

## Coubertin's Ruskianism

Arnd Krüger

Georg-August-Universität Göttingen

### Introduction

The influence of John Ruskin on Pierre de Coubertin has never been dealt with in detail. According to Norbert Müller, Ruskin was one of the personalities that influenced Coubertin the most,<sup>1</sup> a "principal inspiration,"<sup>2</sup> but Müller dealt with Ruskin's actual role only in a small paragraph in the edition of Coubertin's works. In Müller's monograph on the Olympic Congresses he goes into more detail about Ruskin, but does not really follow up the Englishman either.<sup>3</sup> Yves-Pierre Boulogne acknowledges that "there is a tendency today to under-estimate the influence of John Ruskin (1819 - 1900) on the Christian and democratic elites."<sup>4</sup> Boulogne, then went on to show that Coubertin took the idea of the Olympic Art competitions from the British theoretician of aesthetics, John Ruskin, Slade Professor of Art Criticism, at Oxford. But Ruskin had many facets, from political economy to art and art criticism -- and it seems as though Müller and Boulogne have only looked at Ruskin the art critic, and Ruskin the aesthetic,<sup>5</sup> and left out the political and economic dimension. I will show that Coubertin seemed to have taken all of Ruskin into account.

Allen Guttmann does not mention Ruskin at all in his *The Olympics. History of the Modern Games*.<sup>6</sup> John MacAloon does not bring him into contact with Coubertin, but mentions him only as an art critic who was discontent in his early work with the mixing of art and industry.<sup>7</sup> John Lucas -- although he has been concerned early on with the "Beauty of Olympism"<sup>8</sup> -- fails to take the writing of Ruskin into account in his *The Future of the Olympic Games*. Is this why Lucas has so little understanding for the role of the beautification of the modern Olympics?<sup>9</sup> Although Louis Callebat mentions many influences on Coubertin, he does not have Ruskin on his list either.<sup>10</sup> It is understandable that Richard Mandell does not cite Ruskin, either, as the latter seems to have had an influence on Coubertin particularly after the turn of the century, a time with which Mandell ends his study.<sup>11</sup> Could it be that all these authors were influenced by the

first biographies of Coubertin which do not show the influence of Ruskin either? But Ernest Seillière pointed out only the French influences in the midst of the Great War to demonstrate the important role of France in the world<sup>12</sup> and Andre Senay and Robert Hervet were more concerned with ritual and the pedagogical side of the work of Coubertin than with its artistic or economical.<sup>13</sup>

Donald Masterson relates Coubertin's interest in the arts and as Ruskin, his faith in working-men, but he only concludes that there should be again Olympic art competitions without going into any detail on Ruskin or quoting any of his works.<sup>14</sup> By his argument that art and sport have their origin in ritual,<sup>15</sup> he misses the point Ruskin is making in his theory when he is assuming that labour is the basis of things.<sup>16</sup> But Ruskin and Coubertin recommended the education of the working man, and both gave lessons in institutions that were concerned with the education of the worker.<sup>17</sup>

The International Olympic Academy could be another place where the study of Ruskin and Coubertin might have played a role. But he is not in the bibliography of the papers of the first 25 years of the Academy.<sup>18</sup> Durry analyzed the role of fine arts in the history of the Olympic Games -- but does not point at any role for Ruskin.<sup>19</sup> Later he mentions at least Coubertin's *Ruskinism*, but did not go into any detail.<sup>20</sup> Nikolaos Nissiotis, who dominated Olympic philosophical thought for a long time, was very eloquent on behalf of the inclusion of aesthetic elements in the Olympic Games, but he never looked at Ruskin's influence.<sup>21</sup> Fernand Landry was more concerned with the practical outcome of Coubertin's notions of the arts and sport than with the theory behind it, and so he leaves out the role of the beautification of the Games in a Ruskian sense.<sup>22</sup> The Cologne Carl-Diem-Institute, which tried to codify Coubertin's *Olympic Thought*, does not have Ruskin on its list. Is the English theoretician not part of Olympic thought?<sup>23</sup> Modern aesthetics does not have space for Ruskin in the context of sport either.<sup>24</sup> The Socialist world did not have a space for Ruskin in an Olympic context.<sup>25</sup> This is not surprising as Ruskin was considered by his contemporaries, a Christian Socialist of some sort, in favour of cooperatives, often using a language similar to Karl Marx<sup>26</sup> -- although he was having a distinctly different economic theory with far more emphasis on individualism, land ownership,

and beauty, giving also for a long time considerable authority to the Church.<sup>27</sup>

In my own early work I was so concerned with the educational efforts of Coubertin, with his work outside the Olympic arena, that I overlooked the influence of Ruskin, too.<sup>28</sup> Of course, I had read what Coubertin had written about him,<sup>29</sup> but Coubertin had been influenced by so many people,<sup>30</sup> that I did not follow up that lead either. It is only due to the influence of Synthia Slowikowski<sup>31</sup> that I started to look at the Olympic Games in a postmodern sense and by this came back to Ruskin.

I do not want to go into the details of the Olympic Games in a postmodern context, as I have done this elsewhere,<sup>32</sup> but I would like to have a closer look at Coubertin's Ruskianism as in the current literature about Coubertin John Ruskin is obviously not sufficiently dealt with. And the literature on Ruskin does not seem to mention Coubertin and the Olympic Games at all, as it is largely an influence that occurred after Ruskin's death in the year 1900.

We do not know what Coubertin actually knew about Ruskin. Ruskin wrote an enormous amount on a wide variety of subjects. His *Works* contain 39 volumes.<sup>33</sup> When Coubertin's library was auctioned, he did not have a book by him or directly on him,<sup>34</sup> there were, however, plenty of books on the history of art and on political economy which included the role of Ruskin.<sup>35</sup> On the other hand, Ruskin was much discussed in France between 1895 and 1914, particularly after his death, i.e. between the turn of the century and World War I, his main works had been translated into French and Coubertin's English friends certainly knew Ruskin.<sup>36</sup> Coubertin published in journals that also carried articles which were important for the reception of Ruskin in France.<sup>37</sup> Just before Coubertin mentioned Ruskin for the first time, *La Grande Encyclopédie* carried a lengthy article on Ruskin and made his activities -- including those in political economy - known to the French intellectual elite.<sup>38</sup> Coubertin was probably much impressed by the public notion that Ruskin "had reconciled England with Beauty, reconciled Protestantism with the Catholique celebrations, reconciled luxury with democracy."<sup>39</sup>

