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Abstract

The more enjoyable and fascinating the Olympic ceremonies, the more positive the impression and appreciation of the host nation gained by audiences worldwide. For this reason, the creators of Olympic ceremonies have gradually paid more attention to the host nation of each Olympic Games. It seems to have become the practice for each successive Olympic host to attempt to produce a greater spectacle in order to compete with past Olympic ceremonies. On occasion, this could lead to internal friction, as was the case with the 2004 Olympics, when there was a disagreement over creative ideas for the production of the Olympic Ceremony between Dimitris Papaioannou, the ceremony director, and the International Olympic Committee (IOC). This case describes Papaioannou’s attempt to present the Olympic ceremony in an unconventional way and the reactions thereto on the part of the IOC.
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ผมถูก คุณที่
แนวคิดเพื่อการผลิตพิธีเปิดโอลิมปิกเกมส์ปี ค.ศ. 2004
ณ เมืองแอธเนส ประเทศกรีซ

วีเชียร์ ลิคทิพงศ์พันธ์

บทความย่อ

ความประทับใจ และความพิเศษของของผู้ชมทั่วโลกต่อความบันเทิงและความทรงจำทาง
ของพิธีเปิดโอลิมปิกเกมส์ สามารถสร้างภาพหลักฐานทางบางให้กับเมืองและประเทศเจ้าภาพของ
การแข่งขันกีฬาที่ได้เป็นอย่างยิ่ง ด้วยเหตุผลนี้ทำให้เมืองเจ้าภาพของแต่ละประเทศเห็นใจและ
ให้ความสำคัญกับการผลิตและสร้างสรรค์พิธีเปิดที่มีความแปลกใหม่และแตกต่างจากที่เคยมีมา
ซึ่งความคาดหวังนี้สามารถที่จะนำไปสู่ความมั่นคง ซึ่งเห็นได้จากการมีตัวอย่างในกระบวนการ
สร้างสรรค์เพื่อทันท่วงทัณฑ์การนำเสนอพิธีเปิดโอลิมปิกเกมส์ปี ค.ศ. 2004 ณ เมืองแอธเนส
ประเทศกรีซ ระหว่าง คุณ วีเชียร์ ลิคทิพงศ์พันธ์ ผู้อำนวยการผลิตพิธีเปิด ซึ่งชื่อว่า ที่เปิดนี้ควร
นำเสนอ หรือ เดินทางถึงผู้ชมของพิธีเปิดที่จะร่วมในอีตจ แต่ความคิดที่แตกต่างนี้กลับถูกท้าทาย
โดยจะผู้บริหารโอลิมปิกเกมส์นานาชาติ (IOC)

คำสำคัญ: โอลิมปิกเกมส์ แอธเนส 2004 พิธีเปิดการแข่งขันโอลิมปิก ความคิดสร้างสรรค์
การถ่ายทอดงานพิธีเปิด

* การนี้คือเรื่องเกี่ยวกับโดย ดร. วิเชียร์ ลิคทิพงศ์พันธ์ อาจารย์ประจำคณะแพทยศาสตร์และวิทยาการจัดการ สถาบันยุทธศาสตร์-
พัฒนาวิทยาศาสตร์ (อิสก) ซึ่งได้เข้าร่วมขึ้นมาจากงานวิจัยที่ร่วมมือของผู้เขียนของ โดยมีเป้าประสงค์เพื่อใช้ในการเรียน
การสอนและการถ่ายทอดในเรื่องนี้เอง ไม่ได้ถูกจัดสรรเพื่อใช้เป็นแหล่งอ้างอิงหรือนำไปปรับของประสิทธิภาพการบริหาร
การจัดการใด ๆ การนี้คือเรื่องเกี่ยวกับของอาจารย์ประจำคณะแพทยศาสตร์และวิทยาการจัดการ สถาบันยุทธศาสตร์-
พัฒนาวิทยาศาสตร์และ ดร. วิเชียร์ ลิคทิพงศ์พันธ์ ผู้สนใจสามารถติดต่อเพื่อ
ขออนุญาตการใช้งานได้ที่โทรศัพท์ 02-727-3752 หรืออีเมล์ที่เว็บไซต์ http://www.nida.ac.th หรืออีเมล์ arc.hong@gmail.com
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The International Olympic Committee

