

South African Journal for Research in Sport, Physical Education and Recreation, 2017, 39(1:2): 19 - 34.
Suid-Afrikaanse Tydskrif vir Navorsing in Sport, Liggaamlike Opvoedkunde en Ontspanning, 2017, 39(1:2): 19 - 34.
ISBN: 0379-9069

LEGACY, RESOURCE MOBILISATION AND THE OLYMPIC MOVEMENT

Vassil GIRGINOV

Department of Life Sciences, Brunel University, London, United Kingdom

ABSTRACT

There has been a growing interest in legacies of the Olympic Games focusing on external tangible outcomes, such as the number of sport competitions, participants and jobs created. Little is still known about the equally valuable internal benefits to individuals and organisational capacities of national sport systems. While the former tends to explore the contribution of the Games to host cities and countries, the latter is concerned with the role of Olympism in developing sport globally. Using a resource mobilisation approach to social movements, this study examines the powers of the Olympic Movement (OM) to generate resources needed for the advancement of its mission. This ability of the Movement is critical if it is to sustain its relevance to the modern world and to deliver on its stated objectives for social change, as well as to leave any lasting legacies from the Olympic Games.

Keywords: Olympic Movement; Olympic Games legacy; Resources; Social change.

INTRODUCTION

Over the past several years, the field of Olympic studies has been dominated by concerns with Olympic Games legacy. The International Olympic Committee's (IOC, 2016) own bibliography on legacy is 20 pages long and Collins and Girginov's (2015) analysis of Routledge special Olympic issue, involving 174 articles across 23 academic journals from the humanities and social sciences, revealed that 24 of them (14%) were devoted to various aspects of legacies. Yet, despite the dominant position afforded to Olympic legacies in academic and popular discourses, commentators have generally failed to acknowledge the critical link between the Olympic Movement (OM) and its most prominent representation, the Olympic Games. This link is critical for understanding the powers of the Olympics to deliver any transformations at individual, organisational and societal levels, which have become collectively referred to as 'legacy'. This article challenges the current legacy orthodoxy with its preoccupation with the Games as a project and the neglect of Olympism as the ultimate source of legacy and a movement for social change. It offers a developmental approach which recognises the critical role of resource mobilisation capacity of Olympism in inspiring social change in society and in building capacity at different levels. Establishing such understanding of Olympism is necessary for better aligning its mission with the practices of different Games organisers and for sustaining its appeal into the future.

This article proceeds first by analysing Olympism as a social movement for change, it then examines its development aspirations and finally, it takes a resource mobilisation approach to Olympism and outlines the main mechanisms for resource access within the movement.

OLYMPISM AS A SOCIAL MOVEMENT FOR CHANGE

The starting point of this article is the recognition of Olympism as a movement for social reforms. Defining the Olympic Movement (OM) as a social movement is a challenging task because even a cursory glance at its history, philosophy, aims, principles and structure, would suggest that in many ways it both conforms and defies generally accepted formulations. Traditional explanations of the formation of social movements have revolved around grievances and beliefs on the part of a group of people or a society. Competing explanations, such as the resource mobilisation approaches and public interest movements, have emphasised the importance of entrepreneurs who can mobilise wider public support and institutional resources (Jenkins, 1983). For McCarthy and Zald (1977:1217-1218) “a social movement is a set of opinions and beliefs in a population, which represents preferences for changing some elements of the social structure and/or reward distribution of a society”.

Tilly and Wood (2013) offered an understanding of social movements as a synthesis of three elements including:

1. A sustained organised public effort making collective claims on target audiences (*a campaign*);
2. Employment of combination from among the following forms of political action: creation of special purpose associations and coalitions, public meetings, solemn processions, vigils, rallies, demonstrations, petition drives statements to and in public media, and pamphleteering (...the social movement *repertoire*);
3. Participants’ concerted public representations of WUNC: worthiness, unity, numbers and commitment on the part of themselves and/or their constituencies (...WUNC *display*).

For Tilly and Wood (2013), what creates the distinctiveness of a social movement is not a single element but the combination of a campaign, repertoire and WUNC display. Social movements make different kinds of collective claims targeting government policies or socially unacceptable behaviours, while the campaign extends beyond any single event and includes three interrelated parties, namely self-designated claimants, object/s of claim and a target public. Of particular relevance for the current analysis is the observation of Tilly and Wood (2013:3-4) that social movements represent a distinctive form of contentious politics:

...contentious in the sense that social movements involve collective making of claims that, if realized, would conflict with someone else’s interests, politics in the sense that governments of one sort or another figure somehow in the claim making, whether as claimants, objects of claims, allies of the objects, or monitors of the contention.

This explains why various frameworks for studying Olympic Games legacy refer not only to positive but to negative legacies as well including forced displacements, diversion of public investments, environmental degradation, and privileging private over public interests (Dixon

et al., 2011; Preuss, 2015). It is worth noting that the core aspirations of Olympism have always been contingent on public support and state guarantees, thus inevitably they have been operating in the realm of contentious politics.

The Olympic Movement was formally constituted and its mission publically articulated by Pierre de Coubertin in 1894 at the inaugural meeting at the Sorbonne in Paris. Coubertin spent several of the preceding years laying the ground work for this event including researching, writing, proselytising, traveling, negotiating, and mobilising political support (see Georgiadis, 2003 for an extensive analysis on the founding Olympic congress). The formative stages of the OM were concerned chiefly with the organisation of the Olympic Games and establishing them as the pinnacle of world sport. This required their recognition by national athletic associations and the athletes, a process that was successfully completed with the 1908 London and 1912 Stockholm Olympics.