On the whole the influence of Ruskin on Coubertin

and the Olympic movement can be looked at in two fields: (1) The inclusion of the Arts into the Olympic Games and (2) the beautification of the Games themselves. While in the first field Coubertin had to rely on artists, he spent a lot of time on the second one himself. But before I go into these influences, I will give a short biography of John Ruskin, as I do not assume that he is that well known in the context of the history of sport.<sup>40</sup> There is, however, an ever increasing amount of literature on Ruskin, even a special *Ruskin Newsletter* published by the *Ruskin Association*. I will not go here into the question of Ruskin's influence on other than Coubertin. The list would be too long. For his influence on American thought, one might turn to the excellent study by Roger Stein.<sup>41</sup>

### John Ruskin

John James Ruskin (1785 -- 1864) married his cousin Margaret Cock (1781--1871) in 1818. One year later their only son, John, was born on February 8. Their family had a background in inn-keeping, operating for a long time *The King's Head* in Croydon. They were English, although some branches of the family lived for some time in Edinburgh. In 1815 John James started an import business of sherries as the active partner of *Ruskin, Telford et Domecq*. John James experimented with shapes of bottles, wine labels, to find out how his wine achieved the highest price. He can be considered an economic genius, one of the inventors of trademarks when they could not be registered, of brand names when things were sold as a kind. He learned that beautification permits a considerable profit -- and made so much money that his family, including his son John, was well off.

According to their biographers, Margaret was the more strong-willed of the parents,<sup>42</sup> so strong that it had a long-lasting influence on the life of their son John. D.H. Lawrence compares him with the heroes in his *Sons and Lovers*: "When they come to manhood, they can't love, because their mother is the strongest power in their lives, and holds them... It is a great tragedy ... It's the tragedy of thousands of young men in England... I think it was Ruskin's."<sup>43</sup>

When John was four years old, his parents moved from London to Herne Hill (four miles south of London)

where he spent his youth. He published his first poems when he was eleven (*Ileriad*, more than 2000 lines long, after a visit to the Lake District). He made his first extended tour to the continent with his parents when he was 14. At 15 he published his first longer piece of prose ("On the causes of the Colour of the Water of the Rhine") and had three articles in the prestigious *Magazine of Natural History*; at 16 he was for the first time in Venice, a town he visited eleven times, and would make such a difference in his life.<sup>44</sup>

At 18 he entered Christ Church, Oxford University, as a Gentleman Commoner (a status normally reserved for nobility). His mother followed him to Oxford and expected him for tea daily (sometimes he avoided going), his father coming to the university town for the weekend. Ruskin had mainly been prepared for university at home; he was fluent in Latin and Greek, but with a wide variety of interests. He knew much of the Bible by heart -- and allusions to the Bible made much of the charm of his language.<sup>45</sup> At age 19 he published his first monograph, *The Poetry of Architecture*. At his 21st birthday he received an annual income from his parents of £ 200, became a Fellow of the Geological Society, and met Turner (his father had a large Turner collection). John Ruskin would, in time, publish much about Turner's paintings, and defended him in *Modern Painters* against criticism.<sup>46</sup> Ruskin had a physical breakdown which made him interrupt his university studies. Finally, he went again with his parents to Italy to overcome his illness.

The following year, 1841, he completed his Oxford degree. In 1843 he published the first volume of *Modern Painters*, which did not yet establish him as a major force in the study of aesthetics, as his theories therein were very much against the current of public opinion. In fact, he published it under a pseudonym. In 1845, he made his first continental tour without his parents, and the following year he published volume two of *Modern Painters*. In 1848 he married Effie Gray (nine years younger than himself); six years later their marriage was annulled as John's parents often intruded in his family life. In 1849 he published the *Seven Lamps of Architecture*, spent his summer in the Alps with his parents (without his wife), and the winter in Venice (with his wife). In 1850 he published his first book of poems and *The King of the Golden River*. The

following year brought the publication of *The Stones of Venice* (volume 1), and in 1853, volumes 2 and 3. He also started his first public lectures, which he published the following year (*Lectures on Art and Paintings*). It shocked many of his friends when in 1854 he started to lecture in the Working Men's College.<sup>47</sup> His association with Rossetti and the pre-Raphaelites is from the same year.<sup>48</sup>

In 1855, he began the annual series of the *Academy Notes*; the following year he published *Modern Painters*, vols. 3 and 4. His many skills became most obvious in the following year when his *The Elements of Drawing* was simultaneously published with his *The Political Economy of Art*, which established him also as a major thinker in the field of sociology and economy -- but with theories that were not at all accepted by his peers at first. The following year he met Rose La Touche, to whom he proposed marriage eight years later.<sup>49</sup> In 1860 he published *Modern Painters*, vol. 5 and four essays on political economy in *Cornhill Magazine* (published in book form as *Unto this Last*) and the year after, more essays in Fraser's (which were published later as *Munera Pulveris*).

The years 1859-60 can be seen as a division in his life. In the first part of his life he was more concerned with art work; in the following years, with social work. The fascinating thing about his life is, however, that his theoretical work contained a lot of practical application and his practical, a lot of theory.<sup>50</sup> This is why he did not only publish about art, but produced also many drawings, wrote about political economy, and eventually founded an utopian community. He wrote about the beautification of things, and eventually founded his own publishing house to produce his books by hand at a very high price. In all cases he was willing to improve on his theories by what he learned in his practical work.

When his essays in *Cornhill Magazine* met with complete rejection -- the readers accepted him as an art critic but not as a political thinker and strongly resented his brand of socialism at the time -- what was Ruskin's reaction? In the *Introduction* to the book version he pointed out: "The four following essays were published eighteen months ago in the *Cornhill Magazine*, and were reprobated in a violent manner, as far as I could hear, by most of the readers they met with. Not a whit

the less, I believe them to be the best, that is to say the truest, rightest worded and most serviceable things I have ever written." Needless to say, he spent the rest of his life to prove it.