The International Olympic Committee (IOC) – a non-profit organization situated in Lausanne, Switzerland – played an important role in the modern era of the Olympic Movement initiated by the father of the Modern Olympic Games, Baron Pierre de Coubertin. The Olympic Games were overseen by the IOC Executive Board that had overall responsibility for the administration and the management of the Committee’s affairs in promoting the Olympic Movement throughout the world. It consisted of the President (Jacques Rogge at the time), four Vice-Presidents (Ser Miang Ng, Thomas Bach, Nawal El Moutawakel, and Craig Reedie and ten other members (IOC, 2011).1

As stated in the Olympic Charter (IOC, 2011, pp. 42-43), all members of the Executive Board were elected by the Session, by secret ballot, majority vote for a four-year term. However, each elected Executive Board member could stand for reelection and serve an additional four-year term once the initial four years of service had been completed. Although not an explicit policy requirement of the Olympic Charter, traditionally each continent had at least one denizen on the Executive Committee.

As the senior-level management arm of the International Olympic Committee, the Executive Committee, was empowered to make and implement major organizational decisions and to perform a number of more routine organizational duties. Concerning its authority to make and implement major organizational decisions, the Executive Committee was generally empowered to “exercise all powers and performs all duties not attributed by law or by the Olympic Charter to the Session or to the President.”2 These included the following:

- Submit to the Session the names of the persons whom it recommends for election to the IOC;
- Upon the proposal of the President, appoints – or dismiss – the Director General. (The President decided on his/her compensation and was authorized to take sanctions);
- Establish and supervise the procedure for accepting and selecting candidatures to organize the Olympic Games;
- Take all decisions, and issue regulations of the IOC, which are legally binding, in the form it deems most appropriate, such as, for instance, codes, rulings, norms, guidelines,
guides, manuals, instructions, requirements and other decisions, including, in particular, but not limited to, all regulations necessary to ensure the proper implementation of the Olympic Charter and the organization of the Olympic Games;

- Organize periodic meetings with the IFs [the International Federations who are in charge of administrative works related to various sports at world level and national level.] and with the NOCs [National Olympic Organizing Committee who are responsible for any affairs related to the Olympic Movement in their respective countries.] at least once every two years. (Such meetings were chaired by the IOC President, who determined the procedure and the agenda after consultation with the relevant bodies.)

With respect to performing those more routine, but nonetheless important, duties and functions essential for the conduct of the organization’s affairs, the Executive Committee was obliged to:

- Monitor the observance of the Olympic Charter;
- Approve all internal governance regulations relating to its organization;
- Establish an annual report, including annual accounts, which it submits to the Session, together with the auditors’ report;
- Submit a report to the Session on any proposed change of Rule or Bye-law;
- Establish the agenda for the Sessions;
- Provide for the safe keeping of all minutes, accounts and other records of the IOC in compliance with the law, including minutes of all Sessions, IOC Executive Board and other commission or working group meetings;
- Create and confer the honorary distinctions of the IOC.
The Philosophy, Nature, and Purpose of the Olympic Opening Ceremony

As acknowledged by the International Olympic Committee (IOC), the ceremonial aspects of the Olympic Games had come to take on enormous importance in the modern era of the Games. As stated in an IOC document,

\[\text{The ceremonial aspects of the Olympic Games have served to set them apart from other international sports competitions. The protocol and splendor of the Olympic ceremonies, which go hand-in-hand with the celebration of the Games as everyone knows them today, make this event a unique and unforgettable festival.} \]

(IOC, 2008, p. 1)

In the era of the modern Olympic Games, the Olympic Games Opening and Closing Ceremonies (OGOCC) had been fashioned to promote the ideology of the modern Games, which concerned “peace or harmony” in relation to the mind, body and spirit of individuals, and also to showcase the host nation’s achievements in cultural, social and economic matters, displaying its achievements with a sense of national pride to audiences worldwide. These two purposes were often realized in the OGOCC, which were highly regarded as meaningful rituals in the modern Olympic Games:

\[\text{If sport means more than simply pleasure for the active participant, as the Olympic idea claims that it should, then it is only possible in the context of “mise en scene” [the staging of events]. Connecting the motion of the body with aesthetic and mythical patterns can transform a sport spectacle into a meaningful event.} \]

(Alkemeyer & Richartz, 1993, p. 80)

Theatrical performance provided a platform for the generation of the opening and closing ceremonies. Lighting, sound, stages, special effects and performers (to name but a few) all formed a part of the system that generated these aesthetic presentations. Thus, in addition to the Olympic rituals dominated by protocols in the Olympic charter, aesthetics enriched and added significant value to the OGOCC. To ensure this enrichment and
enhanced value, rule number 38 in the Olympic Charter explicitly set forth the fundamental requirement concerning the opening and closing ceremonies. To wit:

