of interventions. In the light of the experience of Moscow's planned programming and Seoul's and Barcelona's development and renovation plans, whose permanence was a feature of the operations, the two cases of Los Angeles and Atlanta reach the opposite extreme, with the ephemerality of their approach.

The Olympic Village of the Moscow'80 Olympics is an obvious example of the operation's insertion into regulated planning, the city's Development Master Plan, 1971-1990, within the general context of the 10th Five-Year Plan of Economic and Social Development. Even though the inclusion of Olympic Villages in social housing programmes has been a constant since the Second World War, since the Helsinki'52 experience, the interventions had never been included in such a major planning programme. A later case was perhaps Tokyo. The Olympic operations were included in a ten-year development plan. An Olympic action plan was part of it and, in turn, there was a sub-plan for the sports facilities and another for the Olympic Villages. In any case, the Tokyo Villages were not scheduled from the outset of the operations, as mentioned earlier. From the construction and land management process to the post-Olympic use of the housing, as we shall see later, it is impossible to talk about a planned intervention.

The Moscow Development Master Plan envisaged the installation of a sports infrastructure and divided the city into eight planning zones, each one equipped with a recreational and social centre. The concession of the Olympic Games speeded the process up and between 1979 and 1980 sports centres in six different zones were built (Organising Committee of the Games of the XXII Olympiad, 1981:42).

Considered as an integral part of the Olympic infrastructure interventions and as yet another of the residential complexes already projected, the Village was built in an area of urban extension as part of the city's programmed growth, towards the South-West, along the Kremlin, the Lenin stadium and the Moscow University axes.

The 107 hectares were occupied by a residential zone, a total of 18 pre-fab housing blocks with 16 storeys, a large sports complex with facilities for training and playing sports, a facilities zone which included a multi-purpose hospital building and a cultural centre where the remaining and by then typical Village services were located, from shops to cinemas or reading and meeting rooms (Organising Committee of the Games of the XXII Olympiad, 1981:135).

The Olympic operations of Seoul'88 and Barcelona'92 were characterised by the existence of major urban renovation plans, with a double content: on the one hand, the city's urban and economic development, clearly focused to encourage degrees of urban internationalisation and globalisation, and on the other, the recovery of hitherto marginalised urban elements. In this context, in contrast to the territorial ephemerality of the University Villages of Los Angeles and Atlanta, the Seoul and Barcelona Olympic Villages had a strong territorial vocation in common, defining the recovery of suburbs in crisis by the symbolic importance of the Olympic urbanism installed and by the inauguration of a new urban space, of new residential fabric as the driving force behind the creation of new centres.

---

[26] The temporary Village proposal was put forward by a group of lecturers and students from the Town Planning School of Montreal University in conjunction with an architects' studio and a firm specialising in the construction of pre-fab elements (Organising Committee of the Games of the XXI Olympiad Montreal 1976, 1978:99).

In spite of the differences between the two cities, the Olympic interventions in both cases fall within very similar planning contexts. Programmes which, since the end of the 70s, had encouraged and programmed urban, economic and territorial decentralisation activities on the basis of infrastructure location, the dispersion of the commercial fabric and the provision of hotels[27].

In both cases, the areas subject to urban renovation, the Chamsil area to the south-east of the city in Seoul and the Poblenou area on the sea front in Barcelona, constituted city problem areas. The first case was an old, floodable area on the banks of the Han River, occupied in the 60s by various mass-housing installations affected by major environmental pollution problems (Stratton, 1986: 219). In Barcelona's case, it was on old area occupied by industry characterised by the accumulation of warehouses, railway facilities and precarious housing.

In both cases, together with the major investment in transportation infrastructures and improvements in accessibility[28], works were carried out in the city centre. In Seoul five streets in the down-town area were renovated and folled out. In Barcelona the municipal programme for the renovation of the old town was already in operation, although the proximity of major investment located on the sea front brought about a bias in terms of the improvements to the housing stock, the first objective of the programme, towards other uses producing greater added value (Tatjer; Costa, 1989: 44).

With regard to the two Olympic Villages built, the layout was typical of the villages mentioned so far: the residential zone, the service zone, the centre and the international zone. The one in Seoul consisted of 86 high-rise buildings in the centre, from 4 to 26 storeys high. The Barcelona Village was part of the municipal policy of creating a contextualised city neighbourhood organically connected to the sea front of the old town, constructing different sets of very diverse buildings, mostly blocks of flats with 6 storeys, with the spaces between them being conceived as spaces for recreation or relaxation.

Los Angeles was a total contrast to the cases we have mentioned, to such an extent that it went against the general approach prevailing in Olympic urbanism, in the sense that the Games had always been used in one way or another to set up urban action programmes. The city already had 17 of the 23 required competition facilities, so the impact on the urban structure was minimal (Gnocchi Ruscone, 1982: 86). In line with this approach and with the desire to maximise the use existing facilities in order to minimise spending on building (Los Angeles Olympic Organizing Committee, 1985:368), the Organising Committee decided not to build any new residential complexes and to accommodate the athletes in three university campuses which contained the necessary technical services, logistics and facilities.

The Southern California University (USC) Village was characterised by its proximity to the city centre and by the closeness of the building units. The main management problem was the organisation of pedestrian and service-vehicle traffic. In contrast the University of California at the Los Angeles (UCLA) Village was defined by the isolation of the buildings on the campus, so the services were concentrated along the "high street". In both, an important element with regard to the resulting space was the introduction of elements of decor, not only used to facilitate signposting but also to give a sense of identity and homogeneity to the whole (Los Angeles Olympic Organizing Committee, 1985:192).

In addition, the Los Angeles Villages were characterised by not contemplating the international area. As leisure and meeting places, USC had the "Village square", whereas UCLA had the "high street". Another important

---

[27] As in Seoul's case in 1978 when the local government considered the Global Development Plan. The Han River Development Project came into operation in 1983. It defined the directives of the Olympic operation (Kwaak, 1988: 135). In 1984, several decentralisation initiatives were put into action with the construction of new hotels and shopping centres (Brandizzi, 1988: 167). In Barcelona's case, as from the end of the 70s and particularly throughout the 80s, with various reconstructions and sponging of urban fabrics in different areas of the city and, as from 1986, with the creation of the so-called "New Centre Areas".

[28] In Seoul, with the connection of the Kimbo international airport to the Olympic complex (Stratton, 1986: 221) and in Barcelona, with the improvements to the airport and the construction of the city-centre bypasses and metropolitan access routes to the road network.

management issue was transport within the Village or, in other words, within the campus because of the "considerable distances between the residences and the Village's main entrance."

