

## From the *Partners in Pursuit of Excellence* to *Own the Podium*: An Ideological Slip in Canadian Olympic Sport

Douglas A. Brown  
Canada

*In 1979, Canada's federal government published a national policy on amateur sport. The policy document was ambiguously titled: Partners in the Pursuit of Excellence. In 2005, the federal government committed \$55 million to an externally managed program titled Own the Podium. Unlike the policy document from 1979, there is nothing ambiguous about Own the Podium. It makes a definitive statement about Canada's priority on winning at the Olympic Games. Where did this confidence and clarity of vision come from? What is the broader social implication of such a shift? This paper examines the shift from the Pursuit of Excellence to Own the Podium. These are catch phrases that not only reflect the different social and cultural expectations for sport in the 1980s and the first decade of the new millennium respectively, but they also function as constitutive (or generative) utterances that enact real funding schemes, administrative structures and ultimately experiences in the field of sport production. This paper originated from a meta-analysis of governmental, sport administrative and journalistic discourse from 1961 through 2008. Initial analysis revealed that the Pursuit of Excellence was not tied exclusively to the federal government's sport discourse. Indeed, as a figurative iteration (or idiom) the pursuit of excellence was pervasive in government policy and position papers throughout the 1980s and early 1990s and characterized a national interest in positive change measured against standards of success based on previous results. In the realm of sport, excellence was gauged primarily on continued improvement at the Olympic Games. Performing "better than before" (or Best Ever) was a measure of excellence and equally reflected the idea of its ongoing pursuit. With Vancouver's successful bid to host the 2010 Olympic Winter Games, sport success is conceived, financed and managed very differently. Excellence is defined in terms of one time single outcome as opposed to the process of ongoing improvement. This has a profound impact on the long-term ideological substance of Canadian sport discourse and its constitutive powers. This paper argues that the shift from the Pursuit of Excellence to, Own the Podium is a product of changing power relations in the field of Canadian sport production. Specifically, analysis pin-points the radically different relationship that has emerged between the federal government and the Canadian Olympic Committee (COC) since 1979. During this period, the authority and legitimacy of the COC has increased in the broad field of Canadian sport production. This is due in no small part to the financial autonomy that the COC achieved following the 1988 Olympic Winter Games in Calgary and subsequent decades of intense corporate marketing.*



**F**rom the 1960s to the present day, the discourse on Canadian sport has incorporated the phrase or slogan, "the pursuit of excellence." Can we presume that "the pursuit of excellence" unifies this discourse; does it bring the different stakeholders of sport together for a shared experience with a

shared meaning? Is there a Canadian *connaissance*<sup>1</sup> of Olympic sport that is linked to “the pursuit of excellence?” Is there a general sense among Canadians that the Olympic Games and “the pursuit of excellence” are somehow linked? This paper considers the historically specific nature of this phrase in the field of Olympic sport in Canada. More importantly, it reveals how “the pursuit of excellence” has not been a stable concept in Canadian sport. This genealogy reveals ideological shifts and slips that tell us about Canadian society and culture during a pivotal period in the country’s history.

In the discourse of sport, “the pursuit of excellence” can be interpreted as an immutable human ideal. However, it can also be seen as a rhetorical cliché that ineptly evokes motherhood values of sport that may *or may not* truly reflect the ideological foundation of this pastime. This paper focuses on the tension between the high human ideal and the utterly mundane nature of the phrase. This paper probes the discourse of Canadian sport which is understood as those cumulative texts (both spoken and performed) that converge at specific historical moments and in specific geographical places.<sup>2</sup> It is the convergence of these texts that generate a collective sense of truth (*une connaissance*) about human society and its cultural practices.<sup>3</sup> The analysis is limited to the discourse of Olympic sport in Canada between 1960 and the present. In this case, I am interested in those texts that converge to provide Canadians with confident sense that Olympic sport is distinct from other genres of sport (NHL, NBA, WWE, Aboriginal sport, road hockey, etc.). Analysis focuses on the so-called “official” texts generated by governments and sport organizations.<sup>4</sup> These texts tend to take the form of policy statements, funding proposals, and ideological treatises. Subsequent analysis will incorporate the contribution of journalists and athletes to the discourse of sport. Care is taken throughout the analysis to expose the extent to which the authors of these official texts are simply one specific group of stakeholders in Canadian sport. The paper is divided into three sections. The first section considers the historical context that shaped the discourse of sport in Canada. The second section traces the evolution of “the pursuit of excellence” in the official texts of Canadian sport. The third section offers a theoretical analysis of power relationships in Canadian Olympic sport reflected in this genealogy.

From the perspective of method, this paper is a genealogy of one unifying concept in the discourse of sport (“the pursuit of excellence”).<sup>5</sup> By focusing on “the pursuit of excellence,” the analysis conforms to Michel Foucault’s genealogical method of history. This approach to history reflects a

... strategy of conducting an ascending analysis of power, ‘starting, that is, from its infinitesimal mechanisms, which each have their own history, their own trajectory, their own techniques and tactics, and then see how these mechanisms of power have been—and continue to be—invested, colonized, utilized, involuted, transformed, displaced, extended, etc., by ever more general mechanisms...’<sup>6</sup>

From the outset, “the pursuit of excellence” is regarded as a linguistic signifier with its own history within the field of sport. These four words seem to articulate the underlying value of sport. From a theoretical perspective, “the pursuit of excellence” may also be described as a unifying concept in the discourse of sport; it conveys a *gravitas* and logic for sport production.<sup>7</sup> It is a concept that seems to unify the myriad texts that constitute the discourse of sport.<sup>8</sup> A cursory analysis suggests that from a politician’s commitment to funding Olympic sport, to a journalist’s review of an Olympic rowing race, or to an athlete’s motivation to achieve a win an Olympic Games medal, “the pursuit of excellence” serves as a logical common denominator; it is an ideal that allows the texts of different stakeholders to “hang together,” to generate a particular meaning and rationale for Olympic sport in Canada. On the surface, this organizing concept appears to be “continuous and uninterrupted” in Canadian sport.<sup>9</sup> It seems to exist as a “time tested and true” ideological foundation for this cultural pastime. Certainly, “the pursuit of excellence” emerges repeatedly from the discourse of sport between 1960 and the pres-

ent. It is exactly the ubiquity of this entrenched, and yet unchallenged, statement that Foucault asks us to consider.

*Genealogy... concentrates on the forces and relations of power connected to discursive practices; it does not insist on a separation of rules for production of discourse and the relations of power.*<sup>10</sup>

In this case, “the pursuit of excellence” prompts a genealogical analysis that seeks to expose something about the power relationships in Olympic sport over the past 40-50 years. This one phrase reveals an order, or pattern, in the discursive practices of sport as well as the relations of power associated with the production of the discourse. Genealogical analysis requires historians to identify moments and circumstances in which the seemingly “continuous and uninterrupted processes” of forming discourse become destabilized.

