



# The International Journal of the History of Sport

ISSN: (Print) (Online) Journal homepage: <https://www.tandfonline.com/loi/fhsp20>

## The 1952 and 1994 Olympic Flames: Norway's Quest for Winter Olympic Identity

Matti Goksøy & Gaute Heyerdahl

To cite this article: Matti Goksøy & Gaute Heyerdahl (2021) The 1952 and 1994 Olympic Flames: Norway's Quest for Winter Olympic Identity, *The International Journal of the History of Sport*, 38:13-14, 1440-1458, DOI: [10.1080/09523367.2021.1984893](https://doi.org/10.1080/09523367.2021.1984893)

To link to this article: <https://doi.org/10.1080/09523367.2021.1984893>



© 2021 The Author(s). Published by Informa UK Limited, trading as Taylor & Francis Group.



Published online: 17 Nov 2021.



Submit your article to this journal [↗](#)



Article views: 367



View related articles [↗](#)



View Crossmark data [↗](#)



OPEN ACCESS



## The 1952 and 1994 Olympic Flames: Norway's Quest for Winter Olympic Identity

Matti Goksøyr and Gaute Heyerdahl

Norwegian School of Sport Sciences, Oslo, Norway

### ABSTRACT

On two occasions, in 1952 and 1994, the Olympic Winter Games were entrusted to Norwegian organizers. As the only Nordic country to have hosted winter Olympics, the organizers of both games presented a version of the Olympic Winter Games and their increasingly fundamental and sacred symbols, which were not always in accordance with the International Olympic Committee's (IOC) official interpretation, nor the international public's understandings of these symbols, their origin, and meaning. For the 1952 winter games, Norway developed an original, separate winter Olympic flame and torch relay. Both the flame and torch relay exemplify specific Norwegian nation building, based on national sporting and cultural traditions, but also the importance of cultural invented symbols in sport, and the challenges that arise when national interpretations and expressions meet international interpretations. Myths and interpretations of the significance of the Norwegian hamlet of Morgedal in Telemark within skiing history challenged the IOC's preferred Olympic flame protocols at both the Oslo 1952 and Lillehammer 1994 Olympic Winter Games.

### KEYWORDS

Identity;  
skiing;  
torch relay;  
Winter Olympics;  
Norway

The International Olympic Committee (IOC) awarded Norwegian cities the honour and responsibility of hosting both the 1952 and 1994 Olympic Winter Games. These decisions meant not only an Olympic visit to one of skiing's strongholds, but also resulted in a meeting and a confrontation between two different sports cultures and traditions. The Olympic movement, which from Pierre de Coubertin's days had been short of winter traditions and corresponding symbols, met with a nation in which winter sports, and especially skiing, played an important part in the national culture. For the influential skiing nation with a strong feeling of cultural ownership such a symbolic void could appear as a tempting field. This particularly came to show in the controversies around a separate winter Olympic fire and its suggested origin in the Norwegian town of Morgedal, Telemark.

On both occasions the host city organizers had their own ideas of how they wanted Norway to appear to a Norwegian and an international audience. An increasing body of literature addresses aspects of public diplomacy around the hosting of

**CONTACT** Matti Goksøyr  [Matti.Goksoyr@nih.no](mailto:Matti.Goksoyr@nih.no)  Norwegian School of Sport Sciences, Box 4014 Ullevål stadion, N-0806 Oslo, Norway

© 2021 The Author(s). Published by Informa UK Limited, trading as Taylor & Francis Group.

This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>), which permits non-commercial re-use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited, and is not altered, transformed, or built upon in any way.

Olympic games and other sports mega-events.<sup>1</sup> Sport can act as a prism for national identity, affecting how a nation sees itself, and what image or performance the nation wants to send to the rest of the world.<sup>2</sup> In Norwegian culture, it was first and foremost the activity itself that was considered important, with competitions giving rise to identification as well as identity formation.<sup>3</sup> Nevertheless, major sporting events also act as a reminder of identity. When hosting the Olympics, the background is an important element of this process, and the organizing committees in both 1952 and 1994 emphasized that the right scenery, in the sense of appropriate Norwegian winter landscapes and environment, was crucial.

The global spread of sports has made expressions of national identities and the imagined national community through sports into a global phenomenon, creating a globalized arena for expressing national identities, although not all sports cultures have been globalized.<sup>4</sup> Nationalism is an inevitable part of modern sports, and its role in sports has not disappeared as a result of globalization, as sports still demonstrate the importance of *national* community, and not some shared community of humanity.<sup>5</sup> Modern sport can be used as a tool to construct national cultures through a set of discourses that shape popular perceptions of national identity.<sup>6</sup> In these discourses sports is a part of the stories people tell about themselves, but these stories are constantly changing parallel to the inherent development of sports.

For the Norwegian hosts, a perk of hosting the winter Olympics was showing Norway at its best and displaying visions of a unique Norwegian culture. A recurrent theme in the preparations was to use the opportunity to instigate national propaganda in an 'exemplary' and 'distinguished' way, with both material and symbolic dimensions.<sup>7</sup> However, the host city organizing committees did not have free rein and were obliged to act according to the Olympic Charter and Olympic etiquette. The Norwegian organizers found the Olympic Charter's specific definitions and understandings of symbols and responsibilities somewhat of a novelty, while Olympic etiquette was well known as Norwegians had participated in several Olympics. Hence, the host city organizers took on the challenge of using the winter games to build identity and legacy through the Olympic symbols. In particular, the Olympic fire from Morgedal, in both 1952 and 1994, served as a carrier of a specific vision of Norway, and its symbols, identities, and legacies. Morgedal was vital because it symbolized the sport of skiing, while simultaneously linking to some of Norway's historical achievements connected to winter and snow.

### **Symbols: A Sport and Its Home**

The modern Olympic movement from the beginning of its existence in 1894 emphasized the importance of symbols.<sup>8</sup> Pierre de Coubertin proposed the five-ring symbol in 1913 and then introduced it to the public at the Olympic games in 1920. Since then the Olympic symbols have evolved into a whole catalogue of IOC-controlled attributes and invented traditions. Joining the Olympic white flag with its five coloured rings was the Olympic hymn, Olympic oath, and Olympic fire, which again became the core of new ceremonies and traditions. The lighting of the flame in Olympia, Greece, along with the torch relay, preferably by athletes (or volunteers),

to the Olympic stadium where the flame ceremonially ignited the Olympic cauldron, which burned during the games of the particular Olympiad, became another important symbol.

Sport historians recognize Amsterdam 1928 as the first modern Olympics to integrate an Olympic flame.<sup>9</sup> Carl Diem, the Secretary General of the Berlin 1936 organizing committee – who had served as the Chef de Mission for the German teams competing in Amsterdam in 1928 and Los Angeles in 1932 – successfully advocated for the inclusion of a torch relay from Olympia to Berlin as part of the 1936 Berlin Olympics, making the flame an ever more important and increasingly sacred symbol of the Olympics.<sup>10</sup> The 1936 winter games in Garmisch-Partenkirchen was the first winter Olympics that had an Olympic fire, lit at the site, burning throughout the event. The organizers of the scheduled – but never realized – winter games in 1940, which after some turmoil had been moved from Sapporo to Garmisch-Partenkirchen, took the idea one step further and attempted to organize a torch relay from Chamonix to Garmisch-Partenkirchen. They claimed that the relay would convey messages of peace from the French athletes to their German comrades.<sup>11</sup> The flame and the torch relay became objects of controversies again in 1952, and similar issues rematerialized in 1994 when Lillehammer hosted the winter games in Norway for the second time.

