The Olympic Movement and the Development of Global Citizenship Education Policy

Report prepared by:

Dr. Simon C. Darnell
Lecturer – Sport, Exercise and Physical Activity Program
School of Applied Social Sciences
Durham University, UK

For submission to:

Postgraduate Research Grant Program
Olympic Studies Centre
Lausanne, Switzerland
March 2013

I. Abstract

The research reported here is concerned with the concept of 'global citizenship' and the role of the International Olympic Committee and Olympic Movement in promoting or advocating for global citizenship, particularly among young people. Global citizenship refers to the idea that people can now be understood to be citizens of the world, with global rights but also obligations to the common good (Dower, 2003). Through an analysis of archival documents dating back to the late 1960's, the Olympic Movement's burgeoning interest in global citizenship is described and analyzed, particularly as constituted within 20th Century forces of globalization and de-colonization. In turn, an analysis is offered of current articulations of global citizenship for youth within the Olympic Movement with a focus on the recently introduced Youth Olympic Games. The conclusion compares these activities against an ideal type of global citizenship described by Cabrera (2010), in order to argue that a fully formed global citizenship within the Olympic Movement would extend beyond cosmopolitanism. Instead, full commitment to global citizenship within the Olympic Movement would mean mobilizing and educating youth into action as well as further institutionalizing opportunities for young people to act as citizens of the entire world.

II. Report

- Research subject and objectives

The research reported here is concerned with the concept of 'global citizenship' and the role of the International Olympic Committee and Olympic Movement in promoting or advocating for global citizenship, particularly among young people. Global citizenship refers to the idea that people can now be understood to be citizens of the world, with global rights but also obligations to the common good (Dower, 2003). Policies like *Olympism in Action*, programs like the *Olympic Values Education Program*, facilities like the *Olympic Youth Development Centres* and events like the *Youth Olympic Games* can all be considered examples of global citizenship within the Olympic Movement given that they support opportunities for the development of 'an enhanced civic sense and a renewed practice of citizenship' (Albala Bertrand, 1995, p. 4).[i] This notion of global citizenship rests on four content dimensions or principles – human rights, democracy, development and peace – and global citizenship education generally seeks to help young people acquire the skills necessary to act on each dimension in positive ways.

Connecting the Olympic Movement to global citizenship requires understanding that sport as a dimension of culture is an important, though often under analysed, feature of citizenship. While the terms and structures of citizenship and rights have traditionally been limited to the civil, political, and social spheres, Roche (2002) has drawn attention to cultural citizenship, concerned with identities, meanings, expression and information particularly within the fields of education, communication, media and leisure. From this perspective, the history, politics and organization of sport have implications for citizenship, and the Olympic Movement – the 'pre-eminent international cultural movement in global society' in the 21st century (Roche, 2002, p. 165) – is implicated in serving to define, promote and advance particular forms of citizenship practice.

Roche (2002) has shown that the Olympic Movement's support for cultural citizenship on a global scale has tended to draw from two concepts: Universal Human Rights, and Corporate Social Responsibility. Emerging patterns and forces of globalization in the late 20th century highlighted the challenges of securing universal human rights and also saw the emergence of a global civil society that the IOC embraced through its support for citizenship education. Thus, Olympic related policies around citizenship are not just about training or educating young people to be global citizens but also illustrative of efforts to promote the Olympic Movement itself as a responsible global force evidenced by and through what it does for youth around the world.

There are, then, three distinct yet overlapping forms of global citizenship practice that connect to, and are promoted by and within, the Olympic Movement:

- Activities that attempt to make a positive contribution globally and solidify the standing of the International Olympic Committee (IOC) as a responsible civil society organization and good corporate citizen, exemplified by efforts like the *Olympic Truce;*
- The promotion within the Olympic Movement of securing access to sport participation as a cultural human right, particularly for youth, exemplified by the *Olympic Youth Development Centre*s, *Sports for Hope*, and various elements of *Olympism in Action*;
- The education of youth as global citizens and future leaders, exemplified by the *Olympic Values Education Program*, the *Youth Olympic Games*, and the *Olympic Youth Camps*.

All three of these categories are important and relevant to the overall understanding of the Olympic Movement as it connects to global citizenship and all three informed this research project to a degree. However, given the ultimately limited scope of this study, the results reported here are principally concerned with the third of the forms listed above.

To direct the analysis, the study employs as a guiding framework Luis Cabrera's (2010) recent theoretical contribution to the burgeoning notion of global citizenship. For Cabrera, global citizenship is best conceptualized as the fully realized form of cosmopolitanism. Cosmopolitanism submits that the morally primary entity in contemporary life is the individual, as opposed to the state. The global citizenship framework laid out by Cabrera (2010, p. 19) builds on cosmopolitanism to argue that cosmopolitan individuals are "…responsible to each other in community, both for answering challenges to perceived exclusions, and for justifying decisions that could lead to exclusions." From this perspective, adopting the notion of global citizenship serves to hold the individual freedoms of cosmopolitanism to account by not just requiring, but indeed institutionalizing, the actions of citizens as fundamentally responsible to others on a global scale.

There are three types of duties then, which are deemed necessary or requisite within a fully integrated global system of citizenship according to Cabrera (2010, p. 71). These are: contribution duties, or the duty to contribute one's fair share to the global good; accommodation duties, or the duty to tender value, respect and recognition to others who may not share one's own state citizenship and make allowance for their claims to and acts of citizenship; and advocacy duties, or the duty to support and agitate for the protection and realization of rights of others. Taken together, an exemplary global citizen is one who would:

1) Contribute to the public good;
2) Communicate respect for non-compatriots, and;
3) Actively take part in supporting others whose rights may have been restricted (Cabrera, 2010, p. 72).

This theoretical global citizen would benefit from the activities of fellow citizens who work to secure his/her rights and simultaneously be beholden to acting on behalf of the realization of the rights of others as co-equals. This relationship would be encouraged and facilitated institutionally, not just through acts of charity, in order to best secure the realization of human rights.

Cabrera (2010) advocates for the place of education and critical pedagogy as means and processes by which to promote and secure this type of global citizenship practice in individuals, particularly among youth. He also, though, argues that such a framework of global citizenship should be institutionalized, and done so at the supra-state level. Indeed, according to Cabrera, this absence of a transnational structure is the missing piece or element that prevents the realization of true global citizenship in the new millennium. In his words, currently:

> *"…there are no cohesive global political bodies to define citizen duties and rights, to specify participatory procedures, avenues of institutional access and other parameters of concrete citizenship practice*" (Cabrera, 2010, p. 73).

The institutionalization of global citizenship is therefore central. While it is possible to argue that institutionalizing citizenship matters less than the promotion of a general sense of global solidarity when working to secure broad social and political change, in Cabrera's framework it is not until people can assert their rights and act on their duties as global citizens that the basic rights of all can be achieved. It is here that the efforts of the Olympic Movement are of clear importance and significance; given Cabrera's calls for global citizenship to be facilitated supra-nationally in order to move beyond the interests of the state, the history and current policies of global forces like Olympism and the Olympic Movement is worthy of attention, particularly with a critical eye paid to successes and failures.

Indeed, the Olympic Movement of the 21st century appears to be more firmly committed than ever to global citizenship, particularly through the promotion of universal human rights and international development and as a corporate actor within international civil society, with support to and from the United Nations system (Roche, 2002). In addition, the Olympic Movement's commitment to global citizenship proceeds from the continued internationalization and globalization of the Olympic Games themselves, as they are awarded to host cities in emerging countries and economies – such as Rio de Janeiro, Brazil for 2016 – and included within broader development policies (see Darnell, 2012). This commitment to

global citizenship by the Olympic Movement means that programs and policies like *Olympism in Action* can also be situated within the broader trend whereby international non-governmental organizations (INGOs) and civil society actors now take a lead in global citizenship education among youth (Witteborn, 2010). Current programs within the Olympic Movement like the *Youth Olympic Games*, the *Olympic Values Education Program* (OVEP), and London 2012's *International Inspiration*, can all be viewed as activities designed to foster a sense of global citizenship, particularly among young people. In fact, the promotion of *Olympism in Action* advocates for sport in the service of education, development, and peace, as well as for 'sport for all,'[ii] values that form the conceptual core of global citizenship (see Nussbaum, 2002).

At the moment, many questions remain to be analyzed in this relationship between the Olympic Movement and global citizenship. Currently, the actual discussions and decisions that led to the Olympic Movement embracing and adopting global citizenship, particularly through youth education, has not been examined in the literature. To this end, this study offers an empirical assessment of the ways in which the Olympic Movement responded to social and political challenges of the late 20th century and how this led to the development of current policies and programs designed to educate youth to be global citizens. Further, Roche (2002) has concluded that global citizenship is attractive to the Olympic Movement because the movement has always experienced difficulty in operationalizing its global interests and that its focus on elite sport has regularly excluded 'ordinary' people. This study builds on Roche's analysis by examining how and why the Olympic Movement has constructed its commitment to global citizenship education for youth in the face of these challenges.

With this background in mind, the main objectives for this study were to examine, identify and assess:

1) The historical and contextual factors that underpinned the Olympic Movement's move towards, and commitment to, global citizenship education, particularly for youth;
2) The specific inter- and intra-organizational and processes (political and rhetorical) that led to global citizenship education being taken up within the Olympic movement;
3) The ways in which the main tenets of global citizenship have informed, and continue to inform, Olympic programs and policies targeted at the education of youth, and how and why this has been the case, and;
4) The actions and citizenship practices that current Olympic Movement programs and policies promote (or presume) for young people

In the process, the study questioned whether and how the Olympic Movement has critically reflected upon the challenges of supporting global citizenship education given critiques that posit the very concept of global citizenship to be 'fraught with insurmountable problems' (Bowden, 2003, p. 349), several of which are discussed in the next section.

- Academic significance and Impact on the Olympic Movement

The support for global citizenship within the Olympic Movement aligns with broader developments in education policy calling for pedagogical practices that develop globally oriented individuals. In terms of ideology, the study of global citizenship is relevant because the Olympic Movement has always connected the sporting spectacle of the Olympic Games to the 'universal, individualistic, and humanistic values' that are central to global citizenship (Roche, 2002 p. 168). In this sense, the more recent promotion of global citizenship education through the Olympic Movement is but the latest incarnation of a philosophy that is central to modern Olympic sport.