_The opening and closing ceremonies shall be held in strict compliance with the IOC protocol guide. The contents and details of all scenarios, schedules and programs of all ceremonies must be submitted to the IOC for its prior approval._ (IOC, 2007)

The main protocol elements of the opening ceremony consisted of the parade of the participants, the speech by the head of state, the speech by the IOC President, the playing of the national anthem of the host country, the raising of the Olympic flags, and the playing of the Olympic anthem. These initial ceremonial events were then followed by the parade of athletes; the declaration to open the Games by the head of the Organizing Committee of the Olympic Games; the symbolic release of pigeons; the oath taking by a competitor, an official and a coach; the last stage of the Olympic torch relay and the lighting of the Olympic cauldron; and the artistic program (IOC, 2008). Besides the set of rituals, the artistic segment that followed the opening rituals had been used by each Olympiad's host nation as a communication tool to promote its nation. Thus, the OGOCC could be considered an aesthetic framework, which artfully combined symbols, rituals and ceremonies to convey its chosen message (Loland, 1994). The employment of such aesthetic considerations was an attempt to allow people of all races to connect easily to the opening and closing ceremonies.

Art and entertainment practitioners were the main contributors to the creation of Olympic ceremonies (dubbed “infotainment”), which thus provided ample opportunities for local and international talent such as musicians, dancers, actors and artists to collaborate and show off their best work to an international audience. This phenomenon enriched Olympic ceremonies and turned them into a sophisticated entertainment medium through which audiences worldwide could be simultaneously informed and entertained instead of being subjected to only a boring welcome or farewell by members of the Olympic Games officialdom. This had made Olympic ceremonies a major and potentially highly lucrative attraction on international television networks worldwide, thus prompting very substantial financial commitments as these networks bid for the
rights to broadcast these ceremonies live.

Moreover, this practice had created an intersection among the worlds of sport events, the entertainment industry, and commerce through the Olympic ceremonies. In one symbiotic undertaking, the ceremonies accomplished the promotion of sports and its ideology and demonstrated culture, creativity, and the image of nations through the theatrical performance, while also generating considerable profits through commerce and sponsorship opportunities. Therefore, worldwide audiences had become greatly attentive to these key event phenomena. According to a study of cumulative TV-viewers of Olympic Summer Games from 1996 to 2012, the numbers of TV-viewer had been significantly increasing. Specifically, the Olympic Summer Games 2004 in Athens were watched by a total TV-audience of 3.9 billion, as can be seen in the table below:

![Bar chart showing cumulative TV-viewership of Olympic Summer Games from 1996 to 2012.](chart.png)

*Source: Olympic Summer Games: Total TV-viewership Worldwide up to 2012 (in Billions) (IOC, 2012 as cited in Statista, 2013)*

As a result, Olympic ceremonies had been transformed from being a mere spectator show to global “media events” that drew immense international attention.

*Mega events such as World Fairs and Expositions, the World Cup Soccer final, or the Olympic Games, are events which are expressly targeted at the international tourism market and may be suitably described as “mega” by virtue*
of their size in terms of attendance, target market, level of public financial involvement, political effects, extent of television coverage, construction of facilities, and impact on economic and social fabric of the host community. (Hall, 1992, as cited in McDonnell, Allen, & O'Toole, 1999, p. 11)

Olympic ceremonies could be seen as a cultural product with a number of dimensions including the social, economic and touristic. One such dimension was its potential to make a significant contribution to the host nation’s economy. For example, one of the anticipated economic results of hosting the Olympic Games was the maximizing of tourism and investments, with the host nation often using the OGOCC to communicate its attractions to tourists and investors both domestically and internationally. Moreover, host nations realized the potential of Olympic ceremonies for polishing their national image through the international media in order to promote economic growth. For example, China, the host of the Beijing 2008 Olympics, spent over US $110 million on the artistic spectacle that was the opening ceremony devised by the internationally renowned Chinese filmmaker, Zhang Yimou. This made it the most eye-catching of all the Beijing Olympic events, with Zhang’s artistic dream making a crucial contribution to the opening ceremony. Thus, sharpened by artistic creativity, the OGOCC had become some of the most prestigious live entertainment productions ever devised.