His political economy was strongly influenced by Thomas Carlyle and by the Christian Socialists,<sup>51</sup> but he took many examples from the field of art production and from what he had learned at home in the wine trade.<sup>52</sup> His resentment of Manchester liberalism<sup>53</sup> was later taken over by many others, but his particular economic theory that includes *beauty* of products but also of landscape as an integral part of national wealth can only be appreciated very recently in view of the ecological crisis as highly sensible.<sup>54</sup> Ruskin is therefore also considered one of the driving forces behind the English<sup>55</sup> (and consequently many other<sup>56</sup>) Arts and Crafts movements and was also in favour of garden towns,<sup>57</sup> ideas that were followed up later, for instance, in Germany and Holland.<sup>58</sup> His notion that the worker should be responsible for the output of his work, and not just for a single part, was directed against the Taylorism of his time. It has also been only very recently accepted by factories like Volvo that better products with much higher quality translates into happier and therefore more productive workers, that is, if you have skilled craftsmen responsible for their products -- by job rotation and small working groups, rather than a complete division of labor. For Ruskin it was not the "division of labour, but rather the division of men" that had to be overcome.<sup>59</sup> From the wine trade he knew that a well decorated piece can fetch a much higher price than a simple one, that on the open market governed by supply and demand, it is always sensible to keep the supply side short, so that one could get a fair price.<sup>60</sup>

In 1864 John Ruskin's father died, a fact that made him a rich man. Apart from the \$20,000 he made per year in royalties from his books and public lectures, he inherited a house and a fortune in the sherry trade.<sup>61</sup> He continued to be a most productive writer in many fields, from which he was named Slade Professor of Fine Arts at Oxford University in 1869, one of the first chairs for art criticism in England.<sup>62</sup> The same year he published a study about the prices art pieces were fetching at *Christie's*. From 1871 to 1884 he published *Fors Clavigera*, a journal which gave him an exclusive platform for his political ideas.<sup>63</sup> When his mother

died, he bought a new home -- for the first time, one exclusively his. He also spent a lot of money endowing the *Ruskin School of Drawing* at Oxford.

Ruskin published more art books in the following years. In 1875 Rose died and Ruskin started to experiment with spiritualism, claiming he received "messages" from her. In 1876 he became involved in the struggle to hinder the construction of a railway line through the Lake District. In 1878 he established the *Guild of St. George*, the club for the readers of *Fors*, who followed the teachings of their Master.<sup>64</sup> The Guild planned to buy land in England and to train as many English as possible to start what may be called a utopian society, an English Eden.<sup>65</sup> In the same year he suffered a severe mental breakdown. He resigned the professorship the year after when he lost a libel suit and concluded that he could not be an art critic under such conditions. Although he suffered more attacks of mental instability he was reappointed Slade professor in 1883, delivered lectures published as *The Art of England*, later published as *The Pleasures of England*

In 1885 he resigned the professorship again as he protested the vivisection at Oxford. The first sections of his last work, *Praeterita*, appeared, and his mental condition deteriorated. In 1888, he made his last tour to the continent, the following year the last sections of *Praeterita* were published. In 1890 a volume of his letters appeared. The last eleven years of his life he spent in his home at Brantwood where Joan and Arthur Severn took care of him and admitted many guests to visit the aging Master. John Ruskin died on January 20, 1900.

Ruskin was one of the more controversial figures of his time.<sup>66</sup> He was much discussed during his lifetime, and few did not have an opinion, one way or the other, on his strongly formulated beliefs.<sup>67</sup> It has been characteristic of him that he did not present a complete, "perfect" theory, but one could see how it developed piece by piece<sup>68</sup> -- and in this it may rightfully be said, resembled even Coubertin. He used strong language to make his point, and was active in many fields. Even his critics praised his language which influenced generations of writers.<sup>69</sup> Ruskin's ideas became so well known in England that from 1851 onward *Ruskinism* was used as a noun, later his name was used also as a verb *to Ruskinize* (from 1880 onward), as an adjective

## Olympic Perspectives

Ruskin etc.<sup>70</sup> It should also not be overlooked that much of Ruskin's thought was so "prophetic"<sup>71</sup> that much of its actual impact has become visible today.

### The Inclusion of the Arts into the Olympics

It is uncertain when Coubertin started to think about the inclusion of artistic competitions into the Olympic Games. Müller claims that this was in 1904. He quotes Coubertin:

Now the moment has come when we enter a new phase and intend to reestablish the original beauty of Olympic Games. In the high times of Olympia ... the fine arts were combined harmoniously with the Olympic Games to create their glory. This is to become reality once again.<sup>72</sup>

Unfortunately, the quote is neither contained in the article given as the source, nor in the article from *Le Figaro* on the date cited by Müller.<sup>73</sup> Boulogne copies Müller in this erroneous quote, although he should have known better as in his own bibliography he has the article at least at the proper date.<sup>74</sup> The quote is contained in Coubertin's *21 Year Sport Campaign*, where he stated that he wrote this immediately following the London IOC-Meeting (June 20 - 22, 1904) for the *Le Figaro*.<sup>75</sup> But this quote is not from any of Coubertin's editorials in the *Le Figaro* in 1904, 1905 or 1906.<sup>76</sup> The question is, therefore, still open from what time exactly Coubertin started to be really concerned about the inclusion of the Arts in the Olympic program? Even if it was 1904, he did not do anything about it until 1906.

In a circular letter to the IOC members dated April, 1906 Coubertin invited them all to an advisory conference at the Comédie Française, 23 through 25 May 1906 (after the Athens Intermediate Games), to discuss "with which measures and in which formed the Arts and Letters can participate in the celebration of the modern Olympic Games, and in general, how they can become part of sport to help enoble it."<sup>77</sup>

In our context, it is interesting to note that prior to the conference Coubertin did not mention Ruskin a single

## Centre for Olympic Studies

time. It appears that Coubertin only learned about the theories of Ruskin in any detail by preparing for the conference (through the *Grande Encyclopédie*?<sup>78</sup>) and, at or after the conference that took place in 1906 and which was attended almost entirely by the French. Considering the short notice for the meeting and Coubertin's inability to meet anybody's traveling expenses it is not surprising that this was almost entirely a national meeting of the International Olympic Committee. The short notice for the invitation also points to the assumption that Coubertin only started to be more concerned about the inclusion of the Arts in conjunction with the Athens Intermediate Games (April 22 - May 2, 1906).

As Coubertin was more concerned with education than with the arts, he may or may not have taken notice of Ruskin. But it is certain that Ruskin was discussed at the advisory conference, as his theories about the value and use of art were en vogue in France at the time.<sup>79</sup> Ruskin was, for the French readers at the time, more than an expert for mere aesthetics; Ruskin had always been popular in France: an art critic of the highest order, a poet willing to take social and political responsibility and publish not only in his original field but write also what the French soon termed *la Bible de l'économie politique*.<sup>80</sup> Why should Coubertin consider Ruskin anything less after he started to consider Ruskinism as an option for the Olympic Games?