More practically, this study is relevant given that the promotion of global citizenship education now informs so many of the contemporary Olympic Movement programs.

For example, OVEP sets out to 'promote the values of Olympism' and the 'universality of the Movement' to youth.[iii] The *Youth Olympic Games* strives 'to educate, engage and influence young athletes...to live by the Olympic values'.[iv] And London 2012's *International Inspiration* is currently 'working in countries all over the world, to use sport as a positive force to enrich the lives of over 12 million young people.'[v] Understanding the history and processes that led to these types of commitments being made to global citizenship education for youth is clearly relevant to the Olympic Movement.

Further, there is an important ethical dimension underpinning the relevance of this proposed study. While the Olympic Movement has traditionally claimed to be politically and ideologically independent, it is nevertheless beholden to the social and political implications of the particular citizenship that it promotes (Roche, 2002, p. 169). This is of central importance given critiques that despite attempts to use the concept to reform globalization (see Cabrera, 2010), global citizenship is at the least anti-state and even potentially Imperialistic for the ways that it presumes a universality of rights and responsibilities applicable to all (see Bowden, 2003; Davies, Evans & Reid, 2005; Tiessen, 2011). An ethical assessment of the development of global citizenship education is relevant to the Olympic Movement because it can contribute to critical reflection and future reform of citizenship education programs and policies. It can only be helpful to understand the processes and contestations that led to the current promotion and invocation of global citizenship education in and through the Olympic Movement.

Indeed, several important criticisms of global citizenship not only inform understandings of the Olympic Movement but also suggest future policy reform and recommendations. First, at an organizational or policy level, INGOs now regularly promote global citizenship values, particularly to young people, as universally applicable but in practice these values can actually conflict with local ways of communicating, learning and behaving (Witteborn, 2010). Such conflict has been found, for example, in the diffusion of Olympic values in support of international development in Africa (see Guest, 2009). For this reason, the values that underpin

global citizenship education are not inherently universal, but best understood as policies choreographed by INGOs, in this case within the Olympic Movement, through processes that have ideological and moral implications (Witteborn, 2010; Desforges, 2004). Thus, the political, ideological and even moral decisions that led to the Olympic Movement embracing global citizenship education are worthy of note.

A second critical argument is that given the changing nature of citizenship within processes of globalization, INGOs should now also be changing as institutions in order to engage with global citizenship in productive and progressive ways (Desforges, 2004). At the same time, critics argue that the kind of global citizenship currently offered by INGOs rarely lives up to its participatory ideals primarily because the activities of INGOs to promote global citizenship are restricted by limited research on, trust in, and knowledge of, the social field being targeted (Desforges, 2004), in this case that of young people. This critique begs the question of how the Olympic Movement has interpreted the 'citizenship needs' of young people and constructed programs and policies of global citizenship education as a result.

A third significant criticism is that global citizenship exists as a utopian concept with moral and normative authority but one largely absent of an actual system of governance or education (Roche, 2002, p. 168, Davies, 2006). Cabrera's framework of a fully realized, integrated, and institutionalized practice of global citizenship is essentially an ideal type of which there are few contemporary examples (though he does call for such a system to be put into place). It may be, then, that global citizenship education will not, or cannot, deliver tangible results for marginalized people of the world and may actually secure oppression or marginalization by promoting a benevolent worldview (of sport and the Olympics) without insisting on concrete social and political change. There is a risk in global citizenship education therefore of promoting cultural imperialism through a presumed social and political universality that in practice has little chance of securing change and instead solidifies northern prosperity and statelessness for dispossessed people (Bowden, 2003). This may occur despite arguments that promoting global citizenship can

secure a sense of duty and responsibility to act towards the realization of rights for all (Cabrera, 2010).

Such criticisms beg for analysis of the extent to which the IOC and Olympic Movement's education of young people into a norm or global citizenship aligns with or diverges from the conception of the term as produced by theorists like Cabrera. It also asks for analysis of whether the IOC and Olympic Movement have effectively embraced the opportunity to serve as a global political body that supports the institutionalization of global citizenship in the ways that Cabrera advocates. In this sense, even though Cabrera does offer only an ideal type of global citizenship, it is a useful one against which it is possible and reasonable to compare and assess the conceptualization, politicization, development and implementation of citizenship education and policy making taken by the IOC and Olympic Movement in recent decades.

In this way, this study contributes to the Olympic Movement and the academic literature by assessing whether the values and ethics of citizenship promoted by the Olympic Movement and the IOC beginning in the 20th century fit with the definition of global citizenship as described and conceptualized by Cabrera. If any sport organization or sport-based movement is likely to be able to achieve the institutionalization of global citizenship beyond state interests it is the Olympic Movement, and examining the successes to date in its global citizenship promotion is relevant to the Olympic Movement.

Finally, it should be noted that Roche's notion of global citizenship in the Olympic Movement differs slightly from its use in this study. Roche (2002, p. 168) contends that mega-events and their governing organizations, like the Olympic Games and the IOC, have tended to rationalize the investment in and benefits of hosting in terms of their relevance to human rights. From this perspective, the promotion of global citizenship by the IOC has served its interests in securing itself as a responsible organization within international civil society. It is reasonable to suggest that in the face of critiques of its relativism and neutrality regarding abuses of what are

ostensibly human rights (see Hoberman, 2011), the IOC and Olympic Movement has turned to youth education to promote its identity and reputation as a citizenship organization. While Roche (2002) has written about the promotion of a general notion of global citizenship through the Olympic Movement, this study is concerned with a more specific notion of global citizenship and also one that is primarily focused on youth and the IOC's attention paid to them. There is little question that the IOC and Olympic Movement have expressed interest in and support for the notion of global citizenship – and the role of Olympic sport therein – but questions remain as to how this interest in global citizenship was negotiated and formalized within the history of the organization and how this commitment to global citizenship is operationalized within current Olympic programs, policies, and events.

In sum, while there is an argument to be made that the IOC and the Olympic Movement has deemed itself to be a supra-national institution of global citizenship along the lines that Cabrera describes and advocates, a specific assessment of this commitment to global citizenship remains to be developed. The extent to which the Olympic movement has worked and continues to work to implement a new supra-national system of global citizenship is worthy of critical scrutiny and recommendations are called for to support the realization of ethical global citizenship through the global reach of the Olympic Movement.

- Methodology and Data Collection

This study examined key textual records and accounts of events within the Olympic Movement in order to construct a timeline of policy development regarding global citizenship education. In addition, the study investigated such texts for their social and political meanings and considered their content against the critical issues raised in the global citizenship literature. Finally, current policies and programs were analyzed for the ways in which they align with or divert from, key understandings of the goals and challenges, both practical and ethical, of global citizenship education.

In so doing, the study followed the tenets of 'policy historiography' and 'policy archaeology,' noted methodologies within policy studies (see Gale, 2001).

According to Gale (2001), policy historiography analyzes issues within a policy domain and charts their development over time. For this study, a policy historiography was deployed to analyze when and where the Olympic Movement embraced the components of global citizenship education for youth. Specific attention was paid to events such as 'The 10th Congress Varna 1973,' which focused on *The Olympic Movement and its Future,* as well as 'The 11th Congress Baden Baden 1981' that proceeded under the heading *United by and for Sport*. The policy historiography examined whether and how the approaches to global citizenship and youth education embraced within the Olympic Movement has changed over time.

Policy historiography is an important method of policy research. However, it should also be supported by policy archaeology, a methodology that examines a) the conditions that make the emergence of a particular policy agenda possible, b) the rules or regularities that determine its development, and c) how these rules shape actual policy (Gale, 2001, p. 387). By combining these two steps within a single policy analysis, an empirically robust and theoretically informed result can be delivered.

Given this methodological imperative, the proposed study also conducted a policy archaeology to consider the Olympic Movement's interest in global citizenship education within the context of broader education policy developments and debates regarding ethical citizenship. Specifically, the policy archaeology addressed the following question: How, and to what extent, have the broader policy and political shifts, particularly during the increased globalization of the last four decades, underpinned the Olympic Movement's move towards global citizenship education?

The research study was undertaken over a two-week period during July-August 2012 using materials obtained from the library and archives of the Olympic Studies Centre (OSC) in Lausanne, Switzerland.

- Key Information Sources Consulted

The following documents made available in the OSC archives and library were analyzed and stood as the key information sources for this study:

- Speeches and official documentation from the Olympic Congresses in Varna (1973) and Baden Baden (1981);
- Minutes of the IOC Executive Committee from 1969-1975;
- Official and personal communication between the IOC and United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) in the 1970s and 1980s;
- Public speeches given by IOC Presidents Lord Killanin and Juan Antonio Samaranch in the 1970s and 1980s;
- Archived correspondences between the IOC and various organizations: Federation Internationale du Sport pour Tous; Association Internationale Contre la Violence dans le Sport; Comite Internationale pour la Pedagogie du Sport; International Peace Research Institute; International Fraternal Society of Sport; International Council of Health, Physical Education and Recreation;
- A variety of books, policy documents and official texts about the *Youth Olympic Games*, the *Olympic Values Education Program*, the *Olympic Youth Development Centre* and other current examples of youth education within the Olympic Movement;
- Documents from the IOCs Committee on Culture and Olympic Education.

- Results and Conclusions

The Results section is organized into two sub-sections. The first examines negotiations and priorities within the IOC and the Olympic Movement – as well as various political and social relations and forces – that underpinned the IOC and Olympic Movement's shift towards supporting global citizenship between the late 1960s through the 1980s. The second section examines contemporary policy and

programming and compares it to the ideal type of global citizenship put forth by Cabrera. Conclusions are then drawn and Recommendations offered.

i. Results 1 – The Emergence of Global Citizenship Education for Youth within the Olympic Movement, 1960s-80s

The seeds for current policy around youth and global citizenship education within the Olympic Movement were sown in the 1960s and 70s amidst a sense of renewed commitment to Olympism on a global scale promoted at the Olympic Congresses of Varna (1973) and Baden Baden (1981) and alongside a burgeoning relationship between the IOC and UNESCO. The Congresses and the relationship with UNESCO served, at least to a degree, to move the traditional understanding of Olympism as a form of education towards a new internationalism, particularly given social and political pressures emanating from forces of post-colonial independence and globalization. The IOC increasingly embedded itself, and its youth focused policies, within this new internationalism in a way that laid a foundation for its later dalliances with global citizenship. In this sense, it is not enough simply to say that the brand and recognition of the Olympic Games and Olympic Movement has become global. More specifically, from the 1960s onwards, the IOC and Olympic Movement was confronted by, and increasingly connected itself to international movements, like de-colonization and universal human rights, and to organizations like the United Nations and UNESCO that helped underpin the notion of Olympic sport as a positive force for global citizenship education.

