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Abstract

The current editions of the Olympic Games have been criticized as being too
grandiose and expensive to stage. While the IOC’s Programme Commission attempts to
address these concerns, one need only look to the 1932 Olympic Winter Games in Lake
Placid, New York, and Summer Games in Los Angeles, California, to find possible
solutions for the efficient delivery of the Games. The 1932 Olympic Games were unique
because they occurred in the same country, used the same currency, in the same year, and
occurred during the Great Depression. In using data collected from a variety of different
archives, this study analyzed the significant disparities between the two municipalities
and Organizing Committees (OCOGs) concerning the strategies and implementation of
hosting their respective Olympic festivals. With a particular emphasis on the period
leading up to the delivery of the Games, this study focused on how the Great Depression
altered the financing and planning of each. After delineating the data into four separate
categories of analysis, two separate narratives were formed, conclusions made, and the
two narratives were compared.

Results reveal two distinct methods of delivery and financing of the respective
Olympic Games by each OCOG. For Lake Placid, the small nature of the town combined
with the need for construction of large facilities caused a heavy reliance on public monies
with few examples of private involvement. For Los Angeles, the strong business
community and existent facilities helped minimize the effects of the Great Depression.
Conclusions emphasized the efficient modes of delivery and the need to adapt to the new
local environments as a result of the Great Depression.
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Chapter I

Introduction

Every two years the world’s attention focuses on the winter or summer versions of the Olympic Games, a multi-national celebration of athletics and culture. Regardless of its version, the participants of the Olympic Games regularly attract a large following within their own countries. But the Games generate far more than just interest in the global sporting system; they also inject millions of dollars in a variety of different ways into the host city’s economy. For example, according to the International Olympic Committee (IOC) publication *Marketing Matters*, the Salt Lake Organizing Committee (SLOC) received approximately $1.4 billion U.S. from Olympic Marketing Revenue, of which 865 million was from broadcast revenue.¹ This share of the television revenue is substantially larger than the $30 million U.S. for the 1980 Olympic Winter Games in Lake Placid and the $724 million U.S. for the 1996 Olympic Summer Games in Atlanta, two out of the three previous festivals held in the United States of America.² This statistic reveals that the sheer magnitude of revenue generated by the modern Olympic Movement within the global sport community has increased dramatically over the past twenty years.

Currently, there are two-hundred and one member National Olympic Committees (NOCs) of the modern Olympic Movement, a higher percentage of countries than are currently members of the United Nations.³ This comparison clearly emphasizes the importance placed by national governments on the Olympic Games. The event not only provides an opportunity to demonstrate a nation’s athletic prowess, but also through participation in the event, contributes to a nation’s cultural, political, and social
environments. In gaining recognition by the IOC, NOCs hope that multi-national organizations, along with other key players, will recognize the respective country as an excellent place to grow their corporate economies.

Although the economic impact of the Games relies heavily on the choice to bid for the festival, there are plenty of countries that do not have the political will or the economic capital to invest in staging a mega-event. Yet, despite limited resources, these countries still send small athletic contingents to the Olympic Games. Clearly, there is more international recognition in winning a medal or placing well in an athletic event than investing resources in the traditional lobbying techniques often used by governments. Although controversies, such as the bribery scandals related to the bidding of the Olympic Games of Salt Lake City and Sydney have certainly call into question the spirit and essence of the Olympic Movement, recent formalized organizational reforms provide evidence to suggest that the Games will still prosper.

One of the most important indicators of the continuation and growth of the Olympic Movement is the increasing number of athletes (see Appendix III) and NOCs recognized by the IOC and their respective delegations at the Olympic Winter and Summer Games. Only within the last twenty years, coupled with an increasing number of NOCs, has the field of Olympic history become an important topic within the discipline of sport history. Academic journals, such as *Olympika: The International Journal of Olympic Studies* and the *Journal of Olympic History*, were only formed within the last fifteen years, emphasizing the relative infancy of the field of Olympic sport history.

A similar pattern exists within the limited scholarly research concerning the Olympic Winter Games. A review of the current scholarship reveals that only recent
Olympic Winter Games are being seriously investigated for hosting issues. Specifically, there is limited literature focusing on the 1932 Olympic Winter Games in Lake Placid, New York. The most logical reason for this lack of attention towards the Lake Placid Olympic Winter Games is the overwhelming interest by researchers in the 1932 Olympic Summer Games in Los Angeles, California. While both of the 1932 Olympic Games occurred during the Great Depression, the size and scope of the event in Los Angeles seemingly eclipsed that of Lake Placid. Additionally, Los Angeles was a booming metropolis in the 1920s, while Lake Placid was, and is to this day, a small resort town. When coupled with the availability of vast archival sources, Los Angeles provides those interested in Olympic history with a plethora of different research topics concerning the 1932 Olympic Summer Games and thus attracts more scholarly interest.

The increased interest in the 1932 Olympic Summer Games as compared to its winter version, can also be applied to the general field of Olympic history. This is partially due to the importance of revenue generation was first recognized by IOC president Lord Killanin (1972-1980) just prior to the 1972 Olympic Games in Munich, Germany. Killanin’s predecessor Avery Brundage (1952-1972), while acknowledging that the IOC could do more with increased revenues, was not as concerned with the economic viability of the movement. Of greater concern to Brundage were the issues of professionalism, commercialism, and the continued growth of the event. Even with the lack of concern for funding the event, Avery Brundage was still painfully aware of the business affairs of the organization. In a letter sent to IOC members on 3 August 1955, Brundage exclaimed, “I am not sure that we should ever get into business, but on the other hand we should not give millions of dollars away.” This statement reflected the
IOC’s unwillingness, under the leadership of Brundage, to actively seek out private revenue sources. It was only under the leadership of Lord Killanin (1972-1980) that the IOC established an enhanced initiative to gain control of sponsorship and television revenue. While revenues were maximized under the direction of IOC president Juan Antonio Samaranch (1980-2001), the economic security currently enjoyed by the Olympic Movement was not always as promising.

To fully understand the current economic situation and potential areas of future development by the Olympic Movement, it is beneficial to study the past for clues that may inform the future. While the current editions of the Olympic Games have been characterized as being too grandiose and expensive to effectively stage, the third Olympic Winter Games in Lake Placid and the Games of the Tenth Olympiad in Los Angeles were two important examples of the respective Organizing Committees of the Olympic Games (OCOG) efficiently hosting the mega-event amid unprecedented financial constraints. As a result of the apprehension and despair that accompanied the Great Depression, the two Olympic Games of 1932 are of prime importance to the ongoing research concerning the economic viability of the Olympic Games.

This importance of analysis is further heightened by the current initiatives of the IOC’s *Olympic Games Study Commission* to reduce the size, cost, and complexity of the Olympic Games. The current IOC Executive Board has stated that it is important to “make recommendations on the means by which the costs, complexity, and size of the Games can be controlled.” Given this focus, partnered with the mandate of the organization’s recently elected president, Jacques Rogge, the 1932 Winter and Olympic Summer Games provide a unique framework from which the current Executive Board
can draw.\textsuperscript{13} The Great Depression forced the respective OCOGs to focus on the costs, complexity, and size of the Games. Generally, it is these very same issues that are currently being investigated by the \textit{Olympic Games Study Commission}.\textsuperscript{14}

In an attempt to analyze the hosting issues faced by the 1932 OCOGs and the unfolding national economic downturn, it is helpful to review earlier versions of the Olympic festival. As previously stated, during its infancy the IOC regularly faced financial difficulties. Pierre de Coubertin’s personal finances dwindled as he spent his own money attempting to continue his vision for the Olympic Movement. Coubertin’s wife, in an interview with noted Olympic historian John Lucas, stated that her husband had also relied heavily on her personal fortune to finance the operations of his IOC.\textsuperscript{15} Despite the immense interest of the first Olympic Summer Games hosted by Athens in 1896, the next three Olympic Games had little attention focused on the athletic event itself. The 1900 Olympic Games in Paris, the 1904 Games in St. Louis, and the 1908 Games in London, were all held in conjunction with the World Fair’s exposition.\textsuperscript{16} As a result of these partnerships, the Olympic Games were lost within the shuffle of an even larger festival. Instead of fostering a strong relationship with the international business community, the Olympic Games garnered little interest beyond that received from local merchants. Incorporated within the activities of the World’s Fair, it was relatively easy for the existing Organizing Committee to commit the resources necessary to stage the Olympic Games.\textsuperscript{17} Owing to the limited interest shown by other cities in hosting the Games during this period of Olympic history, the only viable choice to the IOC was to commit to the bids made by the existing World’s Fair committees.\textsuperscript{18} Clearly, the success of the modern Olympic Games was a long way from being guaranteed.\textsuperscript{19}
Despite the fact that the initial merger between the World’s Fair and the Games of the Second Olympiad was not successful at promoting interest, the controversy surrounding the bidding for the 1904 version marked an awakening in the United States to the possibilities of using sports as a tool to enhance national pride. The increasing population of urban areas, such as St. Louis and Chicago, created an immense amount of rivalry and pride amongst big cities. This sense of civic pride prompted a group of thirteen Chicago businessmen to send a formal letter to the IOC president on 1 May 1901 outlining their intentions to host the Games of the Third Olympiad. While these plans were being formulated, the city of St. Louis was preparing the 1903 World’s Fair exposition. Despite the efforts, organizers quickly realized that they would not have the necessary facilities completed in time. A postponement of a year was in order to help with the completion of the facilities. However, by moving the opening date back one year the World’s Fair clashed with the scheduled Olympic Games in Chicago. Using the delay as a coercive manoeuvre, St. Louis organizers were able to wrestle the Games from Chicago due, in part, to the strong economic backing and support already existing within the community.

Noting the controversy, newspapers throughout the United States reported on the conflict between the two cities. In an effort to add context and interest to the developing story, newspaper articles often referenced the connection between the modern Olympic Games to those staged in Ancient Olympia. As Robert K. Barney, a noted Olympic historian, states concerning this media coverage:

“Americans, the larger percentage of whom had little or no education in the classics, now became correspondence students of sport history, or more specifically, consumers of articles describing the nature of the ancient Olympic Games.”
As the story was disseminated via the media, citizens who had little to no exposure to the meanings and values of the Games, quickly became experts on all matters Olympic. Despite the controversy, this event only served to enhance the importance of the Olympic Games. Subsequent Games would now be watched by a new, educated, and growing segment of the American population. The resulting interest in the Olympic Games fostered an increasing demand to host the festival and thus contributed to the interest in hosting the event in Lake Placid and Los Angeles.

**The United States Re-Awakens**

Although the 1904 Olympic Summer Games were staged in St. Louis, the United States truly awakened to the value and potential of the Olympic festival during the period of World War I (1914-1918). The Olympic Games were not used as a tool to promote national pride in the United States until after the victory of the Allied troops over the oppositional forces. A major contributor to this enlightened view of the Olympic Games in the United States was the 1919 Inter-Allied Games hosted in Paris, France. Although the war ended on 11 November 1918, the Inter-Allied Games provided Allied Forces with healthy happy soldiers and an opportunity to ensure continued support for future war effort. The latter point was most important as the Games provided the American military with an opportunity to “disseminate sport propaganda as well as athletic news.” Not only did the American troops win the war, but they were also superior, in an athletic sense, to any other troops in the world.

Already an important political superpower, another way for the United States to demonstrate superiority, in the post-WWI era, was through the domination of athletic practices, and the achievement of medals in Olympic and other worldwide competitions.
As Dyreson stated, "America seemed a model of energetic productivity and bountiful consumption that beckoned the rest of the globe to follow in its powerful footsteps to a future of comfortable plentitude."\(^{29}\) The post-war era saw the United States emerge as a leader in industry and athletics due to the numerous resources at its disposal.

The 1920 Olympic Games were held in Antwerp, Belgium, a site that was one of the first areas to be attacked by German troops during World War I.\(^{30}\) In selecting Antwerp, the IOC acknowledged the site as a symbol of the Allied forces victory.\(^{31}\) The American media cheered the selection of Antwerp, noting that it was, in part, the attacks on Belgium that resulted in the American forces being sent to fight in the first place.\(^{32}\) Although the Games of the Sixth Olympiad provided an opportunity to unite a world divided in the post-war era, little effort was made to include the countries that fought as part of the oppositional forces.\(^{33}\)

The first quarter of the modern Olympic Movement (1896-1920) can be characterized as an organization trying to develop and market its product globally. The connection between the Olympic Games and the World’s Fair, although convenient, was not financially successful, thus affecting the development of early versions of the Games. In addition, the impact of World War I on the United States, and the cancellation of the 1916 Olympic Games, challenged the operations of the IOC. These events ultimately affected the continued feasibility of the Olympic Movement as a whole. But as previously noted, the Inter-Allied Games served to ensure the necessary momentum that would help to frame the environment for the 1932 Olympic Games.
History of the United States during the Early Twentieth Century

In an effort to contextualize the early twentieth century as it relates to this investigation, it is important to summarize some of the major events and their effects on government policy in the United States. This section will focus on the time period of 1896 to 1928. While the previous section analyzed how the United States began to understand the modern Olympic Movement, this section looks at events which affected the general economic and political health of the country during the same time period.

The beginning of the twentieth century saw massive urban expansion, with the railroad industry playing an important role in connecting the United States. As the population began to grow, the people looked to the federal government for support. Under the presidential leadership of Theodore Roosevelt (1901-1909), the use of executive power was once again prominent in American politics. Roosevelt believed in the role of the presidency and his responsibility to appropriate leadership because of his position. He tried to mediate between the capitalists and labour, ensuring that each was treated fairly.

The following decade of the twentieth century, mostly under the pre-war leadership of William Taft (1909-1913), was characterized by a different approach to the role of president. Although Taft was considered Roosevelt’s right hand man, Taft felt that his presidency should be less intrusive than the previous administration. Despite the shift in leadership style, he supported the exclusion of foreign trade by signing the Payne-Aldrich Act and the creation of a federal income tax.

In opposition to the intrusive national government of previous years, the 1920s were dominated by the post-war emergence of laissez-faire economics, a 19th century
concept which suggests that "(w)hat is good for big business is good for the nation." A dominant ideology of the time, it was felt by the federal government that the developing post-war economy was not in need of economic intervention. With the exclusion of the government in business affairs, the development of the super-corporation re-emerged within American business culture. By 1929, the top two hundred corporations possessed one fifth of the national wealth and nearly half of the corporate wealth in the United States. Certainly this period can be classified by great expansion and economic gain for the private sector in the United States.

The optimism of big business and the resulting urban expansion of the early 1920s was halted in the late part of the decade by the Great Depression. As a result of low consumer demand coupled with continued production, many businesses were not able to move product and, as a result, millions of jobs were lost. With an ever-increasing unemployment rate, the federal government was relied on to provide the necessary leadership and policy to stimulate the economy. Government policy would be more carefully scrutinized due to the pressure of the time and the expectancy of American citizens for relief programs. Coupled with unpaid post-World War I debts from European countries, the federal government was faced with its greatest challenge of the twentieth century; rekindling an economy without the required resources at its disposal. The Great Depression had caused both anxiety and hesitancy within the national government, resulting in a tailspin which forced the Lake Placid and Los Angeles OCOGs to re-evaluate the delivery of their respective events.
History of New York and California During the Early Twentieth Century

In the middle of the worst economic depression in United States history, two of the biggest global sport events were staged, the third Olympic Winter Games and the Games of the Tenth Olympiad. The winter festival was hosted in Lake Placid, New York, and the summer version in Los Angeles, California. In a time when the average citizen had little disposable income to spend on amenities, it is difficult to understand the motivation of the respective organizers behind hosting the mega-event. To aid in the development of this understanding, one must first analyze the history of both states during the period just prior to the hosting of the Games.

New York State in the 1920s

The state of New York was in a period of transition during the post-World War I era. Unlike the rest of the country, the Democratic Party, a left-wing group concerned with the social welfare of its citizens, represented the state. As a result, the 1920s were characterized by responsible, centralized government, welfare legislation, and the rekindling of the democratic spirit. The Democratic Party was lead by Governor Al Smith from 1918 to 1926. David M. Ellis, James A. Frost, Harold C. Syrett, and Harry J. Carman note that Smith was extremely honest with the voters, sometimes providing them with explicit details of the state finances. Consistent with his leadership style, legislation and lobbying were of extreme importance. He also opposed, and eventually vetoed, the New York state assembly’s bill which would have forced private and public schools to teach only state sponsored curriculum. While the majority of the country was unifying into a monolithic capitalist view, the leadership of the progressive party ensured that the state, while prospering economically, did not forget the disadvantaged.
With the large amount of government intervention during the 1920s, New York changed drastically from a state needing infrastructure and social reform, to a state desperate for economic intervention and recovery. Although hints of a strong economic recovery began, Smith still fought for social reform and unionization. With this political belief, he progressively moved away from the interests of the business elite toward a position of representing broader constituencies. Owing to the downturn of the economy at the end of the decade, the social reform he advocated became increasingly unpopular with the public. This disposition continued until Smith's defeat by Franklin Delano Roosevelt in 1928.

Although public opposition mounted, New York was a bastion for social development and progression in the United States during the 1920s. William W. Bremer, in his book *Depression Winters: New York Social Workers and the New Deal*, argues that the New York social service community served as the framework for the "New Deal," a post-World War I government intrusion to stimulate and repair the infrastructure of the United States.47 As many of the developers of New York's social policies moved into national government when Governor Roosevelt took the office of the presidency in 1932, the foundations for the "New Deal" were represented in office, and Roosevelt could rely on people with experience in writing policy. Through the leadership of Al Smith, the 1920s represented a time of economic intervention and reform for New York's citizens.

**California in the 1920s**

While New York, for the majority of the 1920s, had a proactive state government concerned with the health and well being of every citizen, California was continuing to become an environment where the individual businessman was making a lot of money
without fear of stringent economic regulations. The ever-expanding economic boom of the post-World War period identified California, by outsiders, as the mecca of cultural and economic reform. As industry and civilians rushed towards the new promise of the west coast, the state, particularly the Los Angeles area, began to grow exponentially. By the beginning of the decade “business and agriculture had matured into highly organized, rationalized, scientific, and professional systems.” The population of California approached 5.5 million, an increase of approximately 365% since the beginning of the century. A statewide promotional campaign advertised the beneficial climate, the abundance of natural resources, and numerous opportunities for employment. Owing to the subsequent influx of visitors and potential residents, many industries within the state were positively affected. For example, in 1929 the California auto industry produced the highest number of cars per person in the country. The expanding demand for automobiles resulted in the development of the state’s road, tourism, and recreation industries. This rapid urbanization helped foster the image promoted by the state, as a place to visit and host major events, such as the Olympic Summer Games.

Despite the mass appeal to visit and move to the state, the rapid urbanization of California was not beneficial to all interests in the region. Unions were particularly hit by the rapid expansion of the private sector. Given the relatively easy access to jobs, public sentiment for the championing of employee benefits was at an all time low. The abundance of jobs weakened the power and demand for unions, and, as a result, public policy was influenced. In 1919, the state created the Criminal Syndicalism Law to control labour leaders. By 1921, in northern California, both unions for fisherman were
abolished. The state adopted the position that it was more important to continue the
growth and development than worry about the rights of the individual worker.

The most important political outcome of the big business era of the early 1920s
was the emergence of one party domination. The Republican Party virtually ruled the
decade as the Democrats only won 25 out of 555 contests for partisan office in the state,
and none for statewide executive. Consistent with the sentiment of the time, Governor
Friend Richardson cut expenditures on education and social reform and rejected spending
legislation. Additionally, he extended no support to the unions and subsequently passed
anti-union legislation in the state’s legislature. The anti-union public sentiment and the
one party dominated state legislature created an environment suitable for bidding on the
Olympic Summer Games.

Despite the fact that California and New York are states within the same country,
very different political and economic philosophies affected and altered their urban
environments in the post World War I era. New York was the hub of social reform and
tolerance, while California was identified as a region filled with new opportunities for the
private sector. Each of these ideologies experienced great success during the early part of
the decade. Yet both states would be drastically different by the end of the decade as
they prepared to host the world’s largest sporting event, the Summer and Olympic Winter
Games.

By 1928, the period of relative economic comfort had disappeared as the
government at all levels prepared for the worst economic downturn in the nation’s
history. For California, the era of economic prosperity was coming to an end as the need
for social relief and economic reform limited the escapist appeal of the area. For New
York, with the shift in political philosophy in the governorship, a resistance emerged in opposition to the social progress made throughout the early parts of the decade.

As a result of a downfall in the economy and a heavy reliance on relief from the three levels of government, the Olympic Games of 1932 were set to be staged in a growing environment of uncertainty. In Lake Placid, the Organizing Committee was concerned about the solicitation of government funds to offset the cost of running such a mega-event. In the small resort town, it became clear that there would need to be a heavy reliance on the public sector given the limited industrial base, outside of tourism and outdoor recreation, in the area. As the Winter Olympics were still in their infancy, and the fact that the two previous events were held in Europe, the Organizing Committee was faced with the tough challenge of confirming European NOC participation in the Olympic Winter Games.

The Los Angeles Organizing Committee faced equally daunting tasks. The appeal of California was slowly diminishing as hordes of people moved to the area with hope of newfound economic gain. In reality, the exponential increase in residents caused a strain on the economy that would be difficult to overcome. As a result, the increased number of tourists and the resulting strain on the infrastructure to the area for the event were identified as the biggest barriers to overcome when convincing the residents of the merits of hosting the Olympic Games. By the late 1920s, the idea of boosterism that drove the Community Development Association (CDA) to bid for the Games, clashed with the harsh realities of an over-populated area in need of economic relief. Given this clash, it would seem logical to conclude that the financing and hosting of the event would have been difficult. Yet both of the 1932 Olympic Games were staged with very few problems
or resistance. The Great Depression caused differing political and economic environments in New York and California. While the economic slump facilitated the methods of delivery, it did not distract from the overall outcome of the events. This was partially because the Great Depression was truly felt in 1930, too late in the process to halt operations of the OCOGs or the IOC.

While there is an ongoing debate concerning the future of the Olympic Games and the direction of commercialism and sponsorship, little has been researched concerning the process and outcomes of ‘ordinary’ Olympic Games, such as both 1932 Olympic Games. It is the relative ease with which these events were delivered that may well provide an effective framework upon which all future OCOGs can stage the modern Olympic Games.


4 Pittsburgh Post Gazette, “Short Track: Ohno Misses Further Medals” (Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania: February 24, 2002), http://www.post-gazette.com, retrieved January 30, 2003; Examples, including the disqualification of the South Korean skater Kim Dong-sung from the short track event at the Winter Olympics, or the Salt Lake City Olympic bribery scandal, emphasize the power and importance of the Olympic Games on the international stage. South Korea threatened to pull their remaining athletic contingent if Kim-Dong-sung was not restated and awarded his gold medal. This example reveals the value of a medal as not only national and athletic achievement, but also political capital. The Salt Lake City bribery scandals revealed the corruption within the IOC and how recent bid winners had bribed their way to victory. This not only indicated the relative ease to which some IOC members could be bribed, but also the length to which a region would go to achieve the winning of the final vote for awarding the Games.

5 This assumption states that bigger events and controversies have not halted the spirit and development of the event. Examples of this are the deaths of the Israeli athletes at the 1972 Olympic Games in Munich, or the mismanagement of funds of the 1976 Olympic Games in Montréal.


7 As indicated by the recent Salt Lake City Winter Olympic Lecture Series hosted by the University of Utah, Salt Lake City, Utah, there is a growing interest in the development of research focusing on the Olympic Winter Games. However, the lecture series included a limited number of scholars that focused specifically on the Winter Olympics, which speaks to a gap in the current research. It is important to begin to bridge this gap in order to place the Olympic Movement within the global culture.