### Historical Context

For some historians and philosophers, “the pursuit of excellence” is a *bona fide* topic of inquiry as reflected in journal article titles like: “Plato’s Paragon of Human Excellence: Socratic Philosopher and Civic Guardian” (from *Journal of Politics*, 2003)<sup>11</sup> or “The Pursuit of Excellence” (from *Educational Theory*, 1970).<sup>12</sup> As an ideal, “the pursuit of excellence” can be traced back to ancient Greece and the Socratic dialogues of Plato. For the philosopher kings in *The Republic*, “the pursuit of excellence” was an essential attribute of nobility and power.<sup>13</sup> In the everyday lives of Greek men from the Classical period, the quest for *arête*, or the “the pursuit of excellence,” was central to their worldview. One might argue that medieval chivalry parallels the social function of *arête*. Medieval noblemen pursued achievement throughout their lives. Like *arête*, chivalry was an active virtue. Striving for and achieving excellence in life emerges consistently as an ideal state of being through out human history.

In 2003, historian Charles Murray published *The Pursuit of Excellence in Arts and Sciences, 800 B.C. to 1950*.<sup>14</sup> Murray considers achievements of human excellence in the context of monumental innovations in art and science: the Parthenon in Athens, the paintings on the Sistine Chapel, and the discovering of penicillin. In contrast to Murray’s understanding of “the pursuit of excellence,” the latter decades of the 20<sup>th</sup> century and the beginning of the 21<sup>st</sup> century have seen “the pursuit of excellence” incorporated into the rhetoric of public institutions. This phrase is pervasive in institutional language. The achievements associated with institutional “the pursuit of excellence” hardly convey the *gravitas* or monumentality that Charles Murray celebrates in his book. A database search of academic and professional journals reveals the frequent use of this phrase:

*The pursuit of excellence; education and the future of America*<sup>15</sup>

*Encouragement, Effort, Expectation and Entitlement in the Pursuit of Excellence*<sup>16</sup>

*In pursuit of Excellence: A History of the Indian Institute of Science*<sup>17</sup>

*Expensive ambitions; economist says pursuit of excellence has increased college spending and tuition*<sup>18</sup>

*You can climb higher: the Christian’s pursuit of excellence*<sup>19</sup>

*In pursuit of Military Excellence: The Evolution of Operational Theory*<sup>20</sup>

Clearly, “the pursuit of excellence” has been taken-up by diverse social and cultural institutions: education, higher education, the military, the justice system, religion, and professions like nursing, medicine, engineering, and even library science. Unlike the achievements of Phideas (the Parthenon), Michelangelo (the Sistine Chapel) or Sir Alexander Fleming (penicillin), the contemporary focus on “the pursuit of excellence” lies prominently with organizations or institutions with tenuous public identities. Educational theorist Rubin Gotesky offers a phenomenology of this ubiquitous institutional

appropriation of “the pursuit of excellence” by western bureaucracies. His critique culminates with poignant insight into the institutional uses and abuses of the “the pursuit of excellence” in social and political life.

*The slogan, Pursuit of Excellence gives the false impression that both goals and their worth are given and known. It has the consequence of leading large masses of men to believe that they need not be concerned with goals and their worth; all they need to do is pursue the goals they are taught to revere relentlessly and conscientiously.*<sup>21</sup>

It should be no surprise that “the pursuit of excellence” also provides discursive traction in the field of Olympic sport and particular for the stakeholder institutions like Sport Canada, the Canadian Olympic Committee and the International Olympic Committee. Indeed, between 1960 and 2008 sport organizations have been required to answer difficult questions and justify their existence and actions.

Physical education and kinesiology graduates of the 1980s would have been formally introduced to “the pursuit of excellence” through sport psychology. Terry Orlick’s *In Pursuit of Excellence* (1980) was a standard textbook for introductory level sport psychology courses.<sup>22</sup> In 2007, Orlick published the fourth edition of the book. Orlick has refined his title by adding a subtitle. The title now reads *In Pursuit of Excellence: How to win in sport and life through mental training*.<sup>23</sup> The content of the fourth edition is markedly different than the first edition. “Excellence” is in the title of every major section: “Envisioning Excellence;” “Preparing the Mind for Excellence;” “Building Towards Excellence;” and “Realizing Excellence.” One of Orlick’s theoretical models is even called the “Wheel of Excellence.” Over four editions and thirty-three years, Orlick’s book has institutionalized “the pursuit of excellence” within the discourse of sport through the sub-field of sport psychology. At the same time, this institutionalization of the concept does not necessarily suggest that its meaning remains unchanged. Initially, Orlick’s emphasis was “the pursuit of excellence” in sport. In the fourth edition, Orlick seems to be emphasizing “the pursuit of excellence” in life through sport. The current subtitle alludes to a more holistic or humanistic interpretation of “the pursuit of excellence.” The purpose of discussing Orlick’s book is not to critique his interpretation of “the pursuit of excellence.” Rather, this brief discussion is intended to highlight the way concepts like “the pursuit of excellence” become entrenched in disciplinary language and fields of cultural production. It is also important to point out that Orlick’s book was published one year after the federal government produced its national policy on amateur sport. This policy was titled *Partners in Pursuit of Excellence*.<sup>24</sup>

### Government Stakeholders in Olympic Sport

In 1968, Pierre Trudeau’s liberal government sponsored a task force to investigate the status of sport in Canada.<sup>25</sup> This task force launched an era in which “the pursuit of excellence” became the mantra of politicians and sport administrators. According to John Munro, the minister of national health and welfare, “excellence must become a national goal in sport as well as in education, the arts, and all the other fields of human achievement ... and government has a moral duty to assist in the development of this excellence.”<sup>26</sup> From the 1968 task force emerged a *Proposed Sports Policy for Canadians* and ultimately much of the infrastructure that has come to be known as the Canadian Sport System.<sup>27</sup>

In the late 1960s and early 1970s, the topic of national identity and nationhood were a prominent topic of public debate. This was an era where bold assertions and definitive federal programming were intended to foster national unity through cultural institutions. An emphasis on formalizing cultural “industry” was fueled by the Quiet Revolution in Quebec and ultimately the new aggressive federalism of Pierre Trudeau.<sup>28</sup> Achieving national unity was also associated with achieving international prominence in Canadian cultural pastimes. Fostering human accomplishment in the arts and sciences

and celebrating international success was perceived as a measure of Canada's maturity and significance as an agent in international society. Historically, this commitment to national unity is identified with several monumental events. In 1967, the country celebrated its centennial and Montreal hosted an international exposition, EXPO 67: Man and his World.

