
Olympic Scholars and Olympic Records: Access and management of the Records of an Olympic Games

Richard Cashman*

Introduction

The records of an Olympic Games, consist of archival files, books, reports, videos, photographs, art work, plans, memorabilia, and even internet sites: they constitute a valuable educational and cultural asset and resource. However, until recently, the value of records has not been fully appreciated. Records are the central component of legacy, an issue treated in general terms in my University of Western Ontario Conference paper in 1998.

The fate of the cauldron, which was used to light the flame at the 1956 Melbourne Olympics, provides an illuminating insight into legacy and post-Games planning in this era. It is also a telling example of how legacy was regarded at this time. After the 1956 Games the cauldron was lost for 30 years and not rediscovered until 1987. By then it was recognised that the cauldron was an artefact of great value and public interest. The cauldron became a central focus at an exhibition, opened in December 1999, at the Australian Gallery of Sport at the Melbourne Cricket Ground (MCG), the main arena for the 1956 Games.

The exhibition text beside the cauldron is worth quoting in full:

The cauldron displayed here was constructed shortly before the Games by local sheet metal engineers Rayson Industries. The flame was fuelled by liquid petroleum gas supplied by Shell Oil Company and maintained by students from the University of Melbourne who kept a vigil at the cauldron to change the gas bottles and ensure the flame did not go out.

After the Games, the cauldron was exhibited throughout Victoria in a series of public displays for charity. Subsequently it was lost and its whereabouts unknown for 30 years. In 1987 the cauldron was found in a city council warehouse in West Melbourne and donated to the Australian Gallery of Sport by the Melbourne City Council. Although constructed quickly and not intended to last for longer than the period of the Games, the cauldron was found to be in good condition in requiring only minor refurbishment before again being presented for display.¹

It is interesting to note that the cauldron, itself, was not built to last; it was 'constructed quickly' for the task at hand. Once the Games were over, this important ceremonial item was not considered to have any enduring value. There was a similar approach to Olympic records: once the Games were finished and, presumably after some culling of the records, they were packed away in various places and that was that. It was assumed that scholarly and public interest in the records would be minimal. The records of the 1956 Games are deposited in various repositories: the Public Record Office (PRO) of Victoria (the records of OCOG and some of the photographic collection); the Australian Gallery of Sport at the MCG (reports, memorabilia, some private papers and part of the photographic collection); the University of Melbourne (part of the collection of Frank Beaurepaire); the Melbourne City Council; which has its own Olympic collection; and the National Archives. There is no overall inventory and finding aids for the Melbourne Games. Description lists of the records in each archival box at the PRO provide a form of finding aid. The images, however, are not easy to access because the list is a rudimentary one: it consists of what was written on each negative by the respective photographer. However, a project is underway and should be completed in the next few years to create a more user-friendly database of images.

Post-Games planning in Melbourne in 1956 was rudimentary. The main concern was to restore the MCG to its previous use as

* Richard Cashman is the Director of the Centre for Olympic Studies at The University of New South Wales, Australia.

the premier cricket and football venue in the country. The media declared that Melbourne was the ‘friendly Games,’ maybe the last of the ‘innocent’ Games before drugs, spiralling costs, security problems, television and sponsorship created many new challenges for the Olympic Movement. There was an element of truth in this media tag as the Games were generally considered ‘successful’ and largely incident free with the notable exception of the water polo match between Hungary and the USSR., which became a bloodbath. The Melbourne public responded to the Games with large crowds turning up every day. However, for decades there was limited interest in probing further into the reality of the ‘friendly Games.’

For three decades, Melbourne lost its cauldron and there was limited Olympic legacy. During this period, little of substance was published on the Games;² there was no critical and scholarly analysis of the 1956 Olympics. It appears that usage of the records was limited and largely confined to small-scale projects. The records were largely left to gather dust.

It was not until 1986 that legacy issues began to surface in Melbourne. The Australian Gallery of Sport, which was opened in 1986, included a permanent Olympic display though it was also a museum of Australian sport in general — the permanent Olympic display was the first of its kind in Australia. The cauldron was rediscovered in 1987. In 2000, the Public Record Office of Victoria has organised an exhibition of Olympic memorabilia, which has moved around the country in the months before the Games.

