

**"The Olympic Art Competitions of 1936  
and the counter-exhibition of Amsterdam"**

Summary of MA Thesis

by Alexandra Thumm,

Johannes Gutenberg-Universität Mainz,  
Germany

1. Introduction .....	1
2. Introduction to the political and cultural situation of Germany in 1936.....	2
3. The Olympic Art Competitions of 1936 .....	3
4. The consideration and interpretation of a single work of art .....	5
5. The counter-exhibition "D.O.O.D." in Amsterdam .....	8
6. Conclusion .....	10
Appendix .....	12
Selected references .....	16

## 1. Introduction

For the founder of the modern Olympic Games, Baron Pierre de Coubertin, the combination of sport and art was an essential part of the Olympic Spirit from the very beginning. Art and sports competitions were supposed to form equal parts in the Olympic Games in order to renew the long forgotten unity of and interplay between body and spirit.

This connection of sport and art, to be found in the model of the ancient Olympic Games, was supposed to be regained through the artistic organizing of the performance of the Games on one hand and through the introduction of Olympic competitions in the fields of architecture, sculpture, painting, literature and music on the other.

The art competitions took place for the first time at the 1912 Olympic Games of Stockholm, after their reintroduction had been decided upon 1906, and formed part of the Olympic programme until the London games in 1948.

Due to a close ideational contact between Carl Diem and Pierre de Coubertin, art played a much more important role in the organization of the 1936 Olympic Summer Games in Berlin than before. The leaders of National Socialism laying special stress also on the preparation and performance of the games to impress wide sections of the general public through a pompous organizing in order to conceal the real intentions of their race- and world power politics.

As a consequence there were numerous protests in advance of and during the Games against their holding in National Socialist Germany. In Amsterdam artists and intellectuals organized an art exhibition, which was intended, at least according to its name *De Olympiade Onder Diktatuur* (An Artistik Olympiad Against Diktatorship), to protest against the taking place of the Olympic Games in Berlin.

The aim of my paper is twofold: First, I investigated to what extent the Olympic Art competitions were integrated into the self-portrayal of the Third Reich and abused for National Socialist ends; second, it seemed promising to work out the reactions and comments of the Amsterdam counter-exhibition towards this proceeding.

The basis of my investigation is the examination of the Olympic Art Competitions and, related to it, the Olympic art exhibition in Berlin as well as the Amsterdam counter-exhibition. Documentary evidence comes primarily from the Olympia -archives of Potsdam and the local archives of Amsterdam.

First I investigated the Olympic Art competitions and the Amsterdam counter-exhibition separately presenting the relevant documentary evidence and analyzing single works of art. My

investigation is primarily concerned with the description and interpretation of single works of art in the field of painting and sculpture in order to be able to supplement the documentary evidence in the artistic sphere. Finally the exhibitions were related to each other and evaluated with respect to each other in order to consider them both with respect to politics and art.

In what follows I will try to give an outline of the results of my investigation and of the evaluation of the documentary evidence, including a short introduction to the political and cultural situation of Germany in 1936.

Presenting a paradigmatic analysis of one piece of art, I want to show how these are integrated into my work and how the description and interpretation of single works of art could provide important insights into the general theme alongside the mere formal-aesthetic aspects.

To give you an idea of the coming-into-existence of my thesis, I will include a summary of early working hypotheses and single steps taken during my work in an appendix.

## **2. Introduction to the political and cultural situation of Germany in 1936**

After Hitler had taken over the power in Germany in 1933, the National Socialists began to establish their totalitarian regime in quick steps. Repealing all basic rights, which were till then guaranteed for in the existing constitution, and banning all political parties they managed to put into effect their intended one-party state. To a larger and larger extent, almost all public and social areas of life were, in most cases with radical terror, "reorganized" by the new rulers and put under the so-called "Gleichschaltung".

The massive arming, the preparations for war and the general readiness for aggression, which could already be seen from the internal events during the seizure of power, were reflected more intensely in Hitler's proceedings concerning foreign affairs and couldn't be looked over at the beginning of the Olympic Games.

The more intensively the preparations for war were propelled, the more Hitler tried to affirm his will to hold peace in his speeches and interviews. The actions undertaken by the ministry of propaganda were supposed to persuade the native population as well as foreign countries of the new rulership and deceive them about the plans concerning foreign affairs.