With overt political gestures, the Trudeau government passed Canada's Multicultural Policy in 1971. 1976 was a landmark year in terms of Canada's presence on the international scene. Montreal hosted the summer Olympic Games and Canada was invited to join the G6. This was an era of unprecedented growth for Canada's cultural institutions. Several national museums were opened in Ottawa. The National Art Centre began inviting Canadian and international performing artists to its spectacular stages in 1969. The creation of national sport institutions was also a product of this era. Hockey Canada, the Coaching Association of Canada, the National Sport and Recreation Centre and Participaction Canada were products of this wave of development as centralization.<sup>29</sup> Like the arts, sport became a much more complex field of cultural production during these years. Unfortunately, historians who characterize this period as one of unprecedented federal involvement in the cultivation of nationhood through art and culture tend to overlook or outwardly dismiss the relevance of sport development during the same period. Although the late 1960s and 1970s are typically seen as a pivotal era in the public debate over Canadian culture and identity, the seeds of this discourse were sown well before Pierre Trudeau's Liberal Government gained power. For example, in 1945, a non-governmental amalgamation of organizations called themselves the Canadian Arts Council. Its purpose was to lobby government on behalf of Canadian cultural institutions. As an interesting footnote, it is worth noting that the Canadian Arts Council also intervened in the representation of Canadian sport. According to historian J. M. Bumsted, the Canadian Arts Council facilitated the relationship between the Canadian Olympic Association and the International Olympic Committee.<sup>30</sup>

In 1949, a Royal Commission on National Development of the Arts, Letters and Sciences convened. It became known popularly as the Massey Commission. The members' agenda was well publicized and the outcome of their work was scrutinized in the national media. This commission identified the cultural pastimes that they thought ought to be promoted and celebrated in Canadian society. The Massey Commission provided recommendations that effectively laid a path for federal government involvement in Canadian culture. The federal bureaucrats who began implementing the recommendations became known as "Masseyites." The Massey Commission's recommendations focused on "high culture" and the objective was to achieve excellence and international prestige. Achieving excellence in traditional art forms like opera, theatre, dance, and literature, etc. was considered the foundation of a mature and internationally respected nation.

The Canada Council for the Arts was founded in 1957. A couple of years later, parliament passed *Bill C-131: An Act to Encourage Fitness and Amateur Sport*. Both of these initiatives reflected the government's interest in developing Canada into a cohesive and effective nation and both of these initiatives emphasized the achievement of excellence. The Canada Council addressed the cultural health of the nation where Bill C-131 addressed the medical and economic health of the nation. The government saw sport as means of promoting healthy Canadians who would not drain the health care system. But, Bill C-131 also acknowledged the cultural (symbolic) importance of sport. Specifically, this government legislation was motivated in part by a will to bring Canadian hockey back to a level of international prominence.<sup>31</sup> It is interesting to note that in the 21<sup>st</sup> century, Sport Canada resides in the mega-ministry known as Heritage Canada.<sup>32</sup> Now, for the federal government, Olympic sport seems to be valued much more for its symbolic power than its direct health benefits.

The 1980s was a period in Canadian history where the concept of "cultural industry" took form.<sup>33</sup> Prior to this time, cultural practices (both "high" culture and "popular" culture) were valued as essen-

tial components of society. The field of cultural production was not expected to intersect with the field of economic profit. The production of fine art was challenged as being inherently important to society. For example, the Massey Commission (1949) justified public spending on the arts without any concern that the arts would in turn have a positive impact on the economy. When the government enacted the Canada Council, it did so as a Crown Corporation (arms-length government funded organization). This is significantly different than the government relationship to sport. Amateur Sport has always been administered through Ministries of State. Throughout the 1960s and 1970s, federal interests in Canadian culture did not wane so much as re-orient. The field of economic production influenced the government's benevolent and idealistic interest in the arts and culture. By the end of the 1970s, government policies on culture began to expose contradictions in the way art and culture were valued.<sup>34</sup> Federal policies reflected an interest in supporting art practices that contributed to broader fields of economic production. They began to refer to Canada's "cultural industry."

Although Sport Canada fell under the jurisdiction of Health and Welfare Canada, the medical and economic benefits of sport were only partially interesting to politicians and bureaucrats. They also recognized the potential of sport to foster Canadian cultural identity and ultimately national unity. The creation of the Canada Games in 1967 reveals many of the contingencies between sport, national unity, and "the pursuit of excellence" and the public discourse on art and culture. The Canada Games were imagined as a grass roots movement and an elite sport project. The sport festival was seen as a mechanism that would enable young (but elite) Canadian athletes to share a common cultural identity through sport.<sup>35</sup> And, the competitions in this festival environment would give young (but elite) athletes valuable experience in a multi-sport event like the Olympic Games.

In the 1960s, 70s and 80s, the Canadian Sport System reconfigured itself as a field of cultural production. Much of this reconfiguration reflected Canadians efforts to reconcile an autonomous sporting culture with the pervasive thrust to pursue excellence and assert a powerful presence internationally. 1979 was pivotal year in the reformation of Canadian sport; the Minister of State for Sport, Iona Campagnola, published the federal government's second sport policy, "Partners in the Pursuit of Excellence." The use of "partners" was a bold statement that sport, as a cultural pastime, has multiple stakeholders. In the decades that followed, the relative position and legitimacy of stakeholders in Canadian sport have been negotiated and contested. As a document, *Partners in Pursuit of Excellence* asserts the federal government's stake in the field of sport production. Oddly, the assertive nature of the sport policy led Iona Campagnola to justify a unilateral decision to establish the Canadian Sport Council without a formal consultation with the "so-called" partners. In her statement within the policy document, Campagnola makes no excuses for the authoritative role of her government in the leadership of Canadian sport.

*It may well be asked why, if partnership was the objective of federal policy, the federal sport agency (a.k.a. Sport Council) is to be established before the Congress of Sport was held. The answer is simple and straightforward. We at the federal level have learned through action what we have to do to put our house in order, so that we may best work towards the cultivation of Canadian athletic excellence.<sup>36</sup>*

The document also provides a clear interpretation of the concept of "the pursuit of excellence." At this stage of the federal leadership in sport, the concept meant achieving results in international competition. Campagnola stated that it is the goal of the new policy to restore Canada's international athletic prestige.

*I am proud of what has been accomplished in recent years—not for myself or even those who preceded me in this challenging responsibility, but for the splendid rise of a field of endeavour in which Canadians were once to the fore and now, after too long a lapse of time, are again coming to the front.<sup>37</sup>*

From the perspective of social change, this new clarity of vision and firm commitment to excellence had a profound impact on the position that athletes held in Canadian sport. Most Canadian sportspeople welcomed the government's commitment to sport. But *Partners in Pursuit of Excellence* was sufficiently vague in terms of laying out specific goals that could serve as markers of excellence. This vagueness led to a decade in Canadian sport where the boundaries in "the pursuit of excellence" would be tested by an increasingly diverse array of stakeholders in the production of Olympic sport. The 1980s would become a decade where the authority and legitimacy of athletes to define and direct Canadian sport was challenged by new stakeholders that were effectively introduced to the field of sport by *Partners in Pursuit of Excellence*. Sport administrators and government officials would interpret this policy in such ways that legitimized new stakeholders in sport and effectively repositioned athletes, the producers of sport performance, within the field.