Indeed, a review of historical and archival documents suggests a general narrative in the 20th century that propelled the IOC and Olympic Movement to begin considering opportunities for it to assume a role and even take responsibility for, the promotion of global citizenship. These intra-organizational, political and ideological maneuvers by three IOC Presidents in particular – Lord Killanin, Juan Antonio Samaranch and Jacques Rogge – illustrate an increasing trend in the Olympic Movement towards support for global citizenship and the role of the Olympics therein, culminating in 21st century policies and programs designed to educate youth as global citizens.

Of course, to a large degree, the notion of the modern Olympics as a means of education and development for young people can be traced back to Coubertin's revival of the modern Olympic Games. For Coubertin, individuals could be educated towards peace through sport and the modern Olympics were about nothing less than peace on a global scale (see Spaaij, 2012 for a recent overview of Coubertin's vision). Given Coubertin's vision and efforts, the argument here is *not* that the concept of youth education and development through the Olympics was invented in the latter half of the 20th century. Rather, an emerging interest in, and increasingly firm support and advocacy for, a notion of global citizenship is traceable to the Olympic Movement under IOC President Killanin who worked in the 1970s to build better relationships between the Olympic Movement and the international organizations of the day such as UNESCO. This foundation of internationalism laid by Killanin led in turn to the efforts spearheaded by Samaranch to promote the role of the Olympic Movement in championing and supporting youth development on a global scale particularly in emerging independent polities. This then led to Rogge's continued support for – and extended institutionalization of – the Olympic Movement as a force of citizen education for youth alongside broader commitments to international development and peace-building. The remainder of this section examines the movement towards, and negotiations around, global citizenship for youth education that took place under the stewardship of each of these three presidents.

It should be noted that this section focuses on the 1960s onward because of the emergence of several social and political forces that changed the context in which the Olympic Movement existed and pushed it towards global citizenship in a way that could not have been anticipated by Coubertin. The formal de-colonization of the so-called Third World in the mid '60s, emerging discourses of and support for universal human rights, and new forms of globalization through media, technology and commerce all affected the place of Olympic sport on a global scale and the ideological and practical understanding of Olympism and citizenship education for youth. More recently, the emerging popularity of and support for policies and

programs of sport-for-development and sport-for-peace, supported by, among others, the United Nations, has lent further legitimacy to the citizenship aspirations of the Olympic Movement.

One of the themes in this sub-section, then, is a move within the Olympic Movement of the 20th century from a focus on individual and moral character building (in the tradition of Coubertin) and towards more outward looking and global pursuits as well as responsibilities taken on by the IOC and Olympism on a global scale.

Discussions about the importance of promoting and practicing global citizenship education for youth did not start with Killanin. In fact, such discussions took place within the Executive Committee of the International Olympic Committee at least as far back as the late 1960's under then IOC President Avery Brundage and took on more specific focus and importance in the years that followed. The minutes from the IOC Executive Committee meeting at Dubrovnik in 1969 report that a seminar on "Furthering Human Relations through the Olympic Games" chaired by the IOC President recommended that Olympic Movement should support Olympic education designed to teach "…sports morals in schools and an open minds towards other countries." A report to the IOC Executive in Lausanne in February 1970 stated support for "steps to be made in order to disseminate the Olympic conception amongst the youth of the world." Further, in February 1971, Prince George of Hanover proposed to the IOC the creation of a Department of Education within the Olympic Movement, reminding the Executive that in addition to organizing the Games themselves, "There is another very important objective of the Olympic Movement, guided by the I.O.C., and that is its paedagogical (sic) responsibility for the young generation" and he reminded the IOC that an objective of the Olympic Movement is to "make better and happier citizens through the character building" opportunities within sport.[vi] Notably, Brundage, known for his strident opposition to the politicization of the Olympic Movement, responded to a proposal in that same meeting for the organization of youth camps during the Olympic Games by stating that these could be 'dangerous' if they were to fall into the wrong hands and implicate the Olympic Movement in 'political problems.' This suggests that there

remained a general reluctance under Brundage for the IOC and the Olympic Movement to overstep its boundaries and take on responsibilities usually reserved for nation states.

And yet the momentum within the IOC towards youth education and citizenship promotion showed little sign of waning. In May 1972, the Belgian National Olympic Committee (NOC) proposed a change to "Rule 1 – Duties of the IOC and NOC's" in order that the statement of non-discrimination during the staging of the Games themselves would be expanded to include sport in general. More significantly, the rule change also called for a written commitment by the IOC and NOCs to make the promotion of non-discrimination among the world's youth "…the task of the I.O.C. and the Olympic Movement." At the same meeting, the Romanian NOC called for a renewed commitment to the Olympic Truce citing it as "more necessary today," and a means and opportunity to promote "the principal aim of the Games – a manifestation of the young peoples' wish for mutual knowledge, well-being, friendship and peace." Not surprisingly, Brundage's minuted response made reference to a similar attempt made in Melbourne in 1956 to revive the Truce that had ultimately failed, but he nevertheless encouraged the Romanians to "try again."

There were clearly commitments, then, within these statements, of a renewed and globally oriented commitment to youth based on universal human rights and internationalism, components central to the notion of global citizenship. While such concerns did not dissipate entirely in the following years, the notion of promoting and implementing youth education was to take on increased significance within the Olympic Movement under Brundage's successor.

1972 – Lord Killanin

Michael Morris, 3rd Baron Killanin, became President of the IOC in 1972 and presided over an era where interest in, and promotion of, global citizenship education for youth took on increased significance within the Olympic Movement. At the conclusion of the Tenth Olympic Congress in Varna in 1973 – held under the

banner "Sport for a World of Peace" – an appeal was drafted and directed by the congress participants and to "All Sportsmen of the World." On behalf of the IOC, the International Federations and National Olympic Committees who had participated in the Congress, the appeal called for recognition that:

> *"sport as a social movement of world scale, and being connected with so many different aspects of human life, is an effective help to the moral upbringing of the young generation, and through honest competitions and friendly meetings strengthens the spirit of understanding and cooperation, among the peoples of the world."*

In this passage can be seen early elements of the connections being made within the Olympic Movement between Olympism and global citizenship with a specific focus on youth. Support for internationalism, universality, peace and responsibility all featured in this statement. The appeal further stated that sportsmen (sic) of the world should promote the ethos of the Olympic Movement, namely to:

> *"Disseminate the spirit and principles of friendly Games to the youth of the world in all spheres of the world sport movement, creating thereby international trust and goodwill."*

Lord Killanin, in only his second year as IOC President, was clearly at the fore of this renewed commitment to position the Olympic Movement in the service of global interests. In the President's speech at the Congress, Killanin stated:

> *I am frequently asked what is "Olympism" and what is the Olympic Movement about. You have all read the works of Baron de Coubertin and his ideals. You will have all heard, during the past twenty years, the President of the International Olympic Committee repeating those views and expressing various interpretations of them. At the risk of appearing critical, I believe that perhaps too much time has been spent in discussing minor details and philosophic theories and insufficient to how the Olympic Movement can contribute to the world to the end of the 20th Century.*

Killanin, in effect, called for the efforts of the Olympic Movement at the highest level of power to be (re)focused not solely on reform of Olympic sport itself but on ways in which to (re)connect the Olympic Movement to forces of social and political good. This call, of course, hearkened back to Coubertin but was notably situated firmly in

response to the challenges posed by contemporary social and political forces and reforms. Killanin went on to state:

> *"When Baron Pierre de Coubertin convened the meeting at the Sorbonne in Paris in 1894 – we will be celebrating the 80th anniversary next year – the world was very different. I would mention in Europe, for instance the only two states which were not Monarchies were France and Switzerland. It was an era of colonisation when the flags of the European colonising powers flew around the world. It was a time when few countries had developed an intense interest in sport and much of it was restricted to those with a higher educational standard as is frequently stressed by Baron de Coubertin's references to English Public Schools and especially to Dr Arnold of Rugby. In Baron de Coubertin's country sport in the way in which we speak of it today, barely existed."*

Killanin's recognition of the particulars of the political moment, a moment in which globalization and de-colonisation had drawn new attention to human rights and internationalism, as well as led to the emergence of new stakeholders within the Olympic Movement and new challenges to the IOC's authority particularly in the southern hemisphere, appears to have filtered throughout the congress. There was clear recognition during the Varna Congress of a new era in world affairs facing the Olympic Movement. The Conclusions of the congress stated that:

> *"The Congress in Varna notes that in the 43 years since the previous Olympic Congress significant socio-political changes have taken place in the world and that the role, significance and place of physical education and sport in modern world should be viewed in the light of these changes."*

Advancements in science, medicine and technology, the proliferation of mass media, and the increasing social significance of sport were all cited as forces influencing sport and requiring a revising and reassertion of the core values of the Olympic Movement. To these forces recognized by the congress needs to be added the shifting geo-political landscape. For Killanin, this meant not just that reform was necessary, but that the Olympic Movement needed to reassert itself as a positive social force and that the promotion of universal solidarity and peace was an opportunity for this renewed assertion of Olympism to occur.

> *"Let me say I would prefer to see no punches pulled in criticism but at the same*

time I would ask for positive suggestions for the future of the Olympic Movement. Friends, it is in our hands. It is only with the co-operation and guidance that we can find these common denominators and advance together towards a great Olympic future with Peace through Sport."

In response to the challenges of the political moment, the congress responded. In the concluding the event, the congress made the following statement:

"Proceeding from the principles of the Olympic Charter, the Congress stresses the importance of providing all citizens equal possibilities and equal rights in physical education and sports irrespective of age, sex, political convictions, race, creed and social status."

There is a sense in this conclusion from the Varna conference of a new sense of global citizenship being advocated by the Olympic Movement as it recognized not just the role that sport could play in development of individuals, but, perhaps more importantly, that the Olympic Movement itself had a responsibility as a global citizenship organization to make available opportunities for participation in sport to those citizens for whom access and chances were unjustly foreclosed or restricted.