The 1912 Games also marked the transition from Olympic idea to the novel concept of Olympism, which entered the Olympic Charter in 1914. It is instructive, as Müller (2000) pointed out, that with one exception, all Coubertin's writings on the philosophy, history and educational dimensions of Olympism had been published after 1911. It follows that the philosophical underpinnings and concerns of OM have evolved over time, which is evidenced by Coubertin's own interpretations. In answering the question 'what is Olympism' in 1918 Coubertin explained "it is the religion of energy, the cultivation of intense will developed through the practice of many sports, based on proper hygiene and public spiritedness, surrounded with art and thought" (cited in Müller, 2000:156). As Müller (2000:156) observed "in forging the idea of *religio athletae* he brought his movement beyond the educational goal he had set for himself originally". By 1923 Coubertin described his social movement in very certain terms:

Olympism as we have conceived it and seek to organise it, is nothing other than a garden for the cultivation of willpower ... our progress has been too rapid, I might add, if the twofold guarantee of democracy and universality had not been there to support it. This is what ensures the strength of an institution in this day and age. (cited in Da Costa, 2006:68)

The above statement suggests that the focus of the OM has shifted from micro (individual) to macro (society) level where sport was the driving force behind Olympism. As Da Costa (2006) argued, Olympism represents a process philosophy grounded in the Hegelian proposition that reality is constantly in a process of change. Its ultimate objective, according to Brown (1996:127), was to teach the poor how to play sport, which in combination with a powerful normative theory of the beautiful "would empower the lower classes by educating them in the social directives of modernity: universalism, democracy, progress, harmony between people, and harmony between humans and nature".

Olympism was framed as a philosophy of social reform that emphasises the role of sport in world development, international understanding, peaceful co-existence, and social and moral education. Coubertin understood that as physical activity grounded in rule adherence where sport was apparently 'universalisable' - providing a contact point across cultures:

The reform that I am aiming at is not in the interest of grammar or hygiene. It is a *social reform or rather it is the foundation of a new era that I can see coming and which will have no value or force unless it is firmly based on the principles of a completely new type of education.* (emphasis in original, Coubertin, 1936:34)

At the heart of this new type of education were a number of fundamental values and aspirations which form the essence of Olympism: for education, international understanding, equal opportunities, fair and equal competition, cultural expression, independence of sport and personal excellence embodied in the modern Olympic Games. Olympism was a novel project, yet grounded in ancient Greek heritage:

As in ancient times, Olympism is the manifestation of a fundamental dialectic between body and soul, existence and essence, individual and group, and competition and cooperation. By seeking to assuage conflict and enhance harmony, Olympism places sport in the service of an enlightened humanity. (Segrave, 1988:159)

The explicit pursuit of social values is what distinguishes the Olympic Movement and the Olympic Games from all other international sport events and institutions.

Coubertin (1908:110) articulated the rationale for reviving the Olympic Games in the following terms: “the athletic life of modern youth demands the revival of the Olympic Games; and in that conviction I called the revival thinking not merely of France or England, Greece or Italy, but of humanity in general”. Olympism therefore, claims the status of a social, political and educational ideology. Any such ideology necessarily appeals to a philosophical anthropology - an idealised conception of the human being towards which the ideology strives in its attempted social reproduction of the individual. Unlike social anthropology which is concerned with the investigation of whole cultures, that are alien to the researcher’s own society, philosophical anthropology tries to create a theory about human nature by thinking about human beings at the most general level. Writing about the differing political conceptions of sport, Hoberman (1986) pointed out that several levels of explanation and theorising pertinent to different societies’ distinct political anthropologies are possible. They all promote the exemplary citizen by offering complex answers to the fundamental question of philosophical anthropology: ‘What is a human being?’ Thus, from a research point of view, from its inception, Olympism has concerned itself with issues of ontology (the consideration of being) and epistemology (the consideration of knowing).

Olympism was not only original and comprehensive in terms of the scope of social change anticipated, but highly altruistic, optimistic and controversial as well. Since 1894 Olympism aspired to realise its humanistic narrative of placing everywhere “sport at the service of harmonious development of man” (IOC, 2007:11). The results of these aspirations, as the philosophy that underpins them, have been equally controversial and contested. It was only logical to encounter the same controversies with Olympic legacies as exemplified by numerous claims and counterclaims (DCMS, 2013; Holt & Ruta, 2016; Brittain *et al.*, 2017).

The emergence of the Olympic Movement therefore, followed the traditional formation path of social movements in the sense that Coubertin expressed both certain grievances about the deplorable moral and physical state of youth and the state of general education, and a belief in

the constructive educational role of sport in society. But Coubertin was also a social entrepreneur (Chatziefstathiou, 2007) who almost single-handedly established the foundations of the Olympic Movement rather than capturing a prevailing public mood. It would suffice to note that he referred to the members of the International Olympic Committee (IOC) as a “college of disinterested priests” (Coubertin, 1966:99). The construction of Olympism as a movement differs substantially from the typical process of forming sport organisations that emerged at the beginning of the 19th Century. The early sport clubs were a reaction of small-scale informal self-help solidarity groups to the needs of their members for recreational and sport activities. While the English sport emphasised competition, the German Turnen, Russian and Swedish gymnastics movements focused on the overall development of individual (Heinemann, 1999; Vamplew, 2013), but they all commonly exemplified grass-roots social formations for change. The Olympic Movement of 1894, led by the IOC, was designed as a large-scale special purpose top-down organisation.