10 Avery Brundage to Armand Massard, Lord David Burghley, S.A.R., The Prince Axel of Denmark, S.E., Mohammed Tahir, Miguel A. Moenck, and Court Paolo Thaon de Revel, 3 August 1955, Windsor, Avery Brundage Collection, University of Illinois, Champaign-Urbana, 1908-1975, [hereafter cited as ABC], Box 114, Reel 62.


Although the 1936 Winter and Summer Olympics occurred in Germany, events were funded by the Nazi Regime. Grandiose spending and massive marketing served the purpose of propagating the beliefs and values of the Nazis through sport. Due to these ulterior motives for hosting the Olympic Games, it is not appropriate to compare these Games under a capitalist system because of the lack of business interest involved.

International Olympic Committee, “Olympic Games Study Commission,” (Lausanne Switzerland: 2002), http://www.olympic.org, retrieved June 19, 2003. The mission of the commission is “to study past, current and future Games (both Summer and Winter) and make recommendations on the means by which the costs, complexity and size of the Games can be controlled, while recognizing that the Games remain the foremost sporting event in the world. The Commission will review, amongst other things, such matters as construction, transport, competition and other venues, accreditation, information technology, media and broadcast requirements and services, accounting and legal requirements, security and hospitality with a view to assisting host cities and host countries to reduce the expenditures incurred by the Olympic Games.”
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The first mix of World’s Fair and Olympic Games occurred between 14 May – 28 October 1900 in Paris, France. Given Coubertin’s staunch belief in the superiority of French culture and the length of the event, he must have been disappointed with the disappearance of the Olympic Games in the *Exposition Universelle Internationale*; The second mix was in St. Louis between 1 July – 23 November 1904 and was also lost in the shuffle of the World Expo; Alfred Senn, 1999, p. 10.
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Ibid., p. 101.
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Ibid., p. 117.

Alfred Senn, 1999, p. 30; While the first four Olympic Games had little financial success, the Games of the Fifth Olympiad in Stockholm, Sweden, was quite successful. Additionally, new technology was utilized
to help alleviate some of the controversies experienced at the previous Olympic festivals. These inventions included electronic timing, photo finishes, and a public address system. As a result of the success in Stockholm, the IOC became truly aware of the self-financing possibilities of the Games.


30 Michael J. Lyons, *World War I: A Short History* (Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall, 1994), pp. 86-106; Germany launched the Schlieffen Plan, attacking Belgium in an attempt to secure France very early on in World War I in the summer of 1914. By August 20th, the Belgian army retreated to Antwerp which was considerably out of the way of the oncoming German Army. Following the fall of the forts at Liege in Belgium on 16 August 1914, King Albert I ordered a withdrawal of Belgium’s remaining 65,000 troops to Antwerp. Together with 80,000 garrison troops, Antwerp’s ring of 48 outer and inner forts presented formidable opposition to von Kluck’s German First Army’s flank. The presence of so many troops at its flank presented a constant threat.

This danger transpired into many sorties conducted from the forts on 24-25 August and 9 September 1914, designed by the Belgians to distract the Germans from their attack upon the British and French at the Mons and Charleroi. German General von Boseler, of the German Army, was given the task of capturing Antwerp and began firing upon the outer southeast forts of Antwerp on 28 September 1914.

Receiving a request from the Belgian government for more assistance, the British dispatched 6,000 Royal Navy troops on 4 and 5 October 1914. An original division of 22,000 troops were also en route for Ostend. Landing at Ostend on October 6th, the British naval forces were too late; the Belgian government relocated from Antwerp to Ostend the same day, with the city itself evacuated the following day under heavy artillery bombardment, formerly surrendered by its Military Governor, General Victor Deguise to the Germans on October 10th. Nevertheless, British intervention had prolonged the defence of Antwerp for perhaps five days, giving the British valuable time for the deployment of troops in Flanders, the next battle.

German forces continued to occupy Antwerp until its liberation in late 1918. Most Belgian and Allied forces had, however, managed to escape the city west along the coast, subsequently taking part in the defence at Ypres in mid-October.

As a result of the massive attacks on the city, the IOC selected the city of Antwerp for the 1920 Olympic Summer Games. This was an act not only designed for economic investment in the infrastructure of Antwerp, but an example of the political will of the IOC. The selection of Antwerp was specifically designed to emphasize the homogeneous culture of the IOC at the time.
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Ibid. Although he was considered “fair,” his aggressive behaviour in office was not well liked by big business. It was felt that he was far too intrusive in the economic affairs of big business.


Ibid., The Payne-Aldrich Act created high tariff rates on any international product. It was felt that this would stimulate growth in the national economy of the United States by encouraging domestic purchasing by big business, and subsequently the consumer.

Oswald Fred Boucke, *Laissez Faire and After* (New York, NY: Thomas Y. Crowell Co., 1932); Laissez-Faire economics was a 19th Century Macro-economic theory which suggests that it is the role of the government to stay out of the day-to-day affairs of the private sector. Price levels and business behaviour can be implemented and policed by competition in the private sector. Government takes an arm’s length approach to the control of the private sector. Oswald Fred Boucke, *Laissez Faire and After* (New York, NY: Thomas Y. Crowell Co., 1932).
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56 Ordinary is used to identify Olympic Games that did not have any major catastrophes or occurrences that are still being investigating in Olympic history research. Welky suggests that by "concentrating on the extraordinary, authors have ignored the seemingly mundane" Games; see David B. Welky, "Viking Girls, Mermaids and Little Brown Men: U.S. Journalism and the 1932 Olympic Games," Journal of Sport History, 24 (1, 1997), p. 1.
Chapter II

Literature Review

This review is divided into three sections of analysis: (1) the 1932 Olympic Winter Games in Lake Placid; (2) the Games of the Tenth Olympiad in Los Angeles; and (3) important economic factors which influenced the Great Depression. The third section is necessary to develop an understanding of the published research focusing on the Depression because the selected Organizing Committees were operational before and during the economic collapse. Additionally, this section provides insight into the areas of research that are deemed important by the researcher.

Since this study focuses on the unique challenges of staging both the Winter and Olympic Summer Games, this review will address the respective events in chronological order. The description will be limited from the time of conception of the bid committee to the closing ceremonies. This includes a review of the published research discussing the effects of the Great Depression on the staging of the Olympic Games and any other unique factors affecting the respective municipality.

Although there is substantial available research on the Great Depression, the researcher has limited the literature investigated to subjects pertinent to this analysis. These themes include: causes of, and U.S. Governmental Policy concerning the Great Depression; the effect of the Great Depression on the states of New York and California; and, the effect of the Great Depression from an international perspective. Each theme will be individually analyzed to assess the overall contribution to the economic despair experienced by the United States.
Introduction to Olympic Research

Within the girth of Olympic research, specific themes have been repeatedly examined. The available research has tended to focus on the extraordinary events that have occurred within the modern Olympic Movement while, as David Welky suggests, ignoring the seemingly mundane. Furthermore, the majority of this research has focused on the Olympic Summer Games. Additionally, Welky points out in his article *Viking Girls, Mermaids and Little Brown Men: U.S. Journalism and the 1932 Olympic Games*, current research has focused on the political meanings of the Games, such as the black power demonstrations of the 1968 Olympic Summer Games, or the Black September crisis of 1972 in Munich.\(^1\) Additionally, he argues that little effort has been spent analyzing the normal procedures and results of the Games. As a result, the 1932 Olympic Winter Games in Lake Placid and the Games of the Tenth Olympiad in Los Angeles have had little scholarly attention. Given this under-representation of research, and the importance of the Great Depression on the United States during this period, it is important to analyze this topic to fill the gaps that currently exist.

As mentioned in the previous section, the identified gaps in knowledge include a detailed historical analysis concerning the challenges of hosting both of the aforementioned events within the context of the Great Depression. In attempting to fill the economic analysis gap, it is important to acknowledge that the data in the *Official Reports* are not completely free of subjectivity. Since the IOC did not mandate the requirement of an official report until 1949, the writers of the *Official Reports* of both of the Olympic Games under investigation received little, if any, guidance for structuring the document. As no stringent procedure existed for the presentation and content of the
report, it is important to confirm much of the information provided through primary and secondary sources. With the differences in structure, format, word choice, and size of document, Holger Preuss noted in his book *Economics of the Olympic Games, Hosting the Games 1972 – 2000*, that it is generally hard to compare different Olympic Summer Games.² Although Preuss did not consider comparing the Winter and Olympic Summer Games, similar to this study’s methodology, he was able to identify and use consistent measurement tools to evaluate the outcomes.³ While the consistency of the reporting method has been gradually formalized as the Olympic Movement has progressed, the *Official Reports* for the two selected Olympic Games of 1932 are far less formalized in the reporting method and language used as compared with the current versions.

**The 1932 Olympic Winter Games in Lake Placid**

Consistent with the majority of other Olympic Winter Games, very little scholarly research has focused on the third Olympic Winter Games in Lake Placid. There are two identifiable reasons for this lack of research. First, due to the relative size of the event (17 nations, 5 sports) as compared to its bigger counterpart, there may be little interest by researchers in investigating an event in a small resort community with very few existing official documents from the Organizing Committee.⁴ A second possibility is that the records were not as accurately kept for the Olympic Winter Games during this period. As a result, there is less available scholarly research on the topic which has, in turn, limited the development of further investigative efforts.

Mark Dyreson, in his paper "*Visions, and Versions, of American Culture at the Winter Games*", and Paula Metzler, in her paper "Third Winter Olympics: neither the Great Depression nor the rise of fascism could deter Lake Placid from hosting its first
Winter Olympics”, emphasize the importance of the Lake Placid Club president Godfrey Dewey’s desire to increase the prestige and size of Lake Placid as a ski resort through staging the Winter Olympic Games. Even though civic boosterism was a contributing force behind the bid, the authors point out that Dewey’s motivation primarily stemmed from his love for alpine skiing. While Metzler’s analysis is focused on the motivations of Dewey, Dyreson elaborates on how New York’s Governor Franklin Roosevelt used the Lake Placid Olympics to spearhead his run for president of the United States in 1932. Roosevelt used the potential bid as an example of how a large event could rejuvenate the economy through the creation of jobs.

Perhaps the most difficult aspect of hosting the Olympic Games, as reflected in the literature, involved the bidding and administration of the event prior to its commencement. The delegation’s toughest task would have been convincing the IOC of the merits of Lake Placid as a viable site for the winter festival. As the two previous Winter Olympics had been held in major winter tourist destinations, Dewey had the difficult task of promoting the merits of hosting the event in a small community. As stated by numerous authors, Dewey was able to convince the IOC of the merits of Lake Placid when compared to the other American sites, such as Lake Tahoe, California and Denver, Colorado.

In terms of the development of the necessary facilities in Lake Placid, many of the authors cite the problems associated with the construction of the bob-run. John Fea, in *The Historical Dictionary of the Olympic Games*, notes that the proposed removal of 2,500 trees when constructing the bob-run caused many concerns with local environmentalists. Eventually, the debate was settled and the bob-run was constructed
due, in part, to a 125,000 grant dollar U.S. from the state legislature. This grant was mostly due to the leadership of Governor Franklin Roosevelt. Clearly, Roosevelt had a vested interest in the delivery of this event. Throughout the literature on the third Olympic Winter Games, the construction of the bob-run is deemed the single largest obstacle that the OCOG encountered.

Similar to its summer equivalent, the organizers of the Winter Games were faced with numerous European countries threatening to stay home because of the high travel costs. To overcome the economic barriers, the American Olympic Committee (AOC) provided aid in an effort to secure the participation of the European teams to the Games. Although travel and accommodation rates were drastically reduced, numerous authors suggest there was still fewer European NOCs participating than initially expected. The hesitancy of foreign NOCs to send their athletic contingents to the event is the only detailed evidence of the direct effect of the Great Depression. Clearly a gap in the literature exists with regards to the true economic difficulties faced by the Organizing Committees in the midst of the Depression.

Furthermore, there is little detailed analysis of the cost and true economic impact of hosting the Olympic Winter Games on the surrounding community. The majority of the economic figures used in the research are taken from the Official Report for the Third Olympic Winter Games. The numbers often cited are the total expenditures of the Games ($1,074,024.25 U.S.), the amount of public funds expended (approximately $600,000 U.S.), and the passing of a bond by the town of North Elba, located in New York (approximately $350,000 U.S.). Although these amounts were calculated by the OCOG, there has been no independent validation or analysis of the expenditure figures reported.
Outside of Metzler’s article, there is little non-OCOG analysis of the economic effects of the Games. Metzler speculates about the total attendance by using the total number of season tickets (ticket that let spectators into every event) plus individual attendance tickets. With this calculation, the author’s only conclusion is that 58,434 people attended the third Olympic Winter Games in Lake Placid.19 Given the low amount of existing research, it is important to analyze the true effects of the event to gain a better understanding of the economic uniqueness of hosting these Games and the Olympic Winter Games as a whole.

The 1932 Olympic Summer Games in Los Angeles

As previously noted, there has been little scholarly work done specifically focusing on the Games of the Tenth Olympiad. Many of the general overview books on the Olympic Movement mention only the construction of the Los Angeles coliseum and the grandiose presentation of the Games themselves. There is also very little discussion on the daily activities of the OCOG beyond the documented outcomes of the various athletic competitions.

The most complete analysis concerning the difficulties and challenges of hosting the Games of the Tenth Olympiad in Los Angeles is Robert K. Barney’s article entitled Resistance, Persistence, Providence: The 1932 Los Angeles Olympic Games in Perspective.20 Although other studies, such as those by Mark Dyreson and Doris E. Pieroth, acknowledge the uneasy climate of hosting this event in such a large city, Barney provides the most detailed analysis of the challenges of securing and hosting the Olympic Summer Games. These include, but are not limited to, the events of William Garland’s attendance at the 1920 Antwerp Olympic Games and the general apprehension of the
community towards the viability of hosting the event. Of most importance to this study is the analysis of the funding challenges faced by the bid committee and the OCOG. This article aids in the contextualization of the environment during the years prior to the delivery of the Games. It further provides a detailed historical analysis of the OCOG’s numerous challenges in hosting the Games in a proper manner.

Outside of Barney’s article, the majority of the literature on the Games of the Tenth Olympiad focuses on the lack of public interest and participation in the delivery of the Games. The works of Mark Dyreson and Doris E. Pieroth note the limited public interest in the Olympic festivals up to six months before the event. With the help from movie celebrities, such as Mary Pickford and Douglas Fairbanks, a national advertising campaign was created pleading for support of the upcoming event. While this advertising campaign was designed to generate American interest, of even further concern for the OCOG was the lack of confirmed participants from countries other than the United States, prior to the event.

The most studied area of the Games of the Tenth Olympiad involves the construction and administration of the first official Olympic Village. Given the ongoing concerns about the cost associated with travel and accommodation, a village was proposed to minimize the costs for athletes from foreign countries. By keeping the costs of living and food to a daily charge of two dollars, the village was viewed as the “salvation” of the Olympic Games in Los Angeles. To increase the number of European countries attending, the construction of the Olympic Village and discounted transportation costs aided in the feasibility and legitimacy of staging the event. According to Dyreson, given the ongoing concerns about staging the event, the Olympic
village began to represent a symbol of economic prosperity, particularly in the context of the Great Depression.\textsuperscript{27}

While most of the scholarly works acknowledge the importance of the Olympic village, only Barney, Wenn, and Martyn, in their book \textit{Selling the Five Rings: The International Olympic Committee and the Rise of Olympic Commercialism} and Jeremy White's "The Los Angeles Way of Doing Things" detail the various funding and sponsorship initiatives instituted by the Los Angeles Organizing Committee. Barney, Wenn, and Martyn's analysis focuses on the extent to which the Los Angeles OCOG profited from selling the use of the Olympic symbols (rings, motto, and the word Olympic) to various sponsors.\textsuperscript{28} Using the Helms Bakery case as an example, the authors effectively argue the extent to which the OCOG profited from its sponsors. Citing the normal avenues of revenue generation, they also note the free products supplied by sponsors necessary to stage the event.\textsuperscript{29}

While the analysis of the Helms' case is argued effectively by Barney, Wenn, and Martyn, White's article expands on the importance of the village as a source of revenue, and a promotional tool designed to generate interest not only in the local community but also on a national level.\textsuperscript{30} As compared to the body of work on this subject by Barney, Wenn, and Martyn, White is far more detailed in describing the importance of the physical layout of the village as a representation of the mandate of the Games as a whole.\textsuperscript{31} Although the construction of the village is often noted for creating jobs and as a source of revenue, White emphasizes that it was an area which "forced together rich and poor, aristocrat and worker, in a democratizing confrontation that helped spread the supposedly American way of life to the far corners of the world."\textsuperscript{32} While White
recognizes the importance of the village as more than just a revenue source, the value of
this article is emphasized in the author’s analysis of the overall culture of boosterism in
the Los Angeles area.

David Welky’s article “Viking Girls, Mermaids and Little Brown Men: U.S.
Journalism and the 1932 Olympic Games”, and Steven Riess’ article “Power Without
Authority: Los Angeles’ Elites and the Construction of the Coliseum”, complement each
other as both focus on a select group of people who held the power within the bid
committee and the OCOG.\textsuperscript{33} Although the topics investigated by the authors do not
necessarily relate to this analysis, a general theme of elitism within the OCOG exists
throughout both of these research articles. Both articles suggest that there was a lack of
public consultation concerning the construction of the stadium and the media coverage.
Consistent with those Olympic Games that preceded the Games of the Tenth Olympiad,
the power was clearly held by a select few. Riess argues, with some effectiveness, that
the power behind the construction of the coliseum was not with elected politicians, but
rather an elite group of individuals.\textsuperscript{34}

**The Great Depression**

There is a wide variety of scholarly material available concerning the Great
Depression. Within the limits of this study, the author has focused his attention on the
historical and economic effects of the Depression on the topic and regions under
investigation. As such, the analysis was deliberately limited to the time period of 1924 to
1932. This period reflects the efforts of the bid committees to secure the Olympic
Games, and those of the OCOGs to organize and stage their respective Games.
Causes of the Depression

Although popular opinion has suggested that the stock market crash of 24 October 1929 was the major cause of the Great Depression, most economists suggest that this is not entirely correct. The majority of scholars, including Robert S. McElvaine, Michael E. Parrish, and David A. Shannon, agree that the Stock Market crash of 1929 was just an outcome of a long series of international and regional restrictions and policy decisions by the United States government. Parrish notes the failure of purchasing power to keep pace with rising productivity, especially in agriculture and those industries which traditionally employed large numbers of workers. McElvaine further suggests that “the capitalist genius for production was on a collision course with the capitalist limits on consumption.” This suggests that there was no drought on the production of goods even though the demand for them was rapidly decreasing. As a result, the majority of scholars agree that the collision course that manifested itself into the Depression was inevitable.

This collision course is confirmed in David A. Shannon’s analysis of the stock market prior to the crash of 1929. Shannon charts the effect of groups of industrial and commercial stocks. He notes that there existed an unusual amount of hesitancy in the market during this period. Although the economy was growing, Shannon argues that investors were concerned by the exponential growth of the economy in the early 1920s. Under normal circumstances, this growth in the economy would be accompanied by a consistent increase in the value of stocks in the stock market. However, as Shannon suggests, the market fluctuation represented the hesitancy of investors to believe that the economy would always be so prosperous.
policy initiatives. With the Republican leadership of the time, President Herbert Hoover never fully supported extensive unemployment and economic relief programs. This lack of support caused a heightened over-debtiness of the Federal Reserve.\textsuperscript{42} This debt and a federal election in 1932, distracted the federal government from implementing appropriate and necessary policy initiatives.

Although a large segment of the public would suggest that the Great Depression had a singular cause, many authors have suggested that a unicausal explanation is not a sufficient argument.\textsuperscript{43} According to Robert McElvaine, the research has focused too much on isolating a single cause for the Depression rather than accepting the many and varied causes of the event.\textsuperscript{44} The author further strengthens his argument by comparing the Depression to having cancer, in that it is just as difficult to isolate a specific cause of the Depression as it is the disease.

\textit{Professional Sports During the Great Depression}

Although other well organized professional sporting leagues existed in the early 1900s, no sport or league entered the daily lexicon of Americans like Major League Baseball (MLB). There are numerous books concerning its role and importance to the United States during its many stages of development. As a result of this importance, it is beneficial to analyze the previous research on this topic because the challenges faced by such a large sport organization, such as MLB, may mimic, or at the very least have some similarity to those of the IOC during this period.

According to David Voight, in his book \textit{America through Baseball}, the Great Depression profoundly affected the administration and delivery of the game.\textsuperscript{45} He argues that the results of the Depression on baseball were declining attendance, financial losses
by teams, and reduced team payrolls.46 The rich market teams were able to stay competitive, but the poor markets had to sell their best players to meet expenses. As well, consistent with the work of William Bremer concerning New York during the Depression, Voight notes that a “union ethic” amongst the players began as the national economy started to crumble.47 Furthermore, in relation to the emergence of baseball in California, Joel Franks suggests that baseball was a healthy outlet from “the pressure cooker atmosphere of the Great Depression.”48 In an effort to maintain the health of the sport, baseball used expanded concession stands, novel promotional tactics, and night games. The literature seems to point out a redefining of baseball as a national past time during this period.

The Great Depression also played a significant role on the day to day operations of the National Football League (NFL) as the number of teams in the league dropped from 22 in 1925 to 8 in 1932.49 Due to the economic situation, not only were teams contracting, but those who remained were not necessarily on solid ground. For example, in 1930 the New York Giants played a team compromised of former Notre Dame players to generate funds for New Yorkers affected by the Great Depression.50 This was thought to be not only a good public relations decision, but also a way to ensure that fans would continue to come to the games. With the reduction in teams during this period, the NFL suffered through a difficult period framed by the Great Depression.

While the NFL and MLB were well-established leagues, the National Hockey League (NHL) was just in its infancy. The league took steps during the mid-1920s to limit the amount of spending so that each club could remain competitive. Bruce Kidd, in his book *The Struggle for Canadian Sport*, notes that the NHL capped salaries and total
players numerous times throughout the late 1920s and early 1930s in an effort to keep the league competitive.\(^{51}\) The franchises in Ottawa and Pittsburgh were the most affected by the Great Depression as both teams sold players to richer teams, attempted to play in other cities, and ceased operations for a number of seasons in an effort to survive.\(^{52}\)

Although these strategies aided in the short-term, the lack of revenue and competitiveness caused both teams to fold in 1935.\(^{53}\) The effects of the Depression caused the league to become more unbalanced, establishing an identifiable distinction between the have and have-nots, in competitiveness of revenue and on-ice product.

*New York during the Depression*

William Bremer analyzes the role of social policy in the state of New York during the Depression.\(^{54}\) He states that due to the leadership from the local and state governments, the economic expansion era of the early 1920s was handled differently than most of the United States.\(^{55}\) As mentioned previously, New York maintained its well funded social welfare system throughout the 1920s. In 1929, under the threat of economic collapse, Governor Franklin Roosevelt was concerned with the lump sum payments that were required under the executive budget to be passed in the legislature.\(^{56}\) Furthermore, as stated by David M. Ellis, James A. Frost, Harold C. Syrett, and Harry J. Carman, the governor was concerned with labour legislation and the protection of the state’s worker.\(^{57}\)

Under the leadership of Roosevelt, the state developed into a bastion of social reform during a period when other states were trying to cut programs and funding in order to achieve a balanced budget.