In the 70s and early 1980s, sport performances were defined and redefined according to an ambivalent commitment to the idea of "the pursuit of excellence." This wavering commitment reflected a tension between a humanistic and corporate (or institutional) conceptualization of achievement. In other words, athletes and sport bureaucrats vacillated between the pursuit of (human) excellence and the pursuit of (sporting) excellence. The former celebrates the embodiment of individual excellence across spheres of life including athletic careers. The latter celebrates the administrative and bureaucratic excellence that produces athletes who win consistently. By the late 1990s and early years of the new millennium, the ambivalent interpretation of "the pursuit of excellence" had dissipated. Nowhere is this more apparent than in the creation of the "Own the Podium" program (to be discussed later in the paper). Although "the pursuit of excellence" is embedded literally and figuratively throughout the rhetoric of this corporate collaboration, the explicit agent of excellence is not the individual athlete, the multifaceted human being. It is the corporate stakeholders.

The 1979 Canadian sport policy should be considered relative to an earlier effort by government to assert itself as a legitimate and authoritative stakeholder in Canadian sport production. "Game Plan '76" was a meek federal program committed to financially assist Canadian athletes prepare for the 1976 Olympic Games in Montreal. It was a classic example of "too little too late." Canadian sport performances at the Montreal Olympics did not satisfy "federal" stakeholders. Nor did they satisfy the interests of the Canadian Olympic Association or the Canadian public. However, "Game Plan '76" is significant from the perspective of understanding the stakeholder dynamics in the field. This federal commitment to funding athletes was spear-headed by athlete-activists like Abby Hoffman and Bruce Kidd. At the time, Hoffman was still competing in athletics and preparing for her fourth Olympic Games in Montreal. Although both government and athlete-activists would likely agree that "Game Plan '76" had little impact on Canadian results in Montreal, the dialogue that generated the program is very important in Canadian sport history and reveals a moment in time when active athletes played a vital and effective role in the field of sport production. What is important is that it was athletes who initiated the dialogue.

Undoubtedly, *Partners in Pursuit of Excellence* influenced the integrity of the sport system in the 1980s. Indeed, system is the operative word. In the realm of sport administration, "system analysis" provided the dominant paradigm for decision-making and strategic planning. The interpretation of "the pursuit of excellence" was also influenced by the past and the future. Calgary was awarded the Olympic Winter Games for 1988. Fearful of hosting another Olympic Games without winning a single gold medal most certainly provided implicit motivation for sport administrators. Still, "the pursuit of excellence" was meekly defined. The "Best Ever" program was established during the lead-up to the 1988 Olympic Winter Games in Calgary.<sup>38</sup> In conceptualization and delivery, "Best Ever 88" simply

translated into “better than before” and at that moment in Canadian sport history, “better than before” meant winning at least one gold medal as the hosts of an Olympic Games. This program truly represented a corporate investment in the ideal of excellence. Interpreted a different way, sport administrators and politicians would have been happy with any gold medal. Like “Game Plan ’76,” the “Best Ever 88” program did not achieve its singular objective.

“Best Ever 88” was followed by another Federal Task force that generated *Toward 2000: Building Canada’s Sport System*. This task force has a particularly interesting historical context. It was published after the Olympic Winter Games in Calgary and before the Olympic Games in Seoul, 1988. Sport administrators and politicians were energized to fix whatever problems brought Canada to the embarrassing position of hosting a second Olympic Games without winning a single event. Little did they know that an even greater embarrassment was about to hit a few weeks later when sprinter Ben Johnson failed a doping test after winning the 100 metres in Seoul. The publication of *Toward 2000* and the fallout of the Seoul Olympics is nothing short of ironic in the history of Canadian sport and “the pursuit of excellence.” The Task Force report articulated a confident vision for sport where “the pursuit of excellence” was finally defined with specific quantitative performance outcomes. Still, the sport community that comprised the task force attempted to balance a humanistic view of excellence with a clear corporate vision of excellence. This is evident in statements such as “The Pursuit of Excellence is one of the highest forms of the human condition.”<sup>39</sup> Similarly, the authors of the report referred to “winning” internationally as “the” measure of excellence. One of the goals was expressed as follows: “To develop a Canadian sport system which will provide opportunities to enable athletes with talent and dedication to win at the highest level of international competition.”<sup>40</sup> Refinement of the definition of “the pursuit of excellence” is evident in the precise prescription of medal totals and overall rankings of Canadian teams in the 1992 Olympic and Olympic Winter Games. This was the first time sport bureaucrats and politicians published numerical goals.<sup>41</sup> At the time, the goals were to place among the top 6-8 nations in the Barcelona Olympic Games and among the top 6 nations at the Albertville Olympic Winter Games.

This confident commitment to a numerically-based “pursuit of excellence” was shattered when many of the visionaries who penned *Toward 2000* were vilified by the Dubin Inquiry and the media for allegedly interpreting “the pursuit of excellence” too corporately without a sufficiently humanistic understanding of Canada’s Olympic athletes. This brought about absurd accusations from athletes who claimed that the pressure to win from the sport system was so intense that they were compelled to cheat in order to meet corporate expectations. Pathetically, these same athletes did not acknowledge the same expectations of their corporate sponsors who were lavishing unprecedented endorsement deals on winning athletes. We must keep in mind that this was a decade in which “sport marketing” entered Canadian sport discourse. In 1986-87, Sport Canada provided seed money to a small agency known as the Sport Marketing Council. This small organization reflects the extent to which government and sport bureaucrats were willing to admit (often uncritically) new stakeholders into the field of Olympic sport production.<sup>42</sup>

The headiness of *Toward 2000* was quickly eclipsed by the Dubin Inquiry and the subsequent Minister’s Task Force on Federal Sport Policy. This task force generated *Sport: A Way Ahead*.<sup>43</sup> At the time, this revision of the sport system’s intense focus on winning seemed terribly profound. In retrospect, *Sport: A Way Ahead* represented a temporary lapse of confidence. The document made a couple of fleeting references to “the pursuit of excellence” in the context of the values that athletes embody. International results were replaced with the buzz-phrase “athlete-centredness.” The report brought about some profound changes in the structure of the Canadian sport system. Some stakehold-

ers' positions were uprooted. The federal government and its rigid emphasis on quadrennial planning received the harshest criticism. Similarly, arms length organizations like the Sport Medicine and Science Council of Canada were effectively neutralized in the field. New power organizations like the Canadian Centre for Ethics in Sport also emerged. Drove of doping control bureaucrats were welcomed into the field of sport production. This era saw doping control become a sideline industry to Olympic sport: an industry that owed its very existence to different interpretations of "the pursuit of excellence." One might argue effectively that deterrence and punishment became an integral operational logic of the field in the fall-out from the Dubin Inquiry. Overall, it is difficult to assess how effectively the discursive emphasis on "athlete centeredness" translated into real power for athletes in the field of sport production. It is important to note that while the federal government lost some of its cultural capital in the post-Dubin Inquiry years, the Canadian Olympic Association found itself growing increasingly wealthy, as the new era of Olympic capitalism had fully bloomed.