In this sense, an emerging approach to global citizenship on the part of the Olympic Movement can be seen during this time in its increasing self-positioning as an organization with international standing and importance beyond the strict or traditional confines of sport. This emerging sense of the Olympic Movement's understanding of itself was particularly evident in its burgeoning relationship with UNESCO, a relationship that made clear strides under Kilannin's leadership and that began to solidify the IOC's status as an international organization concerned with citizenship issues and youth education and development.

A series of official meetings at this time illustrate this budding affiliation. As stated in *Olympic Review* (1976, p. 227), 1976 marked the first time that:

"Ministers and senior officials responsible for physical education and sport in the education of youth met from 5th to 10th April in Paris, under the mandate of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization."

The official documentation from the event stated that its purpose was to:

> *"Examine strategies which will guarantee education and sport their proper place in the school curriculum in order that they may effectively play their role in the preparation of youth in the perspective of life-long education."*

Lord Killanin spoke at this First International Conference of Ministers and Senior Officials Responsible for Physical Education and Sport in the Education of Youth, and his speech signalled and recognized renewed contact between the IOC and UNESCO.[vii] In this speech, Killanin made reference to the fact that UNESCO Director General Amadou Mahtar M'Bow had recognized Coubertin's legacy and vision for sport and that the IOC and Olympic Movement were very pleased to be assuming a new role in youth development and education. Clearly the opportunity to solidify the legitimacy of the Olympic Movement as a youth development organization amidst an international field of youth policy officials was appealing to Killanin and he spoke at length of the vision of youth education and citizenship development being undertaken under the banner of Olympic sport:

> *"This high-level competition radiates down to the youngest school-child. The Olympic movement can claim credit for the ever increasing demands for, and the interest in, the recreational sporting facilities in schools, colleges, villages and towns, and education is not complete without recreation and leisure"* (Killanin, 1976, p. 228).

Solidifying relations with UNESCO offered the IOC and the Olympic Movement the opportunity to develop, hone and deploy its message about youth development. It also offered the chance to legitimize the Olympic Movement as an international organization. It further reflected the Olympic Movement's efforts to remain relevant and contemporary amidst a changing international landscape and shifting social and geo-political norms. As Killanin stated:

> *"Travel time has been reduced and the social structure of the world has changed. Today all should have equal opportunity, as envisaged by Baron de Coubertin, to compete in sport for pleasure. Sport is no longer the preserve of a privileged few"* (Killanin, 1976, p. 228).

Clearly, Killanin had a willing partner in M'Bow, who had opened the event in Paris

by stating that amidst the challenges of emerging globalization, "education for sport must go hand in hand with education through sport." UNESCO's final report of the meeting recognized, in article 21, the broad support for physical education as a "constituent part of the right to education, just as it was possible to begin speaking of a right to the practice of sport." And articles 26 and 27 of the report show clear signs of an emerging sense of global citizenship in and through sport, calling as it did for democratic sport participation in which young people would learn responsibility facilitated by the removal of obstacles to the universalization of sport participation and physical education. It is reasonable to suggest that this type of international approach to youth education and development through sport endorsed by UNESCO – one that clearly looked beyond the strict confines of competitiveness and which carried an explicit focus on responsibilities to, for and of youth – eventually filtered into policy and programming taken up by the IOC and within the Olympic Movement in subsequent years.

The foundation for a relationship with UNESCO laid down by Killanin in 1976 would continue for several years, further cementing the Olympic Movement's role in international youth education, development and internationalism more broadly. On December 13th, 1978, the IOC released a statement recognizing M'Bow's attendance at the IOC Tripartite Commission meeting in Lausanne. The statement acknowledged that M'Bow had informed the commission of UNESCO's actions taken the previous month to create an "Intergovernmental Committee for Physical Education and Sport," a "Fund for the Development of Physical Education and Sport," and to adopt its "International Charter of Physical Education and Sport." The statement also made clear that these activities marked just the beginning of an ongoing relationship with both Killanin and M'Bow expressing hope that the relationship would continue and affirming that their "sole aim was to serve physical education and sport and to strengthen international understanding between all peoples of the world."

There is an important subtext to this relationship that also needs addressing,

namely that the international standing and role of UNESCO, particularly amongst emerging forces of recently de-colonized nations, was viewed by some in the Olympic Movement as something of a threat to the sovereignty of Olympic sport. Indeed, minutes of an earlier UNESCO Interim Intergovernmental Committee show a movement within the organization to "…concern itself with the structures of international sport, which were not cut off from the other structures of the social system of each country." The needs of so-called Third World countries were directly identified as connected to the organization of international sport. There is even reference in the minutes to the desire on the part of some within UNESCO for a "new world order in sport" to be entrusted to a permanent UNESCO committee.[viii]

Clearly, such developments were of concern to Killanin and the IOC but it appears from historical documents that his strategy was to build stronger relationships with UNESCO that neutralized the threat UNESCO posed to IOC control over elite international sport. Killanin also benefited from a general sympathy on the part of M'Bow and his disinterest in having UNESCO take over global sport. As M'Bow wrote in a letter to Killanin in October, 1978:

> *"I trust that any possible misunderstanding as to UNESCO's position with regard to the material organization of international sports competitions has now been dispelled."*

UNESCO continued to be an influential actor in the emerging international scene of youth education and development through sport and as such continued to be an institutional site or backdrop against which the Olympic Movement continued to assert itself and its aspirations and ideologies in the area of citizenship education for youth. UNESCO's adoption in 1978 of the "International Charter of Physical Education and Sport" drew specific attention to accessible sport participation as a right for all, and sport as a central and valuable component of youth education. The charter recognized the importance of national level institutions, but importantly from a global citizenship perspective, it also called for "wholly disinterested motives" on an international scale so that "in the universal language of physical

education and sport, all peoples will contribute to the preservation of lasting peace, mutual respect and friendship and will thus create a propitious climate for solving international problems" (UNESCO, 1978, Article 11).

This activity by UNESCO was influential on the Olympic Movement. In 1979, Killanin once again addressed UNESCO, this time at a meeting of the Intergovernmental committee for physical education and sport hosted in Paris. At the meeting, Killanin lamented the mixing of sport and politics, but also recognized it as something of a *fait accompli*. In response, he drew attention to the common goals of the IOC and UNESCO to mobilize sport in such a way as to overcome social and political divides and stated that: "this I hope will also be the object of UNESCO as they develop their educational policy as regards political education and sport." He solicited support from UNESCO for positioning sport and the Olympic Movement in support of this type of educational policy and then drew attention to the forthcoming Olympic Congress in Baden-Baden as an important opportunity for developing this policy agenda further.

1980 – Juan Antonio Samaranch

Sustained by continuing globalization and internationalism, the increasing profile and equity of the Olympic brand, and an improving relationship with UNESCO, the Olympic Movement under the new leadership of Juan Antonio Samaranch continued to commit to efforts that can be classified as consistent with global citizenship education for youth. Such efforts can be seen within the rhetorical commitment to youth and citizenship education at the 1981 Olympic Congress in Baden Baden, held under the motto 'United by and for sport.'

Theme 2 of the Congress in Baden Baden was 'International Co-operation' and much of the rhetoric under this theme embraced a new sense of responsibility on the part of the IOC and the Olympic Movement to make a positive contribution to rights and development on a global scale. Milan Ercegan, President of the International Amateur Wrestling Federation, told the Congress that the world was working

towards the "fulfillment of humanitarian aspirations" in response to discrimination and inequality on a global scale. He reminded delegates that within such goals of international development and human rights, "the gap is considerable between the proclaimed aspirations on the one hand, and their realisation in practice on the other." Notably, his response to such inequalities was to advocate for a commitment to universalism and a new set of accountability for the Olympic Movement:

> *"Since we all belong to one human community, we should be aware of our responsibilities regarding the enormous differences between the developed and developing countries in fields of sport, economy, culture, research and many others."*

Ercegan was not alone in advocating such a vision for the Olympic Movement. There was a clear sense in the rhetoric espoused at Baden Baden of some of the key tenets of global citizenship. Chief among these was a commitment to internationalism as a value and to global equality as a goal. The President of the Bolivian Olympic Committee, Jose Gamarra Zorilla, proclaimed that sport "…should become a social instrument, with access to the most diverse economic resources in order to encourage and sustain poor and needy countries" and he called for the IOC to establish a "committee of ambassadors." These ambassadors would be responsible, according to Zorilla, for travel to different countries "in order to debate with their governments about economic support to carry out programmes of the National Olympic Committees" including reminding governments "of the duty to guarantee to their people, and particularly to their youth, a social education and development." His focus was supported by the likes of IOC member Joao Havelange, who spoke to "The Development of Sport in the Third World," a region that he claimed had "evolved in recent years." He called for the establishment of a development programme for the Third World based on key principles of Olympism including working "to strengthen the personality of the individual by constant work in youth education."

It was against this emerging notion of globalization, inequality and decolonization that delegates at Baden Baden began to draw stronger connections between sport,

Olympism, and citizenship. A. de O. Sales, President of the NOC of Hong Kong stated that the spread of sport on a global scale had the potential for the "formation of better citizens." Not surprisingly, many saw a focus on youth as a means and opportunity through which the Olympic Movement could act in response to these challenges, and also in which the Olympic Movement could assume new responsibility to support global rights, development and citizenship for all. Manfred Ewald, President of the NOC of the German Democratic Republic opened his address to the Congress with this statement on behalf of global citizenship education for young people:

> *"International amateur sport and its organisations, and the worldwide humanitarian Olympic movement, have made it their aim to contribute by their activities to the physical and mental development of individuals. They wish through sport to encourage young people to a better mutual understanding, to fairness and friendship, as well as to strive for understanding and peace all over the world. The international events organised by them should also serve this end."*

And Professor August Kirsch, President of the NOC of the Federal Republic of Germany went so far as to call for an amendment to Rule 1 of the Olympic Charter stating that it was no longer sufficient given the demands facing the Olympic Movement. He advocated for revised text that would read that an aim of the Olympic Movement be:

> *"To educate young people through sport in a spirit of better understanding between each other and of friendship, thereby helping to build a better and more peaceful world."*

Indeed, others echoed the idea that the Olympic Movement had, at least to date, failed to meet its responsibilities to youth and their education and development. Willi Daume, President of the NOC of the Federal Republic of Germany spoke under the first theme of the Congress – "The future of the Olympic Games." He asked:

> *"What were we able to tell the young in the past? Our own athletes! I went to the trouble of looking through old rules and files. All we ever said was what the young should not do. We told them what they should not do instead of helping them. I wish from the bottom of my heart that our young athletes will take advantage of their*

opportunity during this Congress in order to obtain a real say in the future, a right which up until now - let us be honest - has not been granted. But the fact that something does not yet exist does not make it wrong or senseless. We are counting on all that is young in the world and, all the more, in the Olympic Movement. The Olympic Congress in Baden-Baden will be assessed according to what it does for the young – seen through the eyes of the young – for the athletes, on whose performances the Olympic Games primarily depend; which ways it shows, how much understanding it has, and how it helps our athletes."