While New York was governed by an era of social reform, California was beginning to feel the effects of the ongoing influx of people. The image of Hollywood
and the escapist appeal of the region were beginning to lose the interest of outsiders as the state’s supply of resources began to dwindle. This emerging sense of despair is reflected in a brief scan of the literature on the state of California during the Great Depression.

*California During the Great Depression*

Andrew Bergman investigates the environment in Hollywood and the movie industry during the Depression. Using it as a symbol of American culture, the author’s analysis focuses on the mood and content of the movies during this period. Although the movie companies were generating substantial profits before and during the economic collapse, the Depression was met with great apprehension by movie executives. According to Bergman, the worst year for the movie industry was 1932, substantially later than most of the other industries. This downfall would seem to be in direct conflict with the Hollywood image of the Olympic Games in Los Angeles that Dyreson analyzed. The movies produced in a country “reflect its mentality in a more direct way than other artistic media.” Although the movie industry did not directly feel the early economic effects of the Depression, it would be wrong to assume that the decision makers were not affected by the economic downturn.

However, Richard Rice, William Bullough, and Richard Orsi, in their book *The Elusive Eden: A New History of California*, suggest that the idea of California as a “balmy paradise of orange groves and Hollywood fantasy” was a prominent aspect of the appeal of the state and therefore attracted a large number of people during the late 1920s. Andrew F. Rolle suggested that the local politicians suffered from “… a transient mentality.” Although its public image was predicated on a bastion of
economic prosperity, California was not as prosperous as was publically promoted. For example, the state’s agriculture revenues fell from $750 million U.S. in 1929 to $327 million U.S. in 1932. Additionally, due to its aging population, California had numerous residents who required economic support while not being able to contribute to the work force. As a result, and argued by Richard B. Rice, William A. Bullough, and Richard J. Orsi, the aging population caused an immense strain on the state sponsored funding relief initiatives. While California was promoted as an unique tourist destination, it was impossible to avoid a connection with the economic woes experienced in the rest of the country due to increasing debt load and overpopulated areas.

*International effects of the Depression*

A great number of the works on the Great Depression lack a detailed investigation concerning the collapse of the world economy as a contributor to the economic despair being experienced in the United States. Peter Fearon, in his book *The Origins and Nature of the Great Slump 1929-1932*, analyzes the global influences of the depression in the United States. Following World War I, the United States was a major lender to countries such as Great Britain and France. Additionally, in light of the United States limited propensity to import goods; other countries needed to, but ultimately could not, generate the necessary funds to repay their American loans. As a result of the demand of repayment by the United States, and the inability of the countries to do so, the United States eventually felt the burden of these economic restrictions. Of the selected works, Fearon is the only author that truly acknowledges the role of foreign influences on the Depression in the United States.
One of the major contributors to the beginning of the Great Depression was the introduction of the Hawley-Smoot Act in the late part of 1929. Designed as a protectionist law, the tariff raised “American import duties to stratospheric levels” which made it more difficult for nations to pay off their World War I debts. Originally conceived before the stock market crash, the bill had a completely different effect than originally intended. The American Economics Association publicly urged Congress and President Hoover to reject the bill. Considered a “huge policy blunder” by the Hoover administration, the bill served as a catalyst for a severe economic downturn in the post-Depression era. A review of the available literature reveals that there is a general consensus that the stock market crash was not the cause of the Depression, but a result of the restrictive foreign policy and unrestricted domestic economic initiatives.

Although the respective Games were two very important events within the ethos of the United States, there is little analysis of the important role of the Great Depression on the staging of the two mega-events of 1932. Given the wide breadth of research analyzing the macro effects of the economic depression on business and governmental policy, it is faulty to assume that the Olympic Games of 1932 would be immune from the effects of the Great Depression. As a result, it is important to treat the staging and delivery of the 1932 Olympic Games as unique analyses.
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Chapter III

Methodology

Problem Statement

This research outlines a new investigative path that seeks to identify the perceived differences between the funding and revenue generation for the summer and winter versions of the Olympic Games of 1932. As a result of the perception of similar social, cultural, and economic environments, researchers analyzing the 1932 Olympic Games have paid very little attention to any distinctions between the two versions, beyond the event itself. With the Great Depression occurring at different points in the planning and staging of each event, the potential for new and efficient strategies for revenue generation and delivery of the Olympic Games were necessary in both Lake Placid and Los Angeles. This scholarly initiative emphasized a historical analysis and comparison of the challenges faced by each municipality and OCOG during the organizing and staging of their respective Olympic festivals.

Hypothesis

Upon analyzing the third Olympic Winter Games in Lake Placid and the tenth Olympic Summer Games in Los Angeles, a significant disparity will emerge between the two municipalities and OCOGs concerning the strategies and implementation of their respective Olympic festivals. Owing to the relative size of the respective host city, and the differences in structure, financing and advertising, the researcher predicts that there are significant differences in revenue generation and private sector involvement between the Organizing Committees of Lake Placid and Los Angeles in the delivery and administration of the fiscally restrained events. As a result, future researchers will need
to seriously consider the uniqueness of these two festivals within the broader field of Olympic History

**Direction of the Study**

This investigation restricted its analysis to a macro perspective which analyzed, through a historical perspective, the impact of hosting the 1932 Winter and Summer Olympic Games on the areas of Lake Placid and Los Angeles as a whole. As this analysis focused on the general outcomes of planning the event, the researcher avoided undertaking a microeconomic approach. It was not the goal of this study to analyze the impact of the events on an individual level. Furthermore, the purpose was not to impose a theoretical bias towards data collection, but rather analyze the data for trends and outcomes. As Arthur Stinchcombe suggests in his book *Theoretical Methods in Social History,* "(o)ne does not apply theory to history; rather one uses history to develop theory."³

The Olympic Winter and Summer Games of 1932 were selected because they both occurred in the same year, in the same country, and utilized a common currency. With these commonalities, the effectiveness of the analysis was strengthened. By controlling the factors of monetary unit, general geographic region, and relative time period, an effective analysis of possible differences in hosting the two festivals can occur. Similar to the two World Wars, the Great Depression affected not only a localized region (i.e. the host city), but also the vast majority of the countries in the free market system. As a result, the challenges of hosting the event were considerable and unique to each festival.
The analysis begins with a separate investigation of each of the selected Olympic Games. Although this study considered the divergent effects of the Depression on the two events, it is necessary to extend the analysis from the bidding stage to the completion of the Olympic festival. The analysis of the bidding stage is critical to this investigation as concerns or issues about funding that arose prior to the initial stages of the hosting process can be identified. It is these concerns that are amplified with the onset of the Great Depression. By analyzing various funding initiatives during this economic crisis, conclusions were drawn regarding the importance and uniqueness of the 1932 Olympic Winter and Summer Games.

Limitations

There are numerous limitations that affected the study. The sheer size of the Olympic Games limits the researcher’s ability to treat the event as a singular unit. While the two *Official Reports* of the Olympic Games are audited and deemed official, there is an inconsistency in the style and presentation of the information provided that hinders analysis. The revisions to the 1949 “Olympic Rules,” found in the IOC’s *Olympic Charter*, mandated an OCOG to publish an official report no more than two years after the staging of the Games have been completed. Since the 1932 *Official Reports* were published prior to this revision, the researcher understands that an assumption has been made that the information is as accurate as possible.

Delimitations

This study strictly focused on the marketing and sponsorship initiatives of the respective OCOG as depicted by the media, and did not analyze various other common predictors of success of the Olympic Games. Although there are many factors that
influence the success of the Games, this study looked at those related to financing the Games. As this research initiative focused on the general outcomes of the financing of the 1932 Olympic Games, the researcher, as previously noted, has framed this study from a macro perspective.

This study strictly focuses on data concerning the economic viability of hosting the two events during the Great Depression. Although the economic collapse, caused, in part, by the Depression, affected the host cities well beyond the delivery and completion of the Olympic Games, this study does not analyze the legacy of the two events or the various other common concerns that existed. The researcher has limited his analysis to the economic data gleaned from the two OCOG reports, the selected media archives, the U.S. government archives, and the IOC General Session and Executive Council Minutes.

This research endeavour is limited to the Games of the Tenth Olympiad and the third Olympic Winter Games and will not use other Olympiads as a form of comparison. As mentioned previously, these Games have been selected because of their proximity in time, cultural similarities, geographic region, and similar economic conditions.

**Data Collection**

There are numerous sources of primary data that have been reviewed in order to obtain the required information. These sources include, but are not limited to, the primary source data from the two OCOGs, the Los Angeles, Lake Placid, and national print media archives, the National Archives of the United States, and the local and state government archives. Each of these sources is further described in the paragraphs below.

Relating to information regarding the two 1932 Olympic Games, there are substantially different amounts of relevant primary source data located in two separate
archives in the United States. The predominant source for information on the Olympic Games is the Amateur Athletic Foundation of Los Angeles (AAFLA) located in Los Angeles, California. Created from the legacy of the Games of the Twenty-third Olympiad, the foundation houses an elaborate sports library and archive. Within this archive exists a large collection of primary source documents from the Tenth Olympiad and the third Olympic Winter Games in Lake Placid (see Appendix I).

In complete contrast to the AAFLA, the Lake Placid archives are small and highly decidedly less formalized. Through personal communication with various Olympic scholars, the researcher has determined that the archives exist in a variety of different locations and with little or no filing system. The documents at the Lake Placid Olympic Museum contain the IOC file of Godfrey Dewey, the chair of the bid committee. These archives may also contain OCOG information, appropriate news clippings, and various promotional materials necessary for this investigation. However, given that many of these materials were available from other archival sources, a visit to Lake Placid was deemed unnecessary.

A large portion of data was gleaned, through Inter-library loans, from the coverage of a selected local newspaper in each city during the time period of 1924 to 1932. The Lake Placid News offers a unique perspective on the Lake Placid area. Of particular interest to the researcher was a section within the newspaper about events and proceedings of the Lake Placid Club. The club’s president, during the period of bidding to delivery of the event, was Godfrey Dewey. The Los Angeles Times is the city of Los Angeles’ largest newspaper, first published on 1 December 1884, and has served as a major source of news for the city from its infancy. As the city has grown, so has the Los
Angeles Times. However, the competition among newspapers was fierce, and it was not until the mid-1940s that the Los Angeles Times became the predominant newspaper in the region. Today, the paper ranks as the largest metropolitan daily newspaper in the country.

**Data Analysis**

Upon completion of the data collection from the sources identified, the data was grouped by chronological order of the event. As this study looks at the challenges of staging the 1932 Winter and Olympic Summer Games, the relevant data was categorized by four distinct time periods: the bidding stage; the 1924-1930 period; the 1930-until the start of the event period; and the period actually defined by the event itself. The bidding stage represents the time period from when the idea was first conceived by the key characters, to the approval from the IOC to host the event. The 1924-1930 period reflects the challenges prior to and in the beginning of the Great Depression. Additionally, this period represents the time, before the Great Depression, of facility construction, generation, and securing of funds for hosting purposes, as well as the early promotional campaigns. The setting of the post-stock market crash era demands that the 1930-32 period and the actual period of the Games be kept separate. This division is used as it is hypothesized that the onset of the economic depression will have affected the funding initiatives by each OCOG.

The general categories of economic data that are analyzed are the various sponsorship initiatives undertaken from the sponsors and recipient perspective, as well as those funding initiatives that have yet to be identified. Sponsor marketing included a tally of the number and variety of Olympic related paraphernalia. This includes advertisements in newspapers, magazines, and any affiliated Olympic paraphernalia.
Given the size and scope of the study, the researcher has not analyzed the purpose for the affiliation with the Games. The host city marketing initiatives will indicate how each host city exploits the partnership with sponsors and markets the affiliation. This includes evidence of using promotional channels and funding from the sponsors to further enhance the event and the efforts made to accommodate the sponsors. The final section of analysis involves other sources of funding, such as self-generated revenue (sales of memorabilia, and programs), private revenue (radio and cinema), and public funding (government funding and donations).

A content analysis has been conducted to tabulate the number of Olympic related advertisements in both of the selected newspapers (see Appendix IVa). In the three groups that make up the period of 1924 to 1932, the analysis was limited to the Saturday edition of the Los Angeles Times and the Friday edition of the Lake Placid News. During the event itself, it was important to analyze the daily editions of the Los Angeles Times to obtain the necessary data for analysis.8

While it was important to complete an analysis of the media’s delivery of the two Games, it was also necessary to analyze primary source data to confirm or deny the material extracted from the media archives. The order of analysis occurred from the most to least important archives, as the information required from the smaller archives was available from the larger collections.9

The archive with the most perceived relevance to this study is the AAFLA. A large majority of the information for this study came directly from this archive, and as a result, this analysis occurred first (see Appendix I). After using the keywords to focus the data, each piece of data was first divided into the four identified time periods. By reading
the documents, the data, within the identified time periods, was divided into three separate streams of data. As previously mentioned, these categories are: 1) sponsorship from the sponsor's perspective; 2) from the bid committee, and OCOG’s perspective; and 3) other sources of funding.

Each of the additional archives served a specific purpose, and as a result, provided a specific set of information. In each one of these analyses, the keywords from this study were applied. The Avery Brundage Collection has an index that highlights different themes of data throughout the American Olympic Committee (AOC) president's career. As a large part of this collection is personal correspondence, the analysis focused on the role of the AOC in the financing issues of each of the Games. Given the uncertainty of the host city for the Summer Games, and the delayed awarding of the Olympic Winter Games, it was expected that the Avery Brundage Collection data was prominent in both narratives. The IOC General Session and Executive Council Minutes are expected to provide the same organizational insight as the Avery Brundage Collection.

In an effort to facilitate the analysis of data extracted from all sources, the researcher identified numerous keywords. For both of the analyses, these keywords were: Olympic Games; sponsorship; funding; government; the Great Depression; and facility construction. The terms sponsorship, funding, government and facility construction are secondary keywords that were only coded when they were found in the same document as Olympic Games. These words have been specifically identified to establish limits in the study. Words, such as sponsorship and funding, are self-evident as they are the primary focus of this investigation.
In addition to the terms used for both analyses, there are specific search terms related to each of the events. To gain an increased understanding of the decisions and programs implemented by both bid committees and OCOGs, a background of the major contributors of each of the Games was necessary. Godfrey Dewey, the chair of the Lake Placid Club and head of the OCOG, was an important person in the delivery and administration of the event. Dewey was born in September 1887 to Melville Dewey and Annie Godfrey. Dewey’s father is best known as the creator of the Dewey Decimal System in 1873, a classification system to help organize collections and materials in libraries. Dewey grew up in the Lake Placid region, and spent his early education at the Albany Academy, a military school his father wanted him to attend. He continued his education at Harvard, earning his Bachelors’ (1909), Masters’ (1921), and Doctorate (1926) in Education. Dewey married Marjorie Kinney with whom he had five children, Kienne (1916-1918), Katharin (1917-), Arthur Kienne (1919-1930), Margaret (1923-) and Stuart (1925-1942). In his professional career, Godfrey was an academic and continued the work of his father with the Lake Placid Club and the Dewey Decimal System. He published many works on the importance and evolution of the cataloguing system. Godfrey Dewey was employed at Emerson College between 1940-1968, where he taught and published the majority of his works on the decimal system. Along with his participation in the 1932 Organizing Committee, Godfrey was a contributor to the Organizing Committee for the 1980 Lake Placid Olympic Winter Games until his death on 18 October 1977.

As William May Garland was an important contributor to the success of the Games of the Tenth Olympiad, his name was included in the keyword list for the content
analysis of The Los Angeles Times. William May Garland, president of the Los Angeles Organizing Committee, was born 31 March 1866 in Westport, Maine, to Jonathan May Garland and Rebecca Jewett. He attended school in the region of Waterville, Maine and upon completion, worked at the Illinois Trust Savings Bank in Chicago until 1890. He moved to Los Angeles in 1890, where he was auditor of the Pacific Cable Company and worked in real estate from 1890-1894. On 12 October 1898 he married Blanche Hinman, and they had two children, William Marshall and John Jewett. During his career, he served two terms as president of the National Association of Real Estate Boards and three as the president of the Los Angeles Realty Board. Garland attended the Republican National Conventions in 1900, 1924, 1928, 1936, and 1940. Given his many involvements in the private sector, the Republican party aligned with his own business beliefs. Garland’s interest in the Olympic Games stemmed from his 19 years as president of the Los Angeles Athletic Club. This, combined with his many other private interests, secured his place in the Community Development Association. This group, formed in 1918, eventually bid for the Olympic Games as a way to boost the Los Angeles area. Garland continued to be immersed in the real estate and athletic fields following the Olympic Games up until his death on 26 September 1948 at the age of 82. Garland was an important contributor to the Olympic Games which helped contribute to the infrastructure and growth of Los Angeles.

With the extraction of the data using the selected keywords, the researcher coded the grouped data. As this study focuses on the economic challenges of both 1932 Olympic Games, coding occurred only when there was a direct connection with the Olympic Games. In order to be coded, the article or advertisement must have mentioned,
or included a symbol which represents, a direct affiliation with the Olympic Games. If there was no direct visual evidence, then the data was not coded, as the affiliation was not completely direct or obvious. This enabled the researcher to distinguish the official sponsors from those who had no affiliation. In addition, through the analysis of newspaper articles using the selected keywords, a coding procedure was administered regarding the mood of the media towards OCOG funding initiatives.

After coding was completed, the data was grouped into the four periods previously mentioned (pre-bid, 1924-1930, 1930-1932, and actual event). Although the third Olympic Winter Games were not awarded to Lake Placid until mid-1930, preliminary analysis revealed sufficient media coverage before the awarding of the event to maintain the distinction between the bidding stage data group and the 1924-1930 group.

After completion of the grouping, a tabulation of the coded information from each of the four periods occurred. While this tabulation was quantitative, analysis was compared with data, using the same coding method from the other archives, to form a separate historical narrative addressing each of the two Olympic Games. By combining this tabulation with an analysis of the Olympic related newspapers stories, a characterization of the hosting of the event was expected to emerge.

Given the volume of expected data present in each separate narrative, a comparison of the two narratives identified the similarities and differences in hosting the two selected Games. Similarly to each individual narrative, the analysis followed the same four identified periods (bid, pre-1930, 1930-1932, and actual Games), with each period being broken down into the three types of economic data (sponsorship from the
sponsor's perspective, the host city, and other sources of funding). From the results of these comparisons, conclusions have been made regarding the feasibility of the selected events during the period of the Great Depression. As well, these conclusions can be compared to the current initiatives of the IOC to formulate potential new strategies for hosting the Olympic Games.
Endnotes

1 Ibid., p. 301; Macroeconomics is defined as “the body of economic theory that attempts to analyze the behaviour and performance of the whole economy. It describes and explains the dynamics of the institutional and governmental framework of our economic system by focusing on the total or aggregate performance of the economy.” It is not the purpose of this study to analyze to impose macroeconomics on this study, but rather document the economic decisions of the OCOGs from a macro, or non-individual perspective.

2 Tom Ridell, Jean Shackelford, Steve Stamos, and Geoffrey Schneider, *Economics: A Tool for Critically Understanding Society*, 6th ed. (Boston, MA: Addison Wesley, 2002), p. 117. Microeconomics is defined as “concerned with describing how an economic system operates to allocate resources, determine incomes, and organize production. Consequently, it focuses on the decision makers—firms, consumers, the government—that determine how resources will be used.”


4 Through personal communication with Martha MacIntosh, Documentation Services at the IOC by electronic mail on January 17, 2003; “In the 1946 edition of the "Olympic Rules" there is no mention of the Official Report. In the 1949 edition of the "Olympic Rules," under rule 30, we find the addition of the reference to the Official Report. The precise reference reads "As soon as possible after the Games a full and complete printed report must be submitted to the International Olympic Committee." (Lausanne: International Olympic Committee, 1949) p. 14. This text can be seen through to the 1955 edition of "The Olympic Games: Charter, rule and regulations, general information" (rule 29 – p. 15). In the 1956 edition of "The Olympic Games" the section referring to the Official Report is shifted to fall under rule 54. Here we see, for the first time, a reference to a specific time period. The text reads "A full and complete printed report must be submitted by it to the International Olympic Committee, within two years of the close of the Games." (Lausanne: International Olympic Committee, 1956) p. 30.

5 Through personal communication in 2002 with Dr. Robert K. Barney and Dr. Scott Martyn, they indicated that the information is very sporadic and not very well organized. In fact, Dr. Barney suggested, while researching the origins of the medal podium, that he was actually providing them with information to further enhance the Lake Placid Museum’s collections.

6 D. Sandler and D. Shani, Olympic Sponsorship vs. ‘Ambush’ Marketing”, *Journal of Advertising Research* (New York, NY: Advertising Research Foundation, 1989), August/September, p. 10. The authors define sponsorship as “the provision of resources (fiscal, human, and physical) by an organization directly to an event or activity in exchange for a direct association to the event or activity. The providing organization can then use this direct association to achieve either its corporate, marketing, or media objectives.” In Bernard Mullin, Stephen Hardy and William Sutton, *Sport Marketing* (Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics Publishers, 1993), p. 206.

7 Ibid., p. 215. The authors list the reasons why companies are interested in sport sponsorship. These include “to increase public awareness of the company, the product or both; to alter or reinforce public perception of the company; to identify the company with particular market segments; to involve the company in the community, to build goodwill among opinion formers and decision makers; to generate media benefits; to achieve sales objectives, to create an advantage over competitors, through association or exclusivity; and to gain unique opportunities in terms of hospitality and entertainment.” Each of these factors were considered in this analysis.
The newspaper microfilm of the Lake Placid News only had a Friday edition and as a result, daily edition analysis is not possible.

The more important archives are the AAFLA and both newspaper archives. Secondary sources include the Avery Brundage Collection, IOC General Session and Executive Council minutes, and the National Archives.

University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, “Avery Brundage Collection” (Springfield, Illinois: University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign Library, 2003), http://www.uiuc.edu/index.html, retrieved July 10, 2003. Avery Brundage was born in Detroit, Michigan on 28 September 1887 to Charles Brundage and Amelia. He graduated from Chicago English High School and received a Bachelor of Science in Civil Engineering from the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign. Brundage enjoyed an illustrious athletic career, representing the United States in decathlon at the 1912 Olympic Summer Games in Stockholm. In addition, he was the U.S. all-around amateur champion in 1914, 1916, and 1918. Avery Brundage business interests began when he formed and was president of a construction company, named after himself, from 1915-1947. In 1927, at the age of 40, he married Elizabeth Dunlap of Chicago with whom he had no children. He did eventually have a child via an affair. The following year, he began his career in the administration of amateur athletics, as he was named president of the Central Amateur Athletic Union (1928-1933) and the Amateur Athletic Union of the United States (1928-1933, 1935). In 1929, he served one term as president of the United States Olympic Association (1929-1933). In 1930, he was named vice president of the International Athletic Foundation, a post he held until 1952. In 1936, Brundage was elected to the International Olympic Committee, an organization he would contribute to for 37 years. From 1945 to 1952, he was the organization’s vice president and from 1952 to 1972, its fifth president. In 1973, Brundage married Mariann Princess Reuss but the marriage was short lived as on 8 May 1975 Brundage passed away at Garmisch-Partenkirchen, Germany.

Facility construction was chosen because given the grandiose nature of the Games, this issue would seem to be a hotly debated one. As mentioned previously, Lake Placid had difficulty with the construction of the bobsleigh run and required an injection of funds to complete the construction of the facility. In addition, several other facilities had to be built or renovated to make the area to meet the appropriate standards of the IOC for hosting the event. In opposition, according to the Official Report, Los Angeles only had to build stadiums for the swimming and rowing events. Although Los Angeles already had the existent infrastructure to support the majority of the events, this does not mean that this did not result in public debate. Given the backdrop of the Great Depression, it would preposterous to suggest that this new construction was uniformly accepted.

