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ABSTRACT

The goal of this research is to understand the role, influence, and attitudes of downtown Atlanta business elites on downtown redevelopment policies. The downtown business elites has dominated the local politics of Atlanta for decades in order to achieve their redevelopment objectives. This research investigates the behavior of Atlanta business elites on downtown redevelopment policies from 1950s to 2000s in light of the 1996 Summer Olympic Games experience. This research explored the interplay between Atlanta’s downtown business elites and the city elected officials as well as other interested parties in order to analyze the power and involvement of elites on the urban policy-making process. This study is grounded in urban regime theory to analyze how the business elites of downtown Atlanta attempted to transform Atlanta from a regional-national hub into an international city using the city’s hosting of the Olympic Games as a convenient vehicle to implement their vision.

First, the author lays out the picture in 1950s by introducing the regime actors in Atlanta and by explaining how the regime was shaped and has evolved over decades. Next, the author investigates how the business elites used the Olympics as a convenient vehicle to implement their own vision for downtown redevelopment. Finally, the author discusses the short- and long-term impacts of the Olympics on downtown Atlanta redevelopment. By establishing a connection between the Olympic bidding idea, Olympic legacy, and the changing role of downtown Atlanta business elites in urban policy-making process, this study contributes to the body of literature in urban politics by linking the regime theory and mega-event literatures to expand the understanding of Atlanta’s local political power structure and the city’s policy dynamics in light of the 1996 Olympic experience.

The results indicate that the regime in Atlanta has changed since its creation because of several internal and external factors, including the relative decline of downtown Atlanta, growing and
attractive competitive suburbs, and changing demographics. Local growth advocates have promoted Atlanta first as a regional, then a national, and finally an international city. The Olympic bid was a logical result of the existing regime in Atlanta seeks to transform the city into a world-stage player. Downtown Atlanta business elites sought to use the Olympics as a convenient strategy to create an international city image, reverse the declining trend of office and retail businesses in downtown, and to increase the primacy of downtown Atlanta over growing suburbs in the region. The elites seized the opportunity presented by a potential Olympic hosting in Atlanta to make promises and implement a vision that revitalizes certain downtown areas. Atlanta’s Olympic strategy gave positive results in the short-run, however did not help to increase the primacy of downtown Atlanta in the long term due to short-term focused strategies selected by downtown business elites as well as prioritized regional issues and shifted focus of business elites to regional growth. The findings suggest that regime theory has limited ability to explain the changes in governing coalition.
CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

The goal of this research is to understand the role, influence, and attitudes of downtown Atlanta business elites on downtown redevelopment policies. The downtown business elites has dominated the local politics of Atlanta for decades in order to achieve their redevelopment objectives. This research investigates the behavior of Atlanta business elites on downtown redevelopment policies from 1950s to 2000s in light of the 1996 Summer Olympic experience. This research explored the interplay between Atlanta’s downtown business elites and the city elected officials as well as other interested parties in order to analyze the power and involvement of elites on the urban policy-making process. This study is grounded in urban regime theory to analyze how the business elites of downtown Atlanta attempted to transform Atlanta from a regional-national hub into an international city using the city’s hosting of the Olympic Games as a convenient vehicle to implement their vision. The research aim is to: 1) introduce the regime that was already in place in Atlanta and discuss its primary motivation; 2) explore the business elites’ strategy for using the Olympics to keep their power in stay and to facilitate the primacy of downtown Atlanta; and 3) assess the results of their efforts.

The study is organized as follows:

Chapter two critically reviews the literature on urban theories and mega-event planning. The focus of the literature review is on the determinants of urban political process outcomes. The first part of chapter two examines the studies focusing on the major urban theories—pluralism, regime, elite, and growth machine theory—. The author grounds this study in urban regime theory which argues that public and private interests “function together to make and carry out governing decisions”
The second part of chapter two explores the mega-event literature, specifically Summer Olympics, to identify the challenges and opportunities generated by the events. Overall, in chapter two, the author reviews the past literature to build a theoretical framework suggesting that the downtown Atlanta business elites used the Olympics as a convenient vehicle to implement their own vision for downtown revitalization.

Chapter three outlines the methodology used in this study into four sections: Hypotheses and Time Frame for the Analysis; Study Design, Data Sources and Data Collection Activities; and Data Management and Analysis. The study was grouped into three phases – before, during, and after the Olympics – to facilitate the research design and analysis. Specific propositions of the study were the following:

- **Proposition 1**: the business elites manipulated and shaped the planning decisions in downtown Atlanta to increase their business interests – the regime that prioritizes downtown development projects. From the 1950s to the 1980s, the elites had power to implement their vision and the regime was in good shape.

- **Proposition 2**: starting from 1980s, the local, national and international dynamics limited the power of elites in downtown policy-making process, and the business elites had difficulties influencing the planning decisions of elected officials. In this sense, the Olympic idea provided a means to facilitate the primacy of downtown Atlanta and justify the physical redevelopment of downtown Atlanta.

- **Proposition 3**: from the business elites’ perspective, the Olympics partially delivered the expected benefits, such as revitalizing specific downtown area, increasing the global recognition of Atlanta, and attracting more businesses and residents to downtown Atlanta. These effects were positive for a short-time period right after the Olympics, but these
benefits were not long-lasting and did not help to facilitate the primacy of downtown Atlanta for the long-term because of other internal and external factors. From a theoretical perspective, regime theory has limited ability to explain the changes in Atlanta’s governing coalition.

As examining these propositions, the author focused on addressing the research questions listed below:

- Who are the downtown Atlanta business elites (Individuals and organizations)?
- What has been the downtown Atlanta business elites’ goals?
- How do the elites influence, manipulate, and shape local policy decisions?
- How and why have the downtown Atlanta business elites’ attitudes evolved throughout the time?
- What was the logic behind the Olympic bid of Atlanta from the business elites’ point of view?
- How did the Olympic idea provide a means to facilitate the primacy of downtown Atlanta and to justify the physical redevelopment of downtown Atlanta as a convention and touristic destination?
- What was the Olympic legacy from the business elites’ point of view?
- Did the Olympics meet the elites’ expectations? Why?
- Does regime theory help us understand the changes in Atlanta’s governing coalition?

The study covers the time period from 1950s to 2000s to set the boundaries of the case. Phase 1 covers the period before the Olympic idea was introduced (starting from the 1950s to the early 1980s). This phase is the regime baseline that represents the conditions before the Olympic bidding
idea (Corresponds to proposition 1). Phase 2 covers the period of Olympic bidding and preparation (late 1980s to 1996). (Corresponds to proposition 2). Phase 3 covers the period after the Olympics was staged, from 1996 to the present. (Corresponds to proposition 3).

This qualitative case study investigation used multiple sources, including public agency documents at different levels; interviews with key decision makers; academic articles and books researching urban planning, regime theory, and mega-event planning; newspaper articles; and other online documents. Both primary and secondary data are reviewed: the official documents and reports from various governmental and non-governmental organizations (Public and private memos, local government policy statements, Olympic host city report, master plans, official websites), previous academic studies on mega-event planning, regime theory, planning policy, and press releases and media reports from local and national newspapers.

The data is analyzed and reported in three phases in the following three chapters;

Chapter four describes the history of Atlanta’s “governing regime” from its early period to 1980s. The author introduces the regime actors in Atlanta, their motivation for downtown redevelopment, and presents the story of elites in Atlanta trying to shape policies in order to further their objectives in the face of external factors (suburbanization/decentralization); how the regime is shaped and evolved, who the elite actors are, and how they affected the policy making process. Atlanta is well known for its “governing coalition” that functions as an “informal agreement” between the elected officials, white business leaders, and the black community leaders to make governing decisions (Stone, 1989). Atlanta business elites focused their attention on downtown development and they used every policy tool, including transportation plans, urban renewal, and other federal laws to increase the primacy of downtown Atlanta. Despite the suburbanization/decentralization trend that
affected all the US cities in 1950s, Atlanta civic leaders were very active to keep the central business district vibrant and attractive.

The Atlanta regime established with William Hartsfield’s mayoralty in 1940s and kept the same structural and functional form during Ivan Allen, Jr.’s mayoralty in 1960s. Hartsfield and Allen created “the City too busy to hate” with racial integration and massive urban development including the infrastructural facilities such as the stadium, civic center, the airport, rapid-rail system, and the freeway network; strong convention and tourism industry. Atlanta completed its transformation from being a regional capital to a national city during Allen’s mayoralty. In 1969, Sam Massell got the majority of the black votes and won the election as the first Jewish mayor of Atlanta. Maynard Jackson was also elected as the first black vice-mayor of Atlanta in that election. The transition began with Massell’s election, which was a clear sign that power was shifting toward a growing black electorate. He was Jewish and liberal, and he had strong ties to labor groups. As a result of the change on electoral dynamics with “white flight,” Maynard Jackson was elected in 1973 as the first black mayor of Atlanta. The regime dynamics began to change with blacks’ stronger presence in Atlanta politics, but the power of business elites on governing coalition have not weakened. During his mayoralty, Jackson realized that he needs the business elite’s support in order to govern effectively, and the relationship between the mayor and the business elites were repaired by the end of Jackson’s second term in order for Jackson to govern effectively with the support of business elites. The governing coalition recovered during Jackson’s second mayoral term and a new phase started with the election of Andrew Young in 1981 as the second black mayor of Atlanta, who has been a growth advocate.

Chapter five discusses how the Olympic Games provided an opportunity for downtown business elites to overcome the loss of interest in downtown Atlanta and to increase their power in
manipulating and shaping policy decisions. The author explores the business elites’ strategy for using the Olympics to facilitate the primacy of downtown Atlanta. Downtown Atlanta started to relatively decline in 1980s and the business elites looked for a strategy to keep the primacy of downtown. Atlanta business leaders turned to market based solutions, such as tourism and convention promotion, in order to generate profit and increase the reputation of the city in an era where the manufacturing is declining and the competition with the surrounding suburbs for office space tenants and residents has intensified. The new strategy carried out with the idea of Olympic hosting. In chapter five, the author examines the rationale of the Olympic bid and analyzes the short- and long-term impacts of the 1996 Summer Olympics from the business elites’ perspectives.

Chapter six reviews the changes after staging the Olympics and explores the Olympic legacy from the elites’ point of view as well as the regime changes after the Olympics. The author evaluates the role of business elites in Atlanta after the Games, and seeks to analyze the differences between the pre-Olympic and the post-Olympics phase based on the changes that took place during the Olympic preparation phase. The focus is not on the Games themselves, but the opportunity presented by the Olympic Games for Atlanta business elites to make promises and implement a vision that promotes the downtown area. The aim is neither to justify the use of the Olympic Games as an urban regime tool, nor to denigrate it. Instead, the principal objectives are to identify and evaluate the way that the Olympics was used by the business elites within the context of Atlanta.

In Chapter seven, the author assesses the results of downtown Atlanta business elites’ effort with respect to downtown redevelopment policies in light of Atlanta’s Olympic experience and presents overall findings and recommendations. Chapter seven concludes that the regime in Atlanta was established in 1950s and was in good shape until 1980s. The business elites had the power and resources to shape and manipulate the planning decisions in downtown to increase their business
interests. However, starting from 1980s, the local, national and international dynamics limited the power of elites in downtown policy-making process. In this policy environment, Olympics as a new strategy provided a means to facilitate the primacy of downtown Atlanta. This new strategy was partially successful mainly because of other external factors. The Olympic organizers used the key strengths of Atlanta such as the convention facilities, rapid-rail system, and the airport to get the Olympics and implemented a vision that revitalizes certain downtown areas. The elites seized the opportunity presented by a potential Olympic hosting in Atlanta to make promises and implement a vision that revitalizes certain downtown areas. Atlanta’s Olympic strategy gave positive results in the short-run, however did not help to increase the primacy of downtown Atlanta in the long term due to short-term focused strategies selected by downtown business elites as well as prioritizing regional issues and shifting focus of business elites to regional growth. The regime in Atlanta was different than what it was in 1950s or 1970s. Economic, social, demographic, and political changes resulted in changes on governing coalition and the elites focus have shifted to regional issues rather than concentrating on downtown Atlanta.
CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW AND THE THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

In this chapter, the author reviews and synthesizes the past literature to build a theoretical framework suggesting that the downtown Atlanta business elites used the Olympics as a convenient vehicle to implement their vision for the future of downtown Atlanta as an attractive business and convention center. The theoretical framework engages a wide literature on theories of urban politics – especially regime theory – and mega-event planning in order to establish a connection between the Olympic bidding idea, Olympic legacy, and the changing role of downtown Atlanta business elites in urban policy-making process. The theories of urban politics literature provides an understanding of how business interests are integrated into governing coalitions in order to shape and manipulate policy-decisions as seen in Floyd Hunter’s (1953 and 1980) and Clarence Stone’s (1989) case studies of Atlanta. The mega-event planning literature addresses the challenges and opportunities generated by mega-events itself, specifically Summer Olympics, and how Atlanta managed those subjects in practice. Olympics are not just a sporting competition, but also big international phenomena in many respects and generate demand not only for the event itself, but also for other related services. The Olympic Games require years of event planning, also posing one of the biggest global planning challenges, and this research investigates Atlanta experience in detail. The examination of these intimately related literatures will set the stage for the analysis of the business elites’ interest in downtown revitalization, their involvement in the Olympic preparation process, and the results of their effort.

In the first section of this chapter, major urban theories - namely elitist, pluralist, growth machine, and regime – are presented, and the differences between these theories and regime theory are explored in order to justify the significance of regime theory to apply to this study. The chapter
also presents the main components of regime theory, particularly from Floyd Hunter’s and Clarence Stone’s case study of Atlanta and other relevant studies. The author uses regime theory as the foundation of this study as it provides the most relevant approach to study Atlanta’s governing coalition. In the second section of this chapter, the mega-event and the Olympics literature is presented.

2.1 Theories of Urban Politics

2.1.1 Pluralist Theory

The Merriam-Webster Dictionary defines pluralism as “a situation in which people of different social classes, religions, races, etc., are together in a society but continue to have their different traditions and interests.” Pluralism proposes that city politics are defined by fragmentation and the influence of a variety of different actors in different spheres (Judge et al., 1995).

In pluralist model, the structure of electoral organizations and political coalitions determine public officials’ behavior (Elkin, 1987). Pluralists discount the idea that a group of elite could dominate the policy-making process in a community. Instead of a central business elite or coalition controlling all decisions, non-governmental organizations and community groups have access to government actors. Decision making process is fragmented and decentralized in pluralist theory. Pluralists argue that the elected officials have a distinct authority and power to make policy decisions, but the political system is “open to groups who are active, organized and want to be heard” (Dahl, 1986, 182-3). In Pluralist theory, benefit of a policy for specific groups determines their motivation level to participate, “those groups with the greatest immediate stake have the most say in any given decision arena.” (Stone 2008a, p. 161-62)
2.1.2 Elitist Theory

Elitist Theory argues that the power is concentrated rather than dispersed as it is argued in Pluralist Theory. According to Elitist Theory, one single group can influence the policy making process with their reputation or close relationships with elected officials and affluent business leaders. Floyd Hunter applied elite theory in his reputational analysis of Atlanta (1953 and 1980). Floyd Hunter’s influential case study of Atlanta, “Community Power Structure” was published in 1953 and gained popularity for its analysis of business involvement in politics and civic affairs in the “Regional City” (Hunter declined to identify Atlanta by name).

Hunter (1953) finds that a group of individuals and institutions in Atlanta dominate the policy arena with their economic power, and they manipulate the decisions to accomplish their business objectives. Hunter’s book Community Power Structure: A Study of Decision Makers resulted in elitist theory. Hunter (1953) designated the “men of power” who “were located by finding persons in prominent positions in four groups that may be assumed to have power connections. These groups were identified with business, government, civic associations, and “society’ activities.” (p. 11) Majority of the “men of power” in Regional City were wealthy businessmen, not government members. In Atlanta, “institutions and the formal associations play … a vital role in the execution of determined policy … but the formulation of policy often takes place outside these formalized groupings. Within the policy-forming groups the economic interests are dominant” (Hunter, 1953, p.82). Hunter argued that the real power was a function of reputation. “All policy-makers are men of power, but all men of power are not, per se, policy-makers” (Hunter, 1953, p. 113). The organized and active business community of Atlanta used its resources to shape and manipulate the policy agenda.
Hunter (1953) focused on “growth coalition” and described Atlanta as a city with the business power structure where businessmen and manufacturers have the power to influence all important public policy decisions. He stated that a small group of businessmen in the “Regional City” influenced the decisions regarding community problems, issues, and projects. Hunter (1953) argues that some individuals and organizations have the power to affect policy decisions: “policy decisions tend to center in the actions of a relatively few men in the community. These men are highly conscious of their position as community leaders, and they use all the propaganda media and the various devices … to keep established policies settled.” (p.208).

Hunter asked the informants “what holds the system together?” and the responses were in a general direction: “It is a sense of obligation which some men have toward others which keeps the system operating.” “It is obligation plus confidence in the ability of some men to get things done, while other men cannot get things done.” “Money holds them together” (Hunter, 1953, P. 104) Hunter concluded that “the structure is held together by common interests, mutual obligations, money, habit, delegated responsibilities, and in some cases by coercion and force.” (Hunter 1953, P. 113)

In his follow up study, Hunter (1980) “views Atlanta in transition” and questions “How does it differ from that of 1950?” He analyzes the changes in Atlanta’s power structure over time and finds only minor changes. Hunter (1980) states that “the policy-makers are few in number, and generally the underlying population has acquiesced to their decisions regarding actions affecting the whole community.” (Hunter, 1980, p.14)

2.1.3 Growth Machine Theory

Logan and Molotch (1987) developed Growth Machine Theory, which formalizes a political economy of place by distinguishing use-value and exchange-value of land. According to the
Growth Machine Theory, “rentiers,” who are interested in maximizing their profit from their land, shape the urban development process. Rentiers are allies with several groups, who also benefit from the development process: businesses that directly benefit from the development—such as developers, contractors, and architects; businesses that indirectly benefit because development increases the demand for their product and services—for instance utility companies and local media; lastly the local institutions such as universities, cultural organizations, and professional sports clubs can benefit from the development policies because of their local ties. Logan and Molotch (1987) recognizes the fact that the power of a group determines their capacity to influence the decision making process, and in general the system works against the least powerful. “In many cases, probably in most, additional local growth under current arrangements is a transfer of wealth and life chances from the general public to the rentier groups and their associates” (Logan and Molotch, 1987, 53).

Logan and Molotch (1987) identify the major players in “growth machine” model as “the people who use their time and money to participate in local affairs are the ones who—in vast disproportion to their representation in the population—have the most to gain or lose in land-use decisions” (p. 62). Other players include the “business people in property investing development and real estate financing” who are supported by “lawyers, syndicators and property brokers” (p. 62) Local media, especially the local newspaper, plays an important role in the governing collation and their owners and editors are in favor of growth and they often serve as coalition builders, growth advocates and gatekeepers to prevent opposition views. Universities and civic institutions are also supportive players in the governing coalition.
2.1.4 Regime Theory’s Emergence as a Critique of Earlier Methods

Clarence Stone (1976) found pluralist theory’s foundation as a good starting point to formulate an alternative theory of community power and group influence by focusing specifically on public officials’ role in policy formation. In regime theory, however, preferences are disaggregated and shaped through interactions in the policy arena (Stone, 1993). The pluralist notion that each group can impact the decision making process is considered to be defective in regime theory. Every group who has a stake may not be able to participate in governing coalition because of their limited resources to offer elected officials (Stone, 2008a). As a result, the regime disproportionately benefits a small elite as seen in Atlanta case where affluent business elites had a strong power to manipulate the policy decisions, whereas community groups without any resources had little impact.

Stone (1993) emphasizes the differences of regime analysis from pluralism by rejecting the three main assumptions of pluralist theory; voting as a key aspect of political power, considering public and private as politically separate units, and autonomous state assumption (p. 4) Stone (1989) acknowledges that “voting power is certainly not insignificant, but policies are decided mainly by those who control important concentrations of resources” (p. 239) According to Judge et al. (1995), “Regime theory sees the world through the lens of building governing coalitions to accomplish public purposes. It leads us to focus our attention not on how decisions are made, but on how important goals are set forth and achieved, on social production rather than social accounting” (Judge et al., 1995, p.3). In other words, the focus of regime theory is on “social production” or “power to”, not on “social control” or “power over” as it is the case for the pluralist and elitist theory. Regime theory “directs our attention away from the question of ‘who rules’ to the question
of how public purposes are accomplished and, in particular, to how long-term effective governing coalitions to achieve such purposes are constructed and sustained” (Judge et al., 1995, p.6).

One major difference between growth machine theory and regime theory is their starting point to explain the coalition formation: “growth coalition theory starts with the private economic sector and shows why and how it corrals government, whereas regime theory starts with government and then looks at how elected officials find coalition partners in the private sector.” (Domhoff, 2014) Growth machine theory emphasizes the importance of land-based policies on formulating policy agendas, focuses mostly on land-based development policies, and ignores other players and elements of the decision making processes. Whereas, regime theory explains the policy making process by including other groups and individuals to the analysis, and it advances the growth machine theory.

The basic proposition of each of these theories is the same: interested actors manipulate and shape the local policy agenda in their favor by using the resources they have. According to Stone (1987), local development agenda is shaped by the structure of the growth coalition, the interrelationship among the coalition members, and the available resources. As Schimmel (2001) states, “whether labeled as ‘growth machines’, ‘growth coalitions’, ‘governing coalitions’, or ‘urban regimes’, local level urban policy is produced through the proximate actions of interested actors with common stakes in urban development who use their political and cultural resources to intensify land use for profit.” (p. 264)

2.1.5 Regime Theory’s Central Propositions

Elkin (1987a) first introduced the term “regime” to describe the local adaptation of growth coalitions. Elkin (1987a) suggests that different coalitions between elected officials and land-based
interests are possible depending on the local business community. Elkin classifies regimes as pluralist, federalist, and entrepreneurial. Pluralist regimes are common to racially diverse industrial cities in 1950s and 60s, whereas federalist regimes are common in cities where neighborhood organizations and minority groups are included in political arena. Entrepreneurial regimes, however, are common in the Southern part of the United States where the business interests dominate the political arena.

According to Elkin (1987a), the key point in understanding the growth politics in a city is that the officials feel obligated to consult the “privileged” businessmen’s interests because “officials believe that their cooperation is necessary and that their own electoral prospects are tied to the benefits engendered by development efforts; and businessmen believe that they rightfully have a special place in the city’s politics.” (p.46) Elkin argues that his explanations “are structural in the sense that the choices open to political leaders are understood to be constrained by the economic arrangements in which the city is situated.” He continues: “But, not only do I argue that political leaders have choices in how to respond to this economic context; I contend that they also have other considerations in mind, most notably how to pursue their political ambitions and how to get and continue to be elected. … The result of these various factors, I argue, is that there is a strong tendency for political leaders and businessmen, particularly those concerned with land-use matters, to find themselves in tacit or open alliance. The results of this, in turn, are the foreshortened public agenda alluded to above, the corresponding problems of systematic bias and ineffective problem solving, and a citizenry ill-suited to the running of the sort of republic that we wish to be.” (p. 8)

Clarence Stone applies the regime analysis into his work. Stone (1989) analyzes the “urban regime,” which is “the informal arrangements by which public bodies and private interests function together to make and carry out governing decisions” (p.179). Stone (1989 and 1993) characterizes
“regime” as a complex and fragmented system with no consensus and no formal hierarchy. Stone (1989) is concerned with “social production” – how to achieve a governing capacity: “What is at issue is not so much domination and subordination as a capacity to act and accomplish goals. The power struggle concerns, not control and resistance, but gaining and fusing a capacity to act – power to, not power over” (Stone, 1989, p. 229).

Stone (1987) identifies three factors that shape the specifics of local urban growth: 1) the composition of the community’s coalition for growth; 2) the relationships among the members; and 3) the resources available to the coalition. Stone (1993) identifies four types of regimes: 1) maintenance regimes that attempts to preserve what is already in place rather than making major changes (suburban regimes), 2) development regimes (the regime in Atlanta) that seeks for more resources to “promote growth or counter decline” (p. 18), 3) middle-class progressive regimes that prioritize environmental protection and neighborhood preservation over growth, and 4) lower-class opportunity expansion regimes that require more resources to achieve mass mobilization that would involve “enriched education and job training, improved transportation access, and enlarged opportunities for business and home ownership” (p.20).

Stone (1987b) lists the elements of governing coalitions as follows (p. 287-288); 1) Business control of investment activity is a basic feature of all regimes; 2) Control of economic and organizational resources makes major business and financial institutions attractive as allies, especially for activist public officials; 3) Developers themselves are something of a wild card and can show up in any of several arrangements-incorporated into a general business coalition (as in Dallas) or more as free agents in deal making (as in Albuquerque); 4) As a force for passivity, the caretaker coalition is dependent on access through the city council, ward-based political organizations, or the referendum process; 5) Progressive coalitions are dependent on strong
ideological commitment among key public officials and a favorable ideological predisposition among the voting public; 6) Unless public officeholders are attached to a traditional system of small-stakes patronage or are alternatively committed to a progressive ideology or perhaps a new-fiscal-populism ideology, they are likely to be drawn toward an alliance with corporate interests. This is especially likely for officeholders who have a taste for activism and a pragmatic bent of mind. It seems likely that many elected executives and top-level professional administrators fall into this category; 7) Because an executive-centered, corporate-allied coalition rests on such a formidable concentration of resources, it is perhaps especially able to circumvent popular preferences and to disregard opposing interests; and 8) A likely countervailing force to executive-centered coalitions that are oriented toward corporate interests is an extensive network of neighborhood, small-business, and minority-group associations actively engaged in politics. Institutions, such as Dayton’s City-wide Development Corporations, can strengthen the representation of diverse interests.

Other distinct features of regime theory lies on the complexity of relationships between individuals and institutions, fragmented character of the urban system, and lack of consensus (Stone, 1989). Thus, “to be effective, governments must blend their capacities with those of various non-governmental actors” (Stone, 1993, 6). Institutions and individuals are mutually dependent to each other, and they obtain sustained cooperation through trust. Regime theory concerns long-term engagement of coalition actors. It is outcome-oriented, and sees political power as a means to achieve certain outcomes. When the regime reaches the “capacity to govern”, each member in the governing coalition gets their share.

Stone (2003) outlines the role of coalition members as follows: “Governments do a certain amount of planning and exercise some wide responsibilities, but much of what they do is to respond to
breakdowns—react to particular problems. Big businesses like banks and utilities also do a certain amount of planning and overall assessment of trends. Business associations, typically the local Chamber of Commerce, also engage in planning and assessment of trends. Large nonprofit institutions and some social agencies conduct studies and plan as well. But none of these entities, not even the government sector, provide comprehensive direction.” (p. 127)

Regime theory is the theoretical foundation on which the author argues that its tenets best fit the subject matter at hand, because it has already applied to Atlanta and expanded the understanding of Atlanta’s local political power structure and the city’s policy dynamics. Stone’s (1989) examination of the biracial governing coalition of Atlanta over four decades shows how the elites manipulated the policy agenda for downtown development, which was the main strategy of elites to transform the city into a global business center. The airport, MARTA system, freeways that “lead to downtown,” sport facilities, and hotels all together created an attractive touristic and convention center. Business elites has actively engaged in policy-making process to manipulate the policy agenda in favor of their interests. In this sense, Atlanta’s “regressive” policy agenda “favors the interests of upper-strata groups and disregards or harms the interests of lower strata groups” (Stone, 1989, p.166).

This study attempts to advance the regime theory by applying it to Atlanta for the Olympic planning and Olympic legacy periods. The competition among local governments in the United States to attract businesses leads to the promotion of growth of cities, and this growth orientation creates motivated and determined coalitions that are engaged in politics more than ever (Altshuler and Luberoff, 2003). As a result, the projects that are implemented are mostly the ones with a political support as well as support from the business coalition. In the case of the Atlanta Olympics, we see a situation where most of the decisions are made through public-private partnerships, the
winning projects were the ones that the business coalitions promoted and the political support followed later.

2.2 Mega-Event and the Olympics Literature

Mega-Event and the Olympic literature is essential for the analysis of this study, because this study covers the Olympic bidding, Olympic preparation, and Olympic Legacy aspects of Atlanta case. The largest exceptional public events (ECMT, 2002) that are defined as ‘mega’ includes the Summer Olympic Games, Expos, World Cups, and Commonwealth Games, which attract millions of visitors and also justify large-scale infrastructure development (Roche, 2002).

Mega-events have the potential to be the catalyst for host cities to apply their planning strategies in a more focused environment, and they can result in remarkable changes in infrastructure, urban form, and city image (Essex and Chalkley, 1999; Essex and Chalkley, 2004). For example, according to Essex and Chalkley (1998), the Olympic Games offer “the justification for related developments to be ‘fast-tracked’ through accelerated planning, design and construction.” (p. 201). Mega-events are “the best stage upon which a city can make the claim to global status” (Short, 2004, p.24). Thus the appeal of local elites to mega-events and their own economic interests seem logical.

1976 Montreal Games and 1984 Los Angeles Summer Olympic Games are two mile stones for the Olympic movement in terms of the financial concerns. 1976 Montreal Games concluded with a debt of $2.8 billion, and cities hesitated at hosting the 1984 Olympics. Two years before the 1976 Olympics, the host city for the 1980 Olympics had already been selected. Los Angeles and
Moscow were the only two cities to bid for the 1980 Summer Olympics, and Moscow was selected over Los Angeles as the host city in 1974.

After the financial problems of 1976 and 1980 Games, only two cities expressed their interest for hosting the 1984 Olympics: Tehran and Los Angeles. When Tehran decided to drop out, Los Angeles became the only bidding city and was awarded to host the 1984 Summer Olympic Games by default. Two consecutive Olympic Games were boycotted; US-led boycott of the 1980 Olympics prompted the Soviet-led boycott of the 1984 Olympics. 1984 Los Angeles Olympic bid was privately-initiated by a group of business leaders (Burbank et al., 2002). The City of Los Angeles refused to sign financial responsibility contract with IOC (Rule 4) and IOC had no other option rather than waiving this rule for 1984 Olympics (IOC, 1978; 1979). This could explains “the absence of significant public sector financial support in Los Angeles, and, perhaps, the private financial success the 1984 Games are thought to have enjoyed.” (Baade and Matheson, 2002, p. 32) The success of Los Angeles Games and the profit that is generated increased the interest of other cities to host the Games.

Especially after the 1984 Los Angeles Games, the economic value of the Olympics has increased. The Los Angeles approach to the bidding process changed “the Olympic Games financial model for less public and more private financing” (Zimbalist 2011, p. 120), and showed that the Games could be profitable. The Games generated positive publicity for the city and its tourist industry with a minimum amount of tax money. Therefore, hosting the Games became more popular and got more attention from city leaders all around the world (Burbank et al. 2001). The image of a success Olympics and $223 million profit of Los Angeles Olympics increased the number of competing cities for the following Summer Olympic Games. As seen in Table 1, Olympic Games has been growing in many aspects since the 1984 Los Angeles Olympics.
Table 1. The Growth of the Summer Olympic Games

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Host City</th>
<th>Year of the Olympics</th>
<th>Tickets Sold (in millions)</th>
<th>Number of Countries</th>
<th>Number of Athletes</th>
<th>Number of Events</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles, USA</td>
<td>1984</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>6,829</td>
<td>221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seoul, Korea</td>
<td>1988</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>8,391</td>
<td>237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barcelona, Spain</td>
<td>1992</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>9,356</td>
<td>257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atlanta, USA</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>10,318</td>
<td>271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sydney, Australia</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>10,651</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athens, Greece</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>10,625</td>
<td>301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beijing, China</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>10,942</td>
<td>302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London, UK</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>10,500</td>
<td>302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rio De Janeiro, Brazil</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


The shift to the significance of mega-events increased the interest of researchers to the impact of mega-events. Mega-events have been studied from many different perspectives, such as their economic impacts, tourism impacts, or urban regeneration impacts. The early studies by Ritchie (1984), Hall (1992, 1997), and Roche (1992) provide the foundation that the Olympics can be seen as a tool for local economic development. For Preuss (2004), the Games globally increase the recognition of the host city and this positive climate attracts business investment to the host city.
The Olympics also create a positive tourism legacy by strengthening the host city’s image as a brand. The involvement of government at different levels has also been investigated.