All social movements subscribe to a certain ideology that both justifies their existence and calls for action. Loland (1995:67-68) neatly summarised the essence of Olympic ideology as a transformative project based on a four-stages progressive logic: first, Olympism builds on a belief in the possibility of cultivating the individual through education of both mind, soul and body; second, if sport could cultivate the individual, it ought to be able as well to cultivate the relation between men in society; third, if sport can develop the individual and society, it should have a cultivating potential in the relationship between societies and nations as well; and finally, Olympism praises the ethos of excess while at the same time prescribes participation in sport and turns into a “new humanistic religion for the 20th Century”. Coubertin also made explicit the democratic nature and the inclusive character of modern sport:

Formerly the practice of sport was the occasional pastime of the rich and idle youth. I have labored for thirty years to make it the habitual pleasure of the lower middle class. It is now necessary for this pleasure to enter the lives of the adolescent proletariat... All forms of sport for everyone; that is no doubt a formula which is going to be criticised as madly utopian, I do not care. I have weighed and examined it for a long time; I know it is accurate and possible. (cited in Loland, 1995:64)

Tilly’s (1978) comprehensive historical analysis of collective actions in the form of social movements supports this broad shift of Olympism from an elitist to an egalitarian project.

The main goal of Olympism appeals to three important conceptions of any social movement including progress (harmonious development of man), the social mechanisms needed to achieve progress (promoting a peaceful society), and education (preservation of human dignity). Coubertin’s view of progress followed Comte’s law of progress according to which society inevitably develops in a positive direction. Simonovic (2004:74) called the Olympic motto *citius, altius, fortius*, the “theory of positivist progress”. Positivism, as MacAloon (1992:14) explained:

... whether classical or neo-, totalizing or compartmentalized in a specific methodological practice, proclaims the existence of a world of universal truth beyond all boundaries of language, nation, ethnicity, culture, class, gender, religion, and history. Socio-political and cultural dimensions of science, according to this view, are conditions or consequences of

scientific practice, never its constitutive essence. The existence of an impersonal, objective, lawful, and universal Nature is said to be the guarantee of this ontology.

Never mind that the Olympic Movement has started increasingly accepting the importance of national culture in interpreting its values (diversity is one of the five key themes of Agenda 2020), the belief in the universalizing powers of sport rooted in a positivist ontology continues to dominate both official discourses and practices. As expressed in the OM strategic document Agenda 2020 (IOC, 2014:3):

For us change has to be more than a cosmetic effect or just a procedure, change has to have a goal. And this goal is progress. Progress for us means strengthening sport in society by virtue of our values.

Another defining feature of positivism is its belief in causality and human ability to predict and control the future. The framing of various legacy visions bears the hallmark of positivism in that they purport a positive causal relationship between hosting the Games and the occurrence of certain benefits to local communities and the country as a whole.

Closely related to Coubertin's notion of progress is his idea of how this progress should be achieved. The task of spreading Olympism globally was delegated to a dedicated network of organisations in the form of National Olympic Committees (NOC) which at the beginning of the 21st Century vary vastly in terms of their level of formalisation, staffing, resources and capabilities. McCarthy and Zald (1977:1218) defined a Social Movement Organisation (SMO) as "a complex, or formal, organisation which identifies its goals with the preferences of a social movement or a countermovement, and attempts to implement those goals".

Since IOC's establishment in 1894, the range of SMO that have joined the Olympic Movement has expanded greatly starting with the first permanent NOC of Germany in 1904. As of 2017, in addition to 205 NOC, those SMOs include 35 recognised International Federations (IF) on the Olympic programme and over 60 other sport, education, media and other organisations, as well as a myriad of national and local sport organisations. To be formally recognised as a member of the Olympic Movement, an organisation ought to accept and to comply with the Olympic Charter (IOC, 2015). In their totality, all SMOs that have as their goal the attainment of the broader aims of the Olympic Movement constitute a social movement industry (SMI) (McCarthy & Zald, 1977).

Critics of the Olympic Movement questioned its fundamental principles and the very notion that sport constitutes a movement. Some commentators see Olympism as an anachronism in today's commercial and professional world of top level sport and as an industry promoting global capitalism (Lenskyj, 2008; Shaw, 2008) led by an organisation (IOC) that subscribes to "amoral universalism" which "... strives for global participation at all costs, even sacrificing rudimentary moral standards" (Hoberman, 1986:2). Furthermore, it has been claimed that the fundamental principles of Olympism provide little action-guiding force, and the movement has been plagued with inconsistencies and contradictions that have reduced its value as a system of ideas (Boycoff, 2014).

For Harvey *et al.* (2014:9), the presence of a mission, values, structures and strategies, has not been sufficient and analytically helpful to classify sport as a social movement. They argued that:

... such a broad and inclusive definition is too imprecise to help understand the differences between movements that have a progressive social agenda and those that do not, which includes several so-called 'movements' within sport. ... rather than positioning sport itself as a social movement, it is more accurate to state that sport has often had a connection to social movements and social movements have influenced sport.