The purpose of the government keyword is twofold. The first reason involves the amount of government intervention in the delivery of the event. For example, as previously stated, Franklin Roosevelt used the Lake Placid Games as a tool in his campaign for president in 1928 by promising that the event would serve as a catalyst for job creation and the injection of funds. Second, this keyword may help further quantify the amount of government funds that were injected into the event. It is possible that the newspapers would have information about unreported funds, such as potential tax breaks and fee reductions, involved with its staging.

As a result of this association with the event from its beginning to end, it is assumed that Dewey will be a consistent presence in the coverage of the event in the Lake Placid News and quite possibly The Los Angeles Times.
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In 1923, Garland representing the Community Development Association (CDA), went to convince the IOC of Los Angeles’ merits as a future host site. From this time until the delivery of the event, Garland maintained an association with the event. This is particularly true after the securing of the event, when he was named chair of the bid committee.


Sponsors were deemed official if the official insignia of either Olympic Games was visually present or a direct statement of affiliation in the selected document. Without the direct visual or written evidence, the researcher deemed the sponsor unofficial.
Chapter IV

Results

Lake Placid

Pre-Bid Period

Although both of the Olympic Games under investigation occurred in the same year, the infancy and perceived unimportance of the Winter Olympic movement resulted in differing approaches to the awarding of the 1932 summer and winter Olympic Games. For Dr. Godfrey Dewey, president of the Lake Placid Club and the bid committee, the biggest obstacle to overcome came from other bids within the United States. As revealed in a 17 May 1929 article in the Lake Placid News, the strongest opposition to the Lake Placid bid was from other competing bids from Lake Tahoe and Yosemite National Park, both located in California.¹ Col. William Garland, president of the California Olympic and Los Angeles Olympic Summer Games Organizing Committees and member of the AOC, was very hesitant to present the Lake Placid bid to the IOC.² Garland had championed California’s bid and as a result, was significantly opposed to Lake Placid’s efforts.³ This article is the most detailed information in the media concerning any potential controversy during the pre-bid period.

The idea of awarding the Olympic Winter Games to the United States was first raised at the 25-27 July and 3 August 1928 IOC General Session meeting in Amsterdam.⁴ Following the selection of the country, the IOC requested bids from prospective host cities in the United States, establishing a deadline of January 1st to submit a viable bid. As a result, Dewey worked very hard to develop a bid with appropriate financial guarantees within the remaining eight months. With a limited period of time to secure the rights to
the mega-event, Dewey kept in constant contact with Olympic officials and made numerous trips to the AOC and IOC headquarters.\textsuperscript{5}

While Dewey worked diligently on the details of the Lake Placid proposal, he assumed the senior position for the bid, ensuring a visible presence.\textsuperscript{6} Of the eight articles found in the content analysis of the pre-awarding period (pre-12 April 1929) in the \textit{Lake Placid News}, each focused on donations from the local communities and government support for the Games.\textsuperscript{7} Although many factors contributed to the overwhelming approval of the mega-event, the tireless efforts of Dewey should be considered the most important. For example, a 18 January 1929 article stated that the overwhelming support from both sides of the New York state legislature for a bill to officially back the Games was due to Dewey’s “bending of every effort to bring these international games to Lake Placid.”\textsuperscript{8} While an established relationship with the state and local government was required, strong public support was the most important. During the pre-bid period, Dewey delivered two speeches in the local region, one to Kiwanis Club and one to the town. Both talks were intended to raise interest and also detail the potential impact that the event would have on the community. Outside of the immediate need to build a bobsled run, readers were rarely provided any detail concerning the logistics of the bid.

As a result of the data obtained, only one category of analysis applies to the pre-awarding period. Given the importance for the bid committee to solicit financial backing prior to any attempt to secure the event from the IOC, the residents of Saranac Lake made a contribution of $4,000 U.S., and the county of Essex also pledged its support to aid in the staging of the event. These pledges of support received throughout the state clearly demonstrated that interest in the event stretched beyond the borders of Lake Placid. Even
though the pledges from the identified parties were not officially received, Dewey and the athletic contingent departed on 31 March 1929 to present their bid to the IOC General Session in Lausanne, Switzerland. With the departure of the delegation from Lake Placid, the bid committee felt reasonably confident about the overwhelming public support received.

The most comprehensive overview of the dealings of the bid committee is the front page article that was published 12 April 1929 exclaiming that Lake Placid had been awarded the Games. Given the description by Paula Metzler, in her article entitled “Third Winter Olympics: neither the Great Depression nor the rise of fascism could deter Lake Placid from hosting its first Winter Olympics”, she highlighted Dewey’s affinity for skiing and the Lake Placid Club. Metzler also documented the steps involved in the creation process of the Lake Placid Club and explains Dewey’s desire to enhance Lake Placid’s stature as a winter resort community.

While Dewey is given appropriate credit for the awarding of the third Olympic Winter Games, the general public and government must also be considered important parties in the success of the delegation in Lausanne. Although local citizens and businesses were interested in promoting Lake Placid to the national and European business community, without the support of the state government the bid would not have been feasible. The overwhelming support for the hosting of the event from both houses of the state government ensured that the major expenses, such as facility construction, would be well funded.
1924-1930 Period

With the awarding of the third Olympic Winter Games, announced in the 12 April 1929 edition of the Lake Placid News, the newly formed OCOG developed an action plan for hosting the event. Similar to the increasing activity of the Organizing Committee, the coverage in the newspaper became far more detailed and regular. From the period between the awarding of the mega-event and the end of 1930, the research revealed twenty articles of relevance to this study. Most of the articles are of a positive nature and address the day-to-day operations of the committee. However, as an article entitled “Award to Lake Placid of Olympics Is Called ‘Outrage’” revealed, there was a strong opposition from California towards the final IOC decision. Citing perceived facility and resource limitations, William F. Humphrey, president of the California Olympic Games Committee, felt that Lake Tahoe and Yosemite were far better choices than Lake Placid. Given the immense growth of California and the existing summer OCOG, Humphrey argued that California was far better suited to host the winter festival.

Although these objections were printed in the Lake Placid News, there was little evidence of any response from the OCOG or the newspaper to the opposition’s dissent in California. The first couple of weeks following the awarding of the Games continued the celebration while continuing to generate interest in the Olympic festival. On the front page of the 19 April 1929 issue of the Lake Placid News, there are three articles that specifically pertain to generating additional interest in the festival. Two of the articles relate to Olympic publicity, and the other article announced the appointment of Thomas P. Faherty to supervise the organization of the publicity for the Chamber of Commerce in connection with the Games. Faherty had experience in writing and promoting with his
work for the *New York Evening Post*.\(^{16}\) Related to this appointment, a major headline in the same issue of the *Lake Placid News* announced “Sports Writers Get Line On 1932 Olympics.”\(^{17}\) With widespread excitement in the New York region over the awarding of the Games, and a large amount of public funds committed to the staging of the event, one would assume that a substantial amount of the overall spending would be committed towards advertising in the media. However, as stated in the *Official Report*, the committee’s funds were limited enough that the promotion of the mega-event through advertising was deemed unfeasible. Consequently, due to the lack of available funds, it was very important to ensure that the New York media was well aware of the day to day activities related to the Games. In an effort to strengthen local support, a collection of writers — representing *The New York Times, New York American, New York Evening World, New York Tribune*, and the *Gannett* newspaper chain — came to Lake Placid to inspect the facilities and talk to North American Speed Skating Champion Jack Shea. By conversing with experts and inspecting the existing infrastructure of the Games, the New York media representatives became educated unofficial representatives of the Organizing Committee.\(^{18}\)

In addition to the writer’s tour, a dinner was planned for Dewey on May 7\(^{th}\) to celebrate his return to Lake Placid.\(^{19}\) Various members of the local Chamber of Commerce attended this event in order to “promote its advantages whereby the whole world will come to know Lake Placid as the winter sports headquarters for the entire United States.”\(^{20}\) In his speech, published verbatim in the 17 May 1929 newspaper, Dewey described how Lake Placid was awarded the international festival. Of relevance to this section was the fact that Dewey’s speech outlined the next steps in the process,
providing a guide identifying potential obstacles and barriers to the staging of a successful Olympic Winter Games. He cited three potential problems: publicity; financing and constructing facilities; and the coordination of information with the NOCs, the IOC, the AOC, and international and national sports federations. Dewey also stated in his speech that the budget for the Games would not exceed $200,000 U.S., with a large majority retrieved from gate receipt revenue. In addition, money from the budget would be used for “permanent improvements of large and permanent value for the community.” By a vote of 343 to 66, on 4 June 1929, the taxpayers in the district of North Elba gave their resounding endorsement to a public bond of $200,000 U.S. to finance the Games. As promoted by the OCOG, the funds would be used for facility construction, with at least $100,000 U.S. promised to return from ticket and gate receipts. According to the author of the article, this endorsement ensured that nothing would be “lacking in the way of adequate financial backing for these games.”

While a large majority of Dewey’s speech details the steps that would be taken as they move closer to the delivery of the event, he does indirectly address the potential effects of the Depression. Understanding the potential implications, Dewey stated that the 200,000 dollar U.S. bond initiative would be formulated quickly and “submitted to the voters at the earliest possible moment.” By passing the bond, he argued, construction could begin immediately on the necessary facilities. In addition to the speed of construction, it could be argued that Dewey realized that the quicker the vote, given the effects of the Great Depression, the more likely the people would be in favour of the bond. Importantly, Dewey emphasizes a smaller tax, on the individual taxpayer, than the current hospital tax. By noting the minimal amount of taxes that each individual
taxpayer would pay as a result of the bond, Dewey was trying to limit the opposition to the Olympic Games.

The final obstacle that Dewey addressed was the construction of two facilities: the bob-run and the Olympic Stadium.30 Two contradictory bills had been passed in the legislature concerning the construction of the bob-run. The first suggested that the event should be staged at Mount Jo, a private area of land where construction could occur without the Games organizers using state land. The second bill suggested moving the run only three to four miles from the town so that the community would have easier access.31 As a way of ensuring the long-term stability of the bob-run, German Bobsleigh expert Stanislaus Zentzyski was brought in to survey and identify an appropriate place to build the facility. Having designed and supervised the construction of many European bob-runs, his expertise was deemed extremely valuable in ensuring that Lake Placid had the best facilities in the United States.32 In addition to the bob-run, the main arena was to be planned for the centre of the town and serve as a centrepiece for the renovated resort.33 Requiring the greatest amount of community involvement, the article suggests that the construction of the stadium will be an economic stimulant for the stagnant local economy.34 The plan suggests that the arena be built in the centre of town to ensure the maximization of tourist dollars, as well as serving as a multipurpose facility for community use.

Following the endorsement of the bond, Dewey travelled to New York City to attend a meeting of the AOC.35 There he reported on the results of the bond vote and the next steps that the OCOG would be taking. In addition, Dewey guaranteed 21 countries would be attending the event.36 Considering what is known from the literature about the
hesitancy of the NOCs to travel overseas during the Depression, Dewey could not have secured guarantees from 21 countries as he suggested.

With the international community beginning to express potential interest in the event, the local community delivered on the financial guarantees made before the awarding of the Games. The residents of Saranac Lake made a contribution of $1,000 U.S., one tenth of the verbal commitment that the community made to the bid committee. As North Elba was not within the city limits of Saranac Lake and would not be taxed for the other initiatives, this gesture should be considered a voluntary manner of ensuring the economic stability of the event (See Appendix V for map of Lake Placid area). A 27 September 1929 article reprinted from the Adirondack Enterprise, another regional newspaper, describes a publicity campaign to fulfill the pledge of $10,000 U.S. made to the OCOG. Instead of door to door campaigning, it was felt that this would be quicker and a more secure way of soliciting the required funds. It was evident that with this contribution that the area surrounding Lake Placid was very supportive of staging the international Olympic festival.

After the June 28th article about the Saranac fund payment, there is a significant gap in the relevant articles from the Lake Placid News. The next significant one was a 8 September 1929 article concerning an initial response to the OCOG’s request for specific 1932 Olympic Winter Games’ stamps. The assistant postmaster stated that while it was too early to officially deny the request, there was little chance of creating a special event stamp for the Games. The lack of precedence was cited as the reason for the initial hesitancy. As this was a source of revenue generation and promotion, the initial
apprehension by the postmaster must have caused the OCOG to question the value of promotion with public companies.

As 1930 came to a close, a controversy arose in the newspaper concerning the use of state land for the bob-run. The *Association for Protection of Adirondacks* sued the OCOG for private use of state land.42 As mentioned by Metzler and Fea, the destruction of some 2,000 trees violated the proper use of a provincial park as stated in article 7, section 7, of the constitution of New York State.43 This section states:

> (t)he lands of the state, now owned or hereafter acquired, constituting the forest preserve as now fixed by law, shall be forever kept as wild forest lands. They shall not be reused, sold or exchanged, or be taken by any corporation, public or private, nor shall the timber thereon be sold, removed or destroyed.44

Should a violation of this law occur, the constitution of New York states that:

> (a) violation of any of the provisions of this section may be restrained at the suit of the people or with the consent of the Supreme Court in appellate division, on notice to the attorney general at the suit of any citizen.45

It was from this specific section that the *Association for Protection of Adirondacks* based their case. The position of the association was that the Lake Placid natural habitat should remain unaltered. As the group continued to pursue legal action, this group represented a legitimate barrier to the smooth progression of facility construction and the delivery plan.

With potential fallout from the lawsuit and the resulting problems with promotion, this period was characterized by problems early on in the hosting process for the OCOG. Winning the lawsuit and convincing the postmaster general about the merits of a commemorative stamp would require a substantial amount of energy and time. Given that the Olympic Winter Games were just over a year away, these types of interruptions would overshadow the progress made over the previous two years.
1930 to Start of the Games

As previously mentioned, 1930 began with no guarantee that the process of hosting the event would pass without barriers. With a total of 106 articles over 109 weeks before the Games, there is a clear indication that readers of the newspaper were constantly informed about the developments involving their Games.

With the financial needs of the OCOG secure, the committee could proceed with promotion and marketing. This progress was further propelled when state assemblyman Fred L. Porter introduced a bill that would allocate 150,000 dollar U.S. of state money for the sole purpose of Olympic publicity. The bill also included the formation of a state Olympic commission to oversee facility construction, advertising, perfecting transportation facilities, and cooperation to ensure the successful delivery of the Games. The bill guaranteed the state would have a more proactive role in the OCOG’s decision making process. To further emphasize the partnership between the OCOG and government, community representatives Willis Wells, supervisor of the town of North Elba, and Dewey, were named to the government commission. Two weeks after the bill was introduced, it passed through both houses of the legislature with an adjustment to the overall funding amount. After unanimous support from the lower house, Senator Charles J. Hewitt objected to the initial budget amount of $150,000 U.S. As a result, a deduction of $25,000 U.S. from the originally requested amount was made in order to ensure unanimous support from the senate.

Even though the OCOG had received additional funding following the establishment of the publicity committee, the original lawsuit against the use of public land for the bob-run had not been resolved. As such, little progress could be made
without a location to build the bob-run. Finally, on 21 March 1930 the issue was resolved when the Appellate court ruled against the use of public land for the construction for the bob-run.\textsuperscript{50} Although no reason is cited in the \textit{Lake Placid News} article, other sources indicate that the judgment stated that the removal of trees was deemed unconstitutional under the New York State Park Act. As a result of the decision, the OCOG was forced to examine a site on privately owned land. The only private land that was identified in the original plans was Mount Jo, nine miles away from the area of North Elba.\textsuperscript{51} When compared to the two public sites, the mountain was identified as the best place for slope and length of the proposed run, although the distance from town was identified as a major concern.\textsuperscript{52} The three sites, originally designed to be used for skeleton and bobsleigh, was changed after the IOC voted to eliminate skeleton from the programme due to construction issues at the 22-24 May 1930 General Session meeting in Berlin.\textsuperscript{53} With the elimination of skeleton, Mount Jo, for the time being, was identified as the best sight for the construction of the run.

While the OCOG was forced to evaluate new alternatives for the bob-run, on another front the OCOG was excited about the announcement that the New York state government had agreed to issue a special stamp for the event.\textsuperscript{54} While initial reports in the \textit{Lake Placid News} suggested that there had been opposition due to an issue of precedence, under pressure from the letter campaign orchestrated by the recently created Publicity Committee, the Postmaster General finally agreed to issue a special stamp.\textsuperscript{55} The article suggests that the key reason for the change in attitude was the importance that previous commemorative stamps had in preserving national history.\textsuperscript{56} As the event
brought many worldwide travellers to the region, this stamp served as another souvenir of the visitors’ stay in Lake Placid.

In early April, Dewey met with Governor Roosevelt to report on the progress of the OCOG, the structure of the overall Olympic Committee, and discuss the problem of housing the participants. Stated as a “vexing” aspect of the Games, the inconsistency in the confirmed number of countries and the perceived low amount of available hospitality were unforeseen obstacles that required immediate attention. Dewey reassured the governor that the OCOG was ensuring that the surrounding community would cooperate by providing additional space for accommodations.

However, in order to fill all of the available accommodation space, he noted that additional promotion of the event was required. Despite the news of the issuance of a commemorative stamp, the OCOG recognized the need to promote the Games in a variety of different ways. As a result, the committee began to plan for a publicity book that would be distributed internationally. The book was to be distributed by civic organizations, Olympic organizations, hotels, travel bureaus, and express organizations throughout the world. Clearly, the OCOG was efficiently using those parties with a vested interest in the success of the event to deliver and promote the book.

While the OCOG was in court defending its right to build on public land, other alternatives for construction on private property were pursued. The Organizing Committee needed to reevaluate their whole plan as the need for an accessible bob-run was vital to the long term effectiveness of the facility. The OCOG identified South Meadow Mountain, a mountain located eight miles out of town on land owned by the Lake Placid Club, as the appropriate location for the bob-run. When the OCOG learned
of the Appellate Court's decision, the committee finally decided, on 2 May 1930, that the bob-run would be constructed on South Meadow Mountain as opposed to Mount Jo. With the decision of the Appellate Court only 5 weeks old, the OCOG showed that it could act quickly in evaluating all appropriate sites and come to a final decision in a timely fashion. However, this decision is particularly interesting considering that the South Mountain was the initial private site to locate the run.

Although the news of a final site for the bob-run was reassuring for European NOCs, the biggest obstacle in delivering the Olympic Winter Games for the OCOG was the confirmation of their attendance. Given the potential expenses of traveling across the Atlantic Ocean, many NOCs were hesitant to send their athletic contingents on such a long and expensive journey. In early May 1930, Lewis H. Crane, a manager of one of the New York train lines, began to address this problem. Crane discussed with the OCOG possible strategies for bringing local, national, and international travel companies together to entice foreign participation for the betterment of the event. In addition, a meeting was announced between private sector travel companies to debate the strategies suggested by Crane. This meeting clearly emphasizes that the OCOG was aware of the high expense for travellers and athletes to the Games, as well as its need for corporate partners.

To combat the lack of accommodations during the event, a media release was published in the 16 May 1930 edition of the paper. The article listed the families who agreed to billet international athletes during the festival. Approximately 300 different families had approximately 2500 rooms available for foreign diplomats and athletes. The published information served two purposes: to allow the people on the list the
opportunity to correct the numbers of rooms available, and those not on the list to feel inspired to open their houses for the betterment of the event.\textsuperscript{71} As there was no remuneration for those families listed, this article emphasized the philanthropic attitude of the community, well in advance of hosting the Olympic Winter Games.\textsuperscript{72}

On 13 June 1930, as in previous issues, the \textit{Lake Placid News} published a report written by committee secretary Ernest Gamache on the progress of the OCOG.\textsuperscript{73} The report covered progress in the advertising program, the development of the bob-run, housing, transportation, medals, and the solicitation of more members for the Olympic Committee.\textsuperscript{74} The report served as a synopsis of the events thus far, but did not provide any additional information. Coupled with the local report, the same basic information was published in an IOC report delivered at the 9\textsuperscript{th} Congress in Berlin.\textsuperscript{75} These regular updates ensured an informed public and regular communication between the IOC and the OCOG.

Given Dewey’s desire to increase the profile of Lake Placid internationally, any praise received from outside of the community was important.\textsuperscript{76} Rene M. Fonjallez, a noted writer and historian in Switzerland, paid a visit in mid-1930 to Lake Placid specifically to evaluate the site for eager European bobsleigh enthusiasts.\textsuperscript{77} After evaluating the site and seeing the plans for the proposed run, Fonjallez exclaimed that the facility would be on par with many European resorts.\textsuperscript{78} To the comfort of the OCOG, Fonjallez stated that there was much interest in sending athletic representation from numerous interested European NOCs.\textsuperscript{79} Fonjallez’s endorsement reassured the OCOG about the quality of the facilities and the likelihood that the event would be a success.
Over the first couple of weeks of July 1930, the state government, with input from the governor, finalized the nine member Olympic Commission. Governor Roosevelt nominated five of the members (Dewey; Rolfe J. Kennedy, head of the North Elba Parks and Playgrounds commission; Walter G. Howard, superintendent of forests for the state conservation department; George Foster Peabody of Saratoga Springs; and T. Harvey Ferris of Utica), while each house of the state nominated two members (Senate: State Senators Henry Breton and Chairman of the Commission Warren Thayer, House: Assemblyman Fred L. Porter and Paul L. Boyce). Although Dewey had made some previous decisions with consultation of the state’s office, the approval of the commission helped speed up and unify the decision making process.

The formation of the Olympic Commission contributes significantly to the formalization of the OCOG’s structure. Focus could now be shifted to promotion and construction of the facilities. Fonjallez’s endorsement of the bob-run signified the beginning of support from outside sources concerning the upcoming event. A 22 August 1930 article listed all of the foreign press that had received information via direct or indirect method from the OCOG. This included newspaper services in Germany, Switzerland, Norway, Czechoslovakia, and the Soviet Union. Given that the OCOG had a limited budget to spend on publicity, confirmation of the global distribution of Olympic related news excited the members of the publicity committee.

This news was communicated to IOC president Count Baillet-Latour upon his visit to Lake Placid on 5 September 1930. He came to inspect the progress of the OCOG and facility construction. Upon finishing his discussions with the OCOG and a facility tour, Baillet-Latour had many positive comments about the current state of the facilities.
He "was very impressed...with the excellent spirit of co-operation existing between the village, the county and the state." Additionally, he suggested that the lodging facilities are "as good as those offered at St. Moritz...if not better" and that the physical needs of such a major event have been met in "a highly satisfactory manner." The only element of concern for Baillet-Latour was the lack of an indoor rink that would attract more international events and avoid weather concerns for some events. With IOC and foreign press endorsements, there were many interested and excited parties about the upcoming mega-event.

On 12 September 1930, a synopsis of the publicity plan was made public giving people an opportunity to get a complete picture of how 'their' Games were being marketed. Relevant information included the selection of the James F. Newcomb advertising agency to supervise all distribution channels of publicity, advertising campaigns in international magazines and newspapers, as well as a synopsis of the important contacts in each of the private companies that were affiliated with the Games. With such a large stake in the hosting of the event, consistent updates about the progress of the OCOG were important and necessary to continue growing the support for the event.