Olympic Games, as the biggest mega-event, have been extensively investigated by researchers in different fields. The literature examines the impact and benefits of the Olympics in promoting economic development, marketing, creating a world city image, and attracting tourists and international businesses. Most of the studies focus on the potential benefits and positive impacts of mega-events. For example, the 1992 Barcelona Games has been cited as an exemplary Olympic Games because of the indelible mark left on Barcelona. 1992 Barcelona Games used “the Olympics as a mechanism to re-qualify existing urban land” and the Games has been recognized as a success story in terms of its urban legacy (Millet, 1997, p. 128). The Games showed the positive effects of events on the city by strengthening its image, infrastructure, urban landscape, and culture to compete with global cities (Millet, 1995). “The [Barcelona] Games served as a catalyst for urban and economic change in the city, positioning Barcelona internationally and communicating its constructed image to a global audience” (Kenneth and Moragas, 2006, p. 191).

On the other hand, there are some studies that investigate the negative impacts of the Olympics on host cities. The Atlanta Games are seen as the examples of negative social impacts of Games on host cities (Lenskyj, 2000). The Atlanta Olympics includes the features of the Los Angeles Games with a minimum of new public investment and a maximization of private profit (Rutheiser, 1996), mainly because both the Games were privately funded. For Atlanta, “no new taxes” pledge was in the heart of the Olympic Organization to get and keep public support for the Games and it limited government involvement on major decisions (French and Disher, 1997). The lack of public involvement and public funding for the Atlanta Games also meant that implementing comprehensive and integrated planning was limited. In order to hold the city harmless against any
financial liability, Atlanta took full advantage of existing facilities and adapted them to Olympic sports venues through necessary modification and/or installing temporary equipment and systems in order to avoid the under-use of venues (Larson and Staley, 1998; Smith, 2007). In this sense, Atlanta Olympics did not result in extensive urban redevelopment effort, rather the Olympic organizers targeted for intangible benefits. For Atlanta, the main motivation was to advertise itself as an international city. Atlanta focused more on “Olympics-as-sport” side and, thus, the needs of some of its communities were disregarded (Andranovich et. al, 2001) The goal of the Atlanta Games was to promote business growth, create a world city image, and attract international business to the city without paying enough attention to residents’ needs (Hiller, 2000). For example, the Centennial Park construction dislocated many businesses without assistance for relocating, and the Olympic Stadium construction inflicted further damage on low-income black neighborhoods in the area. Their limited role in Olympic planning prevented local governments from taking action to protect these people from damage (Keating, 2001).

The Olympic Games are one of a kind opportunity for any city to attract global attention and become the center of the globe for three-week period. This is one of the main motivations for cities to compete for hosting the Games. The Olympics could also serve as a catalyst to solve the aged urban problems, and could “provide a unique opportunity for politicians and industry to move hidden agendas such as the improvement of infrastructure for sport, housing, communication, traffic and other sectors.” (Preuss, 2004, p. 1)

Overall, the regime theory and the mega-event literature provides the necessary tools to analyze the Olympic strategy of downtown Atlanta business elites. These two literature guides the author to expand the understanding of Atlanta’s local political power structure and the city’s policy dynamics in light of the 1996 Olympic experience.
CHAPTER 3

STUDY DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

This chapter covers the study design and research methodology employed for this research. The author organized this chapter into four sections: 3.1) Propositions and Time Frame for the Analysis, 3.2) Study Design, 3.3) Data Sources and Data Collection Activities, and 3.4) Data Management and Analysis.

3.1 Propositions and Time Frame for the Analysis

Case study methodology was employed for this research since regime research requires this methodology (Mossberger and Stoker, 2001). Atlanta was selected as the single case for this study mainly because of the extensive literature in Atlanta’s regime and Atlanta’s reputation as a well-known and well-documented case. Propositions of this study were grouped into three phases – before, during, and after the Olympics – to facilitate the research design and analysis:

- **Proposition 1:** the business elites manipulated and shaped the planning decisions in downtown Atlanta to increase their business interests – the regime that prioritizes downtown development projects. From the 1950s to the 1980s, the elites had power to implement their vision and the regime was in good shape.

- **Proposition 2:** starting from 1980s, the local, national and international dynamics limited the power of elites in downtown policy-making process, and the business elites had difficulties influencing the planning decisions of elected officials. In this sense, the Olympic idea provided a means to facilitate the primacy of downtown Atlanta and justify the physical redevelopment of downtown Atlanta.
• **Proposition 3:** from the business elites’ perspective, the Olympics partially delivered the expected benefits, such as revitalizing specific downtown area, increasing the global recognition of Atlanta, and attracting more businesses and residents to downtown Atlanta. These effects were positive for a short-time period right after the Olympics, but these benefits were not long-lasting and did not help to facilitate the primacy of downtown Atlanta for the long-term because of other internal and external factors. From a theoretical perspective, regime theory has limited ability to explain the changes in Atlanta’s governing coalition.

This single-case study investigation engages a wide literature on regime theory, mega-event planning, and urban planning; archival data; and in-depth interviews with area urban planning experts, business leaders, and other interested parties in order to examine the propositions stated above. As examining the hypotheses, the author focused on addressing the research questions listed below:

- Who are the downtown Atlanta business elites (Individuals and organizations)?
- What has been the downtown Atlanta business elites’ goals?
- How do the elites influence, manipulate, and shape local policy decisions?
- How and why have the downtown Atlanta business elites’ attitudes evolved throughout the time?
- What was the logic behind the Olympic bid of Atlanta from the business elites’ point of view?
• How did the Olympic idea provide a means to facilitate the primacy of downtown Atlanta and to justify the physical redevelopment of downtown Atlanta as a convention and touristic destination?

• What was the Olympic legacy from the business elites’ point of view?

• Did the Olympics meet the elites’ expectations? Why?

• Does regime theory help us understand the changes in Atlanta’s governing coalition?

The study covered the time period from 1950s to 2000s to set the boundaries of the case. The following timeline outlines the phases of this research project (Table 2):

• **Phase 1:** The period before the Olympic idea was introduced (starting from the 1950s to the early 1980s). This is the time period before the bidding process. This phase is the regime baseline that represents the conditions before the Olympic bidding idea (Corresponds to proposition 1).

• **Phase 2:** The period of Olympic bidding and preparation (late 1980s to 1996). This phase covers the period starting with the Olympic bidding declaration and ending when the Games are over. This phase includes the short-time period that the Games are staged; however this research separates the staging period from the analysis. Olympic Staging is completely separate than the short- and long-term legacies of the Games. (Corresponds to proposition 2).

• **Phase 3:** The period after the Olympics was staged (from 1996 to the present). Starting from this time period, permanent effects, readjustments, and adaption to new conditions are counted as legacy aspects of the events (Corresponds to proposition 3).
Table 2. Timeframe for the Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phases</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Phase 1: Before the Olympics (1950s-early 1980s) | 1950s: The urban regime in place in Atlanta  
Early 1980s: The idea of Olympic bid | Analyze the regime differences between phase 1 and phase 3 based on the changes/events during phase 2. |
| Phase 2: Olympic Preparation (late 1980s-1996) | 1987: Atlanta submitted its Olympic bid to USOC  
1996: The Games are staged | Examine the vision for Atlanta before the Olympics and the reality after it. |
| Phase 3: After the Olympics (1996 to the present) | Starting from this time period, permanent effects, readjustments, and adaption to new conditions are counted as legacy aspects of the Olympics | |

This study evaluates the role of business elites in Atlanta before the Olympics and the changes after the Games, and seeks to analyze the differences between the pre-bidding phase and the post-event phase based on the changes that took place during the Olympic preparation phase. The focus is not on the Games themselves, but the opportunity presented by the Olympic Games for Atlanta business elites to make promises and implement a vision that promotes the downtown area. The aim is neither to justify the use of the Olympic Games as an urban regime tool, nor to denigrate it. Instead, the principal objectives are to identify and evaluate the way that the Olympics was used by the business elites within the context of Atlanta.

3.2 Study Design

The research followed a logical flow of activities from the preliminary activities and the development of theoretical framework through the data collection and analysis. Preliminary activities include conducting an extensive literature review on regime theory, Olympic planning, and Atlanta history. The review corroborated the need for this research. Next, the author conducted
a series of preliminary interviews with scholars, business leaders, and planning experts that confirmed the need for research on this subject. Lastly, the author incorporated his knowledge and assumptions about Atlanta business elites and their involvement on Olympic idea into the study design. After that, the data collection and analysis activities started. The data is coded and analyzed manually and then, the author synthesized the data by comparing and checking the information from diverse sources. Finally, the findings are reported in an historical chronology framed in the context of regime theory.

### 3.3 Data Sources and Data Collection Activities

This qualitative case study investigation used multiple sources, including public agency documents at different levels; interviews with key decision makers; academic articles and books researching urban planning, regime theory, and mega-event planning; newspaper articles; and other online documents. Both primary and secondary data are reviewed: the official documents and reports from various governmental and non-governmental organizations (Public and private memos, local government policy statements, Olympic host city report, master plans, official websites), previous academic studies on mega-event planning, regime theory, planning policy, and press releases and media reports from local and national newspapers. The resulting information created a triangulation at the data collection level to ensure cohesive research findings.

The most significant data sources for this study were primary documents from the governmental and non-governmental organizations. The second source of information consisted of interviews. At the beginning of the research, the author expected that the interviews would take precedence over the documents; instead, he found that the former sources of data supplemented the latter.
3.3.1 Preliminary Interviews with Experts and Scholars

The author conducted initial telephone interviews with area experts and scholars, with follow up face-to-face interviews. The initial interview participants were identified from the previous scholarly publications, local newspaper articles, and government agency documents. These individuals had either engaged in local policy making and/or Olympic planning process of Atlanta or conducted research on Atlanta and/or Atlanta Olympics. The author asked these interviewees to share their overall thoughts about Atlanta politics and the Olympics itself. These preliminary interviews helped the author to gain necessary contextual information on wide-ranging issues and concerns related to local political dynamics in Atlanta. These interviews confirmed the author’s initial reading that a research on downtown Atlanta business elites’ evolving role and the impact of Olympics on this role was warranted. It also provided a foundation for developing the extent and the direction of the research.

3.3.2 Primary Sources and Documentary Evidence

The author relied on primary data sources for developing a chronology of Atlanta and its elites; identifying key individuals, groups, and organizations involved in policy-making process in Atlanta; and discovering the important information, activities, and events related to elites and their mega-event strategy. This data was crucial in answering the following research question: How did the Olympics provide an opportunity for Atlanta elites to implement their vision for the future of Atlanta?

The author identified and selected the data sources by its authority (e.g., Central Atlanta Progress, Research Atlanta, Atlanta Regional Commission, Olympic Organizing Committee reports) to ensure credibility and its relevance to Atlanta elites and the Olympics. The Kenan Research Center
at Atlanta History Center contained important official and unofficial documents, papers, and reports regarding the history of Atlanta and the Olympic bidding and planning process.

Additionally, newspaper articles from the Atlanta Journal-Constitution (AJC) were obtained from 1950s to 2000s. The author also searched the online databases using the terms, “Atlanta business,” and “elites,” and “Olympics” in the major world publications section in order to retrieve articles about Atlanta Olympics and business elites. The articles were analyzed to explore how the media in Atlanta captured the business involvement in public policy decision-making process and how the media framed the Olympics and created meaning of the concept of Olympic hosting and legacy for the public.

3.3.3 Interviews with Stakeholders

In addition to the wide-ranging research on regime theory, mega-event planning, urban planning, and archival data, the author conducted in-person and telephone interviews with individuals who (or their organizations) were key to overall policymaking process and/or played a key role during Olympic planning process. Interviews with these persons provided a basis for understanding the key players’ involvement on decision-making process from the perspective of the people/organizations directly or indirectly involved. The focus was on the interactions between city elected officials and businesses, and the operation of the urban policy process.

The purpose of the interviews was as follows: (1) to analyze the urban policy-making process and its evolution; (2) to analyze the role and involvement of Atlanta’s downtown business elites on this process; (3) to identify the interactions between players that are involved in this process; and (4) to explore the impacts of Olympic bidding/hosting on the policy-making process.
The author identified the potential interviewees by reviewing various official publications (International Olympic Committee (IOC) documents, Olympic Bid, Local Planning Documents), archival research at the Kenan Research Center, local newspaper releases (the Atlanta Journal-Constitution), and academic publications. This documentary review resulted in both a better understanding of the planning history of Atlanta and an understanding of which individuals and/or business organizations seemed to be regularly engaged in policy discussions.

The author then contacted other individuals as suggested by those interviewees who were believed to have knowledge of decision-making processes and/or Olympic planning process. The author conducted interviews in a snowball manner being aware of the possible bias in such snowballing interviews; he made sure to interview at least one person from the public sector, business sector, Olympic organizing committee, and other stakeholder groups. He stopped interviewing when he was no longer learning anything new from interviewees.

The group of interviewees was the following; city officials and agency staff serving in a position in local or regional planning agencies., private-sector representatives, individuals involved in the Olympic bidding and planning process, community representatives and other interested groups, and academics who carried out research on Atlanta. Around 20 interviewees were conducted. A roster of interviewees is listed in Appendix A.

After each interviewee was identified, the author approached them with a written email invitation that explained the purpose of the study and invited their participation in an in-person or phone interview. The author followed specific research guidelines established by the Florida State University. He completed an overall research application for FSU’s IRB office prior to data gathering (Appendix B). Each interviewee signed individual consent forms (Appendix C) before the interviews. If the individual agreed to participate, the author emailed a set of generic interview
questions (Appendix D) to them in advance, obtained their formal agreement to participate through signing the consent form, and obtained their consent to record the interview for note-taking purposes. Each of the participants who sat for an interview agreed to the stipulations. The interviews ran between 30 minutes – 90 minutes. The author continued to communicate with some interviewees by email for follow-up questions and further clarifications. All interview notes are typed, organized to correspond to each of the three phases of the Games, and then subjected to content analysis to identify the key areas of interest and/or concern that helped organize the mass of interview data.

During the interviews, the author asked questions about the overall policy-making process, the involvement of the businesses on this process, motivation for an Olympic bid from their point of view, their image and their expectations of the Olympics, their view of the consequences of the hosting/bidding process, the easy/difficult tasks and challenges during these processes if they were part of the Olympic planning process, and finally the long-term impact of the Games on urban policy in Atlanta.

The interviews were informal, conversational, and semi-structured in order to obtain a better understanding of each individual’s level of engagement in the policy-making process. During the interviews, the author acted as a “listener” rather than an advocate of a point of view. The author’s primary interests and concerns guided interviews, but he allowed the interviewees to lead him in new directions when appropriate.
3.4 Data Management and Analysis

The author made (electronic or paper) copies of relevant documents to the extent possible. In addition to the online inventory of the materials, the author also organized the documents chronologically (e.g., before Olympics, during the Olympics, after the Olympics) and by themes (e.g., Olympic planning, economic development, business involvement, individuals and organizations as part of the elite coalition, race relations, Atlanta history, regime theory, mayors and their relations with the elites). The interviews are recorded, transcribed, and then summarized to the relevant portions of each. Finally, the author identified scholarly journal articles, newspaper releases, books, and technical reports on Atlanta, business elites, and the Olympic Games. This documentary review resulted in both a better understanding of the planning history of Atlanta and an understanding of which individuals and/or business organizations seemed to be regularly engaged in policy discussions.

Data collection, data analysis, and write-up were all an iterative process, since the study design evolved throughout the research. The historical narrative reported in chapter four was a logical first step for a general understanding of Atlanta business elites and the author addressed some research questions through the historical narrative (e.g., who are the downtown Atlanta business elites (individuals and organizations); what has been the downtown Atlanta business elites’ goals?; How do the elites influence, manipulate, and shape local policy decisions; How and why have the downtown Atlanta business elites’ attitudes evolved throughout the time). Based on this foundation, the author proceeded to analyze the data to address the remaining research question for the second and third phases of the case study (chapters five and chapter six).

After all the data is collected, the author organized and analyzed it chronologically in three different phases; Pre-Bidding Phase covers the time period from 1950s to early 1980s, Bidding
and Candidacy Phase includes the time period from late 1980s to 1996, and Post-Event Phase is the time period starting right after the events are over (1996) to late 2000s. The analyses for the Pre-Bidding Phase are compared to the Post-Event Phase in order to answer the research questions.

The primary data sources are manually coded based on themes (e.g., Olympic planning, economic development, business involvement, individuals and organizations as part of the elite coalition, race relations, Atlanta history, regime theory, mayors and their relations with the elites) to capture data for answering the research questions. The data sources are analyzed by developing a historical narrative focused on outlining the chronology of events in Atlanta, examining the documents in detail, and summarizing them in themes as mentioned above to generate a complete database. The interviews allowed the author to hear from the stakeholders’ point of view and gain their interpretation of the phenomenon. Interviews guided to explore the concerns and to gain a deeper understanding of the activities and events documented in the primary data sources. This analysis allowed the author to develop an historical narrative focused on outlining the chronology of events in Atlanta. First, the author read through the documents and noted key arguments, facts, and quotes that he finds interesting. Next, he identified the connections between the data sources and the historical context. At the end, the author created an outline of the ideas, themes, and events that emerged based on the analysis.
CHAPTER 4
THE STORY OF DOWNTOWN ATLANTA BUSINESS ELITES

This chapter examines how the business elites of downtown Atlanta attempted to transform Atlanta from a regional distribution center to a national hub. The main proposition is that the business elites had engaged in manipulating and shaping planning decisions in order to increase the primacy of downtown Atlanta – the regime that prioritizes downtown development projects. From the 1950s to the 1980s, the elites had power to implement their vision and the regime was in good shape. However by the 1980s, downtown Atlanta started to decline and the competition with the surrounding suburbs for office space tenants and residents intensified. As a result, downtown business leaders turned to market based solutions, such as tourism and convention, in order to generate profit and facilitate the primacy of downtown Atlanta. Market based solutions emerged as the new strategy for the business elites to shape and manipulate policy decisions to pursue their goals.

This chapter answers the research questions listed below:

- Who are the downtown Atlanta business elites (Individuals and organizations) and how do they influence, manipulate, and shape local policy-decisions?
- What has been the downtown Atlanta business elites’ goals?
- How and why have the downtown Atlanta business elites’ attitudes evolved throughout the time?

The purpose of this chapter is to give the reader an informative account of how Atlanta’s regime works. This chapter describes the history of Atlanta’s “governing regime” from its early period to early 1980s by;
• Evaluating the regime that was already in place in Atlanta
• Introducing the regime actors
• Investigating the process of shaping and manipulating planning decisions
• Exploring the dynamics of regime and regime continuity, and
• Explaining the reasons that led the business elites to see the Olympic bid as a convenient vehicle to facilitate the primacy of downtown Atlanta.

4.1 Early History of Atlanta

The history of Atlanta begins when the Georgia legislature authorized a new rail line named, the Western and Atlantic of the State of Georgia, in 1837 to connect the Midwest to the Southeast. At that time, this little village was called “Terminus” because the new railroad “terminated” there, then renamed Marthasville town in 1843, and finally renamed Atlanta in 1845 (Ivey Jr. et al., 1948; White and Crimmins, 1980; ARC, 1997). Atlanta was incorporated as a city in 1847 and the city’s population was about 500 in that year. The population increased to 2600 in 1850, and ten years later reached to 10,000 (Ivey Jr. et al., 1948). Atlanta replaced Milledgeville as the capital city of the State of Georgia in 1868. By 1880, Atlanta became the largest city of the State of Georgia.

After World War 2, Atlanta strengthened its regional primacy as it was designated as the military supply center for the eight states of the Southeast and several federal agencies made Atlanta their regional headquarters (Allen, 1996; Basmajian, 2008). In Allen’s words, by 1946, “Atlanta was the capital of the region by default, in a sense, the one-eyed king in the land of the blind. The demise of the plantations and their barter system gave rise to country stores and a retail economy, with Atlanta as the natural distribution point, the commercial center of an agrarian hinterland” (p. 32). Rose et, al. (2009) argues that Atlanta grew faster than the Southeast region as a whole in the
first half of the 20th century for two reasons. First, Atlanta’s commercial economy was based on the needs of the Southeast region, and then the region grew. Between 1900 and 1950, the population of Georgia and its border states increased at an annual average rate of 1.26 percent. Second, Atlanta extended its economic reach beyond the Southeast and the changing nature of the U.S. economy made urban location economically more rational. By 1950s, Atlanta truly became the economic and administrative capital of the Southeast and its population increased by almost 50 per cent in a decade and reached one million by 1960. Appendix E indicates a more detailed timeline of events.

4.2 Downtown Atlanta Business Elites

“For ordinary citizens of Atlanta, it is [a] widely known fact that ‘things get done’ by a group of people including ‘at least the Coca-Cola Company, the Trust Company of Georgia, the Georgia Power Company, the First National Bank, the Chamber of Commerce, Rich’s department store, the mayor—a list sometimes expanded more recently to include the fast-growing Citizens and Southern Bank, and a half-dozen other names.” (Hunter, 1980, p.14)

Atlanta is well known for its “governing regime” that functions as an “informal agreement” between the elected officials, white business leaders, and the black community leaders to shape the downtown policy agenda. According to Stone (1988), two groups dominate the regime in Atlanta: the elected officials and the downtown business elites – “the banks, the utilities, the major department stores, the daily newspapers, and Coca Cola, in particular, have a long history of acting in concert, and they draw other businesses that may be new to the Atlanta scene into the same pattern of unified public action” (p.169). Real estate firms, the utilities, manufacturing companies, major banks have also had interest in any policy decision that affect the city. Atlanta is the home
of global institutions, such as, Georgia Trust, First National Bank, Coca-Cola, Rich’s, UPS, Southern Bell, and Georgia Power. All these institutions are involved in the policy making process. In Atlanta, “the policy-makers are few in number, and generally the underlying population has acquiesced to their decisions regarding actions affecting the whole community.” (Hunter, 1980, p.14)

The governing coalition consisted of white downtown business leaders, elected officials, and African American political leadership. White “power structure” realized that “Atlanta must come to terms with the Negro if it is to continue to grow and prosper” (Banfield, 1965, p.30). White business leaders supported desegregation and policies to increase housing for middle-class blacks; African American leaders as “junior partners” in the coalition (Stone, 1989), in return, provided electoral support for white elites to control the city hall.

Downtown Atlanta elites viewed Atlanta as a “pattern of land use” thus, the business activities centered on rearranging land-use patterns (Elkin, 1987b). The elites wanted to maximize their profit from land development and manipulated policy-making process. The politics of Atlanta was shaped around land interests, and the elected officials felt obligated to agree with the “privileged” business elites because “officials believe that their cooperation is necessary and that their own electoral prospects are tied to the benefits engendered by development efforts; and businessmen believe that they rightfully have a special place in the city’s politics.” (p.46)

The interviewees also recognized the influence of downtown Atlanta business elites in policy-making processes. One interviewee argued, “Atlanta has a highly functional culture…. Good or bad? No. It has its own way at the extreme end” (Academic 1). One Community representative described Atlanta as a “business-driven town” (Community Representative 1). Up to the late 1960s, the politics and business of the city were pretty much intertwined. The mayor of the City
of Atlanta relied on the support of the business community for their elections. Members of this
downtown elite wielded power not by holding political office but by influencing major decisions
made by elected officials. One exception to this was Ivan Allen Jr., a prominent member of the
downtown elite who served two terms as mayor in the 60s.

Civic-minded leaders such as Robert Woodruff, Ivan Allen, Sr. and many others dedicated their
time, money, and energy for Atlanta to make it a major world city. Robert W. Woodruff is
presumed to be at the top of the “power structure” (Banfield, 1965). As the son of the president of
Trust Company of Georgia, Robert Woodruff, started his business career at the Coca-Cola
Company. He later became the head of both the Coca-Cola Company and the Trust Company of
Georgia. Woodruff led the Coca-Cola Company for more than 50 years and Atlanta’s fate was
linked to the fate of Coca-Cola Company in a sense. Coke’s growth and popular image in the world
increased the recognition of Atlanta as well. “Aside from his financial gifts – or because of them
– Woodruff exerted his influence through close ties to city leaders, and many of them became the
interpreters of Mr. Anonymous’ [Robert Woodruff’s] dream for the city.” (Harris, 1990, p. 134)
Woodruff was very well respected as the unofficial mayor of Atlanta. “No major projects was
executed in Atlanta during the 1940s and through the 1970s without Woodruff money” (Hunter,
1970, p.54). Those business leaders had close relationships, and they were mostly part of an
exclusive club. For the governing coalition, “City Hall and official governmental institutions were
often less important as linkages in the public-policy process than were such private, voluntary
associations as the Capital City Club, the Commerce Club, the Piedmont Driving Club, and of
course the Chamber of Commerce itself.” (Read, 1987, p. 204). Most of the discussions about the
development policy were discussed and formulated in these informal meetings at these clubs and
luncheons (Hunter, 1953).
Newspapers have also been influential by being in favor of progress and civic improvement. Similar to other American cities, two principal newspapers – the morning Atlanta Constitution and the evening Atlanta Journal – and the combined Sunday Journal and Constitution mostly shared the views of the business community and has been a main support of Atlanta. Especially the daily local newspaper Atlanta Journal-Constitution, owned by Cox Enterprises, promoted the elites’ perspective on policy issues. The editors and publishers of the newspaper put the owner’s philosophy in effect: “Make money, support the Chamber of Commerce, vote Democratic, and urge a progressive approach to race.” (Allen, 1996, p. 125)

4.2.1 Civic Organizations and Their Actions

Despite the suburbanization/decentralization trend that affected all the US cities in 1950s, Atlanta civic leaders were very active to keep the central business district vibrant and attractive. As an organization explicitly focusing on downtown, Central Atlanta Progress (CAP) was established to respond to suburbanization trend as well as to coordinate and put the downtown development plans into action (Stone, 1989). CAP, the downtown business interest’s civic organization, has been a very active advocacy group for downtown development, and dominated the planning process in Atlanta since the World War 2. It was created in 1941 as the Central Area Improvement Association. The name changed to Central Atlanta Association, and got its current name as Central Atlanta Progress (CAP) in 1966 (Keating, 2001). CAP has been financed by the private sector – entrepreneurs, banks, insurance companies – and took the initiative to raise funding for several downtown development project, including Bedford Pine Urban Renewal, Underground Atlanta, and finally the Centennial Olympic Park.
As an important organization to promote growth agenda of business elites, CAP produced its first master plan for downtown Atlanta in December, 1971: Central Area Study (CAS-I). CAS-I was the product of a cooperative effort of the City of Atlanta, Central Atlanta Progress, and the U.S. Department of Transportation. CAS-I was originally a transportation plan, and recommended connecting downtown with the airport and the surrounding suburbs by expanding the freeways and the transit system (Leary 1971). The study stated, “there is strong evidence that Atlanta, among only a few U.S. cities so fortunate, can avoid the dominant cycle of declining investment that has seriously affected the viability of central areas in recent years” (Leary 1971).

CAS-I was not adopted as an official report, but “it found its way into official city development policy.” (Rutheiser, 1999, p. 325) Major accomplishments implemented from CAS-I include: the Bedford-Pine/Park Central Communities redevelopment, downtown freeway completion, MARTA rail and bus system, Underground Atlanta, and Woodruff Park (CAP, 2000). CAS-I “became an important planning document in justifying massive new freeway capacity for the city, a rail system, greater gateway capacity into the downtown area on major arterials, the development of parking reservoirs to intercept downtown-bound traffic on its margins, and the decking of Peachtree Street to create a pedestrian promenade above a transit corridor.” (Hartshorn, 2009, p. 140)

Planning for the second Central Area Study (CAS-II) started in 1984, “when individuals who implemented the first Central Area Study saw its recommendations were near completion” (CAP, 1988, p. 12). CAS-II was released in February, 1988 as a cooperative effort of the City of Atlanta, Central Atlanta Progress, and Fulton County. CAS-II focused “not so much on building new buildings, transportation or infrastructure but rather on improving on what we have through maintenance, marketing and design” (CAP, 1988, p. 16). The second study differs from the first
one in its emphasis on improving the tourism, entertainment, and marketing of Atlanta. CAS-II development improvements include: the APEX Museum, Atlanta University Center urban design and streetscape improvements, Fernbank Museum of Natural History, Georgia Dome, Streetscape improvements spurred by Peachtree Street and Auburn Avenue design competitions, Piedmont Park expansion, and public green spaces created, such as the Centennial Olympic Park (CAP, 2000).

CAS-II stated that, “there is a need to develop a national and international campaign to market Atlanta as a fun place to visit. Because of its strength as a regional business center, the presence of professional sports and its reputation for southern hospitality, Atlanta has a sound base on which to build a perception for “funness.” (CAP, 1988, 32) The “funness” was absent of the entertainment facilities. 1984-1988 Comprehensive Plan of Atlanta states that “While the convention industry is centered downtown, most of the restaurants, nightclubs, discos, and other places of interest, such as Stone Mountain and Six Flags, are located outside downtown. Further, many of downtown's shops and restaurants are closed in the evenings.” (Matthews, 1983, p. 11)

The Atlanta Chamber of Commerce has been also engaged in civic matters, and remained active in promoting crime control, downtown housing, and other similar development programs. Research Atlanta, a public policy research institution reflects the view of downtown business elites, has been funded by the Atlanta Chamber of Commerce until it was affiliated with Georgia State University in 1992 (Keating, 2001).

In the African American community, however, there has not been any organization similar to CAP with a capacity to take action for the civic and social matters like the “white-controlled organizations do” (Keating, 2001). Two major black organizations; the Atlanta Urban League (AUL) and the Atlanta Business League (ABL) “have very small staffs that concern themselves
primarily with the immediate issues of affirmative action and the particular problems of smaller black-owned firms.” (Keating, 2001, p. 75) AUL was founded in 1920 as one of the first major southern branch of the National Urban League (Hornsby and Henderson, 2005). In practice, AUL was “apolitical” especially on rights for black mainly because it “largely dependent upon a white-controlled and financed charitable agency for its financial sustenance.” (Hornsby and Henderson, 2005, p. 66)

4.2.2 Mayors as Key Players of the Governing Coalition

Atlanta’s regime emphasis and priorities has changed partially with each mayor’s style, goals, and interests (Stone, 1989; Stein 2003).

The mayors of Atlanta have been a key component of the governing coalition. One interviewee says, “Business involvement was always in place in Atlanta. Business leaders run for political offices, they frequently end up being the mayor (e.g. Ivan Allen from 1962 to 1970). For much of the history of Atlanta, the business leadership class and the political influential had a common ground. Even the election of black mayors did not result in a big shift.” (Academic 4)

Banfield (1967) characterizes the power of the mayor in Atlanta like a three legged stool; the press, the ‘white’ business power structure, and the Black community. These three “legs” came together and formed the stool starting with Hartsfield mayoral term: “he instituted businesslike fiscal practices, found a way to finance operating costs from current revenues, and inspired such confidence in the business community that the local bankers bailed the city out. … Although not a liberal on race matters, he saw very early that a ‘good government’ regime needed a heavy Negro vote in order to stay in office, and he responded realistically. … To save him and the coalition he
had put together, leaders of the business community are said to have persuaded the newspapers to endorse him for reelection, something they had not planned to do” (p. 23-24).