The experience of the Los Angeles Villages demonstrated how fitting out university campuses could provide places for extremely flexible Olympic Villages as far as capacity[29], whilst solving the problem of post-Olympic management, although some works did have to be carried out.

As in Los Angeles's case, Atlanta'96 used the facilities of the Georgia Institute of Technology for the Olympic Village. These were chosen because of their central location, their proximity to competition venues, all at distances if under 5 km, and because of the existence of all sorts of infrastructures: residential, restaurants, telecommunications, medical, athletic and leisure facilities. These facilities were rounded off with the construction of the "Village Festival Center", a large shopping mall, and the Olympic towers, two apartment buildings for athlete accommodation.

The Village was therefore within the Olympic Ring, an area of 3 km where 16 out of 25 Olympic facilities were located. The athletes taking part in the yachting competitions, held in Savannah, some 390 km from Atlanta, also needed accommodation. This was provided by fitting out a hotel in the city (Atlanta Olympic Organizing Committee, 1996:paragraph 1.20).

I feel that the best way to finish off this run-through of Olympic Villages built throughout this century is to take a look at what Sydney plans to build for the Olympics of the year 2000.

The Olympic operation and the construction of the Village in particular have a great deal in common with the urban renovation analysed earlier. In Sydney, the initiative involves the creation of a housing neighbourhood in an area of renovation near Sydney harbour in Homebush bay. In fact, the whole Olympic complex is considered to be connected with urban recovery and development of the area, as was the case in Seoul. The whole approach of project contemplates of the environmental advantages of an area characterised by water courses and marshes. Thus, various parks have been planned, adapting the operation to the topography of the area. As far as the type of housing at the Village is concerned, there will be a wide variety ranging from detached houses to apartment blocks of varying heights. The operations include improving transportation and the connection to Parramata, Sydney's second largest commercial centre, using ferries to cross the river of the same name (Sydney Olympics 2000 Bid Limited, 1995:v.2, 20).

Olympic Villages and Architecture. Modernity and Localism
Buildings types. From the cottage to the housing block
In his book *Olympic Buildings*, Martin Wimmer suggests classifying of Olympic Villages on the basis of the styles of the different types of housing and defines a three-stage evolution (Wimmer, 1976:49).

The first one corresponds to detached houses or bungalows laid out in a similar way to the suburban housing estates or industrial colonies built in the first decades of this century in Europe and the United States. The Villages we have termed "inaugural" - Los Angeles'32 and Berlin'36 - would fit into this model.

The second stage began with the appearance of the apartment block at the Käpylä Olympic Village in Helsinki'52. With the exception of Melbourne'56, which reverted to the suburban estate model for its Village, this model is the one was used for the Rome'60 and Tokyo'64 Villages, although in Tokyo's case the apartment blocks were combined with wooden modules.

The third stage corresponds to the construction of large housing complexes organised around identical tall housing blocks, in some cases with different designs. This was the case for Mexico'68, Munich'72, Montreal'76 and Moscow'80.

---

[29] "With its great availability of beds and low cost, campus housing it was able to accommodate large groups such as ceremonial dancers, band members, extra NOC officials and Organizing Committee members last time". (Los Angeles Olympic Organizing Committee, 1985:397).

We could even add another stage which would include the Villages of the last two decades. On the one hand, although the Seoul'88 and Barcelona'92 Villages were large residential complexes, the combination of different types of buildings and of varying heights apartment blocks made them distinct to earlier operations. On the other hand, the "ephemeral" Village cases of Los Angeles'84 and Atlanta'96 introduced the idea of a multi-purpose "container" as a type of building.

Formal languages

The complex analysis of the evolution of the formal and aesthetic contents used in Olympic Villages is another extremely interesting point. In an attempt to structure my speech, I suggest classifying the cases which serve as examples of the two extremes which appear to a lesser or greater degree in the cases under examination. On the one hand, examples of modern and avant-garde ideas on architecture have always been found in the Villages, especially in the 60s, when the Village took on the representative and symbolic content of what we could call Olympic mythology. On the other hand, we saw the presence, also to a lesser or greater extent, of elements inherent to local traditions and cultures. This blend of modernity and localism best defines the following run-through[30].

"Inaugural" Villages. Taylorization, rationalism and localism
. Los Angeles'32. Pre-fab housing, the Ford T and "Spanish" architecture

Two factors contributed to a large extent to reducing the costs of the Los Angeles Olympic Village : firstly, the low price of land in a city that was expanding thanks to the investments from the film industry which, since the 20s, had gradually set itself up there and, secondly, the use of pre-fab elements in the detached house modules. In fact, the village was a repetition of just one single housing unit with different functions, capable of being repeated infinitely. Thus, the Village incorporated many elements of the new, Taylorized modernity which began to characterise urban life in the United States. The most tangible example of this was the serial production and consumption of the car. The mass-produced Ford models thus carried the mass-produced ceilings, doors and façades to the Village to be installed as fast as they were dismantled after the Games.

With regard to the aesthetic criteria, pre-fabrication meant the disappearance of typical, historical elements of the first decades of the century, liked the gates of the Memorial Coliseum built in 1921[31].

However, in conjunction with this modern content, the Los Angeles Village, in the same way as all residential architecture of the first three decades on the west coast of the country, provided a major array of local stereotypes. In fact, in addition to the type of housing and the organisation of the complex, similar to the suburban housing developments of that period, right from the very entrance gate to the Village, the landscaping with small gardens for each housing module and even the interiors of the administrative buildings or the presence of elements like rooves or arches employed the aesthetic elements of so-called "Spanish architecture" (Ramírez, 1992). All these elements were equally present in other Olympic facilities like the "central swimming pool" next to the stadium.

. Berlin'36. Rational housing, Frankfurt kitchen and the Siedlung

The ideas stemming from thought on the rationalisation of the "efficient" house and housing, introduced into social housing policy in Germany for over two decades, appear in the Döberitz Village. From the type of housing to the furniture which emphasised "...comfort, simplicity and cleanliness..."[32], the Village was an exemplary representation of urbanistic and architectural rationalism: "...minimal habitational cell for the athletes and coaches, ego and mimesis of rational social housing; urban design, ego and mimesis of the garden-city" (Bellioni; Brandizzi; Carbone, 1982:54).

---

[30] A blend already put forward by Coubertin in his explanation of the architectural requirements of the *Modern Olympia*: "It is for the architects now to fulfil the great dream, to let soar from their brains a resplendent Olympia, at once original in its modernism and imposing in its traditionalism,..." (P. de Coubertin, 1910).

[31] In the same year, the New York Museum of Modern Art organised an exhibition of European Architecture which provided architects in the United States with the key elements of the modern movement (Schmidt, 1986: 468).