It was not until the 1980s that the first significant scholarly studies first appeared, providing a broader understanding of the context of the ‘friendly Games.’ Harry Gordon, in a commissioned history of Australia at the Olympic Games (1994), recounted the political problems, bickering, and indecisiveness that characterized Melbourne’s preparations for the Games after 1949. Just eighteen months before the Games, IOC President Avery Brundage visited the city and threatened to take the Games from Melbourne. Historian Graeme Davison (1997) suggested that there were reservations about the Melbourne Games from the outset by labour and welfare leaders and rural interests. Surprisingly, initial support for the Games was weaker in the home state of Victoria (63 per cent) than with Australia as a whole (75 per cent). Once the Games were won, there were a series of ‘pitched’ battles between amateur sporting bodies, the business community, and various political groups and Melbourne came close to losing the Games on three occasions, in 1951, 1953, and 1955.³ Geoffrey Ballard, commandant of the Olympic village at Heidelberg, wrote an interesting book, *Nation within Nation* (1997), outlining how this ‘gay modernistic venue’ exemplified Olympic ideals. However, an article by Diane Bagnall in 1993 suggested that by the 1990s the village had degenerated into a slum for no-hopers. Shane Cahill completed a Master’s thesis in 1989 at the University of Melbourne on *‘The Friendly Games’: The Melbourne Olympic Games in Australian culture* — this was the first thesis written on the Games. Historical scholarship of the 1980s and 1990s provided a revisionary perspective on the Games in the video, *‘Lies, Spies and the Olympics’* (1999). This video elaborated the lies and broken promises of the organisers of the Games; the Cold War agendas pursued by the Australian Government and the role of espionage at the time of the Games; Graeme Davison was a consultant for this video. The renewed interest in the Melbourne Games was also undoubtedly a product of Sydney’s successful bid of 1993 to stage the 2000 Olympic Games and during the 1990s there were many other popular and scholarly works published on the Melbourne Olympics.⁴

So it is only after some four decades that there has been a genuine scholarly engagement with the records and a more clearly defined assessment of the Melbourne Games is starting to emerge. But how much of Melbourne’s records had been lost in 30 years? What opportunities have been missed to interview some of the key personnel of the Melbourne Games?

Why Have Records and Legacy Become Such important Issues?

Unlike 1956, there is now a greater sense of the value of records in particular and legacy in general. Four reasons can be suggested for the changed climate in regard to records in 2000: the growth of sports exhibitions and museums; the rise of sports history and sports studies; the recognition of the value of knowledge transfer and the fact that memorabilia has become big business.

Since the 1980s, there has been a growth of interest in sports museums and exhibitions. During this period it has become evident that museums can be used to promote a sport and its values and, in addition, can even be commercially viable. Museums can add to the value of sports stadiums by attracting a continuing number of sports tourists. Museums, which make use of electronic and interactive technology, can also be used to interest young people in a particular sport or sporting venue. The IOC, recognising the importance of an Olympic Museum, opened its own museum at Lausanne in 1993.

Sports scholars, who now are an important part of the Olympic landscape, have a particular interest in records of the Games. Although the Olympic Movement was initially slow to recognise the value of scholars, the climate of opinion has changed markedly in recent times for a number of reasons. It is now recognised that scholars can assist with Olympic education, articulate reform agendas and provide an objective long-term assessment of the strengths and weaknesses of a particular Games. In recent years the Olympic Studies Centre at the International Olympic Committee has recognised the value of scholarship. It has initiated a Research Council through which there is ongoing interchange between senior personnel of the Olympic Museum and some of the leading international Olympic scholars.

Given the size and the complexity of the Games, there is increasing recognition of need and desirability of knowledge transfer from one Games to another. SOCOG has been aware of the importance of this process and has advanced the practice of knowledge

transfer, or, as it has become known the Transfer Know How Program (see below).

Memorabilia is now big business. Souvenirs, pins, merchandise, individual torches are all products available for sale and are a core part of the financing of each Games. Design is not only an important aspect of the 'look' of a particular Games, it is a focal point of merchandising strategies.

The climate in regard to sports archives has changed dramatically even in the past decade. In the early 1990s Finnish archivist Kenth Sjöblom and Richard Fagan, a student in the School of Librarianship at the University of New South Wales, lamented the limited interest in sports archives and the failure of archivists, sports administrators, and sports scholars to develop a creative discussion about their respective interests in records.⁵ The rich records of the Olympic Games appear to be one critical reason why sport is being removed from 'archival obscurity' — to coin a term of Fagan.⁶

Olympic Records

This paper will explore one central issue of legacy, that of records, and the relationship of scholars in regards to records management, and related issues of research and promotion.