Daume was clear in his assertion that youth should constitute the focus of the Olympic Movement in the coming years and that youth should play an active role in organizing and benefiting from the opportunities that the Olympic Movement offered. This understanding of supporting the agency of youth within Olympic sport can be seen in current policies and practices – such as the Youth Olympic Games – discussed in the next sub-section.

In further keeping with discussions of global citizenship on display at Baden Baden, some delegates advocated a rights-based approach. Lamine Ba, member of the NOC of Senegal, cited the increased interest of national governments in sport given its strong connection to education. Ba urged the IOC to recognize this new fact of global politics and to support state intervention in sport, not as a means of interference in global events like the Olympic Games, but in order "to encourage the existence of legislative texts and regulations, which guarantee rights and opportunities for all citizens to practise the sport of their choice."

To a degree, even though this was a call for a commitment to rights-based citizenship it served as something of a dissenting voice as it advocated for the state as the guarantor of these rights, more so than supra-national organizations like the IOC or Olympic Movement. Still, overall the message at Baden Baden was strongly in support of supranational citizenship based on rights and responsibilities as facilitated through Olympic sport and focused on youth. Masaji Kiyokawa, vice-President of the IOC, suggested that amidst social and political changes facing the world:

> *"The main task of the IOC is to improve and to contribute to the strengthening of the foundations of the Olympic movement, by gathering young students from all over the world, teaching, cultivating and infusing them with the principle and the humanitarian ideals of the Olympic philosophy."*

Notably, UNESCO remained on the Olympic Movement radar amidst this discussion. Tsegaw Ayele, from the Ethiopian Olympic Committee stated:

> *"A constant and close cooperation between the IOC and UNESCO has to be intensified because this is one of the global organisations where we can inject our burning desires for the better promotion of physical education and sport."*

Perhaps the strongest advocate of the ethos of global citizenship at Baden Baden was IOC member Alexandru Siperco. Siperco reiterated the role of the Olympic Movement in promoting peace and education on a global scale, but also made an explicit request for the recognition of these actions by national governments. In this way, he drew attention to the limits of the nation state and the potential of a supranational organization like the Olympic Movement to make a contribution to peace and human rights:

> *"On the basis that the Olympic movement is working for all nations in the field of physical and moral education of youth, and through peace and international détente, governments should therefore grant it international recognition."*

Siperco went on to warn that rapid developments in sport were increasing the chances and opportunities that commercial and/or political interests would overrun the educational and youth-focused elements of Olympism. For this reason, he called for renewed focus on internationalism and for "all members of the Olympic movement to promote the worldwide spreading of Olympism and actively promote this concept all over the world."

It should be noted that support for this new commitment to global citizenship found its way to the top of the IOC. In his preamble to the report of Theme 3 of Baden Baden – "The Olympic Movement in Prospect" – Samaranch stated that the discussion at the Congress:

> *"illustrates clearly that all members of our Olympic family are becoming increasingly aware that we cannot divorce ourselves from the facts of life, that we all live in the same world, however unsatisfactory it may sometimes seem, and that political, economic, commercial, religious and other problems exist, and must be faced."*

This was a significant break from the ways in which previous presidents, particularly Brundage, had shied away from proactively responding to such politicization of the Olympic Movement less than 20 years earlier. According to the final report of Baden Baden, one of the conclusions to which Samaranch arrived was that:

> *"A world-wide educational campaign should be undertaken with all governments perhaps through UNESCO, regarding the beneficial aspects of practising sport."*

In addition, the final statement published from Baden Baden asserted that:

> *"Close collaboration has been established with UNESCO and several common projects are being carried out. The President of the IOC is frequently in touch with the Director of UNESCO."*

From this perspective, Samaranch was clearly interested in further securing the possibilities and opportunities that UNESCO presented for the Olympic Movement to be involved in youth education and the teaching and promotion of Olympism on a global scale.[ix] In 1983, he led an IOC delegation to meet in Paris with M'Bow and education experts within UNESCO. The working lunch was, according to an IOC press release, an opportunity to discuss integrating the teaching of Olympism into school curricula.[x] In 1984, building on the relationship that Killanin had helped to cultivate years earlier, the IOC and UNESCO agreed to a memorandum for cooperation. The memorandum, signed by Samaranch and M'Bow, stated that the cooperation between the organizations would focus, among other areas, on the:

> *"Encouragement of world-wide manifestations aimed at the promotion of physical education and sport, in accordance with the Olympic ideal and the principles of the UNESCO International Charter for Physical Education and Sport."*

UNESCO embraced the relationship with the Olympic Movement as much as the IOC sought it. In 1984, UNESCO's Intergovernmental Committee for Physical Education and Sport recommended to member states that they should "promote the education of youth in a spirit of the Olympic ideal" by teaching the principles of Olympism.

The relationship continued in the following years. In January 1988, Samaranch visited the new Director General of UNESCO, Frederico Mayor Zaragoza and Zaragoza returned the favour with a trip to Lausanne in June. Later that year, the two organizations released a joint declaration stating:

> *"UNESCO and the Olympic Movement undertake to join forces in order to reduce the disparities in physical education and sport that exist between the most advanced countries and the developing ones and to ensure that as many people as possible enjoy the benefits of physical education and sport, practiced in the spirit of the Olympic ideals."*

The implications of this statement are significant on two counts: One, in contrast to the clear tensions that had existed between the IOC and UNESCO only several years earlier, by 1988, the two organizations were releasing joint declarations and combining their efforts, at least publicly, towards the justification and mobilization of Olympic-led sport and Olympism as a force of youth development on a global scale. Two, Samaranch and the IOC, and by extension the Olympic Movement more broadly, became more closely linked with UNESCO at a time when UNESCO was pushing for understandings of sport, and particularly Olympic sport, as more than just an event, but as fundamental to youth development, as a human right, and connected to the development of poor countries in the newly emerging Third World or Global South. Considering the extent to which the Olympic Movement supports the concept and practice of sport-for-development and sport-for-peace in the 21st Century, the relationship with UNESCO appears to have had a formative impact.

Given this recent history, it is reasonable to suggest that the relationship with UNESCO helped to promote, solidify and justify the Olympic Movement's aspirations to be a force for youth education and development, particularly at a transnational level beyond the nation state. In a manner similar to that described by Peacock

(2011), the IOC and Olympic Movement recognized the trend towards internationalism and rights-based policies underway, as advocated within UNESCO, and capitalized on this momentum through partnership and through self-presentation (as well as self-preservation) of Olympism as a supranational force of youth development and citizenship education.

There was increased legitimacy to be gained for both the Olympic Movement and UNESCO as a result of partnering in this way. The IOC 'allowed' UNESCO to promote Olympism in schools and, through this relationship, encouraged UNESCO to soften demands for reforming the hosting of major sports events and the structure of international sport more broadly. This relationship was similarly important to UNESCO considering that, beginning in the 1980s, its global standing and influence had come under significant criticism, accused of patronage and an anti-western bias and deemed to be driven by interests in the Third World and the Soviet Bloc. As a result, the IOC and Olympic Movement went their own way in promoting a notion of global citizenship and youth education through sport. The IOC neutralized the threat to its sovereignty of international sport that UNESCO posed and then once relations had been built with UNESCO, enjoyed a strong platform from which to continue promoting global citizenship education for youth through sport and its position as a leader of international sport.

This relationship with UNESCO under Samaranch can also be read as one that afforded the IOC increased legitimacy within the international community and civil society in ways that satisfied Samaranch's increasingly public desire for the Olympic Movement to assume increased international importance. Samaranch, as demonstrated through his speeches in the 1980s, clearly desired the IOC to be an increasingly influential international organization, one that embraced the tenets of global citizenship and acted as a good corporate citizen in the manner defined and described by Roche (2002). A public commitment to the education of youth as citizens on a global scale was a path to establishing such a reputation. Indeed, the basic tenets of the global citizenship framework found their way into Samaranch's public rhetoric at the time.

For example, in a speech delivered to the General Assembly of the Pan American Sports Organization (PASO) on July 11th, 1981, Samaranch stated:

> *"Education and sport should…remain linked. It is true that sport is an efficient instrument for the teaching of citizenship, but it is also a right of the people. When one says right of the people, one immediately thinks of the duty of the state. But the duty of the state in this domain should be defined and precisely limited in order to preserve the Olympic independence which is dear to us and which is the very reason for the life and survival of Olympism."*

The commitment in Samaranch's remarks to rights-based citizenship, and to the securing of these rights for individuals at a level and by a means beyond the state, are clear indications of a burgeoning ethos of global citizenship within the Olympic Movement at the time. However, the subtext of political independence within Samaranch's speech is palpable, as it suggests a primary motivation to maintain both distance from national interests and control over the governance of the Olympic Movement and international sport. In addition to this somewhat cynical reading of Samaranch's actual intentions in this speech, the promotion of global citizenship as articulated in this speech is also one that is open to the criticism of perpetuating a citizenship system that works well in theory but one that in practice largely serves to secure statelessness and reduce the authority and opportunity for state's to protect citizens (see Bowden, 2003). In other words, while the conceptualization of global citizenship embraced in this speech by Samaranch demonstrated many of its hallmarks, it also illustrated its limitations.