[32] (Organisations komittee für die XI Olympiade 1936, 1936:175). The three attributes were perfectly synthesised in what was perhaps the maximum approach to rationalism applied to the minimal house, the Frankfurt Kitchen of 1926.

The rationalism of the Döberitz Village even used landscape management to achieve rational organisation and an ensemble integrated into the environment[33]. From this point of view, it was the total opposite to Reichssportfield Olympic urbanism, characterised by overpowering monumental structures and non-association with the environment.

Together with these contents, the elements inherent to the local urbanistic tradition can also be clearly found, in particular the Siedlung ones, working class colonies that had sprung up all around the immediate peripheries of the main German towns which constituted a form of city expansion at the end of the 19th century. On the other hand, local stereotypes found their means of expression in the decoration of the rooms. Each house was given the name of a German city and the rooms were decorated with paintings referring to "...the economic and cultural lifestyle" of each one (Organisations Komittee für die XI Olympiade 1936, 1936:169).

. **From functionalism to radicalism. "Modern" urban Villages**
After the experiences of the post-war villages, the 60s signified a radical change with regard to the role of architecture in the Olympic Villages. Gradually, architecture became an essential mainstay of the complex Olympic facilities. As the Olympic Village's role became more and more important within the "menu" of Olympic urban interventions, its architecture also turned into a platform for the suggestion of proposals that gave priority to modernity instead of localism.

. **Fordist functionalism. The 60s Villages**
The comparison that Le Corbusier himself made between the Campo Paroli Olympic Village and his "ville radieuse" was not gratuitous (Brandizzi, 1988: 180). Both the urbanistic and architectural approach, from the type of building to the formal elements employed, were actually an imitation of Le Corbusier's proposals. In fact, with a lesser or greater degree of success, all the residential urbanism of Fordism, characterised by the colonisation of new territories by the "urban machine", considered translating Le Corbusier's and the CIAM's proposal on a large and sometimes drastically over-simplified scale. Between these standardised derivations of functionalist ideas, the Rome Olympic Village adhered to the original model: the conception of residential elements, the pilots on which the horizontal housing blocks stood, the conception of spaces between blocks and the role of open areas created a project with a strong territorial stamp, even more evident with the communication infrastructures that were added: the bridge and the roads.

The two Olympic Villages built in Mexico in 1968 represented a much more radical version of the functionalist considerations. Strongly influenced by the European experience of "grands ensembles", characteristic of emergency social housing at that time, the "Miguel Hidalgo" and the "Villa Coapa" Villages reflected the desire to create neighbourhood-cities, understood as being self-sufficient units with elements of distinctive design: zoning on a larger scale than in Rome, tall, residential units with a greater capacity and a much more standardised interpretation of the spaces between blocks were some of the elements that distinguished the Mexican Villages from the Rome Villages almost one decade later.

The Olympic Village built in Moscow in 1980 also took on some of the premises of the modern movement, introduced on a large scale within the residential architecture of the Soviet Union since post-war reconstruction.

. **Radicalism and mega-structures. The 70s Villages**
For architectural avant-garde groups, the 70s kindled thought about the cultural condition of western urban societies and the mass culture of Fordism, characterised by the mythologies of leisure, instant consumption and ephemerality. From this point of departure, a whole series of proposals considered renovation and radical visions not only of architectural design but also of the city and urban organisation.

---

[33] The project was adapted to the landscape from the outset, although it was transformed to reproduce an integrated whole. The undulations of the land were modelled, the woods within the area were "designed" to the extent of introducing the animal species best-suited to the environment. The aim of providing the Village with an internal organisation depended equally the scenic possibilities of the landscape, designing, for example, the views that could be seen from the accommodation or from the sauna. *Report of the Organising Committee for the Berlin Olympic Games*, 1932:172-175.

From the expansive organicism of the Japanese metabolists to Archigram's technological pop, radicalism in the 60s suggested the creation of mega-structures as the basis for a new way of organising residential units, the city and urban systems (Solà-Morales, 1994: 403). In brief, the mega-structure was defined by the integration of services and facilities, joining functions from urban space and, as a result, becoming autonomous in relation to the environment and aterritoriality.

These two orientations, the vision of the city as a recreational city and the notion of mega-structure, can be found in the two Villages built in the 70s, one in Munich and other in Montreal. In the first case, leisure took on a territorial approach, clearly demonstrated by the recreational vocation of the whole Olympic Park and the Village itself, as we shall see later.

In the second case, the Montreal Village was clearly inspired by the mega-structure notion. In fact, the residential function and the function of different types of service, from restaurants and logistics to leisure, were integrated into the four large semi-pyramidal structures. Their organisation demonstrated the extremes mentioned earlier: the basements and first couple of floors were for the kitchen, restaurant and maintenance services, whereas athletes' residences were located on the sixth floor and above. This integration of urban functions also manifested the aterritorial function of the complex in the sense that the autonomous semi-pyramids could be infinitely reproduced as micro-cities.

. **Post-modern readings. The Villages of the last two decades**
As already mentioned in the previous point, the Villages built in the last two decades constitute a range of different locations and a range of formal qualities as expressed in the projects.

The urban renovation operations carried out in the Seoul and Barcelona Olympic Villages have many points in common with a whole collection of other contemporary operations like Battery Park in New York, the renovation of the docklands in London, particularly with the final interventions in the Canary Wharf area, and the wide range of experiences of sea-front restoration, for which architecture is the vehicular and symbolic support to a global programme (Crilley, 1993: 246). Thus, elements of this post-modern architecture characterised by spatial indifference on the one hand and by simulation on the other, with elements that used the stereotypes of reconstructed local history, for example, can be repeatedly found in the case of Seoul and Barcelona[34].

In the first case, they can be found in the "Koreanity" of the complex Olympic architecture and the architecture of the Village itself, inspired by "...the Korean architectural tradition, based on values like tranquillity and modest elegance and, at the same time, expressing the spirituality so deeply-rooted in the country's culture, observable in the forms of the spaces created, the sculptures and colours". (Brandizzi, 1988: 173). In the Village, for example, these premises expressed by the isolation of the complex, achieved by locating the tallest buildings on the outside and the smallest on the inside, protected by the former.

The "Koreanity" of Seoul architecture became "Mediterraneanity" in Barcelona's case where the most significant Olympic buildings, especially the Olympic Village itself, the sites in the old city and the seafaring tradition of the city are constants.