In "the pursuit of excellence," the federal government remained on the sidelines for much of the 1990s. This was not the case for the COA. With greater economic autonomy, winning at the Olympic Games was reasserted as the essence of excellence. Aligning "the pursuit of excellence" with explicit international performance results was no longer a sub-text. With increasing financial autonomy and its entrepreneurial instinct in over-drive, the COA was not encumbered by the humanist ideal of "the pursuit of excellence." Instead, this sport organization saw excellence in vivid corporate terms. It was a question of "being" excellent, rather than seeking excellence.

At the beginning of the new millennium, the federal government cautiously re-introduced "the pursuit of excellence" into its policy rhetoric. Once again, collective self-examination was called upon as the National Summit on Sport was held in Ottawa in the spring 2001. The report from the summit was titled *Toward a Canadian Sport Policy*. "The pursuit of excellence" received considerably more emphasis than it did in *Sport: The Way Ahead*. The report is interesting in many ways. First, the scale of the consultation process was unprecedented.<sup>44</sup> The introduction makes specific references to the stakeholders in Canadian sport: athletes, officials, Aboriginal peoples, national sport organizations (NSOs) and multi-sport organizations (MSOs), and national media representatives.<sup>45</sup> The sport summit was strategically organized around three themes. "Excellence" was subtly sandwiched between "Participation" and "Building Capacity." Leaders in Canadian Sport were charged with composing summaries of these themes. Marion Lay wrote the following on "Excellence."

*Excellence. To stimulate pride in Canadian achievement and to promote Canadian identity at home and abroad, Canada will improve high performance excellence. Stretch targets for international performance will be developed collaboratively to guide and direct the efforts of the entire sport community and programs will promote the development of world-class athletes, coaches and officials in a sport environment characterized by the highest standards of values and ethics.*<sup>46</sup>

Significantly, there is no reference to overall medal counts, international ranking or even winning.

Ultimately, the 2001 sport summit provided the foundation for *The Canadian Sport Policy, 2002*. The tentative commitment to the concept of excellence outlined by Marion Lay in *Toward a Canadian Sport Policy* (2001) was reformed in the eventual policy document with an expression that signifies a clash between bureaucratic rhetoric and ideological "fence-sitting." Evidently, the government was still ambivalent about the locus of "the pursuit of excellence" in Olympic sport. The document refers to "enhanced excellence."<sup>47</sup> What could this possibly mean? Better than excellent? Excellence PLUS! Or, SUPER Excellent! This overly contrived objective of achieving "enhanced excellence" signifies an unresolved commitment to individual athletes, corporate stakeholders and a desire to justify winning

at the highest level in a climate where society at large is hyper sensitive to the corruption and cheating in Olympic sport. “Enhanced excellence” really means ‘pursue winning ferociously, but within the rules of the game’. Fundamentally, this is an admission that “the pursuit of excellence” is no longer a humanistic quality that implies adherence to the highest order of conduct. In other words, excellence in sport only implies winning at the highest level. “Enhanced excellence” means winning at the highest level while adhering to the new institutionalized codes of ethical behaviour. All in all, the 2002 sport policy picked up where *Toward 2000* left off. Performance targets were discussed without reservation, but no quantitative measures were established. The sport policy re-asserted the legitimacy and authority of sub-fields within the field of sport production. Specifically, coaching, sport science, and sport medicine were recognized as essential partners. The sport policy falls short of acknowledging these partners as stakeholders.

By 2005, the federal government was, once again, engaged in “the pursuit of excellence” via medal counts. *Sport Excellence Strategy: Achieving Podium Results at Olympics and Paralympic Games* was published in 2005.<sup>48</sup> It is a position paper on the federal government’s commitment to the other stakeholders who are invested in the 2010 Olympic and Paralympic Games, Vancouver. Significantly, “pursuit” is replaced with the definitive word “achieving.” The report also employs the ideologically redundant concept of “enhanced excellence.” The report offers a definition of excellence.

*Canadian Heritage is committed to making Canada a leading sport nation, where all Canadians and their communities enjoy and celebrate the benefits of active participation and excellence in sport. Sport excellence, as a component of a leading sport nation, is defined as: World class athletic achievements as a product of quality high performance development systems and programs.*<sup>49</sup>

Regardless of the reference to grassroots development, this position paper represents the government’s enthusiastic articulation with a corporate interpretation of “the pursuit of excellence.” It must also be recognized as a reactive re-engagement with this corporate ideology fuelled by the upcoming Olympic Winter Games in Vancouver, 2010.

In 2008, there is nothing ambiguous about the extent to which Canadian athletes are expected to perform in Olympic sport. Politicians and sport bureaucrats have joined forces to “Own the Podium” in 2010. “The pursuit of excellence” is nowhere in the “Own the Podium” texts. “Excellence” does appear in the documentation, but as an end point. How did this extreme clarification of vision for Canadian sport come about? A number of obvious factors can explain how the Canadian sport system is capable of articulating the goal to dominate winter sport. Paramount among these factors is the reversal of financial fortunes in the Canadian sport system. Specifically, the federal government lost its financial domination of the field while the COC and several other NSOs gained financial independence. More importantly, what does this change mean in terms of the social and cultural reality of Canadian athletes? As this genealogy suggests, the respective authority and autonomy of stakeholders (athletes, administrator, organizations, sponsors, media, etc.) is reflected in the ideological shifts and slides evident in the discourse of sport. The final section of this paper examines the dynamics of power relationships in Canadian sport as evident from this genealogy of “the pursuit of excellence.”

### A Theoretical Consideration

This genealogy has revealed that the direction of Canadian Olympic sport has been influenced by the way politicians and sport bureaucrats interpret the success and value of sport performances. From the early 1960s to the present, the achievements of Canadian athletes at the Olympic Games have been evaluated on an oscillating scale of excellence. At one end of the scale is “the pursuit of excellence”

where the outcome is really only assessed by the athletes. From this perspective, “the pursuit of excellence” is valued for the process and the experience gained along the way. The ultimate achievement of winning at the Olympic Games is important, but not the only factor in achieving excellence. At the other end of the scale is simply “excellence” where the outcome is most relevant to a corporate body: the Canadian Olympic Committee, Sport Canada, VISA. From this perspective, “excellence” is measured in the country’s ranking in the overall medal count. Why should we care?