The strong Norwegian link to skiing as an unquestionable identity marker led the Oslo 1952 organizers to proclaim that skiing was coming home and returning to its origin.<sup>12</sup> In Norway, debates began on whether skiing was an indigenous, Sami invention, or whether Morgedal in Telemark was the birthplace of modern skiing. For example, Telemark author Torjus Loupedalen in 1947 published a book featuring the skiing pioneer Torjus Hemmestvedt, who had emigrated to the United States, and stated:

The root of the ski sport is in Morgedal, Telemark, the tree itself grew up in Oslo with a crown big enough to spread her seeds all over the land and then over Scandinavia and Europe. Thereafter we, good people from Telemark, brought with us a branch which we planted in America. A branch which now grows well.<sup>13</sup>

This rather nationalistic stand caused problems as it did not align with the international ideas of the IOC and the rest of the world.

One of the 1952 Oslo symbols that ended up in the centre of controversies was the Olympic flame and its lighting. For the Norwegian organizers, representing the unquestionable home of skiing, it seemed only natural that the winter Olympic fire should be ignited in Morgedal, Telemark, and that the Olympic torch should be brought by skiers from Morgedal to the venue of the Olympic opening ceremony. Although the organizers' apprehension of the meaning and the function of the Olympic symbols had developed from 1952 to 1994, there were striking similarities between the ideas of the time regarding how to use and present the 'Olympic' fire(s). All this could be linked to the content of the concept of 'home'. The modern use of the concept in sports points to factors like place of invention and the rights and privileges of the firstcomer. Here lies power and influence to define rules of the sport and hence to establish values and in a broader sense to develop the 'right' culture. The next step in an international sport would then be to encourage other

nations to pick up the activity and, after such a successful cultural diffusion, monitor that the sport was performed in the correct and proper way.<sup>14</sup> 'Home' constitutes the safest place for authentic sports practice. This understanding of 'home' mixed with nostalgic emotions easily enthused by the concept gave the self-proclaimed custodians of the home of skiing an undoubted advantage in sports ideological debates.

In Olympism, as developed by Coubertin, Greece and Olympia undoubtedly stand out as 'home'. However, Olympia was not the obvious quadrennial birthplace of the winter Olympic flame. Even though the winter Olympic fire tradition started in 1936, it was not until the 1964 games in Innsbruck, Austria that the IOC established by law that the flame was to be lit in Olympia, Greece.<sup>15</sup> Until then, the local organizers found different solutions. For example, in 1948 the fire was lit at the venue in St. Moritz. Four years later, the organizers in Oslo came up with the idea of lighting the Olympic flame in Morgedal, Telemark, the 'home of skiing' according to a traditional direction in Norwegian skiing history. Morgedal provided the perfect landscape and distance for a skiers' torch relay. Hence, 1952 became the first winter Olympics to include a torch relay in its arsenal of symbols.<sup>16</sup> Four years later, the Italian organizers in Cortina 1956 ignited their flame in Rome, by the temple of Jupiter, using a tripod sent from Olympia for the occasion, assuring some history was also attached to this fire. However, Morgedal again ignited the winter fire for the Squaw Valley winter games in 1960, as an acknowledged substitute when Olympia failed to organize a ceremony, 'due to time restrictions'. After it was lit in Morgedal, the flame was transported by air 'carried in an asbestos box' to the United States.<sup>17</sup>

During the 1950s and 1960s the IOC started to express a growing awareness of commercial 'copyrights' and ownership privileges attached to the Olympic symbols. Parallel to this awareness, the IOC saw the need for assuring the pureness and authenticity of their symbols, and perhaps especially so of their Olympic flame. The 1964 edition of the Olympic Charter added a rule to guarantee that the flame presented as an Olympic flame was an authentic Olympic flame: 'The Olympic flame is the flame which is kindled in Olympia under the authority of the IOC' (Rule 13).<sup>18</sup> Related to this decision are ideas about the pure and un-polluted fire: 'As was the case in ancient times, and as continues to be the custom today, the Olympic flame for Berlin 1936 was lit with the aid of a parabolic mirror reflecting the sun's rays, a time-honoured method that guarantees the purity of the flame', the IOC states on its official website.<sup>19</sup> This idea of a pure fire led to complications, especially at the 1994 winter games.

The Olympics, through their acclaimed values – *citius, altius, fortius* – act as a self-reinforcing extravagance mechanism for host nations; only the best is good enough and the host nation's facilities must outperform the previous Olympic hosts. This factor had not reached its present state in 1952, as Norway's *best* side was sufficient for the local organizers. Showcasing the best side of Norway ran parallel to an attempt to expand the cultural repertoire of the winter games. When Norway was to showcase itself, winter was never far away. The foremost expression of this spectacle came through the torch relay imitation of the summer Olympics, while simultaneously highlighting vital parts of Norwegian culture. The other cultural innovation was a mix between Norwegian and Olympic aesthetics. The organizers

wanted to emphasize skiing and cross-country skiing.<sup>20</sup> Even though Norway had been more successful in speed skating at that time and speed skating was the major spectator sport, the organizers did not consider speed skating as important, perhaps because the roots of this sport were not possible to anchor in Norway in the same way as skiing.<sup>21</sup> Therefore, this sense of cultural ownership can be interpreted as more important than sporting success to the Norwegian organizers.

### Oslo 1952: Visions of Norway

In Oslo's process of applying to host the 1952 Olympic Winter Games, the chance of material investments for sports seems to have been the most effective argument used to convince fellow Norwegians of the rationale behind the bid.<sup>22</sup> Gradually, however, the leading local actors came to see hosting the winter games as something more: an opportunity to present Norway to the world. Norwegians perceived and represented nature and skiing as something quintessentially Norwegian. Winter sports and winter form vital parts of Norwegian history, culture, and identity. A small nation of just 3.3 million (1952) and 4.3 million (1994) inhabitants, Norway was and still is the most successful nation in winter games history, both in number of gold and total medals won.<sup>23</sup> While previous winter games had been awarded to relatively small winter resorts with interests in tourism, the 1952 winter Olympics for the first time took place in a bigger city, in a country where both the organizing committee and the population was aware of the connection between winter sports and national identity. The question of how – and perhaps why – sport and sporting events function as nation building tools and identity markers, are more fruitful than the simple fact that they are.<sup>24</sup> Weather, climate, and geology were branded as a backdrop for a specific Norwegian lifestyle, which consists of activity in winter landscapes, especially skiing. Skiing was a collective symbol, rooted in a perception of national uniqueness, which had gained cultural identity.<sup>25</sup> Skiing and the geographical location of Morgedal played a vital role, which the Norwegian organizers elevated and made into the Olympic symbols.

On February 13, 1952, Olav Bjåland lit a torch in the fireplace of a modest homestead in rural Morgedal. This torch linked several essential threads in Norwegian history: winter, skiing, and polar exploring.<sup>26</sup> Bjåland was not an ordinary Norwegian but was the first man to reach the Pole point on Roald Amundsen's South Pole expedition in 1911. The modest homestead was the home of Sondre Norheim, celebrated in Norway as the father of modern skiing, and Morgedal, Telemark, was according to traditionalist Norwegian skiing history the cradle of modern skiing. Olav Bjåland's nephew (with the same name) came up with the idea in 1948, suggesting to The Association for the Promotion of Skiing that 'One of the oldest events in winter sports is skiing. The origin of this originated in Morgedal, linked to the famous skier Sondre Norheim. As part of the opening of the Olympiad, I propose to ship a relay race from Morgedal in Telemark to Oslo.'<sup>27</sup> The proposal was not immediately embraced. The Association for the Promotion of Skiing (Foreningen til Skiidrettens Fremme) forwarded Bjåland's proposal to the Norwegian Skiing Federation in December 1948, where it remained. One year later, Bjåland enquired about the status of the proposal. In response, the Norwegian Skiing

Federation passed the proposal to the Oslo Olympic Organizing Committee (OOOC), after the regional sports federation of Telemark supported the proposal. The proposal was forwarded with an additional remark that an Olympic torch should be replaced by a traditional Norwegian 'budstikke'.<sup>28</sup> A 'budstikke' is a short stick of wood or iron, used to carry news and important messages in rural areas. This goes straight to the core of the question of 'home,' ownership, and what was considered essential elements of Norwegian identity and winter culture.