Records produced by an Olympic Games are becoming greater in quantity and more varied in character as the Games themselves get larger with a greater number of athletes and events and more media coverage. Records consist of archival tiles, reports, serials, memorabilia (ceremonial props, merchandising and so forth), audio-visual formats, images, photographs, art, and plans. They also include electronic material: the website of the organising committee — before the Games and during the Games — and its intranet document management data base (known internally in SOCOG as Athena). However, to date, electronic material has not been considered to be part of the OCOG's core archives. No electronic material from the 1996 Games for instance has been kept.

As the Games get bigger so too do the archives. It is likely that the size of the archives of the Sydney Olympics may be 150 per cent larger than the 1984 Los Angeles Games. The LA Games produced approximately 20,000 boxes of files; the number produced by the Sydney Games could be as many as 50,000 boxes. All in all, the records of contemporary Olympic Games provide a rich and varied collection relating to sport and event management in one city over more than a decade. They provide the bases for possibly ten years worth of research projects and even more.

A major problem with all cities is that the planning for the pre-Games and the Games period is so intense that important issues of post-Games planning tend to get lost. In the rush to finalise and close down an OCOG valuable parts of the records may be removed, lost, and even sold off. There are also grounds for believing that many people in OCOGs and NOCs, do not realise the potential value of Olympic records.

Records as an Asset

Properly organising and maintaining the records of an Olympic Games are an extremely expensive undertaking so some questions are worth posing. Why are records an asset? Who will benefit from their proper organisation and maintenance? What is the justification for the expense? Are there people, other than scholars, who have a long-term interest in a well-organized collection of records?

While each Olympic city is obliged to keep some records of the Games, OCOGs and NOCs and owners of the records have a variety of options. First of all, not all records need be kept and a substantial part of the records will be culled as non-essential. The organisers of Olympic archives also have a choice whether they adopt an 'active' or a 'passive' policy in regards to records. An 'active' policy involves promoting and publicizing the records in various ways to make them more accessible to potential users. An inventory of the records and finding aids for instance will assist those who wish to consult them. An alternative 'passive' policy consists of simply storing the records with limited organisation and assistance for those who may wish to consult them. Potential users have to use some initiative to find a particular research item.

A large variety of potential stakeholders can be identified. There is, first of all, the National Olympic Committee. The Australian Olympic Committee is taking an active interest in the location of the records of the Games because it is likely that it will use the records on a comparative frequent basis. The Australian Olympic Committee also has been involved in discussions about the fate of the archives because it recognises that they can be used to enhance a greater understanding of Australia's rich Olympic heritage. Secondly, there are a growing number of students and scholars who constitute a second group who will want to make use of Olympic records. Scholarly interest is not limited to Olympic researchers, many others will be interested in event management or a multitude of Games-related issues — such as the environment, media, security, transport and so forth. Thirdly, there appears to be a growing interest among the general public in sports museums and archives. Fourthly, the possibility of legal action arising out of Games-related contracts will attract another group of people to the records and is another reason for ensuring adequate provision for Games records. Finally, there will be those people who seek to make commercial gain out of the records. An auction sale of memorabilia of the Games is a one-off measure undertaken by an OCOG to help defray the costs of the Games. There are others

who may seek to make ongoing profit from Games memorabilia by locating them in a museum.

There are some broader reasons for encouraging best Olympic archival practices. Well-organised records will enhance public understanding of an important event and help to locate it in a particular city's history. If the records are linked to a museum and a research and resource facility, they will demonstrate to all that a particular city values its Olympic legacy and its unique opportunity to host the Games.

There are also some interesting broader issues to consider. Who owns the records? Who should have access to them? Who should promote them? How best should they be located in a city? Ownership varies from city to city depending on the legal framework of a particular OCOG.