Two figures dominated the politics of Atlanta in the time period from 40s to 70s: William B. Hartsfield, mayor from 1937 through 1962, and Ivan Allen, Jr., mayor from 1963 to 1970. Both of them had good relations with the business elites of Atlanta. Hartsfield and Allen created “the City too busy to hate” with racial integration and massive urban development. Both of them had close relationship with the downtown business elites, especially with Woodruff of Coca-Cola (Figure 1). In 1940s through 1960s, Robert Woodruff dominated Atlanta politics through his close relationship with mayors Hartsfield and Allen, and through civic organizations (Hunter, 1953; Keating, 2001). Woodruff has been an important “political advisor and philanthropist” for both Hartsfield and Allan “behind the scenes” (Banfield, 1965; Martin, 1987). Woodruff was the head of both the Coca Cola Company and the Trust Company of Georgia. “No major projects was executed in Atlanta during the 1940s and through the 1970s without Woodruff money” (Hunter, 1980, p.54). Mayor Hartsfield had only Woodruff’s picture on his office wall (Banfield, 1965). In addition to Woodruff, Dick Rich – the owner of Rich's department store retail chain – known as “Mr. Atlanta”, has been involved in major projects in Atlanta since 1950s (Hunter, 1980). The first Central Atlanta Study was completed under his leadership. He also actively supported the stadium and the rapid-transit system ideas.

In 1969, Sam Massell got the majority of the black votes and won the election as the first Jewish mayor of Atlanta. Maynard Jackson was also elected as the first black vice-mayor of Atlanta in that election. The transition began with Massell’s election, which was a clear sign that power was shifting toward a growing black electorate. He was Jewish and liberal, and he had strong ties to labor groups. As a result of the change on electoral dynamics with “white flight,” Maynard Jackson
was elected in 1973 as the first black mayor of Atlanta. The regime dynamics began to change with blacks’ stronger presence in Atlanta politics, but the power of business elites on governing coalition have not weakened. During his mayoralty, Jackson realized that he needs the business elite’s support in order to govern effectively, and the relationship between the mayor and the business elites were repaired by the end of Jackson’s second term in order for Jackson to govern effectively with the support of business elites. The governing coalition recovered during Jackson’s second mayoral term and a new phase started with the election of Andrew Young in 1981 as the second black mayor of Atlanta, who has been a growth advocate.

Figure 1. Robert Woodruff (left) with mayors William Hartsfield (center) and Ivan Allen Jr. (right) (Source: Allen, 1996)
4.2.2.1 Mayor Hartsfield (1937-1941 and 1942-1962). The “governing regime” of Atlanta began with William Hartsfield’s mayoralty and kept the same structural and functional form during Ivan Allen, Jr.’s mayoralty in 1960s. Hartsfield’s support came from “business leaders, most of the aldermen and city officials, middle and upper-income whites, and increasingly over the years, blacks.” (Hein, 1972, p. 209) Hartsfield himself shared some of the segregationist views, but as a “pragmatist” he included blacks into the “governing coalition” and increased the votes he received from the black voters (Stone 2008b). Hein (1972) shares an interesting story: “[black] leaders went to Hartsfield requesting street lightings for a certain area. The mayor told them to come back went they had 10,000 votes and he would see that they got their lighting. They did, and he did.” (p. 209) During his mayoralty, “Hartsfield’s evolving preferences marked the emergence of a biracial coalition that rested, at least in part, on a shared embrace of policies and how to pursue them.” (Stone, 2003, p.132)

Hartsfield was not part of the business elites, but he had good personal relationship with the business elites of Atlanta, with Robert Woodruff in particular. Hartsfield and Woodruff were former schoolmates and they had been close friends since then (Stone 2008b). Hartsfield had only Woodruff’s picture on his office at City Hall and introduced himself as “the mayor of Coca-Cola City” (Banfield, 1965; Allen, 1996). Hartsfield was a big advocate of growth and progress. During his mayoralty, he “looked to the business elite for cues about what was acceptable and unacceptable.” (Stone 2008b, p. 186) When he has to decide on any major issue, he first consulted with Woodruff (Allen, 1996). In return, business elites strongly supported him – financially and strategically –on the elections.

In Hartsfield’s view, only growth could provide the wealth the city needed to become great. In the 50s, the Hartsfield administration began construction of a highway system radiating from
downtown. The main goal was to attract more businesses to downtown Atlanta with the easy access provided by highways. Extended highway system has been one of the major factors that makes Atlanta an attractive location for businesses since then. The trends of decentralization was not noticeable in early 60s, but became more visible in the 70s when; 1) the freeway system was completed in 1970 and provided transportation connection between the growing suburbs and the major employment centers; 2) the basic infrastructure of the surrounding suburbs were improved; and 3) the suburbs challenged downtown with the suburban office facilities for white-collar job (Wright, 1980; Basmajian, 2008).

4.2.2.2 Mayor Allen (1962-1970). In July 1961, Hartsfield announced that he is not running for mayor again, and the business elites agreed on Ivan Allen, Jr, as his successor. Allen, Jr. was already part of Atlanta’s “governing coalition” as a businessmen and as the son of a civic leader (Banfield, 1965).

As the president of the Atlanta Chamber of Commerce, Allen, Jr. formulated the second Forward Atlanta plan in the late 1950s. A booster like his father, Allen, Jr’s boosterism was reflected into the second Forward Atlanta Plan; he proposed adding freeways, having a rapid-transit system, building a stadium, and having a civic center in order to create a major league city. The second Forward Atlanta marketing campaign successfully attracted new businesses and industries to Atlanta, and created jobs to employ tens of thousands people. The second Forward Atlanta plan was "a business-like plan, conceived and executed by businessmen for the good of the business community and thus for the good of Atlanta," and this plan enabled Atlanta to rise as an international city (Townsend, 1969, p. 96).

Under similar circumstances [rising black activist] elsewhere, white businessmen were beginning to snap their briefcases shut and abandon downtown business
The growth of Atlanta continued in the 1960s. Service industry expanded and as a result of this expansion downtown office space increased by 76 per cent between 1960 and 1970, hotel rooms are doubled, retail sales dramatically increased, and the unemployment rates significantly declined (2 per cent in 1965) (Stone, 1976; Allen, 1996). Mayor Allen explains the success of Atlanta in 1960 as follows: “Yet, I submit that no major city in America has ever been guided by a group of men who were so totally dedicated—albeit, pragmatically, benevolently, and paternalistically—to the welfare and prosperity of their city. That was the secret to Atlanta’s success in the sixties. When I look back at what happened during the decade I can find few major efforts that were accomplished without the totally unselfish support of the business community” (Allen, 1971, p. 239).

Mayor Allen also describes Atlanta as “the city of the sixties in America” and he lists the reasons why Atlanta grew more than any other cities: “for one thing Atlanta faced the racial issue realistically while many others (including, by all means, its former rival, Birmingham) tried to act like it wasn’t there or else became adamant in its attitude to it. As the sixties came along, Atlanta, too, was not so provincial as most other cities outside the East; we had a goodly number of branch offices in town already… And we had always had a geographical edge on the rest of the Southern cities; between mountains and coasts, transportation center, good climate, national resources, abundant recreation facilities. We also had that hard core of business and civic leaders who had the benevolent attitude that whatever was good for Atlanta was good for them. So the potential
was there as Atlanta entered the sixties, and I don’t believe it is an exaggeration to say that the Forward Atlanta program unleashed it and became the catalyst for the city’s sudden surge forward” (Allen, 1971, p. 148).

By the mid-sixties, with the ads appearing in selected national media - such as New Yorker, Fortune, and the Wall Street Journal - Atlanta "became one of the best advertised metropolitan areas in the country" as a good place to live and do business (Driskell, 1964, p. 37). Allen’s two-term mayoralty was an extensive advertisement campaign for Atlanta, and the “start of a new era of downtown redevelopment”; constructions to expand the freeway system was completed, and the stadium and the civic center were built (Keating, 2001).

Mayor Allen also promoted the rapid-transit system during his term, however he was not able to implement the system within his term because the first referendum failed in 1968. The next referendum passed in 1971 and the construction began after he left the office. Lindsay states that Mayor Allen’s success can be seen “in the physical renaissance of Atlanta—in the revived neighborhoods, the new stadium, and the booming business on Peachtree Street” (Foreword in Allen, 1971) Stone (2003) notes Allen’s transformation as follows:

“Early in his career, he ran for state office as an unapologetic defender of segregation. Later, as chamber president, he became more pragmatic. In office, charged with the responsibility of governing a city with a large and growing black population in an era of rapid change, he became an avid proponent of racial progress and saw that change as a matter of civic pride.” (p. 132)

Mayor Allen describes the power structure of Atlanta as follows: “In every case, all I had to do was suggest that Atlanta had a need, ask a member of the “power structure” to look after it, and
merely sit back and wait until it was done. The sixties was the right time, Atlanta was the right
city, and this business community was the right one. No city had ever seen anything like it before,
and no city is likely to see it again.” (Allen, 1971, p.240)

Mayor Allen made extensive use of federal urban renewal and other public monies to build the
necessary public infrastructure to attract private investment and put Atlanta on the map as a city
of national significance, a "major league city" (Stone, 1989). These features included a stadium
for major league sports teams, extensive hotel and convention facilities, and a mass transit system
focused on downtown. Together with freeway construction, urban renewal projects demolished
more than 30,000 units of low-income housing and displaced 67,000 people between 1958 and
1968, nearly all of whom were African- American (Stone, 1976).

Allen’s mayoralty was a turning point for Atlanta. Atlanta completed its transformation from being
a regional capital to a national city during his terms. Mayor Allen describes Atlanta in 1960s as
follows: “You could use “tremendous” or “fantastic” or “incredible,” and you would be correct,
but you would still be understating the situation. In that short span of ten years Atlanta grew as
much as it had in all of its previous history, moving from being a somewhat sluggish regional
distribution center to a position as one of the dozen or so truly “national cities” in the United
States” (Allen, 1971, p. 145). Along the same line, according to the editor of Atlanta magazine,
Atlanta "is sort of the national hero of the sixties." (Townsend, 1967, p. 96)

Allen describes his mayoralty as a success story:

“Whether we were “sincerely liberal” is inconsequential. We succeeded in Atlanta
because we were realistic. We established a logical game plan in the beginning—
basically the Six-Point Program—and we followed it. Coping with the racial issue
and making long-range plans were the keys. When the racial problem was reasonably settled, it cleared the way for everything else: new industry, expressways, sports, jobs, entertainment, housing. One begets another, in a fascinating chain of events. When you “solved” your racial problems, you earned a favorable national image. A favorable national image attracts new industry. New industry means more jobs. More jobs mean more personal income and spending. More income and spending mean a broader tax base for the city, which means more and better city services, which mean happier people, which is what it is all about. It is wonderful to be idealistic and to speak about human values, but you are not going to be able to do one thing about them if you are not economically strong. If there is any one slogan I lived by as mayor of Atlanta that would be it.” (Allen, 1971, p. 240-41)

4.2.2.3 Mayor Massell (1970-1974). Allen did not run for mayor in 1969 and the governing coalition started to erode beginning with the 1969 mayoral election. Until the 1969 elections, the black voters were just “approving” the governing coalition’s candidates for mayor. However, the old electoral conditions was not in place for the 1969 elections. Massell was opposed by state representative Rodney Cook, who “was endorsed by Allen, the newspaper, and the business community” (Stone 2008a, p. 172). Massell got the majority of the black votes and won the election as the first Jewish mayor of Atlanta. Maynard Jackson was also elected as the first black vice-mayor of Atlanta.

“Massell faced the challenge of presiding over an economic boom that showed no signs of letting up. The city was like a teenager who gradually outgrew the clothes
Massell’s election was a clear sign that power was shifting toward a growing black electorate. He was Jewish and liberal, and he had strong ties to labor groups. During his campaign, Massell made it clear that he opposed the excessive influence that business interests had on city government. Despite his reputation as a political maverick, Massell ended up being an ideal coalition mayor. “Jewish, unabashedly liberal, a friend of organized labor, Massell had such a perfect profile as a transitional figure that he might have come from central casting.” (Allen, 1996, p. 164)

As one study concludes: “Since 1953, at least, Atlanta’s mayors had been chosen by a coalition composed of virtually all black voters, most of the middle and upper-middle class whites who live on the northside of the city, and a minority of whites elsewhere … The previously successful coalition of blacks and northside whites was shattered in 1969 … Upper-middle class whites and the city’s traditional “power structure” lost their former position of influence …” (The Atlanta Elections of 1969, a study by Voter Education Project, Inc., Atlanta. Quoted in Allen, 1971, p. 219).

Massell was “nobody’s man” (Pierce, 1974, p. 356) during his first year at the office but became closer to the business elites later in his term, and this change did not please the poor black constituents. Massell also “made no effort to bring together an alternative governing coalition. Even the rhetoric of city policy lost its neighborhood flavor and incorporated terms that were especially congenial to the Atlanta business community.” (Stone 2008a, p. 172). In 1970, blacks became the electoral majority, and they had the power to elect a black mayor. Black constituents did not have any serious opposition to Massell, but “Massell was a good mayor – a good one-term mayor.” (Allen, 1996, p. 174). There was that feeling among blacks that it is time to elect the first
black mayor of Atlanta. The circumstances was in favor of Vice-mayor Jackson for the coming elections.

Figure 2. Mayor Sam Massell (Source: City of Atlanta, 1972)

4.2.2.4 Mayor Jackson (1974-1982 and 1990-1994). Maynard Jackson won the elections in 1973 with 95 per cent of the black vote and 17.5 percent of the white vote and became Atlanta’s first black mayor. “Maynard Jackson’s runoff win over Massell seemed to pose an immediate and direct threat to the old regime.” (Fleischmann, 1991, p.106) Jackson tried to form a “new coalition” with “African Americans of all classes, liberal white gentrifiers, and the city’s small Jewish community” (Keating, 2001). As Hoffman (2003) concluded, “For decades, the mayors of Atlanta took orders directly from the downtown businessmen, especially the executives of the city’s first great corporation, the Coca-Cola Company. The white businessmen were even able to win support
from African American businessmen and college officials who had an interest in renewal and new housing plans. The neighborhoods, black and white, gained a voice in 1973 when maverick politician Maynard Jackson was elected mayor.” (p. 163)

Figure 3. Maynard Jackson at the opening of his mayoral campaign headquarters, June 1973 (Source: Bayor, 1996)

With the election of Maynard Jackson as the first black mayor of Atlanta in 1973, the regime dynamics began to change. It was “a reaction against the governing coalition which had done a fairly good job of keeping the peace in Atlanta but had done very little for the city's poorest residents.” (Varner, 2010, p. 34)

Black electoral clout, however, has allowed control of City Hall to pass from white businessmen to a generation of black politicians who matured during the civil
rights movement. White business leaders did not respond by abandoning Atlanta. Rather, they forged a new governing coalition with black mayors and City Council members. This transition was far from smooth, and while it did leave some lasting changes in the local policy agenda, the new regime also maintained the commitment of economic and political elites to promoting growth. (Fleischmann, 1991, p. 105)

The downtown business leaders were not happy with the new mayor and they found him “arrogant, demanding, and difficult to get along with” (Huey, 1996, p. 53). With Jackson’s mayoralty, the white governing coalition had to learn sharing the governing power. During his first year as mayor, Harold Brockey the Chairman of CAP, sent a letter to Jackson, expressing his concerns about the “lack of access to the mayor and the breakdown of close government-business cooperation,” as well as noting that he is perceived as being “anti-white” (Jones, 1978, p. 111-112) Jackson realized the importance of business coalition and in response to Brockey’s letter, he came together with local business leaders and established the independent Atlanta Economic Development Corporation, which replaces the Office of Economic Development that was created by Mayor Jackson under his control (Stone 2008a). Leadership Atlanta and Action Forum were also created to bring white and black business leaders to discuss civic matters on which both groups would find a common ground (Stone 2008b)

Governing is different from winning elections. “Votes Count but Resources Decide” (Rokkan, 1966, p. 105)

The coalition between blacks and the white downtown elites paused for a while during Jackson’s first term as mayor, but reestablished during his second term. During his first mayoral term, Jackson learned two important lessons: exaggerated black expectations of a black mayor and
exaggerated white anxiety over a black mayor (Alexander and Rucker, 2010). Jackson’s first term as mayor was a learning experience for both Jackson and the business elites. Business elites had to “adjust” themselves to Jackson and his management style, meanwhile Jackson had to learn the “importance of business coalition in reaching some of his goals” (Stein, 2003 p.157). During his first term as mayor, Jackson realized that he needs the business elite’s support in order to govern effectively, and the relationship between the mayor and the business elites were repaired by the end of Jackson’s second term. As Read (1987) notes, “the experience of Maynard Jackson shows how complex the relationship is between political power based on electoral strength and economic power based on the private control of investment activity.” (p. 199-200)

4.2.2.5 Mayor Young (1982-1990). After two terms as mayor, Jackson was prohibited by law from standing for reelection, and new phase started with the election of Andrew Young as the second black mayor of Atlanta. Young was well-known as a former member of the U.S. House of Representatives, U.N. ambassador during Jimmy Carter administration, and a civil rights activist. Young’s mayoral term “was energized by his belief in what he called ‘public interest capitalism’ or, as some have called it, Andynomics (Varner, 2010, p. 178). The business leaders believed that it was possible to elect a white candidate and supported liberal state representative Sidney Marcus for mayor, not Andrew Young. After Young won the election in 1982, he promised to be Atlanta's ambassador for economic development. Young said, “I want the business community to know we want them here and you don’t have to bribe anybody to get things done…The most important part of my job is creating jobs, and that means we must have private investment.” (Labich, 1989, p. 66) Young was very popular internationally as the former UN representative of the US, and he appeared to be an ideal candidate for the business elites to achieve Atlanta’s dream of being an international city. Once he was elected mayor, at a luncheon with the business leaders, Young
made it clear that he did not get elected with business leaders support, but he could not “govern without the confidence of the business community” (Atlanta Constitution, July 24, 1983). He was reelected in 1985 and strengthened his ties with the business elites.

“Atlanta continues to be dominated by a coalition of city officials, corporate leaders, and middle-class black leaders who concur on the community-wide benefits of downtown revitalization. The current black mayor, Andrew Young, embraces the downtown-revitalization strategy more enthusiastically than did Maynard Jackson, whose modest efforts to support black community development were depicted as pork-barrel politics.”

(Clarke 1987, p. 118)

Young was supported by the business elites for his effort for economic development. The Atlanta Journal-Constitution endorsed Young in the August 7, 1990 Democratic gubernatorial runoff election against Zell Miller by stating that “Business boomed in Atlanta throughout his administration, and in no small part because of his efforts on behalf of the city's economy. Ask the city's chamber of commerce if it has ever seen a more effective salesman. The Democratic National Convention came to Georgia and the Olympics are very likely coming here, too, in substantial part because of Mr. Young's ability to sell those audacious notions.” (Teepen, 1990) With Young’s mayoralty, the coalition restored, and it reached to its highest harmony during the Olympic bidding process. As Huey (1996) states, “blacks and whites cooperate in an unlikely but mutual self-interest that is unique among the world's large cities. It's called the Atlanta Way. It is played out over and over every day--but never with more impact than during the competition to stage the Olympics.” (p. 43)
4.3 From Terminus to a National Hub: Transportation as a Key for Growth

*People in other southern states liked to say that whether a person was going to heaven or hell at the end of his life, he’d have to change planes in Atlanta.*

*(Hays, 2004, P.84)*

From Terminus to one of the biggest airport in the world, transportation has been one of the major sectors of Atlanta economy and one of the factors that makes Atlanta an attractive location for business. Thus, not surprisingly, Atlanta’s business elites has made transportation policy a priority with an emphasis on downtown in particular to complete the transformation of the city into a world city. For Atlanta’s business elites, automobile has been the desired mode of transportation to increase the accessibility of downtown. Atlanta has grown rapidly as a transportation hub as a
result of its geographical location advantage. Atlanta’s location at a crossing point provided advantages for transportation operations and commercial activities. Originally being a rail center, Atlanta became an air hub after the airport, and finally a major connector in the federal highway system after the three major interstates that intersects in Atlanta were completed (White and Crimmins, 1980; Rose et al., 2009). Figure 5 shows the Atlanta metropolitan region with the major highways.

![Figure 5. Atlanta Region](Source: ARC, 2011a)

Not surprisingly then, the business community has made transportation policy a priority. One example for the influence of business community on transportation policy decisions in 1920s is that the Georgia Railway and Power Company used its power to eliminate the jitney services in
Atlanta by convincing the city’s alderman to pass an ordinance (Hartshorn, 2009). All early transportation planning documents in Atlanta (the 1924 Beeler Report, 1929 Atlanta Traffic Survey, and the 1946 Lochner Report) focused on building highways with the main principle being “all roads lead downtown” – until 1970s (Giovinazzo, 1980; Keating, 2001; Hartshorn, 2009).

One of the interviewees states the transportation vision of Atlanta as follows: “The growth of Atlanta depended on the easy accessibility. The connection between transportation and economics was well recognized and it has been a big part of the transportation vision. Now, that was clear to the leaders that transportation routes can make a place either very accessible or marginal. And a lot of the planning for transportation has been within that insight.” (Planning Agency Staff 4)

Transportation is one of the major sectors of Atlanta economy and it is one of the factors that makes Atlanta an attractive location for businesses. It accounts for a larger proportion of jobs in the Atlanta region than in any other metropolitan area in the nation. The city’s location makes it a natural transportation hub. The development of Atlanta is associated with railroads, which made it a center of commerce for the southeast. While details of the economy have changed, Atlanta is still associated with transportation and serves as the distribution center for the growing Southeast by virtue its extensive highways, aviation, and rail connections. “Physically, Atlanta is highly favored. Its unique situation with respect to the physiographic provinces of eastern United States has made it the southeastern regional center for rail, highway and air route patterns.” (MPC, 1950, p. 5)

4.3.1 The Airport

Atlanta business leadership also lobbied for an international airport in the 1940s. Although the city of Atlanta had no preparation to compete for designation, William Hartsfield – then city alderman
and later mayor—worked very hard to make Atlanta the designated stop on the federal airmail route from New York to Miami (Peirce, 1974; Allen, 1996; Kunstler, 2003). This designation also marked the starting point for Atlanta to be a major traffic hub of the South. In 1941, Delta Air Lines moved its headquarters to Atlanta and increased the city’s accessibility and connectivity to the South.

Atlanta’s connectivity and accessibility is largely due to its airport. The airport expanded its status and capacity in the 70s as well. The first scheduled nonstop to a foreign country was Eastern's flight to Mexico City in July 1971 and this flight gave the airport the “international” title. Hartsfield died the same year and the airport was named as “William Berry Hartsfield International Airport” to honor former mayor of Atlanta, who spend the most energy and effort to promote air travel. By the 1980s, Hartsfield was the second largest airport in the world in terms of air traffic movements. The airport became even more accessible when Metropolitan Atlanta Rapid Transit Authority (MARTA) Airport station opened in 1988 in order to connect the rail line with downtown. The convenience and the accessibility of the Airport has been cited as one of the main reasons for businesses to choose Atlanta. The name of the airport was changed to the current Hartsfield–Jackson Atlanta International Airport in 2003 to honor another former mayor, who died the same year. The airport is still one of the busiest airports in the world.

4.3.2 The Marta System

The construction of the MARTA system is also a good example to show how the regime operated in Atlanta. In 1954, The Atlanta Region Metropolitan Planning Commission (ARMPC) noted the need of rapid-transit system in the region. In 1961, ARMPC published the Atlanta Region Comprehensive Plan—Rapid Transit, calling for a 60-mile, 32-station, $215 million system. Rapid transit became legally possible when the legislature passed the bill in 1965 with a required
referenda approval in the counties involved (MARTA, 1973; Peirce, 1974). The Metropolitan Atlanta Rapid Transit Authority Act was passed by the Georgia legislature in March 1965, and the creation of the rapid rail system was voted on in five counties (Fulton, Cobb, Gwinnett, DeKalb, and Clayton) and was approved in 4 counties (only 43 percent of voters approved MARTA in Cobb County) in June 1965. Finally, MARTA was officially formed in January 1966. The funding referendum for MARTA failed in 1968, and it succeeded in only two counties out of 5 (Fulton and DeKalb) in 1971 referendum. As the principal alternative to private transportation in Atlanta region, MARTA is operating bus services since 1972 and rail services since 1980. Table 3 below summarized the key dates of MARTA system.

Feasibility studies argued that Atlanta is not dense enough to support a potential rapid-rail system. However, as Keating (2001) argued, MARTA’s creation was part of the city leaders’ effort to create a “big city” image with a downtown-oriented network: “The most striking feature of this undertaking was that it was essentially an effort to enhance the city’s image, not a realistic solution to the region’s transportation needs.” (113) Business elites supported rapid rail transit but not to an extent that transit would dominate the urban travel. For the elites, MARTA system was a way to increase the land value of downtown. Mobility of automobile meant economic growth and progress for the elites.

MARTA’s primary funding sources are passenger fares and a 1% sales tax levied in the City of Atlanta and Fulton and DeKalb Counties, which became effective on April 1, 1972. MARTA has not received any state funding for its operating expenses. Given the fact that the current low-density settlement do not serve the heavy rail system well, the system investment would have been justified with density-focusing land-use regulations which was the rationale presented to voters for
building the system in order to generate new development around stations. However the city failed to pass land-use regulations because of the pressure from real-estate interests.

Table 3. MARTA System – Key Dates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>January 1966</td>
<td>MARTA began operating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 1971</td>
<td>The referendum passed in Fulton and DeKalb counties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 1972</td>
<td>MARTA purchased the Atlanta Transit System (ATS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 1972</td>
<td>Local 1% rapid transit tax became effective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 1975</td>
<td>Construction began for the rapid rail system in downtown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 1979</td>
<td>MARTA began rail operations: East Line Rail Service opened</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 1979</td>
<td>Construction began on the Airport rapid rail station</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 1979</td>
<td>East Line Bus feeder routes began</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 1979</td>
<td>West Line Rail Service Opened (includes Five Points)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 1980</td>
<td>West Line bus feeder routes began</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 1981</td>
<td>North/South Line rail service opened</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 1982</td>
<td>South Line Bus feeder routes began</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 1983</td>
<td>North Line Bus feeder routes began</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 1988</td>
<td>South Line extended to Airport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 1994</td>
<td>MARTA became the official provider of public transportation for the 1996 Summer Olympic Games</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 1996</td>
<td>North Line rail service open (Buckhead to Dunwoody)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: MARTA, 1997
Before the referendum, the governing coalition members were in favor of land-use regulations in order to increase the density around the rail stations. After the referendum approval in Fulton and DeKalb Counties, the construction of the multibillion-dollar rapid-rail system began in the early 1970s. After the referendum, however, the governing coalition members argued for a “laissez-faire approach” which “inverted the role of the system from ‘growth shaping’ to ‘growth chasing,’ with a concomitant reduction in public benefits.” (Keating, 2001, p 3) The elites changed their position once they got what they wanted: the referendum passed and the constructions started. As (Keating, 2001) argued, “in subsequently opposing land-use regulations that would have coordinated development with the rail system, business leaders contradicted the rationale they had used to sell rapid rail to local government officials and the public.” (p. 130)

The goal of business elites were not to create an efficient rapid-rail system, but to generate economic activities and enhance the image of Atlanta. According to Konrad (2009), the MARTA system “has been variously envisioned as a vehicle for transforming Atlanta into a world-class city; as a reducer of both traffic congestion and air pollution; as a means for those with no other options to have decent mobility opportunities; and as the hub of a regional transportation system linking the region in a seamless manner. Yet, from its failure to deliver adequate services to the transit dependent to its inability to attract choice riders, MARTA has been received at best as a disappointment and at worst as a blight on the city” (p. 51).

Referring to the MARTA plans, the first Central Area Study states that “the reality of central Atlanta’s strategic importance underlies the plans for a massive rapid transit system centered on downtown Atlanta with spokes extending to outlying parts of the metropolitan area” (Leary 1971, p. 1) Downtown elites considered MARTA system as an investment to shape the future of Atlanta. MARTA report published in 1981 considers Atlanta being not big enough as a rapid transit city.
The report states that in fact, Atlanta “is so far the smallest city in North America to have built a rapid transit system. Similarly, its population density is not great.” (p. 2) Using census tract-level data from 1980 to 1990s, Bollinger and Ihlandfeldt (1997) concludes that MARTA system had neither a positive nor a negative impact on population and employment growth, attributing the findings to MARTA’s insignificant impact on accessibility, the absence of a significant increase in transit use, and public policy efforts limited to rezoning. (p. 267).

With the increased federal funds available for transit, Atlanta’s regional policy shifted on expanding the existing rapid-rail system as far as it could be and rely on transit expansion. While the highways were eliminated and the existing ones are expanded, there was not any expansion on transit: “Unfortunately, even though we had good plans, if the politicians really wanted a project in those days, they seem to win, they seem to always get their project in the plan. We had to accommodate that by either removing other projects or talking about how to politically …. Financially it could not be afforded, since there were no requirement for fiscal restraint, it still was a wish list.” (Planning Agency Staff 1)

Regarding MARTA’s role in the region, AJC editor Jim Wooten (2005) says, “Grow the private sector and, in the process, create a regional transportation system with one mission: transportation. When advocates veer off into other agendas – land use, density, or anything that has the word “justice” connected to economic or environmental policies – be wary. We’re no longer talking about solving a transportation problem. We’re into social engineering.”
4.4 Race and the Creation of Two Atlantas

“From the early days of the civil rights movement through its Olympic bid, the promoters of the city have created an image of a city where different ethnic and racial groups work hard and live together in peace and harmony…. Despite the best efforts of the city power brokers to smooth over racial and ethnic divides, Atlanta has a history of conflict and segregation”

(Murphy, 1997, p. 4)

Atlanta is known as the “black mecca” for its considerable black population. Blacks have been the key component of the governing coalition since all-white election law was declared unconstitutional in 1946. Black constituencies reached 40% of the Atlanta’s registered voters at that time, and the share of blacks increased since then. Hartsfield had close relationship with the black community leaders, and some reform requests of blacks was adapted by Hartsfield, such as black voters’ registration and recruitment of black police (Martin, 1978). Mayor Allen maintained the same close relationship with black leaders. Holmes (1977) characterizes “black political history as moving from a position of bargaining with those in authority to actually seizing positions of authority. Blacks had for decades played the role of silent partners in the coalition with white ‘better class’ element, and for their efforts got few rewards. Black politics in Atlanta has been one of cooperation and persuasion, not confronting.” (p. 82) As Banfield (1967) concluded, “The alliance between the business-led white middle class and the Negro is the main fact of local politics and government; only within the limits that it allows can anything be done, and much of what is done is for the purpose of holding it together.” (p.35)
Although the racial aspects of the 1922 zoning law was ruled unconstitutional in 1924 (Bayor, 1996), highway plans, urban renewal policies, and other federal laws allowed the members of the governing coalition to separate the races and create two Atlantas: White North and Black South. A buffer was created between the Central Business District (CBD) and poor black neighborhoods through the interstate highway and urban renewal programs. White and Crimmins (1976) term it “the caste system,” which “emerged as the officially accepted integration of blacks and whites by the turn of the century, left an indelible mark on the pattern of the city in its creation of two separate ‘sides’ of the city, two ‘communities.’” (p. 243)

In 1930s, the elites lobbied for federal funds to replace the poor neighborhoods of CBD with public housing. In 1936, Atlanta built the first federally-funded public housing project – Techwood Homes – in the United States (Rutheiser, 1997; Newman, 2002b). Downtown business elites created the Central Atlanta Improvement Association (CAIA) (later known as the Central Atlanta Association or CAA) in 1941, to advance their involvement shaping the future planning of Atlanta. After the creation of CAIA, the elites pioneered altering Atlanta’s land-use pattern by expanding the city core and removing largely African-American low-income residents from downtown to support the downtown tourism businesses (Newman, 1999). Overall, the elites were successful in influencing and manipulating the urban renewal policy in Atlanta.