The conference recommended -- as Coubertin had planned -- the inclusion of five arts events in the Olympic Games.<sup>81</sup> Only after Coubertin's resignation as President of the IOC were these original competitions split into smaller, more precise categories.<sup>82</sup> The competitions came at too short a notice for 1908 in London,<sup>83</sup> but were started in, 1912: and continued until the Olympic Games of 1948. Originally they consisted of: *Architecture* (Gold medal, 1912. Monod/Laverrière for their building plan of a modern stadium); *Sculptures* (Gold medal, 1912: Winans: (*An American Trotter*<sup>84</sup>); *Painting and Graphic Arts* (Gold medal, 1912: Pellegrini: *Winter Sports*); *Music* (Gold medal, 1912: Bathelemy: *Olympic triumphal march*); *Literature* (Gold medal, 1912: Coubertin: *Ode to sport*).<sup>85</sup>

There is nothing in Ruskin that suggests he was in favour of any competitions for art. He was reluctant to

accept the judgment of art critics and was concerned with the market for the arts. He never published on music. It is very far fetched to assume that the Olympic competitions of the Arts have anything to do with Ruskinism. The word had a different meaning.<sup>86</sup>

If it is not Ruskinism, what are the Olympic Arts competitions? I assume Hans Lenk was right when he put this under the heading of Coubertin's revival of the ancient Olympic Games.<sup>87</sup> This also seems to be much closer to Coubertin's own interpretation, who wanted the well rounded athletes according to the Greek ideal and the well rounded games. "It was no accident that literary men and artists assembled at Olympia around the ancient sports."<sup>88</sup> He also advocated to bring them together again in modern times. Artists should watch athletes in training, e.g., as models, and the ancient gymnasium should be rebuilt to have artists and athletes side by side.<sup>89</sup> But Coubertin was sufficiently self-critical to accept, after the end of his involvement in the Olympic movement, that his efforts to recreate not only Olympia but also Delphi had failed.<sup>90</sup>

### The Beautification of the Olympic Games

If the Arts competitions have next to nothing to do with Ruskinism, what about the beautification of the Games? Here we are at the heart of Ruskinism, not only because Coubertin defined it like this,<sup>91</sup> but also because this is the essence of the political economy of Ruskin. For Ruskin, matters had to be beautiful to have a more unique value. To what extent did Coubertin know and accept Ruskin, not only as an aesthetic but also as a political economist? Coubertin at least mentions that he had read Ruskin's works. He also read about Ruskin.<sup>92</sup> He resented that Ruskin did not include eurythmics in his Gesamtkunstwerk which for Coubertin included expression through movement.<sup>93</sup> For Coubertin the French styles of previous epochs best represented such unity of form, color, and style. He was therefore discussing whether things should not to be all done in the styles of Louis XV or XVI.<sup>94</sup>

But as far as Ruskin goes, Coubertin was in tune with him. The Arts and Crafts movement which has often been used as being synonymous for putting decorations on everything, is the basis of Coubertin's thinking. He was spending a lot of time considering the decorations in the sport stadia, with flags, garlands, emblems and

use of actual sporting implements. He pondered how this sort of decoration could best to be achieved, not only in the opening and closing ceremony, but throughout the Games. It is in this context that he invented the Olympic flag which was shown for the first time at the celebration of the twentieth anniversary of the Olympic movement in 1914, and used for the first time for the Olympic Games of 1920 in Antwerp.<sup>95</sup> He was discussing the best form of trophies, assuming that the sporting implement itself would be a good trophy if properly adorned. But he accepted that what was correct for a foil or discus did not work for a canoe or a skiff.<sup>96</sup> For others at the time, trophies were viewed as part of the question of amateurism, which put emphasis on the financial value of the price<sup>97</sup> -- Coubertin, however, was concerned, just like Ruskin, with the beauty. The value would come by itself.

He also considered how best to build the stadium to have the Games set in the most splendid environment. How should you construct the tribunes to assure the best view - and have the most aesthetic ensemble? In this context he even used se ruskinianiser as an intransitive verb, so familiar had he become of the concepts of Ruskin.<sup>98</sup> What does he mean with the verb: The eye accustoms itself to the constant beautification of things to avoid straight lines (like many stadia are) and put matters in the proper proportions and colors, to beautify so as to increase its value.<sup>99</sup>

Coubertin was also aware of the fact that what is a proper decoration in one country may not to be so proper in another. Coubertin, who had traveled a great deal though many countries, discussed his experiences in a transcultural context. He used as one example, the flower and reef decorations in Greece, and said that, to him, as a Frenchman, they gave the impression of a funeral. He recommended that one should find styles that are generally acceptable. For the same reason he did not like cypresses in the stadium as they made it look like a funeral home.<sup>100</sup> Looking at "fine" national differences, Coubertin keenly sought international understanding.<sup>101</sup>

Coubertin thought about night events under flood lights, events in the light of lanterns (all in the same color), about fire works (not to to be done during the

competitions as that would draw the attention away from the athletes), the use of electrically illuminated flowers, Bengalese fires, torches. All these light effects were used by Coubertin as a means of decoration in which he invested a lot of thought.<sup>102</sup> Finally, he proposed marches, ceremonies like the Olympic oath,<sup>103</sup> and the unity of sight and sound -- and no more than one speaker, in an effort to keep the verbal part integrated into action as short as possible.<sup>104</sup>

The organizers of the Olympic Games have followed Coubertin's lead and have attempted to make the Olympic Games something special, more than the mere assembly in one place at one time many world championships. Coubertin tried to revive the *religio athletae* of antiquity to make the Games more solemn, not only on the side of the organization, but also for the participants.<sup>105</sup> Coubertin was concerned that Ruskin had not included sport into the "eurhythmics"<sup>106</sup> of his aesthetic and political theory, as for the founder of the Olympic movement the athlete in his unity of motion, plastic form of the body and expression in the beautified Olympic Games played a major role. The sporting event should exhibit unity between the athlete and the spectator, with the surroundings, the decoration, the landscape, etc. Coubertin attempted such a noble Gesamtkunstwerk.<sup>107</sup> Although Ruskin had gone to Oxford which was the athletic hotbed of the times, he never acquired an interest in sports; he resented Alpine mountaineering -- one of the favorites of the day -- as "they had turned the majesty of Nature into a race track."<sup>108</sup>

### Conclusion

*Voir loin, parler franc, agir ferme* was one of Coubertin's life mottoes.<sup>109</sup> If he was willing to evoke Ruskin, put all of his efforts under the aegis of his theory,<sup>110</sup> we can safely assume that he knew what he was doing and why he was doing it, as he was talking frankly about it and acted firmly. Why can we not trust him that here, too, he was looking into the future as it says in his motto?

If, on the other hand, we assume with Landow that Ruskin's "criticisms of society, his interpretations of art, his readings of literature remain valid ... continue to apply and will apply for some time to come,"<sup>111</sup> we have to look not just at the Olympic Games of

Coubertin's time but of the Games of today. We may then ask questions with Ruskin, like: Why are the Olympic Games such a marketable commodity? Has the beautification of the Olympic Games - that Coubertin favored as *Ruskinisation* and put a lot of time and thought into -- led directly into the chances to market the Games so efficiently?<sup>112</sup> Are Ueberroth and Samaranch -- who stress the exclusivity of sponsorship to provide a unified and "beautiful" image of the Games -- closer to Coubertin via Ruskin than John Lucas and others who resent their (post)modern commercialism?<sup>113</sup> We may also ask whether Coubertin did not want the commercial success of the Olympic Games and their ability to achieve such a high market value. Ruskin would certainly have seen it as a proof for his economic theories - but did Coubertin really understand them?