Cristina Bianchi reported that the Archives Section of Olympic Museum at the IOC was set up in 1996 to enhance information about sports archives in general and Olympic archives in particular. The Archives Section in undertaking a project on Olympic records with two objectives: to document the location of the records of each Olympic city and to encourage and publicize the existence of inventories to these records, Bianchi commented that while the location of the records for some recent Games are known and there are published finding aids which assist in accessing these records, 'the records of some post-1948 Games are either lost or their location unknown.'⁷

Archival Practices at Some Selected Games

The archival practices at the 1984 Los Angeles Games provide a model that other cities might emulate. Before the Games were held there was considerable co-operation between the Los Angeles Olympic Organising Committee (LAOOC) and the Special Collections of the University of California Los Angeles Library, where the archives were later deposited. "A detailed inventory was completed two years after the Games" and has since been placed on the internet.⁸ Meanwhile a substantial surplus from the Los Angeles Games underwrote the magnificent Amateur Athletic Foundation (AAF) Library, which has a fine collection of Olympic and sports history books. Because the AAF is generously funded it has an ongoing policy to acquire relevant Olympic and sports titles.

Los Angeles was fortunate that a university was available to house its Olympic legacy in a professional manner. It demonstrated a successful marriage between Games organisers, a university library, and scholars. However, few Olympic cities have such a large surplus to spend on legacy, nor do many cities have such a well-endowed university such as UCLA that can afford to properly house archival collections — particularly as Olympic archives continue to get bigger. Well-endowed American universities are better placed than universities in other countries to house Olympic archives. At an early stage in the preparations for the 2002 Salt Lake City Winter Olympics, it was agreed that a state university should be the repository for the records of the Games.

At the 1988 Calgary Winter Games there was competition between university and city council to obtain the archives, with the City earning the right to house the collection. The archives were well organised over ten years by a professional archivist. An inventory of the archives (in thirteen volumes) has been published.

Archivist Glenda Leslie expressed some regret that there has been no substantial scholarly involvement in the Olympic archives — though materials are used by scholars. She commented that while the people in the City Council enjoy holding the archives, "they don't really understand their worth and how they might be publicised." As a result she argued that there has been insufficient promotion of the records. She suggested that conferences, publications, and even scholarships would all help to draw attention to their value and provide greater incentive for people to make use of them.

After the 1992 Barcelona Olympic Games there was a tripartite split of the records between the Galleria Olimpica the City Council, and Centre for Olympic Studies at the Autonomous University of Barcelona. The division of the records was an unusual one. The Galleria doubled as a Museum of the 1992 Games — including artifacts from the Opening Ceremony and as home for images. The majority of the archives are housed in the City Library. Just how successful these institutions are remains to be seen; it partly depends on whether there is a continuing role for a small museum based largely on the 1992 Games.

The Centre for Olympic Studies, however, is a vigorous and successful institution. It provides the best model for a Centre in an Olympic city developing strong research and documentation roles after the Games. In part this has been due to the passion and energy of its Director, Professor Miquel de Moragas, but its success is also reflective of the increased support for such Centres in recent times. The Director has demonstrated the benefits of collaboration with the Olympic Studies Centre at the IOC. The Barcelona Centre demonstrates the benefit of having an ongoing scholarly involvement in the Olympic legacy.

Anecdotal evidence suggests that records management at the 1996 Atlanta Games was far from systematic and there was little involvement of scholars in the process before and after the Games. The question of ownership appears to have been an issue after the Games with Atlanta Games supremo Billy Payne assigning the records to a private foundation with public access closed for 50 years. The city newspaper, the *Atlanta Journal and Constitution*, successfully contested this decision and secured the right for some part of the archives to become accessible to the public.⁹

It could be argued that the most successful archives in Olympic cities are those where the post-Games manager(s) pursue an

active policy to maximize the value of the records and to add to the collection by actively pursuing non-OCOG Olympic records — this represents a more dynamic rather than a static records vision. The records available at the end of the Games, when an OCOG closes down, are not the sum total of the potential Olympic records for that city. A good research and resource facility may attract additional private and non-OCOG records. Greater engagement with scholars, students, and the general public can not only publicize the records but also add to their value. There is the possibility to organize conferences and create publications relating to the records. The Australian War Memorial for instance offers scholarships to undergraduates, who spend a month or two researching a project based on the records. This model could be extended to an Olympic research and resource facility in an Olympic city.

Issues and Debates About Sydney's Olympic Archives

Over the past few years officers for the Centre for Olympic Studies at The University of New South Wales has been involved in ongoing debates both about the fate of Sydney's Olympic Archives and also about a possible Museum of the Sydney Olympics. Discussions have taken place with a variety of interested stakeholders in Sydney and Australia. Investigation of what Sydney might do have also entailed discussions with people overseas involved in Olympic archives, museums, and legacy in general.