Race relations improved with the opening of the new stadium in 1965. Braves played an exhibition game against the Detroit Tigers on that day and it was observed that some of the remaining signs of segregation were gone. “The restrooms were marked “Braves” and “Squaws,” not “White” and “Colored.” The ushers and usherettes, decked out in red-and-white-striped top hats, were fully integrated. So were the players and the crowd.” (Allen, 1996, p. 144). The funeral of Dr. King on
April 9, 1968 in Atlanta was one of the momentous occasions of Atlanta’s history, and one chapter of the Atlanta story is closed in peace with the funeral (Pierce, 1974; Allen, 1996).

### 4.5 Image Creation and Slogans

As an item on the governing coalition’s agenda, civic image and “catchy slogans” has always been a high importance for Atlanta boosters (Stone and Pierannunzi, 2000, p. 2): the name of the city was changed from Marthasville to Atlanta to “conjure coastal images of a trade port on the Atlantic Ocean.” Atlanta is reinvented and became the “Gate City of the South” through the early 20th century, and the movie “Gone with the Wind” was an early event that introduced Atlanta to the world. During Jim Crow and the Civil Rights struggles, “The City Too Busy to Hate” was the new slogan used by elites to emphasize the racial harmony and growing economy of the region. Finally, Atlanta is advertised as the “World’s Next Great City.”

All these efforts had been part of a social engineering process used by elites to attract businesses and tourists to Atlanta. Rutheiser (1997) uses the term “imagineers” to describe the players and institutions who shape the image and future of downtown Atlanta. The imagineers include “journalists and academics as well as politicians, developers, business leaders, and their hired cadres of architects, designers, engineers, and public relations specialists. These imagineers in no way constitute a unified group. Indeed, they do not recognize themselves as such, and relations among some of them are better described more in terms of conflict than consensus.” (p. 14)

The advertisement and economic development campaigns of Atlanta goes back to 1860s, when the city hosted important exhibitions to showcase its attractions and accomplishments. Atlanta hosted three “cotton exposition” between 1861 and 1865 (Newman, 2014). These expositions are
followed by the 1881 International Cotton Exposition, The 1887 Piedmont Exposition, and finally the most ambitious—The 1895 Cotton States and International Exposition— which “indicated not simply a desire for growth, but also the outlines that such growth ought to follow in terms of commercial and industrial expansion, race relations, the balance between the sexes, and the very landscape itself” (White and Crimmins, 1980, p. 31).

Advertisement promotion of Atlanta as the “New South Creed” continued with the first Forward Atlanta Commission, chaired by Ivan Allen, Sr., the President of the Atlanta Chamber of Commerce. The commission created the first Forward Atlanta Plan in 1925 to “proclaim the city’s advantages in location, climate, labor supply, and natural resources.” (Peirce, 1974) This four-year, million-dollar advertising campaign determined the economic character of Atlanta for the following decades (MPC, 1952; Thomas, 1988). The plan “encouraged the relocation of business from outside of the region to this area, promoted the expansion of local firms, lobbied for improved education, and supported a number of projects for civic improvement” (White and Crimmins, 1980, p. 32). Forward Atlanta advertising campaign resulted in bringing 762 new businesses with 20,000 jobs to the city, and strengthening the “distribution center” identity of Atlanta (Peirce, 1974; Thomas, 1988).

One of the interviewees describes the vision of Atlanta at that time as follows: “The city leadership always had the idea that growth is good. There were several booster campaigns to get the interest of public and the business to Atlanta. 1890s is the time period when we see a rapid growth in the region: high profile expensive events and expositions (Chicago was a model to copy the effort). In 1920s, “Forward Atlanta Champaign” was well advertised in the media to attract headquarters, factory manufacturer etc.” (Academic 3)
Atlanta won its first world-wide attention with a novel. In 1936, Margaret Mitchell published her only novel, Gone with the Wind, which tells the story of a spoiled girl in Atlanta region during the Civil War era. This historical novel became very famous in the United States and the story was adapted into a film in 1939. Mayor Hartsfield saw the movie as an opportunity for Atlanta to advertise itself. It put Atlanta in the national spotlight, when the world premiere of the movie was staged in Atlanta in 1939 with a parade, receptions, and a costume ball for the visiting cast. The event was one of the memorable moments for Atlanta and its residents to remember to this day. President Jimmy Carter recalls it as "the biggest event to happen in the South in my lifetime." (Lambert, 1973). According to a study cited by Allen (1996), Gone with the Wind has been the most familiar idea evoked by Atlanta.

Atlanta later relied on its history to create an image. In 1963 with Robert Woodruff of Coca-Cola’s “approval,” Mayor Allen endorsed the Civil Rights bill in Washington D.C. as the only elected official in the South (Allen, 1996). When Martin Luther King, Jr. won the Nobel Peace Prize in 1964, not Atlanta but at least one of its citizens became “internationally” known.

4.6 Atlanta becomes a Major League City

“The local partnership of white business and political leaders used the combination of expressway construction and three urban renewal areas to transform the city’s earlier downtown tourist space.”

(Newman, 2002a, p. 307)

The urban renewal program was the first step to remove poor black neighborhoods near downtown in order to create the “touristic bubble.” (Newman, 2002a) “The federal urban renewal program
provided the Atlanta public-private partnership with the means of clearing the land within the curve in the expressway by relocating black residents and businesses outside the downtown area.” (Newman, 2002a, p. 306). Urban renewal program provided the guidance for downtown revitalization in the central business district. Atlanta’s urban renewal program worked in favor of the business community. The proposals that were supported by the business community were more likely to be implemented. “Sites for civic facilities, expansion room for medical and educational institutions, and land for commercial redevelopment have all been provided under the aegis of urban renewal. … For example, the city constructed a new civic center and exhibition hall on land acquired through urban renewal. The civic center, in turn, encouraged the private development of nearby hotels. And, at a time when many communities built sports facilities in outlying areas, city officials in Atlanta promoted the construction of a new stadium on a renewal site just south of the central business district.” (Stone, 1976, p.3)

Creating a “major league city” idea has been expressed in official planning documents as well. Early plans state the expected future economic base for downtown Atlanta as a convention center. The business elites’ vision for downtown Atlanta has been formulated by the planning agencies in their planning documents. The Metropolitan Planning Commission (MPC) was established on March 27, 1947 by the General Assembly of Georgia as the first publicly funded, multi-county planning agency in the United States (MPC, 1950).

MPC began operation in 1949, and created its first two comprehensive plans, namely Up Ahead: A Regional Land Use Plan for Metropolitan Atlanta in 1952 and A Master Planning Program for the DeKalb-Fulton Metropolitan Area: Now…For Tomorrow in 1954. These two plans formalized the elite’s vision for the future of Atlanta. Up Ahead “called for a network of connecting and perimeter highways linking the center to the growing suburbs, the extensive rebuilding of
downtown in a style of megalomaniacal modernism.” (Rutheiser, 1999, p. 320) The plan recommended conversion of a naval airport in Chamblee to a civilian airport (Peachtree DeKalb), a civic center and merchandise mart in downtown Atlanta, along with several major parks. The plan also states that majority of the investments in that period were the constructions of new office buildings, not factories. Now…For Tomorrow revised the previous plan and recommended more extensive growth of convention and tourism businesses. The prospects of the 1954 plan for Central Atlanta consists of office spaces, retail spaces, new hotels, and convention and entertainment facilities. These two plans along with the first and second Central Area Studies (CAS-I and CAS-II) produced by Central Atlanta Progress provided the groundwork to promote growth agenda of business elites for downtown redevelopment projects. Next sections discusses the infrastructural improvements which created the major league city Atlanta.

4.6.1 The Mart, Peachtree Center, OMNI, and Luxury Hotels

John Portman was one of those “cadres of architects” who gave Atlanta its personality. He created space for tourism and convention industry by building the Atlanta Merchandise Mart in 1960 as one of the first skyscraper in Atlanta. With the opening of the Mart, Atlanta emerged as a major convention city. Portman also designed luxury hotels -such as Hyatt, Westin, and Marriott- to accommodate the people attracted by the mart; and developed Peachtree Center, which was “the largest single commercial venture ever financed with private capital” (Mynatt, 1977, p. 128; Allen, 1996; Newman, 2002a). Portman designed Peachtree Center as the “new downtown” of major-league city Atlanta (Rutheiser, 1997). The success of Peachtree Center encouraged Tom Cousin, a well-known architect and a competing developer, to build an arena called the OMNI. He later
created the OMNI complex which consists of OMNI hotel, restaurants, shops, and an indoor amusement park. Cousin’s project was not as successful as Portman’s: the amusement park closed within six months and the hotel and the complex were sold and converted to CNN Center (Newman, 2002a). Portman and Cousin developed projects to make downtown Atlanta “safe and attractive for out-of-town visitors” (Keating, 2001), and the competition between them had a positive impact on “downtown Atlanta’s tourist bubble” (Newman, 2002a).

4.6.2 Atlanta-Fulton County Stadium

The business elites recognized the need of cultural amenities to label Atlanta a “major league” city and this aspiration came true when an $18 million new stadium (Atlanta-Fulton County Stadium) was built in 364 days in 1965. Mayor Allen recalled that the stadium was built “with money we didn't have, on land we didn't own, for teams we hadn’t signed.” (Harris, 1990, p. 65) Two National league teams occupied the new stadium later. The Braves decided to relocate from Milwaukee to Atlanta in 1966 and then Rankin Smith Sr. – the Executive Vice President of Life Insurance Company of Georgia at the time – paid the highest price in NFL history for the Falcons franchise. An article in Atlanta Magazine in 1964 stated that the new stadium and major-league baseball would “complete the transformation of Atlanta from a semi-southern into a full-fledged national and international city.” (Bisher, 1964). Allen (1996) identifies this article as the first published reference that refers to Atlanta as an international city. Despite the fact that the gate revenues did not cover the financing expenses, for Atlanta boosters, hosting two major-league teams was a validation for Atlanta’s national status (Martin, 1987; Newman, 2002a).
4.6.3 Underground Atlanta

Underground Atlanta opened in 1969 as a downtown shopping and entertainment complex. Underground Atlanta immediately became the most-visited tourist attraction in Atlanta with its popularity among downtown office workers, tourists, and conventioneers (Newman, 2002a). However, the situation became reversed and the site closed in 1982, because of safety issues, crime problem, and the decline in businesses in Underground (Newman, 2002a). Mayor Young started revitalization efforts of Underground with great expectations, but there were considerable doubts about the project. Underground reopened in 1989 and did not meet the expectations.

4.6.4 The Georgia World Congress Center (GWCC)

The Georgia World Congress Center (GWCC), opened in 1976, was planned to finance with private money, but it failed and the State of Georgia issued a $35 million general obligation bond to build the Center as “the only state-owned facility of its kind in the country, and other than the construction of state highways, the largest single construction project ever financed by the State.” (Research Atlanta, 1982, p. 36). The plan was to attract national and international conventioneers to Atlanta. With the opening of the GWCC, Atlanta became one of the country’s primary convention destinations in the United States and “hospitality became downtown Atlanta’s leading industry.” (Allen, 1996, p. 172)

“Though the Georgia World Congress Center brought more tourists to the downtown area, the baseball stadium, civic center, and rapid-rail system contributed very little to the downtown economy, and Underground Atlanta was a notable failure. As for the highway system, though it improved access to the downtown area, it also helped accelerate dispersal of economic activity to the suburb. Though these redevelopment efforts added to Atlanta’s prestige as a modern,
progressive city, and though they gave city leaders a sense of pride, they did not have enough of an effect on the downtown economy to make downtown Atlanta the thriving, growing, exciting place that the governing coalition wanted it to be.” (Keating, 2001, p. 91)

In the 60s, the Allen administration built a baseball stadium and a civic center close to the downtown area. It also promoted a metro-region rapid-rail system. Mayor Allen describes the physical, infrastructural, and image change of Atlanta in the 1960s as follows:

“In 1959 we were known for Coca-Cola, Georgia Tech, dogwoods, the Atlanta Crackers, and easy Southern living; by 1969 we were known for gleaming skyscrapers, expressways, the Atlanta Braves, and—the price you have to pay—traffic jams. Although by 1969 the metropolitan area ranked only twenty-first nationally—up from twenty-fifth, increasing by 31.4 per cent to 1.3 million—we ranked in the top ten in most important growth categories over the 10-year period: downtown construction, bank clearings, air traffic, employment, mercantile construction, et al. Atlanta’s growth was evidenced everywhere. Eleven of the city’s twelve tallest buildings were constructed during the sixties. Atlanta Airport went from the tenth-busiest in the nation to the third-busiest, right behind Chicago’s O’Hare and Los Angeles’s international ... Hotel and motel space nearly tripled, bank clearing doubled, unemployment plummeted at one point to an unheard-of 1.9 per cent.”

(Allen, 1971, p. 145-6)
4.7 Pressure Emerging on Downtown Atlanta

The post-World War 2 era was the beginning of suburban expansion in the United States and Atlanta region was also affected by this phenomenon. The development of the interstate system and suburban building boom revealed the “laissez-faire market economy-driven approach to growth, which has created a very pro-growth and highly competitive atmosphere that itself has stimulated development in the region” (Hartshorn and Ihlanfeldt, 2000, p. 17)

Starting from 1950s, not only Atlanta but also the region as a whole entered to a growth period. Atlanta took the biggest share of that growth, but this growth turned to the city’s disadvantage over the suburbs in the coming decades. The city experienced “white flight” starting in 1960s and increased throughout the 1970s and 1980s. Percentage of black population in the City of Atlanta increased while white population declined: black population of the City of Atlanta was one third of the city’s total population in 1960 and more than 50 per cent in 1970. In the same period of time, white population of the city declined. On the regional scale, the population also increased: the Metro population grew by 43 per cent from 1950 to 1960 and 37 per cent from 1960 to 1970. In 1970, white population in the Metro area reached 1 million, when the black population was only 314,000. By 1980 more than three out of four metropolitan Atlantans lived outside the mother municipality. During the thirty year period, 1960 to 1990, the population in the City of Atlanta, according to the U.S. Bureau of Census, declined from 487,455 in 1960 to 394,017 in 1990. During the same period, the surrounding Atlanta area grew by almost 1.5 million people. The population of the City of Atlanta declined from 1960 to 1990 even as the region's population grew by almost 150 percent. This loss has been heavily concentrated among the white population, which fell by nearly half during the period.
Jackson’s mayoralty was the time when whites and downtown businesses started moving to suburbs. This era was not as productive as 1960s in terms of development projects for downtown Atlanta, and the business shifted their focus and interest more on the regional market, rather than downtown Atlanta. Deterioration of downtown Atlanta became evident in the 1980s. In the 1980s, Atlanta’s growth continued at the regional level as a result of its accessibility in the Southeast region and its capacity to provide services to the growing metro region. However, the share of the city of Atlanta from this growth declined and suburban and exurban fringes benefited the most (Hartshorn and Ihlanfeldt 1993; Rutheiser 1996). 1980s data show that the surrounding suburbs contained 80 per cent of the region’s population and provided new economic development opportunities for businesses. With regional growth, downtown Atlanta became less important to the business sector than it was before and they became less interested in downtown Atlanta. As a result, the business sector’s attention was directed to regional growth and they found the surrounding suburbs more attractive for business.

4.8 National Policy Changes in the 1980s

Ronald Reagan’s campaign for the 1980 Presidential election focused on reducing government spending and maximizing private control over investment capitals. Reagan’s supply-side economic policies advocated a return to free market capitalism. After he took office as the 40th president of the United States (1981–89), Reagan altered the urban policy for American cities. During Reagan’s administration, “private sector has assumed responsibility for the creation of urban social policy” and “has become the urban planner of the 1980s” (Cumming, 1988, p. 4). With Reagan administration, the federal urban programs and federal funds had been reduced, and the new policy relied “heavily upon economic growth shaped by private investment decisions, and
a tax reform package requiring that state and local governments raise more of their own revenue.” (Cumming, 1988, p. 4).

In 1982, Martin Anderson, the Assistant to President Reagan for Policy Development, stated in the White House that “the election of Ronald Reagan to the U.S. Presidency in 1980 was a statement by the American people that their government has become too large, too expensive, and too intrusive.” He continued, “It is now time to translate that mandate into pragmatic, sensible actions to bring about responsible change in the boundaries that separate the sovereignty of the government.” (Cumming, 1988, p. 3)

The federal policy changes had some implications for Atlanta and its downtown-focused elites. Changes on federal policy increased the attractiveness of “consumption-based development” such as tourism and convention businesses, and “mega-events as an engine for economic growth” became more noticeable for American cities (Burbank et al. 2002, p. 183) and Atlanta was among those cities to shift its policy to consumption-oriented development. The changes in federal policies and the growing global economy distinguished the mega-event strategy as a potential solution for American cities: “As trade in goods and services became increasingly open and internationally competitive, American cities had to compete with cities from around the world for investment capital, businesses, and tourists.” (Burbank et al. 2002, p. 181)

4.9 New Role for Downtown Atlanta: Convention and Tourism

Downtown Atlanta started to decline as a business and retail center in the 80s. From the elites’ point of view, the only option for Atlanta to compete was to increase the city’s unique role in the region and built on its potential to become a unique and great convention center. According to
Vetter (1977), Atlanta had to keep providing low-cost work and residential environment in order to maintain its regional function. The city’s economic future depended on the regional economy which in turn would generate demand for the services Atlanta provides to the Southeast region including professional, administrative, support and infrastructure services. In a similar study, Hurst (1977) calls the convention business as “an industry without a smokestack” since it does not pollute, and it allows Atlanta to take the city to a maximum level of usage of its hotel and infrastructural capacity. Hurst (1977) concludes that the city of Atlanta needs to develop new activities to attract and satisfy its visitors, since the convention industry is one of the largest industries operating in Atlanta, and its growth has no limits or bounds. The result of improved convention industry would be a vibrant economy with a lively downtown area and a greater economic force in the residential areas.

The ultimate goal was to attract new business and residents, and to entice conventioneers to add a day or two of tourism to their stays (Thomas, 1988). Residential development in downtown Atlanta was important to change the segregated housing pattern of the metro region as well as to increase the downtown vitality (Martin, 1977). The City of Atlanta Comprehensive Plan listed the benefits of downtown housing development as follows: “greater utilization of the CBD, particularly in the evenings and on weekends, an increase in the demand for shopper and convenience goods, an increase in the number of people who have commitment to downtown, and an improvement of the public perception of the safety of downtown. (Matthews, 1983, p. 17)

In addition to other metropolitan areas, Atlanta was also competing with its suburbs for convention business. Commercial and manufacturing activities started to spread out as well. Prior to 1960s, more than 90 per cent of the office space in the metro region was located in central city. Atlanta’s CBD continued to attract regional service industries, but the growth of suburban office locations
were much higher than the CBD (Research Atlanta, 1978). Suburban areas, especially on the north side of the metro region, increased their portion in the regional retail and office space market. The suburbs have attracted businesses with their advantages over Central Atlanta “site availability and space to expand, and the rents and taxes lower than within the city boundaries, plus the detachment that the outer suburbs, at least, can enjoy away from the social problems that predominate in the older part of the region.” (Duffy, 1995) Atlanta’s central business district did not lose office space; it actually gained a small amount. But almost all of the new growth was on the north side. Buckhead, as “Atlanta’s white downtown” succeeded the CBD with high dominance of white businesses and residents (Keating, 2001).

The downtown needed new roles to replace many jobs lost in downtown, restore the economic base of downtown Atlanta, and show the city’s adaptability and resilience. The health of hospitality (tourism and conventions) industry is seen as a vital business for the future of downtown Atlanta. Hospitality industry of Atlanta grew a result of three factors: accessibility of the Hartsfield-Jackson International Airport; the expansion of “Mart” buildings that attract near 300,000 people to Atlanta each year; and the World Congress Center and the Georgia Dome (Rose et al., 2009). These amenities have a significant impact on local economy by creating jobs in hotels, restaurants, and other associated businesses. Rapidly growing convention industry stimulated Atlanta’s economy by generating revenues and by creating jobs. The city also benefited from the hotel-motel tax and the property taxes resulted from local hotels and trade facilities. In 1981, “convention delegates spent approximately $382.5 million in Atlanta, the City collected $3.8 million in hotel-motel tax revenue, and over 75,000 people were employed in 5,280 convention related businesses.” (Research Atlanta, 1982, p. 47)
Giovinazzo (1980) lists the factors that resulted in development of convention activities in Atlanta. First of all, the overall growth of “sunbelt” region changed the perceptions of the South, and several Sunbelt cities including Atlanta became possible alternatives for conventions. Second, the hotel/motel space dramatically increased in Atlanta. Third, the Atlanta Civic Center increased the convention activities in Atlanta. “With the new facility [Civic Center], more than 10,000 downtown hotel rooms, and the city’s transportation connections, local business leaders hoped Atlanta could overtake New York and Chicago to become “America’s Convention Capital” (Galphin 1975, p. 74). In addition to these points, number of direct flight from Atlanta increased, and the presence of major league teams and the advertisement efforts of several organizations resulted in an increase in prominence of Atlanta as a convention center.

Comprehensive Development Plan of the City of Atlanta (1983) also recognized the importance of convention industry for the future of Atlanta. “In the face of new and expanding competition from other cities which have begun to promote themselves as convention cities, Atlanta needs to focus on expanding its capacity to attract conventions. The planned expansion of the city’s convention meeting facilities and the hotel construction, renovation, and expansion provide Atlanta with the capacity for continued prosperity as a convention city. Further, since Atlanta is easily accessible by air, rail and automobile, the city has most of the qualities which are necessary to compete successfully as a convention city.” (Matthews, 1983, p. 16)

Downtown Atlanta business elites have used tourism and convention as an economic development strategy. Atlanta’s regime created a “tourist bubble” in downtown, where tourists and conventioneers were “isolated from the daily fabric of urban life” and downtown touristic space was “devoted to sports, consumption, and spectacle but encloses its visitors within a secured and protected environment.” (Newman, 2002a, p. 320) By 1980s, Atlanta became one of the major
convention centers in the U.S. in terms of number of conventions held, and attendance (Giovinazzo, 1980; Research Atlanta, 1982, and Research Atlanta, 1983). Table 4 shows that the number of conventions held and convention attendance dramatically increased in the years around the Olympic Games. The numbers declined in 1996 because some of the conventions were rescheduled because of the Olympics. We see an increasing trend following the Olympics.

However, according to a nationwide survey, Atlanta is not among the top most popular convention sites (Research Atlanta, 1982). As a result of the isolation, visitors did not find Atlanta safe and attractive to spend few extra days. Downtown Atlanta was still a “9 to 5” office workers’ space and streets were empty at night. “As a result of all these efforts to make Atlanta a viable convention city, many downtown streets are almost empty at night. Because developers and business leaders were afraid of letting conventioneers mingle with the city’s black population, they created a downtown that lacks a natural, vibrant, nighttime street life.” (Keating, 2001, p. 109) Image is important for the success of consumption-based development (Burbank et al., 2002) and the city’s negative image was the main issue for Atlanta to attract more tourists and conventioneers.

Table 4. Convention Activity, Atlanta Metropolitan Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Conventions Held</strong></td>
<td>330</td>
<td>525</td>
<td>710</td>
<td>1090</td>
<td>1489</td>
<td>1721</td>
<td>2560</td>
<td>2280</td>
<td>3057</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attendance (x1000)</strong></td>
<td>195</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>545</td>
<td>1003</td>
<td>1380</td>
<td>1883</td>
<td>3102</td>
<td>2780</td>
<td>3423</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Atlanta Convention and Visitors Bureau; Research Atlanta, 1982; City of Atlanta, 1989
The literature determined several factors that increase the attractiveness of a city as a convention site, such as accessibility, accommodation and meeting facilities, local support, and site environment (Rose et al., 2009). Atlanta is very accessible with its airport, highway and transit system. Atlanta has accommodation and meeting facilities as well as local support, but the city needs to improve its environment and increase the number of entertainments. The promotion of Atlanta as a touristic and convention center required preserving a healthy CBD, improving the pedestrian environment, and adding entertainment facilities.

Research Atlanta, a research organization reflects the view of downtown business elites, published a report in 1980, which discusses the strengths and weaknesses of Metro Atlanta region in order to provide solutions to its problems. The Report states the success of Atlanta in 1960s and 1970s, but also mentions that becoming a major urban center has not solved the city’s problems. The report emphasizes the growing convention business as an important new industry for the future of Atlanta: “The opening of major hotels and convention facilities enabled Atlanta to attract national conventions and trade shows. Visitors attending these events generate both jobs and tax revenues and spend millions of dollars on lodging, food and entertainment. Plans for new hotel development, an expansion of the World Congress Center and additional capacity at the airport strengthen the prospects for continued growth in the convention industry.” (p. 27)

The report also points out the need to increase the use of downtown Atlanta and the need for entertainment opportunities: “First, there is a continuing need to get residents of Atlanta to utilize downtown for more than just work—most people who work here during the day leave the area deserted at night except for conventioneers and tourists. Second, and a related issue, the thousands of tourists and conventioneers who do stay downtown need additional recreational and entertainment opportunities if Atlanta is to continue as a convention center. As more people come
to Atlanta for their second and third convention, they will search for way; to entertain themselves which currently do not exist downtown.” (p. 85) The report recommends public and private sector to support the convention and tourist industry and concludes that “the challenge of the 1980s is to develop ways of applying the region's strengths to the region's problems by overcoming weaknesses inherent in economic, social and political fragmentation.” (p. 91)

Research Atlanta published two other reports in 1982 and 1983 to evaluate the strengths and weaknesses of Atlanta as a convention city. According to the reports, the number of conventioneers increased over 300 per cent since 1965 as a result of the strengths of Atlanta, including location, general quality of hotel properties and meeting facilities, easy flight connections, cultural/entertainment possibilities, climate, and convention center activities. On the other hand, as a convention city, Atlanta appear to be weak in terms of entertainment facilities, perception of crime, taxi services, and international accommodations. Research Atlanta reports recommend developing a downtown entertainment complex, benefiting from the existing facilities and attractions, and developing other opportunities to ensure the continued growth of convention industry.

This “business-oriented form of tourism” strategy did not change with Jackson’s mayoralty. Black residents and businesses were moved from downtown Atlanta in favor of “touristic bubble” expansion. As part of the national advertisement campaign, Jackson painted a “picture of harmony” with the business elites of Atlanta (Newman, 2002a, p. 316). Business elites have controlled the investments decisions in Atlanta, and Mayor Jackson had no other option but to have good relations with them. Jackson once said, “Atlanta can’t prosper without city hall and business in bed together” (Teasley, 1974)
Mayor Young also worked closely with the business elites for downtown touristic development projects including the transformation of Underground and building Georgia Dome (Newman, 2002a). Atlanta’s distinction as one of the finest convention destinations of the United States is confirmed with the hosting of the Democratic National Convention in 1988. The strength of convention business helped Atlanta to host 1994 NFL Super Bowls, and finally the 1996 Summer Olympic Games. The Olympic idea represents the peak point of the long-dated strategy of downtown business elites that has been envisioned for decades. This strategy focused on generating interest and attracting more investments and residents in downtown Atlanta in order to facilitate the primacy of downtown.

4.10 Key Lessons from This Section

This chapter showed that downtown Atlanta business elites has functioned as a powerful figure to manipulate and shape the planning decisions in downtown Atlanta since 1950s in order to increase their business interests. Downtown Atlanta policy was driven by the governing coalition, consisting of the business elites, elected mayors, and black electoral power in order to increase the primacy of downtown Atlanta and further their objectives in the phase of suburbanization/decentralization. During Hartsfield’s and Allen’s mayoralty, with the strong support of downtown business elites and black votes, Atlanta’s governing coalition was successful implementing their policy agenda by using every policy tool, including transportation plans, sports and convention facilities, urban renewal, and other federal laws. Atlanta achieved continues growth and by the end of Allen’s mayoralty (1970) the city completed its transformation from a regional capital to a national city.
1970s was also the time when the transition in regime started with the election of Massell and Jackson as mayors. The regime dynamics began to change with blacks’ stronger presence in Atlanta politics, but the power of business elites on governing coalition have not weakened. In late 1980s, Atlanta looked completely different than it was in the previous decades; the blacks were the voting majority since 1970s; the city lost population and its population share declined on the metropolitan level. The city was not able to keep pace with the changing local and national dynamics. The city experienced “white flight” starting in the 1960s. Improved transportation technology, extended highway network throughout the nation, and national policies supporting home ownership resulted in migration of middle class and live further from their workplace. In addition to these national forces and policies, fear of crime, concerns about city schools, and higher share of property taxes for services in downtown influenced the location decisions of white middle class.

Despite these changing dynamics, downtown Atlanta business elites believed that downtown Atlanta would keep its primacy in the region by investing on city’s unique strengths, including the infrastructural facilities such as the airport, rapid-rail system, and the freeway network; strong convention and tourism industry; concentration of strong institutions and industries; and strong economy and business community. As a result, Atlanta business leaders turned to market based solutions, such as tourism and convention, in order to generate profit and increase the reputation of the city in an era where the manufacturing is declining and the competition with the surrounding suburbs for office space tenants and residents has intensified. In other words, the focus of the governing elites shifted to planning for visitors, not for residents. The future of downtown Atlanta is imagined as a place for consumption, not for production.
Although some elements of the regime have changed over time, the regime sustained its stability and the business elites committed on the “regressive agenda” of economic growth. In this sense, the idea of hosting major conventions and events became a new strategy. The rewards of these efforts was hosting some major events later, including the 1988 Democratic National Convention, 1994 NFL Super Bowls, and finally the 1996 Summer Olympic Games. Next chapter discusses the Olympic strategy of downtown Atlanta business elites in detail.
CHAPTER 5

OLYMPIC STRATEGY OF DOWNTOWN ATLANTA BUSINESS ELITES

When it comes to overheated imagery, teaming Atlanta and the Olympics is like pouring gasoline on a house fire. (Huey, 1996, p. 42)

This chapter explores the business elites’ strategy for using the Olympics to facilitate the primacy of downtown Atlanta. The author discusses how the Olympic Games provided an opportunity for downtown business elites to overcome the loss of interest in downtown Atlanta and to increase their power in manipulating policy decisions. The main proposition of this chapter is that starting from 1980s, the local, national and international dynamics limited the power of elites in downtown policy-making process, and the business elites had difficulties to influencing the planning decisions of elected officials. In this sense, the Olympic idea provided a means to facilitate the primacy of downtown Atlanta and justify the physical redevelopment of downtown Atlanta as a convention and touristic destination.

This chapter answers the following research questions:

- What was the logic behind the Olympic bid of Atlanta from the business elites’ point of view?
- How did the Olympic idea provide a means to facilitate the primacy of downtown Atlanta and to justify the physical redevelopment of downtown Atlanta as a convention and touristic destination?

This chapter covers the time period from the Olympic bidding declaration (late 1980s) until the Olympic Games are over in 1996, the time period during which fundamental changes occur. This
phase includes the short-time period that the Games are staged; however this research separates the staging period from the analysis by only focusing on the planning and preparation process. It is critical to separate the staging period from the long-term impacts for the purpose of this study. This chapter analyzes the rationale for the Olympic idea and discusses the changing power dynamics between politicians, business elites, the Atlanta Committee for the Olympic Games (ACOG), IOC, and other stakeholders that occurred during the Olympic planning process. The investigation in this chapter reveals the evidence that the Olympics provided the necessary tools to intervene in the urban policy-making process.