Although the Lake Placid News served the purpose of educating and alerting their readership concerning the event, the OCOG required the public to serve a more active role in the process. Extra houses would be necessary to accommodate foreign visitors. The Housing committee calculated 6,000 people would require accommodations in Lake Placid, while others could be housed within 20 miles of the town. In a 30 September 1930 article, the OCOG encouraged more of the public to open their houses during the
festival. With so many people expected to visit during the two weeks, the OCOG identified the biggest problem as “properly caring for this throng (of visitors).” The combination of the quality of the facilities and the comfort of the guests were identified as the best method of ensuring a return visit for the tourists. Additional concessions were made by the Housing Committee, including discounted rates for athletes and media, in an effort to attract a higher number of foreign representatives. While these lower rates affected the revenues, the Housing Committee promised to make up the difference and as a result, no money would be lost by the homeowners and hotels. During a report at the 1930 Quadrennial Meeting of the American Olympic Committee in Washington D.C., the Organizing Committee stated that they could guarantee 20% below the off season rates of trans-Atlantic cruise ships and substantial drops on train fares between New York and Lake Placid. The rate was dropped to $15 U.S., just barely above the normal one-way rate between the two locations. As a result, organizers guaranteed room and board costs to European participants were as high as $600 and as low as $400 U.S. per week, while Canadian and American participants $200 U.S. per week. Designed to ensure a high level of athletic participation, the discounted rates were a large contributor to the promotion and success of the event.

Additional concessions were made by the commission to aid in the ongoing construction or renovations of additional rooms to accommodate temporary guests. A new position was suggested by the committee to answer any concerns and questions from residents about the temporary construction. Dewey communicated the Organizing Committee’s responses to these concerns in a nationwide radio address broadcast from New York and carried in Detroit, Omaha, and Philadelphia. Designed to stimulate
interest from the rest of the country, Dewey highlighted the need for outside funding to relieve the local burden of staging the event. It is these same messages that were communicated by the International Secretary of the Third Olympic Winter Games, Bjorn Blix, when he was visiting European NOCs in December 1930.

As the end of 1930 approached, approximately two years had passed with no public objection to the activities of the OCOG. However, in a move with ulterior motives, David N. Mosesohn, editor of The Jewish Tribune, sought legal action against the use of public monies to finance the Games. Mosesohn stated that the public financing of the Games was an "improper use of state funds and to seek recovery of such funds that have already been expended without legal warrant." While the reporting of this legal action has some legitimacy, the article does speculate that it is due to the Lake Placid Club's anti-Jewish rules concerning membership. Dewey suggested that Mosesohn's legal action was more of a publicity stunt than true concern about the admittance policy. However, as reported on 21 November 1930, the Jewish media supported this cause and was prepared to support the legal action. The additional media outlets felt tax monies, of which Jewish people contributed to, should not be used to finance a large public event. To finance Olympic athletes, when Jewish people could not participate in activities at the club because of race, was unjust. The controversy was halted when the Jewish conglomerate dropped all legal actions a week later because the Lake Placid Club promised to re-evaluate its membership policy. While the situation was resolved quickly, the OCOG could not afford any additional controversy to affect the overall procedures of the OCOG.
As the one year countdown to the beginning of the event approached, the area prepared to host numerous types of minor contests in the various Olympic facilities. These included: college women’s athletics; figure skating; international bobsleigh competitions; a statewide school winter carnival; and various ski outings. The objective of hosting these events was to practice the administration and delivery of the mega-event, and to also allow the media another opportunity to view the beauty of the area and the community involvement surrounding the event.

Spurred on by the statements from Baillet-Latour in September 1930, a meeting occurred between the Lake Placid and North Elba civic and school boards, the Chamber of Commerce, and the Olympic directors on 28 December 1930. The main purpose of the meeting was to discuss the idea of an indoor arena. Seven sites were proposed and those attending the meeting stressed the need for immediate action. While urgency was stressed, the supervisor of the town of North Elba, Willis Well, noted that the need of a united front was more important. This, he argued, would ensure a better chance of securing the $375,000 U.S. requested from the state legislature to build the venue.

With the one-year point looming, specific and consistent problems kept requiring attention. As a result, at a 3-4 January 1931 meeting of the OCOG, two new specialized committees were formed to address these issues. One was formed to address the problem of international motion pictures rights. The mandate of the committee would be to oversee the problems involved with the process and to correct them. The other, with AOC president Avery Brundage as chair, was formed to address special financial problems concerned with the administration of the event. Although their mandate is not included in the *Lake Placid News* article, these specialized problems probably involve
decisions related to the two major facilities: the bob-run and the indoor rink. The formation of these committees brought the total number of OCOG subcommittees to six: Publicity, Housing, Transportation, Finance, and the two specialized subcommittees. By forming specific sub-committees, the OCOG proactively recognized the need to address specific problems before they affected the overall effectiveness of the event.

With these specialized committees in place, the structure and the administration in the OCOG was stable. Larger projects could now be addressed with the knowledge that the distribution of labour and responsibility was spread out. Occurring at the beginning of 1931, an additional public canvassing raised an additional $250,000 U.S. to cover costs. Unlike previous campaigns, this particular one focused on areas outside of the Lake Placid region. The goal was to raise $100,000 U.S. in Manhattan, $40,000 U.S. in Boston, $50,000 U.S. in Philadelphia, and $60,000 U.S. total from other eastern cities, including Detroit and Chicago. This ensured more funding without having to continue to canvass local residents.

The $250,000 U.S. would be used to construct a newly designed indoor rink. The campaign began because Governor Roosevelt vetoed a bill that requested the additional $375,000 U.S., of which $210,000 U.S. was for the temporary facility previously discussed. As Roosevelt said “I am interested in their (Olympic Games) success, but I do not feel that it is right to use 210,000 dollars (U.S.) for an (en)closed skating rink that will be used for a brief period in connection with the games and then revert to the village.” Although the governor vetoed the bill, the finance committee was still confident that the proper amount of funding would be received by removing the arena from the proposed bill. Instead, public canvassing was required to finance the
construction of the arena. A week later, with the removal of the arena from the bill, Governor Roosevelt approved a 375,000 dollar U.S. bill. The funding marked the OCOG was able to take the final step needed to complete additional facility construction and as a result, the final step towards the completion of the process.

The Organizing Committee continued to receive praise from the press about the organization of the event and the facilities. In an article in the February 25th issue of *Outlook and Independent*, writer George Trevor compared the run from St. Moritz to Lake Placid and said that Lake Placid was a substantially better place. Of particular importance to organizers, Trevor mentions that the course is steeper and far more scientifically designed than its European equivalents. In addition, Trevor suggests that while the Lake Placid run does not have the “sky-scraping panorama” like St. Moritz, it does have a “rugged backwoods beauty peculiar to the backwoods of Lake Placid.”

For the period of April and May 1931, articles focus on the selection of a site and use of the proposed indoor rink. While journalists and athletes were enjoying the newly built bob-run, the indoor arena was the only facility not finished. Given the budget limitations, selecting a site was important to the OCOG as some of the proposed sites were too expensive to build on. Cited in the *Lake Placid News*, an important reason for putting the location within the town was the ability to monitor ice conditions of the arena. Thawing of ice was a prominent inconvenience at the previous Olympic Winter Games, and if it were a possibility again, European NOCs would be hesitant to send their teams on a long journey to participate once again on poor ice. As the debate progressed on preliminary issues, plans for the temporary status of the facility changed. Given that the arena required a large financial commitment, the Finance Committee decided to
pursue the possibility of constructing a permanent facility.\textsuperscript{128} Maintenance costs were projected to range from $6,000 – 8,000 U.S., too high for some committee members.\textsuperscript{129} The committee identified a number of methods to cover the high maintenance costs. They included: receipts from hockey games; use of the arena by private organizations; rental of facilities to major-league hockey teams; and other as yet unidentified sources.\textsuperscript{130}

With a year passed since the worldwide release of the first promotional booklet for the Games in Lake Placid, the Publicity Committee agreed to publish a second edition. With an expected release date of July 1\textsuperscript{st}, the booklet included a message of endorsement from President Herbert Hoover and new information about prices on different transportation routes, hotels, and tickets to all of the events.\textsuperscript{131} The second edition was designed to build on the publicity from the first book and provide additional technical details about the event.\textsuperscript{132} Perhaps the most important aspect of this book was the last part that provided answers to the most commonly asked questions.\textsuperscript{133} Evidently, with requests from the press and other delegates, including countries such as Japan and England, the booklet was intended to reach numerous countries whose primary sporting interests were not associated with winter activities.\textsuperscript{134} Having announced the dates of the Games, at the 25-26 April 1931 IOC General Session meeting in Barcelona, the publicity committee now had a target date, and the hotels in the area could plan for the anticipated reservations from the event.\textsuperscript{135} In addition to the second edition of the publicity booklet, 20,000 copies of a new second Olympic poster were prepared for a late August release.\textsuperscript{136} Although the majority of the first edition of the posters were shipped overseas, this copy was for distribution within North America only.\textsuperscript{137} When coupled with the second
booklet, the committee made every attempt to ensure that the event was promoted thoroughly.

In terms of official paraphernalia, the booklet provided the only example of sponsorship within official OCOG publications (see Appendix V). The Official Report indicated that the OCOG was mandated not to sell any advertising in day-day programs. As such, the book was created not only as a souvenir of the Games, but also as an opportunity to allow local firms to feel involved in the event by advertising in the Games promotional booklet. Following negotiations with various organizations, it was agreed that Clayton E. Brooke publishing company of New York City would provide 6,000 copies of the Souvenir booklet at no cost to the OCOG. In return, the company would keep all revenue derived from advertising space. A review of the advertising reveals that there was a wide range of companies who bought advertising space. The list includes local companies such as hotels, photographers, garages and restaurants, who bought small size ads placed throughout the document. In addition to these local interests, larger New York City-based companies such as a men’s furnishing store and a bookstore bought larger ads. Finally, generic companies, such as Camel Cigarettes and Waterman’s Pen shop purchased large full page ads in what would become a sixty page publication.

Although numerous NOCs were evaluating the economic viability of attending the event, the public continued to support every stage of the Games. A $150,000 U.S. bond was passed on July 30th by special election concerning construction on the ice arena even though many details had yet to be finalized. As mid-August 1931 approached, the specifics of the arena had not yet been finalized. With construction of the facility becoming a priority, work was scheduled to start in late August with the goal of finishing
before scheduled fall events. In addition to making plans for construction, the OCOG announced the formation of a special building committee to oversee the day-to-day concerns during the construction of this facility.

One of the important selling points of hosting the Games that was consistently promoted by the OCOG was the economic impact on the local community. In evaluating the summer tourist season before the event, drug store owner Richard Lyons stated that “residents (don’t) realize how much the III Olympic Winter Games publicity helped the Lake Placid 1931 summer season.” These statements reported at the Finance Committee meeting on September 19th, reflect the early positive economic impact the event. Although no numbers are provided, Mr. Mcdonell (first name not provided), a member of the committee, reported that a large number of visitors to the area enquired about the availability of rooms, the cost of tickets, and general questions about the area. In addition to these inquiries, these tourists promised a return visit to the area. This was the first evidence for the readers of the Lake Placid News of the direct economic effects of hosting the mega-event.

Although the event was economically stable and consistently promoted in the European movie theatres, the OCOG was still forced to suppress ongoing rumours of a possible site change, or even its cancellation. In early October, under pressure to move or cancel the Olympic Games because of the global economic depression, Dewey said:

(i)n spite of foreign dispatches indicating that the current economic situation is causing some apprehension on the part of those charged with the problem of raising funds to send teams to compete in the III Olympic Winter Games at Lake Placid next February, there is absolutely nothing to warrant rumors that the Games might be postponed or cancelled.
These comments were made in response to the pressure, from global media, of moving the event to Sweden, in order to reduce the cost for the European NOCs. With Germany deciding to send a limited number of athletes and countries such as France initially deciding to send none, the OCOG had the problem of convincing the remaining NOCs to send a full contingent of athletes.

In an effort to entice the remaining NOCs, and possibly those who had indicated they would not attend, the OCOG voted quickly to cut the housing costs of officials and athletes by one dollar. With this reduction, the cost now ranged from two to four dollars for this group depending on the type of accommodation desired. Word was sent by Bjorn Blix, international secretary, at a conference with Olympic officials in various European cities. In addition to this reduction, the article reports that the OCOG would pursue other methods of reducing the costs for those attending.

Although this reduction was seen as a necessity, there was little need to deviate from the publicity plan. On 15 November 1931, advertisements were placed in the New York City newspapers, promoting the opening of Stern Brothers sports shop in conjunction with the third Olympic Winter Games. This sponsorship was a mutually beneficial relationship for the two parties involved. As a winter sports shop, it was logical for Stern Brothers to partner with the world’s largest winter celebration of sport. For the OCOG, the store agreed to distribute posters, books, and photographs. They also agreed to have an extensive display throughout the entire shop. This effort was also combined with other initiatives with Abercrombie & Finch, and several other hotels around New York City.
As Christmas 1931 approached, sixteen countries had confirmed entrance for the great festival, including France and Germany.\textsuperscript{158} Although the number was lower than previously estimated, the confirmations of France and Germany, after declining initial invitations, shows that the discounted lodging and travel was a significant contributor to the decision making process.\textsuperscript{159} With the confirmed contingent from Europe, a large group of media was anticipated to attend and broadcast the events back to Europe.\textsuperscript{160}

While the media coverage of European participation was important, the guarantee of participation received from them was more important to the OCOG. With some of the overseas NOCs still undecided, a pamphlet was sent to the NOCs in 1931 providing all of the necessary information for participating countries.\textsuperscript{161} The information in the package included information about: identification cards to enter the country; discounted travel and accommodations arrangement and rates in Lake Placid and New York; transportation to and from the venues; and living arrangements for the athletes.\textsuperscript{162} Although the document is useful for information, it also indicates the effort that the OCOG had taken in ensuring a successful and affordable event.

As 1932 began, the possibility of the Lake Placid Games being transferred to Yosemite National Park was strong due to warm weather and rain that continued to plague the Lake Placid area.\textsuperscript{163} Although improbable, Col. C.G. Thomson, superintendent of the Yosemite, stated that California would be honoured to host the Winter and Summer Games should Lake Placid's weather continue to be inconsistent.\textsuperscript{164} To further strengthen the viability of Yosemite hosting the Games, Thomson enlisted the support of the National Park Service concerning the use of the public park.\textsuperscript{165} The ongoing interest
from California to host both versions of the mega-event reveals how willing the elite were to sell the area to promote the state to the world.

The beginning of the new year brought an ever increasing number of tourists and athletes to the Lake Placid area. The Norwegian athletes were the first to arrive in the area. Many of the athletes were able to train in the facilities for the Olympic Winter Games. However, those athletes expecting to use the arena were required to wait until its official opening on January 16th, only three weeks before the opening of the Games. The 220,000 dollar U.S. project was completed in five months and was considered “the best arranged and most effectively designed skating rink” in the United States. This was important for Lake Placid as it was the first town outside of the major cities to build a multi-purpose arena.

In late January, the arena was opened for public-use. With all facilities now operative, the OCOG focused its attention on the promotional campaign to ensure that tourists would continue to come to the area. One of the anticipated sources of promotion was the commemorative stamps. Funds, generated through the sale of 400,000 Olympic stamps, were helpful for the OCOG. In an effort to educate the public of the merits of selling stamps, an article chronicles the seven other previous issues of commemorative Olympic stamps. Whether these stamps were released for commemorative purposes, financing the Games, aiding war invalids, or as a method for celebrating an Olympic victory, all the previous editions had served their purpose and most importantly, proved to be an important revenue source for the Organizing Committee.
For the OCOG, the bob-run facility and the arena were considered the crown jewels of all the Olympic facilities. These two structures were consistently promoted as world-class and a major reason to contribute to the fundraising campaigns. Any opportunity to promote these facilities in the Lake Placid News was useful. This was the case in the 22 January 1932 edition of the newspaper where the physical layout and logistics of the bob-run were described. Of relevance to this study, the article reveals that up to that date, $247,000 U.S. had been spent on the construction of the facility. However, the article provides no further examination of the amount spent.

With only one week of preparation remaining before the big event, the majority of the media coverage focused on athletes and the opening ceremony preparation. From the attendance of Richard T. Byrd and Governor Roosevelt to the preparation by the Norway and United States athletic contingents, every attention was given to minor details by the OCOG for the event. NBC and Columbia sent a large group of reporters who would report on the games, via radio, taped delay, and pictures. Their role was important in communicating, not only the events, but also the beauty of the Lake Placid area.

Amazingly, the first example of Olympic related sponsorship in the Lake Placid News occurred in the final issue before the Games. Using the official insignia of the Games (See Appendix VII), Northern Telephone proudly displayed their affiliation with the event. The ad stated that Northern Telephone is "an integral part of Northern New York and it is our duty to make it and even better place in which to live and do business." In terms of official paraphernalia, the booklet was the only example of an initiative that solicited sponsorship.
Actual Games Period (4-13 February 1932)

Due to the available weekly editions of the Lake Placid News, an additional edition of the newspaper was analyzed to enhance the content analysis for this period. As a result, the February 5th, 12th, and 19th editions were analyzed during this period, even though the event finished on 13 February. Not surprisingly, due to the limited amount of time and the efforts of all parties before the event, there was a small amount of coded data during the nine day event.

The increased number of visitors and global attention paid to the area did not increase the volume of advertisements in the Lake Placid News. Regardless, the researcher expected more evidence of companies advertising in the paper. There are three advertisements with a direct reference to the Olympic Games: the Whiteface Mt. House mentioning that it was open for the duration of the event; the F.S. Leonard & Co. announcing final clearance prices on Olympic Ski Suits; and the Lake Placid Pharmacy announcing the Thermat Heat Pad as the only thing to take to the Games. Other than these ads, there is no other direct connection between the Olympic Games and private industry that could be found in the newspaper.

In contrast to the limited number of Olympic related advertisements in the Lake Placid News, the OCOG continued to receive strong support from the community. When the event began, the first issue of commemorative stamps sold out within 24 hours. For the OCOG, this meant $9,060 U.S. of revenue from 493,000 stamps and more importantly, the first signs of a successful publicity campaign. Although not previously measured, this was widely regarded as the largest first day sales of a first issue stamp in the history of the United States.
With the lack of reliance on private sector investment, and the $75,000 U.S. reported deficit, the third edition of the Winter Olympic Games cannot be considered a huge economic success. But given the contributions from the AOC, the state governments, and the surrounding counties, the Third Olympic Winter Games in Lake Placid can be considered an example of cooperation and dedication during a time of economic despair. With a particular emphasis on the financial contributions of the communities, the success of these games can be attributed to the ability of the OCOG to integrate the community in the planning process. As evidenced by the passing of two separate bonds and a large nationwide canvassing program, the community was heavily involved in the success of the two-week festival.

Los Angeles

Pre-bid Period

Due to the parameters set by the researcher for this study, the pre-bid period was not covered in the analysis of the Games. This study specifically covers the period between 1924-1932, however, the bid announcement was made in October 1923. As a result, this section uses information gleaned from the Official Report and the other sources used in this investigation for this time period and the additional analysis in the identified time periods.

The literature is quite detailed in its chronicling of the formation and motives behind the bid for the Games of the Tenth Olympiad. Of those articles that have addressed this topic, those by Jeremy White and Steven Riess specifically detail the formation of the Community Development Association (CDA). Given the extensive research done in this area, and to limit the information concerning events not directly
related to the Olympic Games, the analysis of the economic activity of the OCOG begins on 1 January 1924.

Similarly to the Olympic Winter Games in Lake Placid, the primary purpose for the bid for the Games of the Tenth Olympiad was increasing global exposure to the Los Angeles area. Unlike the Lake Placid bid, an organization of wealthy businessman, known as the CDA, was interested in promoting the expanding business centre in the state of California.\textsuperscript{184} The gold rush and subsequent boom of post-WWI economics created an escapist atmosphere in California, a fact not lost on the CDA. As a result, the Olympic Games was an optimal event to continue to capitalize on the economic boom in the region.

\textit{1924 to 1930 Period}

Before the Great Depression, OCOG president William May Garland had many positive economic projections about the hosting of the event. In 1924, he estimated that the non-OCOG advertising would approach $10 million U.S. with approximately 500,000 people coming to the area.\textsuperscript{185} Given the economic climate of the time and the escapist appeal of the area, these numbers seemed attainable. However, the upcoming effects of the Great Depression limited the ability of all parties to deliver on Garland’s forecasts.

With Garland’s optimistic outlook on the future, one would assume that there was a desire by the CDA to realize these lofty economic forecasts as quickly as possible. However, within the selected \textit{Los Angeles Times} articles in this study, only two articles were coded between the time period of 1924 to early 1928. Out of respect for the organizers of the 1928 Games, the CDA realized that “little could or should be done until after the Games of the IX\textsuperscript{th} Olympiade in Amsterdam.”\textsuperscript{186} As a result, the CDA “devoted
itself to numerous other civic projects of major importance.\textsuperscript{187} With this purposeful lack of public activity, the limited number of available articles in the \textit{Los Angeles Times} is not a surprise.

Both of the articles concerned facility construction. The first involved a request by the CDA to the City of Los Angeles for the retention of the grandstands in Exposition Park so that the Olympic pool could be built on the site.\textsuperscript{188} By maintaining the grandstands, a facility construction expense would be eliminated and additionally, the swim stadium would be very close to the Coliseum.\textsuperscript{189} Although much of the planning had not being complete, this early activity indicates a vision for the mega-event. The second article concerned the construction of the Olympic Auditorium. With a headline of “Future Home of Olympic Auditorium Rising Rapidly,” the brief front page article explains how special boxing promotions were sure to follow the construction.\textsuperscript{190} With the facility construction well underway by mid-1925, the CDA was in an advantageous position to complete its action plan established for the successful staging of the Games.

The lack of activity in this time period is a direct reflection of a relatively low amount of Olympic related news. In the post-bid period, the first major piece of important news was the creation of the California Olympiad Bond Act of 1927.\textsuperscript{191} The legislation, unanimously approved by the California State Legislature, had two important provisions:

1) for the issuance of and sale of State bonds in the sum of one million dollars, to yield a fund to be administered specifically in behalf of the expenses of preparing for and hosting of the Games of the X\textsuperscript{th} Olympiad.

2) the creation of the California Olympiad Commission of five members to administer the fund to the Olympiad Corporation mentioned in the Act, which corporation, under the words of the Act, was contemplated and designed to become what is known under Olympic Protocol, as the Organizing Committee.\textsuperscript{192}
With these provisions, the committee had the required funds and structure to begin operations. Prior to official recognition by voters on 6 November 1928, the committee had been relatively dormant. Most of the activities, as stated in the *Official Report*, encouraged private organizations to become more involved in Olympic related sports. For example, although the Olympic Auditorium was built with private dollars for private use, and would be used for boxing, weightlifting, and wrestling during the Olympic Summer Games.

During the initial stages of the OCOG, a small group made up of a General Secretary and two assistant secretaries oversaw the hosting process. It was not until December 1929 that committees were formed and the OCOG began to establish many sub-committees. The first committee to be formed was the Press Department. It was assigned the function of global advertising, press releases, and most importantly, communication with foreign NOCs. Given that the mega-event was occurring in a city on the Pacific Ocean for the first time, expensive overseas travel by the numerous foreign athletic contingents became a primary focus of the committee.