Further complicating the notion of political interference in Olympic sport that Samaranch referenced in his 1981 speech was the Boycott Phase of Olympic history, during which blocs of countries refused to participate in the 1980 Olympic Games in Moscow and the 1984 Games in Los Angeles. It is logical to read Samaranch's commitment to supranational citizenship education as a response at least in part to the purely national interests that had infiltrated, and from his perspective undermined, the political neutrality and social utility of Olympism. A return to youth development was therefore attractive. As Naul (2008, p. 54) states, the "Boycott

phase in the Olympic Movement may itself have contributed to the IOC taking more effective steps to promote the Olympic Games and its historico-pedagogical foundations." Samaranch's frustration with the boycotts for hijacking sport seems to have kick-started his renewed support for the morally educative dimensions of the OM. In an address to the National Congress of the German Sports Federation in May 1984, he stated:

> *"…Whilst I have been asked to deliver you a speech on 'fair play,' I cannot but briefly evoque (sic) the difficulties we are facing right now in connection with the organization of the Games of the XXIIIrd Olympiad in Los Angeles."*

He went on to conclude that:

> *"Our duty therefore is clear: we shall all work endlessly to propagate this state of mind (of fair play), knowing in advance that there will always be some violations. It is through education, not only sporting education, but also moral and mental education that we can hope to achieve this."*

Again, these types of connections and conclusions espoused by Samaranch suggest that his preferred response to the political challenges of the time, in this case those related to boycotts, was to re-visit and re-assert the conceptualization of sport for humanity and Olympism as a model and practice able to transcend the limitations and limited interests of nation-based politics. In this way, a sense of global citizenship can be seen.

A final important example of the emergence of a global citizenship ethos under the leadership of Samaranch can be seen in the ways that he himself began to act as a global citizen in a manner unprecedented for the President of the IOC. In 1981, Samaranch became the first IOC president to travel to Africa on official business, making stops in Zambia, Zimbabwe, Kenya, Malawi, Madagascar to meet with members of the Olympic Movement within those countries. He returned to the continent just 2 years later to visit a further 11 countries.[xi] Given the continuing efforts at development and sustainability taking place across de-colonizing Africa, it was undoubtedly in Samaranch's – and the Olympic Movement's – interest to further establish the presence of the Olympics within this part of the world.

Of note, though, is the extent to which Samaranch's presence in Africa in the early 1980s was met by demands from within the Olympic Movement on that continent for the IOC to respond to challenges of rights and citizenship connected to sport. For example, during his visit to Liberia in 1983, the Liberian Minister of Youth and Sports – Colonel Fred J. Blay – praised Samaranch while also reminding the IOC President of the ongoing challenges of social, political and economic development in the region. Blay called on the IOC and the Olympic Movement to support better the technical and infrastructure development of sport in Liberia to facilitate better participation in the Olympic Games and global sport more broadly. Notably, from a global citizenship perspective, he couched the benefits of this investment in terms of internationalism and the ethical responsibility of those in positions of privilege to contribute. In Blay's words:

> *"I wish to point out here that the overall development of the human race is inter-linked with the common support being given by those in the most capable positions."*

The claim here is not that Samaranch took such invocations (or what might even be interpreted as admonishments) to heart and implemented them into policy. Rather, the point is that the demands for a universal, rights-based conceptualization and organization of sport based on global solidarity and contributing to development – demands largely consistent with the global citizenship framework – were not simply imposed in a top-down manner by the IOC or other members of the Olympic Movement. While such demands were undoubtedly consistent with Samaranch's public interest in securing the munificence and independence of the Olympic Movement, calls for reform within the political and social forces of the moment afforded him the opportunity to pursue such an agenda.

Finally, it should be recognized that the momentum created under Killanin and Samaranch towards connecting the IOC and Olympic Movement to global citizenship has only been further championed and institutionalized under the leadership of current IOC President Jacques Rogge. In 2007, Rogge delivered an address at the

United Nations entitled "Sport for Peace: The Winning Difference" in which he stated that:

> *"Sport unites the principles that the Olympic Movement holds dear – education, sustainability, non-discrimination, universality, humanism, and solidarity."*

He also compared the efforts of the Olympic Movement in peace, development and education directly to those of the United Nations reminding his audience that:

> *"…today the IOC provides more assistance to developing countries than ever before, often in collaboration with many UN agencies and other international partners."*

Rogge then went on to provide a list of the humanitarian and development activities in which the Olympic Movement is involved. Rogge's actions hearken back to those of Killanin and Samaranch in working to connecting the Olympic Movement to supranational bodies like UNESCO. Of further note has been the extent to which Rogge has attempted to cement the activities of the IOC and Olympic Movement as evidence of its commitment to social responsibility and a force for peace – in effect, its standing as a global citizen – in the manner that Roche (2002) has theorized and Hoberman (2011) has critiqued. In his 2007 UN address, Rogge stated:

> *"In a world where commitment to social responsibility wavers, it has always mattered to the IOC."*

Rogge's efforts have led to significant achievements of institutionalizing the IOC and Olympic Movement as a global citizenship actor. Chief among these was the decision taken by the United Nations in October 2009 to grant Observer Status to the IOC. Done largely in recognition of the IOC's commitment to achieving the UN's Millennium Development Goals (MDGs), the new status for the IOC further cements its standing as committed to global citizenship activities for itself and others. In January 2011, UN Secretary General Ban Ki-moon visited IOC headquarters in Lausanne, and Rogge used the opportunity to confirm the Olympic Movement's global citizenship aspirations by reasserting that:

> *"As a global sports organization, the IOC has the moral duty to place sport at the service of humanity."*

In sum, this section has demonstrated that the IOC under Killanin, Samaranch and now Rogge, capitalized on the opportunities available at the time (increased globalization, mass media, internationalism, emerging southern polities, and the significance of global sport) to connect the Olympic Movement to the service of global citizenship, particularly through education for youth. However, as argued in the next section, despite these connections, current policies and programs suggest that the IOC and Olympic Movement has stopped short of confronting and acting upon the most fundamentally challenging and difficult element of a commitment to global citizenship, which is the actual institutionalization of a supranational system whereby rights can be realized, but in which duties and responsibilities to the rights of others are also taken up and acted upon.

ii. Results 2 – Contemporary Policies and Programs of Global Citizenship Education for Youth within the Olympic Movement: The Youth Olympic Games

In the previous sub-section, a historical overview was provided of the move within the Olympic Movement during the late 20th century towards support for global citizenship. In this sub-section, an analysis is offered of how these outward looking trends have filtered into and influenced current educational policies and programs directed at young people. The argument is advanced that while the general rhetorical or ideological commitment to youth development that was put forth in the 1970s and '80s within the Olympic Movement bears some of the hallmarks of global citizenship as outlined by Cabrera (2010), current policies, programs and curricula also different in significant ways from this definition. This assessment then affords a basis for a critical review of current initiatives followed by recommendations about what future global citizenship education policies within the Olympic Movement might look like in order to best capitalize on the opportunity to support young people's citizenship aspirations.[xii]

In general, the interest in and commitment to youth citizenship education within the Olympic Movement is reflected in the current organization and efforts of the IOC

itself. While the IOC Executive Board approved the creation of the International Olympic Academy and Olympic Youth Camps, as well as the establishment of an Olympic Department of Education, in 1970 and 1971, significant institutionalization of the IOC focus on youth development took place at the very end of the 20th Century. There are now IOC sub-committees for Olympic Solidarity as well as Culture and Olympic Education (Naul, 2008) and the latter was formed in 2000 and now holds an annual IOC World Conference on Sport, Education and Culture.

The first of these World Conferences, held in Barcelona in 2004, not only continued the promotion and institutionalization of Olympic led global citizenship education for youth, but also began to call for more direct action to these ends. The recommendations of the conference, recognizing the expertise of organizations like UNESCO as well as the World Health Organization, called for a reaffirmation of the Olympic ideal and recognition of the "multicultural nature of the Olympic Movement amidst the globalization of sport." Internationalism was clearly important here. In terms of action, the conference urged all members of the Olympic Movement to "redouble their efforts" in order to promote peace and understanding within the "framework of preventive Olympic education." All institutions within the Olympic Movement and in the fields of education and culture were similarly urged to "assist the youth of the world by focusing more on the education of universal ethical values, which is much needed at the present time."

By the 2006 version of the World Conference on Sport, Education and Culture, the momentum had become even stronger. Here the call was made for the IOC to provide assistance in training Olympic educators so that they could in turn encourage NOCs to make the education of universal ethical values a priority within the Olympic Movement. This supranational, universal approach to youth development was clearly consistent with a global citizenship framework. The 2006 meeting also referenced the ongoing relationship with UNESCO – building on the association facilitated by Killanin some 4 decades earlier – and called upon UNESCO to take a leadership role in promoting sport and physical education within educational systems around the world.

Further steps were taken at the 2008 installment of the congress in Busan. This event embraced the notion of the universality of sport and recognized the disparity in access to and development of sport between developed and developing countries. It also, for the first time, invited youth to be heard within the Olympic Movement. Of particular note was the fact that this was the first congress since the approval of the creation of the Youth Olympic Games (YOG) in 2007 and this new event took a central position, with the congress recognizing the YOG as an opportunity for the IOC and Olympic Movement to organize better its positive effects upon young people around the world.

By 2010 in Durban, the calls for action consistent with global citizenship education for youth were clearer still. Youth involvement in the Olympic Movement was again advocated; a call was put forth for the Olympic Values Education Program (OVEP) to be integrated into national education systems; and the importance of sharing best practices among sport-related NGOs in the Global South was recognized. The first YOG, staged in 2010 in Singapore, still maintained a prominent position within the congress, with a recommendation put forth to explore ways in which the "spirit of the Youth Olympic Games" could be extended beyond the hosting of the event itself.

Throughout these World Conferences, there is evidence of an increasingly specific, official and institutionalized commitment to youth development based on global citizenship. However, the component parts of global citizenship as spelled out here within the Olympic Movement call for critical attention as they differ in important ways from the framework advocated by Cabrera (2010). As the preceding analysis shows, there is significant attention paid within the Olympic Movement to encouraging youth to embrace the key tenets of global citizenship. And yet, there is very little in the recommendations from the World Conferences on Sport, Education and Culture since 2004 that calls for youth to *act* like global citizens, nor is there any significant suggestion within the recommendations for the importance or need of establishing or providing a framework to youth that would facilitate their activities as true global citizens.

To illustrate this point in more detail, the remainder of this section provides a critical analysis of a recently developed and currently practiced program illustrative of the Olympic Movement's commitment to global citizenship development for youth: The Youth Olympic Games.

Youth Olympic Games

The creation of the Youth Olympic Games was approved at a session of the IOC executive in Guatemala City on July 5, 2007. A competitive, international sports event akin to the Olympic Games but reserved for athletes aged 14-18, the vision of the YOG is to "inspire young people around the world to take up sports and adopt and live by the Olympic values."