With the National Socialist policy of "Gleichschaltung", which was not confined to the political realm alone but affected the whole cultural and intellectual life, the attack of the National Socialists against modern art had begun.

The social, political, and above all intellectual models of the modern age, which had spread over the whole of the Western World after World War I, were all characterized by a till then unknown demand to self-determination. This demand was diametrically opposed to the world

view propagated by the National Socialists. So all lines of modern art (Expressionism, Cubism, Dadaism, etc.), summarized under the label "degenerate art" by the National Socialists, were treated as cultural concepts of the enemy.

The direct attack against and persecution of avant-garde artists in Germany, which was started off in 1930 by the so-called iconoclasm of Weimar, reached its first summit in the year of the seizure of power in 1933 and finally culminated in the exhibition "Degenerate Art" of 1937. The artists in The Third Reich were indirectly dependent upon the person of Hitler, his views, and his taste concerning art, because with the aid of the "Reichskulturkammer" (the ministry of culture of The Third Reich), which was founded in 1933 by the NSDAP to take on controlling functions and was subordinate to Hitler himself, he was able to check on the whole German intellectual life, the artists and their works as well as to control the conception of art in the press and the exhibitions.

Art was closely tied to the state by laws and regulations in order to thus promote the National Socialist world view and serve the carrying-through of political aims.

Painting was supposed to be generally understandable, uniform and uncritical in order to represent an ideal world and win the favour of the general public. Sculpture was above all supposed to idealize the National Socialist system of rule and to realize the claim to power with the aid of ancient techniques of composition.

### **3. The Olympic Art Competitions of 1936**

Considering the documentary evidence as well as organizational and artistic points, the investigation of the Olympic Art competitions at the Berlin Olympic Games of 1936 clearly showed the intention of the National Socialist rulers to present Germany as a leading cultural nation in order to acquire a good reputation world-wide and free Germany from the increasing isolation by the non-fascistic nations of Europe and the USA.

Although the organizational preparations of the art competitions were formally in the hands of the Organizing committee of the Games, they were to a large extent influenced by the ministry of propaganda of the Third Reich and the ministry of culture, which was itself subordinate to the former, so that the Organizing committee proper was often only left with the function to show approval.

The ministry of propaganda with its institutions (The Publicity Commission for the Olympic Games, The Ministry of Culture) was responsible for the personal filling of the Committee of Art as well as the working Committees and was thus in a position to decide on both, the German and indirectly the foreign members of the international juries. In consequence, the Committee of

Art and the juries consisted primarily of persons tolerating the National Socialist leadership or even actively supporting them.

The rebuilding and enlargement of the hall of exhibition, which was designed to impress the visitor by its mere size and representative character, gave an architectural framework to the exhibition of the works of art to participate in the competition, which emphasized the will to representation on the part of the Third Reich.

All nations invited to the Games had the right to participate in the Art competitions, the selection of artists being determined by the National Olympic Committees of the respective nations.

The works of art handed in for exhibition had to be by artists that were still alive, had to be produced during the X. Olympiad, i.e. after January 1 1932, and were required not to have participated in the competition of the Games in Los Angeles.

All works were permitted that depicted a sporting event, exercise or movement. What was banned was the portrayal of the resting human body, if it didn't carry a piece of sports equipment, and the portraits of famous sportsmen, if they weren't depicted practicing their discipline.<sup>1</sup>

As the Olympic Games of 1936 took place in a time, when free practice of art was not possible any more in Germany and all modern lines of art were judged as being "degenerate", the participation of avant-garde artists was actually made impossible in advance. This was especially true for German artists, whose participation was directly dependent upon the decision of the Ministry of Culture, but also generally there was a trend observable among other nations (f: ex. Austria) and particularly among fascistic ones like Italy to adjust the objects to be exhibited to the artistic guidelines of the Germans.<sup>2</sup>

The available documentary evidence doesn't say anything about to what extent the German Committee of Art had influence on the participation of foreign works of art, but it can be assumed that the single NOCs had tried to assemble their collections according to the art conception of the German jury-members.

The artistic freedom in the Art competition, which was confined anyway by the choice of the topic sport, was indirectly further confined in Berlin by the National Socialist conception of art and as a consequence, only very few internationally famous artists participated in the competition.