Initially, there was some confusion as to whether the proposal was an Olympic flame or a tribute to Norwegian skiing traditions. The remark about a 'budstikke' falls into the tribute category, while Peder Chr. Andersen, an influential journalist and member of one of the subcommittees, thought the torch relay could potentially achieve the same status for the winter games as the flame from Olympia during the summer games.<sup>29</sup> Andersen was concerned with raising the cultural value of the ceremonies in the winter Olympics, which in his opinion dragged down the entire event. Andersen pointed to climatic reasons, where cold weather made it more difficult to perform several events in open air, like orchestras.<sup>30</sup> The opening ceremonies of the winter games usually took place at an ice rink, which led to a somewhat awkward parade.<sup>31</sup> Therefore, Andersen supported a torch relay as a way to increase the festivities, and to add something new to the winter games.<sup>32</sup>

The OOOC was in favor of a relay but could not decide whether the relay should involve a torch or a 'budstikke'.<sup>33</sup> Rolf Petersen, the general secretary of the organizing committee, feared that the whole thing would be 'plagiarism' if the relay concluded with lighting the Olympic flame at Bislett, the main arena, as an Olympic flame had no ideological connection with Morgedal. It would 'on the other hand be an original innovation based on Norwegian history if the ski relay was allowed to bring a budstikke from Morgedal, "the cradle of modern skiing" to Bislett', Pettersen argued.<sup>34</sup> However, torches were needed as a practical measure while carrying the budstikke in the dark, from Morgedal, without creating confusion about what was the important message: the skiing traditions in the budstikke, and not the flame. Norway's IOC member, who was also head of the organizing committee (the OOOC), Olav Ditlev-Simonsen, disagreed. He had no qualms about concluding the relay by lighting the Olympic flame with a Morgedal flame if it took on an 'appealing' shape. On the other hand, 'it would hardly be correct to send a budstikke to be read aloud at Bislett, as during the opening ceremony there shall be no speeches other than those stipulated in the Olympic Charter'.<sup>35</sup> Without concluding the debate, the OOOC's subcommittee for decorations and ceremonies was tasked with planning the relay in detail and presenting a proposal to the main committee.

The question was presented to IOC president J. Sigfrid Edström, who supported the idea.<sup>36</sup> The agreement stated: 'It was explicitly specified that it was not an Olympic flame that was to be brought from Morgedal to Oslo, but a torch greeting from the cradle of modern skiing in Norway. Naturally – because torches have been used in this country for centuries by skiers travelling in the dark'.<sup>37</sup> The planning was well underway when the press began to discuss the torch relay. This discussion revealed a disagreement about what was important in culture and identity. In October 1950, the newspaper *Dagbladet* printed a statement from the president of the Association for the Promotion of Skiing, Ole Bøhn. He stated that he did not mind

a Norwegian budstikke, but he did not want a 'Greek fire' from Morgedal.<sup>38</sup> In an editorial, *Dagbladet* called the proposal artificial and ridiculous because Sondre Norheim should not be a role model for the youth of sport.<sup>39</sup> Norheim and the other skiers from Morgedal were 'professionals', and there was nothing Olympic about them. According to *Dagbladet*, if Norway were to be the source for an Olympic flame, it should find the source in a more 'amateur district'. It did not fit into the fully-fledged Norwegian ski sport that the Morgedal flame would 'spend the night in luxury hotels along the way'. The editorial ended: 'We can only hope it gets a deep sleep.'<sup>40</sup> A few days later, *Dagbladet* continued the crusade against Morgedal; the paper wanted to stop 'this sentimental nonsense' because Morgedal and Sondre Norheim were unique first and foremost in the sense that they earned money from skiing.<sup>41</sup>

Nevertheless, a celebration based on the Morgedal tradition received broad support in the press. Opposition was primarily due to the view of the Morgedal pioneers as 'professionals', who had been openly motivated by cash prizes when they traveled to Oslo to compete. Some voices opposed the version of history that made Morgedal the cradle of skiing, instead branding it as mere local propaganda, and singular critics would rather have a budstikke start from the northernmost point of Norway, a Sami person should start the relay, and that a nicely illustrated leaflet should be published in colour to show the whole route to Oslo.<sup>42</sup> There was also a contributor to *Dagbladet* who did not want a torch, but an unknown Morgedal resident wearing equipment from the 1880s and a moderate, packed lunch.<sup>43</sup> The remaining press supported the plans.

The enthusiasm grew as soon as the torch relay was underway. The newspaper VG, politically leaning conservative, was admittedly a little uncertain and stated that 'a skiing cotter turns in his grave' – pointing to Sondre Norheim as the underprivileged skier barely making a living from his scarce land.<sup>44</sup> Norheim would not have recognized the spectacle outside his former home, but it was uncertain in which direction he turned: whether it was just due to the new spectacle around his name, or whether he turned away in disgust. The OIOC finally decided to light the torch in the fireplace of the modest house where Norheim was born. Outside, 'the school children in Morgedal would line up with their Norwegian flags' before the chairman of 'Skiforeningen' would say a few words 'about Morgedal and Telemark for their contribution to the world of skiing'.<sup>45</sup> The historic connections had now been established in a sports official way.

The country's best male skiers should be encouraged to sign up for the relay, but they would remain anonymous until the last exchange at Bislett, said an OIOC report. In this 'anonymity lay a silent tribute to skiing and to all the Olympic winter sports'.<sup>46</sup> VG criticized the anonymity because the newspapers would get hold of the list of participants anyway (which they did). Moreover, the propaganda value would increase if the world got to know 'what an impressive list of famous names we [i.e. Norway] can muster on such an occasion'.<sup>47</sup> The tribute to the sport of skiing from the anonymous skiers became very public when *Aftenposten* published the names of the participants in the torch relay. This turned the relay into a tribute of legendary winners, including torchbearers such as Olympic champion Petter Hugsted and skiing legend Lauritz Bergendahl.<sup>48</sup> The organizing committee nevertheless



concluded its summary of the torch relay by saying that 'in anonymity' there was a silent tribute to skiing and Olympic winter sports, although it was also a tribute to the big names in Norwegian ski history in the Morgedal – Oslo region.<sup>49</sup>

Within the Olympic context, it was important that the relay was strictly for amateurs. The skiers did not receive any travel or food allowance. The organizing committee listened to criticism from the press on that point. The Olympic context was important, but perhaps more important was the Norwegian packaging. The skiers were to be greeted by Norwegian flags, and 'it is understood that every man wears a Norwegian blue ski suit', the acknowledged correct skiwear of the times.<sup>50</sup> The torch relay would conclude at what the planning memo called the 'Olympic altar' at Bislett. The last skier should be the 'Unknown skier who, in the same way as in London 1948, symbolizes the future of the sport. The skier's name must be kept secret until he embarks on his stage. The skier must, in the same way as at the games in London, represent the qualities that Norwegian sports associates with their athletes and their character.'<sup>51</sup> In this way the organizers would combine their acknowledgement of a new symbol to sport and constitute a silent tribute to skiing and Olympic winter sports.