With regard to the cases of Los Angeles and Atlanta, the urban simulation that they represented should be added, from an architectural point of view, to the ephemerality as the essence of the operations. In fact, managing to achieve an urban "landscape" with the decorative elements was one of the objectives of the space design teams at the Los Angeles Villages. Thus, everything from the "Mediterranean" palette of colours to the

---

[34] In the "modern" Villages of the 60s and 70s, localism, faced with the overwhelming presence of modern avant-garde contents with regard to design criteria and architectural decor, had been relegated to what we could call the "Olympic atrezzo", as in the case of the initiatives to recover the historic buildings in Rome and the sites for some of the competitions, or for the cultural programmes implemented, especially in Mexico and Munich. Only in Tokyo did the architectural programme include a local approach to the manifestations, even though, in the words of Dagoberto Ortensi: "...the Tokyo Village (from an aesthetic point of view) contributed to the evolution of the Olympic Villages" (Ortensi, 1972:276).

signposting elements was thought up not only for the visitor but for the television viewer, too[35].

Olympic Villages and town planning. The Utopian content of Olympic urbanism
I shall now analyse which city models can be contrasted in the Olympic Village projects from the point of view of planning ideas. I shall classify them into four urban models, four different images in which the Utopian content of the "ideal city" manifests itself in different forms and ways: the garden-city, the satellite city, the central city and the metropolitan city. Four models which, as we shall see, are clearly reflected in some of the Villages analysed so far.

The garden city and the suburban world. The "inaugural" Villages
The tradition of reformist thought in Europe had paid special attention to the problems of housing, especially from the second half of the 19th century onwards, as a result of the vertiginous process of population growth in major European cities. The criticism of hygiene on the one hand and the criticism of the economic situation on the other with regard to the incipient industrial urban structures had generated proposals for territorial organisation and for new housing formats which attempted to solve the problem of extreme density and, in the last instance, of the high death rates of urban populations. The idea of the "garden-city" as a means of urban and territorial organisation, taking advantage of the best things that the countryside and the city had to offer, took root in this context of bourgeois reform of the industrial urban society. After its development in Great Britain, the first decades of the century saw it spread to German cities, which found a means of urban expansion at a time of major population growth. In conjunction with the considerations of Bauhaus's incipient modern rationalism, the garden-city was the best example of a rationalisation process of city construction and of a scientific conception of the house, on the basis of criteria of efficiency, minimal space and analysing the house as an efficient habitational cell.

The suburban housing developments and those of Siedlungen, or working class colonies of the two first decades in cities like Berlin, were characterised by an "anti-urban" conception of the whole and by the special attention paid to the landscape. These characteristics were very much present in the 1936 Olympic Village in Döberitz. Conceived as another Siedlungen, the Berlin Olympic Village was characterised by the "landscape engineering" that was analysed earlier. It was a feature missing from the Los Angeles Village, where the suburban aspect offered more links with the industrialisation and standardisation of the building processes, the option of the car and the people's incipient highway consumption.

The satellite city and the city-machine. The 60s Villages
The reconstruction of many European cities after the Second World War and the regional growth of many others from the 60s onwards was carried out based on the of ideas of the modern movement divulged by Le Corbusier and the CIAM. The development of this expansive city planning took place on the basis of notions like the satellite city[36]. The separation of urban functions over the territory, the importance of commercial, health, educational and recreational sports facilities, open spaces next to the residential areas and the notion of an urbanistic standard were some of the determiners of this urban model[37].

The Olympic Villages in Rome'60 and specially the Mexico'68 were designed around these elements. Thus, the Campo Paroli Village was defined as a "large residential quarter, intended for families living autonomosly" and "the urban complex was planned in accordance with criteria of structural unity" (The Organising Committee for the XVII Olympiad, 1960:225). The "Miguel Hidalgo" Village was defined as a residential city with "all essential

---

[35] The function was to create some type of identification with all the Olympic facilities on the basis of the icons and colours used in the decor, able to give that impression on the TV screen (Los Angeles Olympic Organizing Committee, 1985:161).

[36] It was Ludwig Hilberseimer who, in December 1923, took part in a housing competition organised by the specialist magazine *Bauwelt*. He submitted for the urbanism schemes which illustrated the project of a satellite city system, a set of residential cities connected by fast trains to the economic, administrative, industrial and cultural centre. This was a modern-movement interpretation of Ebenezer Howard's garden-city system (Magnano Lampugnami, 1994: 302).

[37] The standard idea was simply a new concept of hygienics and a new revision of the housing and city efficiency conditions, setting the "efficient" boundaries of voluminous habitable space and green space per inhabitant.

services of daily urban life, a primary school, children's park, medical clinic, shopping area, green areas, recreational facilities and car parks, with one parking space per apartment". Whereas at Vila Coapa "the whole project maintains a net population density of 580 inhabitants per hectarea. The ratio of green spaces per inhabitant is 6.8 m^2 and the spaces for the shopping centre and technical school are 19,800 m^2 and 18,750 m^2, respectively" ("México y las instalaciones para los Juegos Olímpicos de la XIX Olimpiada", *Revista Conescal*, num. 9, 1968:11 and 47).

The central city and the accumulation of leisure. The 70s Villages

The Munich and Montreal operations both used the process of land-use modification of different types of central spaces which, since the 60s, have been a major feature of European and North American cities. The conversion of spaces, frequently subject to earlier planning initiatives, introducing a change in use or taking advantage of open spaces with potential as a focus part, has been a constant in urbanism in these cities over the past decades. Very often, it has been a case of operations focused on achieving true recreational districts, providing sports facilities or leisure-culture facilities, or even both. Areas of the city characterised by their content, metropolitan leisure and the high, concentrated added value.

This model of a central and sectorally grouped city, the basis for the Utopian recreation of an urban world of services, leisure and consumption, was the one behind Olympic urbanism as seen in Munich and Montreal. In the case of Munich, the Olympic complex, including the Olympic Village, was a good example of this description. The Organising Committee's point of view about the funcionality of this zone was clear: "...a marvellous large recreation park which has enriched the individuality of the city, has provided a new center of varied community life, and has given new value to nothern Munich" (Organisations Komittee für die Spiele Der XX Olympiade München 1972, 1974:2).

With regard to the Olympic Village, even the layout and landscaping of the green areas was thought of in recreational terms: "...the landscaping and gardening design of the open areas in the Olympic Villages belonged to the realm of recreation. One could relax on a miniature golf course, in a small swimming pool, in a partially roofed table tennis hall or on a large dance floor" (Organisations Komittee für die Spiele Der XX Olympiade München 1972, 1974:126).

Subsequent conversion of the facilities and service buildings at the Village after the Games into leisure areas and structures like shopping centres also proved the vocation for global intervention.