5.1 Downtown Atlanta Starts to Decline

Downtown Atlanta started to decline as a business and retail center in the 80s and lost “its metropolitan hegemony” and became “just another one of the region’s urban-village cores.” (Leinberger, and Lockwood, 1986) The closing of Rich’s downtown location in 1991 was a warning for downtown Atlanta’s role as a center for retail goods and customers (Keating, 2001). In the same year, the downtown office of Citizens and Southern National Bank was closed as well (Keating, 2001). The separation of Atlanta as wealthy white north and poor black south had also increased. As Keating (2001) points out, “despite these ambitious redevelopment projects and all the federal, state, and local money spent on them,” downtown elite coalition’s idea of creating Atlanta as the region’s economic center has not achieved. “One reason for this was that the rapid expansion of the northern suburbs continued to decentralize the area’s economy. But another reason was that with the exception of the convention center, all the redevelopment projects were ill-conceived from an economic standpoint.” (p. 89)
Starting from late 1980s, Atlanta looked completely different than it was in the previous decades; the blacks became the voting majority since 1970s; the city lost population and its population share declined on the metropolitan level. But the city transformed its economy as a business center and designated as one of the nation’s two best cities for business by Fortune Magazine in 1989 (Labish, 1989); Atlanta’s link to service economy strengthened; and the city became more internationally connected to the rest of the world with its consulates for 39 countries (Fleischmann, 1991). Yet, Atlanta still struggled with serious social problems such as poverty, homelessness, unsafety, and crime. Atlanta’s redevelopment regime “produced no palpable policy inroads in employment, education, and affordable housing.” Stone (1989, p. 209). Downtown Atlanta’s unsafe and inactive image was partially the consequence of the lack of residential development, and the presence of vacant land and deteriorated buildings. In addition to crime and safety concerns, as a convention city, downtown Atlanta is also perceived as a “9 to 5” location with limited attractions and amenities compared to other rival convention cities such as New Orleans, New York, and San Francisco. Atlanta had an image problem, “other cities were linked with popular attractions – New Orleans and jazz, New York and Broadway, San Francisco and its cable cars and Golden Gate Bridge. Atlanta did not fare as well in a game of free association,” says Allen (1996, p. 231).

5.2 Downtown Atlanta Business Elites’ Response to Changes

By 1990, only 14 per cent of the metropolitan population was living inside the city limits. Similarly, only 19 per cent of the regional office space was accommodated by downtown Atlanta, although the city has been home to some Fortune 500 companies. Despite these challenges, downtown elites decided that it would reach its objectives by investing on its unique strengths,
including the infrastructural facilities such as the airport, rapid-rail system, and the freeway network; strong convention and tourism industry; concentration of strong institutions and industries; and strong economy and involved business community. The challenges that the city of Atlanta facing led the elites to embrace new strategies and policies for growth. One attractive strategy that fits into Atlanta’s economic development goals was “mega-event strategy” as “a stimulus to, and justification for, local development.” (Andranovich et al. 2001, p. 113) Mega-Event strategy seemed very convenient for the business elites, because Atlanta’s strengths, such as the infrastructure, sport and convention facilities, extensive number of hotel rooms, and convention experience would make the mega-event strategy come true easily in a short time with little effort. In other words, downtown Atlanta was ready to host any major event with the necessary infrastructure in place. In this sense, the Olympic bidding idea received positive reaction from the downtown business elites as a promising means to both revitalize downtown Atlanta and achieve the international city status.

Atlanta business leaders turned to market based solutions, such as tourism and convention promotion, in order to generate profit and increase the reputation of the city in an era where the manufacturing is declining and the competition with the surrounding suburbs for office space tenants and residents has intensified. Atlanta’s Olympic idea represents the peak point of the long-dated strategy of downtown business elites that has been envisioned for decades. This strategy focused on generating interest and attracting more investments and residents in downtown Atlanta and the Olympics “mobilized the business community and transformed the downtown to focus on consumption, and in the process rebuilt the city’s downtown in ways that adhered to the larger institutions’ vision of the city.” (Heying et al. 2007, p. 106)
The focus of economic development strategy has also shifted to attract more international tourists. The future of downtown Atlanta is imagined as a place for consumption, not for production. Olympics was seen as a justification for consumption-based development in downtown Atlanta. “The combination of declining federal aid and increasing worldwide competition for business meant that American cities not only had to employ more entrepreneurial techniques to promote development but had to do so on the world stage.” (Andranovich et al. 2001, p. 114) As an outcome of these effort, the 1996 Olympic hosting refreshed the hopes for the future of Atlanta as an international touristic destination. As Billy Payne argued, the Olympics would put Atlanta on the map “as one of the top cities in the world; right up there with the Parises, and the Tokyos and the New Yorks and the Moscows and the like” (Rutheiser 1996, p. 285).

5.3 Olympics as a Convenient Vehicle

Cities’ interest in global networking and the increasing competition among cities are merged into economic strategies and hosting a mega-event like the Summer Olympic Games is seen as a convenient vehicle to achieve the economic goals of a city such as image creation, tourism, and business investments. The difficulties that the city government and the business leaders face within the broader political and economic environment and within the changing forces in international economy requires American cities to play an entrepreneurial role; thus, hosting a mega-event like the Olympic Games became a major way to help any city achieve local economic goals (Burbank et al., 2001). In contemporary American cities, staging the Olympic Games is not simply an international sporting event but a tool for implementing the vision of a world-class city by providing opportunity for growth (Burbank et al., 2001).
In this sense, Atlanta’s bid for hosting the Olympic Games can be understood as the product of an active growth coalition that already existed in Atlanta. The Olympic regime was created in the form of influential individuals getting involved with the bidding and planning for the Olympics in order to make their vision the local policy agenda. For Atlanta, the vision and the central motivation among growth elites was to show that Atlanta was a “world-class” city capable of hosting the Olympic Games. The city leaders and the business elites used tourism and convention to promote the city’s economic development and attract tourists and business investments. In order to justify local development in Atlanta, public policy strategies promoted tourism, and the Olympic Games provided that promotional means to reach a broader population (Burbank et al., 2002). For Atlanta, the Olympic bid was not just about hosting a major sporting event, but about transforming the city into a world-stage player, which has been part of the long-running agenda of the downtown elites.

Plans range from the modest to the mega and Olympics can be seen as one of these mega plans, since the Olympics “provides an ideal platform for a local development agenda because it allows growth proponents access to the popular symbolism of international sports and makes opposition to development projects associated with those symbols more difficult” (Thomas, 1988). Olympic idea represents the peak point of the long-dated strategy of downtown business elites that has been envisioned for decades. This strategy focused on generating interest and attracting more investments and residents in downtown Atlanta.

Atlanta business elites thought about Olympics before the 1996 bid. Atlanta’s first official Olympic bid was for 1920 Games, however the first serious attempt was for the 1984 Summer Olympic Games. Business elites recognized that Atlanta had grown in the recent decades economically and physically with the necessary sporting facilities, first-class hotels, restaurants
etc., and the city became an important center in the United States. The business elites believed that the next step was to maximize the use of existing facilities and introduce Atlanta to the world. Thus, the Olympics seemed to be the remedy for creating an international image for Atlanta. Research Atlanta, the local think tank, conducted a feasibility study in 1976 to examine Atlanta’s potential to host the 1984 Olympic Games with its existing assets and to identify possible benefits of a successful Olympic bid (Research Atlanta, 1976).

The report was generally negative, especially because of the financial debt Montreal faced after hosting the 1976 Summer Olympic Games. According to the report, an Atlanta Olympic bid should include the following: modest capital investments for the Olympics and spending virtually all construction money for upgrading existing facilities rather than constructing new facilities; financial assistance from both federal and state government; and mobilizing all resources and creating a spirit and dedication for the Olympic bid effort. The report listed the potential benefits of a successful bid as follows: national and international attention on Atlanta; marketing opportunities to attract more businesses; increased business activities and new employment opportunities, especially for restaurants, hotels, and stores; potential of long-term use and enjoyment of newly constructed or upgraded facilities; and civic pride.

According to a study sponsored by Atlanta Olympic Committee, the 1996 Summer Olympics “would have the economic impact of 20 Super Bowls, injecting $3.48 billion into Georgia's economy over the next six years and creating 83,756 new jobs with a payroll of more than $1.1 billion.” (Roughton, 1990a). Similarly, another study estimated that the Olympic Games would have a $5 billion economic impact ($1.16 in direct economic impact, $1.14 in out-of-state visitor spending, and $2.83 in induced economic impact) to Georgia’s economy between 1991 and 1997.
(Humphreys and Plummer, 1995) This impact would have been generated by athletic events, visiting media, athletes, officials, spectators, and temporary employment.

5.4 The Olympic Bidding Process Starts

The Olympic bidding process is a two-level competition. First competition takes place on the national level when the cities express their interest to their respective national Olympic committees. The processes generally led by the powerful players, and does not consider the community’s concerns or opinions. “There is typically little democratic community input, and decisions are largely determined by the will and power of urban political leaderships and/or other relevant and powerful urban elite groups (such as business and cultural elites).” (Roche, 1994, p. 6) The second competition starts when these national candidates compete on the international level.

In the case of the United States, private and non-profit Olympic bid committees take the formal responsibilities of preparing and staging the Games, mainly because the “local governments lack the necessary resources to conduct Olympic bid campaign…. Yet as privately organized committees with controlled access trying to achieve specific sports-related goals and bring somewhat ambiguous intangible benefits to the host city, the bid permits the powerful interests in cities to attach their agendas to the Olympic process, creating the perfect policy mechanism for ensuring a growth agenda.” (Andranovich et al. 2001, p. 127).

The Olympic journey for Atlanta all started on February 8, 1987, when William Porter “Billy” Payne, a real estate lawyer and former football player at the University of Georgia, dreamed of Atlanta hosting a summer Olympic and began campaigns to win the right to host the 1996 Summer
Olympic Games. After raising $2.5 million for his church, Payne started looking for another mission. On the way back home from church on that day, Payne started to “think of something else that would bring even more people together in a sense of celebration and sharing of a common goal. I said I don’t know what it is, but I am going to think about it.” (Payne, 2006). Then he came up with the Olympic idea. Payne called his longtime friend Peter Candler first and shared his thoughts. In a month, he created “Atlanta Nine”.

The downtown business elites were the force behind Atlanta’s bid for the Olympics. Billy Payne was not part of the power elite in Atlanta, however as an outsider he successfully mobilized the regime and the business leaders were motivated to use their resources and power to expand their presence in urban policy making processes. A governing coalition “must be able to mobilize resources commensurate with its main policy agenda” in order to be viable (Stone, 1993, p. 21). Thus, the business elites saw the opportunity presented by the Olympic idea and supported Payne’s vision. Atlanta was able to host the 1996 Olympics through Billy Payne’s vision and determination, along with the support of his friends known as the “Atlanta Nine” who later formed the Atlanta Organizing Committee (AOC) (Rutheiser, 1996). “Atlanta Nine” members were Peter Candler, Charles Battle Jr., Bobby Reardon, Tim Christian, Cindy Fowler, Charlie Shaffer, Horace Sibley, Ginger Watkins, and Linda Stephenson. These community volunteers had strong leadership skills, influence, and contacts who could help Billy Payne direct the bid program (ACOG, 1997). Peter Candler was Senior Vice-President of Duncan Peek, Inc., an Atlanta Insurance firm. Charlie Battle Jr., a King and Spalding attorney, and Bobby Reardon, the CEO of Duncan Peek, Inc. became Atlanta’s representatives to the IOC and its international lobbying effort. Tim Christian, a real estate consultant, was active in a number of Atlanta civic and builder organizations. Cindy Fowler, the president and CEO of Presenting Atlanta, organized the
hospitality for Atlanta's Bid. Charlie Shaffer, who has served on the Board of Directors of the Atlanta Chamber of Commerce, was a partner in the law firm of King and Spalding. Horace Sibley was also a senior partner in King and Spalding and has served on the boards of numerous civic and charitable organizations. As community volunteers, Ginger Watkins and Linda Stephenson supervised the public relations functions.

In Atlanta, no organization was in place to initiate an Olympic bid. Thus, Billy Payne, as Atlanta’s “Olympic entrepreneur” (Burbank et al., 2002), formed the bidding committee of Atlanta and formed the Georgia Amateur Athletic Foundation (GAAF), a non-profit corporation in 1987 for the USOC’s endorsement for the 1996 Olympics. Payne said, even if the Olympic bid fails, the GAAF will be in business to stay to get other international events for Atlanta. He believed, “failing at the '96 Olympics, or even failing forever with Olympics, does not mean the Georgia Amateur Sports Association has failed in its primary mission, which is to make Atlanta, as Indianapolis has made itself, an attractive site for big-time amateur athletics.” (Kindred, 1987)

Next step for Payne was to convince the city leaders to support his Olympic dream. Peter Candler arranged a meeting for Billy Payne with Mayor Andrew Young and all things became possible after this meeting. Candler tells the story: "Billy's getting all excited and going into detail on everything. And Andy starts laughing. Billy goes on a little more, and by now Andy's really laughing. So finally Billy starts laughing. All of a sudden Andy sits up in his chair and says, 'You're serious about this, aren't you?' And Billy says right back, 'What was it that made you think we weren't serious?'" (Huey, 1996, p. 50)

Payne’s Olympic dream became more possible to achieve after he got the support from Young and other business leaders, especially Roberto Goizueta of Coca-Cola. Payne sought out Peter Candler, who is attached to Coca-Cola through blood; “Candler is the great-great-great-nephew of Asa
Candler, who bought the original Coke formula from Doc Pemberton not long after he created it in 1886.” (Greising, 1998, p. 247) Candler arranged a meeting for Payne with Jimmy Williams, the Director of the Coca-Cola Company at that time. Williams’ first reaction to Payne’s Olympic idea was not what Payne was expecting; Williams said, “You know, that’s not a new idea”. Greising (1998) notes the rest of the conversation between Williams and Payne:

“‘Nothing’s changed that would allow Coke to distance itself from your effort,’ Williams said. Payne shook hands with Williams, and made their way to the door. Williams placed his hand on Payne’s shoulder. ‘If I were you, Billy,’ he said, ‘I wouldn’t give up.’ Payne looked over his shoulder, and into Williams’ eyes. ‘Thank you, I wasn’t intending to,’ he said. In a moment, Payne’s mood shifted from despair to destiny. He felt Williams had heard or seen something that had warmed him to Payne’s vision. (p. 249)

Later, mayor Young took the first official step by sending a letter to the United States Olympic Committee (USOC) in August 1987, expressing the City of Atlanta’s interest in being the US nominee for the 1996 Summer Olympic Games (Newman, 1999). In September 1987, GAAF members submitted the formal bid materials in person to the USOC headquarters in Colorado Springs, Colorado (ACOG, 1997). GAAF members met the sport federation leaders and discussed the aspects of Atlanta’s bid. The bid described Atlanta's strengths as follows: a world-class airport; existing venues and facilities; new construction plans for sports venues; more than 60,000 existing hotel rooms; the MARTA system; experience in handling large masses of people because of the city's large convention industry; and private funding through corporate sponsors, television rights, and ticket sales. (ACOG, 1997, p. 7)
After receiving Atlanta’s Olympic bid for 1996 Games, USOC 102-member Executive Board scheduled its annual meeting in Atlanta for January 1988. This was a memorable visit. GAAAF members and other volunteers were able to show Atlanta’s enthusiasm and local support for the bid before the selection in April 1988. In March 1988, USOC narrowed the field of 14 competing cities to 2 – Atlanta and Minneapolis-St Paul – to submit final presentation at the USOC Board meeting in Washington D.C. in April (ACOG, 1997).

On April 29, 1988, USOC selected Atlanta as the US nominee to host the 1996 Summer Olympics. Atlanta won 65-42 over Minneapolis-St Paul (AJC, April 30, 1988). After winning the designation as the US nominee, a new organization, the Atlanta Organizing Committee (AOC), was created by Billy Payne and his friends for the international Olympic campaign. The city’s bid is commonly seen as part of a long term strategy. Even for AOC, the real target was 2000 Olympic Games.

Atlanta was given no chance early on, but this was because people profoundly misread the politics within Olympic movement. Athens, which had hosted the first Modern Games in 1896, was presumed to be the IOC's choice for the Centennial Games. On closer inspection, it was clear that many IOC members doubted Athens' logistical acumen. They shopped for a practical alternative and found Atlanta, which was really positioning itself for the 2000 Games. (Roughton, July 27 1997)

“The hosting of the 1996 Summer Olympics was a maintaining event” for Atlanta’s regime (Stone and Pierannunzi, 2000, p. 3), for the truth, we have to “understand the Atlanta Way to understand how these Olympics came to be. Only in such a climate could Billy Payne and Andy Young become a team.” (Huey, 1996, p. 46) Huey (1996) describes Atlanta’s Olympic idea as a “formula movie plot”. He says, “An aging good ole boy ex-football player named Billy (Mel Gibson) wakes up one day with the idea of bringing the Olympics to his hometown. His notion seems foolish until
he uses a socially prominent fishing buddy to get him a meeting with an international civil rights hero named Andy (Danny Glover), who happens to be mayor and who, unbeknownst to Billy, never met a crazy idea he didn’t like. This ebony/ivory buddy plot soon turns into a road movie, with the unlikely pals traversing the globe eating monkey brains in search of Olympic delegate votes. It concludes with them tearfully embracing in the new stadium they’ve built, as athletes from around the world light the Olympic torch. Corny, huh? But not so far from the truth.” (p. 43-44).

One of the interviewees describe the effort of Billy Payne and Andrew Young as an “amazing PR job.” He continues: “a lot of well-respected people pushing really hard and doing a lot of behind the scenes politicking. They were following the footsteps of those earlier people who basically wanted to elevate Atlanta build its prestige on a world scale, attract businesses, and bring more people … it was very growth oriented.” (Academic 3)

5.5 International Competition and Lobbying

In May 1988, international competition started for Atlanta. Atlanta competed against five other cities: Athens, Greece; Toronto, Canada; Manchester, England; Melbourne, Australia; and Belgrade, Yugoslavia to become the host city for the 1996 Olympics. The modern Olympic Games began in 1896 in Athens and the 1996 Olympics was the 100th anniversary of the Games. Thus, it was assumed, at least by Greece, that Athens has the biggest chance to win the bid and host the Centennial Olympic Games.

Atlanta’s Olympic bid proposed to spend about $1.2 billion in private funds to hold the Games, and expected to generate about $1.4 billion in revenues from television broadcast rights, commercial sponsorships, tickets, and other promotions (Weisman, 1990). Some of the work by
AOC reflected the lobbying priorities of the Atlanta bid. In addition to preparing a technically well bid, Atlanta lobbied and used its “Southern hospitality” as a major themes of its bid to convince the International Olympic Committee members, who at the end decides where the Olympics will be hosted. Part of the AOC’s strategy was to identify Atlanta apart from West Coast and Los Angeles, where the 1984 Olympic Games were held. The 1984 Los Angeles Games were staged only six years earlier at the time of 1996 Olympic host city selection process. Atlanta tried to distinguish itself from Los Angeles and emphasized the city’s advantages. One ACOG member said, “Atlanta established the south … kind of a different part of the country. South has an interesting history, had the civil war. What we used to say was that Atlanta is farther from Los Angeles than Barcelona is from Moscow.” (ACOG Member 1)

Payne considered the Olympic Games as an “opportunity to demonstrate to the world on a scale never before possible the capability, the resourcefulness and the friendliness of Atlanta.” (Cohen, 1989) Payne explains their strategy to be selected as the host city: “Since we won selection as host city and did it surprisingly, and perhaps shockingly, because we were such a underdog, other cities come to us, as they usually do to learn from previous winner, and we tell them it's truly not as complicated as some might think. It's not a bricks and mortar decision. It's a people decision. Decision-makers go with their friends. Selection by the IOC is by individual people voting by secret ballot. People vote for people they trust and know and for whom they have affection and respect.” (Payne, 1997)

One ACOG member describes Payne’s simple strategy along the same line: “He [Payne] knew that the vote by the IOC members would be done in secret. That meant they didn’t have to explain their votes to anyone. He decided to make the members like the Atlanta team better than they liked any of the other bid city teams.” (Yarbrough 2000, p. 37)
“That attitude, friendliness and sincerity were conveyed in every written and spoken communication. It might surprise many people that rarely did we communicate with Olympic officials at great length about buildings and venues. The advantage we had as an American city was that they assumed we could build the right buildings. It was our personal commitments about what could be done for the human community and the quality of the people who were principally responsible for bringing the Games to Atlanta.” (Payne, 1997)

Andrew Young, the bid’s international face, lobbied among African, Middle Eastern, and Asian countries based on his contacts as the former chief delegate to the United Nations. Young also played the “race card” with the African and Caribbean countries when he visited their National Olympic Committees to get their support for Atlanta’s bid. Young said "the fact is, at least half the people of our city are of African descent, so when African delegates came and walked down the street, they saw people who looked like back home." (Weisman, 1990) Young’s argument for the African countries was that Atlanta is “the only city of majority African descent that has a chance to host the Olympics. And we need your support just as though we were on the African continent. And I said that if Lagos were bidding for the Olympics, you--the African group-- would automatically vote as a block for Lagos.” (Huey, 1996, p. 55).

As a former civil rights activists and close friend of Martin Luther King, Jr., Young and the other AOC members described Atlanta as the birth place of the modern human rights movement and this theme was well-received by the IOC delegates. Jean-Claude Ganga, a committee member from the Congo who is also president of the Association of National Olympic Committees of Africa, said "without Andy Young, Atlanta could not have made it.” He continued: “We know Andy Young as a leader of black people in America, a civil rights leader and an associate of Martin Luther King
… When he visited my country to push for Atlanta, he was cheered by crowds like some sort of a chief. He is a hero in my country.” (Weisman, 1990)

When Andrew Young read the book written by Peter Ueberroth – the organizer of the 1984 Los Angeles Summer Olympics – Huey (1996) notes Young’s reaction as follows: “I saw the list of the 86 IOC members. I went through and--just based on instinct--I checked off all the votes I thought we could get. I figured we could get 53 out of 86. In the end, we got 51, but two of those I picked died.” (p. 55).

In its bid book, the Atlanta Committee for the Olympic Games (ACOG) addresses to the members of the IOC and emphasizes the heritage, strengths and vision of the city and shows the enthusiasm as follows:

“We represent a city whose deep, emotional desire for the 1996 Games is balanced by the resources and practical ability to organize one of history’s most memorable Olympiads. Atlanta is a city of vision, the heart of an emerging international center of sport and commerce. As you have discovered, this bid is flavored by Atlanta’s heritage of renewal, its legacy of civil rights, its undiscovered culture, its warm, hospitable people and its intense identification with the high ideals of the Olympic Movement. With its modern transportation and communication systems and its vast network of hotels, sports and exhibition facilities, Atlanta, we believe, has the capabilities to organize the Games” (ACOG, 1990, p. 86).

AOC representatives led internationally by Charles Battle and Robert Rearden seized any opportunities to meet with IOC members abroad. Battle and Rearden began traveling the globe to carry Atlanta’s message to all IOC members and international sports officials. First, they went to
IOC headquarter to meet with IOC President Juan Antonio Samaranch and then visited Ecuador, Canada, Malta, and Mexico (ACOG, 1997). Further, a 20-member Atlanta delegation attended the 1988 Seoul Olympic Games in order to meet IOC members and gather information about hosting the Olympic Games (ACOG, 1997). In February 1990, Battle and Rearden visited Auckland, New Zealand for the Commonwealth Games and they met with 13 IOC members while in Auckland (AOC, 1990b). Until the selection in September, 1990, AOC representatives had traveled to the homelands of 85 IOC members in 70 countries (ACOG, 1997).

In addition to visiting IOC members abroad, AOC hosted IOC members in Atlanta. As the first stop on a tour of the candidate cities, IOC President Juan Antonio Samaranch visited Atlanta in February 1989. During his visit, Samaranch met with Coca-Cola officials, Mayor Young, city business leaders, AOC executive board members, and former Georgia Olympians (Shaw, 1989a). Coca-Cola signed on another Olympic sponsorship agreement during Samaranch visit (Bisher, 1989). Samaranch reportedly advised IOC members to take Atlanta’s bid seriously (Hinton, 1989). During his visit to Atlanta, he said, "I am very much impressed not just for the facilities and the city, but for the people. You have chosen the right people to go with the bid. The bid will be very strong. I think Atlanta will be one of the best." (Shaw, 1989b)

At the time of the host city selection process, Atlanta had already chosen as the host for 1994 Super Bowl and 1988 Democratic National Convention, which proved the convention hosting capacity of Atlanta. However, according to Mayor Young, the Olympic bid was “far more complex than the Democratic Convention… The Democratic Convention was a piece of cake. We were dealing with people we knew and were working with. Most IOC people have never been to Atlanta. So, in a way, we're really starting from scratch.” (Shaw, 1989b)
After Samaranch, on September 2, 1989 more than 20 IOC members visited Atlanta to determine whether the city is capable of hosting the Games. During this visit, AOC has organized many sporting events and festivities in order to show IOC members Atlanta’s ability and desire to host the Games. Atlanta’s strategy was “make friends, make votes” (ACOG Member 2). One interviewee recognized the lobbying effort of AOC members: “Atlanta leaders did a fantastic job of lobbying the IOC. When they visited, they looked at the infrastructure. The transportation network impressed them. That was one of the reasons that they decided to bring the Olympics to Atlanta” (Planning Agency Staff 2). Additionally, AOC designed a weekend of amateur sporting events to display Atlanta’s enthusiasm and demonstrate to the visiting IOC members Atlanta’s ability to host athletic events. (AOC, 1989a)

On January 31, 1990, AOC has presented Atlanta’s bid for the 1996 Olympic Games to the IOC in Lausanne, Switzerland (AOC, 1990b). The bid document was 600 plus pages in five volumes included the required facts and figures confirming Atlanta’s physical capacity to stage the games. Atlanta’s bid proposed spending $1 billion and collecting revenue from broadcast television rights fees, corporate sponsorships, ticket sales, Olympic coins, and other merchandise (ACOG, 1997). AOC identified the city’s transportation system as a strong element of the Olympic bid, especially the airport, MARTA system, and the highway and street network. The airport handled more than 2 thousand flights per day at the time of the bid. The bid document emphasized that the 83 per cent of the US population live within a 2-hour flight of Atlanta (ARC, 1996). In addition to the physical capacity of the city, the bid document also focused on Atlanta’s unique role as the birthplace of the modern civil rights movements and how Atlantans are anxious to show their “southern hospitality” to the rest of the world (AOC, 1990a). On a newsletter to AOC supporters, Billy Payne describes Atlanta “as a rising star on the international scene and as the hub of transportation,
culture, communication, sport and trade for the southeastern United States, the nation’s fastest growing region.” (AOC, 1990a)

After submitting the official bid to IOC, AOC invited IOC members to visit Atlanta in April 1990 and see for themselves how magnificent Atlanta can be. 10 IOC members took advantage of this invitation and were treated not only to an impressive display of public support in the “Run for the Rings,” but were able to see the proposed athletic and cultural venues for Atlanta’s bid for the 1996 Olympic Games. Besides visiting Atlanta venues and meeting the people of the city, AOC also took the IOC members, their families, and guests to Savannah, site of the yachting venue (AOC, 1990c). In his letter to AOC supporters, Payne says, “the success of this well organized and executed visit has helped to solidify Atlanta’s role among competing cities as a great host city.” (AOC, 1990c) As of May 1990, AOC hosted 60 of the 91 IOC members in Atlanta and hoped to add another 10-15 to that number before the vote in Tokyo in on September 18, 1990 (AOC, 1990c). As of August 1990, 70 of the 91 IOC members visited Atlanta. (AOC, 1990d)

5.6 It is Atlanta!

On September 18, 1990 IOC awarded the 1996 Olympics to Atlanta at the 96th Session of IOC in Tokyo, Japan. An exuberant crowd in Underground Atlanta celebrated the announcement that Atlanta will host the 1996 Olympic Games. Atlanta used technology, an image of enthusiasm along with the strong support from Atlantans, and the organization skills to be selected over Athens by a 51-35 vote to host the Games after five rounds of voting (Table 5 shows the five-round sequence of IOC votes). Atlanta’s selection as the 1996 Olympic host city was surprising, even for Atlanta bidding committee. Atlanta was “the best city of the rest” to prepare itself for the 1996 Olympic
Games on time with its concepts for transport – especially the air connection to the world with one of the leading airports in the world–, infrastructural facilities, 65,000 hotel rooms, existing sport facilities, and communication systems. According to an ACOG member, Toronto was Atlanta’s biggest competitor, because “Toronto is similar in a lot of ways. There were people who were concerned about Athens. It is romantic but they can’t do it. They don’t have the facilities, it is chaotic ... Toronto was the real alternative to Athens and all of a sudden Atlanta came in. Toronto had local oppositions.” (ACOG Member 1) Athens’ bid failed mainly because of the governmental instability in Greece at that time, potential security and congestion problems, air pollution, and the consideration that the city is not likely to be ready on time for this huge organization (Weisman, 1990; Hutton, 2001).

Table 5. IOC Voting for the 1996 Summer Olympic Games

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Candidate City</th>
<th>Round 1</th>
<th>Round 2</th>
<th>Round 3</th>
<th>Round 4</th>
<th>Round 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Atlanta</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athens</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toronto</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melbourne</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manchester</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgrade</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: IOC, 2009
According to Payne, “Our [Atlanta’s] greatest asset in trying to sell our community as a host city to the U.S. Olympic Committee and the International Olympic Committee was the people we presented as spokespeople. It was an impressive cross section of business people and governmental leaders who felt passionately about participating in the Olympic movement and in bringing to it the friendliness of the American South. That passion conveyed that our interests were not on narrow economic development or business or tourist development for their own sake but that we were attempting to take the Olympic movement to a new level and let everyone participate.” (Payne, 1997)

According to Roche (2000), several facts were in support of Atlanta’s bid, especially the fact that “the city was the headquarters of one of the Olympic movement’s longest serving and biggest commercial sponsors, namely the Coca-Cola Corporation, no doubt helped.” (Roche, 2000, p. 67) Goizueta of Coca-Cola was the “behind the scene” figure for Atlanta’s Olympic bid, although he never publicly admitted. Coca-Cola entities donated more money for Atlanta’s bid than they donated to other 1996 Olympic bid cities; “By the time the IOC finally chose Atlanta in September 1990, Coke USA and CCE together had donated $350,000 to the Atlanta bid, made corporate jets available free of charge, hosted lunches, and fielded hundreds of volunteers. By contrast, Toronto, Canada, received only $125,000 from Coke entities, and Melbourne, Australia, got only $80,000.” (Greising, 1998, p. 254) For the final presentation to the IOC members in Tokyo, AOC needed $1.5 million more, and that money was raised at a lunch hosted by Goizueta (Greising, 1998). Once IOC chose Atlanta to host the 1996 Olympic Games, Olympics are branded as the “Coca-Cola Olympics” to prove the impact of Coca-Cola Company during the bidding process.
5.7 Olympic Planning Process

*There is an old saying that two things you never want to see being made are law and sausage. To that I would add a third: Olympic planning. It’s not very pretty.*

*(Yarbrough, 2000, p. 13)*

From its bidding until the closing ceremony in 1996, planning for the Olympics was a long decade for Atlanta that included lobbying at the International Olympic Committee (IOC), meeting the Olympic requirements, and making the city ready for the Games on time. Table 6 summarizes this decade-long process. (See Appendix E for a more detailed timeline of events leading to the 1996 Atlanta Olympics).