Not surprisingly, the educational and citizenship components of the YOG have been stressed from the outset. According to Rogge (quoted in Roberts, 2008, p. 35), the YOG:

> *"…is not just about sport but about education and providing opportunities to learn about lifestyle, social responsibility, respect for the environment and, from a sporting perspective, the lessons of anti-doping."*

Similarly, in the 2010 YOG Candidature Proceedings, Rogge made clear that the YOG demonstrates the IOC's commitment to youth and does so through action, not just words. The YOG are, according to Rogge, intended to make young athletes into better human beings. The event also demonstrates the responsibility and commitment of the Olympic Movement to youth. According to Rogge, "We owe this to the youth of the world."

It should be noted that in a manner similar to the social and political forces that influenced the move towards global citizenship education for youth in the 1970s and '80s, there are contextual factors influencing Olympic Movement policy focused on youth development in the 21st century. Chief among these is popular concern (proven or not) of the failing health of young people, regularly articulated through the lens of a growing Obesity Epidemic, and a concern within the Olympic

Movement of declining interest in sport participation among the world's youth in the new millennium. In Rogge's words (Roberts, 2008, p. 34):

> *"The future of sport is bound up in this initiative. The challenge is to catch the attention of the youth."*

The transformative educational goals of the YOG are to take place, according to policy, through the Education and Culture Program, an educational initiative to be held concurrently with the sports program. As stated in the IOC's Candidature Procedure and Questionnaire for the YOG:

> *"The Youth Olympic Games Education and Culture Program (ECP) should represent a unique, once-in-a-lifetime learning experience for the young athletes and participants gathered from all over the world to celebrate the spirit and values of Olympism."*

This integration of the ECP has indeed featured prominently in the planning and hosting of the YOG to date. The inaugural YOG was held in Singapore in 2010. According to its official report, Singapore 2010 "sought to connect youth throughout the world with one another and the Olympic Movement." The ECP of Singapore 2010 was based on five educational themes: Olympism, Skills Development, Well-being and Healthy Lifestyle, Social Responsibility, and Expression. Seven formats or programs were integrated throughout the YOG to facilitate successful pedagogy in line with these themes.

An ethos consistent with global citizenship and directed at youth underpinned the ECP of Singapore 2010. Patrick Stalder, the IOC official in charge of the programme, is quoted in the final report of Singapore 2010 as saying that the ECP is of benefit to athletes in "…widening their horizon on social responsibility." The report also hails the success of the ECP to the extent that it makes a strong suggestion that the Olympic Movement, supported by Rogge, is now considering the inclusion of a program similar to the ECP in the Olympic Games themselves.

Importantly, though, Stalder's description of the ECP in the official report of Singapore 2010 is revelatory, at least to a degree, of the limits to global citizenship

supported and advocated in and through the Olympic Movement and events like the YOG. As he states:

> *"We don't intend that everyone comes out with the same understanding of everything on offer; that's not realistic. This programme offers a set of opportunities and then it's up to the athletes to choose what will enrich their lives."*

There is a clear nod to diversity in Stalder's rhetoric that makes sense both ideologically and practically for the Olympic Movement when attempting to navigate the complex terrain of citizenship education for youth. What this quotation also reveals though is a general abdication at a policy of pedagogical level of the specific *actions* to be taken by youth who have been educated or socialized into the role of global citizens through participation in the ECP and the values of Olympism. Young people are, in this case, left to their own devices to decide how, when and where to put their new information, and newly formed values, into practice. The result is arguably a promotion of cosmopolitanism through Olympic sport, more so than an encouragement within the Olympic Movement for youth to act on cosmopolitanism and in so doing, realize the full form of global citizenship in ways that would be consistent with Cabrera's (2010) terms.

Further, by concluding the event with the notion that it is then 'up to athletes to choose' what they will do to act upon their new education in Olympic values, the ECP stops well short of institutionalizing a framework in which global citizenship could be enacted by youth on a daily basis. Given that the Olympic Movement, as led by the IOC, is one of the preeminent global cultural institutions (Roche, 2002) and generally embraces a notion of leadership within international civil society, this limit imposed on their citizenship education of youth is significant. The distinction here illustrates that despite important and significant shifts in rhetorical treatment of youth and citizenship education, the Olympic Movement continues to focus almost exclusively on development of individuals as the framework of social change but without providing an organization or institution within which individuals can act. This approach limits the likely realization of global citizenship. As Digel (2008,

p. 54) argues in his critical assessment of the YOG, "…the teaching of values must not only take into account people and mentalities, but it must also focus on existing structures or structures to be changed."

In the Recommendations section, I consider some of the ways in which global citizenship education for youth might be more fully institutionalized within the Olympic Movement. Before doing so, though, there is some evidence of a move towards a more fully realized conception of global citizenship in the organization of future hosting of the Youth Olympic Games. For example, the candidature file for 2014 YOG bid city Nanjing spells out its conception of an ECP to be held during its hosting of the YOG. According to the bid, the ECP would be carried out under four themes: Olympism, Skills Development, Healthy Lifestyle, and Social Responsibility. The programming that comes closest to encouraging global citizenship action on the part of young Olympians falls under "Olympism," where the bid states that "YOG Ambassadors" will be selected who will then be supported through the programme to "…learn about the…Olympic culture and the diverse cultures of the world." In this sense, the Nanjing YOG does make suggestions as to the creation of a framework for facilitating global citizenship activity. However, as I discuss in the Conclusions and Recommendations, significant opportunities still remain for the development of Olympic policies that would realize full global citizenship in practice.

iii. Conclusions

When comparing the development in recent years of Olympic led policy and programming focused on youth education against the ideal type of global citizenship described and advocated by Cabrera, a general ambivalence emerges. On the one hand, the recent history outlined in part 1 of the Results section, and the current discussions and programs analysed in part 2, clearly illustrate that the Olympic Movement under the leadership of the IOC have formalized and institutionalized policy and programming designed to promote a sense of global citizenship through sport-based education for youth. By committing to a responsibility to human rights, responding to the challenges of conflict resolution, recognizing unequal distribution

of resources exacerbated by globalization, and doing so in ways that attempt to transcend the interests of nation states, the Olympic Movement has embraced a role in educating global citizens in a way that is largely compatible with the definition and ethos of the concept as outlined by Cabrera (2010).

This conclusion is significant for at least two reasons: one, it illustrates recognition on the part of the IOC and Olympic Movement of the need for citizenship support for a generation of youth who are in a position to make a positive contribution to overcoming the entrenched and grave challenges within world affairs and global politics, such as climate change, war and poverty. Two, it suggests a sense of responsibility on the part of the IOC and Olympic Movement to mobilize its significant power, influence and abilities in positive ways and in support of youth as change agents. As Cabrera (2010, p. 94/95) argues, it is difficult to hold individuals accountable for the type of change that the global citizenship framework implies or even demands; global decision makers and those with transnational influence are also important, and the IOC and Olympic Movement appear to be taking this responsibility seriously.

And yet, as the preceding analysis has argued, there are significant limitations to the approach to global citizenship education for youth that has developed within the Olympic Movement over the past 4 decades. The IOC's current definition and implementation of global citizenship is clearly based more on universal recognition of sport as a right and a metaphor or values than it is based on facilitating actions or structures to realize those rights or put these values into practice. This is not an entirely new conclusion regarding the Olympic Movement. As Roche (2002, p. 177) has argued, the IOC has always had trouble operationalizing the 'universal citizenship' dimension of its public commitment to human rights. What the analysis here adds to this is the conclusion that in the face of criticism of its record with universal human rights as well as other social and political challenges, the IOC has committed even further to youth education in order to re(constitute) itself as a relevant player in citizenship politics (see Peacock, 2011). Yet, in practice, the approach taken up by the Olympic Movement through programs like the YOG

appears to be mostly concerned with producing good people (which is laudable), but not facilitating or encouraging global citizens who would act to secure the rights of others. Nor does the IOC appear to be concerned with or committed to producing itself as an organization that provides the institutional means through which cosmopolitan individuals can act as fully realized global citizens.

It is worth considering this conclusion in some historical context. The sense of internationalism and responsibility taken on by the IOC, particularly beginning with Killanin's presidency in the 1970s, did suggest a shift within the Olympic Movement beyond education policies directed at simple character building of youth through sport and towards a more structural and political commitment to human rights, development and peace. From this perspective, it is reasonable to assert that the IOC, via Olympism as a movement, has championed and promoted a sense of global citizenship for decades, as Roche (2002) has argued. Roche's assessment, however, requires some updating given that changes in globalization have led to changes in the notion of global citizenship. Given contemporary issues of mobility, exploitation and global inequality, global citizenship based on human rights requires new institutions connected to a framework of individual action, which Cabrera's ideal type describes. That the IOC and Olympic Movement is *not* organizing or developing programming for youth education in the terms laid out by theorists like Cabrera serves to illustrate and even expose some of the limitations in its current policies.

The stakes and implications of this issue are high for the Olympic Movement, particularly in relation to its aspirations to be a leader in global civil, evidenced by, among other initiatives, its growing relationship with the United Nations and standing within the UN system. As Hoberman (2011) has argued, it is difficult and perhaps even impossible to classify the IOC and Olympic Movement as a peace promoting organization when it employs relativistic approaches to human rights abuses and remains explicitly politically neutral in the face of rights restrictions or marginalized people. For a conclusion to be drawn that the IOC and Olympic Movement is truly committed to human rights and global citizenship, it would need to begin to leverage its convening role in international sport in ways that not only

challenge rights abuses, but actively institutionalize avenues and opportunities for citizens to act on contribution, accommodation and advocacy duties. This means that the IOC would become an institutional conduit through which cosmopolitan individuals would be responsible for contributing materially to the global good, would express respect for non-compatriots and would also engage in advocacy and even direct action on behalf of those denied full citizenship. Absent of adopting changes to these ends, examples of which are outlined in more detail in the following section, the IOC and Olympic Movement are clearly susceptible to the charges that the global citizenship framework is flawed for the ways that it claims to transcend state responsibility without providing guarantees of rights claims for citizens.