In Montreal's case, the existence of an area, subject at different times to recreational planning, provided the ideal basis for the construction of the Olympic complex, which included the most significant facilities and the Village. As for Munich, the special attention that was paid to the recreational aspects and their post-Olympic use as a public commercial sports area can be glimpsed from some of the considerations included in the Organising Committee's report: "As a result, Montrealers now have one of the largest and most sophisticated sports centres in the world, with facilities for an almost unlimited variety of events" (Organising Committee of the Games of the XXI Olympiad Montreal 1976, 1978:40).

. The metropolitan city and the central "non-places". The villages of the last two decades

I mentioned earlier how the Seoul'88 and Barcelona'92 Olympic Villages represented an Olympic urbanism focused on the urban renovation of problem areas which, however, were areas with potential as a central point: Chamsil on the Han River in Seoul and the sea-front in Barcelona. In addition, it is an urbanism understood in metropolitan code. In fact, with the organisation of the Olympics, both cities found a way to articulate policies tending towards decongestion and decentralisation by improving and adapting the metropolitan structure. A Utopian structure that considered the Olympic operations as de-peripherised in Seoul's case and the no less Utopian balancing-out of the territory in Barcelona's case.

Olympic urbanism implemented such actions on the basis of different approaches: firstly, with a metropolitan conception of the facilities, understood as a means of creating a central point. In Seoul's case: "This concept (multi-centre) is backed up the planning of parks and the rigid restraints on construction applied in areas between Chamsil and the outskirts of the city" (Brandizzi, 1988: 168).

Or as surgical instruments of city urbanisation in Barcelona: "To suitably locate the facilities in relation to the urban structure, situating the large nuclei of facilities in the best positions possible, in order to reinforce the idea of the city being complete" (*Preliminary Project, Barcelona's Candidature for the 1992 Olympic Games*, 1984:12).

Secondly, on the basis of the improvements to the metropolitan communications network, with the explicit objective in both cases of connecting centres, either existing or potential, with the cities of the metropolitan continuum. In Seoul's case: "Also by improving transportation facilities between Seoul and other surrounding cities, an expanded urbanization system was established..." (Kwaak, 1988: 142).

And in Barcelona: "...centrality had to be redefined... That meant defining the service and influence borders that had to be given to this central city or, in other words, to define a system articulated between this centre and the centres of other metropolitan and regional cities" (Millet, 1992: 4).

Thirdly, it was assumed that the two renovation areas were key elements within a territorial land-use modification scheme on a metropolitan scale. In Seoul's case, to pivot the operations around rehabilitation and conversion of the Han River. In Barcelona's case, to create various action areas along the metropolitan sea-front[38].

Olympic Villages and Town Planning. The Village as an Urban Item

I shall now go on to analyse Olympic Villages as urban objects in their own right, bearing in mind the relationship and dependence on Olympic urbanism. In this sense, I shall concentrate on the process of city production that these operations signify: from their location, land management, the building and urbanisation processes and the agents involved, and, to round off, I shall highlight the types of urban insertion of the Villages after the Games.

Olympic locations. Periphery and centre

It is difficult to talk about location, or about central or peripheral location of the Olympic Villages because the comparisons between very different urban realities and between dissimilar historical moments suggest the terms "centre" and "periphery" should not generally be used. So, we shall talk about peripheries and centres relative to the different locations of the Olympic Villages throughout this century, without any desire to classify the types or the different cases.

A second example that should be emphasized is the dependence existing between location, layout and organisation of the main Olympic complex, which usually, and quite obviously, has an important influence on the location of the Village in the city.

The Villages that we have termed "inaugural", the Los Angeles'32 Village, "...a twenty-five minute drive from the heart of the city" (Los Angeles Organizing Committee, 1933:256) and the Berlin'36 one, 15 km from the Reichssportfield, were characterised by a territorial separation, and the latter was even separated by its formal and conceptual opposition to the Olympic sports complex, as mentioned earlier. The Olympic urbanism model at that time was clear: an Olympic complex located in a significant area of the city centre and a Village defined by its opposition to the sports complex, totally unconnected with the set of facilities. The latter is the place for competitions, for fighting and "Olympic production" whereas the former is a place for fraternity.

The Helsinki'52 and Melbourne'56 Villages were characterised by their location in the suburbs of the two cities. The one in Käpylä, to the north of Helsinki, was under 6 km away and was, therefore, fairly close to the central Olympic complex, just 1.5 km from the city centre. The Hiedelberg Village, clearly suburban, was 14 km from the Olympic stadium.

---

[38] In Barcelona's case, the protagonism of the Olympic Village in this project is clear to see: "The future sea park will reach the residential nucleus of Poblenou and shall join up with the beach. The Olympic Village can extend this residential façade thus formally defining the sea-front promenade, acting as the embryo of a further reaching urban land-use modification. The sports, cultural, commercial, administrative and leisure facilities will act as regenerating elements of the current stretch" (*Preliminary Project, Barcelona's Candidature for the 1992 Olympic Games*, 1984:12).

The Villages of the 60s - Rome, Tokyo and Mexico - were clearly defined by an increasingly peripheral location, like the other Olympic sports facilities. The Olympic unit model corresponded to multi-location sites. I've already mentioned that we are talking about several urban contexts in which both the sports facilities and the Villages themselves were conceived as elements of city growth and expansion. The typical central Olympic complex of the Games was thus broken up and spread out over the territory, conforming to a more or less heterogeneous conglomerate of elements connected by large infrastructures of road communications.

That was how two large Olympic complexes were built in Rome, one in the north and the other in the south of the city, linked by a system of highways which meant that the Olympic Village was just 5 km away from the main stadium. In Tokyo, there were three Olympic areas: Meiji, Komazawa and Yoyogi, where the Olympic Village was built, and a total of 8 motorways with 22 highways were put into operation. Finally, in Mexico'68, the multiplicity of Olympic facilities brought about an unprecedented dispersion, with distances of over 30 km between them.

The Villages of the 70s were a radical break with this model, as they went back to the central Olympic complex pattern where most - or at least the most significant - of the facilities were located. However, unlike the complexes of Los Angeles'32 and Berlin'36, the Village was indeed part of them. The central location was not again repeated until the four Olympic areas of Barcelona'92 or the Olympic ring of Atlanta'96, some twenty years later.

In fact, even though the Olympic complex in Moscow was central, it was split into different locations and the Village was situated in one of the city's programmed growth areas. The organisation of the facilities and the three university Villages in Los Angeles'84 was again characterised by its dispersion.