The main motivation of Olympics was to introduce Atlanta to the world and make Atlanta more international. John Portman writes as a guest columnist for Atlanta Journal-Constitution on May 12, 1991 and argues that Atlanta’s challenge is “to develop a master plan that blends the four elements of a successful community: housing, shopping, recreation and office space, both commercial and governmental.” He continues: “The flames of the Civil War allowed us to rebuild our city and begin a century of growth. The flame of the Olympics gives us a unique chance to again energize Downtown Atlanta and position our city for the next century of exciting progress.” (Portman, 1991) As an ACOG member stated, “The city needed something like Olympics to get everybody motivated and work together. Because the city was able to build things needed, the city was able to enhance some of its infrastructure - not extensively; we were able to pull the community together. It also helped the city to survive some of the economic downturns of the 90s.” (ACOG Member 1)
Portman’s editorial received criticism, especially for not indicating the potential of Olympics to be used as an excuse to displace the poor from downtown Atlanta and for not mentioning the housing needs for the homeless and poor (Stroupe, 1991). Along the same line, Clarence Stone, who spoke at Oglethorpe University’s Olympics Symposium in October 1991, said “the city [of Atlanta] and Olympics officials should use profits from the 1996 Games to benefit impoverished black citizens, who historically have been left without a voice in city government.” Stone continued, "Until it addresses this issue, Atlanta will be a place of uneven success, a place where it's good to be affluent but a place where it's hard to be poor." (Hiskey, 1991) Stone described the Olympic Village and the Stadium as “the latest features of the horseshoe,” which was built as a
buffer between downtown businesses and black communities in 1940s by moving “blacks from the fringes of the central business district to land in south and west Atlanta.” (Hiskey, 1991)

Ideally, the actual management and planning for the Olympic Games start with the idea of bidding. However, for Atlanta, actual planning of the Games started after Atlanta’s selection as the 1996 Summer Olympic Games host city. Atlanta Olympics are planned to be clustered in two major venues: The Olympic Ring in downtown Atlanta and the Olympic Park at Stone Mountain. Sailing was planned to be in Savannah venue (Figure 6). The 1996 Olympic was the most compact in history, with competition venues for 16 sports located within a 1.5-mile radius in downtown Atlanta called the “Olympic Ring” (Figure 7). In addition, several non-competition venues were also located inside the Olympic Ring, including most Olympic Arts Festival venues, Centennial Olympic Park, the Olympic Village, the Main Press Center, the International Broadcast Center, and the Olympic Family Hotel. This imaginary Olympic Ring idea also represents a conflict with the decentralized urban characteristics of Atlanta. “This was by no means an accident and represented a major victory for downtown’s business and political elite.” (Varner, 2010, p. 68)

In its bid book, ACOG introduced MARTA as the backbone of the Olympic Transportation System for spectators and as a direct link to the city and to the venues. The bid book states: “more than 500.000 passengers now ride MARTA on an average day, which clearly indicates Atlanta’s capability to efficiently transport the 250.000 visitors expected at the Olympics” (ACOG, 1990), p.24) According to a planning agency staff interviewed, Atlanta Olympics was a success story: “MARTA served the intercity very well, so it served the venues very well. Transportation have been always a problem for the Olympics. We did not solve that problem but gave them an alternative way of looking at how you handle masses of people. Selling point for Atlanta was that
our venues were relatively close together; they were well served by our transportation network, particularly our rail system” (Planning Agency Staff 2)

Initial transportation plans for the Games are outlined on August 4, 1994. Key features include: first-ever Olympic transportation for spectators; loaned buses from transit authorities nationwide; use of MARTA rail and buses; walking; free, day-long use of Olympic transportation for ticketholders for the day of their tickets; and “Park and Ride” lots in outlying areas that link to the Olympic Transportation System (OTS) (ACOG, 1996). The goal of the Olympic transportation plan in Atlanta was to confine activities to a constricted area to shorten travel time between venues. Thus, major venues and events were concentrated within the imaginary “Olympic Ring” circle. “The more we can intercept traffic outside the perimeter, the better our chances of keeping the buses and other vehicles moving within the Olympic Ring area…” said ACOG Transportation Director Joel Stone. He added that “It is also going to make it more convenient for spectators coming in from around the region and from the suburbs to get to their destinations” (Hudson, 1996, p36).

Once Atlanta won the Olympic bid, AOC is converted into ACOG (Atlanta Committee for the Olympic Games) on January 28, 1991. As a non-profit, private organization, ACOG was responsible for all aspects of financing and staging the 1996 Olympic Games. ACOG was formed to manage the day-to-day operations and stage the Olympic Games for the city of Atlanta. ACOG was governed by a 31-member board of directors including the IOC members from the United States, representatives from the AOC, local governments, the business community, and representatives of the community (ACOG, 1996; ACOG, 1997). ACOG Board of Directors are listed in Table 7. Andrew Young - Atlanta’s former mayor and former US ambassador to the United Nations – and Robert M. Holder Jr. - a recognized business and civic leader in Atlanta and
the former chair of the Atlanta Chamber of Commerce – were named as co-chairs of the board. Andrew Young and Robert Holder both increased the credibility of the team with the Atlanta business leaders as well as enabled the team to raise the necessary funds to carry out the effort (Yarbrough, 2000). “With the Honorable Andrew Young on board, the effort took on a whole new level of sophistication—in strategy, visibility, and credibility. Andy had never thought of it, of course, but his resume—the Movement, Congress, the U.N., big-city mayor-- was made to order for winning these games.” (Huey, 1996, p. 56)

Four of the members of AOC took full-time positions at ACOG, namely Billy Payne, Ginger Watkins, Linda Stephenson, and Charlie Battle. Payne is elected as the president and the CEO of ACOG, and became the first person in modern Olympic history to lead an Olympic bid and continue uninterrupted as president of the Olympic organizing committee until the end of staging the Games. Payne, having no management experience before, earned an annual salary of $669,000, which was the highest salary paid to a non-profit organization executive in the U.S in 1996 (Huey, 1996). Three Atlanta businesswomen, who organize charity fund-raising events, joined the ACOG team to impress the IOC visitors with Southern hospitality.

IOC rules at that time decreed that the host city was financially responsible for the Games. IOC and AOC signed a contract that transferred the financial responsibility of the 1996 Olympic Games to ACOG, which was against the effective Olympic Chapter (Rule 4) at that time, which stated “complete financial responsibility for the organization of the Olympic Games … jointly and severally’ to the NOC and the city.” (IOC, 1989, Rule 4). ACOG “modeled its operations on the highly profitable Los Angeles Games of 1984, rather than on the more lavishly state-subsidized ventures in Seoul (1988) and Barcelona (1992)” (Rutheiser, 1997) and organized a privately financed Olympics with a relatively small budget.
Figure 6. Olympic Venues in Downtown Atlanta, Stone Mountain, and Savannah
(Source: AJC, July 15, 1990)
Figure 7. The Olympic Ring (Source: French and Disher, 1997)
Table 7. ACOG, the Board of Directors

ANDREW J. YOUNG, CO-CHAIR

Young, former US ambassador to the United Nations, three-term US congressman, and two-term mayor of Atlanta, played a key role in Atlanta's Bid effort. Young was the pastor of small Congregational churches before becoming associate director of the National Council of Churches' department of youth work in New York City. He returned to Atlanta in 1961 to work as a top aide to Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. during the civil rights movement and to serve as executive director of the Southern Christian Leadership Conference. Young has received many awards, including the Presidential Medal of Freedom, America's highest civilian award; the Legion d'Honneur (France); and more than 45 honorary degrees from universities such as Emory, Morehouse, Notre Dame, and Yale.

ROBERT M. HOLDER JR., CO-CHAIR

The founder and chair of the board of Holder Corporation, one of Atlanta's leading construction companies, Holder is a director of Wachovia Corporation and National Service Industries, Inc. He is honorary consul general of Thailand and past chair of the Atlanta Chamber of Commerce. Holder also serves as chair of the Carter Center Board of Councilors and co-chair of the Atlanta Action Forum.

WILLIAM PORTER "BILLY" PAYNE, PRESIDENT AND CEO

Inspired to bid for the Centennial Olympic Games in 1987, Payne took a leave of absence from his Atlanta real estate law practice to lead the effort. As president of the AOC, Payne served as a full-time volunteer in directing the Olympic Bid campaign, which was funded with $7 million raised almost entirely from merchandising and contributions from the local business community. Born in Athens, Georgia, Payne has both an undergraduate degree and law degree from the University of Georgia, where he excelled academically as vice president of the student body and athletically as an All-American defensive end on UGA's 1968 SEC Championship football team.

MEMBERS OF THE BOARD

Stewart Acuff
Ivan Allen Jr.
Sandra Baldwin
Charles H. Battle Jr.
Edward Bowen Jr.
Hugh Chapman
Michael Coleman
Dr. J. Patrick Crecine
A. William Dahlberg
Anita DeFrantz
Jim Easton
A. D. Frazier Jr.
Dr. Ralph Hale
Joe Frank Harris
Mike Jacki*
Mattie Jackson
Maynard H. Jackson
Sandy Knapp*
John Krimsky
Ronald Krise
Michael Lenard*
Charles London
Dr. Kaneta Lott
DeWitt Martin
Sam Massell
James Miller Jr.
Michael Plant
Robert Rearden Jr.
James Reynolds III
Raymond Riddle
Carl Sanders
Dick Schultz
Horace Sibley
Linda P. Stephenson
Perry Toles*
Dr. LeRoy Walker
Ginger T. Watkins
*Alternate members

Source: ACOG, 1997
5.7.1 Federal Government Relations

Due to its timing, the 1996 Olympics was highly politicized at the federal level as well. President George Bush led the creation of the Interagency Task Force on the Olympic Games to coordinate all federal activities related to the Games (ACOG, 1997). The 1996 Olympic Games were held between July 19 – August 4 and the presidential election was in November 1996. The new-elected president, Bill Clinton, considered the Olympics as a potential event to be viewed positively for his re-election in November 1996 elections. Clinton administration worked closely with ACOG at a very senior level to make the Olympics a success for both Atlanta and for the United States. When President Clinton assumed office in 1993, he created a new task force chaired by Vice President Al Gore (ACOG, 1997). Vice President Al Gore held meetings every week for three years at the White House regarding the 1996 Atlanta Summer Olympics (Gillespie, 2002). President Clinton also visited Atlanta one year before the Games and told the Atlanta team that “they were doing this for the US and in order to make the US look good.” (Gillespie, 2002, p. 260) Increased political profile of the Games resulted in getting more funding for different Olympic activities.

5.7.2 The State and City Involvement in the Olympic Planning Process

This section discusses the planning, organization and administration of the Olympic Games by ACOG and the numerous related organizations that contributed to the preparation and planning of the 1996 Summer Olympics. Once Atlanta won the bid, new organizations were established, including Metropolitan Atlanta Olympic Games Authority (MAOGA) and Corporation for Olympic Development in Atlanta (CODA) to manage governmental, operational, and financial aspects of the Olympic Games.
Metropolitan Atlanta Olympic Games Authority (MAOGA) created first as a state entity exclusively composed of public officials. However, Atlanta Olympic organizers preferred an organizational structure where decision making process could be less subject to public oversight. As a result, AOC was converted to a new organization and on January 1991 and ACOG was legally incorporated as a civic organization to foster national and international amateur sports competition and to organize and conduct the 1996 Atlanta Olympic Games (ACOG, 1997). That same day, A “Tri-Party Agreement” was signed between the private sector led ACOG, the state run MAOGA, and the city of Atlanta to oversee the Games. The Tri-Party Agreement outlined the responsibilities of each entity in the Olympic preparation process. The state of Georgia, the city of Atlanta, and ACOG agreed that the state and the city will have no financial liabilities. MAOGA assumed the IOC obligations that the City of Atlanta cannot, and transfers them to ACOG. ACOG, in turn, indemnified MAOGA and the City of Atlanta from any Games-related financial liabilities (ACOG, 1996). Table 8 summarizes the role of the major local organizations involved in the Olympic planning.

ACOG formed its strategy by establishing private-public partnership schemes and limiting its focus to “inside the fences” for the Olympic planning effort (Rutheiser, 1997). "Our responsibility basically ends at the security fence around the venues," said Billy Payne (Roughton, 1992b). Thus, the policy making process dominated by business leaders and the Olympic-related development was largely controlled through ACOG, not MAOGA. (Andranovich et al., 2001)

Local officials wanted to benefit from the Olympics for the betterment of Atlanta. City Planning Commissioner Leon Eplan specifies three categories of work they proposed as follows: Better quality of life by improving conditions in inner-city neighborhoods and enhancing social services; introducing commuter trains and other alternatives to cars and implementing systems to manage
traffic flows; and improving the city streets and making downtown safe and inviting to pedestrians. (Roughton, 1992a). In order to implement these plans, “most of the money must come from the layers of government above the city - which simply cannot afford to pay for the proposal - as well as the philanthropic sector” according to Eplan. "The Olympics is not the city Olympics, it is a state and national event," Eplan said. "The degree to which we can get the interest of the state and federal governments will be the degree to which we will successfully carry out our plan." (Roughton, 1992b)

Table 8. Major Local Organizations Involved in the 1996 Atlanta Olympic Games

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Atlanta Committee for the Olympic Games (ACOG)</strong></td>
<td>ACOG is created as a non-profit, private, ad hoc organization responsible for all aspects of financing and staging the 1996 Olympic Games in accordance with the IOC’s 1990 Olympic Charter.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Metropolitan Atlanta Olympic Games Authority (MAOGA)</strong></td>
<td>MAOGA is created by the Georgia State Legislature to enable Atlanta to bid for the 1996 Olympic Games. MAOGA assumes IOC obligations the City of Atlanta cannot and transfers them to ACOG. MAOGA was responsible to oversee ACOG’s finances and approve all ACOG contracts to ensure legality and long-term financial viability.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The City of Atlanta</strong></td>
<td>The City of Atlanta involved in Olympic planning through MAOGA. Then Atlanta’s Mayor Jackson signed the IOC Host City Agreement, a document that confirms the Games will be held In Atlanta. City of Atlanta was responsible for infrastructural improvements around venues and visitor sites.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Corporation for Olympic Development in Atlanta (CODA)</strong></td>
<td>CODA is created by the City of Atlanta and the business community with the mission of revitalizing public areas in time for the Olympic Games and enhancing certain Olympic legacies for post-Games use. CODA was funded by federal and private grants.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Metropolitan Atlanta Rapid Transit Authority (MARTA)</strong></td>
<td>MARTA, the publicly funded transit operator, was contracted by ACOG to manage and operate the Olympic Spectator Transportation System.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: From various sources, principally ACOG 1996 and ACOG 1997
The city officials were assumed to take the responsibility “outside the fence” plans, but reacted very late to rationalize its effort. The city government established the Rural /Urban Design Assistance Team (R/UDAT), consisting of architects, designers, and planners, as a consulting team to create a report for possible “outside the fence” developments. The R/UDAT 100-page report did not recommend any major infrastructural improvement, rather concentrated on creating a better street life by improving pedestrian corridors between Underground Atlanta, Peachtree Center, and World Congress Center area (R/UDAT, 1992), which corresponds with the CAS-II streetscape plans.

5.7.2.1 The Metropolitan Atlanta Olympic Games Authority (MAOGA). The Metropolitan Atlanta Olympic Games Authority (MAOGA) was created by the Georgia State Legislature in 1989 to enable Atlanta to bid for the 1996 Olympic Games (ACOG, 1996; ACOG, 1997). The state’s constitution prohibited the City of Atlanta from accepting certain IOC obligations. Through MAOGA then Atlanta’s Mayor Maynard Jackson signed the IOC Host City Agreement that confirms the Games will be held in Atlanta. MAOGA was created to pass the financial obligations on the ACOG and to pass over the state constitution that does not authorize the city of Atlanta to enter into multi-year construction contracts as well as to review the Olympic planning process to protect the Georgia taxpayers’ money (Rutheiser, 1996; French and Disher, 1997; Yarbrough, 2000; Toohey, 2007). As a temporary state agency, MAOGA was created “specifically to oversee ACOG’s finances to ensure the long-term financial viability of the Games.” (Simmons, 2000, p. 26) MAOGA was given the authority to bond for Olympic projects and the eminent domain power and it functioned as the “holding company” for Atlanta Olympics. In addition, MAOGA had the authority to borrow and lend money, approve ACOG construction contracts in excess of $250,000, hold ownership of the Olympic Stadium, enter into intergovernmental contracts on ACOG’s
behalf, and approve venue change in the city of Atlanta (ACOG, 1996). In other words, “the state government, with unanimous support from the city government, and no public debate, gave away its own power and created an unrestrained super-governmental authority: no checks, no balances, no regulatory agency, no democratic input.” (Davis, 1996, p. 2)

Acting on its own initiative, MAOGA has also been a catalyst for downtown development, leading several revitalization projects including 18 major housing projects in areas affected by Olympic venues – two of the largest projects are around the Olympic Stadium (ACOG, 1996). MAOGA cleared “the way for developers interested in creating affordable housing in conjunction with Olympic capital improvements.” (West, 1996, p. 50)

Payne (1997) explains how the state of Georgia supported Atlanta’s Olympic effort: “The IOC contract requires a government guarantee. We created an authority under the state of Georgia. That authority didn’t have full taxing powers. The guarantee was supported by private business. That rule of a government guarantee doesn’t change things. A government-funded Games is not going to happen in America. The private sector will carry the day. Government treasuries shouldn't be subjected to unlimited demands of anybody. You should not sign any open-ended guarantees. Our budget was our guarantee.”

*We promised we could do it without taxpayer investment, without government helps. People said, why did you do that, and I have said, had we not said that we could not have bid. It was a self-fulfilling prophecy we said it, so we had to do it.*

(Payne, 2006)

Payne’s effort got little attention at the beginning and “this made it even easier to work in virtual secrecy.” (Davis, 1996, p. 2) AOC was able to decide on future planning of the Games and
establish contracts before anybody in Atlanta knew anything about the Olympic bid. Atlanta’s bid was different from other bidding cities in terms of the openness of the bidding process to the public. Anita Beaty, the Director of the Metropolitan Atlanta Task Force for the Homeless, states that “Atlanta activists knew that the entire process had occurred behind closed doors, with no public discussion, much less debate. There was no information provided to the public about the bid process, nor even an open debate about whether or not Atlantans even wanted the Games. The resistance that surfaced at the bid announcement and grew during the planning years was hardly covered by the local press.” (Beaty, 2007, p. 16) Some community groups protested the Olympic idea and the Olympic Conscience Coalition formed, however, it was after the Olympics were awarded to Atlanta. Along the same line, Davis (1996) noted “in Atlanta, there has never once been a public hearing or forum on the Olympics that invited criticism, or even questions. There was never a public financial analysis by any independent group. The city and the public have relied solely on the figures from AOC/ACOG and their consultants” (p. 2)

5.7.2.2 Corporation for Olympic Development Authority (CODA). The City of Atlanta was willing to, but not able to influence the Olympic planning process (Rutheiser, 1996). The mayor at that time was Maynard Jackson who re-elected in 1989 for his third term. Mayor Jackson described his vision and optimism using a metaphor of “the twin peaks of Atlanta’s Mount Olympus.” The first peak was to “stage the best Olympic Games ever,” and the second peak was to “simultaneously uplift the people of Atlanta and fight poverty in the process” (Roughton, 1991, p. F3) Mayor Jackson presented Atlanta’s Olympic development program at the 99th Session of the International Olympic Committee in Barcelona, Spain in July, 22, 1992 and he stated, “the Olympics will be used as an opportunity to improve the physical environment and raise the quality of the lives of citizens residing in neighborhoods lying close to the main venues. There are nine
such neighborhoods. Several of these will be most directly impacted by Olympic events, particularly Summerhill, the Vine City/Atlanta University/Ashby area, Techwood/Clark Howell, and Mechanicsville. Efforts to revitalize these communities will require major new investments in their parks, infrastructure, housing, education facilities, and programs involving human and social services. Additional funds are needed to help local communities organize, plan and oversee the rebuilding of their neighborhoods.” (Jackson, 1992, p. 8) (Figure 7 shows the neighborhoods within the Olympic Ring) However, the ability of city government to achieve its development plans generally depended upon the agreement of the business elites with these plans and “this was certainly true of the Olympics, where attempts to improve social infrastructure made increasingly little impression on the city’s private-run Olympic body.” (Whitelegg, 2000, p. 805) Atlanta Olympic organizers did not pay attention to the community needs, rather targeted on maximizing the profit of Atlanta Games. In other words, “the mostly white, suburban corporate mandarins atop the summit of ACOG modeled their operations on the highly profitable Los Angeles Games of 1984, rather than on the more lavishly state-subsidized ventures in Seoul (1988) and Barcelona (1992).” (Rutheiser, 1999, p. 318)

Later, the city of Atlanta and the business community created a non-profit corporation called the Corporation for Olympic Development Authority (CODA) in 1993 intended to plan and coordinate redevelopment projects “outside the fence” (Rutheiser 1996, French and Disher, 1997; Hoffman, 2003). Mayor Jackson said "this will be about brick and mortar and physical development," describing CODA’s mission (Hill and Roughton, 1992). For the neighborhoods, CODA raised hopes to meet the immediate needs, such as housing and creating jobs. From the business elites’ point of view, CODA’s mission was to improve urban landscaping. At the end of the day, CODA concentrated on urban landscaping projects.
CODA was funded by federal and private grants, and was charged with developing a master plan to upgrade Atlanta neighborhoods; establishing a budget for the master plan; raising the money needed for the redevelopment projects; and ensuring the plan is implemented on schedule. CODA was co-chaired by Mayor Jackson and a business leader selected by the mayor. CODA’s 21-member board consisted of ACOG president, the chairman of MAOGA, business representatives, government officials, and neighborhood leaders. "It's a good-sized board, but it's not unduly large," Mayor Jackson said (Hill and Roughton, 1992).

Shirley C. Franklin - then vice president of ACOG and future mayor of Atlanta – became the first director of CODA, but she quit after a few months and Clara Axam became the new director (Hoffman, 2003). The board members of CODA had no enthusiasm, as Hoffman (2003) quotes Axam, “they [the board members of CODA] were serving out of a sense of civic duty or personal obligation to the mayor, not because they thought that CODA would succeed” (p. 172). The local press described the mission of CODA as “making the city presentable” for the Games. However, CODA had no significant impact on inner city neighborhoods given the fact that the organization was underfunded to accomplish its goals (French and Disher, 1997).

CODA’s Master Olympic Development Program for the City of Atlanta proposed redevelopment projects in fifteen neighborhoods within the “Olympic Ring,” which costs almost $400 million (Simmons, 2000). Mayor Jackson envisioned CODA as a catalyst to revitalize the poor neighborhoods of Atlanta, however, CODA did not generate the necessary financial support – either public or private – to implement its goals. A total of $72 million budget – $32 million from the bond issue, $25 million in federal matching grants, and another $14 million in private donations – mostly spent towards urban landscaping projects. These projects included improvements such as new street lights, widened sidewalks, benches, trees and street furniture along 12 major downtown
corridors; new and enhanced open spaces in 12 parks and plazas, and pedestrian corridors leading
to venues in Olympic Ring (ACOG 1996; Simmons, 2000; Burbank et al 2001). The business
elite’s agenda was predominant and CODA was far from enough to implement its envisioned goals
(Hellerman, 1995; Burbank et al 2001; Hoffman, 2003). Jackson did not run for another term
because of his health problems, and he was succeeded by the more business-minded Bill Campbell
in 1994. Besides the limited funds and Jackson’s absence, the major problem with the unsuccessful
CODA venture was that the downtown business elites did not genuinely support CODA. CODA
was dissolved in 1997.

Figure 8. Olympic Ring Neighborhoods (Source: French and Disher, 1997)
ACOG was created as a non-profit organization that was in charge of planning and staging the 1996 Atlanta Olympics, and CODA was created as an effort to “uplift the people of Atlanta and fight poverty in the process” (Burbank et al. 2001, p. 88). In reality, ACOG was representing the business elites’ interests while CODA was trying to increase the benefits of the Games for Atlantans. ACOG and its representatives resisted to fund some of the projects on CODA’s agenda.

“With the civic improvement projects now in the hands of the business community, rather than publicly elected officials, the projects tended to be mainly structural and the social goals Jackson had championed were largely ignored.” (Varner, 2010, p. 67)

Mayor Jackson saw the Olympics as an opportunity for the inner city neighborhoods. “Mayor Jackson said this is an opportunity – whether we succeed or not – to have resources brought to the city to help the run down neighborhoods. He and some other people saw the Olympics as an opening of a door for a broader social benefits. Those ideas were resisted by some of the leaders, ‘big sharks’ of the Olympics. They basically saw it as a sporting event, not necessarily for the betterment of the people” (Academic 3).

5.7.3 Cost of the 1996 Atlanta Summer Olympics

Atlanta Olympics were supposedly “privately-funded” without any burden on the city and state taxpayers. AOC 1989 brochure to promote the Atlanta bid stated that “it is anticipated that the 1996 Atlanta Olympic Games will [not] require any net taxpayer investment. The Atlanta Games will be privately funded from television and corporate sponsors. The financial success of the Los Angeles 1984 Games ($260 million profit) and the Seoul, Korea, 1988 Games ($500 million reported profit) attest to the sponsorship attractiveness of the Olympic Games.” (AOC, 1989a)

Atlanta Olympics official report defines the mission of Games as fiscal responsibility, sharing the spirit of America’s South, positive spiritual and physical legacy, and inclusiveness in planning.
The report states, “scrupulous attention to keeping expenses commensurate with revenues was essential because of ACOG’s commitment to stage the 1996 Games without governmental financial support” (ACOG, 1997, p. 22).

However, planning for the Olympics was a big financial challenge, and some of the infrastructure improvements required public subsidy. Specifically, the federal government provided $609 million (in 1999 dollars) for the Atlanta Olympics; the majority of these funds –about $424 million- was spent for infrastructural projects, such as highway, transit, public housing, and other capital improvements, and the rest of funds –about $185 million- were spent on projects and activities related to planning and staging the Games (GAO, 2000). However, Keating (2001) argues, “a careful analysis of exactly how much money federal, state and local governments actually spent on preparing the city and putting on the games reveals that the cost to taxpayers exceeded Olympic-generated government revenue by a wide margin” (p. 143) According to Keating (2001), the total government spending for the Olympics reached over $1 billion (p. 148). ($1,050,970,000.) According to United States Department of Transportation (DOT) and other agency officials, the funds for infrastructural improvements would have been provided to Atlanta regardless of hosting the Games, but some of those improvements were immediately reviewed and identified as “Olympic-related”, thus, priority was given to these projects to complete them in time for the Olympics (GAO, 2000).

According to ACOG officials, the 1996 Olympic Games cost the organizer about $2 billion – more than three times the cost of 1984 LA Olympics (GAO, 2000). The total Olympics-related expenditures amounted to about $2.22 billion and ACOG generated a financial surplus at the end. Federal government also provided $114 million for three Olympic-related transit projects: the North Line Rail Extension, the Atlanta University Center Pedestrian Walkway, and the Intelligent
Transportation System (GAO, 2000). Additionally, in 1993, the City of Atlanta obtained federal funding for $300 million federal office complex construction next to Underground Atlanta (Rutheiser, 1997). According to an interviewee, the primary lesson of the Atlanta Olympics was that the event organizers should be very careful in investing money just for an event: “We [Atlanta] confirmed what LA had already proved that you can stage a major event without burdening tax payers with long term debt. An organizing committee even if it assumes the financial responsibility for staging the games, an organizing committee needs the public sector to make it happen.” (Planning Agency Staff 3)

5.7.4 Major Olympic Projects

“Those projects that fit the interests of local business or established institutions were accomplished, while efforts by public officials to encourage development projects to benefit local residents fell far short.” (Burbank et al. 2002, p. 195)

The Atlanta Olympics were a catalyst for a number of urban development projects including the Centennial Olympic Park, the new Stadium, neighborhood developments, and urban design projects. In Atlanta, the Olympic bid occurred because of urban regime existed to offer a way to overcome the limitations of city government and to benefit from businesses (Burbank et al., 2001). The projects that met the desires of both public and private entities were undertaken and completed with a coalition (e.g. the Olympic Stadium and the Centennial Olympic Park). In other words, the Olympic bid created a golden opportunity for the downtown business elites to revitalize and attract attention again to the downtown area. In this section, two major projects led by business coalition, namely the new Stadium and the Centennial Olympic Park will be discussed. Other Olympic-related projects will be analyzed in detail in the following chapter.
5.7.4.1 The Stadium. The Atlanta Braves' lease with Atlanta-Fulton County stadium was ending in 1990 and the team was seeking a new stadium and seriously considering a move to the suburbs unless they get a new stadium (Shaw, 1989a; Yarbrough, 2000). The team put off negotiations on suburban stadium proposals until after the IOC's vote, since one of the promises of the Atlanta bid committee was to build a new stadium for the Olympic Games and convert it to a baseball stadium after the Games to be occupied by the Braves.

On March 9, 1993 the Fulton County Commission approved plans to build the Olympic Stadium adjacent to Atlanta-Fulton County Stadium (AFCS) and demolish AFCS after the Games, when the Olympic Stadium is converted to a baseball stadium for the Atlanta Braves. The vote follows similar requisite decisions by the Atlanta City Council and the Atlanta-Fulton County Recreation Authority (ACOG, 1996). ACOG funded the $209 million cost of the stadium construction (Duffy, 1995). The new Olympic Stadium opened on May 18, 1996 with the IAAF Grand Prix (ACOG, 1996).

“Atlanta has a long history of using civic projects as an occasion for obliterating poor Black neighborhoods” and the 1996 Olympics provided another such occasion (Davis, 1996, p. 3). As part of the new stadium construction, only 114 units of Techwood Homes – the nation’s oldest housing project – was planned to tore down, but, “while they had the bulldozer on the block, they went on and tore down the rest of Techwood homes – all 1,193 units” (Davis, 1996, p. 3) The city converted the housing project into “Centennial Place,” a 900-unit, privatized mixed-income residential development (CAP, 2000). This was part of the “surgery” for the area that was described as “a sore and a cancer on downtown Atlanta” by Gerald Bartels, the President of the Atlanta Chamber of Commerce (Davis, 1996, p. 3).
After the Olympics, the 83,100-seat stadium downsized to 49,831 seats and become the new home of the Atlanta Braves in time for the 1997 season. The Braves, Turner Broadcasting, and Time Warner covered the $35 million cost of conversion of the stadium (Malfas, 2004). Figure 9 shows the Olympic Stadium site when construction had just begun and when work was nearly complete. The new stadium only postponed the Braves move to the suburbs for about two decades. In November 2013, the Braves announced their plan to move from Turner Field in Atlanta when the 20-year lease expires at the end of the 2016 season to a new ballpark in Cobb County by the 2017 season. Mike Plant, the Braves' executive vice president of business options, notes that “We're not leaving Atlanta. We're just moving 14 miles up the road.” (Bowman, 2015).