It is reasonable to argue therefore, that the IOC and Olympic Movement have dealt with the fraught political and ethical terrain of global citizenship by essentially ignoring the more challenging aspects of the concept. They have promoted the benefits and strived to educate youth into the paradigm, but have stopped short of promoting of facilitating action to be taken by youth. Nor have the IOC or the Olympic Movement embraced the concept that they have the opportunity and the responsibility to provide structures in and through which global citizenship can be realized for marginalized people around the world. In this way, they are open to the criticism that they selectively attempt to transcend and replace state provisions and, in so doing, weaken citizenship opportunities that currently exist, such as they are.

iv. Recommendations

Given the limitations of current policy and programming identified in the previous section, this final section discusses what a fully realized commitment to youth education for global citizenship would look like within the Olympic Movement. To reiterate, there are three types of duties that are deemed necessary or requisite within a fully integrated global system of citizenship according to Cabrera (2010, p. 71): contribution duties, or the duty to contribute one's fair share to the global good; accommodation duties, or the duty to tender value, respect and recognition to

others who may not share one's own state citizenship and make allowance for their claims to and acts of citizenship; and advocacy duties, or the duty to support and agitate for the protection and realization of rights of others. Each is discussed here.

Fully realizing contribution duties within the Olympic Movement would mean that the IOC would support a system whereby participation in sport on a global scale would be based on ability to pay and be funded and organized through forms of progressive taxation. The IOC in this framework would become a global organization for the distribution and coordination of aid. To a degree, some of the duties in this category are already taken on by the IOC such as education opportunities and distribution of aid through projects like Olympic Solidarity, Olympism in Action and efforts at local capacity building. The difference here is that the access to, and funding of, sport in this framework would be based on rights-based claims, not charity, and claims to these rights would be institutionalized in policy within the Olympic Movement. The education of youth as global citizens would similarly be based on more than tolerance of Others, but include an ethical and even moral commitment to contribute to the public good through the distribution or resources and access.

In the case of accommodation duties, the full realization of global citizenship would mean that the IOC would re-position the Olympic Movement as an assertion of open-ness towards non-citizen others. In contradistinction to claims to political neutrality and presumed transcendence that its supranational standing has regularly afforded it, the IOC would recognize the hosting of the Games themselves as a platform for the identification of human rights abuses and calls to action to redress such abuses. This would offer a rejoinder to Hoberman's (2011) critique and move the Olympics more in line with global citizenship. Educating youth to be global citizens in these terms would mean that they would not only be encouraged to respect their opponents in the spirit of fair play, but also to act in support of the realization of the rights of their opponents when and where these were denied, even in cases where it impinged on the privileges or benefits enjoyed by accommodators.

In the case of advocacy, the IOC, the Olympic Movement, and the hosting of the Games would come to stand as a supra-national rights protecting institution. Those for whom state rights offer insufficient protection, the migrating poor for whom rights in a new country are rarely granted, or those for whom rights to basic material existence have gone unfulfilled, would find in the Olympic Movement a series of rights to citizenship coordinated by the IOC. Youth as global citizens in this framework would become activists to draw attention to rights claims and abuses and the IOC and Olympic Movement would open up media and marketing spaces to support this activism. The power of the Olympic brand would become one that celebrates humanity by regularly advocating for those whose humanity is imperiled.

In sum, according to Cabrera (2010, p. 255) NGO's efforts at promoting inclusion are best directed at institutional transformation. From this perspective, a commitment to global citizenship means that the International Olympic Committee, as the leader of the Olympic Movement, could and should be trying to transform global institutions, including its own, so that actions and practices of global citizenship can be realized. As it currently stands, however, discussion, policies and programs within the Olympic Movement suggest that it tends to approach the challenge of global citizenship by framing the issue in terms of the needs of youth for access to sport or education. Such issues are clearly important but what remains absent in this approach is the encouragement for youth to act as global citizens that would advocate on behalf of others and resist systems and legislation that prevent the realization of rights.

Of course, whether the IOC and Olympic Movement wish to be considered a truly committed force of global citizenship education for youth remains open to analysis and debate. However, as the preceding analysis has demonstrated, for this to occur, the IOC and Olympic Movement will have to do more than provide services to youth; it will have to encourage global action among youth to advocate for the rights of others and it will have to provide structures and opportunities for marginalized people around the world to realize their basic human rights.

III. Annexes

References

Albala-Bertrand, L. (1995). What Education for What Citizenship? *Educational Innovation and Information, 82*.

Bowden, B. (2003). The Perils of Global Citizenship. *Citizenship Studies, 7*(3), 349-362.

Cabrera, L. (2010). *The Practice of Global Citizenship*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Darnell, S. C. (2012). *Sport for Development and Peace: A Critical Sociology*. London: Bloomsbury Academic Press.

Davies, L. (2006). Global Citizenship: Abstraction or Framework for Action. *Educational Review, 58*(1), 5-25.

Davies, I., Evans, M., & Reid, A. (2005). Globalising Citizenship Education? A Critique of 'Global Education' and 'Citizenship Education'. *British Journal of Educational Studies, 53*(1), 66-89.

Desforges, L. (2004). The Formation of Global Citizenship: International Non-governmental organisations in Britain. *Political Geography, 23*, 549-569.

Digel, H. (2008). The Risks of the Youth Olympic Games. *New Studies in Athletics*, *3*, 53-58.

Dower, N. (2003). *An Introduction to Global Citizenship*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Gale, T. (2011). Critical Policy Sociology: Historiography, archaeology and genealogy as methods of policy analysis. *Journal of Educational Policy, 16*(5), 379-393.

Guest, A. (2009). The diffusion of development-through-sport: analysing the history and practice of the Olympic Movement's grassroots outreach to Africa. *Sport in Society, 12*(10), 1336-1352.

Hoberman, J. (2011). The Myth of Sport as a Peace-promoting Political Force. *SAIS Review, 31*(1).

Killanin, L. (1976). First International Conference of Sports Ministers. *Olympic Review, 103-104*(May-June), 227-231.

Naul, R. (2008). *Olympic Education*. Meyer and Meyer Sports Books.

Nussbaum, M. (2002). Education for Citizenship in an Era of Global Connection. *Studies in Philosophy and Education, 21*, 289-303.

Peacock, B. (2011). A Secret Instinct of Social Preservation: Legitimacy and the Dynamic (Re)Constitution of Olympic Conceptions of the Good. *Third World Quarterly, 32*(3).

Roberts, K. (2008). Youth Games Target Sport's Lost Generation. *SportBusiness International*, 131, p. 34-36.

Roche, M. (2002). The Olympics and 'Global Citizenship'. *Citizenship Studies, 6*(2), 165-181.

Spaaij, R. (2012). Olympic Rings of Peace? The Olympic Movement, Peacemaking and Intercultural Understanding. *Sport in Society, 15*(6), 761-774.

Tiessen, R. (2011). Global Subjects or Objects of Globalization? The Promotion of Global Citizenship in Organisations Offering Sport for Development and/or Peace Programmes. *Third World Quarterly, 32*(3), 571-588.

UNESCO (1978). *International Charter for Physical Education and Sport*. Available at: http://www.sportanddev.org/en/learnmore/sport_education_and_child_youth_development2/policy_developments/index.cfm?uNewsID=24

Witteborn, S. (2010). The Role of Transnational NGOs in Promoting Global Citizenship and Globalizing Communication Practices. *Language and Intercultural Communication, 10*(4), 358-372.

IV. Financial Accounting

Lausanne: July 22 to August 5, 2012 (14 days)

Plane ticket	Geneva Hotel	Train	Hostel	Subsistence	Transport	Total
CHF 359	CHF 125	CHF 50	CHF 1400	CHF 1500	CHF 200	CHF 3634

Notes

[i] This study does not suggest, however, that the Olympic Movement has ever specifically claimed to be a global citizenship organization, nor has it claimed to educate youth to be global citizens *per se*. Still, the concept of global citizenship as described by Cabrera clearly aligns with many recent goals and aspirations of youth education within the Olympic Movement and is an appropriate framework through which to analyse current policies and programming.

[ii] www.olympic.org/olympism-in-action

[iii] http://www.olympic.org/olympic-values-and-education-program

[iv] http://www.olympic.org/yog-presentation

[v] http://www.london2012.com/get-involved/education/international-inspiration/index.php

[vi] Hanover stated: "I think "COUBERTIN INSTITUTE FOR MODERN OLYMPIC EDUCATION" might be the right name for this department of the I.O.C." (Minutes of IOC Executive Board, March 1971).

[vii] In a letter he wrote to Samaranch in 1984, Killanin claimed that it was his speech in 1976 that had "re-inaugurated communications with UNESCO."

[viii] This Nairobi Resolution asking UNESCO to create a permanent inter-state body for sport was further driven by divides of political ideology as Soviet Bloc countries viewed the IOC and international sport federations to be western-dominated and biased against nations with heavily state-managed sport systems. In response, the IOC issued a manifesto re-asserting the importance of political neutrality in international sport and its leadership over international sport alongside international sport federations. Eventually, given in part to the strong personal relationship between Killanin and M'Bow, UNESCO backed off such demands.

[ix] It is also interesting to note that in his speech at Baden Baden, Lord Killanin claimed it was him who had approached UNESCO to make the case that sport should be included in UNESCO's plans for, and responsibility to, education for young people.

[x] Not all members of the IOC were entirely supportive of the burgeoning relationship between the Olympic Movement and UNESCO. In a letter written to Samaranch dated February 20, 1984 Richard Pound expressed reservations about making public claims "that there is any linkage between the Olympic principles and those contained in the UNESCO charter. In addition, educational matters within various countries are often matters of extreme sensitivity and I would not wish such authorities…to have the impression that the IOC was seeking to exert any improper

influence." Pound's trepidations, which connected to the criticism that UNESCO had become a problematically politicized organization by the mid '80s, also suggested some measure of reservation that the Olympic Movement would try to transcend the sovereignty and influence of national governments and take education policy beyond the level of nation states.

[xi] On this trip, he visited Nigeria, Liberia, Cote D'Ivoire, Guinea, Gambia, Senegal, Gabon, Angola, Afrique, Zaire, and Cameroon.

[xii] It should be noted that this analysis is not exhaustive of the policies and programs within the Olympic Movement that can be deemed to align with a commitment to Global Citizenship. For example, OlympicAfrica and Olympic Solidarity are both good examples of Olympic initiatives that are consistent with a commitment to the general ethos of Global Citizenship. However, given the limited scope of this report, and the choice to focus on youth, the section focuses on the Youth Olympic Games, Olympic Education, and the recently established Olympic Youth Development Centre.