The organizing committee planned for the torch's last stage and the lighting of the Olympic flame to be memorable moments of the opening ceremony: 'The torch bearer's arrival and skiing across the stadium, his front facing the audience, a short pause before the flame is lit and his last salute to the protector of the Games, are among the unforgettable memories of the opening ceremony.'<sup>52</sup> According to the OIOC plans, it would be the first time a torch relay was held during the winter Olympics, and the organizers hoped it would add something crucial to Oslo's success. The official report of the 1952 winter games stated that there was a 'parallel' to the torch relay in the summer games, from Olympia to the host city.<sup>53</sup> This phrase was used in the Norwegian version of the report but was not included in the English version. In the English report, the whole paragraph that states that the Morgedal flame was a parallel to the summer games' torch relay is shortened to one sentence, which described the relay as a festive entrance to the games. Rolf Petersen, who authored the official report, may have been aware that the Norwegian version could be controversial to the IOC. On the other hand, the Swedish IOC president J. Sigfrid Edström would not have had too much trouble understanding the Norwegian version. Forty years later, Gerhard Heiberg, the president of the Lillehammer organizing committee, quoted an unnamed French IOC member describing the episode as: 'One wrong word and the northerners would be ready to go to war, and hold their own Nordic Games!'<sup>54</sup> It remains unknown if the Morgedal 1952 flame was accepted as sacred Olympic fire by other IOC members as well.

The OIOC's records indicate that committee members struggled to reach consensus on what the torch relay and flame represented. It was definitely a tribute to the pioneers from Morgedal and to Norwegian skiing. Nonetheless, the official report indicated that there was also a 'parallel' to the summer games' torch relays. This split self-perception and understanding that emerged in 1952 served as an example for the next Norwegian hosts – the 1994 Lillehammer Olympic organizing committee (LOOC) – to consider 42 years later.

## The 1994 Lillehammer Torch Relay(s)

According to Norwegians, in 1994 the winter games came ‘home’ for the second time. While socio-economic conditions had changed substantially since 1952, the myth of Morgedal as the cradle of modern ski sport was easy to bring back to life. Nowhere was this more visible than in the debate around the torch relay and the Olympic flame. From the Norwegian side, the case for and rhetoric surrounding the upcoming Olympics was established through Lillehammer’s candidature. The day before the IOC decided the host city of the 1994 games, Norwegian prime minister Gro Harlem Brundtland gave a speech where she invited the winter sports ‘back to Norway, the cradle of skiing.’<sup>55</sup> Skiing was invited home to its origins, once more.<sup>56</sup> However, ‘home’ was now a different place. Due to vast oil and gas discoveries, Norway was now an affluent nation, enabling immense budget deviations without concern.<sup>57</sup> The new wealth, accompanied by a series of sports achievements previously not seen, paved the way for a national self-confidence, which rose to a level calling for comments by leading politicians, like Brundtland, who assured the world: ‘We have the resources.’<sup>58</sup> The 1994 torch relay was part of this new optimism. Several local agents, who were cultural and economic entrepreneurs, now came to the forefront expressing wishes of repeating the successful ritual of 1952 and once more confirming Norwegian winter traditions as an authentic part of the winter Olympics.<sup>59</sup> To the Norwegian public as represented through the daily newspapers, this approach seemed almost self-evident.

Originally the LOOC’s plans were relatively modest, mentioning a ‘possible Olympic torch relay’ as early as 1990.<sup>60</sup> There is little to suggest elements of national chauvinism; rather, the plans were formulated in line with the Olympic Charter’s requirements, and LOOC members were eager to follow all Olympic protocols. However, the Olympic Charter was vague about the transport of the flame from Athens to the organizing venue.<sup>61</sup> The transport was, and still is, a case for the respective organizing committees to figure out. An un-broken torch relay had not been conducted since 1936. However, an amendment to the Charter’s article 62 clarified that there shall be only one Olympic fire, *except* from cases where the IOC provided a special permit. This clause sparked an idea for the 1994 Lillehammer organizing committee to plan two torch relays.

The host city organizers suggested several alternatives to the IOC. They involved both Morgedal, Telemark and the grand concept of running the torch all the way from Olympia to Lillehammer. The latter would take 80–90 days involving approximately 6000 runners, and not cost much, according to the optimistic plan. Such an effort was meant to increase the interest in Lillehammer along the route across Europe. The ambitious plans were gradually concretized into two versions: one international torch relay originating from Olympia and one national torch relay with its origin in Morgedal. The two flames were, according to the plans of the Norwegian organizers, to meet and be united in Oslo, before they, as one flame, continued the journey to Lillehammer where the Olympic cauldron waited to be ignited at the opening ceremony. None of the LOOC’s archival sources indicate that committee members were familiar with the agreement of 1952, but meeting minutes establish clearly that the LOOC was aware that a possible Morgedal-fire required approval

from the IOC.<sup>62</sup> From October 1992, the LOOC pursued the idea of staging two different, extensive relays. One, with the traditional Olympic fire, to be brought as a relay all the way from Olympia to Lillehammer, while the other, soon to be called the 'Morgedal-fire' was to be lit on November 27, 1993, and spend 75 days, this time mostly on the road and not in skiing tracks, crossing Norway.

The traditional, international relay soon ran into difficulties as the UN-related International Postal Union, meant to be the practical organizers of the relay, withdrew in early autumn 1992. When inquiring about possible alternatives among the respective National Olympic Committees along the route, the LOOC did not attract much interest. A contributing factor to such lack of enthusiasm mentioned by the Norwegians was the possible conflict of sponsoring deals between the LOOC and the other National Olympic Committees inside their respective geographical and judicial territories.<sup>63</sup> LOOC president Gerhard Heiberg announced he had received communication from the IOC that it was advising against moving forward with an international torch relay. In November 1992 the international torch relay was cancelled.<sup>64</sup> The flame had to be transported by other means, meaning air flight.

The LOOC designed the national relay to create enthusiasm for the approaching games. It was meant to fulfil the cultural ambition of the LOOC's visions and goals: to give the people ownership of the games but also a responsibility.<sup>65</sup> For this purpose, the national torch relay stood out as a suitable means as it passed by the inhabitants' various places of residence for a period of two months. As such it emerged as part of the growing positive sentiments surrounding the Lillehammer Olympics.<sup>66</sup> Due to the cancellation of the international relay, the national relay gradually stood out as *the* torch relay in the national media and thereby in most Norwegians' conception of the situation. It was also a successful cooperation between commercial sponsors – among which the state-owned petroleum company Statoil played an important part<sup>67</sup> – and the LOOC. Next to its flame, the relay also carried a message designed as a traditional Norwegian 'budstikke' – an old, Medieval way of communication, emphasizing the national and historic elements involved in this relay. The content of the message carried was a combination of a call for togetherness and for the ability to host the world for a winter celebration, and Olympism while at the same time clearly claiming Morgedal as the 'cradle of skiing'.<sup>68</sup> What is noteworthy, however, is that Heiberg and the LOOC notoriously described the flame of the national relay as 'Olympic'.

The language surrounding the Morgedal flame was significant for several reasons. In the decade leading up to the 1994 winter games, local activists sought to gain recognition of the Morgedal flame as Olympic. To do so, local enthusiasts and amateur historians in 1987 established a Morgedal foundation to promote ski sports and traditions with tourism.<sup>69</sup> Efforts to market Morgedal as the cradle of skiing were unsuccessful leading up to the Albertville 1992 winter Olympics, but fared better on home soil, due to the LOOC's increased efforts to highlight symbols and attempt to construct 'authentic' traditions. National media picked up an old slogan from 1924, after the first winter Olympics in Chamonix where Norwegian skiers did well: 'We showed the world the winter way', suggesting that this now must happen again.<sup>70</sup>

In 1952 the torch that ignited the Olympic flame was lit by a matchstick. For the 1994 games, the LOOC sought a more symbolic method of lighting the torch as the 1952 lighting lacked historical depth and references. The LOOC announced a competition to develop the fastest way of catching fire with 'stone age methods' – openly simulating the ritual in Olympia, where the fire was and is ignited by the sun. According to the IOC, 'this was the case in ancient times', while today the Olympic flame is lit 'with the aid of a parabolic mirror reflecting the sun's rays, a time-honoured method that guarantees the purity of the flame'.<sup>71</sup> The idea of a flame's purity became a vital element in the discussions leading up to the 1994 winter games. The winner of the competition received the honour of lighting the Morgedal fire. On November 26, 1993, recreating the 1952 lighting, the fire was lit in the fireplace of Sondre Norheim's home. The next day, the flame started its journey towards Lillehammer, this time mainly transported by walking or running relay volunteers. After having been ignited in presumably stone age fashion, though televised for the modern audience, the flame was kept alive by North Sea gas, sponsored and supplied by Statoil, the state oil company.