A New and Different Philosophical Approach

Unbeknownst to the IOC at the time that the decision was taken to bring Dimitris Papaioannou aboard as the ceremony director, by his friend, Gianna Angelopoulos-Daskalaki who was the president of the National Olympic Organizing Committee, Papaioannou would come forth with a new perspective on the production of the opening ceremony. His perspective would prove to be so unconventional that it precipitated a major disagreement between him and the IOC.³

Dancing and painting had been the starting points of Papaioannou’s artistic career. He was a renowned Greek artist in the theatrical arena. “Medea One”, “Medea Two”, and “2” were acclaimed as his prestigious signatures in visual silence theatre domestically and internationally. Therefore, the creative direction of the 2004 Athens Olympic Ceremony was
highly regarded by Time Magazine and The Times of London (Papaioannou, 2008).

*Dimitris Papaioannou . . . combines good taste with humbleness, and his reflections on life are devoid of inanity . . . he grasped the overarching spirit of uninterrupted Greek history, honoring the deeply rooted structure of Greek thought, . . . the great honor I feel to be a compatriot of this artist, who announced to all the world that Greece not only was. Greece is.* (Georgoussopoulos, 2004)

Recalling how he had gone about devising his new perspective on the opening ceremony, Papaioannou stated that his creative process began with three research questions: “Can something really interesting happen within the frame of the large scale show?”; “What was the best possible way to create a ritual that allowed people to dream through knowing of the portrait of the civilization?”; and, “Can I make a ritual that can be liberating for people’s souls?” Underlying these research questions was his conviction that Greek civilization had been important for the western world and indeed had strongly influenced ways of life globally. He wanted to stage an opening ceremony that would tap into that reality but without it veering into kitsch and without it being pedantic.

His intensive study of previous Olympic Games ceremonies revealed some key insights into what had been done and “in what interesting ways.” More specifically, he discovered that past Olympic ceremony productions had gravitated around two major issues. First was the fact that the Olympic ceremony was intended to be a celebration of humankind – a celebration meant to connect to worldwide audiences and vice versa. Second was a trend in which host nations had been attempting to produce Olympic ceremonies in the ways that he viewed as not reflecting well the host nation’s identities and cultures. He stated that:

*They]... tried to entertain in the global sense, like China tried American songs, . . . , [while] America tried to be ancient Greece. All these I found it did not work at all. It was very funny. The only thing that was really interesting for me was anything that was
uniquely local and presented as [in] international way.

Instead of those attempts by American and Chinese hosts, Papaioannou suggested that the best way to convey Olympic ceremonies that could reflect host nations’ identities was to tell the story through arts. In other words, an artistic perspective was an important element that could facilitate entertainment and make the Olympic ceremonies more pleasurable. His research into the ethos of past Olympic ceremonies had led him to the conviction that the most memorable Olympic ceremonies were best communicated through arts. This, he implied, would be a form of indirect communication. “You don’t have to show the product in a good ad,” he pointed out.

Despite his conviction, winning acceptance by the IOC had not been easy. He ended up having to propose his ideas several times to the IOC before they gained approval. His initial idea for the entire artistic portion – a breakthrough Olympic ceremony tradition – was to have only one or two performers in cooperation with music instruments and special effects such as lighting and pyro technique at the stadium field for the duration of 15 to 20 minute performances. He stressed that:

If I was [the IOC] I would definitely try to find a [new] way to create enormous impact with much less waste of money. It could be a composition of a wonderful music piece, it could be a great dance, it could be a great visual show. And you don’t have to spend so much money. It is not necessary.

Among the IOC’s objections was their view that Papaioannou’s proposed opening ceremony was neither “comprehensible” nor “pleasurable.” The IOC’s critique of the proposal yielded the conclusion that it was so amorphous or ethereal that nobody would really be able to tell what the story was about. Further, they believed that the absence of dance and music in the proposed ceremony rendered Papaioannou’s ideas insufficiently “entertaining” (see Exhibit in the Appendix). Papaioannou understood their reaction because in proposing something that represented a significant departure from the traditional opening ceremony, he was in essence asking them to approve “an excursion into uncharted waters,” something “completely different [from] what they [were] used to.” He thus faced the very difficult
challenge of attempting to persuade the IOC to buy the proposed idea. Regarding this circumstance, he suggested that: “You have to know how to believe what you are doing and transmit your [belief] to others. So, you must unite people under a common faith. You have to be [enduring], inspiring, and demanding.”

Regarding the specific areas of criticism from the IOC, he asserted that:

> My belief was that it was dancing in a way. I wanted people to walk on and circulate, all the while being totally serious, allegiant and beautiful. My conception was that the core movements of the ceremonies would be running, walking, and standing. These were to be the only elements of human movement.