The Centre's interest is threefold. It is, first of all, acting on behalf of international scholars in general who will want to make use of the archives in the future. Secondly, there is an interest in promoting Sydney's legacy, as the records provide a valuable and important cultural asset. Thirdly, the Centre is pursuing its own self-interest in offering itself as a partner to a potential primary record-holder. During 1998 and 1999 the Centre actively canvassed the possibility about whether The University of New South Wales could make a 'bid' for the archives. While there was considerable sympathy for this action, it was deemed to be beyond the resources on the University. However, this situation did not rule out the possibility that the Centre could have an active relationship — and even a partnership — with the primary holder of the records.

The next section provides a summary of some of the issues raised and the debates about records and where they might be housed after the Sydney Games. It is worthwhile to make some comments, from the perspective of the Centre and of scholars in general, on the issues raised by the Sydney debate. A number of questions can also be posed. How have the Sydney Games organisers and stakeholders advanced and improved the management of records before and after the Games? What are the strengths and weaknesses of archival management and legacy in the Sydney Olympics? In many respects there have been great advances in Sydney in understanding and articulating important issues in regard to the storage and classification of records. However, the vision has not always been sustained in practice.

Positive Achievements

The first positive aspect of Sydney records management has been that there have been SOCOG leaders who have recognized the importance of legacy. An Olympic legacy concept was embodied in the mission statement of SOCOG and included in SOCOG *Annual Report* for 1996 in the following terms:

Aims and Objectives

In staging the Games of the XXVII Olympiad, the mission of SOCOG shall be governed by the following principles: to leave a lasting beneficial legacy in spiritual, physical and financial terms for the Olympic Movement and for Sydney.

The choice of the word 'spiritual' is an interesting one. Its use by SOCOG suggests that they believe that records contain materials which enhance the core ideals of the Olympics.

Documents had been listed in SOCOG under the Recwin/Recfind system from 1994. However, in 1997 and 1998, there was a greater focus on document management leading to a Central file registry of records and archives using the 'TRIM (Tower Software) records management, system. This practice of a central register of records, and professional record management practices, contrasted with the practices at many previous Games. With some exceptions, such as the Los Angeles Games, the issues of records management and post-Games records placement were not generally addressed until the conclusion of the Games.

An additional step was undertaken in 1999 with the employment of Peter Orlovich, as a consulting archivist to develop an Archives Management Action Plan, to oversee the best home for the archives, and to explore a possible custodian or custodians for the archives. Orlovich operated within the framework of the *State Records Act 1998* which identified the *State Archives* as the designated custodian of the records. However, the provision of 'distributed management' meant that authority for part or all of the archives could be 'distributed' to another stakeholder. Orlovich also considered issues relating to eliminating and disposing of non-essential records and also investigated potential synergies between records and archives and the 'Transfer of Know How Program'.¹⁰

Discussions with stakeholders in 1999, including the Centre for Olympic Studies, indicated that all concerned with records management at SOCOG favoured a unitary model — it was preferable that the records should remain intact.

Another feature of the SOCOG approach was that there was an effort to consult and brief all of the potential stakeholders so they would be aware of the issues involved. It was suggested that a round table conference take place so that all the stakeholders could deal with common issues. Some of the stakeholders included the State Government as represented by State Archives and the State Library, the Australian Olympic Committee, the Olympic Co-ordination Authority, SOCOG, and the Centre for Olympic Studies at UNSW. However, there were many other parties who had an interest in a particular part of the Archives, including a number of groups who were keen to establish a museum either in Sydney or even Melbourne.¹¹

A further advance achieved in Sydney was the sophistication of its 'Transfer of Know How Program,' previously referred to as the Transfer of Knowledge Program. The need for an improved transfer program was recognised by Hugh Watson, SOCOG's Group General Manager—Games Support. In an address to the Canberra Press Club on 30 June 1999 he noted that there is an:

Almost staggering paucity of management information passed from one Games to another ... There is a crying need to pull management information together systematically as a legacy for future host cities and for the Olympic Movement, and Sydney is keen to play a part in that.