---

<sup>1</sup> Cf.: Bestimmungen für den Kunstwettbewerb und die Kunstausstellung der XI. Olympiade Berlin 1936. In: Organisationskomitee für die XI. Olympiade Berlin (Hg.): Handbuch der allgemeinen Bestimmungen und Sport-ausschreibungen. o. J., 313-326.

<sup>2</sup> The Japanese works with their art concept of old Japan were, contrary to expectation, not oriented towards fascism, though.

Although the choice of topic, set up in the regulations, met with disapproval of popular avant-garde artists also in the previous Olympic Art competitions, there could still be found some internationally famous names among the participants. In Berlin, these were lacking completely with few exceptions and one might, without wanting to belittle certain single achievements (f ex. Gerhard Marcks), speak of a relatively low artistic standard.

This is, among other things, also due to the fact that some countries had cancelled their participation only shortly before the beginning. Interestingly enough France and Great Britain were lacking, two nations that had participated at all Olympic Art Competitions from 1928 to 1948 predominantly with a considerable number of artists and refused their participation only now in Berlin.

Considering the works of art in the catalogue of the exhibition, the following tendencies at the realization of the sporting theme are observable:

The branch of painting shows exclusively works of naturalistic depiction. A simplification of the real world object can only be seen in some rare cases, certain modern lines of art are lacking completely.

In the field of sculpture two main possibilities to realize the sporting theme are observable. One part of the works shows the athlete, following ancient models, in a resting position. He can often only be recognized as a sportsman through the added piece of sports equipment. Other works try to depict a sporting movement at a certain moment in time in order to express the dynamic dimension.

Both in painting and sculpture you can often find the sporting movement or the athlete himself depicted in an idealized way.

The intention inherent to the National Socialist conception of art to prohibit any artistic freedom whatsoever, could be seen in the Art Competitions by the fact that the few participants with modern tendencies in their styles were nearly ignored when the works were judged by the jury, this being much more evident in the field of sculpture than in painting.

As far as sculpture is concerned, the attempt to depict as realistically as possible the sporting movements by artistic means was downgraded by the jury-members as being "unsightly". The subject of the resting, idealized athlete and the formal principles connected to a classical ideal were heavily preferred, however.

#### **4. The consideration and interpretation of a single work of art**

The "decathlete" by the German Arno Breker paradigmatically illustrates, how the connection of sport and art, laid down in the regulations for the competition and deeply anchored in the

Olympic Idea, was used by the National Socialists in order to glorify the status and function of sport in the Third Reich.

Arno Breker was one of the great official sculptors in National Socialist Germany and since 1938 was regarded as the most praised and most esteemed sculptor of the Reich. In the year of the Olympic Games he got the commission, to sketch two figures "decathlete" and "victress" for the Olympic stadium, which was under construction at that time; this undertaking resulted in the coming-into-existence of the decathlete, a figure with a height of 3.25 meters for the "House of the German Sport" on the so-called "Reichssportfeld". According to Breker himself, the work with which he participated in the Art Competition was a life-size sketch of this monumental sculpture.

The sculpture "decathlete" is a nude male figure which is standing upright, the elongated legs slightly open, firmly on both feet. The upright position of the upper part of the body is strengthened by the shoulderblades, which are drawn back, the bulging thorax and the tensed chest muscles. The head is erect, the expression of the eyes is framed by prominent cheek-bones and grave features, frontally and self-consciously directed towards the observer. The vertical dominance of legs, upper part of the body, head and arms in connection with the horizontal line of the shoulders add up to a symmetrical construction of the body. This brings about a posture, having a strict and rather unrealistic effect, far from being a natural or even sporting movement at all. The volumes of the body do not extent into the room. There is no dynamics and it seems as if all power is contracted within the body.

The "decathlete" was a popular subject for sculpture during National Socialism, because with his shape and traits of character he came closest to fulfill the National Socialist demand for physical training of the whole body. In his ideally proportioned body all qualities, required in the single disciplines, as for example strength, quickness and condition seemed to be united. Through multiple and hard training as well as achievements and proving himself in competitions he was said to possess positive traits of character such as courage, the willingness to endure physical strain and staying power.