Figure 9. The Olympic Stadium Construction (Source: ACOG, 1997)

5.7.4.2 The Centennial Olympic Park. After the HUD promised Atlanta officials to provide fund for the rehabilitation of Techwood/Clark Howell Homes, ACOG went out of the “inside the fence” line and saw the opportunity to link the site of the Olympic Village with the GWCC and Omni Coliseum through the creation of a park. Payne proposed the plan for an Olympic Park south of Techwood in November 1993 (ACOG, 1997). Business leaders perceived the park plan as an opportunity for downtown redevelopment. “This expanse of parking lots, single-room occupancy hotels, homeless shelters, and small manufacturing enterprises had long
been re-visioned by architects and coveted by speculators, but the depressed state of the downtown real estate market throughout much of the 1970s and 1980s, not to mention the existence of the nearby Techwood/Clark Howell housing projects, stymied efforts at redevelopment.” (Rutheiser, 1999, p. 332)

The Centennial Olympic Park was planned as the focal point for the new touristic activities. The Park itself was not an essential part of hosting the Olympic Games, but the Park was “strategically located for the tourism and convention businesses.” (Andranovich et al. 2001, p. 123) The plan for Olympic Park was made by business elites’ influence without input from the elected officials or residents. ACOG did not consult the city of Atlanta because of possible objections for the Olympic Park plan, keeping the city “as far out of ‘their’ park as possible,” rather discussed the park concept with the president of Coca-Cola and Georgia Governor Zell Miller (ACOG, 1997; Rutheiser, 1997; Keating, 2001). Payne knew that he needed to get Goizueta’s support, new CEO of Coca-Cola, first to come the plan true. In order to convince Goizueta, Payne ordered a drawing of the proposed park as if seen from Goizueta’s office and showed this drawing to Goizueta when he met him at his office and the gamble worked (Greising, 1998). At a reception, Goizueta “urged” Governor Miller to support the Park plan. “With Miller behind the proposal, offering state condemnation powers but no money, private enterprise quickly lined up to help buy the land.” (Greising, 1998, p.263)

On November 19, 1993, conceptual plans for Centennial Olympic Park—the largest center city park to be built in the US in the past 25 years—are revealed (ACOG, 1996). On January 7, 1994, Governor Zell Miller designated the state-owned Georgia World Congress Center Authority to oversee the whole effort; obtain the land for the park, built the park, and operate it (ACOG, 1996). However, the Park was financed and constructed through private sources (Rutheiser, 1997). Dr.
Sherman Day, former interim president of Georgia State University, supervised the construction of the Park as an agent of the state (Seth, 2013). Figure 10 below shows the master plan of the Centennial Olympic Park and an aerial view of the site where Centennial Olympic Park was constructed.

The Centennial Olympic Park was developed entirely with private funds. The estimated $75 million cost was paid through the sale of commemorative bricks, funds raised by the Atlanta Chamber of Commerce and local philanthropic foundation grants. Half of the Phase 1 park development cost was funded by Woodruff Foundation and the rest of the cost was raised through the commemorative brick program (Simmons, 2000) Home Depot assisted the program by selling nearly 500,000 bricks at $35 each nationwide in its stores and raising $17.5 million for the Park’s construction (ACOG, 1996; ACOG, 1997).

Figure 10. Centennial Olympic Park Master Plan and the Aerial View of the Site
Source: ACOG, 1997
Land cleaning for Centennial Olympic Park began on March 13, 1995, launching 16 months of construction (ACOG 1996). For the Centennial Olympic Park idea, “ACOG used a political strategy that harked back to a strategy used by the downtown elite. Just as downtown business leaders had allied themselves with state government in the late 40s and early 50s to win approval for the Plan of Improvement, and just as they had used this strategy to secure financing for building the Georgia World Congress Center in the 70s, ACOG allied itself with state government to get the Olympic Park built.” (Keating, 2001, p. 147). The Park was initially planned to be more than 50 acres, but the final plan produced a 21-acre Park, which was completed right before the Games started. During the Olympic Games, ACOG leased more than one-third of the park to Olympic sponsors, such as ATT, Anheuser-Busch, Swatch, and General Motors for entertainment activities. Additionally, Coca-Cola Company and the Georgia Department of Agriculture created exhibitions and activities for the park visitors (ACOG, 1997).

Rutheiser (1997) sees the Olympic Park project as a “major refiguring of the concept of the public-private partnership. In this case, the ‘public’ in the partnership was constituted by the State of Georgia, and its quasi-public entities like the World Congress Center Authority, and not the city government, much less the citizenry the latter represented. Rather than being players, the city and its panoply of development agencies were reduced, essentially, to bench warmers at best, mere spectators at worst.”

The major beneficiaries of the new Park can be listed as follows (Heying et al. 2007);

- The local government with increase value of the new facilities, which means more tax revenue,
- Georgia World Congress Center got a palatial lawn for its front yard
- AJC and Atlanta Chamber of Commerce headquarters now overlook a park rather than an industrial district
- Coca-Cola expanded its headquarters on a large parcel it assembled along the park’s northern boundary
- Turner broadcasting invested $27 million to renovate its CNN Center and OMNI Hotel
- Turner also replaced OMNI Coliseum with a new $213 million complex, Philips Arena, in 1999. The facility hosts the Atlanta Hawks, the Atlanta Thrashers, and major concerts and events (Turner, 1999; Central Atlanta Progress, 2000). Turner credited the creation of Centennial Park with his decision to make these investments and keep his teams downtown (Turner, 1999).

On the other hand, the Olympic Park construction dislocated over 70 businesses, removed at least a thousand homeless people and four shelters designed to help them (Whitelegg, 2000). “Rather than deal with more complex and difficult issues of poverty, unemployment and uneven development, Atlanta's power structure has focused its efforts on creating an urbane disguise intended to confirm an image of a world-class city to viewers, visitors and potential investors.” (Rutheiser, 1996)

The Urban Land Institute prepared a panel to evaluate redevelopment strategies for the Centennial Olympic park area in 1995. The panelists advance their knowledge through briefing materials, a tour of the study area, and conducting 70 on-site interviews with nearly 100 Atlanta citizens. The panel suggested that the downtown redevelopment strategy should prioritize supporting existing downtown activity centers to keep those businesses in place, facilitating new residential and entertainment-oriented development, and attracting new businesses. (The Urban Land Institute, 1995) These recommendations has been envisioned by the business elites of Atlanta for so long.
Downtown business elites envisioned the Centennial Olympic Park area as a commercial retail zone for so long, but it was not possible to collect all the land in the area, finance the project, and create a secure environment by removing Teckwood/Clark Howell Homes until the Olympics (Burbank et al., 2001). Olympics served as a convenient vehicle to implement the vision of business elites for the future of Atlanta.

5.8 Key Lessons from This Section

This chapter showed that starting from 1980s, the local, national and international dynamics limited the power of elites in downtown policy-making process, and the business elites had difficulties to influencing the planning decisions of elected officials. In this sense, the Olympic idea provided a means to facilitate the primacy of downtown and justify the physical redevelopment of downtown Atlanta. Billy Payne, as an outsider, was able to mobilize the regime actors to support his Olympic idea. Atlanta’s business elites mobilized their resources around tourism and convention businesses as well as residential development in order to create an international city image as they engaged in Olympic planning process. The Olympics was part of a long-dated strategy of downtown business elites that has been envisioned for decades, thus the Olympics served as a maintaining event for Atlanta’s regime (Stone and Pierannunzi, 2000) In this sense, Atlanta’s bid for hosting the Olympic Games can be seen as a product of an active growth coalition that already existed in Atlanta. The governing elites believed that the Olympics would help shifting the economic development strategies to attract more international tourists and to create an international city image that would serve the tourists and conventioneers with its maximum capacity. The main motivation of governing elites through Olympics was to introduce
Atlanta to the world and make Atlanta truly an international city. The 1996 Olympic hosting refreshed the hopes of elites for the future of Atlanta as an international touristic destination.

The business elites heavily engaged in Olympic bidding and preparation processes. Atlanta’s Olympic bidding committees consisted of influential business leaders, especially Goizueta of Coca-Cola was the “behind the scene” figure for Atlanta’s Olympic bid. In a sense, the bidding committees was another ad hoc form of the governing regime in Atlanta. With extensive lobbying effort, enthusiasm, and organization skills, Atlanta convinced the IOC members and the 1996 Olympics was awarded to Atlanta. Atlanta came forward with its sports facilities already in place, transportation network, and strong convention business. This proves the success of business elites’ vision in a sense that investing on Atlanta’s unique strengths and turning to market based solutions would help the city to keep its primacy in order to generate profit and increase the reputation of the city in an era where the manufacturing is declining and the competition with the surrounding suburbs for office space tenants and residents has intensified.

From its bidding period to the Olympic staging, ACOG’s strategy was to meet the Olympic requirement at the minimum level by limiting its attention “inside the fence”, increase the profit, and implement the long-dated agenda of putting Atlanta on the international map. CODA which was intended to plan and coordinate redevelopment projects “outside the fence” was not successful to increase the community benefits of the Olympics. Besides the limited funds, the major problem with the unsuccessful CODA venture was that the downtown business elites did not genuinely support CODA. ACOG was representing the business elites’ interests while CODA was trying to increase the benefits of the Games for Atlantans. In this process, MAOGA overseen ACOG and functioned as the holding entity for the Olympics.
The Atlanta Olympics were a catalyst for a number of urban development projects including the Centennial Olympic Park, the new Stadium, neighborhood developments, and urban design projects. The business led projects were implemented without any major objections, whereas the community needs largely left out of discussion. The construction of the Centennial Olympic Park and the Stadium removed poor residents and dislocated businesses without any assistance; whereas the major beneficiaries of the new facilities were the business elites.

After years of preparation, the Olympics started on July 19, 1996 with the opening ceremony and one phase of Atlanta’s history ended with the closing ceremony on August 4, 1996. The Olympics resulted in positive and negative legacies and has impacted Atlanta’s regime. The short- and long-term impacts of the 1996 Summer Olympics from the business elites’ perspective as well as the impact of the Olympics on Atlanta’s governing coalition is discussed in next chapter.
CHAPTER 6

THE ATLANTA REGIME AFTER THE OLYMPICS

This chapter reviews the changes after Atlanta staged the Olympics in 1996 and explores the Olympic legacy from the elites’ point of view. Additionally, this chapter investigates the behavior of Atlanta business elites on downtown redevelopment policies in light of the 1996 Summer Olympic experience and examines the impact of the Olympics on Atlanta’s governing coalition. The main proposition is that starting from 1980s, the local, national and international dynamics limited the power of elites in downtown policy-making process and the Olympics as a new strategy provided a means to facilitate the primacy of downtown Atlanta. This chapter answers the research questions below:

- What was the Olympic legacy from the business elites’ point of view?
- Did the Olympics meet the elites’ expectations? Why?

First part of this chapter identifies the positive and negative legacies of the 1996 Atlanta Summer Olympic Games as an outcome of the effort. The legacies are analyzed as 1) tangible legacies such as the infrastructural improvements and Olympic venues; 2) intangible legacies which are not easy to identify and quantify, such as image, pride, recognition, and citizen perception; and 3) the negative legacies of the Olympics for Atlanta. On one hand, the 1996 Atlanta Olympic Games created opportunities for the construction of new sporting facilities as well as the improvement of the physical environment of the host city, generated civic pride, provided an opportunity to generate world recognition and contributed to transforming the image of Atlanta; on the other
hand, the Games created negative social impacts on low-income residents, intensified social problems and deepen existing divides among residents.

The second part of this chapter analyzes the changes in governing coalition in downtown Atlanta after the Olympic Games and examines whether the Olympic Games resulted in expected changes in Atlanta’s regime.

### 6.1 The Olympic Legacy

> “Atlanta’s Olympic imagineers, faced with a product of dubious appeal, have focused their resources on a superficial makeover, leaving a complex and troubling set of problems to be ‘rediscovered’ in 1997”

*(Rutheiser, 1996, p. 287)*

#### 6.1.1 Tangible Legacies

Although Atlanta put a priority to create a world-class city image instead of creating permanent physical legacies, the city itself and Colleges and Universities in or near downtown Atlanta benefited the most from some of the physical facilities that are built for the Olympics. Many public and private construction projects took place during the Olympic preparation phase but they cannot be credited entirely to the Olympics. Among all, most notable tangible legacies from the Games include:

- The Centennial Olympic Park: The Park was one of the focal point of the Games and is one of the important marks of the Games. The park became a catalyst to revitalize its surrounding area with commercial and residential development after the Games *(Rutheiser,*
The park was closed after the Olympics for renovation and re-opened in March 1998. Since reopened, the park continues to serve as a catalyst for downtown development. The park has greatly improved the amenity level of the CNN Center and World Congress Center neighborhoods. The park has also served as a catalyst for loft conversions along nearby Marietta Street, new hotel development around the World Congress Center, and for planned condominium development just north of the park. The Centennial Olympic attracts over one million tourists and local residents annually to downtown Atlanta, and provides a critical link between the Georgia World Congress Center and the hotel district on Peachtree Street. The park contributes to an increased sense of safety among Downtown’s visitors.

- **Olympic Stadium:** The 83,100-seat Olympic Stadium of Atlanta used for the opening and closing ceremonies and for some athletic competitions. It is converted to a 45,000-seat stadium, renamed Turner Field and became the home of the Atlanta Braves after the Games as planned (ACOG, 1997).

- **Hartsfield Atlanta International Airport:** gained a $300 million international concourse and a $24 million central atrium (MARTA, 1996b), all of which was part of the Airport’s master plan, but the Olympics became a catalyst to implement these projects faster.

- **The ITS System:** Another legacy fact for the city is that the advertising of the ITS services has resulted in a continuing high usage rate following the Games and this advanced technology will benefit the community in the future.

- **The Atlanta Convention and Visitors Bureau's new Welcome South Visitors Center, and the International Sports Plaza,** restoration of historic landmarks such as the Margaret Mitchell House
• Other neighborhood revitalization efforts achieved through federal funds and CODA projects including upgraded sidewalks, planted trees, installed new lighting, built bicycle paths, and repaved streets.

• In addition to these new permanent facilities, ACOG made renovations/adaptations to Georgia Dome, Georgia World Congress Center, and The Omni Coliseum (Athletic Business, 1996).

In addition to the legacies listed above, Colleges and Universities in or near downtown Atlanta – particularly Georgia Tech and Georgia State University – benefited the most from some of the physical facilities that are built for the Olympics. New dormitories that will be used by Georgia Tech and Georgia State University after the Games were constructed by $47 million ACOG contribution, a new $24 million natatorium was built on the Georgia Tech campus, and ACOG spend $1.5 million to renovate Georgia Tech’s Alexander Memorial Coliseum, the basketball arena, and the Olympic Boxing venue (Humphreys and Plummer, 1995; Athletic Business, 1996). $14.4 million Georgia Tech Aquatic Center was the site of many events and is also being used for student recreations after the Games (Athletic Business, 1996; ACOG, 1997). An outdoor plaza, amphitheater, and a bell tower also added to the Georgia Tech campus as a result of the Olympics. Furthermore, Georgia State University Gym renovated and the school gained its first dorms. Atlanta’s historically black colleges — Morehouse College, Clark Atlanta University and Morris Brown College — also benefited from the Olympics with new and upgraded facilities. The $31 million Hockey Center was one of ACOG’s largest venue investments. The two-field, artificial turf field hockey complex includes a 5,000-seat stadium at Clark Atlanta University and a 15,000-seat stadium across the street at Morris Brown College. After the Games, Morris Brown started
using the new stadium for football, while Clark Atlanta started using its stadium for football and track and field events (Athletic Business, 1996).

Figure 11. Projects Inspired by the Olympics: Georgia Tech Student Housing and Georgia Tech Aquatic Center. Source: ACOG, 1997

The Olympic Games was also played a catalyst role for some other physical improvements. Atlanta had the right policy settings before the Olympics, but did not have the pressure to implement some of the improvements that are needed. For example, in Atlanta, in cooperation with other states and federal agencies and private sector partners, a $16 million ITS system was installed by MARTA before the Olympics with a grant from FTA. The Empowerment Zone was established in Atlanta in 1994 mainly because of the Olympic effort in place to revitalize some of the poor neighborhoods. Department of Housing and Urban Development provided Atlanta’s Empowerment Zone Corporation (EZC) with $100 million to enhance housing, childcare, and job training in a nine square mile area to the south, east, and west of downtown where over half the population live below the poverty line and more than a fifth are unemployed (AJC, 3 June 1994). MARTA was awarded a $14 million federal grant to purchase natural gas buses which will be showcased during the summer of 1996 (Glisson and Arbes, 1996). Lastly, Atlanta was given the
designation as the first U.S. Customs Inland Port in preparation for the 1996 Olympics, which improved the cargo business (Rose et al., 2009.)

6.1.1.1 Economic Benefits. Another important goal for Atlanta Olympic organizers was to promote business growth and attract international business to the city. Before and during the Olympics, Atlanta has been advertised to the potential investors and corporations as a good place for business with enormous economic opportunities. The Atlanta business elites sought to attract corporate businesses and relocations of office activities as the economic benefits of the Olympic campaign. Additionally, the elites aimed at improving the image of Atlanta to increase convention and tourism businesses. The commercial orientation of the Olympic organizers resulted in a legacy of downtown redevelopment. One study estimated that the Games would add $5.14 billion to state’s economy between 1991 and 1997 (Humphreys and Plummer, 1995). Following the Olympics, 18 major companies moved to Atlanta.

The Olympic Games also contributed to the growth of convention business. In 1996, 7,000 new rooms added to the regional supply and between January 1997 and April 2000, 14,000 more rooms added (Simmons, 2000). However, downtown Atlanta was not the only beneficiary of this improvement, surrounding suburbs also became attractive convention locations. After the Olympics, Atlanta also hosted more major sports events including the Super Bowl in 2000, NCAA Men’s Final Four basketball championships in 2002 and 2007, NCAA Women’s Final Four basketball championships in 2003, and more recently NHL All-Star Game in 2008. Additionally, the old OMNI sports facility was imploded and replaced with the $213 million Philips Arena. This new facility opened in September 1999, and hosts Atlanta's professional basketball team and the new National Hockey League franchise. Furthermore, the business elites constructed new
attractions around the Centennial Olympic Park including World of Coca-Cola and The Georgia Aquarium to increase the attractiveness of downtown Atlanta as a touristic destination.

However, the economic benefits of the Games short-lived. According to Baade and Matheson (2002) the Atlanta Olympics did not meet the expected outcome in terms of its economic impacts. The evidence from Baade and Matheson (2002) suggest that “the economic impact of the Olympics is transitory, one-time changes rather than a ‘steady state’ change.” (p. 28) Regarding the employment impact, the 1996 Olympic Games created 77,000 full and part-time jobs mostly in hospitality industry (38 per cent), business services, construction, and retail trade (ACOG, 1997). Another study found that the Olympics increased employment in the state of Georgia by 17 per cent in the years between 1996 and 2000 (Hotchkiss et al, 2003). Feddersen and Maennig (2013) found no significant positive economic effects of the 1996 Olympics on the regional economic development in Georgia.

6.1.1.2 Residential Development in downtown Atlanta. 1996 Atlanta Olympic Games contributed to the growth of residential development in downtown Atlanta. Prior to the Olympics, residential options were limited in downtown Atlanta and new residential development was practically impossible mainly because of the high property values, limited land availability, and an expectation for relatively low rents (CAP, 2000). As part of the Olympic preparation, developers started to convert office buildings into apartments to rent to the visitors during the Olympic Games. After the Olympics, these units are converted to condominiums. Since 1990, 3,400 new housing units have become available in the downtown area, with more than 2,000 of these coming on line since the Olympics (ARC, 1999). Together with the Centennial Olympic Park, they are the first step toward creating the downtown residential population that many believe necessary to the long-term health of the CBD. A recent Arthur Andersen LLP study estimated that
25,000 downtown residential units can be absorbed. At issue is whether the market for downtown units can be broadened (ARC, 1999).

One interviewee noted that downtown apartments and condos were rent out during the Olympics, and once the Olympics are gone decent amount of people moved back to downtown. He calls this as “back to the city” movement for Atlanta (Private Sector Representative 1). The Olympic Games made downtown housing financially possible: “the rental leases the developers were able to sign for the Olympic period provided a source of equity. That equity enabled these developers to obtain financing for converting vacant offices into apartments. The construction of more than 500 units of housing was leveraged in the vicinity of Woodruff Park, the central city park, in time for initial occupancy during the Olympics. Now, these lofts are being leased to the general public. And the demand is there.” (Patton, 1996, p. 21)

The lack of middle-class housing resulted in expansion of suburbs, exacerbation racial and class tension, and division of north-south gap in the region. Atlanta’s Empowerment Zone designation in 1994 as one of the six U.S. cities was an opportunity to increase the middle-class housing in the neighborhoods near the CBD (Rutheiser, 1997; Stone and Pierannuzi 2000). The new housing units in downtown Atlanta stand as one of the legacies of the Olympics and “it is entirely appropriate to attribute several hundred downtown housing units and over two thousand student dorm rooms to the Olympics, in that none would have been financially feasible at this point in time without the premium rents paid by ACOG and various businesses for their use during the Games.” (Padgett and Oxendine, 1996, p. 2)

As discussed in chapter four, the population of the City of Atlanta declined from 487,455 in 1960 to 394,017 in 1990 even as the region's population grew by almost 150 percent. This loss has been heavily concentrated among the white population, which fell by nearly half during the period. The
trends changed after the Olympics. After experiencing a decline from 1970 to 1990, the population of the City of Atlanta increased from 394,017 to 416,474 between 1990 and 2000, which would be partially credited to the Olympics. The population increased to 420,003 in 2010 census. In this sense, the elites’ strategy to use the Olympics as a catalyst for attracting residents to downtown Atlanta gave positive results.

6.1.2 Intangible Legacies

6.1.2.1 Atlanta is on the International Map. One of the goals of the Atlanta Olympic organizers was to create a world city image and this goal was achieved with the 1996 Olympic hosting of Atlanta. An Olympic bid was a logical next step for Atlanta to grow and put the city in the world map and after the Olympics, Atlanta was finally on the map as an international city. According to Padgett and Oxendine (1996), “the great gift of the Olympic Games to Atlanta's economy, if not necessarily to its economic development, is the world-wide exposure it generated. Indeed, Atlanta's business community will view the Olympic Games historically not as an economic engine, but rather as our city's first global marketing campaign.” (p. 2)

“For the past several years, Atlanta has said it is an international city, but the Olympic Games allowed us to show the world that we are an international city. The games, however, also gave us the responsibility to continue to act like an international city—a 24-hour city where people feel safe, are safe and have interesting things to see and do.”

(Patton, 1996, p. 21)
The Olympics transformed the image of Atlanta and moved the city image beyond being associated
with Gone with the Wind, CNN, and Coca-Cola. ACOG stated the image goal for Atlanta to be
identified as a major international city, and to be part of the “roster of great world cities” (ACOG,
1996a, p.7). Atlanta’s reputation as a world city was expected to influence tourism, convention
activities, business location and expansion decisions, and foreign investment. As Newman (1999b)
points out, downtown Atlanta “has been converted from an area that included large numbers of
low-income residents and small businesses into a major center for conventions and tourism by
massive public and private investments in tourism businesses and their infrastructure.” (p. 294)

As part of the advertising and image creation effort, the media coverage before and during the
Olympics affects the outcome for any Olympic host city. For Atlanta, the international media
coverage, especially during the Olympics damaged the city image. The negative press coverage
during the Olympics concerned mainly on the transportation and information technology
problems, administrative problems, and over-commercialization, all of which damaged the image
of Atlanta (Essex and Chalkley, 2003). Of course the bombing at the Olympic Park increased the
effect of negative Atlanta image at the international level. Press reports redefined the ACOG
acronym as “Atlanta Can’t Organize the Games” and referred to “The glitch Games,” “Olympic
chaos,” or “A horror trip” in their criticism of the organizers’ inability to quickly fix the computer
and results-reporting problems (Rivenburgh, 2008). A final devastation came from the president
of the IOC when he described the Atlanta Olympic Games as “most exceptional”, rather than the
typical “the best games ever” tribute at the closing ceremony. At the end of the day, the Olympics
was an invitation to the world to come to Atlanta and the world’s response to this invitation would
determine the success of the Olympics. In other words, “it is not the event itself, but the sustained
interest that is generated through the Olympics … which makes the spectacle so attractive to the
growth machine and it is one way to put the city ‘on the map’.” (Surborg et al., 2008, p. 350)

Despite the negative media image during the Olympics, Atlanta had a more positive image among
corporate decision-makers after the Olympic Games. Harris (1997) prepared a report for the
Atlanta Chamber of Commerce showing the results of interviews with 620 corporate decision-
makers from 13 nations regarding their perception of Atlanta’s image. According to the report,
Atlanta’s image improved by 17 per cent compared to other ten American metropolises. 24 per
cent of the respondents stated that “they now feel more favorable about the possibility of business
expansion or relocation in Atlanta as a market” (p. 24).

Most interviewees characterized the Olympics as an effort primarily focused on raising the profile
of the city. As an ACOG member stated, “In Atlanta, we were doing the Olympics for more
intangible reasons.” The goal was to enhance Atlanta. Even the most tangible, physical legacy of
the Olympics – The Centennial Park – was not on the agenda at the beginning. It was the idea of
Billy Payne and it is implemented right before the Olympics. It was evolved from opportunities
that were presented because of Olympic hosting. It was not part of any plan. Olympics was a one
off project, because nobody was thinking about the Olympics from a governmental point of view.
(ACOG Member 1)

6.1.2.2 Attitudinal Changes. The tight deadlines of the Games forced the agencies to
cooperate and do much work in a short time. Games served as an excuse to guarantee to complete
the infrastructure on time. Within its unique planning environment, the Olympics helped to make
the process faster with the positive affect of highest cooperation and coordination among different
agencies and authorities. Some institutions, such as Georgia Tech, were in partnership with ACOG
for some projects and all parties mutually benefited from working together. However, some of the
projects, such as Olympic Stadium and Centennial Olympic Park generated serious tensions between ACOG and local residents.

The interviewees who worked for Olympic planning effort saw it as a great challenge. For them it was an enjoyable challenge and it was enjoyable to see how the region come together. One interviewee pointed out, “People were very cooperative. Instead of being for themselves, everyone was together. I was very pleased to work in that kind of environment” (Planning Agency Staff 1). Another interviewee stated, “I used to say, if we were in the planning process, we would be just shifting the deadline. In this case [Olympics], it was going to happen this day and you had to be ready.” And continued: “We had to prioritize some of the projects. Which ones really needed to be done and which ones could be done in the time frame we had. That was part of what we did” (Planning Agency Staff 3). As Padgett and Oxendine (1996) notes, “If we Atlantans are to recognize any one lesson from the Olympic Games that we can meaningfully apply to our future economic development efforts, it must be that we were able to find a way-as painful, stumbling and contentious as the process was to work together to pull the games off.” (p. 1)

Majority of the interviewees agreed that the Olympics certainly brought some harmony and some coordination that Atlanta had never seen before. One interviewee said, “Olympics built the seed for foundation, nevertheless, this harmony did not last long” (Planning Agency Staff 1). He continued, “We [Atlanta] have probably gone backwards since the Olympics. Olympics were almost an anomaly” (Planning Agency Staff 1). Along the same line, another Olympic planner called the Olympics as “a blip on the screen.” He continued: “We met the challenge and we got back to business as usual again. It worked during the Olympics, because everybody wanted it to work” (Planning Agency Staff 2).
Another planning agency staff mentioned the changes after the Olympics, but he does not believe that these changes are completely a result of the Olympics: “This was a small town before the Olympics and it has changed dramatically since the Olympics. We have probably added over a million and a half people since the Olympic to Atlanta. I do not know how much the Olympics did that…. Before the Olympics, you had an old way of doing business which was like building roads. That is what they did. They got federal funding, came to the MPO and build road. It took time after the Olympics; we came to a new thinking, a little bit progressive. There is still some old thinking at the state, but it has changed. Some of them are associated with the Games” (Planning Agency Staff 3).

6.1.2.3 Changing Perception on Transit System. Additionally, the Olympic transportation planning experience changed the perception on transit and proved the capacity of MARTA system, the airport, and the convenient location of Atlanta. Although transportation was one of the biggest challenges for an auto-oriented city like Atlanta, Atlanta’s existing transportation plan, especially the rail system, was a vital part of their proposed transportation plan, which played an important role in Atlanta’s winning bid for the Olympics. Transporting millions of people every day was one of the biggest challenges for a predominantly auto-oriented city. Based on the argument that Atlanta’s transportation system prior to the Games was deficient for providing service to millions of people, MARTA formulated a transport plan on using existing bus and rail systems with the support of a temporary bus system to operate during the Games. Atlanta has not been regenerated through Olympics, instead Olympics is one of the beneficial outcomes of having a good rapid rail system. In MARTA’s history, it was the first time that the transit system has been used with its highest capacity. DOT officials state that almost 11 million
spectators made 25 million transit trips during the 1996 Olympic and Paralympic Games (GAO, 2000).

According to a planning agency staff, Atlanta certainly made a lot of improvements leading up to the Olympics: “It stimulated some projects getting done that would have gotten done as quickly. We made improvements in signal systems, traffic management systems, highway system, and pedestrian systems. MARTA certainly showed what it could do. The fact that MARTA performed so well was a message to people and that showed the value of transit. It shifted attitudes towards especially downtown living, because people started living downtown again.” (Planning Agency Staff 2)

Similarly, another planning agency staff stated that “There were some projects that were already planned. Because of the Olympics we were able to convince the federal government to exonerate the funding so we can get the lines completed.” (Planning Agency Staff 4)

On July 25, 1995, the Federal Transit Authority granted MARTA $10.6 million for Games-related transportation needs: support of the more than 1200 buses loaned to MARTA by transit authorities nationwide and transit information technology that will become part of the Regional Intelligent Transportation System (ACOG, 1996). Leading up to the Olympics, MARTA opened three new rail stations on the North Line: Buckhead, Medical Center, and Dunwoody on June 8, 1996 (MARTA, 1996a). MARTA already had plans for system extensions. With political pressure in D.C., it could have been finished for the Olympics. One interviewee stated that MARTA “was able to complete one line earlier than it could have completed otherwise, because everybody agreed we need it to get it done by the Olympics. Billy and others helped us [MARTA] sell that case to federal government, which needed to make the money available. Federal government also made improvements on the highway side as well. Highway improvements that were planned but they would not take place
until way down to the road” (Planning Agency Staff 2). Olympics helped to stimulate some projects, but did not result in permanent changes on the vision. Another Olympic planner stated that “the [transit improvements] that we made were the ones that we needed, and the rest of the improvements that we made were temporary, because the extraordinary demand was temporary” (Planning Agency Staff 3). The Olympics showed that Atlanta is capable of hosting a major event like Olympics.

One of the interviewees described the transportation legacy of the Olympics as follows: “[the Olympic Games] expedited the extension. More attention brought to MARTA and its potential. At the end of the day, people could see the incredible capacity that is built into the system. Because people were worried, the whole region would break down when you have millions of people. I think, through MARTA, we demonstrated that the region operated very smoothly and that was through MARTA. The legacy is that you can move a lot of people on public transportation system, if you organize it correctly. On the roadside, there were some legacies: monitoring system. The whole notion of working together, what you can accomplish if you work together… We can always reach back to that experience. If you do not have something who is pushing you to continue it, we have not had that.” ((Planning Agency Staff 1).

One of the planning agency staff emphasized that the Olympics was a “wake up call for MARTA” and transit had credibility in policy since the Olympics (Planning Agency Staff 2). The recognition of MARTA’s capacity increased the interest of surrounding suburbs to consider transit as an option to automobile. Recently, Clayton County had a referendum in November 2014 to join MARTA. Clayton is now poised to become the first new county to add MARTA since the agency began operating in DeKalb and Fulton in 1971. “People recognized the opportunity to increase travel
options was something they wanted to say yes to,” said Colleen Kiernan, director of the Sierra Club’s Georgia Chapter. (Simmons, 2014).

6.1.3 Negative Legacies of the 1996 Atlanta Olympics

“Blending capitalism and politics, mega-events like the Olympics promise an influx of capital and opportunities to advance pro-growth political agendas. And they do provide business and political elites in host cities and countries with an international stage and the possibility to consolidate power and effect quick change. But in the process, these spectacles and the infrastructure they require reinforce and exacerbate urban inequalities.”