Watson outlined the extent of Sydney's Transfer of Know How Program which had been developed in conjunction with the IOC: it included such diverse issues as venue management, security, catering, cleaning, command and control, and volunteer recruitment. He added that the Program would be made available to the OCOG of Athens and future Games organisers in a systematic way.

Problems in Implementation

Unfortunately, while the issues relating to best archival practice have been clearly articulated and understood, at least in some quarters, practical issues of implementation have been far less satisfactory. At the beginning of July 2000, no round table conference had been convened, nor had there been any public announcement about the final of the records after 2000. However, discussions appear to be continuing behind closed doors with the key stakeholders such as the Legacy Committee of the Olympic Co-ordination Authority and the Australian Olympic Committee.

The process may well be a flawed one, if the people who know most about the archives are not party to ongoing discussions. At this stage there is no known, planned consultation and liaison between those who have supervised the record managers of the archives until late 2000 and the new custodians of the archives — whomever they may be. Or, put in simple terms, one set of persons has managed the records and will pack up many boxes of records and a totally new set of persons will unpack and re-organise the collection.

Some of the good work undertaken in regards to records in 1998 and 1999 appears to have been undone in 2000. Because of a succession of pressing problems—budget cuts, staff reduction, and a succession of SOCOG public relations problems — the issue of the fate of the archives appears to have become low priority and downgraded.

It now remains to be seen whether those key decision-makers, who will make many important decisions about the future and the character of the archives, have the time to fully understand the issues relating to best management practices and make adequate use of professional advice. There is a danger that they might settle for a lower order and pragmatic solution. The Australian Olympic Committee, one of the stakeholders, appears to favour a consortium model, though it is unclear whether the AOC has thought through the implications of such a policy. How will the records be split between a 'library' and an 'archival' component? Who will undertake this important task? Given the quantity of the records, the costs involved and the late time frame for decision-making, pragmatism rather than best practice may be the order of the day.

There is also a fear that many valuable items may be sold off to the highest bidder to help fund SOCOG budget shortfalls. An advertisement appeared in the Sydney Morning Herald of 10 December 1999 calling for 'expressions of interests' in an 'Olympic auction' of 'products, memorabilia and assets' from the Sydney Olympic and Paralympic Games. The tender was won by the Web-based auction business eBay, of which media magnate Kerry Packer owns a keystone. It was reported in the Australian of 3 July 2000 that an auction was expected to procure 'about \$23 million' and that "almost everything in the Games organisers' possession — from athletes' uniforms, sports equipment and autographed flags to refrigerators, mobile telephones and beds — will be sold."

It would be unfortunate if those involved in records and archives do not have the 'first right of refusal' on items in this giant 'garage sale,' which was the case when a similar sale took place after the Atlanta Games, so that archivists have the right to safeguard and protect what they consider to be core items of any Olympic collection. The distinctive signature wall in the SOCOG lobby, for example, could appeal to both commercial and archival interests.

One might even choose to be pessimistic that a great opportunity may be lost after the Games to establish a first-rate Sydney Olympics records collection. The archives of the Sydney Olympics and the Paralympics represent a unique legacy and an opportunity to promote Olympism. Officers from the Centre for Olympic Studies believe that there is the rare and exciting challenge presented by the Sydney 2000 Olympic Games to plan for the establishment of a nationally and internationally significant reference

and research facility. It could contain an unparalleled accumulation of bibliographical, audiovisual, cinematographic, photographic, and archival resources relating to the Olympic Games, and more generally to the Olympic Movement, and to Olympic-related sports in Australia and make adequate and appropriate provision for the retention, conservation, arrangement, description, and public access to the resources of SOCOG. This could become the nucleus of an Olympic research facility.

It seems important to reiterate that the Sydney 2000 Games are an event of historical importance to the City of Sydney and sport in Australia. It is important for a variety of reasons — academic, cultural, and so forth — that the records, archives, and memorabilia associated with the Sydney 2000 Games be retained and managed and promoted in the best possible way to enhance Sydney's legacy.

Continuing Discussions

The Centre for Olympic Studies continues to be involved in discussions with the Australian Olympic Committee (AOC), one of the post-Games archives stakeholders. Some initial discussions with the AOC suggests that it may prefer a consortium model with an Olympic 'Library' separated out from an 'Archives.' This appears to be different to the model favoured by SOCOG record keepers/archivists, whereby the collection was seen to be most valuable if kept whole rather than broken into parts.