Given the potential problems associated with establishing travel arrangements for foreign NOCs, William May Garland and Leroy Sanders, director of the California Tenth Olympiad Association, departed for France, in early March 1929, to meet with forty-eight nations. With the IOC meeting in Lausanne from April 8-11, the duo also hoped they could encourage participation at the meeting. Given the looming global economic crisis and the amount of time and effort invested by the CDA, their presence in Lausanne was deemed to be of the utmost priority.
Without securing full athletic contingents, the resulting reduction of interest from the public would impact the scope of the event and possibly result in a move of host cities. This threat progressed further when other cities began to inquire about changing sites.²⁰⁹ Citing the extra travel required, cities, such as Baltimore, Philadelphia, and Chicago, expressed interest in relocating the Games of the Tenth Olympiad to the east coast.²⁰⁰ These interested parties misinterpreted the conditions of the awarding of the Games.²⁰¹ Representatives from the three cities felt that the award was to a country and not a city, and as a result, a change of venue was possible.²⁰² However, as noted by Alan J. Gould, the author of the article, the IOC awards the event to a city. As such, there was never any danger of a change of venue.²⁰³

While Garland was concerned with stimulating foreign participation, he also needed to encourage participation from government representatives and public dignitaries. Garland personally invited President Herbert Hoover to open the Games in July 1932.²⁰⁴ Given that the head of state had opened the previous nine Olympic Summer Games, this invitation was part of normal Olympic protocol. However, due to the national economic conditions of the time, there was a real concern that Hoover would not accept the official invitation.

With the uncertainty of attendance from national and international athletic agencies and politicians, a need to control the situation was important. Negative publicity, could not alter the preparations already accomplished by the OCOG. As a result, the OCOG released a report for the purposes of promoting the Games and the area.²⁰⁵ The release specifically addressed the issues of relocation of the Games, the potential for a limited number of athletes, and the readiness of Los Angeles to host the
mega-event.\textsuperscript{206} Given the recent negative publicity, this newspaper release was clearly designed to be a stopgap solution and prevent future damage to the credibility of the OCOG.

Further to these efforts, the visit from IOC president Count Baillet-Latour in mid-September 1929 also helped reassure the potentially sceptical public. His visit also provided the \textit{Los Angeles Times} with an opportunity to print an opinion and perspective from other individuals outside of the OCOG. Baillet-Latour was satisfied with the progress made by the OCOG, particularly with the Olympic Coliseum.\textsuperscript{207} In addition, Baillet-Latour noted that he believed the positive momentum from the winter festival in Lake Placid would transfer over to success in hosting the Olympic Summer Games.\textsuperscript{208} Baillet-Latour also noted the importance of maintaining the partnership between the AOC, IOC, and the OCOG in ensuring the overall success of the festival.\textsuperscript{209}

\textit{1930 to Start of the Games}

As this period began, the OCOG needed to reassure the public about the strength of the Organizing Committee and the host city. Similar to the Lake Placid OCOG, questions continued to be raised about changing the venue and the likelihood that foreign NOCs would have problems sending contingents. The next two years required more control of operations and continual promotion of the upcoming Olympic Games.

For readers of the \textit{Los Angeles Times}, one of the potentially confusing aspects about the articles in the sports section was the other uses of the word Olympic in the newspaper. Two organizations dominated the sports pages during these two years of coverage (1930-1932). In the Saturday editions of the newspaper, the Olympic Boxing Club promoted the scheduled Tuesday fight.\textsuperscript{210} In addition to these boxing promotions,
the Olympic Club of San Francisco regularly found itself on to the sports pages as it was competing with many of Los Angeles' local sports clubs.\textsuperscript{211} The club's name regularly appeared in the sports section without any direct connection with the Los Angeles OCOG.\textsuperscript{212} As a result, the word Olympic represented other meanings not associated with the IOC's Olympic Games and may well have confused the many readers.

With just over two years until the staging of the event, the first examples of advertising appeared in the \textit{Los Angeles Times}. The 17 May 1930 advertisement celebrated the opening of the \textit{Deauville Yacht Club}, a non-profit organization devoted to providing "sufficient care for water-craft participants in the 1932 Olympic Games."\textsuperscript{213} Presumably to attract many local yachtsmen, the club partnered itself with the international festival to add credibility to the newly formed organization, particularly in its target market of Santa Monica.\textsuperscript{214} The Deauville Yacht Club was the first of many private organizations that unofficially benefitted from the Olympic Games in Los Angeles.

With potential threats to the economic success of the event, such as travel concerns and unofficial profiting from the Olympic Games, it was important for the OCOG to be flexible to overcome some of the necessary cost-cutting required for staging the Olympic Summer Games in midst of the Great Depression. The most important example of these measures was the accommodations needed to ensure European participation. Delegates at a Berlin Olympic Congress were pleasantly surprised to find out that estimated costs for the overseas trip for European athletes had dropped by $825 U.S.\textsuperscript{215} Originally estimated at $1200 U.S., the new price was set at $375 U.S., a drastic cut.\textsuperscript{216} Given the reduction, optimism for maximum NOC participation increased.\textsuperscript{217} In addition, American members of the IOC brought some films showing the preparations in
Los Angeles to the IOC General Session and impressed dignitaries with the amount of available equipment and facilities.218 Specifically, members of the local Berlin media were impressed with the fourteen more training fields in Los Angeles as compared to Amsterdam.219

In addition to the films, the IOC also approved the construction of the first official Olympic Village to house the athletes during the festival.220 Considered revolutionary, the idea was passed without controversy by the IOC as members were excited about the global village.221 However, one of the difficult tasks for the OCOG would be bringing all of these cultures together to function within a North American context. This difficulty was exemplified by the puzzlement of IOC members towards the cafeteria style of food preparation proposed for the village.222 In previous Olympiads, athletes were served their food in an attempt to make them feel welcome.223 However, these opinions were partially changed when the American delegates reassured the foreign delegates that even the richest people in the United States eat this way.224

The *Official Report* also reveals some additional hesitancy towards the idea of the global village. In previous Olympiads, teams had selected isolated living quarters as a way of protecting secret training regimes and techniques.225 As a result, a “polite dubitation” arose from some of the athletic contingents.226 While the unity of the Olympic Village was an intriguing concept, the Olympic Games were also intensely nationalistic, and IOC members were concerned about revealing their nations’ training secrets. But ultimately, it was decided, the athletes would determine the success of building an Olympic Village by their behaviour.
On 25 October 1930, Zack Farmer was appointed secretary of the California
Olympiad Commission. The commission was made up of state government officials and
OCOG members.\textsuperscript{227} Already the general secretary and manager of the OCOG, and
secretary-manager of the CDA, Farmer established himself as an influential member in
the delivery of the Games.\textsuperscript{228} Similar to Garland, Farmer was definitely an important
figure in the staging of the Games of the Tenth Olympiad in Southern California.

As 1930 came to end, the beginning of the Olympic Village construction and
heavy advertising drew increasing interest in local and international communities. Local
organizations continued to affiliate themselves with the mega-event for the purpose of
profit. In a 6 December 1930 article, the Knights of Columbus of Southern California
announced a Royal Coronation Ball to be held sometime in 1932 (presumably before the
start of the Games of the Tenth Olympiad).\textsuperscript{229} At the ball, it was suggested, a king and
queen of Olympia would be selected to represent the Knights of Columbus at various
Olympic related events.\textsuperscript{230} With the mayor of Los Angeles, the president of the Chamber
of Commerce, the president of the Los Angeles Realty Board, and the President of the
Los Angeles Community Chest on the selection committee, the importance of the event
was immediately heightened.\textsuperscript{231} Although not “officially” associated with the Games,
events such as this served as a unique way to partner members of the local elite with the
Olympic Games. After what was described as a long and extensive selection process, the
king and queen were selected.\textsuperscript{232} Noted author John Steven McGroarty was selected as
King Zeus and Peggy Hamilton for Queen Olympias.\textsuperscript{233} Both were selected because of
their contributions to the local California culture. McGroarty’s use of California in his
works, combined with his loyalty and service to the area were contributing reasons for his
selection.\textsuperscript{234} Hamilton, a noted style expert, was selected for her “service to womankind and her ambition to exalt them to high esteem and honor.”\textsuperscript{235} Given the importance of the positions and the over 1,000 candidates reviewed for the two positions, the selection of the king and queen was an arduous process.\textsuperscript{236} Most important for this study, the Games of the Tenth Olympiad had two respected figureheads to promote the goodwill of the Games.

The most significant figure for the success of the Olympic Games was William May Garland. In addition to the dual position of OCOG and the CDA president, Garland was also recognized as a major contributor to many local charities. As treasurer of the Los Angeles Tuberculosis Association, Garland expressed his concern over the lack of funds generated for the organization’s annual fund drive.\textsuperscript{237} Considering the funds generated were much lower when compared to previous years, this story provides a tangible example of the early effect of the Great Depression on efforts to raise money. Although not affiliated with the Olympic Games, this illustrates the many varied interests that Garland had in the Los Angeles community. With his dual role related to the Olympic Games, his charity positions, and his position on the Chamber of Commerce, Garland was an influential force within the local business community.

Coupled with the formalization and growth of the OCOG, the AOC also began to implement its plan for the upcoming event. Under the leadership of Avery Brundage, various event specific committees were created.\textsuperscript{238} Each of the sport specific committee heads were instructed to formalize plans for selection and cuts related to the makeup of the various sports teams.\textsuperscript{239} This move marked a new method of team selection for the Olympic Games. Previously, one central committee had administered the selection
procedures. Although no specified reason is given for this change, the increased number of athletes combined with the desire to see American athletes win medals seems to be the most logical explanation.

One of the advantages of having a variety of businessmen on the OCOG is that they can also use their own organizations for promotional purposes. For example, in pre-March 1931 (no date specified), William May Garland, acting in his position of president of the Los Angeles Athletic Club, sent out a membership book extolling the benefits of joining the club. Included in the book, is a letter exclaiming how excited the club is about being associated with the efforts of securing such a prestigious event as the Olympic Games. In an effort to further promote the event, a promise is made that if the reader wants to join the Athletic Club between March 15 and June 15, one-third of the membership fee would be donated to the Organizing Committee and the athletic governors (AOC). By encouraging as many men to join the club, Garland ensured that each new member “contributes to the support of the California’s athletes and the success of the Olympic Games.” While funds may have been limited for the Organizing Committee, the ability to capitalize on other business ventures to benefit the Games, such as the Los Angeles Athletic Club, was a clear asset.

With the Olympic Games approximately a year away, the construction of the Olympic Swim Stadium was started on 27 March 1931. The stadium was designed to accommodate the water polo, diving, and swimming events. It had a seating capacity of 10,000, and was considered a state-of-the-art facility. Built in Olympic Park alongside the Olympic stadium, the fencing facility, and the museum, the swimming facility was designed to be a permanent fixture in the community after the international festival.
With the realization that the Olympic Games were quickly approaching, many counties around Los Angeles began to prepare for the expected influx of tourists. Orange County business leaders gathered on 19 June 1931 to discuss building a hotel to attract people to the county. Rebuilt on the site of an old city building, the hotel would serve as the centrepiece of a publicity campaign designed to start in conjunction with the Olympic Games. Although there were no subsequent articles addressing this issue, the desire to benefit from the Games by the community emphasizes the economic importance of the event.

In addition to the construction of a new hotel, the hospitality industry in the area was also taking steps to ensure the success of the Games. The Southern California Hotel Association assured all of the members of the IOCs, NOCs, ISFs, and the press that discounted rates would be guaranteed. In a letter dated June 1931, the association guaranteed the availability of single rooms at $2 U.S. per day and double rooms at $3 U.S. per day. Furthermore, the letter provided assurances that delegates would be “royally entertained and have suitable accommodations.” These guarantees provided yet another example of the community’s desire to ensure the success of the mega-event.

On 27 June 1931, in an effort to generate publicity, a ticket strategy was prepared for immediate use. Three types of tickets were released to the public: the Olympic Stadium pass, the season’s pass (ticket to every night of one sport), and single tickets to individual events. With a price of $22 U.S. for adults and $11 U.S. for children, the Olympic Stadium souvenir pass allowed the holder to attend all 27 events at the facility. The stadium and individual season’s tickets were immediately made available, while the remaining individual non-reserved tickets were released after mid-March
1932. Although the newspaper reported only three types of tickets in the official press release, the *Official Report for the Games of the Tenth Olympiad* mentions an additional single event reserve ticket available before the general sale of individual event tickets. Pricing the tickets was a difficult challenge as the “prospect of a period of economic depression limit(ed) the purchasing power of the public.” In order for the publicity campaign to show results, the ticket prices needed to be set at an appropriate level.

With tickets now available and a growing number of private and OCOG promotional materials circulating, compounded by the increasing competition amongst businesses in the area, the AOC was concerned about preserving the integrity of the OCOG, the AOC, and the American athletes it represents. In his annual report presented at the November 6th meeting of the organization, president Avery Brundage anticipated misuse of athletes by warning of “private gain by means of radio, moving pictures, advertisement” and other media outlets. It was clear to Brundage that the Games of the Tenth Olympiad was a money-making opportunity for those involved, including both those affiliated and unaffiliated with the organizing. As an organization concerned with the integrity of the athlete, Brundage feared the temptation by athletes to capitalize on the profitability of the events.

One of the most detailed pieces of promotional material on the global festival was a special section in the 50th anniversary edition of the *Los Angeles Times*. The twelve-page section included a history of the Games, the construction of the Olympic stadium and the village, and the role of the OCOG. Attached at the end of this section was the program and directions to each event. Coupled with the anniversary of the *Los Angeles
*Times*, the large section on the Olympic Games was read by millions, and as a result, served as the OCOG’s biggest single publicity initiative.

While the OCOG had an idea as to how many people had heard of the event and how many would attend, the committee had not done a detailed analysis of the economic impact of hosting the Olympic Games. A report published by the All Year Club in the 23 January 1932 edition of the paper, predicted that approximately 325,300 people were expected to attend and spend an average of $2 million U.S.  

Using signed statement from tourists who visited during the summer of 1931, the club released a conservative estimate as to the expected economic impact.  

By using the numbers from the previous year, the club was able to estimate sales of food, clothing, and other items during the sixteen days of the Games.  

Ticket sales alone were estimated to be slightly below $2 million U.S. a day, for a total of approximately $38 million U.S. for the duration of the event.  

Although these estimates are acknowledged to be unscientific, the club does state that there is no chance of the mega-event leaving a disastrous economic legacy. Such statements were important to the Los Angeles OCOG, especially those received from unaffiliated organizations as they contributed to the legitimacy of the event.

On April 11th, the ticket office formally opened, releasing 2,500,000 tickets to the general public.  

As tickets were expected to sell quickly, the OCOG wanted the public to know the types of tickets required for each event.  

It was important to the ticket office to emphasize that there was only one official ticket office given the potential that others might try to sell illegal tickets to unsuspecting parties.  

The immense interest from the public for tickets over the previous two years coupled with occurrences of
unauthorized profiting from the event resulted in the need for the OCOG to communicate clear instructions concerning the purchase of event tickets.\textsuperscript{270}

Coupled with these precautionary measures, \textit{Los Angeles Times} readers were also aware of a group of downtown businessmen selling official Olympic emblems to combat unauthorized selling of goods with the Olympic logo.\textsuperscript{271} Partnered with the AOC, the group was licensed to sell official Olympic memorabilia. As AOC finance secretary Edward Regan suggested, this was in response to “the unauthorized efforts of unofficial organizations that have reaped a rich harvest…through the sale of bogus emblems and stickers.”\textsuperscript{272} The official emblem sold for 50 cents U.S. and was used towards the 30,000 dollar U.S. goal for southern California’s contribution to the AOC’s athlete canvassing activities.\textsuperscript{273} By educating the public about this special emblem, the OCOG hoped to protect the public from ambush marketers, while increasing funds for the Olympic Games.

Continuing the variety of community driven promotional activities, the Los Angeles Junior Chamber of Commerce sponsored an air tour of Canada, Mexico, and the United States.\textsuperscript{274} The fourteen-day, 8500-mile tour was designed to be an alternative to the traditional methods of promotion.\textsuperscript{275} Opposed to the other forms of communication and transportation, airplanes provided the quickest and easiest way to market the Games to the three countries.\textsuperscript{276}

After confirming local southern California merchants would sell the official emblems and patches to help the AOC, schools were approached to sell pins.\textsuperscript{277} The OCOG felt that the student population and their family members were a logical yet untapped source of revenue.\textsuperscript{278} The selling of the official emblems and pins to the general
public was also met with a warning from AOC president Avery Brundage.\textsuperscript{279} Due to the dwindling economy and lack of funds, the outcome of the official memorabilia campaign was going to decide the number of athletes sent to the Games of the Tenth Olympiad.\textsuperscript{280} As of late April 1932, only 40,000 of the desired $350,000 U.S. had been obtained.\textsuperscript{281} With 30,000 of the 350,000 dollars U.S. budget already allocated to the Winter Olympic team, the remaining funds needed to be raised quickly.\textsuperscript{282} Brundage addressed the emergency by saying “(w)e may as well face the music now and consider drastic measures,” and later warns that “(i)f we cannot raise enough money to send more than a half a dozen athletes to Los Angeles, why we will not send more than a half a dozen.”\textsuperscript{283} As a result, three conditions were set by the AOC to maximize athlete participation: no extra coaches for any team; no trainers; and they would confine entries only to competitors of Olympic calibre.\textsuperscript{284} In spite of the harsh warnings of a small athletic contingent, Brundage also mentioned that large funds, expected from previous canvasses, were finally beginning to be paid to the AOC.\textsuperscript{285}

A 7 July 1932 letter from Avery Brundage to Zach Farmer further exemplifies the need for emergency funds and the AOC’s inability to guarantee the number of American athletes present at the Games.\textsuperscript{286} This, argued Brundage, was due to too many canvassing programs across the country. Brundage stated that this was for Farmer’s eyes only as “the wrong kind of publicity at this time would be most harmful to our campaign.”\textsuperscript{287} Brundage elaborated on the lack of funds from the east coast blaming the distance between both coasts and the fact that the east region had been already canvass for other athletic events in California.\textsuperscript{288} Although the OCOG was not directly involved
in these financing initiatives, a low number of athletes would definitely affect the paid attendance at events.

While the size of the athletic contingent was a continued concern, the OCOG could still rely on revenue from the sale of commemorative memorabilia. As it was a successful promotional tool for the Olympic Winter Games, the OCOG was optimistic about the first issue of the Summer Olympic Games stamp by the post office.\textsuperscript{289} Issued in 1, 3, and 5-cents denominations, the number of stamps issued is not specified. However, it can be suggested that it was a large amount given the variety of stamps available and the population of the surrounding region.\textsuperscript{290} These stamps were an additional revenue source to the ongoing OCOG efforts to flood the market with various Olympic paraphernalia and promotional items.

Even though the financing campaigns appeared to be effective, the funds collected continued to be less than was initially expected. For example, the Big Ten collegiate athletic conference had initially committed to turn over all profits from their track meet in mid-June to the AOC.\textsuperscript{291} However, due to spiralling costs and lower than projected attendance figures at the meet, the Big Ten opted to keep the revenue derived from their championship as a way to cover costs.\textsuperscript{292} In addition, members of the conferences voted that the remaining money was to go directly to Big Ten Olympic athletes competing at the Olympic Summer Games.\textsuperscript{293} Although indirectly contributing to the Olympic fund, AOC and OCOG officials were disappointed, but admitted that they had no jurisdiction over the cash and the Big Ten could use it as conference officials saw fit.\textsuperscript{294}

While the reduction from the Big Ten was considered a major setback to the finance committee, the OCOG still valued students’ attendance and participation in the
event. To ensure their commitment, a limited number of half-priced season’s tickets were made available for students under 18. The reduced cost measure signalled the OCOG’s desire to ensure all members, young and old, from the local community would be an important contributor to the economic success of the Games.

On 18 June 1932, President Herbert Hoover indicated his intent to stay in Washington as “his undivided attention must be given to the duties of (his) office.” Although no direct reason is given for his withdrawal, the article speculates that pressing economic concerns were the force behind his decision. In addition to opening the Olympic Games, Hoover had planned to participate in the upcoming Republican presidential campaign and spend some time at his home in Palo Alto, California. His withdrawal from these activities speaks to the importance of his role in policy formation and his concern during the growing economic crisis. He could not been seen as wasting his energy on something as ‘superfluous’ as the Olympic Games.

On 25 June 1932, the Finance Committee released a report on the fund drive directed at mayors and civic leaders across the country. The report presumably released nationwide, urges the leaders to spearhead fund drives in their local community similar to what the mayors and community organizations have done in the Midwest. By encouraging community leaders (particularly on the east coast) to spearhead fund drives, it was suggested the average person could feel part of the success of the Olympic Games and the American Olympic team. The report states:

(w)on’t you help the people of your community, the mayor, the governing body, and everyone who has the civic pride of your community at heart, to realize the responsibility which faces the people – and the communities – of the United States in supporting the American Olympic team.
A letter from Avery Brundage to Zack Farmer dated a month later, revealed that the east coast had yet to fully support the Games. Possible reasons for the lack of response to the earlier appeal include being already taxed by the Winter Olympic Games and the perceived distance between California and the east coast caused an apathetic approach by the general public towards financing the upcoming Games.

In addition to the increase in media coverage concerning the event, Olympic advertisements in all mediums became more prominent. Similarly with the OCOG’s concerns about the stamps and emblems, the majority of the advertisements would be considered examples of ambush marketing. The average reader could shop at the Olympic Cut Rate Sporting Goods Co., buy a Junior Jacket at The Broadway Basement because it represents Olympic values, purchase the new line of Olympic 32 refrigerators from the May Company, or even attend the Olympiad of Religion, without realizing that these were not directly affiliated with the Olympic Games.

_Actual Games Period_

When 30 July 1932 finally arrived, the OCOG had completed all of its requirements. As was expected, there was no coded data concerning the processes and delivery of the OCOG. The facilities were complete, the money had been spent, and as a result, the OCOG focused its attention on the actual sports themselves.

At the onset of the event, an increase in the amount of ambush marketing in the _Los Angeles Times_ was noticed. Many private sector companies found the Olympic Games an excellent outlet to promote their product. From the coffee chosen for Olympic Athletes, to Olympic refrigerators, and pleas to travel to other places in the United States
after the Olympics, the pages of the *Los Angeles Times* were filled with advertisements.\textsuperscript{304}

In addition to many individual advertisements, the fifteen editions of the *Los Angeles Times* had a special advertising column that appeared daily. This column consisted of local business and professional firms welcoming Olympic visitors and promising the same courtesies and the same prices that are given to their oldest customers.\textsuperscript{305} From mutual life companies to political campaigns, numerous companies were provided an opportunity to promote their unofficial affiliation with the Olympic Games.\textsuperscript{306} Given the sporadic nature of the individual advertisement, this was the only consistent feature identified in the paper during the period of the Olympic Games.
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Chapter V

Conclusions

When the 1932 Olympic Games were awarded to Los Angeles and Lake Placid, the economic environment in the two locations was relatively similar. However, as the Great Depression affected the United States, different strategies were adopted in an effort to finance the respective events. This section analyzes these strategies and makes some conclusions as to their effectiveness.

Lake Placid

As the Winter Olympics were awarded to Lake Placid in late April 1929, there was very little time remaining to plan for the delivery of an event of such magnitude because of the small nature of the community and the development of facilities required for the Games. As a result, when compared to the development by the Los Angeles OCOG, the Lake Placid OCOG had to proceed at an accelerated pace.

Pre-Bid period

There is no evidence in the pre-bid periods of Lake Placid and Los Angeles of any forms of sponsorship specifically related to the OCOG. The potential reasons for the lack of sponsorship in Lake Placid include, but are not limited to, the small business community surrounding the region and a heavy reliance on public sector monies to finance the event. With the population of Lake Placid below 2,000, there may have been little choice but to seek public money. The initial commitment from the government was the most important and stabilizing factor in ensuring the economic viability of the Games.