Let us assume for a moment that he did, when he beautified the Olympic Games. Jean Beaudrillard is one of the dominant writers to discuss postmodernism as post-industrialism in the cultural sphere. He is particularly concerned with the transition from "industrial capitalism" to "consumer capitalism" in culture. And exactly here the influence of John Ruskin plays its role. His life and beauty-oriented capitalism (although it contains also bitter critiques of capitalism) extends from the fields of the arts and culture,<sup>114</sup> to consumption, like the sherry trade his father made his money in.<sup>115</sup> Isn't this already a consumer capitalism that the other theoreticians of the time tried to avoid so ardently when they assumed that their theory should not apply to the arts?<sup>116</sup> For Beaudrillard, it is important to note that we do not only consume products, but signs as well.<sup>117</sup>

In yet another field -- which is the basis for the Olympic Games as a post-modern thrill - Ruskin can be seen as one of the important forerunners: Postmodernism is characterized by the lack of distinction between "high" and "low" cultures.<sup>118</sup> This can also be regarded as being propagated first by John Ruskin, who claimed: "All that men do ingeniously is art, in one sense... For, strictly speaking, there is no such thing as 'fine' or 'high' art. All art is a low and common thing, and what we indeed respect is not *art* at all, but *instinct* or *inspiration* expressed with the help of art."<sup>119</sup> The postmodern approach is, however, also one of the reasons for the successful

commodification of the Olympic Games.

I would therefore like to throw the stone into the pond and advance the idea that the Olympic Games are the splendid postmodern phenomenon they are because Coubertin attempted to Ruskinize them towards being such a spectacle. For Ruskin, the best artist was the one who not only put his skill into a matter, but also his heart (“hand and heart”<sup>120</sup>) and his emotion. For Coubertin, this meant that the athlete was also an artist and he provided the perfect surroundings to achieve a perfect presentation. For this, Coubertin invented a corporate identity with a logo, a flag, a powerful myth -- the invented tradition<sup>121</sup> -- so early that he can to be considered an economic genius because he was the first to market a sector of the service industry, invest heavily into a future profit, one which Samaranch and his other nephews are now reaping. Beautification for Ruskin meant, at the same time, commodification.<sup>122</sup> I don’t think it is any hindrance for the argument that it took such a long time to fully sell the beautified Games on the open market -- they were after all heavily subsidized from the very beginning, a measure which has always been in the way of any market economy. It is not unusual to have a path from state sponsorship to a market economy. The reason why they have become such an exclusive commodity is the same as was the case with the signature of the artist at the time of Ruskin and Coubertin, or with the copyright of authors: as soon as their trademark or their copyright could be registered, a fact which was not possible previously, one could make a profit with it. Only this assured exclusivity -- the basis for a high price in Ruskin’s political economy.

As P.D. Anthony observed, “when one Ruskin is in, the other seems to be out.”<sup>123</sup> I suggest that for the cultural history of the Olympic Games as an economic phenomenon, Ruskin is worthwhile to look at, as his political economy seems to have had a longer lasting influence on Coubertin and the Olympic Games than his aesthetic theories.

### Endnotes

1. Norbert Müller (ed.), *Pierre de Coubertin. Textes Choisis*, (Vol. 2), Zürich: Weidemann, 1986, p. 516.
2. Ibidem, 13.
3. Idem, *One Hundred Years of Olympic Congresses*.

1894-1994., Lausanne: IOC, 1994, p.70.

4. Yves-Pierre Boulogne, “The Presidencies of Demetrius Vikelas and Pierre de Coubertin,” in: *The International Olympic Committee -- One Hundred Years: The Ideas -- The Presidents -- The Achievements*, Lausanne: IOC, 1994, vol. 1, p.200.
5. The tendency to look at Ruskin, the aesthetic, is wider distributed in France than in England, but Coubertin was sufficiently anglophile to look at both sides of Ruskin. See for instance, Pierre Fontaney, *Ruskin Esthéticien: Les Années de formation (1819 - 1849)*, Lille: Univ. Lille III, 1980.
6. Allen Guttman, *The Olympics: History of the Modern Games*, Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1992.
7. John MacAloon, *This Great Symbol: Pierre de Coubertin and the Origin of the Modern Olympic Games*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1981, p. 131. In his latter work Ruskin had more pertinent things to say about the mixing of the two.
8. John A. Lucas, *Baron Pierre de Coubertin and the Formative Year of the Modern International Olympic Movement*, Doctoral Dissertation, U. of Maryland, 1962, pp. 149ff.
9. Id., *Future of the Olympic Games*, Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics, 1992. In his *The Modern Olympic Games*, (South Brunswick: A.S. Barnes, 1980) he does not mention Ruskin either.
10. Louis Callebat, *Pierre de Coubertin*, Paris: Fayard, 1988.
11. Richard D. Mandell, *The First Modern Olympics*, Berkeley: University of California Press, 1976.
12. Ernest Seillière, *Un Artisan d’Énergie Française. Pierre de Coubertin*, Paris: Henri Didier, 1917.
13. André Senay and Robert Hervet, *Monsieur de Coubertin*, Paris: S.E.S., 1956.
14. Donald W. Masterson, “The Relationship of Art and Sport: The Relevance of Coubertin’s Views Today,” in: Comité International Pierre de Coubertin (ed.), *The Relevance of Pierre de Coubertin Today*, Niedemhausen: Schors, 1987, pp. 277 - 88.
15. Donald W. Masterson, “Sport, Theatre and Art in Performance,” in: Hans Lenk (ed.), *Topical Problems of Sport Philosophy*, Schorndorf: Hofmann, pp. 169-83.
16. Linda M. Austin, “Labor, Money, and the Currency of Words in *Fors Clavigera*,” in: *English Literary History* 56 (1981), 209-27.
17. Pierre de Coubertin, “Ouvrez les portes du

Temple!" In: Id., *Anthologie* (ed. by Arnold Reymond et al.). Aix-en-Provence: Roubaud, 1933, pp. 120-2.

18. Norbert Müller (ed.), *Internationale Olympische Akademie - IOA. 25 Jahre im Spiegel der Vorträge 1961- 1986*, Niedernhausen: Schors, 1987.