Myths and tales of skiing were central parts of the Lillehammer 1994 fire-lighting ceremony, which then accompanied the torch throughout the country, confirming skis and skiing as significant national symbols.<sup>72</sup> The 1994 process connected skiing, Morgedal and the Olympic Winter Games. Hence, it did not require a giant step to call the Morgedal fire 'Olympic fire', which the Norwegian press did with enthusiasm. The torch was also accompanied by a message, replicating the 1952 'budstikke', again underlining Morgedal as the cradle of skiing. The enthusiasm surrounding the torch relay was exemplified by local festivities as the torch passed through. One place held a three-day cultural festival celebrating the Morgedal flame, and school children received the day off school to watch the torch relay pass by in several places, even though the event took no more than 15 minutes.

While the Norwegian media provided very positive coverage of the torch relay, the guardians of the original, authentic Olympic fire, the Hellenic Olympic Committee, were not amused when they discovered this attempt to hijack their cultural heritage. By September 1993, Greek representatives had requested the IOC to stop the planned torch relay from Morgedal, with the IOC executive leaders forced to take action. Heiberg, explaining the matter to IOC president Samaranch and the IOC director general François Carrard, argued that the idea of Morgedal fire was nothing new and referred to the flames of 1952 and 1960, which constituted a tradition in the eyes of the Norwegians.<sup>73</sup> Samaranch permitted the national torch relay to continue, but the original plan of uniting the two flames into one before the lighting of the Olympic cauldron appeared in jeopardy. The LOOC intended the merging of the flames to symbolize the unification between winter sports and the ancient Olympic ideals. However, what the LOOC saw as a relevant and good idea was, in January 1994, roughly one month ahead of the opening ceremony, described as 'monstrous' by Greek IOC member Nikos Filaretos.<sup>74</sup>

The Norwegian plans of an additional fire was approved by the IOC in 1992, and relay plans had been discussed on different levels in the IOC without objections or protests.<sup>75</sup> The new discord stemmed from Greek dissatisfaction. Therefore, to avoid further Greek objections, the LOOC instructed its employees in correct

use of the term 'Olympic fire'.<sup>76</sup> An immediate amicable settlement on this matter did not transpire and relatively vehement disagreements followed. The municipality of Oslo was planning a grand ceremony surrounding the merging of the two flames, emphasizing historic lines back to the 1952 Olympics.<sup>77</sup> A ceremony of that nature, involving two coequal flames to become one, was totally unacceptable to the Hellenic Olympic Committee, which perhaps felt an extra need to push their Olympic ownership. Two years prior, Athens lost its bid to host the centenary jubilee for the Olympic Games in 1996, with the hosting duties awarded to Atlanta.<sup>78</sup> When the Norwegian delegation, headed by Heiberg and the Minister of Cultural Affairs, Åse Kleveland, arrived in Athens to make their way to Olympia to attend the ignition ceremony at the Temple of Hera within the archaeological site at Olympia, they were, according to Heiberg, met with an ultimatum: 'Either you respect the purity of the Greek fire, or you can travel home, emptyhanded'.<sup>79</sup>

Heiberg, as the Norwegian LOOC president, claimed to have been ready for a confrontation with the Greek representatives.<sup>80</sup> He thought they had gone far above their credentials and that the fire, after all, was the property of the IOC. He was prevented from taking his disagreement too far by Kleveland, who reminded him that even bigger political issues were at stake.<sup>81</sup> Greece chaired the European Union (EU) Executive Committee at the time, and Norway was planning to apply for EU membership. The national tabloid media in both countries tried to agitate the atmosphere while the Norwegian Foreign Ministry and export interests wished the conflict to cool down. Kleveland therefore signalled the LOOC and their supporters to give up the fight.<sup>82</sup> However, the signals did not yet go out to the Norwegian public.

The LOOC accepted it must move on to identify other solutions for the Morgedal torch relay that did not involve a merger of two flames. New agreements between the LOOC and the Hellenic Olympic Committee allowed for a technical 'meeting' of the two flames in Oslo on February 5, 1994 to ignite a flame holder. In this new proposal, the Morgedal torch would be extinguished and the remaining Olympic fire would then travel to Lillehammer. When comments were made that this proposal resembled a mix, since both flames ignited the new flame holder, Heiberg insisted that the flames were not *mixed*, but that they *met*.<sup>83</sup> After some consideration, the Hellenic Olympic Committee found this proposition unacceptable. Adding to the LOOC troubles was their obligations towards their major sponsor, the Norwegian Postal Service, and the more than 7000 torch bearers who believed they would be carrying Olympic fire.

Entangled in the discord were feelings of ownership of the symbols and traditions. Specifically, the Greeks perceived ownership to the Olympic symbols, as the Norwegians claimed ownership to skiing traditions.<sup>84</sup> Connected to this conundrum were the concepts of purity and authenticity. The consensus around the Greek fire as the authentic Olympic fire had not been up for challenge. Its authenticity was unquestionable, in Greece and around the world, including in Norway. However, when it came to winter sports and skiing particularly, these phenomena had not been considered, neither in Pierre de Coubertin's Olympic ideas nor in the initial sports programme of the modern Olympic Games. As such, the Norwegian view

was that they could be regarded as almost a blank spot of the Olympic ideological map, and hence ready for symbolic annexing.

As the Norwegian organizers deliberately invented their Morgedal tradition, they wanted to ensure the winter fire had an authentic and pure origin. To the guardians of authentic Olympism, however, the Morgedal fire was a newcomer, outside of the sacred history of the ancient games. Notwithstanding it had come into use a couple of times and had met local demands for being produced in a relatively authentic and pure way, for Olympic purists, referring to the Greek flame, the Morgedal fire had to be considered totally un-authentic and un-pure. In an increasingly spirited debate, it became tempting for Norwegian media to make connections to the German Nazi origins of the torch relay.<sup>85</sup> Compared to that, the Morgedal flame was very pure. Parallel to this debate, historical literature on skiing attacked the myth of Morgedal as the cradle of modern skiing (but not Norwegian skiing traditions).<sup>86</sup> In historic research, Morgedal had long ago lost its role as the definite geographic source of the sport of skiing. Nonetheless, when faced with foreign criticism the traditional myth of Morgedal and skiing could work unifying Norwegians.