In Seoul'88, the facilities complex corresponded to the central model of Munich and Montreal, and even included the Olympic Village, though the location was rather more peripheral. In Barcelona'92, the exact opposite occurred; the facilities were close to the city centre, within a 5 km radius, but the unit was organised into four Olympic areas. Finally, the ring in Atlanta, a "concentrated geographic area in the heart of the city"[39], encircled most of the facilities - 16 out of 25 - with an average of 3 km between the different venues. Despite the relative central location of the most recent Olympic complexes, we have not again seen the degree of concentration characterising the Munich proposals or the ensemble formed by the stadium, the swimming pool and velodrome iconographically identifying the Montreal Olympics.

Olympic Villages and city production. Land management, and construction and urbanisation processes
Throughout the century, the process of urban production with regard to the construction of Olympic Villages has undergone major changes. From the dependence of free land, of military servitude, the situation has changed to the programming of location strategies even affecting changes in use and new urban functions. From mostly public sector participation witnessed earlier, the situation has changed to complex variations of public and private sector cooperation. In brief, the complex process of the urban management of Olympic operations is a by-product of the developments that have taken place on a general town planning scale.

An initial analysis would include a wide range of approaches, as follows. Standard urban development operations, like land development for the construction of the Helsinki'52 and Melbourne'56 Villages, using the same model as public sector housing developments. The Rome, Tokyo and Mexico Villages were characterised by the public sector development of the land in which a whole host of public organisations were involved, whereas the private sector agents took charge of either the construction process or, more simply, the urbanisation. The cases of Munich and Montreal shared the common factor of major private capital investment in the interventions, with the uniqueness of their sectoral specialisation. These cases are particularly interesting for temporary regulation. Here the public sector initiative manages the processes up to a certain point in time when the private sector initiative intervenes, and because of the constitution of companies with public sector capital which took part in certain interventions.

Finally, leaving aside the Moscow case, where the Communist State bore the whole weight of the urban

---

[39] Official Candidature of the City of Atlanta for the Organisation of the 1996 Olympic Games (introduction).

production process, the Villages of the last two decades have offered a wide range of intervention possibilities involving more and more new urban agents like universities, as was the for the Los Angeles and Atlanta Olympics.

In any event, the first "inaugural" village - the one at Los Angeles'32 - was characterised by totally private development, as were all the other facilities, if we exclude the cooperation of the municipality itself.

A totally opposite model was the Berlin'36 Village. The army and the National-Socialist State controlled everything from the outset, and the chosen location was in fact a military camp.

The Rome Village was the first to demonstrate a certain degree of complexity with regard to land management and the subsequent construction and urbanisation works. The National Housing Institute on the one hand, and the Ministry of Public Works on the other, took charge of intervention development. In addition, it created the public sector company called Olympic Constructions of Rome, which managed the urbanisation works. During the urbanisation works, a total of up to 33 companies took part in the construction of a road network, the organisation of street lighting and landscaping (The Organising Committee for the XVII Olympiad, 1960:43).

In Tokyo'64, the metropolitan government created different sections that were later integrated into the Olympic Works Bureau to coordinate the various works. With regard to land management, military terrain was once again used. The Mexico Olympics, on the other hand, returned to the organisational model used for the Rome Olympiad. The Villages were built as an integral part of the National Housing Institute's housing programme, and different public organisations like the Mexican Institute for Social Security, the Institute for Health and Safety of State Workers and the National Mortgage Bank for Urban and Public Works were involved in and responsible for the execution of the works[40]. The Federal District Department, for its part, carried out the necessary modifications and extensions to the road systems in order to connect the Villages to the remaining Olympic facilities.

In Munich, The Olympic Construction Company took charge of the projects until the design and planning criteria were clearly defined. Then the jobs were divided among five private construction companies in the city[41]. The Montreal interventions were controlled by the construction trust which was in dispute with the public organisations connected with the projects. With regard to the city council, the Housing Department, the Town Planning Department, the Public Works Department and the Parks Department took part. The Housing Company and the Central Accommodation Company represented the federal government.

In the 80s and 90s, the land management and construction process of Olympic Villages experienced new forms and procedures. Firstly, through the innovation represented by the university locations of Los Angeles and Atlanta, even though the university campuses had already been used on other occasions as Village sub-sites. The Los Angeles case was particularly interesting because, besides the fact that the USC became involved, the multiplicity of private owners severely complicated the securing of the necessary building and urbanisation permission and licences[42]. Secondly, because of the uniqueness of the urban renovation processes developed in Seoul and Barcelona[43].

---

[40] *IOC questionnaire and replies by the Organising Committee for the Mexico Olympic Games*, 1964 (40).

[41] The Münchner Grund Gesellschaft and the Sud Grund Gesellschaft became involved in the Olympic Village building works. In addition, the Working Students' Company was included and carried out a total of 12% of the building works. They also took charge of the pneumatic rubbish collection facilities (Organisations Komitee für die Spiele Der XX Olympiade München 1972, 1974:194).

[42] The negotiations involved the University itself, the Los Angeles Unified School District and several private owners. On the one hand, the radical transformation that had to be carried out in some cases was decisive in terms of the participation of different sections of the city council: town planning, health, public works, transport and real estate (Los Angeles Olympic Organizing Committee, 1985:161).

[43] The land management process of the Poblenou area in Barcelona, where the installation of the Olympic Village had been planned alone involved cooperation between the state railways, the city council, the autonomous government and the former metropolitan government.

Post-Olympic Villages. The Villages after the Games

As from the 60s, organisations like the International Architects' Union, specifically the sports facility working group, and the IAKS, initiated an international debate about Olympic facilities, their character and their relationship with the city as it was. With regard to the Olympic Village, the main conclusion drawn from the various meetings held between 1965 and 1975 was the conviction, manifested by the post-Olympic under-use of Villages as in Tokyo's case, that the Village should fulfil a dual function. It should act as temporary accommodation for athletes during the Games yet thought should be given to the function of its post-Olympic use. Even though the project for the Rome Olympics was considered in these terms, it was not until the Mexico and Munich Games that an international consensus was reached and shared by the IOC that the projects should be thought out bearing in mind the post-Olympic use of the Villages as a determining factor of both design and structure[44].

The consequences of the tensions or the insertion of the Olympic Village into the existing residential fabric of the city can be deduced from the post-Olympic use of the facilities. It is worth mentioning the fact that the Villages that have not been dismantled after the Games, have most commonly been used as social housing. From the 70s and especially in the last decade, the innovation introduced with regard to the type of Olympic Village programmed have also produced a bias towards either university residences or high-quality housing.

A simple typology could give us a clear vision of the process. Villages subsequently used to cover the needs of social housing programmes were the so-called post-war ones: Helsinki and Melbourne. Rome, Mexico and Moscow would also be in this group[45].

The Munich and Montreal Villages inaugurated new formats of post-Olympic use combining student accommodation on the one hand and family accommodation on the other. This was a result of the diversity of elements included in the design process.