While Harvey *et al.* (2014) make a valid point and went on to offer a blended model of analysis of sport, the history of the Olympic Movement clearly suggests that for over 100 years it has made consistent efforts to advance its progressive social agenda. A number of old and more recent socio-economic developments and several critical events have been responsible for shaping this agenda. These include, among others, establishing the Olympic Solidarity programme in 1962 designed to promote sport in less well-off countries; abandoning the concept of amateurism in sport at the Baden-Baden Congress in 1981 that open the gates to commercialism; creating the first global sponsorship programme (TOP) in 1985 ensuring a steady source of revenue; adopting the principles of sustainability in 1999 (Agenda 21), thus aligning Olympic Movement with a global political agenda; the Salt Lake City Games bribery scandal (2002) prompting a greater democratisation of the IOC; and developing Agenda 2020 strategic vision (2014) promoting a greater role of strategic partnerships and appreciation of diversity. More specifically, since the late 1990s, the Olympic Movement agenda has taken a much more coherent form ensuring a greater alignment between strategic visions and actions. The Olympic Movement has always represented an organised form for the pursuit of broader social objectives and has clearly engaged within a rational framework requiring a significant amount of prior work and coordination of a range of diverse national and international actors.

DEVELOPMENTAL ASPIRATIONS OF OLYMPISM

The *raison d'être* of social movements is their explicit concern with seeking to remedy or alter some problematic issue. The Olympic Charter expresses that "The goal of Olympism is to place sport at the service of the harmonious development of man, with a view to promoting a peaceful society concerned with the preservation of human dignity" (IOC, 2015:13). It further spells out this broad goal into 16 specific actionable areas/activities that fully satisfy Tilly and Wood's (2013) three main defining characteristics of social movements. First, the Olympic Movement advocates the need for an organised public effort and makes claims for its authority in promoting ethical sport and educating youth, as well as supporting the development of sport (a campaign). Second, it ensures the regular celebration of the Summer and Winter Olympic Games, and cooperation with public authorities and private organisations in placing sport at the service of harmonious development of man and peace (performances). Finally, the Olympic movement pledges to take actions to strengthen its unity and to protect the independence of sport (a concerted display of Worthiness, Unity, Numbers and Commitment). It is worth remembering that unity in diversity is a leading theme of Agenda 2020 (IOC, 2014).

It follows that directed action is contingent on identification of causality, blame and responsibility, and has a clear attributional component. It is at this junction where the concept of development intersects with Olympism as a movement. The concept of development was first conceived in the European context as a state practice and a corollary of the notion of progress and the capitalist accumulation of wealth (Girginov, 2008). Developmental ideas reflected two conflicting approaches - one which saw development as closely linked to progress (Inglehart, 1997) and the other one, which perceived development radiating from the limitations of progress (Cowen & Shenton, 1996). The nineteenth century marked the beginning of *intentional* development concerned with the deliberate policy and actions of the state and other agencies, which were expressed in various developmental doctrines. Olympism was an example of intentional development in the field of sport and moral education. The visions promoted by these doctrines were rooted in the normalising practices of the modern state and its efforts to produce disciplined citizens, soldiers, leaders and governable subjects. Sport has always played a major part in those state-building activities (Black & Nauright, 1998; Mangan, 2000). In the introduction to the 2016-2021 national sport strategy, the UK Sports Minister Tracey Crouch wrote:

Sport in this country runs broader and more deeply than the legacy of London 2012, though. It can have an impact on almost every aspect of everyone's life and it is this potential that we in Government, along with Sport England and the sport sector, will seek to achieve. Working together we can fulfil the ambition of a truly active nation. (DCMS, 2016:4)

Olympic and general sport discourses possess power generating capacities. Using Foucault's notion of four type of technologies of governability (of production, sign systems, power and the self), Chatziefstathiou and Henry (2012:250) argued:

Olympism, in effect operates as a source of governability in a post-colonial, neo-liberal context...Olympism generates technologies of power... as well as technologies of self, in which Olympism, as an overall philosophy of behaviour, of how to proceed in life, provides a set of values, principles, behaviours which both instantiate and legitimise power from micro inter-personal context, through meso-level contexts (the world of sport or the Olympic world), to the macro (societal) levels.

In this vein, Clammer (2005:107) explained "development does not float above or outside discourse: it is a specific language game that, like, say, theological language, has attempted to define its specific discursive strategies as privileged, while in fact being as much subject to deconstruction as any other world view". Olympism is also a specific language which uses a wide range of labels to indicate which sports are Olympic and non-Olympic, what parts of the world are "developed" or "underdeveloped" and which sports organisations are "rich" and "poor". The IOC Olympic Solidarity (IOC, 2005:4) mission is to "provide support to the poorest NOCs to fulfil the ideals of the Olympic Movement". These categorisations have massive implications for the public standing, promotion and funding of National Governing Bodies of sport (NGB), the course of sports development and people's experiences. Thus, in pursuing its mission, the Olympic Movement has employed a combination of means including ideology, organisation and performances in order to enhance the organisational capabilities of national sport systems as a whole.

For the first 70 years of its existence, until 1960s, the Olympic Movement's role has been largely confined to proselytising and advocacy activities. Despite rhetoric to the contrary, as Coubertin's writings and the Olympic Congress debates testify, the main concern of the Movement has been the regular celebration of the Olympic Games (Lekarska, 1984; Müller, 2000). But staging the Games is only one element of its three-fold mission, which also includes educating public through sport and promoting Olympism in society. The criticism levied on the Olympic Movement for the lack of concreteness has been justified for the most part of its history.