Not all Norwegians were invested in the Olympic flame debate. In a letter to the editor in the leading national newspaper *Aftenposten*, a professor in chemistry with little appreciation for the role of historical myths pointed to the fact that nothing physical was brought to Lillehammer from either Olympia or Morgedal.<sup>87</sup> The fire was, after all, only a result of a chemical reaction between molecules of carbon and hydrogen, and oxygen and nitrogen from the air.<sup>88</sup> The conflict ended with a solution permitting the Morgedal fire to complete its travel to Lillehammer, on the condition that it did not contact the fire brought from Greece. The torch relay from Morgedal reached Lillehammer the day before the opening ceremony, having been carried by more than 7000 torch bearers, only to be stowed away in an anonymous hiding place, while the LOOC was waiting for the official Olympic fire to arrive by air from Athens.<sup>89</sup>

After the 1994 winter Olympics ended, the LOOC revealed the Morgedal fire from its hiding place. This fire was first brought to the grave of Sondre Norheim in South Dakota in the United States. More embarrassing for the IOC was its next stop: as IOC president Juan Antonio Samaranch had refused to provide Olympic fire for the Paralympic Games, the Paralympians had to do with the 'un-pure' Morgedal flame.<sup>90</sup> Internally, but not officially, the solution was criticized, with the fate of the Morgedal fire called 'unworthy'.<sup>91</sup>

The agreed-upon solution to stow-away the Morgedal flame during the Lillehammer Olympic Winter Games was not made public until after the games. The Lillehammer organizers feared demonstrations towards the Greek delegation, or indeed the Olympic flame. Their concerns proved unfounded. At the opening ceremony, the Olympic flame was spectacularly handed over to a ski jumper who performed a not-so-perfect jump, though landed safely enough on both feet to deliver the torch to Norwegian Crown Prince Haakon Magnus, who ignited the Olympic cauldron. To the spectators and the torch carriers themselves, what they transported or followed probably was confusing, as the torches and the flames were not easily distinguishable. However, the ceremony passed without problems, buoyed by the spectacular ski jump.

## The Role of the Fire

The stow away of the national Morgedal flame for the duration of the Olympic Winter Games demonstrates its perceived lack of Olympic value. In the eyes of the IOC, there is only one winter Olympic fire. While the winter games are still at times considered inferior to the 'real' Olympic Games, the 'summer games' as called within Norway, they nonetheless cannot invent their own traditions. The winter games did not embrace many Olympic symbols until 1964 when the IOC made a formal decision to connect the winter fire to Olympia, Greece.<sup>92</sup> The symbolic void prior to 1964 allowed the Norwegian organizers to cultivate their claimed ownership of these symbols.

Nevertheless, the national 'Morgedal fire' was never a competing or a challenging fire seeking to oust the 'genuine' Olympic fire. Rather the organizers, in a somewhat naïve way, saw it as a symbol meant to be a natural element in 'the celebration' of the winter games, emphasizing the *winter* part. On both occasions the winter games took place in Norway the alternative flames and relays fulfilled the organizers' ambition of a public spectacle. In 1994 the LOOC described what they only called 'the torch relay', i.e. the relay with the Morgedal fire, as a 'wave of enthusiasm' throughout the country.<sup>93</sup> According to Klausen, the sum of the local events made the Morgedal torch relay of 1994 into the largest cultural event in Norwegian history.<sup>94</sup>

The story of the two flames demonstrates the duality of the Olympic movement, itself invented as a universalist movement to promote international peace and unity through sport. However, international elite sport in general and the Olympic games in particular are also powerful vessels to promote national – even nationalistic and chauvinistic – agendas. The hosting of Olympic games can function both as internal collective happenings in the host nation, as well as projecting national culture and symbols of particular national pride to an international public. This duality is present throughout Olympic history, for example, in Olympic sport during the Cold War. It is also visible in the competing Norwegian and Olympic fires in 1952 and 1994. While the torch relay represented a celebration and a marketing of Norwegian culture, it simultaneously expanded the cultural and ceremonial expression of the winter Olympics.

The logic of the alternative winter flame seemed to be that if Berlin could construct its own traditions in 1936, there should also be symbolic space for Norway to invent its own torch relay.<sup>95</sup> The national flame and its corresponding relay did not represent particularly universal ideas. The Morgedal flame was about Norwegian history and Norwegian identity, which could reach an international audience through the Olympics. It could perhaps even be claimed that anticipations of conveyed peace messages as the content of the torch relay, which the Nazi organizers planned for their scheduled winter games in Garmisch-Partenkirchen in 1940 – even if brushed aside as mere rhetoric – appeared as more universal than the message from Morgedal.<sup>96</sup> Hence, even if the Olympic context of Lillehammer 1994 should point to a globalized *communitas*, the national ideas represented through their skiing practice, in particular, could not be disguised.<sup>97</sup> As a piece of public diplomacy, the Norwegian flame, although successful domestically, did not impress the world and

did not make any lasting impression. Instead, as a result of IOC and Greek opposition, the flame and its accompanying debate, according to the *New York Times*, by necessity ‘sputtered out.’<sup>98</sup>

## Notes

1. See for example, Jessamyn R. Abel, ‘Japan’s Sporting Diplomacy: The 1964 Tokyo Olympiad’, *The International History Review* 34, no. 2 (2012): 203–22; Heather L. Dichter, ‘The Diplomatic Turn: The New Relationship between Sport and Politics’, *The International Journal of the History of Sport* 38, no. 2–3 (2021): 247–263; Yoav Dubinsky, ‘Analyzing the Roles of Country Image, Nation Branding, and Public Diplomacy through the Evolution of the Modern Olympic Movement’, *Physical Culture and Sport. Studies and Research* 84 (2019): 27–40.
2. Victor D. Cha, ‘A Theory of Sport and Politics’, *International Journal of the History of Sport* 26, no. 11 (2009): 1581–1610.
3. Matti Goksøyr, ‘Idretten og det norske: aktivitet som identitet’ [Sport and Norwegianness: Activity as Identity], in *Jakten på det norske: Perspektiver på utviklingen av en norsk nasjonal identitet på 1800-tallet* [*The Quest for Norwegianness: Perspectives on the Development of a Norwegian National Identity in the 19th Century*], ed. Øystein Sørensen (Oslo: Ad Notam Gyldendal, 1998); Matti Goksøyr, ‘Vi gir alt for Norge’: Om nasjonal reisning og kulturell tilhørighet: Idretten som historisk arena for identitetsskaping’ [‘We give it all for Norway’: National Rising and Cultural Affinity: Sport as a Historical Arena for Identity Building] (Oslo: NIF/NIH, 1996), 8.
4. Mark Dyreson, ‘Globalizing the Nation-Making process: Modern Sport in World History’, *International Journal of the History of Sport* 20, no. 1 (2003): 91–106; Alan Tomlinson and Christopher Young, ‘Culture, Politics, and Spectacle in the Global Sports Event – An Introduction’, in *National Identity and Global Sports Events. Culture, Politics and Spectacle in the Olympics and the Football World Cup*, Alan Tomlinson and Christopher Young (Albany: State University of New York Press, 2006), 4.
5. Dyreson, ‘Globalizing the Nation-Making process’: 102.
6. *Ibid.*, 93.
7. *Aktstykker Oslo kommune*, [Minutes from Municipal Council debates, Oslo Official files, Norway] 1948–49, vol. III, 188.
8. John MacAloon, *This Great Symbol. Pierre de Coubertin and the origins of the Modern Olympic Games* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1984).
9. Robert K. Barney and Anthony Th. Bijkerk, ‘The Genesis of Sacred Fire in Olympic Ceremony: A New Interpretation’, *Journal of Olympic History* 13, no. 2 (2005): 6–27.
10. Karl Lennartz and Jürgen Buschmann, ‘Carl Diem – Still Controversial 50 Years On’, *Journal of Olympic History* 23, no. 1 (2015): 1–2.
11. Matti Goksøyr, ‘The Rings and the Swastika: Political Ambiguity in Sport before and during the Second World War’, *The International Journal of the History of Sport* 36, no. 11 (2019): 998–1012.
12. Olav Bø, *På ski gjennom historia* (Oslo: Det Norske Samlaget, 1992), English version: *Skiing throughout history*, Oslo, 1993; Olav Christensen, *Skiidretten før Sondre: vinterveien til et nasjonal selvilde* [The Sport of Skiing before Sondre: Winter Way to a National Self Image] (Oslo: Ad Notam Gyldendal, 1993); Olav Christensen, *Den nasjonaliserte skikulturs fremvekst i Norge, 1770–1900* [The Nationalized Ski Culture’s Growth in Norway, 1770–1900] (Oslo: O. Christensen, 1993); Kjell Haarstad, *Skisportens oppkomst i Norge* [The Origin of Ski Sport in Norway] (Trondheim: Tapir, 1993). Norway’s central role in international skiing history is also emphasized in the two standard works on this in English. The history of skiing is one of few topics where Norwegian is a key language. E. John B. Allen, *The Culture and Sport of Skiing: From Antiquity to World War II* (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 1993); Roland