Explaining another key element of the ceremony, he averred that “we don’t need . . . stars and celebrities. We just want the history. . . . Ancient Greek history is about beauty. We wanted to be humble and simple, young kids, boys and girls.”

To overcome the IOC’s objections and win their approval of his plans for the opening ceremony, Papaioannou felt that he had to be aggressive and humble at the same time. He explained that judgments from the key stakeholders – especially the IOC, the Olympic Organizing Committee, and the production team – were crucial because they could influence and affect the idea for the production of the ceremony. Therefore, he had to know when he had to be aggressive and when he had to be humble to people in order to get what he wanted. With this precaution having now been taken, Papaioannou had proceeded to forge ahead in the determination to produce the Olympic ceremony in the way he preferred. He explained:

> I had to just trust my instinct. . . . Everybody was saying “there were not enough dances, there was not enough music, it is slow, nothing is happening, and nobody will [understand] the story.” I had to trust my instinct that [those assertions were] not true. It was [simply that] we are afraid to change the style of a large scale show . . . [E]verybody [was] afraid to change . . .
and wanted] to feel safe – which [unfortunately] is one of the great “solutions” in life.

He insisted, he would never allow any intervention in the process of idea generation for the Olympic ceremony – not by politicians, the Olympic Organizing Committee, or non-artists. He therefore took great care in searching for the right people – such as artists and producers – to include on his idea generation team for the production process.

Moreover, to Papaioannou, the ceremony was ideally presented as a single narrative without TV commercial breaks. “I wanted to create [a] show that [was] coherent, condensed and strong.” However, Olympic ceremonies were traditionally telecast in conjunction with TV commercials and there was to be no exception for the 2004 Athens opening ceremony. Upon being informed of this, Papaioannou’s response was:

I don’t care about the ad let them cut whenever they want. I had never negotiated with that. I discussed . . . it and told them “decide what you wanna cut.” I think this is their problem . . . I cannot unhook the continuing of the show and bring down the energy of the live audience or the people who were watching the show without TV commercials. There were many countries watching the show without the TV commercials. Not everywhere. In America, no I did not do [what] they asked me to do, so, they broke [up] the very important part [of the ceremony] with] TV commercials.

In respect to the bureaucracy, he explained that he was responsible for the production of the 2004 Athens Olympic Ceremony, with Jack Morton Public Events, the hired event organizer, working under his role. They were selected from among the bids for the production, the idea having been to bring on board the artist, followed by the firm that would produce the ceremony. When asked whether the normal sequence was production company first, followed by the artist, Papaioannou responded in the affirmative, but explained that Greece was a somewhat “unique case” and that the contract had been signed that way. He asserted further that he and the event organizer signed the contract with the Organizing Committee and that their contracts stipulated that Papaioannou was to be
Elaboration on Papaioannou’s Vision for the 2004 Opening Ceremony

Papaioannou’s vision for the opening ceremony was propelled by the desire to generate excitement in worldwide audiences. He acknowledged, however, that the interpretation of the show could possibly be varied depending upon values, cultures, domains of knowledge, and experience of any specific demography around the globe. Continuing, he said the ceremony was intentionally designed as visual communication, thus he hoped it could reflect the key messages of the Olympic ideology, as well as inform the identity of the host nation, Greece, to worldwide audiences.

He explained that he was attempting to unlock the mystery of his creativity and bring it to life at the Olympic stadium. He sought to creatively utilize symbols as a key element that could elaborate emotion and thoughts in a very sophisticated way. Significantly, he envisioned the 2004 Athens ceremony as being in the domain of high art. Condensed, superior, and unconventional were the elements of the ceremony. He explained that:

*I was trying to create a big scale show with a minimum sense . . . [through which I] . . . fill the stadium with the water. [I would] . . . bring out six floors high Cycladic head from the center of the stadium and break it into a few pieces . . . [I intentionally floated them in the air] in different directions.*

Papaioannou stated the specifics of his ideas for a very non-traditional kind of opening ceremony “I wanted it to be short. I wanted to have a very strong and a very impressive show”. He noted the most expensive part of the show was the 6 minutes of presentation in which he lifted the massive Cycladic head from the underneath the stadium field and up in the air. Then, he broke it into a several pieces. This segment was apart from the 16-minute artistic portion of the ceremony.
Further, he emphasized that he tried to make it as short as possible. When asked whether he thought a shorter ceremony was better than a longer one, Papaioannou replied in the affirmative, giving his reasoning in the process.