However, from the beginning of the 2000s general lofty statements for peace, harmony and human dignity started gradually to give way to more concrete promises and tangible deliverables as articulated in various legacy visions. As evidenced by Agenda 2020, the IOC has been making explicit efforts to place sport on the global political, social and economic agendas. In order to achieve this objective, it has endeavoured to keep Olympism alive 365 days a year through the Olympism in Action programme (IOC, 2013) including a range of global initiatives in these three mission areas and their main impacts. The quadrennial report (2009-2012) of the IOC (2013) provides evidence for a greater level of concreteness in using sport for building legacies in seven core areas including Sport for All, development through sport, peace through sport, women and sport, education through sport, sport and environment, and culture and sport. For example, in the field of Sport for All, IOC provides strong advocacy, knowledge sharing through bi-annual conferences and tool kits, financial assistance to communities and programmes. In the environmental domain, the IOC has subjected all its operations to the highest environmental standards and has also made compliance with the ISO20121 event management sustainability standard, developed by the 2012 London Games organisers, a compulsory requirement for all bid cities and Games organisers.

The Olympic Charter, IOC annual reports and Agenda 2020 suggest that the delivery of any legacy through sport entails entering into a range of policy domains – from culture to the environment and education – and working with a multitude of agencies. The global consultation exercise, undertaken by the IOC in preparation of Olympic Movement's strategy Agenda 2020, reveals a vast array of stakeholders and ideas. In total, 43,500 submissions were made of which 43% came from the core members of the Olympic Movement (IOC, NOC, IF) and 10% from academic community. Good governance, Olympism in action, and sustainability and legacy were the fourth, fifth and eighth most discussed topics with 75, 70 and 60 contributions each respectively (IOC, 2014). The next section addresses the resource mobilisation powers of the Olympic Movement.

UNPACKING RESOURCE MOBILISATION POWERS OF OLYMPIC MOVEMENT

The analysis follows the premises of the Resource Mobilisation Theory (RMT), as one of the main approaches for analysing social movements. As McCarthy and Zald (1977:1213), one of its leading proponents, explained:

The resource mobilisation approach emphasizes both societal support and constraint of social movement phenomena. It examines the variety of resources that must be mobilized, the

linkages of social movements to other groups, the dependence of movements on external support for success, and the tactics used by authorities to control or incorporate movements.

The RMT is concerned with addressing the three core questions of participation (why people do or do not participate in movements), organisation (what is the difference between the organisations that make the movement possible and those that provide the resources for it), and political success (what are the chances of making political impact). This led Chesters and Welsh (2011:8) to observe that the RMT places the emphasis on how social movements mobilise “resource mobilization theorists shifted the emphasis of movement analysis away from structural factors and towards organisational questions”.

The RMT sees social movements as extensions of institutionalised actions concerned with institutional change aimed at altering elements of existing social structures. In this regard, Coubertin’s (1936:34) views are very instructive for understanding Olympism as institutionalised actions aimed not just at a social reform but rather laying:

... the foundation of a new era that I can see coming and which will have no value or force unless it is firmly based on the principles of a completely new type of education (emphasis in original). Moreover, he wanted to “buttress the structure of general education” which ideas “tended to throw young people off balance by submitting them to the yoke of lacklustre, complicated pedagogy, of morality that alternated between clumsy indulgence and unwise severity, of a philosophy unsure of itself and mean-minded. (cited in Callebat, 1998:3)

Jenkins (1983:529) further elaborated that “institutional change movements tend to conform to the basic resource mobilisation model: rational actions oriented towards clearly defined, fixed goals with centralized organizational control over resources and clearly demarcated outcomes that can be evaluated in terms of tangible gains”. As the analysis below demonstrates, the Olympic Movement fits this model rather well.

Despite reservations about the relevance of RMT today (Jasper, 2010), it still offers a powerful lens for examining Olympism as a movement for social reform. This is because it accounts for both structural factors and organisational questions, and offers the foundations out of which grew the theoretical approach of ‘contentious politics’ as articulated mainly in the work of Charles Tilly. The contentious politics school defines social movements as “the rational behaviour of collective actors attempting to establish themselves at the level of the political system, maintaining this position and extending their influence by mobilizing all sorts of resources including, if necessary, violence” (Wieviorka, 2005:1, cited in Harvey *et al.*, 2014). The ideological evolution and practical activities of Olympic Movement provide ample evidence for fitting this description minus, of course, the violence part.

The relevance of the RMT and the contentious politics approach for the study of Olympic Movement can be summarised in six points. First, unquestionably, sport enjoys almost universal societal support as it has been recognised as a fundamental human right, and is practiced regularly by millions of people around the world (UN, 2015). This support, however, is not unconditional and depends on a number of political, cultural and economic constraints, and turns sport into contentious politics. Second, the RMT acknowledges the importance not only of material resources, but also of cultural, emotional and ideological ones, which represent

the symbolic power of Olympism. Third, it recognises the importance of forging links with external actors in advancing its agenda, including public and non-governmental organisations and other social movements. Fourth, the Olympic Movement acknowledges its dependence on external resources, such as broadcasting and sponsorship fees that account for 47% and 45% of its global revenue respectively (IOC, 2017). Fifth, RMT appreciates the position of the Olympic Movement *vis-a-vis* the state, which suggests that the state should support sport, yet sport ought to enjoy a high degree of autonomy, a political position that makes up for a contentious relationship. Finally, the RMT's emphasis on how social movements mobilise is politically relevant, because after the WW2 in particular virtually all governments and international governmental organisations (UN, UNESCO, WHO) have explicitly recognised the benefits of sport and its value for societies.