- Huntford, *Two planks and a passion: the dramatic history of skiing* (London: Continuum, 2008).
13. Torjus Loupedalen, *Morgedal, skisportens vugge* [Morgedal, the Cradle of Skiing] (Oslo: Aschehoug, 1947), 204.
  14. Julian Norridge, *Can we have our balls back, please? How the British invented sport. (And then almost forgot how to play it)* (London: Penguin, 2008).
  15. International Olympic Committee, 'The History of the Olympic Flame', <http://www.Olympic.org/news/the-history-of-the-olympic-flame> (accessed August 10, 2021).
  16. The plans for the 1940 Olympic Winter Games, including a torch relay, did not materialize.
  17. David C. Antonucci, *Snowball's chance. The story of the 1960 Olympic Winter Games, Squaw Valley & Lake Tahoe*: Art of Learning Publishing, 2009), 57; International Olympic Committee, 'The History of the Olympic Flame', <http://www.Olympic.org/news/the-history-of-the-olympic-flame> (accessed January 15, 2021). The origin of the 1960 flame was actually mentioned in a short *New York Times* article, informing that it was 'kindled in a small log cabin' associated with Sondre Norheim in Morgedal, and eventually transported to California by air, 'carried in an asbestos box.' 'Olympic Flame Leaves Norway for California', *New York Times*, February 1, 1960, 32.
  18. International Olympic Committee, 'The History of the Olympic Flame'.
  19. Ibid.
  20. Gaute Heyerdahl, 'Vinter-OL i skisportens vugge: De VI Olympiske vinterleker i Oslo, 1952 og De XVII Olympiske vinterleker i Lillehammer, 1994', [Winter Olympics in the Cradle of Skiing: the VI and the XVII Olympic Winter Games in Oslo and Lillehammer, 1952 and 1994] (PhD diss., Norges idrettshøgskole, 2014).
  21. Goksøyr, 'Idretten og det norske'; Matti Goksøyr, *Historien om norsk idrett*. [The History of Norwegian Sport] (Oslo: Abstrakt forlag, 2008).
  22. Heyerdahl, 'Vinter-OL i skisportens vugge', 24.
  23. Winter Olympic Games all-time medal table 1924–2018. <https://www.statista.com/>. (accessed August 10, 2021).
  24. Dyreson, 'Globalizing the Nation-Making process': 103.
  25. Rune Slagstad, *Sporten: en idéhistorisk studie* [Sport: a Study from the Perspective of the History of Ideas] (Oslo: Pax, 2008), 276.
  26. Tor Bomann-Larsen, *Den evige sne. En skihistorie om Norge* [The Perpetual Snow. A Ski History of Norway] (Oslo: Cappelen, 1993).
  27. Letter, Olav Bjaaland to Foreningen til Ski-idrettens Fremme, October 29, 1948, Organisasjonskomiteen for de VI. olympiske vinterleker [The Organization Committee for the VI Olympic Winter Games], serie A, boks 1, Oslo Byarkiv [Oslo City Archive], Oslo, Norway (hereafter OB).
  28. 'Protokoll anleggskomiteen, 15. desember 1949' [Minutes, Facilities committee, December 15, 1949], Org.kom, serie A, boks 1, OB.
  29. 'Protokoll samordningskomiteen, 26. april 1950' [Minutes, co-ordinating committee, April 26, 1950], Rolf Hofmo collection, boks 29, Arbeiderbevegelsens Arkiv og Bibliotek [Archive of the Labor Movement], Oslo, Norway.
  30. Peder Chr. Andersen, *De olympiske vinterleker: Oslo 1952*. [The Olympic Winter Games: Oslo 1952] Oslo: Dreyer, 1952, 21. Andersen was chairman for the torch relay, and he also chaired the subcommittee for decorations and ceremonies and the press committee, all while he was sports editor of *Aftenposten*.
  31. Clearly observed in the official Olympic film from Oslo 1952 where the Finnish team used spikes.
  32. Andersen, 'De olympiske vinterleker', 21.
  33. 'Protokoll organisasjonskomiteen, 17. november 1950', [Minutes, Organization Committee, November 17, 1950], Org.kom., serie A, boks 1, OB.
  34. Ibid.
  35. Ibid.

36. Ibid.
37. Organisasjonskomiteen, *De VI Olympiske vinterleker, Oslo 1952. Offisiell rapport fra organisasjonskomiteen* [The VI Olympic Winter Games, Oslo 1952. Official report from the Organization Committee] (Oslo, 1956), 170.
38. *Snø og Ski* [Snow and Ski], (1951): 7.
39. 'Slokk den «olympiske ild» fra Morgedal!' [Put out the 'Olympic fire' from Morgedal], *Dagbladet*, October 24, 1951, 6.
40. Ibid.
41. Kei, 'Skisportens vugge – og de som lå i den' [The cradle of skiing – and the ones who slept in it], *Dagbladet*, October 27, 1951, 13.
42. 'Protokoll organisasjonskomiteen, 17. november 1950', Org.kom., serie A, boks 1, OB.
43. 'Matpakke' in Norwegian. Andreas Solberg, 'Send den «ukjente morgedøl» til Olympiaden!' [Send the «unknown Morgedal resident» to the Olympics!], *Dagbladet*, November 2, 1951, 6.
44. Asbjørn Barlaup, 'En skiløperhusmann snur seg i sin grav' [A ski cotter turns in his grave], *VG*, February 13, 1952, 44.
45. 'Notat, Skiløperstafett Morgedal-Bislett, 13–15. februar 1952'. [Note, Ski relay Morgedal-Bislett, February 13–15.], Org.kom., serie A, boks 1, OB.
46. Organisasjonskomiteen, 'De VI Olympiske vinterleker', 171.
47. Munk, 'Anonyme deltagere i den olympiske fakkelfstafett fra Morgedal til Bislett' [Anonymous participants in the Olympic torch relay from Morgedal to Bislett], *VG*, October 20, 1951, 11.
48. Slagstad, 'Sporten', 597.
49. Organisasjonskomiteen, 'De VI Olympiske vinterleker', 171.
50. 'Notat, Skiløperstafett Morgedal-Bislett, 13.-15. februar 1952', Org.kom., serie A, boks 1, OB.
51. Organisasjonskomiteen, 'De VI Olympiske vinterleker', 170.
52. Ibid.; Slagstad, 'Sporten', 598.
53. Organisasjonskomiteen, 'De VI Olympiske vinterleker', 170.
54. Gerhard Heiberg, *Et eventyr blir til: Veien til Lillehammer* [An Adventure in the Making: The Road to Lillehammer], (Oslo: Cappelen, 1995), 148.
55. Gro Harlem Brundtland, address to the 94th Session of the IOC, Seoul, September 14, 1988, Lillehammer Olympiske Organisasjonskomité (LOOC), Oppland Fylkesarkiv [Oppland Regional Archive], Lillehammer, Norway (hereafter OF).
56. Matti Goksøyr, *Idrett for alle: Norges Idrettsforbund 150 år, 1861–2011* [Sport for All: The Norwegian Federation of Sport 150 years, 1861–2011], (Aschehoug: Oslo, 2010), 210.
57. Tore Jørgen Hanisch, Espen Søylen, and Gunhild Ecklund, *Norsk økonomisk politikk i det 20. århundre. Verdivalg i en åpen økonomi* [Norwegian Economic Politics in the 20th Century], (Kristiansand: Høyskoleforlaget, 1999), 351; Einar Lie, *Norsk økonomisk politikk etter 1945* [Norwegian Economic Politics after 1945] (Oslo: Universitetsforlaget, 2012), 158.
58. Gro Harlem Brundtland, address to the 94th Session of the IOC, Seoul, September 14, 1988, LOOC, OF.
59. Heyerdahl, 'Vinter-OL i skisportens vugge', 216.
60. 'Rammeprogram for kultur og seremonier, LOOC, juni 1990', [Programme for culture and ceremonies, LOOC, June 1990], LOOC, Olympiatoppen, Oslo, Norway.
61. International Olympic Committee, Olympic Charter, 1987, <https://library.olympics.com/Default/doc/SYRACUSE/172824/charte-olympique-1987-comite-international-olympique> (accessed June 16, 2021). Article 62 states, 'The OCOG shall be responsible for the arrangements for bringing the Olympic flame from Olympia to the stadium. The celebrations to which its journey or its arrival give rise, under the auspices of the relevant NOG, shall observe the Olympic protocol and may not be the occasion for advertising. There shall only be one Olympic flame, except by special leave of the IOC'. International Olympic Committee, Olympic Charter, 1987, 33.