Sport is a field of cultural production. Olympic sport is one sub-field within this larger field. According to French sociologist Pierre Bourdieu:

*...a field is a separate social universe having its own laws of functioning independent of those of politics and the economy. The existence of the (athlete), as fact and as value, is inseparable from the existence of the (Olympic sport) field as an autonomous universe with specific principles of evaluation of practices and works.<sup>50</sup>*

The genealogy of “the pursuit of excellence” exposed the “specific principles of evaluation of practices and works” in the sub-field of Olympic sport. It reveals that “the pursuit of excellence” once provided the dominant “specific principle of evaluation” of Canadian athletes at the Olympic Games. Today, the specific principle of evaluation is the extremely finite goal of “Owning the Podium” in 2010. Based on this change in “specific principles” in the field of sport production, Bourdieu’s sociology encourages us to consider the extent to which the field constitutes athletes (as fact) and the social value of athletes (as value). Presently, the field of Olympic sport constitutes Canadian athletes as generic sport performers whose accomplishments become the property of the corporate stakeholders in the field.

Canadian athletes have been complicit in this outcome. They have allowed other stakeholders in Olympic sport to define the structure of the field. If Olympic athletes possessed legitimate autonomy in their field, they would be far more effective at defining the logic that enables them to produce Olympic sport performances. For example, achievements in modern Olympic sport were traditionally governed by the logic of linear progression (or performance meritocracy); athletes competed and moved through the levels of competition until they could progress no further. For most athletes, linear progression was curtailed at a local, provincial or national level. For a few exceptional athletes, linear progression ended with a competition at the Olympic Games. For even more exceptional athletes, linear progression ended with an Olympic medal. This logic of linear progression also incorporated a code of rights inherent in a Canadian performance meritocracy. In other words, if athletes won at one level of Canadian competition, logically they would have the right to test themselves at the next level of Canadian competition. The field of Olympic sport no longer adheres to this logic. Sport bureaucrats, not Canadian athletes, have dismissed this logic. The best Canadian athletes do not have the right to test themselves at the Olympic Games. Over the past few decades, the IOC, COC and NOCs have introduced qualifying standards based on percentages of world records or international rankings. Winning the Olympic trials is not the determining criteria. Here, the idea of excellence is completely external to the experience of the athletes. It is contingent on numerical abstractions that serve the corporate stakeholders’ interests above those of the athletes.

In extreme situations, Canadian sport organizations have completely corrupted the logic of performance meritocracy. In the early 1980s, the Canadian Figure Skating Association denied the women’s national champion her right to compete at the World championships.<sup>51</sup> They justified their decision with the following convoluted logic. The women’s national champion would never perform at a top international level. A younger, more promising, skater would benefit from the experience and exposure at the world championships. For the betterment of the sport, send the athlete who finished third

rather than the woman who believed that she was competing in a field where the logic of performance meritocracy legitimize athletes “as fact and value.”

The further athletes are removed from enacting (or defining) the logic that constitutes their legitimacy as agents in the field and the legitimacy of their sport performances, the less autonomous the field is from external fields of power and economics.

*The specificity of the (Olympic sport) field is defined by the fact that the more autonomous it is, i.e. the more completely it fulfils its own logic as a field, the more it tends to suspend or reverse the dominant principle of hierarchization; but also that, whatever its degree of independence, it continues to be affected by the laws of the field which encompass it, those of economic and political profit.<sup>52</sup>*

The genealogy of “the pursuit of excellence” provides evidence that the fields of economic and political profit are, indeed, encumbering the field of Olympic sport from fulfilling its own logic. Indeed, the evidence might suggest that the field of sport is not encompassed, but rather consumed, by the field of economic and political profit. So what?

When a field of cultural production is very autonomous, a stronger relationship exists between the producers (in this case Olympic athletes) and the symbolic value of their work. Their degree of authority and cultural capital within the field is directly related to the quality of their production in the field. Bourdieu describes this as preserving “the division between the field of restricted production, in which producers produce for other producers, and the field of large-scale production [*la grande production*], which is *symbolically* discredited....<sup>53</sup> When the division erodes, Olympic sport performances are devalued by a market of consumers that does not have a vested interest (a stake) in the logic of the field. This is significant for Canadian Olympic athletes to consider. As the field of economic and political profit redefines the logic of Olympic sport in Canada, the symbolic power of individual Olympic athletes’ performances is diluted. Individual sport performances no longer matter—those performances that are contextualized in terms of a person (with a life history) who has pursued excellence in life and in sport. Instead, collective performances are what count—specifically 35 medal performances in 2010 to “Own the Podium.” Athletes should consider this situation relative to the commitments they make to the organizations that support them. Many Canadian athletes anticipate the cultural capital they will gain after becoming Olympians, and ideally as Olympic medalists or champions. They look forward to doors being opened for them in future life pursuits. They look forward to selling their inspirational stories to business executives organizing annual retreats. Unfortunately, they need to recognize that the value of their individual cultural capital is increasingly factored into a corporate achievement of excellence.

*Given that (Olympic sport performances) exist as symbolic objects only if they are known and recognized, that is, socially instituted as (Olympic sport performances) and received by spectators capable of knowing and recognizing them as such, the sociology of (Olympic sport) has to take as its object not only the material production but also the symbolic production of the work, i.e. the production of the value of the work or, which amounts to the same thing, of the belief in the value of the work.<sup>54</sup>*

## Conclusion

Over the past 40-50 years, the logic in the field of Canadian sport has shifted dramatically. This reveals a great deal about the number and nature of stakeholders in this field of cultural production. Indeed, many parallels exist between the history of sport and other fields of cultural production: music, drama, theatre, art, architecture, film, television, and radio. In the 1960s and early 1970s, “the

pursuit of excellence" signified the logic of production for Olympic Sport in Canada. In this era "the pursuit of excellence" can be recognized as one of the last iterations of the highly contrived 19<sup>th</sup> century ideal "sport-for-sport-sake." The number of stakeholders in Olympic sport was limited. Athletes, athletes' families, and poorly compensated coaches and officials defined the logic of the field. Government, media and even the COA and the IOC had very little impact on the way Canadians acknowledged and valued Olympic athletes and their performances. "The pursuit of excellence" was an ideal associated with an Olympic athlete's life. Certainly, there were far fewer Olympic champions during this era. But, those who did achieve this level of success at an Olympic games became iconic figures in Canadian sport. Nancy Greene is the best example.

By the mid 1970s, government and media grew more interested in Olympic sport. Their interests were expressed in terms of a commitment to the symbolic power of Canadian athletes' performances in international arena and specifically the Olympic Arena. Domestically, the symbolic power of these performances was valued within the medical-economic discourse on health and welfare as well as a socio-political discourse on national unity and nationhood. This was also period in Canadian history when the logic of Canadian Olympic sport became entwined with the logic of International Olympic sport. Canada hosted the 1976 Olympic Games in Montreal. At the same time, the Canadian Olympic sport as "cultural pastime" began its transition to the Canadian Olympic sport as "industry." Like the emergence of the cultural (arts) industry in the 1960s, the official and centralized bureaucracy of Olympic sport expanded.