Breker's decathlete is not, like most "sporting sculptures" of the Third Reich, a sportsman in the original meaning of the word, because he is lacking any kind of movement and liveliness. It is only the title of the piece that identifies him as being one.

The so-called "artists of the state" in National Socialist Germany were supposed to portray the athlete in his physical beauty as an ideal picture of reality, not when under the real physical effort or even in exhaustion. The image was meant to become a model for the beholder and present to him a new picture of mankind.

The rigid posture of Breker's decathlete puts emphasis on the well-formed body, not the sporting movement. This ideal beauty is strengthened by the archaic nudity of the figure. Through the leaving out of historically determinable requisites, such as clothes, all individual, social and historical connections are cut off, stressing a certain universal validity and timelessness of the sculpture<sup>3</sup>. In National Socialist art the sculpture of a nude was not only representative of a universally ideal picture of mankind, but was rather designed to raise mankind to a celestial and godlike race. The sculpture became the ideological and propagandistic instrument, which was supposed to support and idealize the claim to power of the totalitarian regime.

With this work Breker won the silver medal after the Italian Farpi Vignoli. The claim made by Davidson that Hitler had pressed for diplomatic reasons for the gold medal being given to an Italian,<sup>4</sup> cannot definitely be proved from documentary evidence. In the reports of the jury it only says:

"Die beiden ausländischen Preisrichter betonen, dass Brekers Zehnkämpfer nicht restlos den Bestimmungen des Kunstwettbewerbs entspräche, da er in keiner sportlichen Aktion dargestellt sei, wenn er auch sportliche Haltung besäße. [...] Schließlich erteilte man aber doch Vignolis Sulky-Fahrer einstimmig den ersten Preis, da er qualitätvoller sei. Brekers Figur erhielt einstimmig den zweiten Preis, da auch die Ausländer die alle anderen Arbeiten überragende künstlerische Qualität anerkannten."<sup>5</sup> (The two foreign jury-members emphasized that Breker's decathlete didn't fully correspond to the regulations set up for the Art Competition, because he was not depicted in sporting action, though having a sporting posture. [...] Finally Vignoli's salki-driver was unanimously awarded first prize, because he was of higher quality. Breker's work was unanimously awarded second prize, because also the foreigners appreciated the quality, which was higher than that of all other works)

This excerpt from the minutes of the jury clearly shows how important it was, especially for the German jury-members, to award the "decathlete", against the regulations, according to which the depiction of a resting human body was not allowed, the silver medal and to present him to the international public at the Olympic Games. Works on the other hand which showed the sporting movement much better but corresponded less to the National Socialist conception of art (f.ex.: Stig Bloomberg: "Wrestling boys", Ansgar Almquist: "The Walker"), won the third prize or received a honorable appreciation.

---

<sup>3</sup> Cf.: Neuwerth, M.: Die Darstellung des Sportlers in der Plastik des Nationalsozialismus. Thesis. Deutsche Sporthochschule Köln, Cologne 1981, p.103.

<sup>4</sup> Cf.: Davidson, M.G.: Kunst in Deutschland 1933-1945. Bd. II. Tübingen 1995, p. 124.

<sup>5</sup> Cf. Reports of the jury in: Thumm, A.: Olympische Kunstwettbewerbe 1936 and die Amsterdamer Protestausstellung. MA Thesis, Mainz 1997. Bd. II: Dokumente, Dokument 39a, b.

## **5. The counter-exhibition "D.O.O.D." in Amsterdam**

In November 1935 the committee BOG, 'Bescherming van de Olympische gedachte', (Protection of the Olympic Idea) was founded in the Netherlands; it consisted not only of sportsmen, but also of workers and intellectuals and supported the anti-fascist movement in general and took action especially against the abuse of the Olympic Games.

After the Dutch Olympic Committee, with the exception of some sports associations, had finally decided on a participation in the Olympic Games in Berlin, the BOG and the BKVK (Association of Artists for the Defence of Cultural Rights) decided to hold an art exhibition with the title D.O.O.D. in Amsterdam at the same time as the Olympic Games took place in Berlin.

The abbreviation D.O.O.D. stands for: "De Olympiade Onder Diktatuur", in which the initials of the title spell death in Dutch. Thus by its mere name the exhibition was able to put emphasis on the repression practiced in National Socialist Germany.