Tilly and Wood's (2013) definition of social movements as a synthesis of three elements including (i) an organised public effort put forward in order to stake a variety of claims on specific, targeted forms of authority (a campaign); (ii) the use of different forms of political action (performances); and (iii) and a concerted display of Worthiness, Unity, Numbers and Commitment (WUNC), allows scrutinising the global activities of Olympic Movement in generating the resources need for advancing its mission. The main claims of Olympism concerned with promoting education, international understanding, equal opportunities, fair competition, cultural expression, independence of sport and personal excellence would entail different forms of partnerships, resource mobilisation strategies and practical actions for their attainment.

The Olympic Movement has developed a broad repertoire of political actions in all major policy domains including sport, education, health, environment, law, labour, media, and intellectual property regulation. The public action repertoire of OM is diverse and can be summarised in seven categories pertinent to these main policy domains. The first category of Olympic public action concerns knowledge production and dissemination and includes giving research grants, producing a vast range of literature for general public, NOC, IF, IOC partners (media, sponsors) and Games organisers (Olympic Games Knowledge Management- OGKM).

The second category involves advocacy through various position statements (child abuse in sport, preventing injuries), and public campaigns endorsed by political figures and celebrities (Celebrate Humanity). Legal actions through the World Anti-Doping Agency (WADA) and the Court of Arbitration in Sport (CAS), as well as the Games host city contract, represent the third category. The fourth category involves sport-consumption which traditionally has been promoted through participation in sport (active consumption), sales of Olympic merchandise, and more recently through the launch of the Olympic TV Channel (passive consumption). The fifth category of public action is forging links with inter-governmental organisations and commercial partners, such as the TOP sponsors and broadcasters. Sixth, the OM has undertaken a number of organisational actions designed to improve its internal governance and effectiveness. Finally, regular public celebrations such as staging the Olympics and the Torch relay constitute the most visible form of public action.

The RMT recognises the uneven distribution of resources in society and the need to pay close attention not only to resource availability, but how these can be accessed as well. Edwards and Gillham (2013:3-4) noted the varied nature of resources needed by social movements that go beyond the traditional material and human resources. They suggested a useful typology of resources including moral, cultural, socio-organisational, human and material. Moral resources include legitimacy, integrity, solidarity support, sympathetic support, and celebrity; cultural resources are artefacts and cultural products, such as conceptual tools and specialised tacit knowledge about how to accomplish specific; social-organisational resources concern infrastructures, social networks and organisations; human resources include labour, experience, skills, expertise and leadership; and material resources combine financial and physical capital including monetary resources, property, office space, equipment and supplies.

Edwards and Gillham (2013) also proposed four main mechanisms of resource access including self-production, aggregation, co-optation and patronage. Self-production is the most basic and obvious mechanism for resource production through participants, organisations and their activities. The Olympic Movement has been able to generate a range of material, human and symbolic resources in the form of networks of organisations and people (NOC, coaches, administrators), knowledge and skills development, sales of literature and merchandise. The aggregation mechanism of access refers to “to the ways a movement or specific SMO converts resources held by dispersed individuals into collective resources that can be allocated by movement actors” (Edwards & Gillham, 2013:2). Within the Olympic context, human and monetary resources are aggregated through soliciting donations by various individuals and corporations, as in the case of building the Olympic Museum in Lausanne, and in acquiring the private archives and items of prominent Olympic figures and athletes.

This mechanism also allows generating moral resources when, for example celebrities and politicians endorse the mission of Olympic Movement, as demonstrated through the ‘Celebrate Humanity’ marketing campaign (see Giardina *et al.*, 2012 and Maguire *et al.*, 2008 for an analysis). Co-optation involves tapping into resources that have been produced by existing organisations with which the Olympic Movement have relationships. These include for example, utilising the global political and communication resources of the United Nations (UN), UNESCO, TAFISA (The Association for International Sport for All), broadcasters and global and national commercial partners in promoting Olympic values and certain programmes.

Finally, the patronage mechanism of resource access concerns the financial support provided by an external organisation that typically specialises in patronage of good causes, and which may in return obtain influence over the activities of the recipient. This is not the most utilised mechanism within the Olympic Movement but there are examples of patronage by various legacy trusts and educational foundations over various Olympic programmes at international and national levels. Table 1 shows the relationship between the main forms of public action and the types of mechanism for resource access they provide.

The IOC promotes a range of programmes focused at developing specific capabilities of NOCs and their personnel and athletes. The main developmental programme of the Olympic

Movement is Olympic Solidarity (OS). As Henry and Cuschieri (2014:1709) explicated, “The primary function of OS is to manifest solidarity between developed (in sporting and in economic terms) and developing nations, within the Olympic Movement through a progressive distribution of funds”.

Table 1. MAIN FORMS AND EXAMPLES OF PUBLIC ACTION PERTINENT TO OLYMPIC MOVEMENT AND MECHANISM OF ACCESS

Forms of public action	Examples	Mechanism of access
Knowledge dissemination	Research grants, bibliographies, statistics, technical manuals, archives, public forums, tool kits, training courses, OVEP, OGKM	Self-production; Co-optation
Advocacy	Position statements, NOC capacity building, scholarships	Self-production; Aggregation
Legal actions	WADA, CAS, Host city contract, national Olympic legislations	Self-production; Co-optation
Sport consumption	Olympic Channel, merchandise, participation in sport	Self-production; Co-optation
Links with inter-governmental organisations and businesses	UN, WHO, EU, UNEP, TOP sponsors, Broadcasters	Co-optation; Patronage
Public celebrations	Olympic Games, Youth Olympic Games, Olympic Day, Congresses, Torch relay	Self-production; Co-optation; Patronage
Internal strategies	Good governance, ISO20121 sustainability framework	Self-production; Co-optation

To this end, OS will distribute over \$509 million for the 2017-2020 quadrennial which represents a 240% increase in comparison to \$209 million for its 2001-2004 distribution cycle (IOC, 2017). The OS funds represent more than a financial resource, as they enable members of the Olympic Movement to use them in gaining access to moral, cultural and socio-organisational resources as well. The four types of resources within the Olympic Movement exist in a mutually constructive relationship where one type of resource helps the production of others.