While it was necessary for each OCOG to seek public money, there is no evidence that Dewey or any other affiliated member of the Lake Placid Club sought out
funds from the private sector during this period. Given the current initiatives pursued by host cities to secure private sector support, this finding was surprising. Today, it would seem logical that before making any attempt to secure a large event such as the Olympic Games, an investigation of the potential support from the local private sector would be important. While there is no evidence of private sector involvement, there is evidence that fits into the category of other funding. As mentioned previously, there was a significant reliance on public money. With the backing of both houses of the state government and the governor’s office, as well as the commitment of funds from Saranac Lake, the bid committee had the necessary backing and appropriate funding to proceed in a confident manner. The two unanimous votes from each state government ensured a long lasting relationship between those organizing the bid and the government.

The pre-bid phase was characterized by a substantial period of investigation by Godfrey Dewey (1928-1929), into the feasibility of staging such an event in Lake Placid. By touring Europe, Dewey was able to gather the specifics of running a world-class winter resort that was necessary for hosting the winter festival. He was also able to gather an immense amount of information from his visits to various European skiing resorts, and all within a very short period of time. With this vast amount of information and his charismatic personality, he convinced the IOC that Lake Placid was the better option compared with other American bids. Given the short period of time from when the bid was awarded (April 1929) to the delivery of the event itself (February 1932), the decision to seek out government support was a logical decision as the required money was readily available to begin operations immediately after securing the bid. In addition, the OCOG only had one other partner to deal with (government) as opposed to a variety of private
investors all expecting differing returns on their investments. The donations received from Saranac Lake and Essex County also provide a perception that the average citizen was willing to help finance the event in an effort to guarantee its successful staging.

1924 to 1930 Period

This period is considerably shorter than that of Los Angeles given the fact that the Games were awarded in April 1929. Comprising only eight months, this period is similar to the pre-bid period, as the OCOG was clearly in its organizational infancy. Committees were in the process of being formed, and construction on the necessary facilities was just beginning. As with the pre-bid period, there is no evidence of sponsorship occurring within this time frame.

The first significant event for the OCOG was to issue a 200,000 dollar U.S. bond. With the funds available, the Organizing Committee enjoyed a period of economic stability. The business of the OCOG could now progress and the focus shifted to the construction of the bob-run and the publicity campaign. This stability was evident as Dewey gave two speeches in the weeks following the awarding of the bid. These speeches, published verbatim, reveal his desire to gain public support in conjunction with the newly realized economic security.

The publicity campaign began with the OCOG requesting information about the possibility of issuing a commemorative stamp for revenue and promotion. Although the response received from the Postmaster General was initially one of reluctance, the effort emphasizes the importance the OCOG placed on distinguishing the Winter Olympic Games from other athletic events. As the Winter Olympic Games were a new endeavour within the North American sport context, it was deemed necessary to distinguish the
mega-event from other outdoor winter recreation festivals that occurred in Lake Placid and the surrounding area. The issuing of a commemorative stamp was one method of distinguishing the Games from all other winter festivals.

Up until late 1929, the process of bidding and planning the event was relatively problem-free. That changed with the filing of a lawsuit by the Association for Protection of Adirondacks against the OCOG in an effort to stop the planned cutting of trees on public land for the construction of the bob-run. The association’s mandate was to protect the natural environment of the region. Citing an act that protects public parkland from construction, the OCOG had little choice but to investigate other private sites. For the OCOG, this change of venue location increased the cost of construction and distance from Lake Placid. With a lack of private sector investment and little time remaining before the Games, the government was identified as the logical source to cover the additional costs associated with locating an additional site.

Similar to the previous period, the coded data generally fits into the category of other sources of funding. The OCOG was relying heavily on public money to finance new initiatives. With other countries and industries beginning to feel the effects of the Great Depression, the OCOG anticipated the need to overcome a number of obstacles during the two years prior to the staging of the event. Cautious optimism and a re-evaluation of the Organizing Committee’s business procedures replaced the excitement for the Games during the first year of OCOG operations.

*1930 to the Start of the Games Period*

The first part of the post-bid period was characterized by the acquisition of required funds. However, the time spent on ensuring the OCOG’s financial structure
resulted in little time and resources being spent on international and national publicity campaigns. Outside of speeches delivered by Godfrey Dewey and the request to the Postmaster's office concerning a commemorative stamp, little, if any time or resources had been spent on attracting visitors to the region.

This changed with the passing of a $150,000 U.S. bill in the legislature that resulted in the formation of a Publicity Committee. With members of the legislature on the newly formed committee, the government began to take a proactive role in the day-to-day operations of the OCOG. Given the large amount of government money committed to the successful staging of the mega-event, and the active role of various government officials, the partnership between the OCOG and the state government was solidified.

The release of the $150,000 U.S., and the formation of the Publicity Committee, enabled the Organizing Committee to begin a publicity campaign. As there was finally a financial commitment for promoting the Games, the data coded reveals the first examples of sponsorship and advertisements. The most prominent of these partnerships was between the OCOG and Stern Brothers sports shop. Formalized in late November 1931, the OCOG was able to display promotional materials in the shop, as well as sell merchandise. In addition to this shop, displays were established in Abercrombie and Finch along with identified hotels around town. By partnering with members of the hospitality and retail business community, the promotional campaign reached tourists and buyers in New York City. While there would be a heavy reliance on the local community of Lake Placid for financial support, it was felt that advertising in New York was more important. With the large population and business sector, the OCOG recognized that it was important to advertise in the most important region of the state.
In addition to the advertising displays in New York City, the OCOG also allowed for private firms to advertise in the second edition of the Olympic booklet. This is the only OCOG publication that includes the involvement of the private sector in the Games. The Organizing Committee allowed Clayton E. Brooks Publishing Company to control the advertising space in the booklet. As a result, while the companies were affiliated with the OCOG, the publicity committee had little input into the companies it would partner with for this publication.

While the OCOG’s refusal to actively solicit a large amount of private funding was perplexing, the fact that only five private companies used the Olympic Games as a form of advertisement undermines the hypothesis of this study. As previously noted, the researcher anticipated that there would be a high number of advertisements in the *Lake Placid News*. Given that the OCOG did not actively pursue private funding sources, the private sector could have avoided advertising in the newspaper, as it was not officially recognized by the OCOG. However, given the excitement within the local community, finding only five advertisements during this period was surprising.

While there was not a heavy reliance for funding from the private sector, there was a continued push for public money. After receiving a 200,000 dollar U.S. bond from North Elba residents, and $150,000 U.S. for publicity, the OCOG requested and received additional funding from both sources. On 30 July 1931 an additional 150,000 dollar U.S. bond was passed devoted specifically to the construction of a permanent ice arena in the centre of town. Even though the Great Depression had taken its toll on many industries, and most likely a large majority of the residents of the Lake Placid region, the vote on the
bond was one-sided, with little opposition to the use of public funds for the construction of additional facilities.

The overwhelming support for the bond is indicative of the media coverage throughout the period of 1930 until the start of the event. An analysis of the *Lake Placid News* reveals only two articles with a negative disposition towards the hosting of the Games. The first article reports on the lawsuit filed by the *Jewish Tribune*, against the OCOG because the Lake Placid Club did not allow people of Jewish descent to join the club. While the lawsuit could have progressed into a long drawn out battle, the issue was settled when the club promised to re-evaluate its membership procedure if the charges were dropped. Given the limited budget and remaining time before the event, a suit involving members of the Lake Placid Club, could have interfered with the financing and day-to-day operations of the OCOG. In addition to the redirecting of funds, an ongoing legal battle could have influenced public perception about the event and those included.

In addition to questions concerning the membership policy of the *Lake Placid Club*, the continued challenge by individuals from Yosemite area of California to relocate the event was difficult to overcome. Yet another challenge was the unseasonably warm weather being experienced in Lake Placid. This issue, combined with efforts to relocate the Games, could have affected the financing arrangements and may well have resulted in the eventual relocation of the Olympic Winter Games.

Although the two negatively coded articles represent the first examples of opposition, neither of the stories disrupted the positive momentum that the OCOG had achieved thus far. Both of these stories occurred with only months remaining in the planning process, and as a result, were generally treated as only minor disruptions.
Actual Games Period

The lack of articles in this period reflect the overall positive impact of the Games. Without any reported controversy or obstacle affecting the hosting of the third Olympic Winter Games, it can be concluded that the event ran smoothly without any obvious economic problems or necessary emergency funding. The revenue generated from the sale of the commemorative stamps exemplifies the positive disposition adopted by all involved. The overwhelming first day sales (first day of the Olympic Winter Games) indicate the level of excitement in the state of New York for the beginning of the Games. Although specific numbers are not provided, it was speculated in the Lake Placid News that the sales resulted in the largest first day issue of any stamp in United States history.

Interestingly, however, the overwhelming public interest in the Games did not result in the exploitation of Olympic insignia by private companies. Within the period of the event, there were three advertisements related to the Olympic Games in the Lake Placid News. Given the number of athletes and tourists visiting the area, the number of advertisements was expected to be higher.

There are two possible explanations for the lack of advertising. The population of Lake Placid was estimated to be at 1,800 in 1932, and as a result, the business climate in the region was not competitive enough to warrant advertisements. Given the size of Lake Placid and the types of companies attracted to the region, little competition existed in each category of product. In addition to this lack of competition, the increase in the number of people visiting the region during the Olympic Winter Games may have lead to a proportional increase in the number of consumers in the stores. Given the available data, it is probable that the number of people in the Lake Placid region doubled during
the entire month of the event. As a result of this increase, advertising in the newspaper may have been deemed unnecessary by local retailers. Given the limited number of options, word of mouth and other forms of advertising may have been sufficient.

The three identified advertisements in the newspaper reference a specific product or service related to the Olympic Games. For the Whiteface Mt. House, advertising in the *Lake Placid News* provided an opportunity for the hotel to advertise special Olympic rates for incoming tourists.² Given that the hotel was located outside the town, it was necessary to alert tourists of the temporary discounted rates.³ For the F.S. Leonard & Co., their yearly clearance on ski suits provided an excellent opportunity to partner with the Olympic Games.⁴ As most winter recreation activities required a ski suit, the Olympic Games afforded the store a perfect opportunity to promote interest in their clearance sale.⁵ The final advertisement referenced the importance of having a Thermat Heat Pad when attending the events.⁶ Although it is difficult to calculate the economic impact of these advertisements, the influx of tourists and the increased demand on the local economy may well have limited the need for local retailers to pursue advertisements in the *Lake Placid News*.

Los Angeles

*Pre-Bid Period*

Given that the official award for the Games of the Tenth Olympiad was made in 1923 and this study focussed its attention on the 1924-1932 period of the *Los Angeles Times*, there was no data collected from the newspaper for this period. However, using the *Official Report* and other relevant sources, some conclusions can be made about the formation of the bid. While the formation of the OCOG did not occur until late 1928, the
structure of the committee was established prior to the bid. The formation of the Community Development Association (CDA) in 1920 initiated the idea of pursuing the Olympic Games. In addition, the CDA had already financed and constructed the Olympic Coliseum as its primary facility for the event. With the financial wealth of the members on the CDA, and having the stadium already constructed, the bid for the Games of the Tenth Olympiad was well positioned and free of the major obstacles of previous Olympiads.

1924 to 1930 Period

The beginning of this period saw the release of projections of economic grandeur for the event. In an interview with the *Los Angeles Times*, Garland was very optimistic about the positive economic impact of the hosting the Games. He projected expenditures of ten million dollars in advertising and estimated approximately five hundred thousand people would attend the event. Given the economic climate of California at the time, these projections were achievable. However, with over eight years before the beginning of the event and the impact of the Great Depression still to come, the realization of Garland’s projections would be impossible to achieve.

As news of the award was conveyed to the public in late 1923, one would have assumed the Organizing Committee would have a rapid desire to begin operations. However, with consideration for the Games of the IXth Olympiad in Amsterdam, there was very little official activity from the CDA until after the 1928 Games were complete. As a result, the CDA focussed its attention on more localized non-Olympic issues. Although there was no official OCOG related news, the construction of the Olympic Auditorium and the initial steps for construction of the Olympic swim stadium indicate
how active the CDA was in Olympic related activities. In addition to its early planning, the CDA encouraged active local participation in Olympic sports in an effort to stimulate interest in the upcoming event.

The first formal economic activity that formed the OCOG occurred in conjunction with the passing of the California Olympiad Bond Act of 1927. The act, which helped forge a partnership between the OCOG and the state government, allowed a one million dollar bond to be issued for the purposes of promoting and administering the Games. With General Secretary Zack Farmer overseeing the official formation of many sub-committees, there was little need to begin economic activity until the organizational structure was established. With the formation of the Publicity Committee, the OCOG was able to engage in immediate communications with the IOC, NOCs, and most importantly, the public.

The consistent theme of this period is the CDA/OCOG laying the foundation of its organization for the staging of the Games. Although the *Official Report* claims that the CDA focused on other localized business and did not form into the OCOG until after the conclusion of the 1928 Olympic Games in Amsterdam, it would be naïve to assume that there were no ongoing discussions concerning the formation of the organization. This conclusion is supported by the solidification of the partnership between Major G. Van Rossen, General Secretary of the Dutch Committee, and Zack Farmer during this period. Rossen was invited to oversee the delivery of the Games during the years of 1929 and 1930 because of his experience in previous Olympiads and his knowledge of the Olympic Law. According to the *Official Report*, Rossen was invited to formalize the hosting process and provide expertise for the OCOG.
With no consistent publicity during the four-year period leading up to the Amsterdam Games, the positive momentum of the successful bid announcement was lost. In addition, as evidenced by the review of the *Los Angeles Times* during this period, there was no national or international publicity during this period. As a result, other eastern American cities became interested in hosting the Games. Suggesting that the award was to the United States and not to Los Angeles, Boston, Philadelphia, and Chicago expressed interest in hosting the event. These particular expressions of interest became particularly more prominent as the effects of the Great Depression began in mid-1929. Had the OCOG being consistently promoting and educating the public on the specifics of the hosting procedure, the confusion could have been avoided.

The passing of the bond was coded as other sources of funding as it represents the only significant OCOG activity during this period. With no evidence of any sponsorship in the *Los Angeles Times*, the funding from the public bond was enough to maintain the early operations of the OCOG. While the bond is considered the only coded data, the private construction of the Olympic swimming and boxing stadium indicate that some dialogue existed between the CDA and private industry.

1930 to Start of the Games Period

As this period began, the majority of the technical aspects associated with the event had been resolved. The majority of facilities had also been constructed or renovated and the financial position of the Games was fairly secure. As a result, this period is characterized by an increase in the promotional activities by the OCOG, and an increase in the exploitation of the event by affiliated and unaffiliated parties. There are two important examples of affiliated parties who benefited from the Olympic Games. The
membership book passed out by the Los Angeles Club emphasizes one of these mutually beneficial partnerships. Interested parties could join the athletic club and contribute to the economic viability of the event, thus allowing both organizations to prosper from the hosting the Games. This promotion not only benefited the OCOG financially, it allowed the organization to access other members of the business elite in the Los Angeles community. The 50th anniversary edition of the Los Angeles Times also exemplified the mutually beneficial relationship that existed between the OCOG and other business interests. This special issue included a fourteen-page section on the upcoming Olympic Games.\textsuperscript{14} Harry S. Chandler, editor of the Los Angeles Times and member of the Executive Committee, used the strong connections between the two organization as a promotional tool.\textsuperscript{15} The anniversary issue brought special attention to the newspaper and the Games, thus increasing public interest in both.

However, it was not only those members of the OCOG who tried to maximize the affiliation with the festival. For the first time in the period preceding the Games, the coded data reveals examples of advertising and clouding of the market. Many different types of organizations looked to advertise their affiliation with the event. For example, spurred on by the potentially high number of tourists coming to the Los Angeles region, Orange County business leaders attempted to capitalize on the influx by building a major hotel complex.\textsuperscript{16} By having such a significant attraction in the region, a publicity campaign was administered which coincided with the construction of the hotel.

In addition to the hospitality industry, other organizations were able to derive direct benefit from the event. The Knights of Columbus benefited from the event by
announcing that a King and Queen would be selected for the Olympics. Once selected, the two figureheads would promote the upcoming festival and the Knights of Columbus.

Not surprisingly the most exploited aspect identified during this period was the unaffiliated advertising by the private sector in the *Los Angeles Times*. There were 25 advertisements from a variety of different companies that were coded during this time period. While ten of these advertisements were associated with the hospitality industry, there were many other unique examples of commercial firms that capitalized on the mega-event. Readers of the *Los Angeles Times* between late 1931 to the start of the Olympic Games could purchase Olympic 32 Refrigerators; stemware for your Olympic entertaining use; represent the values of the Olympiad by wearing a Junior Jacket from the Broadway Basement; or even attend the Olympiad of Religion.\(^{17}\) While these unaffiliated promotions did not help the official sponsors on the OCOG, it exemplified the substantial public interest and profit motive of companies wishing to capitalize on the mega-event.

Of the twenty-five coded advertisements, only two were directly affiliated with the OCOG. The Helms Bakery Company supplied the bakery food for the Olympic Village and an advertisement appeared in the 2 November 1931 edition of the *Los Angeles Times*.\(^{18}\) The other example was in the special section of the *Los Angeles Times*. While there were many other advertisements in the special Olympic section of the paper, only the advertisement for the Sensational Rose of the Decade displayed a direct affiliation with the Olympic Games. The ad promoted the availability of the official commemorative rose that was available at the Howard T. Smith's Florists in Montebello, California.\(^{19}\) Given the unformalized system of sponsorship, and the high volume of
Olympic related advertisements, the reader of the *Los Angeles Times* would have experienced great difficulty distinguishing between the official and unofficial status of the sponsors.

While the official sponsors could not be easily distinguished from the unofficial sponsors, the OCOG was aware of the numerous attempts of unaffiliated parties to profit from the Olympic Games. The emphasis that the OCOG placed on the release of the ‘official’ ticket and other paraphernalia highlighted the importance of official products and services to the public at large. The emphasis culminated in the promotion of the only location of the ticket office due to concern over those who may fabricate and distribute fake tickets.\textsuperscript{20} Identified as unofficial organizations that may reap “a rich harvest,” the OCOG adopted a very protective attitude concerning their own property.\textsuperscript{21}

Given the length of time needed to prepare and secure the necessary financial backing, the period of 1930-1932 should be characterized as a maintenance phase. As 1930 began, the majority of facilities had been constructed and the one million dollar public bond had been spent. The OCOG only needed to focus on the day-to-day operations and prevent any deviations from the planning process. Activities, such as confirming agreements with private companies, establishing fundraising campaigns for athletic support, confirming European athletic participation, and suppressing non-affiliated organizations in their attempts to profit from the event, characterized much this time period for the Organizing Committee.

*Actual Games Period*

Unlike the Lake Placid analysis, there are many examples of advertising in this time period. In total, twenty advertisements appear in this period, with the majority of
these related to unaffiliated parties. Although the *Los Angeles Times*’ editor Harry S. Chandler was a member of the CDA and the OCOG, there is no visual evidence to prove that any of the twenty advertisements were official Olympic partners. As a result, these advertisements must be considered a form of ambush marketing. Although the division between official and unofficial sponsors was difficult to identify, the sheer number of advertisements hampered the ability of partnered companies to promote their official affiliation.

**Comparison Section**

**Similarities**

Upon analyzing the results from both sections, many similarities are evident in each of the identified time periods. In order to be considered for this section, there must be a consistent pattern or theme in the administration or financial aspect of the 1932 Olympic Summer and Winter Games. Adopting such a position ensures that an effective comparison can be made.

Not surprisingly, the first major similarity exists in the need of both OCOGs for financial support from all levels of government. For Godfrey Dewey, and the other members of the Lake Placid OCOG, the financial requirements for staging the Olympic Winter Games were too grandiose without a major infusion of public funds. As a result, full financial government support was the only solution to hosting the event in the small resort town. Fortunately for Dewey and the OCOG, the state government passed a bill pledging full support for the event before Dewey made his presentation to the IOC. As Mark Dyreson points out, Roosevelt used the mega-event as a solution to the economic problems of the state and as a result, was fully supportive of the staging of the Olympic
Winter Games.\textsuperscript{22} In total, $450,000 U.S. was approved in public bonds for the OCOG, as well as having numerous government representatives sit on the OCOG sub-committees.

Similar to the Lake Placid experience, a one million dollar bond was released to the Los Angeles OCOG in 1923. Serving as the OCOG's major funding source, the one time issue of the bond provided the necessary funds for the majority of the facility construction and promotion activities. Given that the early 1920s were characterized by economic prosperity and population increases, it was not as surprising that the government committed financially to the event.

While there was substantial public support for both Olympic Games, the crippling effects of the Great Depression caused similar problems for both OCOGs. With both 1932 Olympic Games occurring in North America, many European NOCs were hesitant to send contingents so far for both events. As a result of this hesitancy, only 17 of the 25 countries in 1930 confirmed for Lake Placid, arrived for the event in 1932. Of those that attended, 15 European countries were helped by discounted travel rates. The partnership between the travel industry and the OCOG ensured the successful delivery of the event. The Los Angeles Organizing Committee ensured that this reduction in NOCs would not be replicated by working with the hospitality industry to guarantee cheaper accommodations for all athletes and coaches. Both OCOGs worked closely with the hospitality industry to ensure the success of the event. Without developing and fostering these relationships, more NOCs may have been forced to drop out and the event would have lost its worldwide appeal. When analyzing the government support for both events, the pressing economic conditions of the late 1920s put more pressure on the New York state government. Dyreson noted the tension that faced Governor Roosevelt following the
public acknowledgement of the $75,000 U.S. deficit from the Games in Lake Placid and the resulting negative publicity. While this investigation only examined the process up until the completion of the events, the pressure after the event exemplifies the uneasiness of the political climate during the recession.

In addition to the troubles faced by each of the OCOGs, the AOC was also facing financial difficulty. In a letter from Avery Brundage to the Zack Farmer, the fund drive for both 1932 Games was not as successful as hoped. The projected fundraising goal was severely below the target and threatened the ability of the AOC to send its usual number of American athletes to the Olympics. Brundage recognized that while the financial shortfall could impact the number of athletes sent to both Games, the information should not be released to the press as it would affect the viability of the event. As a result, the AOC acknowledged the significant role its athletes play in the success of both events, and therefore kept its internal financial problems secret.

Differences

Although there were many similarities identified, the results suggest that there were many more differences in hosting the third Olympic Winter Games in Lake Placid and the Games of the Tenth Olympiad in Los Angeles. Given the difference in size and population of the host cities, the time period of hosting, and the amount of funds required to stage each event, the results are not surprising. These differences only heightened the discrepancy expected between hosting the larger Olympic Summer Games and the smaller Olympic Winter Games.