62. Arne Martin Klausen, *Lillehammer-OL og olympismen. Et moderne rituale og en flertydig ideologi* [The Lillehammer Olympics and Olympism. A Modern Ritual and an Ambiguous Ideology] (Oslo: Ad Notam Gyldendal, 1996), 167; 'Styreprotokoll LOOC, 26. oktober 1992', [Board minutes, LOOC, October 26, 1992], LOOC, styreprotokoller, OF.
63. 'Styreprotokoll LOOC, 26. oktober 1992' [Board Minutes LOOC, October 26. 1992], LOOC, styreprotokoller, OF. For more on sponsorship policies, see Mark Dyreson and Matthew Llewellyn, 'Los Angeles is the Olympic City: Legacies of the 1932 and 1984 Olympic Games', *The International Journal of the History of Sport*, 25, no. 14 (2008): 1991-2018.
64. 'Protokoll Lillehammer OL '94, 27. oktober' [Board minutes], October 27, 1992, LOOC, styreprotokoller, OF; 'Protokoll Lillehammer OL '94, 19. november 1992' [Board minutes] November 19, 1992, LOOC, styreprotokoller, OF.
65. 'Visjon og hovedmål. De XVII Olympiske Vinterleker, Lillehammer 1994.' ['Vision and primary goal'], LOOC, styreprotokoller, OF.
66. 'Protokoll Lillehammer OL '94, 27. oktober' [Board minutes, October 27, 1992], LOOC, styreprotokoller, OF; Heiberg, 'Et eventyr blir til', 149; Klausen, 'Lillehammer-OL og olympismen', 51.
67. Statoil sponsored both the torch, the cauldron and the fuel necessary to keep the flame burning.
68. The relay as an anthropological event and the message of the budstikke is thoroughly analysed in Arne Martin Klausen, *Fakkelstafetten – en olympisk ouvertyre* [The Torch Relay – An Olympic Overture] (Oslo: Ad Notam Gyldendal, 1995), 54.
69. *Ibid.*, 17.
70. Erling Bø, 'Norske ild-sjeler' [Norwegian Fiery Souls], *VG*, December 22, 1993, 2. In Norwegian: 'vise oss selv at vi viser verden vinterveien', referring to a famous first page headline celebrating Norwegian dominance of the first winter Olympics in 1924. 'Vi viste verden vinterveien' ['We showed the World the Winter Way'], *Idraetsliv*, February 1, 1924, 1.
71. Klausen, 'Fakkelstafetten', 47; International Olympic Committee, 'The History of the Olympic Flame'.
72. It is harder to emphasize skiing in costal climates in several parts of Norway, far from the 'Norwegian' winter landscape. Klausen writes that local heroes and the Olympic peace message replaced skis in these areas. Klausen, 'Lillehammer-OL og olympismen', 173.
73. 'Styreprotokoll LOOC, 2. oktober 1993' [Board minutes, LOOC], October 2, 1993, LOOC, styreprotokoller, OF.
74. Gunnar Magnus, 'Samaranch inn i striden om OL-ilden' [Samaranch enters the strife of the Olympic Fire], *Aftenposten*, January 6, 1994, 6.
75. 'Minutes of the meeting of the Coordination Commission, Oslo June 18, 1992', LOOC, serie 0, boks 12, OF; 'Minutes of the meeting of the Coordination commission, Lillehammer March 22, 1993', LOOC, serie 0, boks 12, OF.
76. Klausen, 'Lillehammer-OL og olympismen', 177.
77. *Ibid.*, 178.
78. *Ibid.*, 176.
79. Heiberg, 'Et eventyr blir til', 150.
80. Klausen, 'Lillehammer-OL og olympismen', 180; Heiberg, 'Et eventyr blir til', 150.
81. Heiberg, 'Et eventyr blir til', 151.
82. Kari Aarstad Aase, 'Åse Kleveland stanset Heiberg' [Åse Kleveland stopped Heiberg], *VG*, January 19, 1994, 4. See also: Klausen 'Lillehammer-OL og olympismen', 178.
83. Klausen, 'Lillehammer-OL og olympismen', 180.
84. *Ibid.*, 176.
85. Slagstad, 'Sporten', 594.
86. Haarstad, 'Skisportens oppkomst', 9.

87. Bjørn Pedersen, 'Olympisk ild' [Olympic fire], *Aftenposten*, January 18, 1994, 19.
88. Klausen. 'Lillehammer-OL og olympismen', 178; Gunn Gravdal, 'Oppildnet etter OL-kompromiss' [Inflamed after Olympic compromise], *Aftenposten*, January 11, 1994, 3; 'Styreprotokoll LOOC, 19. januar 1994' [Board minutes], January 19, 1994, LOOC, styreprotokoller, OF.
89. See Heyerdahl, 'Vinter-OL i skisportens vugge', 388.
90. 'Styreprotokoll LOOC, 2. oktober 1993' [Board minutes, LOOC], October 2, 1993, LOOC, styreprotokoller, OF.
91. Among LOOC members, see: Klausen, 'Lillehammer-OL og olympismen', 184.
92. International Olympic Committee, 'The History of the Olympic Flame'.
93. 'Styreprotokoll LOOC, 14. desember 1993' [Board minutes, LOOC], December 14, 1993, LOOC, styreprotokoller, OF.
94. Heyerdahl, 'Vinter-OL i skisportens vugge', 389.
95. Michael Payne, *Olympic Turnaround. Twyford* (London: London Business Press, 2005); Slagstad, 'Sporten', 594; Arnd Krüger, 'Germany: The Propaganda Machine', in *The Nazi Olympics. Sport, Politics, and Appeasement in the 1930s*, ed. Arnd Krüger and William Murray (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 2003), 33.
96. Goksøyr, 'The Rings and the Swastika', 1005.
97. Dyreson, 'Globalizing the Nation-Making process': 92.
98. Anita Peltonen, 'Winter Olympics; Norway's Sang Froid Heats up over opening Ceremony', *New York Times*, February 12, 1994, 31.

## Disclosure Statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the authors.

## Notes on Contributors

**Matti Goksøyr** is an historian from the University of Bergen. He has since 1984 worked at the Norwegian School of Sport Sciences. He has published articles and books on the subject of sport history. His latest book (with Finn Olstad) is "*Skjebnekamp. Norsk idrett under okkupasjonen. 1940–1945.*" [Fatal struggle. Norwegian sport during the occupation. 1940–1945.]

**Gaute Heyerdahl** is an historian from the NTNU, Trondheim. He earned his PhD at Norwegian School of Sport Sciences with a thesis on the Olympic Games in Norway, 1952 and 1994.