CONCLUSIONS

The conceptualisation of Olympism as a social movement combining claims, a repertoire of public actions and displays of worthiness and unity allows identifying some of its critical aspirations, partners and mechanisms for advancing its mission. The RMT acknowledges the importance of both material and symbolic powers of Olympism, its dependence on external resources, as well as independence *vis-a-vis* the state. On a practical level, this conceptualisation offers an important insight into the resource mobilisation power of Olympic Movement that can be utilised in sustaining and delivering on its claims. From this perspective, the Olympic Games legacy represents a contextual microcosm that is representative of the global political actions of the Olympic Movement. As MacAloon (2002:271) rightfully observed, “the Games are first and foremost accumulated cultural capital, which political, commercial, social, and sports actors have been permitted to invest in their own local projects”. Hosting an Olympic Games, therefore, becomes an exercise in interpretation of an intervention stratagem that is Olympic ideology, and the legacies they leave reflect various stakeholders’ visions and actions. This is what brings Olympism and legacies into the realm of contentious politics.

REFERENCES

- BLACK, D. & NAURIGHT, J. (1988). *Rugby and the South African Nation*. Glasgow, UK: Manchester University Press.
- BOYCOFF, J. (2014). *Celebration capitalism and the Olympic Games*. London, UK: Routledge.
- BRITAIN, I.; BOCARRO, J. & BYERS, T. (Eds.) (2017). *Olympic Legacy: Fairy tales or reality*. London, UK: Routledge.
- BROWN, D.A. (1996). Pierre de Coubertin's Olympic exploration of modernism, 1894-1914: Aesthetics, ideology and the spectacle. *Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport*, 67(2): 121-135.
- CALLEBATT, L. (1998). The modern Olympic Games and their model in antiquity. *International Journal of the Classical Tradition*, 4(4): 555-567.
- CHATZIEFSTATHIOU, D. (2007). The history of marketing an idea: The example of Baron Pierre de Coubertin as a social marketer. *European Sport Management Quarterly*, 7(1): 55-80.
- CHATZIEFSTATHIOU, D. & HENRY, I.P. (2012). *Discourses of Olympism: From the Sorbonne 1894 to London 2012*. Basingstoke, Hampshire, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.
- CHESTERS, G. & WELSH, I. (2011). *Social movements: The key concepts*. London, UK: Routledge.
- CLAMMER, J., (2005). Culture, development, and social theory: On cultural studies and the place of culture in development. *The Asia Pacific Journal of Anthropology*, 6(2): 100-119.
- COLLINS, M. & GIRGINOV, V. (2015). Rehashing and new knowledge about the games: A bibliometric analysis and assessment of Routledge's special Olympic journals issues. In G. Poynter, V. Viehoff, Y. Li (Eds.), *The London Olympics and urban development: The mega-event city* (pp. 82-98). London, UK: Routledge.
- COUBERTIN, P. (1908). Why I revived the Olympic Games? *Fortnightly Review*, 84(July): 110-115.
- COUBERTIN, P. (1936). The unfinished symphony. *Olympic Review*, 99-100(January-February): 32-34.
- COUBERTIN, P. (1966). *The Olympic idea: Discourses and essays*. Stuttgart, Germany: Olympischer Sport-Verlag.
- COUBERTIN, P. (1977). The Congress (Lausanne 1913). *Olympic Review*, 120(October): 629-633.