Although "the pursuit of excellence" was embraced by sport bureaucrats and integrated into the "official" discourse of Olympic sport, it continued to signify the best qualities of athletes and their athletic lifestyles.

By the end of the 1970s and through the mid 1990s, "the pursuit of excellence" served a rather ambiguous function in the discourse of sport and the logic of the field. This was due to the increased number of stakeholders as well as the types of investments these stakeholders made in the field. All stakeholders including athletes reassessed the symbolic power of Olympic sport performances. "The pursuit of excellence" was certainly valued as a "back story," but the immediate impact of Olympic victory generated greater symbolic power and was more easily exchanged for economic and political capital by the new corporate interests. "The pursuit of international prestige" was eclipsing "the pursuit of excellence" until the entire field of Olympic sport was forced to reassess its logic of operation through the lens of the Dubin Inquiry. The idea of "athlete-centredness" emerged as a central organizing concept in the discourse of sport and the operational logic of the field. This was only temporary. By the late 1990s, stakeholders other than athletes began to reassert themselves in the field of Olympic sport. The COC and the Canadian Centre for Doping in Sport were likely the two most dominant corporate interests. Ultimately, at the end of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, corporate interests usurped "the pursuit of excellence." The collective achievements of athletes at Olympic Games became the dominate measure of excellence in Canadian sport.

In the 21<sup>st</sup> century, "the pursuit of excellence" serves a minor function in the field of Olympic sport in Canada. At the surface, this is evident from the organizational rhetoric that describes the current state of affairs. With the 2010 Olympic Winter Games in Vancouver, Canadians have gained a new clarity of vision. The value of Olympic sport is winning. In the official discourse, "Owning the Podium" in Vancouver seems to be synonymous with the ideal of "enhanced excellence." Everything about the present logic in Canadian Olympic sport is extraordinarily finite. Even the pursuit of "enhanced excellence" will culminate definitively when team Canada has won more medals than any other country. If this goal is accomplished, stakeholders in Canadian Olympic sport will be playing

defense for the Olympiads following 2010. It will be interesting to see how the new ideal of “enhance excellence” will endure as a formative logic in the field of Olympic sport in Canada. It will also be interesting to see how stakeholders sustain their relative position in the field of sport production once the 2010 Games are past.

## Endnotes

- 1 “Foucault used the French word *connaissance* to stand for such items of surface knowledge, while *savoir* meant more than science; it was a frame, postulated by Foucault, within which surface hypotheses got their sense.” Ian Hacking, “The Archeology of Foucault,” *Foucault: A Critical Reader* (David Couzens Hoy, Editor) (Cambridge, MA: Basil Blackwood, 1992), 30.
- 2 See Michel Foucault, *The Archeology of Knowledge* (London and New York: Routledge, 1994). For an easier read, alternatively see Hubert L. Dreyfus and Paul Rabinow, *Michel Foucault: Beyond Structuralism and Hermeneutics* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1982).
- 3 Here, truth is not an essentialist concept. In this context truth signifies a general knowledge (a *connaissance*) of human activity. For example, the convergence of texts from all different genres of writing, speaking and performing provides a common sense of what sport is and what value is. It is not a stable knowledge. Nor is it an uncontested knowledge. It is simply a starting point.
- 4 Here, the use of “stakeholder” is significant from a theoretical perspective. This paper is informed by several post-structuralist social theorists including Pierre Bourdieu, Michel de Certeau and Michel Foucault. I find these three theorists compliment one another. In particular, I like the way Bourdieu’s work provides a sociological vocabulary to the more abstract, phenomenological, concepts of Foucault. In this instance, “stakeholder” derives from Bourdieu, but translates to Foucault’s idea of legitimate and authorized producers of institutional discourse. Therefore, this paper recognizes sport organizations and government, journalists, and athletes as legitimate and authorized voices in Canadian sport.
- 5 “Genealogy does not try to erect shining epistemological foundations. As any reader of Foucault learns, it shows rather that the origin of what we take to be rational, the bearer of truth, is rooted in domination, subjugation, the relationship of forces—in a word power.” Arnold I. Davidson, “Archeology, Genealogy, Ethics,” *Foucault: A Critical Reader* (David Couzens Hoy, Editor) (Cambridge: Basil Blackwood, 1992), 225.
- 6 *Ibid.*, 226. Here, Arnold I. Davidson is paraphrasing Foucault from “Two lectures,” in *Power/Knowledge* (New York: Pantheon, 1980), 97 and 99.
- 7 The central unifying concept is associated most commonly with Foucault’s archeological method of historical knowledge that preceded the era in which he employed his genealogical approach. However, we must recognize that Foucault did not replace archeology with genealogy. He saw the latter methodology as an extension of archeology.
- 8 Theoretically, “the pursuit of excellence” can be situated in Foucault’s field of presence. This is a category of discursive concepts “by which (is) understood all statements are formulated elsewhere and taken up in a discourse, acknowledged to be truthful, involving exact description, well-founded reasoning, or necessary presupposition.” Michel Foucault, *The Archeology of Knowledge* (translated from French by A. M. Sheridan Smith) (London and New York: Routledge, 1994), 57.
- 9 Arnold I. Davidson, “Archeology, Genealogy, Ethics,” 226. Parentheses and content is my inclusion.
- 10 *Ibid.*, 227.
- 11 Darrell Dobbs, “Plato’s Paragon of Human excellence: Socratic Philosopher and Civic Guardian,” *The Journal of Politics* 65, no. 4 (November 2003), 1062-1082.
- 12 Rubin Gotesky, “The Pursuit of Excellence,” *Educational Theory*, Volume 20, Number 4 (Fall 1970), 406-16.
- 13 Darrell Dobbs, “Plato’s Paragon of Human excellence.”
- 14 Charles Murray, *The Pursuit of Excellence in Arts and Sciences, 800 B.C. to 1950*, (New York, New York: Harper-Collins Publishers, 2003).
- 15 Rockefeller Brothers Fund, “The pursuit of excellence; education and the future of America,” *Panel Report 5 of the Special Studies Project*.
- 16 Sheena Roberts, “Encouragement, Effort, Expectation and Entitlement in the Pursuit of Excellence,” *Canadian Music Educators Online*.