19. Jean Durry, "The Fine Arts and the Olympic Games," in: IOA (ed.), *Report of the 15th Session of the IOA*. Athens: Hellenic Olympic Committee 1975, pp. 205-20; idem, "Sport, Olympism and the Fine Arts" in: IOA (ed.), *Report of the 27th Session of the IOA*. Athens: Hellenic Olympic Committee, 1986, pp. 142-49.

20. Jean Durry, "Pierre de Coubertin: L'esthétique et le sport," in: Comité International Pierre de Coubertin (ed.), *The Relevance of Pierre de Coubertin*, op. cit., pp. 265-275.

21. See e.g., Nikolaos Nissiotis, "Olympism, Sport and the Aesthetics with Reference to the Work of Pierre de Coubertin," in: IOA (ed.), *Report of the 27th Session of the IOA*, op. cit., pp. 83-90.

22. Fernand Landry, "Pierre de Coubertin, The Modern Olympic Games and the Arts," in: IOA (ed.), *Report of the 27th Session of the IOA*, Athens: Hellenic Olympic Committee 1986, pp. 93- 103.

23. Carl-Diem-Institut (ed.), *Pierre de Coubertin. Der Olympische Gedanke. Reden und Aufsätze*. Schorndorf: Hoffmann, 1967; only recently have they included Ruskin in their picture to show that Coubertin's and the IOC's concern for torches and nightly celebrations with fire are no Nazi invention ("a Nazi fire cult") but have a very early origin. See Walter Borgers, "Fackelläufe bei Olympischen Spielen. Vorgeschichte und Bedeutung," in: Carl und Liselott Diem-Archiv (ed.), *Olympische Lauffeuer*, Kassel: Agon, 1994, p. 8 (footnote 26). With Coubertin's concern for athletic meets at night, that argument seems a little far fetched, however.

24. See for example, Part VI "Sport and Aesthetics," in: William J. Morgan & Klaus V. Meier (eds.), *Philosophic Inquiry in Sport*, Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics, 1988, pp. 447-546. This also has a lengthy bibliography to the theme, pp. 541-546.

25. Klaus Ullrich, *Coubertin. Leben, Denken und Schaffen eines Humanisten*, East-Berlin: Sportverlag, 1982.

26. John A. Hobson, *John Ruskin: Social Reformer*, London: James Nisbet 1904, 3rd ed., chapter 8, "Socialism and Aristocracy," pp. 176-209.

27. John T. Fain, *Ruskin and the Economists*,

Nashville: Vanderbilt UP, 1956; Clark Sherburne, *John Ruskin, On the Ambiguities of Abundance*, Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1972; P.D. Anthony, *John Ruskin's Labour: A Study of Ruskin's Social Theory*, Cambridge: CUP, 1983; Jeffrey L. Spear, *Dreams of an English Eden: Ruskin and his Tradition in Social Criticism*, New York: Columbia UP, 1984.

28. Arnd Kruger, "Neo-Olympismus zwischen Nationalismus und Internationalismus," in: H. Ueberhorst (ed.), *Geschichte der Leibesübungen*, (vol. 3/1), Berlin: Bartels & Wernitz 1980, pp. 522-568.

29. Pierre de Coubertin, "Decoration, Pyrotechnie, Corteges: Essai de Ruskianism sportif," in: *Revue Olympique* 11 (1911), pp. 54 -59; pp. 71-6; pp. 106-10; pp. 122-124; pp. 149-53. Reprint in: Norbert Müller (ed.), *Pierre de Coubertin*, op. cit, (vol. 2) pp. 516-535.

30. Tara Magdalinski, Kathleen Moore and I are currently preparing an edited volume on the many Fathers of Olympic Thought.

31. I am indebted to Synthia S. Slowikowski (University of Illinois) and the discussion of her paper at the HISPA-Congress in Olympia: "Ancient Sport Symbols and Postmodern Tradition," in: Roland Renson, et al. (eds.), *The Olympic Games Through the Ages: Greek Antiquity and its Impact on Modern Sport*, Athens: Hellenic Olympic Committee, 1991, pp. 401-408; and also her working group on postmodernism at the NASSH conference 1993 in Albuquerque, NM which resulted in the postmodern questions in my paper published as Arnd Kruger, "Germany and Sport in World War II," in: *Canadian J. History of Sport* 24(1993), 1, pp. 52-62.

32. Arnd Krüger, "Sport, Kommerzialisierung und Postmoderne am Beispiel der IOC, Inc.," in: Hans Sarkowicz (ed.), *Schneller, höher, weiter. Eine Geschichte des Sports*, Frankfurt/M: Insel Verlag, 1996, 79-92; id., "Hundert Jahre und kein Ende? Eine postmoderne Betrachtung der Olympischen Idee," in: Julius H. Schoeps (ed.), *Körper, Kultur und Ideologie. Sport und Zeitgeist im 19. und 20. Jahrhundert*, Weinheim: Beltz-Athenäum, 1996, (in print), 25 pp.

33. Edward Tyas Cook and Alexander Wedderburn (eds.), *The Works of John Ruskin*, London: George Allen, 1903-1912, 39 vols.

34. Louis Meylan (ed.), *Catalogue de la Bibliothèque du Baron Pierre de Coubertin: Fondateur des Jeux Olympiques Modernes, de l'Union Pédagogique Universelle et Promoteur de la Pédagogie Sportive*,

Lausanne: Guilde du Livre, 1944.

35. I will go into this question in more detail at another place in this paper.

36. Jean-Pierre Guillermin, "Le ruskianisme en France ou la célébration du fou," in: *Revue des Sciences Humaines* 60 (1983), N° 189, pp. 89-110.

37. E.g. Léon Barracand, "John Ruskin", in: *Revue bleu* 27, Nov. 1897, pp. 693-696; J. Milsand, in: *Revue des Deux Mondes* (the same author also published the first French monograph on Ruskin in 1869). Articles on Ruskin in English appeared, e.g., in *The Century Magazine* (February 1898); *Reviews of Reviews* (January 1898); articles about his death appeared in France at least in *Le Figaro* (January 23, 1900), *La Libre Parole* (January 23) *Le Temps* (January 22), *La Dépeche* (January 30), *Le Journal* (January 31), *Annales Politiques et Littéraires* (January 28), *Revue des Deux Mondes* (February 15), *Réforme Social* (March 1), *Revue Encyclopédique* (March 1), *Studio* (March 15), *Gazette des Beaux-Arts* (April 1), *Mercure de France* (April 1), *Revue Bleu* (April 5), *Revue Socialiste* (April 5), *Union pour l'Action Morale* (April 15).

38. René Bathélot, "John Ruskin", in: *La Grande Encyclopédie* (vol. 28), Paris: La Grande Encyclopédie 1904, pp. 1145-1148.