The exhibition contained two parts, which were spatially separated:

On the one hand there was the documentary section with photos, letters, reports, books and caricatures, which wanted to point to the present social and cultural situation in Germany, on the other there was the artistic section with about 270 works, including paintings, drawings, diagrams, photos, posters and sculptures.

The documentary contributions were split into the branches literature, education (religion and races), law, science, theatre, film, music, feminist movement and sport; through a clever technique of spatial face-to-face arrangement they were consciously presented in such a way that the beholder became aware of the National Socialist world view in Germany in contrast to the democratic one.

The idea to hold such an exhibition met with broad approval among numerous artists both in the Netherlands and abroad. Many internationally well-known and progressive artists, representing the most varied modern lines of art, some of them even praised as paving the way for a new development in art, such as Max Ernst, Jean Lurcat, Georges Vantangerloo and Otto Freundlich made a contribution to the exhibition.

The most extensive submissions came from the Netherlands, France and England, the countries Belgium, Denmark and Sweden contributed a smaller collection. Czechoslovakia and the USA were represented by one artist each.

Exiled German artists participated in the form of the "Collective of German Artists" from Paris or were integrated into the contributions of the other countries. The artists were neither confined by directions from the management of the exhibition what concerns style, neither what concerns

theme and artistic technique. That's why the exhibition offered a broad range of themes, different styles alongside the most varying artistic techniques.

If you consider the works of the exhibition from a thematic point of view, it is a striking fact that the topic sport was treated very rarely. On the other hand there were many works having a political topic. Some works indirectly revealed the events in Germany, portraying non-Aryans, such as Jews, blacks, gypsies and Asians or being directly devoted to the inhuman crimes committed in the concentration camps. These political themes were often accompanied by caricatures and could primarily be found in the section documentation.

In numerous realistic works, mostly from the Netherlands, the artists wanted to express their solidarity with the workers and peasants.

Some works, following surrealism, showed a sort of "superreality" with allegorical meaning. The biggest part of the exhibited works were of concrete nature and only very few artists, laying more emphasis on form and colour than on content, presented inconcrete, abstract themes.

The counter-exhibition of Amsterdam is of great importance among the international protest movement against the Olympic Games to be held in Berlin, because it was the only massive protest of artists and moreover took place at exactly the time of the Olympic Games. It was the declared aim of the exhibition to give to artists who could not, or refused to, participate in the Olympic Art competition because of their origin or conception of art, the chance of presenting their works to a larger public all the same.

The organizers kept emphasizing not to pursue any political aim with the exhibition. But most of the partaking artists were politically active in some way or the other, whether through the active work in a popular front movement or through the membership in a mostly left-wing oriented group of artists.

Moreover it is justified to assume that the artists, with few exceptions, did not actually want to contribute to the Olympic Art competition in Berlin. Their participation in Amsterdam was not directed immediately against the abuse of the Olympic Games or the abuse of art in the Games, but rather against fascism in general.

What strikes most is that it is those countries which sent a considerable collection to the counter-exhibition that had cancelled their participation in Berlin, as for example France and England. This might well have its reasons in the fact that the anti-fascist consciousness was extremely well-developed especially among the artists of these countries and that the respective governments which were in power at the time of the Olympic Games did not support a participation in the Art competition, as in the case of France.

The interference of representatives of the German government in the counter-exhibition showed how far-reaching the influence of the National Socialist rulers was.

Before the opening of the exhibition it was especially advertising posters (shot-putters with swastika), which had been placarded all over Amsterdam, that arose the annoyance of the German Government. The German consul in Amsterdam urged the major of Amsterdam in a letter to have the posters removed and their further distribution prohibited. The German legation also approached the Dutch ministry of foreign affairs demanding to close the exhibition because according to the consul the documentary section in particular contained a large quantity of anti-german material which would deeply harm Germany's reputation and honour.

As the exhibition did not take place in a public building, it is true that the Amsterdam major was, according to Dutch law, not entitled to have it closed down, but diplomatic pressure on the part of Germany had finally brought about that several works were removed in advance and during the exhibition.

## **6. Conclusion**

The investigation of the Olympic Art competition of 1936 has shown that the National Socialist rulers didn't use the connection of sport and art to express the Olympic Idea, but to glorify the political function of sport in the Third Reich. This paradox made numerous artists from different countries of Europe and the USA come together in order to fight for the preservation of the original Olympic Idea and of artistic freedom within the framework of the counter-exhibition D. O. O. D.