The Seoul and Barcelona Villages corresponded to a high-quality housing model, as did the urban renovation operations that they formed part of[46]. The Villages of Los Angeles and Atlanta introduced the ephemeral variant referred to earlier, although in Atlanta, for example, the unit formed by the "Olympic towers" added to the Georgia Tech campus is still used as accommodation for 1,200 students.

Finally, we have the Villages which have dissapeared, as was the case of the pre-fab Village in Los Angeles'32, and subsequently the Tokyo Village, which was first turned into youth hostel first and then demolished.

To finish off, it is worth running through the types of post-Olympic use planned for the Sydney Village. In the official candidature explanation, the design and structure of the Village have been though out along the lines of a residential use aimed at different public, from students to families and senior citizens. On the contrary to "most new suburban developments, which cater for a narrow range of inhabitants" (Sydney Olympics 2000 Bid

---

[44] The IAKS and the IAU were the protagonists at working meetings devoted to these two factors in the Olympic Games. The end result was two manifestos, one for Mexico and the other for Munich, which clearly manifested the programmes of both organisations: giving priority to post-Olympic use on the basis of town planning which sees the sports facility as a means of providing peripheral urban areas with centrality and quality of life. On this matter, see issues 1 and 2 of the magazine "Cahiers Thématique" from 1968, devoted to the VIII Meeting of the Sports and Recreational Facility Working Committee of the IAU, and issues 26 and 29 from 1973 published as thematic material of the Sports and Facilities Working Group of the IAU. Also see the Minutes of the IAU Congress in Varna, 1973, devoted to the debate about the post-Olympic problems of sports buildings.

[45] The post-Olympic process has sometimes been polemic. The Rome Village was characterised by a scandal because construction problems began to appear soon after the Games. A total of 16 builders were taken to court in 1968 and sentenced to 16 months in prison for fraudulent use of building materials. With regard to the Mexico Villages, they ended up being commuter towns, on the outslaurts of the town, dependent on private transport to travel the long distances between the city centre and other urban sectors (Schmitt, 1971: 260 and 261).

[46] In Seoul, the housing had been sold to private developers before the Games were held to offset the cost of the Olympics.

Limited, 1995:20), the Sydney Village originates from a study of the local population to design housing for people with different income levels and life-cycle situations. As far as other facilities being built in the Village are concerned, the international sector will be turned into a business area, whereas the New South Wales Government will retain a percentage of the houses and facilities for permanent use as a sports academy.

Conclusions. From the Soldier's Hut to the Holiday Apartment
As we have seen, the historical and thematic run-through of Olympic Villages throughout this century clearly demonstrates the existence of discontinuity which makes it hard to generalise.

The Olympic Village, in its historical evolution, has gradually changed as a specific item and has also transformed its relationship with the Olympic complex on the one hand and the city on the other.

From the barrack-Village model that characterised the first attempt to build an Olympic Village at the Paris'24 Games to the resort-Village. In other words, the Village was seen as a place not only for board and lodging, but also for rest and for providing health training facilities. With the appearance of certain facilities and services like saunas and gymnasia in this structural change. A change that was already apparent in the Döberitz Village at the Berlin'36 Olympics. The following step was the one towards the hotel-Village model, characterised by not just providing the services for the athletes' necessary board, lodging and facilities services, but also by the fact that the facilities themselves took on a greater degree of importance. A whole set of Villages, from Helsinki'52 onwards fell in line with this model in some way or another, with the exception of the Villages of the 60s, especially in Rome'60 and Mexico'68.

Finally, the definitive model is the "city-Village", and it is characterised by the culmination of the complex process of the Olympic Village initiated in the 30s. The Village does not only fulfil all the functions I have mentioned earlier; it also materially and symbolically turns into a city. The existence of a whole series of "urban" functions like the circulation of different types of traffic, the container installation of different services or the specialisation of diverse territorial areas, has provoked the need for human resources and management plans for a range of inputs that turn out to be almost infinite, as also happens with city management.

It should be said, however, that this four-stage evolution has not been linear, and that the comings and goings have been quite common as mentioned earlier.

On the other hand, the evolution of Olympic Village models corresponds to a parallel evolution, clearly complementary, of the model of athletes as inhabitants of a Village. The classic model of the athletes, with a "spartan" life style changes to a model of the athlete as a tourist.

The Olympic Villages proposed by different candidatures submitted for the year 2000 Olympics are examples of this model of "city-Villages" inhabited by a tourist-athlete. Clearly, it is in the programming of all the urban functions, from residence to leisure and from transport to security, as well as in the considerations of daily life at the Village.

The historical city rebuilt in the Manchester project, the modern city submitted with the continuative character in the Brasilia project, the simulation of the garden-city in the Berlin project or the mythologies of suburban life in the proposals submitted by Beijing and Istanbul, were different visions of the same thing, a territory, an Olympic Village, characterised by being the spatial counterpart of Olympic times, with a post-Olympic use yet with a clear utility during the Games. A utility that surpasses the base material which it obviously involves to be considered it in terms of the symbolic mainstay of the Olympic spectacle.

This is a constant in the evolution of big cities in the western world. The need for spectacle, the great event, the temporary and spatial element of certain requirements of spectacularity. This is the explanation as to why the city had to be spectacularly simulated in the "ephemeral" Villages in Los Angeles and Atlanta, on the basis of atrezzo and decoration. This is also the explanation as to why, as in Los Angeles'32, the Olympic Village nowadays must be the alter ego of the city, like a miniature city where urban identity is exchanged for Olympic identity, urban conflict for community peace and economic production for sports promotion.

Bibliographical references

BAKER, N.,
1994   "The Games that almost weren't: London 1948" in Barney, R.K. and Meier, K.V. (eds.), *Critical reflections on Olympic ideology*. London, Ont. : University of Western Ontario, p.107-116.

BELLIONI, M., G. BRANDIZZI, E. CARBONE,
1982   "Programa di sviluppo degli impianti di base" in *Spaziosport*, 1, p.41-80.

BERGVALL, Rik, (ed.),
1913   *The Official report of the Olympic Games of Stockholm 1912 : the Fifth Olympiad*. Stockholm : Wahlstrom & Widstrand.

BRANDIZZI, G.,
1988   "Architecture and the Games" in *Spaziosport*, 3, p.166-181.

COUBERTIN, Pierre de,
1910   "A Modern Olympia" in *The Olympic Idea Discourses and Essays*, (1966), Köln : Carl Diem Institut, Deutschen Sporthochschule Köln.