39. Robert de la Sizeranne, "Preface", in: John Ruskin, *Les Pierres de Venise*, Paris: Renouard-Laurens 1906, p. xvi.

40. The most complete biography is still Edward Tyas Cok, *The Life of Ruskin*, (2 vols.), London: George Allen, 1911; more modern ones include: Joan Abse, *John Ruskin: The Passionate Moralists*, London: Quartet 1980; John D. Hunt, *The Wider Sea: A Life of John Ruskin*, London: JM Dent 1982; Wolfgang Kemp, *John Ruskin, 1819-1900: Leben und Werk*, München: Hanser, 1983; Reginald H. Wilenski, *John Ruskin: An Introduction to further Study of his Life and Work*, New York: Russel & Russel, 1967.

41. Roger B. Stein, *John Ruskin and Aesthetic Thought in America, 1840 - 1900*, Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1967.

42. See e.g. Frederick Kichhoff, *John Ruskin*, Boston: Twayne, 1984, p.2.

43. David Herbert Lawrence, *Selected Literary Criticism*, London: Heinemann, 1955, p. 13.

44. Jeanne Clegg, *Ruskin and Venice*, London: Junction Books, 1981; Alexander Bradley, *Ruskin and Italy*, Ann Arbor: UMI Research Press, 1987.

45. According to Frederick Kirchhoff, *John Ruskin*, op. Cit., p. 3.

46. Luke Herrmann, *Ruskin and Turner: A Study of Ruskin as a Collector of Turner*, London: Faber & Faber, 1968.

47. He was very active in many areas in the town of Camberwell. See James S. Dearden, *John Ruskin's Camberwell*, St. Albans: Brentham, 1990.

48. The often overlooked connection between Romantic humanism (socialism with some) and mercantile economy is best explained in Sherburne, *Ruskin or the Ambiguities*, op. cit., pp. 1-26 and by Collin Campbell, *The Romantic Ethic and the Spirit of Modern Consumerism*, Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1987.

49. For their relationship see also Van Akin Burd (ed.), *John Ruskin and Rose La Touche: Her Unpublished Diaries of 1861 and 1867*, Oxford: Clarendon, 1980.

50. Hobson, *John Ruskin*, op. cit., p. 41.

51. Keith Thomas (ed.), *Victorian Thinkers (Carlyle - Ruskin - Arnold - Morris)*, Oxford: Oxford UP, 1993.

52. Jay Fellow, *The Failing Distance. The Autobiographical Impulse in John Ruskin*, Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP, 1975.

53. Patrick Geddes, *John Ruskin: Economist*, Edinburgh: Wm. Brown, 1934.

54. Cook, *Ruskin*, op. cit., Vol. 2, p. 136.

55. Andrea Schlieker, *Theoretische Grundlagen der "Arts and Crafts" - Bewegung. Untersuchungen zu den Schriften von A.W.N. Pugin, J. Ruskin. Wm. Morris, C. Dressler, W.R. Lethaby und C.R. Ashbee*, Bonn: Phil. Diss., 1986.

56. For an overview see Gillian Naylor, *The Arts and Craft Movement. A Study of its Sources, Ideals and Influence on Design*, London: Studio Vista, 1971. For North America see e.g. Kenneth T. Trapp (ed.), *The Arts and Crafts Movement in California. Living and the Good Life*, New York: Abbeville, 1993.

57. Hans Kampffmeyer, *Die Gartenstadtbewegung Auss Natur und Geistewelt* Vol. 2) Leipzig: Teubner 1916; Id., *Wohnungen, Siedlungen und Gartenstädte in Holland und England*; Berlin: Deutscher Kommunalverlag, 1926.

58. Hellerau (near Dresden) was one of the better known ones that included the arts, music, and dance - with the eurhythmics of Emile Jaques Dalcroze.

59. John Ruskin, *The Nature of Gothic*, quoted from Eric Warner & Graham Hough (eds.) *Strangeness and Beauty: An Anthology of Aesthetic Criticism, 1840 - 1910*, Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1983, Vol. 1, p. 57.

60. Linda M. Austin, *The Practical Ruskin*, Baltimore: Johns Hopkins, 1991, pp. 90ff.
61. Barthélot, "Ruskin," op.cit., 1147.
62. Henry A. Ladd, *The Victorian Morality of Art. An Analysis of Ruskin's Aesthetic*, New York: Long & Smith, 1932; George P. Landow, *Aesthetic and Critical Theories of John Ruskin*. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1971.
63. Brian Maidment, "Ruskin, Fors Clavigera and Ruskianism," in: Robert Hewison (ed.), *New Approaches to Ruskin*, London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1981, pp. 194-213.
64. The Guild still exists today; the best description is still Margaret E. Spence, "The Guild of St. George: Ruskin's Attempt to Translate his Ideas into Practice," in: *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library* 40 (Sept. 1947), 147-201.
65. Spears, *Dreams of an English Eden*, op.cit., particularly pp. 127-99.
66. J.L. Bradley (ed.), *John Ruskin. The Critical Heritage*, London: Routledge, 1995.
67. See Peter Fuller, *Theoria*. London: Chatto & Windus, 1988.
68. See Philip Davis, "Arnold or Ruskin?" in: *Journal of Literature & Theology* 6 (1992) 4, 320-44.
69. See Sheila Emerson, *Ruskin: The Genesis of Invention*, Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1993.
70. See the OED for a full selection.
71. My statement goes even further than Peter Quennell, *John Ruskin: The Portrait of a Prophet*, London: Viking, 1949.
72. Norbert Müller, *One Hundred Years of Olympic Congresses*, op.cit., p. 69.
73. According to Müller it is part of "Donner sans retenir," *Le Figaro*, June 16, 1904, p. 1 (translated). The article appeared on June 10, and does not contain anything about the Olympic Games or sports.
74. Boulogne, "Vikelas and Coubertin," op.cit., p. 200, see id., *La vie et l'oeuvre pédagogique de Pierre de Coubertin*, Ottawa: Leméac, 1975, p. 411.
75. Pierre de Coubertin, *Einundzwanzig Jahre Sport Kampagne (1887-1904)*, Ratingen: Henn, 1974, p. 152.
76. I did not read all of *Le Figaro*, only the issues mentioned in Boulogne's bibliography.
77. Facsimili printed on: Boulogne, "Vikelas and Coubertin," op.cit., p. 98.
78. Barthélot, "John Ruskin," op.cit., appeared in 1904.
79. See Jacques Bardoux, *John Ruskin*, Paris: Coulomniens, 1900.
80. Ibid., pp. 358-460.
81. He mentioned in his opening remarks that he wanted the five competitions. See Pierre de Coubertin, "Discours d'ouverture (du 23 mai 1906) de la Conférence consultative des arts, lettres et sports," in: Idem, *Textes choisis*, op.cit., Vol. 2, pp. 483-484.
82. Horst Ueberhorst, "Sport and Art: The Function of Art and Olympic Art Competitions," *NASSH Proceedings*, 23 (1995), 68-70.
83. An Olympic competition in Painting, Sculpture and in Architecture had been planned for London, but could not be realized. See Coubertin, *Textes choisis*, op.cit., Col. 2, pp. 498-502.
84. He had been Olympic champion in 1908 in "Running deer shooting, double shot," thus Coubertin's wish that artists should also be athletes and vice versa.
85. For the development and a complete list see Kamper, *Encyclopedia of the Olympic Games*. Dortmund: Harenberg, 1972, pp. 285-292.
86. Although the meaning shifted with time, it basically meant to produce by hand when you could use a machine, to beautify in the sense of the Arts and Crafts movement. See OED for a variety of meanings.
87. Hans Lenk, *Werte, Ziele, Wirklichkeit der modernen Olympischen Spiele*, Schorndorf: Hofmann, 1964, pp. 30-43.
88. Pierre de Coubertin, *Olympische Erinnerungen*, Berlin: Limpert, 1936 (reprint: Frankfurt/M: Limpert 1958, quote my translation from p. 83).
89. Pierre de Coubertin, *Pédagogie sportive*, Lausanne: BIPS, 1934, pp. 146-9.
90. Pierre de Coubertin, "Delphi und Olympia," in: *Bulletin du Bureau International de Pédagogie Sportive*, (1931), No. 6, pp. 5-7.
91. Coubertin, *Pédagogie Sportive*, op.cit., p. 149-53.
92. Coubertin, "Decoration etc," op.cit., p. 517.
93. None of the authors I have read about Ruskin mentions this in English or French, so there is a pretty good chance that Coubertin had really read those parts of Ruskin that were important to his revival of the Olympic Games.
94. Ibid., Vol. 2, p. 520.
95. Pierre de Coubertin, "La valeur pédagogique du cérémonial olympique," in *Bulletin du Bureau International de Pédagogie Sportive*, No. 7 (1931), pp. 3-5.
96. Ibid., p. 522.
97. "La Charte de l'Amateurisme," in: *Revue Olympique* (1902) pp. 14-15, quoted in, *Textes*