As a result of the consideration of the exhibition it can be stated that the documentary section was supposed to directly, the art section to indirectly draw the beholder's attention to the abuse of the Olympic Games in Berlin.

The biggest part of the exhibiting artists regarded the D.O.O.D. basically as a possibility to be able to face the imminent danger of National Socialism, the exhibition not addressing a small group of revolutionaries, but all people fighting against fascism.

Although the D.O.O.D. exhibition can, in spite of the intervention on the part of Germany and the Netherlands, taken for itself, be regarded as a success, the anti-Olympian movement in general was a failure and the holding of the Olympic Games in Berlin could not be prevented. Leo Klaster, journalist and co-organizer of the D.O.O.D. of 1936, remarked that the result of the exhibition did not, compared to the general anti-Olympic movement, correspond to the efforts taken. 'Das Wichtigste sei es jedoch gewesen, daß man etwas tat, wie wenig es auch bewirkte'.<sup>6</sup>

(But the most important thing was that something was done, irrespective of what could possibly be achieved).

I think that this attitude should serve us as a model to imitate in many respects. This statement encourages us to take massive action wherever human rights are violated in order to create a fertile basis, upon which the Olympic Idea can be realized also in our times.

6 Interview with Leo Klaster from the information film shown at the reconstructed counter-exhibition of 1996.

## **Appendix**

### **Working procedures**

#### **1. Choise of the topic**

##### **1.1. Personal motivation:**

- interest in art
- interest in the thematic connection sport and art
- interest in the topic sport and National Socialism (especially Olympic Games 1936)  
-> trigger: partial reconstruction of the counter-exhibition (presented by the Amsterdam Municipal Archives in 1996)

##### **1.2. Narrowing down the topic:**

- political and cultural situation 1936 as a basis of understanding inherent to the topic itself
- main focus: organization of and contributors to the Art Competitions / counter-exhibition, consideration of single works of art from the field of painting and sculpture

#### **2. Literature**

##### **2.1. SPOLIT - database of the German Sports University of Cologne (Deutsche Sporthochschule Köln)**

##### **2.2. Special literature on the Olympic Games**

- official olympic reports 1928-1948, esp. 1936
- Olympic journals, as f.ex. Olympic Review, Olympisches Feuer
- monographs on the Games of 1936, as f ex.: Mildner (1936), Mindt (1937)
- publications by the Organizing committee of the 1936 Olympic Games, f ex.: OlympiaPressdienst, Olympia-Zeitung
- catalogues of exhibition on the Olympic Art Competitions
- new literature on the Olympic Games 1936, f.ex.: Rump (1996)

### **2.3. Literature on art history**

- encyclopedias on artists
- monographs / biographies on and by single artists
- treatises on art in National Socialism / Degenerate Art
- contemporary journals of art, f ex.: Die Weltkunst, Kunst und Volk, Die Kunst im Dritten Reich

## **3. Study of sources**

### **3.1. Written sources**

- Olympia-archives of Potsdam: records on the Olympic Art Competitions: besides other things, official registration lists of participants / participation, minutes, information on the composition of the committee of art and its collaboration with the ministry of propaganda
- Municipal archives of Amsterdam: collected documents and articles from contemporary journals, esp. records by the Amsterdam police department and the correspondence of Amsterdam authorities with Germany
- Carl and Liselott Diem Archives, Olympic Studies Research Center, Cologne (f ex. speech on the opening of the art exhibition 1936)

### **3.2. Oral sources**

- personal communication with the archivist Peter Hofland (initiator of the reconstruction of the counter-exhibition)

### **3.3. Statements by contemporary witnesses**

- documentary film on the reconstructed exhibition: interview with artists that had participated in the counter-exhibition of 1936 and are still alive
- telephone conversation with an artist still alive (Boris Taslitzky - Prof. Dr. N. Muller)

## **4. The study of literature and sources**

#### **4.1. Collection and ordering of information**

#### **4.2. Hermeneutic interpretation of literature and sources**

- comparison: primary sources - secondary literature  
(comparison: official Olympic report - material in the archives  
exhibition catalogue - material in the archives)  
-> study of the sources  
-> interpretation of single works of art as a supporting element  
(comparison: description of the work in contemporary accounts - actual function  
of the work of art)

#### **4.3. Formulation of working hypothesis and questions**

I. To what extent did the Olympic Art Competitions of 1936 serve the self-portrayal of the Third Reich / National Socialist ends?