- COWEN, M. & SHENTON, R. (1996). *Doctrines of development*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- DA COSTA, L. (2006). A never-ending story: The philosophical controversy over Olympism. *Journal of the Philosophy of Sport*, 33(2): 157-173.
- EDWARDS, B. & GILLHAM, P. (2013). Resource mobilization theory. In D.A. Snow, D. Della Porta, B. Klandermans & D. McAdam (Eds.), *The Wiley-Blackwell encyclopedia of social and political movements* (pp. 1096-1101). Oxford, UK: Blackwell Publishing.
- DCMS (Department for Culture, Media & Sport) (2013). *Report 5: Post-Games Evaluation. Meta-Evaluation of the Impacts and Legacy of the London 2012 Olympic Games and Paralympic Games: Summary Report*. London, UK: DCMS.
- DCMS (Department for Culture, Media & Sport) (2016). *Sporting future: Towards an active nation strategy*. London, UK: DCMS.
- DIXON, T.; BENSON, A. & BLACKMAN, D. (2011). Developing a framework for evaluating Olympic and Paralympic legacies. *Journal of Sport & Tourism*, 16(4): 285-302.
- GEORGIADIS, K. (2003). *Olympic revival*. Athens, Greece: Ekdotike Athenon.
- GIARDINA, M.; METZ, J. & BUNDS, K. (2012). Celebrate humanity: Cultural citizenship and the global branding of 'multiculturalism'. In H. Lenskjy (Ed.), *The Palgrave Handbook of Olympic Studies* (pp. 337-357). Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave.
- GIRGINOV, V. (2008). Managing visions, changes and delivery in sports development: Summary and prospects. In V. Girginov (Ed.), *Management of sports development* (pp. 277-284). Oxford, UK: Elsevier.
- HARVEY, J.; HORNE, J. & SAFAI, P. (2014). *Sport and social movements: From the local to the global*. London, UK: Bloomsbury.
- HEINEMANN, K. (Ed.). (1999). *Sport clubs in various European countries* (Vol. 1). Cologne, Germany: Hoffman Verlag.
- HENRY, I. & CUSCHIERI, M. (2014). Olympic engagement and the use of Olympic solidarity programmes by Gulf Cooperation Council States. *The International Journal of the History of Sport*, 31(14): 1707-1723.
- HOLT, R. & RUTA, D. (Eds.). (2016). *Routledge handbook of sport and legacy*. London: Routledge.
- HOBERMAN, J.M. (1986). *The Olympic crisis: Sport, politics and the moral order*. New York, NY: Aristide D. Caratzas.
- INGLEHART, R. (1997). *Modernization and post-modernization: Cultural, economic and political change in 45 Societies*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- IOC (International Olympic Committee) (2005). *IOC principles and strategy for capacity building*. Lausanne, Switzerland: IOC.
- IOC (International Olympic Committee) (2007). *Olympic Charter*. Lausanne, Switzerland: IOC.
- IOC (International Olympic Committee) (2013). *Building legacies through sport: IOC Quadrennial Report 2009-2012*. Lausanne, Switzerland: IOC.
- IOC (International Olympic Committee) (2014). *Agenda 2020: Recommendations*. Lausanne, Switzerland: IOC.
- IOC (International Olympic Committee) (2015). *Olympic Charter*. Lausanne, Switzerland: IOC.
- IOC (International Olympic Committee) (2016). *Olympic Games: Legacies and impacts (2015)*. Bibliography. Lausanne, Switzerland: IOC.
- IOC (International Olympic Committee) (2017). *Revenue sources and distribution*. Hyperlink: [<https://www.olympic.org/ioc-financing-revenue-sources-distribution>]. Retrieved on 1 April 2017.

- JASPER, J. (2010). Social movement theory today: Toward a theory of action? *Sociology Compass*, 4(11): 965-976.
- JENKINS, C. (1983). Resource mobilization theory and the study of social movements. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 9(1): 527-553.
- LEKARSKA, N. (1984). *Tenth and Eleventh Olympic congresses*. Sofia, Bulgaria: Sofia Press.
- LENSKYJ, H. (2008). Olympic impacts on bid and host cities. In *Olympic industry resistance: Challenging Olympic power and propaganda* (pp. 31-49). SUNY series. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- LOLAND, S. (1995). Pierre de Coubertin's ideology of Olympism from the perspective of the history of ideas. *Olympika: The International Journal of Olympic Studies*, IV: 49-77.
- MACALOON, J. (1992). Sport, science, and intercultural relations: Reflections on recent trends in Olympic Scientific Meetings. *Olympika: The International Journal of Olympic Studies*, I: 1-28.
- MACALOON, J. (2002). Cultural legacy: The Olympic Games as 'World Cultural Property'. In M. De Moragas, C. Kennett & N. Puig (Eds.), *The legacy of the Olympic Games 1984-2000* (pp. 271-278). Lausanne, Switzerland: International Olympic Committee.
- MCCARTHY, J.D. & ZALD, M.N. (1977). Resource mobilization and social movements: A partial theory. *American Journal of Sociology*, 82(6): 1212-1241.
- MAGUIRE, J.; BARNARD, S.; BUTLER, K. & GOLDING, P. (2008). 'Celebrate humanity' or 'consumerism': A critical evaluation of a brand in motion. *Social Identities*, 14(1): 63-76.
- MANGAN, J.A. (2000). Making European masculinities: Sport, Europe, gender. In A. Mangan (Ed.), *The European sports history review, Volume 2* (p. 201). London, UK: Frank Cass.
- MÜLLER, N. (2000). Coubertin's Olympism. In N. Müller (Ed.), *Pierre de Coubertin 1863-1937, Olympism – Selected writings* (pp.33-48). Lausanne, Switzerland: IOC.
- PREUSS, H. (2015). A framework for identifying the legacies of a mega sport event. *Leisure Studies*, 34(6): 627-642.
- SEGRAVE, J. (1988). Towards a definition of Olympism. In J. Segrave & D. Chu (Eds.), *The Olympic Games in Transition* (pp. 149-161). Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.
- SHAW, C.A. (2008). *Five ring circus: Myths and realities of the Olympic Games*. London, UK: New Society.
- SIMONOVIC, L. (2004). *Philosophy of Olympism*. Belgrade, Serbia: Dereta.
- TILLY, C. (1978). *From mobilization to revolution*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- TILLY, C. & WOOD, L. (2013). *Social movements 1768-2012* (3rd ed.). London, UK: Paradigm Publishers.
- UN (United Nations) (2005). *Millennium development goals*. New York, NY: UN.
- VAMPLEW, W. (2013). Theories and typologies: A historical exploration of the sports club in Britain, *The International Journal of the History of Sport*, 30(14): 1569-1585.

Corresponding author: Vassil Girginov; **E-mail:** vassil.girginov@brunel.ac.uk