- 17 Tata, J.R. "In Pursuit of Excellence: A History of the Indian Institute of Science," *Nature*, 362, no. 6418 (March 25, 1993), 304(1).
- 18 Joye Mercer, "Expensive ambitions; economist says pursuit of excellence has increased college spending and tuition," *The Chronicle of Higher Education* 42, no. 33 (April 26, 1996).
- 19 "You can climb higher: the Christian's pursuit of excellence," *Library Journal*, 110 (March 15, 1985), 65(1).
- 20 Eliot A. Cohen, "In Pursuit of Military Excellence: The Evolution of Operational Theory," *Foreign Affairs* 77, no. 2 (March-April 1998), 148(2).
- 21 Rubin Gotesky, "The Pursuit of Excellence," *Educational Theory*, 20, 4, 406-16, (Fall 1970), 416. Gotesky offers a phenomenological critique of "the pursuit of excellence." Although his theory is interesting, it does not factor significantly into this particular paper. However, it is Gotesky's socially conscious skepticism of this expression explained in the quote above that reflects my interest in this research paper.
- 22 Terry Orlick, *In Pursuit of Excellence* (Ottawa: Coaching Association of Canada and Terry Orlick, 1980).
- 23 Terry Orlick, *In Pursuit of Excellence: How to Win in Sport and Life Through Mental Training*, (Champaign Illinois: Human Kinetics, 2007).
- 24 Iona Campagnolo (Minister of State), *Partners in Pursuit of Excellence: A National Policy on Amateur Sport*, (Ottawa: Fitness and Amateur Sport, Government of Canada, 1979).
- 25 Donald Macintosh, Tom Bedecki and C.E.S. Franks, *Sport and Politics in Canada: Federal Government Involvement since 1961* (Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1987), 57.
- 26 *Ibid.*, 65.
- 27 John Munro, *Proposed Sports Policy for Canadians* (Ottawa: Department of Health and Welfare, 1970).
- 28 Ryan Edwardson, *Canadian Content: Culture and the Quest for Nationhood*, (Toronto, Buffalo, London: The University of Toronto Press, 2008). Unfortunately, Edwardson does not consider sport within the paradigm of cultural industrialism and therefore does not incorporate its evolution into his important history of Canadian cultural production.
- 29 Donald Macintosh, Tom Bedecki and C.E.S. Franks, *Sport and Politics in Canada: Federal Government Involvement since 1961* (Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1987), 77-107.
- 30 J. M. Bumsted, *The Peoples of Canada: A Post-Confederation History*, (Toronto: Oxford University Press, 1992), 385. Bumsted does not elaborate on this rather odd intervention.
- 31 Donald Macintosh, Tom Bedecki and C.E.S. Franks, *Sport and Politics in Canada: Federal Government Involvement since 1961* (Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1987), 11.
- 32 Today, Sport Canada falls under the federal jurisdiction of the Ministry of Heritage Canada. "Sport Canada works to help Canadians participate and excel in sport. As part of the Department of Canadian Heritage, Sport Canada strengthens the unique contribution that sport makes to Canadian identity, culture and society." Sport Canada, Website. Accessed from the WWW 10 June 2008. [http://www.pch.gc.ca/progs/sc/index\\_e.cfm](http://www.pch.gc.ca/progs/sc/index_e.cfm)
- 33 See both Bumsted and Edwardson cited above.
- 34 Ken Lum, "Canadian cultural policy: a problem of metaphysics," *Canadian Art*, Volume 16, Number 3, (Fall 1999), 76.
- 35 For a theoretical explanation of "festival" as a genre of cultural performance, see John J. MacAloon, "Olympic Games and the Theory of Spectacle in Modern Societies," *Rite, drama, festival, spectacle: rehearsals toward a theory of cultural performance* (Philadelphia: Institute for the Study of Human Issues, 1984), 241-280.
- 36 *Partners in Pursuit of Excellence*, 1979, 11.
- 37 *Ibid.*, 11-12.
- 38 *Fitness and Amateur Sport Annual Report, 1982-83* (Ottawa: Minister of Supply and Services, 1983), 16.
- 39 *Toward 2000: Building Canada's Sport System, The Report of the Task Force on National Sport Policy* (Ottawa: Government of Canada, August 1988), 11.
- 40 *Ibid.*, 11.
- 41 *Ibid.*, 36. "To have Canada place among the three leading Western sporting nations (with West Germany and the USA) and to rank among the top 6-8 nations overall (assuming that the USSR, GDR, China, Romania and Poland are the leading Eastern block nations) in the 1992 Summer Olympic Games in Barcelona. To place among the top 6 nations in the 1992 Winter Olympic Games in Albertville. To have Canadian athletes win medals in 18-28 summer Olympic sports and 6-10 winter Olympic sport in 1992."
- 42 Sport Canada's Annual Report from 1986-87 explained the creation of the Sport Marketing Council. "Stressing the importance of establishing and maintaining mutually beneficial relationship with the private sector, Fitness and Amateur Sport supports a variety of activities in the following general categories: Marketing Preparation, Marketing Implementa-

- tion, Customer Support." *Fitness and Amateur Sport Annual Report, 1986-87* (Ottawa: Ministry of Supply and Services, 1987) ,25.
- 43 *Sport: The Way Ahead: Minister's Task Force on Federal Sport Policy* (Ottawa: Minister of State for Fitness and Amateur Sport, May 1992).
- 44 *Toward a Canadian Sport Policy: Building Canada Through Sport* (Ottawa: Minister of Public Works and Government Services Canada, 2001) ,1.  
*"The consultation process, unique in the history of sport in Canada, aimed to propose solutions to improve the Canadian sport system and to provide input to the development of a Canadian Sport Policy on Sport. It consisted of six regional sport conferences across Canada, of which five were held with the collaboration of provincial and territorial Governments... This consultation process also led to the National Summit on Sport in Ottawa, on April 27 and 28, 2001."*
- 45 Ibid.
- 46 Ibid., 21.
- 47 *The Canadian Sport Policy*, 24 May 2002.
- 48 *Sporting Excellence Strategy: Achieving Podium Results at Olympics and Paralympic Games* (Ottawa: Government of Canada, August 2005).
- 49 Ibid.
- 50 Pierre Bourdieu, *The Field of Cultural Production: Essays on Art and Literature* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1993) , 162-63. In this quote I have substituted "writer" for athlete and "literary" for Olympic sport. This is indicated by the parentheses.
- 51 "When top brass at the Canadian Figure Skating Association opted to send Wainman to the 1980 Worlds, it was a highly controversial decision; the national champion, 21-year-old Heather Kemkaran, who had expected to go, was so upset that she retired. The decision was viewed as a symbolic statement by the CFSA's incoming president, David Dore, who was trying to shake up the skating establishment. As far as Dore was concerned, the name of the game was medals. He had no qualms about showing off Wainman: 'We're going to stage manage her entrance,' he told *The Globe and Mail*. 'She will arrive later than the rest of the team and we have arranged for the West German press to meet her at the airport... She will leave the judges talking.'" "From "Ice Storm," *Toronto Life* April 2006. Accessed on the WWW 12 June 2008. <http://www.torontolife.com/features/ice-storm/?pageno=1>
- 52 Bourdieu, *Field of Cultural Production*, 38-9. I have substituted "literary and artistic field" with sport field. The parentheses are mine.
- 53 Ibid., 39.
- 54 Ibid., 37.