Is this observable in the organizational / artistic realm? (General preparations, participation, evaluation of the works of art)

II. In how far does the Amsterdam counter-exhibition refer to the abuse of the Olympic Art Competitions?

What are the aims of the contributing artists?

How is this reflected in the organizational / artistic realm?

III. How can the Olympic Art Competitions and the counter-exhibition be related / compared to each other?

#### **4.4. Proposed structure**

#### **4.5. Elaboration of the single points according to the proposed structure**

### **5. Problems in connection with the literature**

#### **5.1. Literature on the Olympic Art Competitions 1936**

- standard works on the Olympics provide hardly any material  
-> investigation of literature on art history:

- a lot of material about art in National Socialism, many remarks on the Olympic Games of 1936 in general, but few references to Olympic Art Competitions
- single artists often difficult to find in artistic encyclopedias, because only known regionally, not internationally

## 5.2. Literature on the counter-exhibition of Amsterdam

- a lot of material on the protest movement in general, but again hardly any special information about the counter-exhibition  
-> a lot of information drawn from the catalogue of reconstructed exhibition
- main source: catalogue of the reconstructed exhibition
- better situation concerning single artists, as internationally famous

=> **aid through:** MA theses of the German Sports University of Cologne:

- Schwarzer, B.: Die Olympischen Kunstwettbewerbe 1928-1948. Cologne 1983
- Neuwerth, M.: Die Darstellung des Sportlers in der bildenden Kunst des Nationalsozialismus - Eine Analyse ausgewählter Beispiele aus Plastik, Relief and Malerei. Cologne. 1981.

=> research project : "Olympic Art Competitions 1912-1948" carried out by the German Sports Museum in cooperation with the Institute of Sport History at the German Sports University of Cologne.

(Computerized list of different references - unfortunately not available to me.)

## **Selected references**

**ADAM, P.:** Kunst im Dritten Reich. Hamburg 1992.

**BARTMANN, D.** (Hrsg.): Die Olympiade unter der Diktatur. Rekonstruktion der Amsterdamer Kunstolympiade 1936. Kunst im Widerstand. deutsche Ausgabe. Berlin 1996. **BRENNER, H.:** Die Kunstpolitik des Nationalsozialismus. Hamburg 1963.

**DAVIDSON, M.G.:** Kunst in Deutschland 1933-1945. Eine wissenschaftliche Enzyklopädie der Kunst im Dritten Reich. Tübingen 1995.

**MILDNER, F.** (Hrsg.): Olympia 1936 und die Leibesübungen im Nationalsozialistischen Staat. Berlin 1936.

**MINDT, E.** (Hrsg.): Olympia 1936. Die XI. Olympischen Spiele Berlin und die VI. Olympischen Winterspiele Garmisch- Partenkirchen. Berlin 1937.

**NEUWERTH, M.:** Die Darstellung des Sportlers in der Bildenden Kunst des Nationalsozialismus- eine Analyse ausgewählter Beispiele aus Plastik, Relief und Malerei. Diplomarbeit DHS Köln 1981.

**OLYMPISCHER KUNSTWETTBEWERB.** Katalog der Olympischen Kunstausstellung in Halle VI des Ausstellungsgeländes am Kaiserdamm, 26. Juni - 15. August 1936. Berlin 1936.

**ORGANISATIONSKOMITEE FÜR DIE XI. OLYMPIADE BERLIN 1936** (Hrsg.): Amtlicher Bericht. 2 Bde. Berlin 1937.

**RURUP, R.** (Hrsg.): 1936 Die Olympischen Spiele und der Nationalsozialismus. Eine Dokumentation. Berlin 1996.

**SCHWARZER, B.:** Die Olympischen Kunstwettbewerbe 1928-1948. Diplomarbeit. DHS Köln 1983.

**WETZEL, H.:** Der Kampf der Anti-Olympiade-Bewegung gegen den Mißbrauch der Olympischen Spiele 1936. Diss. Potsdam 1964.