*The occasion is the only peaceful gathering of young, beautiful and strong representatives from all over the world. . . . The fact is all these people come into one place. . . . That is human history . . ., every four years of the Olympic Games this, is the most important. . . . So, I have to keep in mind that the artistic part is not the most important [aspect] of this ceremony.*

Additionally, he emphasized that the live audience was very much part of the show, as it helped to amplify the show. Therefore, he had to ensure that the show could get and retain the live audience’s attention from the beginning until the end. “Create a volume of energy,” he continued, “and submit it to the television”. He drew attention to those sequences involving a single actor in the massive stadium field – for instance, a lonely boy traveling on a paper boat, one drummer performing on the surface of the water, and one elegant woman walking. He stressed that this was the technique he employed to draw the audience’s attention. Therefore, these were multiplied by the live audience.

If the audience were enthusiastic, then it would create a big wave of the energy that can be transmitted to worldwide home audiences, thus multiplying its impact exponentially. Papaioannou was confident that the show would be magnified, but that it had to first energize and excite the live audience at the stadium. It was they who could amplify the show. He acknowledged, however, that live audiences could be “unpredictable” and had to be “won” first. Once won, they would take the show and elevate it because, as Papaioannou noted, “the ultimate goal is the TV unfortunately”.

Notably, he realized that it would be wise to have a second plan, a sort of contingency plan, in case the first idea did not work out. Having already had to eliminate several ideas during the three-year preparation process because of budgetary constraints, he did not want to be left without an alternative opening ceremony scenario in the event that his preferred option could not go forward.
Stick to His Plans for the Ceremony?

Turning his attention to what the future might hold for Olympic ceremony production, he had made a recommendation to the IOC that future opening ceremonies aim for simplicity and elegance. He explained:

*The opening ceremony has to be cheaper. It has to bring down the scale. I think [the traditional approach] is useless. I think it should concentrate more on a simple elegant ceremonial style and forget those [extravaganza-type] shows. But of course, . . . for a decade or two, . . . it [will likely] be a show case of technology. . . . That’s a mistake that people [make] according to my tastes. They create an average scene for average people . . . They bring it down to everybody’s tastes, instead of trying to phenotype [the] audience [to] come [up] to the higher point. This what I don’t like about [the traditional approach to doing] this show.*

To ensure public safety, Papaioannou did favor a large expenditure of resources, given that a repeat of anything remotely similar to what occurred at the 1972 Berlin Olympics had to be avoided at all costs. But, for the show per se, he saw no reason to spend massive sums on money to produce extravaganzas. Further, he averred that if someone or a country were to do something very cheap that had a great impact, it would change the IOC committee’s mind. He expected to see his recommendation adopted at some point in the future, as there had been a glimmer of what was possible at the 1992 Barcelona Olympics.

*Look guys, it can be very cheap and simple, and you can remember [it] for the rest of your life. For example, the lighting of the cauldron at Barcelona in 1992 was the best ever because it created a moment of high risk which was . . . very nice to see; and, it was [a] transient idea of the flame in the most wonderful way.*

Finally, in view of the unrelenting objections to which his Olympic ceremony plans had been subjected, Papaioannou knew that he needed to make a final decision, and soon, whether to adhere to his carefully
thought-through vision for the Olympic ceremony or acquiesce to the views of the critics. Pondering the issue, he could not help but manage a faint smile as he reflected on how artists throughout history have often found themselves impaled on the horns of some variation of the same dilemma: Stay true to what their inner selves assure them is the right approach from an artistic perspective or abandon the quest and give way to the more pedestrian predilections of those whose desires are not easily ignored.
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Endnotes

1 The remaining ten members of the Executive Committee were:
   John Coates
   Sam Ramsamy
   Gunilla Lindberg
   Ching-Kuo Wu
   René Fasel
   Patrick Joseph Hickey
   Claudia Bokel
   Juan Antonio Samaranch Jr
   Sergey Bubka
   Willi Kaltschmitt Luján.

2 Neither this authority of the Executive Committee of Olympic Committee nor the ones that follow in
   this section of the case represent the order in which these authorities and responsibilities are listed in
   the Olympic Charter. Rather, they are sequenced as shown here in order to differentiate between
   different magnitudes of authority and responsibility, as well as to accentuate the areas in which the
   Executive Committee wields the greatest power.

3 This information was collected during a 2010 interview conducted by Wichain Lattipongpun with
   Dimitris Papaioannou, the 2004 Olympic ceremony director, in Athens, Greece.