One of the more significant differences existed in the amount of media coverage about the two OCOG presidents. With the limited amount of time for planning, and little
protection from economic downturn, Lake Placid OCOG president Dr. Godfrey Dewey was a permanent fixture in the *Lake Placid News* from bid to completion of the event. He made many speeches prior to his European resort scouting trip and was celebrated in the media upon his return. Dewey was clearly recognized as the figurehead of the bid and the Olympic Winter Games. In addition to the natural beauty of the region, the Lake Placid OCOG was selling Godfrey Dewey to the IOC, the European NOCs, and the prospective tourists. In complete opposition to the Lake Placid OCOG, Dr. William May Garland was mostly absent from the media coverage surrounding the event. When compared to the coverage of Dewey in the *Lake Placid News*, the results indicate that Garland was rarely quoted or sought for comment, preferring instead to conduct his work in the background. More often, an article would directly quote the specific head of a committee or venue. Interestingly, this also extended to the correspondence between the AOC and OCOG. In the Avery Brundage Collection, for example, Brundage’s personal communication is with specific committee heads, such as General Secretary Zack Farmer and Harry S. Chandler, and not with Garland.27

There are many possibilities for the identified difference in the public profile of the two OCOG presidents. The first, and most likely reason, is the discrepancy in time between the award and staging of each of the Olympic Games. For Lake Placid, the delivery time was only four years, while the Community Development Association in Los Angeles initially discussed the idea in 1920. In Lake Placid consistent public exposure and promotion was deemed necessary to ensure that all three levels of government and the public maintained interest in the event. As a result, Godfrey Dewey became a consistent figure during the planning procedure. With the extra time, as in the
case of Los Angeles, decisions and linkages could have been made at a much more methodical pace.

Both OCOG official reports claim that commercialism did not permeate or ruin the process of staging the mega-event.28 While both Organizing Committees claim limited commercialization during the staging of the Games, the actual results indicate much different environments. The Los Angeles OCOG demonstrated very little commercial restraint when compared to the Lake Placid OCOG. Although the researcher recognizes that a large event, such as the Olympic Summer Games, is much harder to control the proliferation of commercial advertising, the evidence suggests that the entire planning process for the Los Angeles Games was permeated with examples of private sector involvement. One of the most glaring differences between the two OCOGs is in the hospitality sector. While the Lake Placid OCOG encouraged ordinary citizens to open their homes and become official representatives of the Olympic Winter Games, the Los Angeles Organizing Committee relied heavily on private hotels to provide reduced accommodations. In addition, the Olympic Village relied heavily on the private sector to function through an aggressive “goods-in-kind” program. Private companies were awarded exclusivity contracts with the OCOG to service the Olympic Village. As evidenced by the Helms Bakery Case, companies who recognized the value of association were anxious to continue the affiliation beyond the time period of the Olympic Games.29

In addition to controlling the desire for profit from the official sponsors, the Los Angeles OCOG also had to thwart the many unaffiliated sponsors utilizing the Olympic insignia. The ongoing need to educate the public about the only location of the ticket
office, the announcement of the Official Olympic pins and patches, and the constant need to promote of other official events indicates a strong desire by unaffiliated parties to profit from the mega-event without paying for the right. As a result, the planning period for William May Garland and the Los Angeles OCOG can be characterized as one of attempted control.

The problems associated with commercial interest evident in Los Angeles were not found in the analysis of Lake Placid. Due to the decision of Godfrey Dewey and the Lake Placid OCOG to minimize private sector involvement, there was little need for the same control strategies employed by its bigger brother. In fact, the Lake Placid OCOG strategy was the complete opposite. By giving up control of the publicity to other private organizations, and by mandating the souvenir book as the only material that could contain advertising, the OCOG dissolved its responsibility of controlling the ambush-marketing activities.

**Future Research**

In analyzing the procedure and results of this study, there are many potential areas available for future research. With the analysis ending in 1932, the logical extension to this study is to analyze the post-event impact. This study’s focus was on the Great Depression’s effect on the strategies implemented by each of the OCOGs, but it did not study the post-event use of the facilities or the benefits derived by the city. Future research should consider exploring the post-event time period of 1932 to Roosevelt’s New Deal legislation.

In addition, Olympic Games have many important contributors to its success. This study focuses on both OCOGs, but it can be argued that both state governments and the
AOC played an equally important role in the success of the Games. A similar study applied to both of these organizations would add to the understanding of hosting the Olympic Games. Understanding of the effects of the Great Depression on the processes and policies of the state governments and the AOC could add to the growing knowledge of both 1932 Olympic Games.

By analyzing an additional newspaper from New York and Los Angeles, a researcher could further develop the public perception of each of the events. While the *Los Angeles Times* and the *Lake Placid News* served as valuable sources of information for the purposes of this investigation, including another paper from the state would provide a more holistic view of the corresponding region. As newspapers often represent their readership through the manner and type of stories that are covered, it is possible that a different newspaper would provide a different perspective on the hosting issues for both Olympic Games. By comparing two or more regionalized newspapers, stronger conclusions could be made regarding the overall coverage of the event.

With the current mandate of the IOC’s Programme Committee to reduce the size of the Olympic Games, both 1932 Olympic Games provide potential solutions for optimizing the delivery of the event. The Olympic Winter Games indicate the importance of community involvement. The over 500 homes who housed visitors and athletes in Lake Placid indicates how the community reached out and openly accept visitors to the region. While this is no longer possible because of the large number of personnel, and the required development of an Olympic Village, some of the strategies from the Lake Placid Olympic Winter Games can still be applied today.
The most important legacy from the 1932 Olympic Summer Games is that of facilities. With the construction of the Olympic swimming stadium as its only major facility expense, the Los Angeles OCOG understood the value of renovating and using existing facilities for the staging of the Games. Not only is this an efficient manner to save money, but it also ensures a lasting facility legacy. With the large amount of funds currently needed for facility construction, existing facilities provide a viable and cheap alternative to the current trend of constructing “bigger and better” facilities. The primary venue for the 1932 Olympic Summer Games was the Olympic Coliseum, a structure that was subsequently used during the 1984 Olympic Games, the University of Southern California Trojans football games, and by a professional major soccer league franchise. While the current editions of the Olympic Games require more facilities due to an increased number of athletes, the 1932 Olympic Summer Games indicate the economic value of using existing facilities. As a result, the IOC should consider bid cities with existing athletic facilities. By limiting construction of new facilities, the IOC may be able to attract new bid cities. Potential candidates include Rio de Janeiro, Brazil; Cairo, Egypt; and Johannesburg, South Africa. These cities are in South America and Africa, markets the IOC would like to penetrate.
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19 Ibid.
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Appendix I
Documents Retrieved from the AAFLA

1. *American Olympic Report* = A report to the American Olympic Committee which reports on the success of both of the 1932 Olympic Games.


4. *Boycott the Olympics!!* = Anti-Olympic Brochure promoting the International Workers Athletic Meet in Chicago.

5. *Speech Delivered at the 1932 Opening Ceremonies in Los Angeles.*

6. *In the Matter of the Appropriation of Funds from the 1932 Olympics* = Committee and Senate Approval of Minutes.

7. *Assembly Bill* = U.S. State Bill concerning the issuing of bonds.


9. *Newspaper Clippings from the 1932 Olympic Games.*

10. *Setting the Stage for the IIIFth Olympic Winter Games* = Put out by the Organizing Committee.


15. *Olympic Games* = presumably an official program.

16. *Olympic Games 1932* = Brochure sponsored by the Union Pacific System.
17. *The Games of Lake Placid in 1932 Collecting the Memories* = Jonathan Becker
Collecting memorabilia.

18. *Los Angeles City Council Minutes* = Associated with the 1932 Olympic Games.

19. *California's 1932 Olympic Games Medallists*.


21. *Complete Program of Events and Map courtesy of the California Bank*.

22. *The Friendly Olympics* = book about the hosting of the 1932 Los Angeles
Olympic Games.

23. *Speech by Dr. Godfrey Dewey to the India House, New York City, 11 March 1931*.


25. *Official Information for Participating Countries III Olympic Winter Games, Lake Placid 1932*. 
## Appendix II
Chronological Order of Olympic Games

### Olympic Summer Games

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Olympiad</th>
<th>Host City</th>
<th>Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First</td>
<td>Athens, Greece</td>
<td>1896</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second</td>
<td>Paris, France</td>
<td>1900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third</td>
<td>St. Louis, United States</td>
<td>1904</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fourth</td>
<td>London, England</td>
<td>1908</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fifth</td>
<td>Stockholm, Sweden</td>
<td>1912</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sixth</td>
<td>None (World War I)</td>
<td>1916</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seventh</td>
<td>Antwerp, Belgium</td>
<td>1920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eighth</td>
<td>Paris, France</td>
<td>1924</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ninth</td>
<td>Amsterdam, Netherlands</td>
<td>1928</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenth</td>
<td>Los Angeles, United States</td>
<td>1932</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eleventh</td>
<td>Berlin, Germany</td>
<td>1936</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Twelfth</td>
<td>None (World War II)</td>
<td>1940</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thirteenth</td>
<td>None (World War II)</td>
<td>1944</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fourteenth</td>
<td>London, England</td>
<td>1948</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fifteenth</td>
<td>Helsinki, Finland</td>
<td>1952</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sixteenth</td>
<td>Melbourne, Australia</td>
<td>1956</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seventeenth</td>
<td>Rome, Italy</td>
<td>1960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eighteenth</td>
<td>Tokyo, Japan</td>
<td>1964</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nineteenth</td>
<td>Mexico City, Mexico</td>
<td>1968</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Twentieth</td>
<td>Munich, Germany</td>
<td>1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Twenty-first</td>
<td>Montréal, Canada</td>
<td>1976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Twenty-second</td>
<td>Moscow, Russia</td>
<td>1980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Twenty-third</td>
<td>Los Angeles, United States</td>
<td>1984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Twenty-fourth</td>
<td>Seoul, South Korea</td>
<td>1988</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Twenty-fifth</td>
<td>Barcelona, Spain</td>
<td>1992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Twenty-Sixth</td>
<td>Atlanta, United States</td>
<td>1996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Twenty-seventh</td>
<td>Sydney, Australia</td>
<td>2000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Olympic Winter Games

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Version</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First</td>
<td>Charmonix, France</td>
<td>1924</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second</td>
<td>St. Moritz, Switzerland</td>
<td>1928</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third</td>
<td>Lake Placid, United States</td>
<td>1932</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fourth</td>
<td>Garmisch-Partenkirchen, Germany</td>
<td>1936</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fifth</td>
<td>St. Moritz, Switzerland</td>
<td>1948</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sixth</td>
<td>Oslo, Norway</td>
<td>1952</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seventh</td>
<td>Cortina D’Ampezzo, Italy</td>
<td>1956</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eighth</td>
<td>Squaw Valley, United States</td>
<td>1960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ninth</td>
<td>Innsbruck, Austria</td>
<td>1964</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenth</td>
<td>Grenoble, France</td>
<td>1968</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eleventh</td>
<td>Sapporo, Japan</td>
<td>1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Twelfth</td>
<td>Innsbruck, Austria</td>
<td>1976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thirteenth</td>
<td>Lake Placid, United States</td>
<td>1980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fourteenth</td>
<td>Sarajevo, Yugoslavia</td>
<td>1984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fifteenth</td>
<td>Calgary, Canada</td>
<td>1988</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sixteenth</td>
<td>Albertville, France</td>
<td>1992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seventeenth</td>
<td>Lillehammer, Norway</td>
<td>1994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eighteenth</td>
<td>Nagano, Japan</td>
<td>1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nineteenth</td>
<td>Salt Lake City, United States</td>
<td>2002</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Appendix III
## Athlete Participation in the Olympic Games

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Olympic Games</th>
<th>Version</th>
<th>Male Athletes</th>
<th>Female Athletes</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1896 Athens, Greece</td>
<td>Summer</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1900 Paris, France</td>
<td>Summer</td>
<td>1,206</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1,225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1904 St. Louis, U.S.A.</td>
<td>Summer</td>
<td>681</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>689</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1908 London, England</td>
<td>Summer</td>
<td>1,999</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>2,035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1912 Stockholm, Sweden</td>
<td>Summer</td>
<td>2,490</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>2,547</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1920 Antwerp, Belgium</td>
<td>Summer</td>
<td>2,591</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>2,669</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1924 Chamonix, France</td>
<td>Winter</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1924 Paris, France</td>
<td>Summer</td>
<td>2,956</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>3,092</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1928 St. Moritz, Switzerland</td>
<td>Winter</td>
<td>438</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>464</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1928 Amsterdam, Netherlands</td>
<td>Summer</td>
<td>2,724</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>3,014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1932 Lake Placid, U.S.A.</td>
<td>Winter</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1932 Los Angeles, U.S.A.</td>
<td>Summer</td>
<td>1,281</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>1,408</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1936 Garmisch-Partenkirchen, Germany</td>
<td>Winter</td>
<td>588</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>668</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1936 Berlin, Germany</td>
<td>Summer</td>
<td>3,738</td>
<td>328</td>
<td>4,066</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1948 St. Moritz, Switzerland</td>
<td>Winter</td>
<td>592</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>669</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1948 London, England</td>
<td>Summer</td>
<td>3,714</td>
<td>385</td>
<td>4,099</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1952 Oslo, Norway</td>
<td>Winter</td>
<td>585</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>694</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1952 Helsinki, Finland</td>
<td>Summer</td>
<td>4,407</td>
<td>518</td>
<td>4,925</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1956 Cortina D'Ampezzo, Italy</td>
<td>Winter</td>
<td>688</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>820</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1956 Melbourne, Australia</td>
<td>Summer</td>
<td>2,813</td>
<td>371</td>
<td>3,184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960 Squaw Valley, U.S.A.</td>
<td>Winter</td>
<td>522</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>665</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960 Rome, Italy</td>
<td>Summer</td>
<td>4,738</td>
<td>610</td>
<td>5,348</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1964 Innsbruck, Austria</td>
<td>Winter</td>
<td>891</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>1,091</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1964 Tokyo, Japan</td>
<td>Summer</td>
<td>4,457</td>
<td>683</td>
<td>5,140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1968 Grenoble, France</td>
<td>Winter</td>
<td>947</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>1,158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1968 Mexico City, Mexico</td>
<td>Summer</td>
<td>4,750</td>
<td>780</td>
<td>5,530</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972 Sapporo, Japan</td>
<td>Winter</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>1,006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972 Munich, Germany</td>
<td>Summer</td>
<td>6,065</td>
<td>1,058</td>
<td>7,123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976 Innsbruck, Austria</td>
<td>Winter</td>
<td>892</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>1,123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976 Montréal, Canada</td>
<td>Summer</td>
<td>4,781</td>
<td>1,247</td>
<td>6,028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980 Lake Placid, U.S.A.</td>
<td>Winter</td>
<td>839</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>1,072</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980 Moscow, U.S.S.R.</td>
<td>Summer</td>
<td>4,093</td>
<td>1,124</td>
<td>5,615</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1984 Sarajevo, Yugoslavia</td>
<td>Winter</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>1,274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1984 Los Angeles, U.S.A.</td>
<td>Summer</td>
<td>5,230</td>
<td>1,567</td>
<td>6,797</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988 Calgary, Canada</td>
<td>Winter</td>
<td>1,110</td>
<td>313</td>
<td>1,423</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988 Seoul, South Korea</td>
<td>Summer</td>
<td>6,279</td>
<td>2,186</td>
<td>8,465</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992 Albertville, France</td>
<td>Winter</td>
<td>1,313</td>
<td>488</td>
<td>1,801</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992 Barcelona, Spain</td>
<td>Summer</td>
<td>6,659</td>
<td>2,708</td>
<td>9,367</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994 Lillehammer, Norway</td>
<td>Winter</td>
<td>1,217</td>
<td>522</td>
<td>1,739</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996 Atlanta, U.S.A.</td>
<td>Summer</td>
<td>6,806</td>
<td>3,512</td>
<td>10,318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998 Nagano, Japan</td>
<td>Winter</td>
<td>1,488</td>
<td>814</td>
<td>2,302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000 Sydney, Australia</td>
<td>Summer</td>
<td>6,582</td>
<td>4,069</td>
<td>10,651</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002 Salt Lake City, U.S.A.</td>
<td>Winter</td>
<td>1,513</td>
<td>886</td>
<td>2,399</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix IV
Flowchart of Study
1. Identification of Problem
   - Perceived differences, by the researcher, between funding and revenue generation for the staging of the Winter Olympic Games and the Summer Olympic Games of 1932

2. Literature Search
   - Three categories of research emerge as important to the research topic
     a) Lake Placid 1932 Winter Olympic Games
     b) Los Angeles 1932 Summer Olympic Games
     c) Generalized view of the Great Depression

3. Literature Analysis

4. Research Question - What, if any, significant disparities will emerge between the two municipalities and OCOGs concerning the strategies and implementation of their respective Olympic festivals?

5. Split into two separate paths: a) small town Winter Olympics of Lake Placid; and b) big city Summer Olympics of Los Angeles

6. a) Los Angeles Olympic Games 1932
   - i) AAFLA – examples of sponsorship, AOC reports, personal correspondence between William May Garland (OCOG president) and IOC
   - ii) Los Angeles Times – 1924-1932 – Check Content Analysis Appendix IVa
   - iii) IOC General Session and Executive Council Minutes – Read Minutes on sessions during the 1924 (interest in L.A. bid) to 1932 (delivery of the Games)
   - iv) Avery Brundage Collection – Additional data from communications between the AOC and the OCOGs

b) Lake Placid Olympic Games 1932
   - i) AAFLA – examples of sponsorship, AOC Report concerning the Games
   - ii) Lake Placid News – 1924-1932 – Check Content Analysis Appendix IVa
   - iii) IOC General Session and Executive Council Minutes – Read Minutes on sessions during the 1924 to 1932 (delivery of the Games)
   - iv) Avery Brundage Collection – Additional data from communications between the AOC and the OCOGs

7. Divide each stream of data into four time periods: a) the bidding stage; b) the period of 1924-30; c) the period of 1930-32; and d) the delivery of the Games.

8. Within each of the four periods, divide into the three established categories of potential funding: a) Sponsorship from the sponsor’s perspective, including such issues as advertisements in newspapers, magazines, and any affiliated Olympic paraphernalia; b) Sponsorship from the OCOG’s perspective, including evidence of using promotional efforts and funding from the sponsors to further enhance the event and the efforts made to accommodate the sponsors; and c) other potential
sources of funding, including issues such as self-generated revenue...sales of
memorabilia, and programs, private revenue...radio and cinema ...and public
funding...government funding and donations.

9. Collect the data from the four time periods and unify the data through the three
categories of established funding from 1924-1932: a) sponsor; b) OCOG’s
perspective on sponsorship; and c) other sources of funding. This will create three
units of analysis in the Lake Placid and Los Angeles themes.

a) Sponsor theme – Trace the desire of sponsors to fund the Olympic Games.
The key factors will be monetary contributions of the sponsors, type of
company involved in the process, and length of time for the association.

b) Sponsorship from the OCOG’s perspective – Trace the desire of the
Organizing committee, particularly the finance committee’s of each event,
to solicit sponsorship money. Of particular interest will be the type of
company solicited and during what part of the hosting process they were
solicited for funds.

c) Other sources of funding – This includes self-generated revenue, private
revenue, and public funding. Self-generated revenue will include a
discussion of where the OCOG’s money was generated and how much
was made. This is important as it is the only type of revenue that the
OCOG’s had control over and as a result exemplifies the feasibility of the
Games prior to solicitation of funds from outside parties. Private Funding
involves the selling of the rights to the cinema and radio. This data
category could have a large disparity between the money charged for the
rights in Los Angeles and Lake Placid due to the differences in size of the
event. Governmental Funding involves the approved funding by the three
levels of government in addition to any emergency public bonds and
government funding.

10. Upon completion of the two narratives, the data will be collapsed into one
comparative analysis. This analysis will compare the similarities and differences
of the financing and sponsorship initiatives undertaken by the OCOGs during the
process of hosting the Olympic Games.

11. After completion of the data comparisons: a) discuss the relevance of the research
within the field of Olympic Research, particularly concerning future research on
the economics of staging the Winter Olympics based on the limitations and
deliminations of this research; b) discuss possible applications towards the current
IOC Programme Commission initiatives; c) discuss future implications of this
research.
Appendix IVa
Content Analysis Flowchart

Examination of media coverage of the funding and sponsorship issues in the Lake Placid News and the Los Angeles Times from 1924 to the delivery of the Olympic Games.

Examine every Saturday edition of the Los Angeles Times and Friday edition of the Lake Placid News until the beginning of each Olympic Games. During the delivery of the actual event (Lake Placid, February 4-13; Los Angeles, July 30-August 14), the frequency will increase to daily.

Assumption: Although both newspapers will report the Olympic Games fairly, the big city newspaper, Los Angeles Times, will be much less critical about possible financial issues and will be much more endorsing of the Games than the Lake Placid News.

Initial Lake Placid key words for coding: sponsorship, funding, government, facility construction, the Great Depression, Dewey

Initial Los Angeles key words for coding: sponsorship, funding, government, facility construction, The Great Depression, Garland, Farmer

The manual coding by the researcher will use the variable "present" as it relates to the visual or described affiliation with the Olympic Games, in an advertisement or newspaper article within the selected newspaper.

The manual coding by the researcher will use the variable "present" as it relates to the visual or described affiliation with the Olympic Games, in an advertisement or newspaper article within the selected newspaper.

Group into the four periods identified: Bid Stage, 1924-1930, 1930-32, and Actual Games.

Group into the four periods identified: Bid Stage, 1924-1930, 1930-32, and Actual Games.

For each stream, a tabulation of the number of occurrences of "present" will occur. This tabulation will serve as a representation of the media's role in the reporting of the financing of the Games. In addition, these results will be compared with the data, from the other archives, to form a narrative for each of the Games.
## Appendix V

### Selected List of Official and Non-Official Sponsor

#### Lake Placid Olympic Winter Games

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Official Sponsor</th>
<th>Unofficial Sponsor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stern Brothers</td>
<td>Whiteface Mt. House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clayton E. Brooke Publishing Company</td>
<td>The Homestead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Telephone</td>
<td>Weston, Bull, &amp; Mihinson Company</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Los Angeles Olympic Summer Games

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Official Sponsor</th>
<th>Unofficial Sponsor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Helms Bakery</td>
<td>Broadway Basement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time Mirror Printing &amp; Binding</td>
<td>Olympiad of Religion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arrowhead Spring Water</td>
<td>Deauville Yacht Club</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arden Milk</td>
<td>Panama Pacific Line</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California Bank</td>
<td>Parmelee Dohrmann Company</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bullock’s Wilshire</td>
<td>The May Company</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix VI
Map of Lake Placid Area

Appendix VII
Map of Los Angeles Area

Appendix VIII
Official Insignia of the Third Olympic Winter Games

III Olympic Winter Games

Lake Placid, USA
February 4-13, 1932
Appendix IX
Official Insignia of the Games of the Tenth Olympiad

XTH OLYMPIAD
LOS ANGELES
1932
Vita Auctoris

Name: Jonathan Paul

Place of Birth: Montréal, Quebec

Year of Birth: 1975

Education: Master’s in Human Kinetics
University of Windsor
Windsor, ON
2000-2004

Bachelor of Arts in Recreational Administration
University of Alberta
Edmonton, AB
1994-1998

Presentations:


Scholarly experiences:

Olympic Research Symposium
The University of Western Ontario,
London, Ontario
October 17-19, 2002

Accepted participant to the Olympic Academy of Canada
Canadian Olympic Committee
McMaster University
Hamilton, Ontario
July 27-August 2nd, 2002

Graduate Student Representative
Kinesiology Council
Faculty of Human Kinetics
University of Windsor
Windsor, Ontario
September 2001 – April 2002

Graduate Student Representative
Faculty Council
Faculty of Human Kinetics
University of Windsor
Windsor, Ontario
September 2001 – April 2002

Invited participant to the Olympic Forum
International Centre for Olympic Studie
The University of Western Ontario
London, Ontario
March 8, 2002

15th North American Society of Sport Management (NASSM)
conference
Virginia Beach, Virginia
May 26 – June 2, 2001