choisis, op.cit., Vol 2, pp. 565-567.

98. This can be considered typical for Coubertin's snobbishness and conspicuous use of the English language, as the verb was used like this in English (see OED), but not in the French. Even Coubertin's attempts to introduce the noun and the verb into the French language were not accepted by the official "guardians" of the language and therefore neither included in the Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique (ed.), *Trésor de la langue française*, Paris: Gallimard, 1990, Vol. 14, nor in the *Grand Larousse de langue française*, Paris: Larousse, 1977, Vol. 6.

99. Ibid., p. 523.

100. Ibid., p. 521.

101. Pierre de Coubertin, "Does Cosmopolitan Life Lead to International Friendliness?" in: Review of Reviews 17 (1898), 429-34.

102. Coubertin, "Décoration etc.," op.cit., 528.

103. Also introduced for the first time in 1920, see Coubertin, *Testes choisis*, op.cit., Vol. 2, p. 273.

104. Coubertin, "Décoration etc.," op.cit., pp. 529-30.

105. Arnd Krüger, "The Origins of Pierre de Coubertin's Religio Athletae," in: *Olympika. The International Journal of Olympic Studies* 2 (1993), 91-102.

106. The most prominent artist using eurhythmic at the time was Emile Jaques-Dalcroze (1865-1950) who can also be considered the father of modern rhythmical gymnastics - which Coubertin wanted to have in the Olympics as he regretted the absence of ancient Greek dance from the Games. See Emile Jaques-Dalcroze, *The Eurhythmics of Emile Jaques-Dalcroze*, London: Constable, 1912; for a biography of Jaques-Dalcroze who lived in Paris at the same time Coubertin was there see Antje Schmitt, *Emile Jaques-Dalcroze: Sein Leben und sein Werk unter dem Aspekt der Ganzheitlichkeit*, M.A., Göttingen, 1994.

107. Coubertin, "Décoration etc.," op.cit., p. 535.

108. Quoted in: John Lowerson, *Sport and the English Middle Classes, 1870- 1914*, Manchester: Manchester UP, 1993, p. 55.

109. Coubertin, *Anthologie*, op.cit., p. 159.

110. Coubertin, "Décoration etc.," op.cit., p. 535.

111. Landlow, *Aesthetic and Critical Theories of John Ruskin*, op.cit., p. 5.

112. As a lot of the money benefits the athletes, Ruskin would have approved. As the mass consumption of sport is used for political ends, he would have had his doubts. See: Patrick Brantlinger, *Bread and Circuses:*

*Theories of Mass Culture as Social Decay*, London: Cornell UP, 1983, pp. 145-52.

113. Lucas, *Future of the Olympic Games*, op.cit.

114. Austin, *Practical Ruskin*, op.cit., p. 2.

115. Hewison argues that Ruskin's method is entirely based on visual experiences he had made. See Robert Hewison, *John Ruskin: The Argument of the Eye*, London: Heinemann, 1976, p. 7.

116. See Gary Cross, *Time and Money: The Making of Consumer Culture*, London: Routledge, 1993, p. 18; for difficulty of labor historians to deal with consumption (and sport for that matter) see "Time, Money, and Labor History's Encounter with Consumer Culture," in: *International Labor and Working-Class Theory*, (Spring 1993) No.43, pp. 2-17.

117. Scott Lash & John Urry, "Postmodern Sensibility," *The Polity Reader in Cultural Theory*, Oxford: Polity, 1994, 134- 140.

118. See, e.g. John Storey, *An introductory Guide to Cultural Theory and Popular Culture*, London: Harvester, 1993.

119. Ruskin, *Works*, op.cit., p. 202.

120. Ruskin, *Works*, op.cit., Vol. 16, p. 385; Vol. 19, p. 391.

121. Eric Hobsbawm & Terance Ranger (eds.), *The Invention of Tradition*, Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1983; for the Olympic Games see Arnd Krüger, "The History of the Olympic Winter Games: The Invention of a Tradition," in: Matti Goksøyr, Gerd v.d. Lippe, Kristen Mo (eds.), *Winter Games: Warm Traditions*, Oslo: Norsk Idrettshistorisk Forening, 1996, pp. 101-22.

122. For the problems involved see Richard Butsch (ed.), *For Fun and Profit. The Transformation of Leisure into Consumption*, Philadelphia: Temple UP, 1990.

123. Anthony, *John Ruskin's Labour*, op.cit., p. 2.