The challenge for the Centre for Olympic Studies is to deal with the realities of the post-Games archival situation and to continue to represent its own and scholarly interests in the Olympic records — to make the best of the possible post-Game situation. In April 2000 the AOC invited the Centre to make representation about its possible role beyond 2000. The appendix lists the Centre's brief response as to how it might respond to a consortium model if the records were split between their 'archival' and 'library' components.

There is much to be learned from the Sydney archival experience. Future OCOGs should organise and manage their records in a professional manner from an early stage in their organisation. It also seems desirable that early consideration should be given to the final home for the archives and there should be maximum consultation between the pre-Games and post-Games holders of the records. It is also vital that archivists should have the first right of refusal in any future Olympic auctions.

The views expressed in this paper are those of a professional historian, a user of archives, rather than a person who has professional training in the organisation and management of records. I apologise to my archivist colleagues for any sins of omission or commission. However, the issues of sports archives is of compelling interest and concern to all those who use Olympic archives. Decisions made about the location and management of the Sydney Olympic archives will have far-reaching repercussions.

References

Communication: Wayne Wilson

Interviews: Cristina Bianchi, Bronwyn Fincham, Glenda Leslie, Peter Orlovich, Angie Rizakos, David Studham, Mary-Kate Tews, Kristine Toohey

Diane Bagnall, 'Hell of a Village,' *Bulletin*, 9 November 1993

Geoffrey Ballard, *Nation with Nation: The Story of the Olympic Village Heidelberg, Olympic Games* — Melbourne 1956, Allanby Press, Melbourne, 1997.

Cristina Bianchi, 'Sports History? Sports Archives!' *Journal of Olympic History*, vol. 7, no. 1, winter, 1999, pp. 28-9.

Graeme Davison, 'Welcoming the World: The 1956 Olympic Games and the Re-presentation of Melbourne in the "Forgotten Fifties,"' *Australian Historical Studies*, no. 109, Oct. 1997, pp. 64-77.

Richard Fagan, 'Acquisition and Appraisal of Sports Archives,' *ASSH Bulletin*, no. 16, April 1992, pp. 36-47

Harry Gordon, *Australia and the Olympic Games*, University of Queensland Press, Brisbane, 1994, pp. 193-225.

Bruce Howard, *15 Days in '56: The First Australian Olympics*, Angus & Robertson, Sydney, 1995.

Ian Jobling, 'Melbourne 1956' in John E. Findling and Kimberly D. Pelli, *Historical Dictionary of the Modern Olympic Movement*, Greenwood Press, London, 1996, pp. 119-27.

Hilary Kent and John Merritt, 'The Cold War and the Melbourne Olympic Games,' in Ann Curthoys and John Merritt, eds, *Better Dead than Red*, Sydney, 1992.

Rob McAuley, producer, *Lies, Spies and the Olympics: the Untold Story of the Melbourne Olympics*, Film Australia, 1999.

Kent Sjöblom, 'Taking Care of Sports Archives — Whose Responsibility?'" *Canadian Journal of History of Sport*, vol. 24, no. 2, Dec. 1993, pp. 91-3.

Stephen Wenn, 'Lights! Camera! Little Action: Avery Brundage and the 1956 Melbourne Olympics,' *Sporting Traditions*, vol. 10, no. 1, Nov. 1993, pp. 38-53.

Endnotes

1. The text was supplied courtesy of the Australian Gallery of Sport
2. A few books, written for the general sports public, appeared shortly after the Games such as Keith Donald and Don Selth, *Olympic Saga: The Track and Field Story — Melbourne, 1956*, Sydney, 1957.
3. Davison, 'Welcoming the World', p. 69.
4. Popular works such as Howard, 15 Days in '56 and scholarly articles by Hilary Kent and John Merritt, Ian Jobling and Stephen Wenn (see bibliography).
5. Sjöblom, 'Taking Care of Sports Archives'; Fagan, 'Acquisition and Appraisal of Sports Archives'.
6. Fagan, 'Acquisition and Appraisal of Sports Archives', p. 45.
7. Bianchi interview, and article in the *Journal of Olympic History*.
8. *Journal of Olympic History*, vol. 7.
9. Interview Mary-Kate Tews.
10. Interview Peter Orlovich.
11. There have been a number of groups interested in establishing an Olympic Museum including a consortium brought together by Julian Bickersteth and the SPIRIT Group.