CRILLEY, D.,
1993   "Architecture as Advertising: Constructing the image of redevelopment" in KEARNS, G., PHILO, Ch., *Selling Places. The City as Cultural Capital, Past and Present*. Oxford : Pergamon Press, p.231-252.

DITLER-SIMONSEN, M.O.,
1949   "Preparations for the Olympic Winter Games, Oslo 1952" in *Olympic Review*, 16, p.15-16.

FRENCKELL, Erik von,
1949"   About the Olympic Games in 1952" in *Olympic review*, 15, p.30-32.

GNOCCHI RUSCONE, F.,
1982   "Los Angeles: impianti olimpici per il 1984" in *Spaziosport,* 2, p.86-89.

GRESLERY, G.,
1994   "La Ciutat Mundial" in *Visions Urbanes. Europa 1870-1993. La ciutat de l'artista. La ciutat de l'arquitecte*. Barcelona : Centre de Cultura Contemporània de Barcelona, Electa, p.164-166.

KWAAK, Y.,
1988   "Urban Development and Olympic Facilities" in *Spaziosport*, 3, p.130-143.

LUXTON, Lewis,
1952   "Report on the Melbourne Olympic Games, 1956" in *Olympic Review*, 34-35, p.24-25.

LOS ANGELES OLYMPIC ORGANIZING COMMITTEE,
1933   *The Games of the Xth Olympiad Los Angeles 1932 : official report*. Los Angeles : Wolfer Printing Company.

LOS ANGELES OLYMPIC ORGANIZING COMMITTEE,
1985   *Official report of the Games of the XXIIIrd Olympiad Los Angeles, 1984*. Los Angeles : The Committee.

MAGNANO LAMPUGNAMI, V.,
1994   "Ludwig Hilberseimer, naixement d'un arquitecte, 1885-1919" in *Visions Urbanes. Europa 1870-1993. La ciutat de l'artista. La ciutat de l'arquitecte*. Barcelona : Centre de Cultura Contemporània de Barcelona, Electa, p. 300-306.

MILLET, Ll,
1992   "Els Jocs de la ciutat", *Working paper, 46*. Bellaterra : Centre d'Estudis Olímpics i de l'Esport.

NETHERLANDS OLYMPIC COMMITTEE,
1930   *Olympiade Amsterdam 1928 : rapport officiel des Jeux de la IXe Olympiade Amsterdam 1928*. Amsterdam : J.H. Bussy.

ORGANISATIONS KOMITTEE FÜR DIE XI OLYMPIADE 1936,
1936   *The XIth Olympic Games. Official Report*. Berlin : E.V. Wilhem Limpert.

ORGANISATIONS KOMITTEE FÜR DIE SPIELE DER XX OLYMPIADE MÜNCHEN 1972,
1974   *Die Spiele : der offizielle Bericht. The Official Report of the Organising Committee for the Games of the XVth Olympiad*. München : ProSport.

ORGANISING COMMITTEE FOR THE XIV OLYMPIAD LONDON 1948,
1951   *The Official report of the Organizing Committee for the XIV Olympiad*. London : Corquodales & Co.

ORGANISING COMMITTEE FOR THE XV OLYMPIAD HELSINKI 1952,
1955   *The Official report of the XV Olympiad Helsinki 1952*. Pootvo : Werner Soderstrom Osakeyhtio.

ORGANISING COMMITTEE FOR THE XVI OLYMPIAD MELBOURNE 1956,
1953   "Report to the International Olympic Committee by the Organising Committee for the XVIth Olympiad, Melbourne 1956" in *Olympic Review*, 41, p.17-20.

ORGANISING COMMITTEE OF THE XVII OLYMPIAD, (ed.),
1960   *The Games of the XVII Olympiad : Rome, 1960 : the official report of the Organising Committee*. Rome : the Committee.

ORGANISING COMMITTEE OF THE XXII OLYMPIAD, (ed.),
1981   *Games of the XXII Olympiad Moscow 1980. Official Report of the Organising Committee of the Games of the XXII Olympiad*. Moscow : Fizcultura i Sport.

ORGANISING COMMITTEE OF THE GAMES OF THE XVIII OLYMPIAD TOKYO 1964, (ed.),
1966   *The Games of the XVIII Olympiad Tokyo 1964 : official report*. Tokyo : the Committee.

ORGANISING COMMITTEE OF THE GAMES OF THE XXI OLYMPIAD MONTREAL 1976,
1978   *Montreal 1976. Games of the XXI Olympiad Montreal 1976. Official report*. Ottawa : The Committee.

ORTENSI, D.,
1972   "The Olympic Villages and the Gigantism of the Games", in *Revista olímpica*, 56-57, p. 271-280.

RAMIREZ, J.,
1992   "Habitación mínima y expresión máxima. (El inconsciente fílmico en la arquitectura de la costa andaluza)" in Ramírez J., *Arte y arquitectura en la época del capitalismo triunfante*. Madrid : La Balsa de la Medusa.

SCHMIDT, T.,
1986   "La Arquitectura al servicio del deporte. Los estadios olímpicos en Berlín y Los Angeles" in *Revista Olímpica*, 226, p.466-470.

SOLA-MORALES, I.,
1994   "Fer la ciutat, fer l'arquitectura" in *Visions Urbanes. Europa 1870-1993. la Ciutat de l'artista. la ciutat de l'arquitecte*. Barcelona : Centre de Cultura Contemporània de Barcelona, Electa, p.401-410.

STRATTON, R.,
1986   "La Metamorfosis de Seül" in *Revista Olímpica*, 222-223, p.218-222.

STUMP, D.,
1983   "Los Juegos Olímpicos que estuvieron a punto de no serlo" in *Revista Olímpica*, 188, p.375-383.

STUMP, D.,
1990   "1932: El Sueño "imposible" de William May Garland" in Revista Olímpica, 274, p.381-387.

SYDNEY OLYMPICS 2000 BID LIMITED,
1995   *Sydney 2000 : share the spirit.*- Sydney : Sydney Olympics 2000 Bid Limited.- 3 vol.

TATJER, M., COSTA, J.,
1989   "Grups socials, agents urbans: estrategies i conflictes a Ciutat Vella de Barcelona" in *Primeres Jornades Ciutat Vella. Revitalització urbana, econòmica i social.* Barcelona : Ajuntament de Barcelona, p.39-47.

VERDYCH, Alfred, (ed.),
1920   *Rapport officiel des Jeux de la VIIème Olympiade, Anvers 1920.* Brussels : the author.

VV.AA.,
1968   "México y las instalaciones para los Juegos de la XIX Olimpiada" in *Conescal*, 9, p.7- 47.

WIMMER, M.,
1976   *Olympic Buildings.* Leipzig.