(Ward, 2013, p. 48)

On one hand the 1996 Atlanta Olympic Games created opportunities for the construction of new sporting facilities as well as the improvement of the physical environment of the host city, generated civic pride, provided an opportunity to generate world recognition and contributed to transforming the image of Atlanta; on the other hand, the Games created negative social impacts on low-income residents, intensified social problems and deepen existing divides among residents. “The commercially oriented perspective prevailed with the Games providing a legacy that favored the redevelopment of commercial downtown districts rather than neighborhood renewal on a scale that would significantly improve the lives of the least well-off citizens of the inner city.” (Poynter and Roberts, 2009, p. 125)
Homelessness, crime, and other social problems are not solved, but were intended to be shifted to some other places. Anita Beaty – the Executive Director of Metro Atlanta Task Force for the Homeless – argues that the Olympics were used as an excuse “to accelerate, and even complete the gentrification of [Atlanta] neighborhoods, grab downtown property that the developers had always wanted to control, and incarcerate homeless people who dared to be visible or ask for help.” (Beaty, 2007, p. 7) According to Beaty, “there are many down sides to hosting the Games, and that you won’t hear about those from the planners and from the elected officials, many of whom stand to benefit from the Games. And there were people who benefited; they were the private folks who planned the Games and who benefited from some of the contracts for media and to the accesses to Olympic memorabilia. So there was plenty of benefit, but it did not accrue to the public entities that supported it.” (Beaty, 2009)

Atlanta’s Olympic primary effort aimed to meet the IOC requirements in a most efficient way from Games organization to architecture with limited infrastructure investment. Ginger Watkins, ACOG’s managing director of corporate services, sees the Olympics as an image-enhancing opportunity for Atlanta and he describes this effort as follows: “despite the huge effort ACOG undertakes through the ”Look of the Games” program, what we are really doing is ”decorating” Olympic venues and transportation corridors.” (Watkins, 1993). Payne admits that the Olympic idea was not well planned except the lobbying effort: “We had done, as you can imagine, very little planning about what would happen if we won. We had a plan that was as much cosmetic as it was substantive.” (Payne, 2006) “Temporary” and “aesthetic” features of the Olympic planning inevitably did not leave any room for long-term legacies, and resulted in spending money “on cosmetic enhancements but deferred addressing serious infrastructure problems” such as the inadequate sewer and water system (Keating, 2001, p. 143).
In the words of Dixon (1995), “Atlanta’s objective, for better or worse, was just the boost it could get, economically and psychologically, from accommodating the games effectively. Even if Atlanta had been seeking more far-reaching civic improvements, there is no way it could have amassed such billions for them.” (p. 104). The Olympics did not provide any means to solve the social problems. Rutheiser (1997) sees Olympics as part the ongoing “urban Imagineering” process, and argues that they “fail to address the political, economic, and cultural processes that have not-so-creatively destroyed the urban landscape and pose only a superficial fix to deep-rooted structural problems.”

The Olympic Games did not increase the quality of life for the residents of Atlanta, especially the poor. Atlanta focused more on “Olympics-as-sport” side and the needs of communities are disregarded (Andranovich et. al, 2001) As Andrew Young later said, the Olympics were “a business venture, not an anti-poverty program” and meeting the needs of the poor were not part of the Olympic agenda (Rutheiser 1996, p. 1). The “City too Busy to Hate” became the “city that is excluding its working poor, elderly, and vulnerable citizens.” (Beaty, 2007, p. 49) For example the Centennial Park construction dislocated many businesses without assistance for relocating and Olympic Stadium construction inflicted further damage on the low-income black neighborhoods in the area and their limited role in Olympic Planning prevented local governments to take action and protect these people from damage (Keating, 2001). Focusing and engaging on international business to create a world city image also resulted in losing local identity and neglecting local issues (Keating, 2001).
6.1.4 Citizen Perception

The perception of residents in terms of the legacies of the Olympics was mostly towards Atlanta’s image, pride, and recognition of Atlanta at the international level. According to a survey, the residents of Georgia also recognized the intangible benefits of the Olympics more than the tangible benefits. Twelve surveys, with a combined total of 9,342 Georgia resident responses, conducted by the Applied Research Center at Georgia State University in Atlanta, Georgia, USA between 1992 and 1996 to see resident perceptions of the Olympic Games. In all these surveys, Georgia residents consistently, over time, rated the intangible, non-economic benefits – such as international recognition, image, and citizen pride - greater than the economic benefits. Tangible benefits – such as the Olympic facility developments, increased economic benefits, and increased tourism - were the least important benefits in all surveys. According to another survey conducted by the Governor’s Department, 93% of the residents of the State of Georgia believed that the Olympics positively affected the community spirit, and as citizens they felt proud to host such a great event in Atlanta (Malfas et al., 2004). Most interviewees gave no credit on Olympics for any long-term legacy. They mostly agreed that the Olympics did not change the politics and there is no long-term harm or benefit of the Olympics.

6.1.5 Overall Assessment

The 1996 Olympics served as a catalyst for physical development in downtown Atlanta. The Atlanta Olympics raised the global profile of Atlanta, improved the city’s attractiveness for new businesses to locate, increased growth in service industry – especially in tourism and convention sectors, created a sense of pride for Atlantans, and improved the physical environment with some
tangible legacies, such as the new sports facilities, the Centennial Olympic Park, beautification of the city, new dorms for Georgia Tech and Georgia State Universities, and new housing options in downtown. Olympics and post-Olympics construction projects have made profound changes in and around the edge of the CBD. More than $500 million in new facilities were created for the Games.

Olympic hosting raised hopes for urban redevelopment in Atlanta. However, the benefits of any sporting event depend on the urban context of the city, and this context creates winners and losers. “In addition to the fact that sport matters, is the fact that politics matters” (Schimmel, 2001, p.259). According to Burbank et al. (2002), “the mega-event strategy serves the goals of pro-growth business leaders more than the desires of elected officials or city residents. Even though the prospect of hosting a mega-event has enormous consequences for public policy, the bidding process is conducted in such a way as to limit the accountability of bid organizers to public officials or citizens.” (p. 193)

The Olympic strategy of downtown Atlanta business elites was partially successful. The Olympic organizers used the key strengths of Atlanta such as the convention facilities, rapid-rail system, the airport to get the Olympics, but they failed to address political, economic, and social problems because of the short-term vision and lack of planning during the Olympic preparation process. As Andranovich et al. (2010) argued, “After the Games, it was clear that neither the expectations of city residents for improvements in their neighborhoods nor the desires of local entrepreneurs to cash in on the Games had been met. The city’s attempts to leverage the Olympics for its benefit were largely frustrated by a lack of resources and an inability to alter the relationship between the IOC, the local organizing committee, and corporate sponsors. In the end, the high expectations set
by Mayor Jackson were not realized and the redistributive goals of hosting the Olympics were dashed.”

French and Disher (1997) examined the lessons from Atlanta Olympics for prospective host cities. In this study, four main expected benefits of large scale events for the host cities are listed: creating a physical legacy, short-term economic stimulus, marketing and tourism opportunities, and sufficient urban redevelopment. The study concluded that the first three benefits are achieved; however the hardest benefit to obtain from the event – significant urban redevelopment – remained as a dream for Atlanta. According to this study, the main problems that bounded Atlanta from obtaining this benefit were dependence on private funding sources and divided management body.

According to Beaty (2007), Atlanta’s Olympic legacy is “the creation of a city that is privatizing its healthcare, its public utilities, its public land and eliminating very low cost housing, public healthcare, and access to public transportation.” (p. 49) From the early days of the civil rights movement through its Olympic bid, the promoters of the city have created an image of a city where different ethnic and racial groups work hard and live together in peace and harmony. Dameron and Murphy (1997) show that, in reality, things are not that simple or straightforward. Despite the best efforts of the city power brokers to smooth over racial and ethnic divides, Atlanta has a history of conflict and segregation. It is primarily the city’s downtown business leaders who influence elected officials and control local politics. This political environment in Atlanta leads to the policy decisions that often neglect public interests and undermine regional and social needs because of a narrowly defined private interests (Keating, 2001). Limited vision, class and racial segregation, along with the lack of attention to the fundamental issues created serious problems that are transferred to the future decision makers of the city.
The legacy of Olympics in Atlanta was not long-lasting and hard to be recognized. Atlanta’s bid strategy was not grounded in a specified long-term plan that includes venue planning, funding sources, citizen participation, and community involvement. As a result, the Olympics was relatively unsuccessful and did not create positive lasting legacies. As one ACOG member states, “to know all you need to know about Atlanta, walk around the city today (but not after dark) and look. It is almost as if the Centennial Olympic Games were never here. The hope and promise and expectation that greeted Billy Payne in his triumphant return to Atlanta are dim memories. There are some signs to be sure—stadium, park, dormitories—all gifts of the Atlanta Committee for the Olympic Games. Some public housing projects have been torn down and rebuilt as mixed-income development. But the belief that having the Games in Atlanta would solve all our social and economic problems was naïve. It didn’t even put us up there with the great cities of the world. In fact, if the Games did anything, they exposed our weaknesses—a preoccupation with race and a lack of leadership—that we seem unable to admit to ourselves, let alone anybody else.” (Yarbrough 2000, p. 109-110)

In regards to Olympic planning practice, Atlanta can be considered as an outlier. Atlanta was the second Olympic host city after Los Angeles, which heavily relied on private funding for Olympic planning. The absence of government backing created a planning environment where increasing profit was the main target, not creating a legacy of the Olympics. Eventually, after the Atlanta Olympics, one lesson IOC learned was to require government involvement on Olympic planning. Richard Pound, Vice President of IOC at that time, delivered a speech at the Ambassador’s Lecture Series in Washington D.C. on May 16, 1994 and said, “We [IOC] will never award the Games in future to a city, in the United States or elsewhere, which has no significant public sector
commitment, either in the form of financial contribution or, at the very least, in the form of a guarantee to meet the necessary costs of organizing the Games.” (Pound, 1994)

Additionally, the Olympic bidding process in today’s world is a lot more competitive, more complex, and have stringent rules. In a sense, Atlanta Olympics was a bitter experience for IOC and one period was closed within Olympic history with the 1996 Atlanta Olympics. As one of the ACOG member stated, “now, the technical requirements for a bid are huge. It is too comprehensive. All we did was identifying locations for the venues. It would be interesting to see how much of it we changed. We were going to have 5 venues in Stone Mountains, but we ended up 2. It is a whole different time now. The contract we made was may be 10 pages, it is now about a 100 pages. When Moscow won in 1980, their contract was a one-page document.” (ACOG Member 1)

Another important lesson for IOC was to include legacy aspects to the Olympic bidding process. Atlanta staged the Olympics mostly with temporary infrastructural improvements and not necessarily targeting for a legacy after the Games. Atlanta used its key strengths, such as convention sport facilities and transit system to be awarded to host the Olympics, in contrast to other host cities which used Olympics to improve their urban infrastructure and create a legacy. In one sense, Atlanta was ready to manage Olympic-sized events, but the privately-led approach and profit-maximization idea limited the city’s capacity to prepare for the Games with a comprehensive planning approach and handle the Games without major problems.

The mega-event literature suggests that mega-events have the potential to be the catalyst for host cities to apply their planning strategies in a more focused environment, and they can result in remarkable changes in infrastructure, urban form, and city image. Nevertheless, the economic value of the Olympics is not as important as it was before. The Olympics became more complex
to plan and stage and it is unlikely for another city to be able to organize an Olympic Games without any government support. Even in Atlanta case, where no governmental support was “expected” by ACOG, the Games cost millions of dollars to governments and tax payers. Moreover, it is also hard to convince the residents that Olympics have huge promises to transform the host city. Atlanta’s Olympic experience showed that expecting urban transformation as a result of the Games is not realistic without comprehensive planning effort as well as intention to create legacies. This means, the results of the Olympics depend on the strategies that are implemented and the planning efforts to achieve these strategies. The Olympic experience of Atlanta shows that the Games may have limited long-term impacts, if it was not intended to make significant changes.

Overall Atlanta Olympic experience suggests that the local policy settings matters the most for Summer Olympics planning. That is why we see different planning approaches and distinct legacies in different host cities. Even though the IOC has fixed strategies to handle the huge Olympic planning effort, the local settings of each host city results in different outcomes. As one of the interviewees stated, “in the south, the private sector drives the policy and they bring it to the government. That is also what happened in Olympics. Without a really strong public sector to drive policy, especially legacy type things, larger impacts … I think the impact had to be different here than it is another area.” (Planning Agency Staff 2) In Atlanta, many of the infrastructures were already in place and the Olympics was a catalyst to speed up the process for some necessary improvements that needed to be made regardless of the Olympics. Olympics dramatically increased the image of Atlanta, which was the main goal for the business elites. Summer Olympics were one of those rare events that would put a city on the map quickly and the downtown Atlanta business elites wisely used this opportunity to create an international city image.
6.2 The Atlanta Regime after the Olympics

Mega-events, especially the Olympic Games, are venues for “political games” that involves several actors. In the case of Atlanta, the business elites were the major player to lead and plan the Olympic activities from the beginning until the end. External players such as IOC and Federal government had very limited role and power to lead Olympic development plans. Even the state and local government had very little impact on Olympic planning process. As Hall (1989) argues, “Hallmark events are not the result of a rational decision-making process. Decisions affecting the hosting and the nature of hallmark events grow out of a political process. The process involves the values of actors (individuals, interest groups, and organizations) in a struggle for power.” (p. 219).

Downtown Atlanta business elites created a different form of “governing coalition” for the Olympic Games and implemented their vision for downtown Atlanta. The downtown Atlanta business elites had focused on improving the image of the city since 1950s. Stone’s (1989) examination of the biracial governing coalition of Atlanta over four decades shows how the elites manipulated the policy agenda for downtown development, which was the main strategy of elites to transform the city into a global business center. The airport, MARTA system, freeways that “lead to downtown,” sport facilities, and hotels all together created an attractive touristic and convention center. Business elites has actively engaged in policy-making process to manipulate the policy agenda in favor of their interests.

The Olympic bid created a golden opportunity for the downtown business elites to revitalize and attract attention again to the downtown area. The Olympic bid was a logical result of the existing regime in Atlanta, and hosting the Games helped to turn the weaknesses of local government into an advantage for downtown businesses. The Olympics permitted Atlanta to make some improvements that are long-needed. Local political dynamics and power structure created a
distinctive policy agenda that is long-lived. As a result, the local elites had the power to implement changes and set the vision for the city of Atlanta. Downtown business elite’s role was key to bring any item into policy agenda. “Nothing in the governance of Atlanta moved if it did not originate within, or gain the approval of, a business-dominated elite” (Harding, 1995, p. 39) and it was a similar situation in regards to Olympic planning.

Additionally, the elites seized the opportunity presented by a potential Olympic hosting in Atlanta to make promises and implement a vision that promotes the downtown area. The elites used the hosting of the Olympics as the means of gaining control over policy-making processes to implement their vision. The main objective of an Olympic bid for Atlanta business elites was to create a commercial legacy by creating an international city image and attracting private investment through encouraging companies to locate their regional and national headquarters and offices in Atlanta. The awarding of the 1996 Olympics to Atlanta generated more attention and interest to the downtown area that the city and the business elites have sought for decades.

The Olympics were a significant attempt for downtown business elites to keep the downtown area vibrant, attractive, and lively. Olympics enabled elites of Atlanta to implement the vision they had been unable before. The vision predated the Olympics, but elites were not able to implement the vision until the Olympics altered the local context. The Olympic Games was a logical next step for Atlanta to grow and put the city in the world map and the city generated civic pride. Olympics also provided an opportunity to generate world recognition and contributed to transforming the image of Atlanta.

With the Olympics, the original business redevelopment agenda largely accomplished for downtown business elites. As a result of the Olympic hosting in 1996, Atlanta finally received the “international city” title. Business leaders structured their strategies on consumption-oriented
economic development, and promoted Atlanta as a place of consumption, not a place for production, by focusing on city image and place marketing strategies (Burbank et al., 2001). In Keating’s words, “ACOG was a new formal version of the old downtown business elite. Like downtown business interests, it had so much power and influence that it actually functioned to a great extent as an unelected government. Also it continued the downtown redevelopment that downtown business leaders had pursued for several decades” (p. 147).

However, the impact of the Olympics was not long lasting; if there was any planning for the Olympics in Atlanta, it was very short-term oriented and temporary and this ad hoc coalition was gone when the Olympic Games are over. In this sense, Atlanta’s Olympic experience can be identified as an American way of making a justifiable government decision (Dixon, 1995). Since the problems caused by the Olympics are temporary, it becomes easier to agree on a “potentially controversial strategy” for each agency or authority; but once the games are over, disagreements can easily rise again (Giuliana et. al, 1987). Many of the changes in the way of thinking and operating did not retain after the Games. As a reflection of the existing regime in Atlanta, the lack of public involvement and public funding also meant that implementing comprehensive, long-term oriented, and integrated planning was limited in Atlanta Olympic planning process.

Since the 1996 Olympic Games, downtown Atlanta has changed economically, socially, physically, culturally, and politically. Atlanta community became more complex and more diverse since the Olympics. This change affected the influence of the governing coalition on local context. As a result, the old governing coalition lost its interest on downtown Atlanta, and became interested in growing suburbs, where 80 per cent of the regional population lives. The City of Atlanta was home to 22.4 percent of the region’s population in 1980, but only 13.3 percent in 1999 (Brooking Institute, 2000). With regional growth, the north part of Atlanta, especially Buckhead,
became the new place for business elites to create a new governing coalition and “the city has simply become less critical to the business sector that it was in the mid-twentieth century. Though the business sector continues to have a stake in the future of the city, business increasingly directs its attention to regional issues.” (Stone, 2001, p. 27)

As downtown continued to relatively decline as a business center, its importance for the business elites also declined. Some dominant companies that had been influential in downtown redevelopment in 1960s are either gone or lost their interest in downtown Atlanta. As their geographic interest expands, some of the local institutions -such as Coca-Cola and Delta Airlines- gave more attention to regional issues and becomes less interested “in the fate of the region’s downtown,” politically and economically (Strom 2008, p. 65). Downtown Atlanta was no longer the region’s political or economic power center and the “motivation for business to be involved in the central city has been diminished by the enlarged stage on which economic activity now occurs.” (Stone and Pierannunzi, 2000, p. 3) Today, CAP’s and other downtown boards are dominated by real estate industry, non-profit, and public sector representatives, which shows “the changing value and function of the downtown as productive economic space.” (Strom 2008, p. 78)

The regime lost its interest to implement policy changes in downtown Atlanta as a result of changes over time with new actors emerging in city politics. With the changing demographics, immigrants, multiethnic groups, and labor movements are now part of the regime analysis. Although the “formulation within urban regime theory is that the policy or problem-solving capacity of a governing arrangement depends on the composition of the governing coalition and the relations among the members of this coalition, including the resources they bring to the task of governance” (Stone and Pierannunzi, 2000, p. 18), Atlanta’s long run regime experience taught that the presence of the regime itself does not necessarily increases the governing capacity. In Stone’s words, “The
presence of a regime effective in pursuing some policy aims is no assurance that it can accomplish others.” (Stone, 2008b, p. 268)

Stone and Pierannunzi (2000) examine the governing arrangement in Atlanta through the 1990s and conclude that the external factors change the structure of regimes over time by motivating new members to contribute to the governing coalition. The contribution and response of existing and new coalition members to the changing conditions depend on the regime’s agenda, and how this agenda is set. Leadership and vision also plays a key role in regime politics. The regime’s capacity to solve the problems is bounded by the agenda. For the regime’s continuity, the agenda “needs to be broad enough to bring together a substantial coalition, to be concrete enough to guide specific actions, and to be flexible enough to accommodate a range of particular issues as they arise.” (Stone and Pierannunzi, 2000, p. 2)

The governing coalition also changed as the community changes. “Neither the composition of a governing coalition nor the relationship among its members is static” (Stone, 2008b, p. 189) and “the evolved configuration of relationships” between regime actors “is greater than the parts.” (Stone 2008c, p. 269) Downtown business elites of Atlanta tried to maximize their benefit within the limits of the governing coalition’s conditions and other forces, which changed over time. Thus, the elites did their best to manipulate these forces on their advantage. The experience of Atlanta shows that the regime is not stable (Stone, 2008b) and does not emerge in a vacuum (Stone and Pierannunzi, 2000).

The regime after the Olympics is a reflection of Atlanta’s past (Stone and Pierannunzi, 2000). “The Atlanta configuration—that is, the regime—is not a static phenomenon. And it has evolved in such a way as to make it difficult for the city to address in a sustained way the concerns and challenges faced by Atlanta’s lower-income population.” (Stone 2008c, p. 269) In this sense, Atlanta’s
“regressive” policy agenda “favors the interests of upper-strata groups and disregards or harms the interests of lower strata groups” (Stone, 1989, p.166). Although Atlanta is famous for its global commerce status, the city also struggles with some serious challenges such as class issues, racial division, crime, and homelessness. The Brooking institute report, published in 2000, explored the growth pattern of Atlanta metropolitan region over the last three decades and concluded that “Atlanta residents tend to be extremely rich or extremely poor - not many of them are middle class” (p. 20). Today, the focus and strategy of business elites is completely different than it was in 60s or 70s. “Instead of fostering development that enhances the lives of the people who live in Atlanta, public policy focuses on serving non-Atlantans: conventioneers, tourists, national and international sports fans, and new middle- and upper-class residents.” (Keating, 2001, p.2)

6.3 Key Lessons from This Section

This chapter showed that from the business elites’ perspective, the Olympics partially delivered the expected benefits, such as revitalizing specific downtown area, increasing the global recognition of Atlanta, and attracting more businesses and residents to downtown Atlanta. These effects were positive for a short-time period right after the Olympics, but these benefits were not long-lasting and did not help to facilitate the primacy of downtown Atlanta for the long-term because of other internal and external factors.

First of all, the Olympics created some positive tangible legacies, most notably the Centennial Olympic Park; the new Olympic Stadium; new concourse and a central atrium for the Hartsfield-Jackson Atlanta International Airport; and new facilities for Colleges and Universities in or near downtown Atlanta. In addition to these tangible benefits, the Olympic Games was also a catalyst
for some other physical improvements, such as the $16 million ITS system; $100 million Empowerment Zone designation to enhance housing, childcare, and job training in a nine square mile area in downtown Atlanta; and the $14 million federal grant for MARTA to purchase natural gas buses which will be showcased during the summer of 1996. The Olympic Games also contributed to the growth of convention business. Additionally, Atlanta hosted more major sports events after the Olympics. Lastly, the new housing units in downtown Atlanta stand as one of the tangible legacies of the Olympics.

In terms of intangible legacies, one of the goals of the Atlanta Olympic organizers was to create a world city image. This goal was achieved with the Olympic hosting and Atlanta was finally on the map as an international city. The Games also served as an excuse to guarantee to complete the infrastructure on time. The tight deadlines of the Games forced the agencies to cooperate and do much work in a short time and the Olympics helped to make the process faster. Additionally, as another intangible legacy, the Olympic transportation planning experience changed the perception on transit and proved the capacity of MARTA system, the airport, and the convenient location of Atlanta.

In regards to negative legacies, the Games had negative social impacts on low-income residents, intensified social problems and deepen existing divides among residents. The Olympic Games did not increase the quality of life for the residents of Atlanta, especially the poor. Atlanta focused more on “Olympics-as-sport” side and the needs of communities are disregarded. Atlanta’s Olympic primary effort aimed to meet the IOC requirements in a most efficient way from Games organization to architecture with limited infrastructure investment. Atlanta staged the Olympic mostly with temporary infrastructural improvements and not necessarily targeting for a legacy after the Games. Atlanta used its key strengths, such as convention sport facilities and transit
system to be awarded to host the Olympics, in contrast to other host cities which used Olympics to improve their urban infrastructure and create a legacy. In one sense, Atlanta was ready to manage Olympic-sized events, but the privately-led approach and profit-maximization idea limited the city’s capacity to prepare for the Games with a comprehensive planning approach and handle the Games without major problems.

With respect to Atlanta’s governing regime after the Olympics, the evidences provided in chapter six suggest that the regime in Atlanta changed as the community changes. The business elites accomplished their redevelopment goals with the Olympics. The Olympics were a significant attempt for downtown business elites to keep the downtown area vibrant, attractive, and lively. As a result of the Olympic hosting in 1996, Atlanta finally received the “international city” title and the original business development agenda largely accomplished for downtown business elites. As a reflection of the existing regime in Atlanta, the lack of public involvement and public funding also meant that implementing comprehensive, long-term oriented, and integrated planning was limited in Atlanta Olympic planning process.

Since the 1996 Olympic Games, downtown Atlanta has changed economically, socially, physically, culturally, and politically. The regime lost its interest to implement policy changes in downtown Atlanta as a result of changes over time with new actors gaining more power in city politics. With the changing demographics, immigrants, multiethnic groups, and labor movements are now part of the regime analysis. Today, the focus and strategy of business elites is completely different than it was in 60s or 70s. The business elites are mostly regional- and international-oriented and the civic issues are not in business elites’ agenda. As the population, jobs, and growth shifted to the north side of the region, the business elites also focused their orientation to the north side.
CHAPTER 7

CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

7.1 Key Findings from the Research

First of all, this study questioned who the downtown Atlanta business elites are and how they influence, manipulate, and shape the policy decision. By examining the early period of Atlanta’s regime, the study demonstrated clearly that Atlanta has a strong governing coalition consisted of white downtown business leaders, elected officials, and African American political leadership. Additionally, the role and power of the elites on downtown redevelopment policies are investigated. The first phase of the study which covered the time period from 1950s to 1980s provided an informative account of how Atlanta’s regime works. The main proposition was that downtown Atlanta business elites manipulated and shaped the planning decisions to increase their business interests from the 1950s to the 1980s, and the elites had power to implement their vision and the regime was in good shape. This investigation provided evidence that the regime actors had the power to further their objectives and they have been a major influence on downtown redevelopment policies. The informal agreement between the governing coalition members resulted in implementing their redevelopment agenda for downtown Atlanta by using every policy tool, including transportation plans, urban renewal, and other federal laws to increase the primacy of downtown Atlanta.

Next, the reasons for business elites’ changing attitudes are examined in the face of suburbanization and decentralization. The findings indicate that the changes in electoral power of blacks resulted in election of mayors who are not part of or supportive to the governing elites. As a result of this shift, both the mayors and the business elites adjusted their positions and strategies.
in regards to downtown redevelopment. White flight, crime and other issues in downtown, emergence of suburbs as attractive business destinations altered business elites’ strategy to keep the primacy of downtown Atlanta. As discussed in chapter five, the new strategy to facilitate downtown Atlanta was to focus on the key strengths of downtown, such as convention and tourism businesses. As a result, Atlanta business leaders turned to market based solutions in order to generate profit and increase the reputation of the city in an era where the manufacturing is declining and the competition with the surrounding suburbs for office space tenants and residents has intensified. The focus has also shifted to attract more international tourists. The future of downtown Atlanta is imagined as a place for consumption, not for production. Major development projects targeted at planning for visitors, not necessarily for the residents. As an outcome of these efforts, Atlanta was able to host some of the major events, including the 1988 Democratic National Convention, Two NFL Super Bowls (1994 and 2002), and finally the 1996 Summer Olympic Games.

Furthermore, the logic behind the Olympic bid was analyzed from the business elites’ point of view. Starting from 1980s, the local, national and international dynamics limited the power of elites in downtown policy-making process, and the business elites had difficulties to influencing the planning decisions of elected officials. In this sense, the study argued that the Olympic idea provided a means to facilitate the primacy of downtown Atlanta and justify the physical redevelopment of downtown Atlanta. The evidences discussed in chapter five prove that the Olympic bidding idea was part of the long-term business elite strategy to create an international city image and attract more businesses, residents, and tourists to downtown Atlanta.

Moreover, whether the Olympics provided a means to facilitate the primacy of downtown Atlanta is examined. In the short-term, the Olympics met the expectations of business elites. Enhancing
the image of Atlanta, attracting headquarters from other cities and overseas to Atlanta, and strengthening the convention and tourism have been major objectives to such organizations as downtown business association Central Atlanta Progress and Atlanta Chamber of Commerce. With the Olympics, Atlanta was finally on the map, businesses started to choose Atlanta as their headquarters, and the city strengthened its convention business sector. According to a study conducted by Atlanta Chamber of Commerce, the Olympics had a positive impact on business decision makers to prefer Atlanta for locating new businesses. Business leaders’ familiarity of Atlanta was 51% in 1993 and increased to 76% in 1997.

The sole purpose of the Atlanta’s Olympic bid was to increase the city image and attract businesses. Even though it was expected that the city and its residents would benefit from the Olympics, it was not part of the business elites’ agenda. Atlanta Olympics served only narrow purposes and the local politics and power structure determined the outcome of the Atlanta Olympics. Despite neighborhood resistance and opposition, business elites’ redevelopment projects were implemented including the Centennial Olympic Park and the new Stadium, which proves the power of business elites in manipulating and shaping policy agendas. Olympics served as a catalyst for economic revitalization around the Centennial Olympic Park. New housing units, new hotels, and new retail spaces are added to the area after the Olympics. Overall, 1996 Olympics renewed the interest in the future of downtown Atlanta: the city and the business elites benefited from Olympic legacies, however the Olympics failed to address socio-economic problems and the benefit to the overall community was limited. Atlanta focused more on “Olympics-as-sport” side and the needs of communities are disregarded. Atlanta’s Olympic primary effort aimed to meet the IOC requirements in a most efficient way from Games organization to architecture with limited
infrastructure investment. Olympic Games marked the last phase of civic and downtown orientation of business elites.

Lastly, this study investigated the Olympic legacy and the regime change in the post-Olympics period. The study showed that from the business elites’ perspective, the Olympics partially delivered the expected benefits, such as revitalizing specific downtown areas, increasing the global recognition of Atlanta, and attracting more businesses and residents to downtown Atlanta. These effects were positive for a short-time period right after the Olympics, but these benefits were not long-lasting and did not help to facilitate the primacy of downtown Atlanta for the long-term because of other internal and external factors. As discussed in chapter six, after the Olympics, the business elites’ focus shifted towards regional issues and downtown Atlanta lost its priority to be an attractive location for business interest over growing surrounding suburbs. Although city employment increased in the post-Olympic period, the city share in the region declined. Atlanta has also been promoted as a site for regional offices. This goal was accomplished with the Olympics, but the changing dynamics prevented Atlanta to keep its primacy as the regional economic center. In other words, regional growth surpassed downtown growth. After the Olympics, we see that business elites became more interested in regional economic growth and they shifted their interest to growing and attractive suburbs. The findings suggest that the regime lost its interest to implement policy changes in downtown Atlanta as a result of changes over time with new actors gaining more power in city politics. With the changing demographics, immigrants, multiethnic groups, and labor movements are now part of the regime analysis.
7.2 Implications for Future Research

This study intended to contribute to the body of literature in urban politics by exploring the evolving role of downtown business elites in light of the Olympic experience of Atlanta and it represented an initial attempt to explore this phenomenon. While the results are not universally representative, they nonetheless provide insights to see the regime evolvement.

From a theoretical perspective, this study provided evidence that the regimes are changing over time and are not stable. First of all, regime theory argued that the elected officials and the business elites are the two main actors that dominate the regime, and the development policies addressed the interest of powerful elite groups. In Atlanta case, the resources the elites have, the electoral power of blacks, and the policy tools that the mayors have hold the governing coalition together for decades. However, the regimes are changing over time and regime actors are no longer limited to the elected officials and the business elites. Changing demographics brought new interest and values and new groups such as minorities, multi-ethnic groups, neighborhood organizations, professionals, and environmentalists are being more active in local politics. The findings of this study suggest that not only the resources, but preferences shape the policy decisions, especially with the changing demographics. The regime does not consist of a small group anymore, everybody in that community has more means to participate the decision-making processes.

Additionally, one major weakness of the regime analysis is considered to be its lack of consideration to the social, economic, and environmental problems. Previous research examined how Atlanta business elites transformed the city from a small town into a national city. Different than the case in 1950s or 1960s, as shown in this research, Atlanta’s regime is no longer stable and it is more than resources, policy agenda, and the governing coalition. The new groups mentioned above mobilized their actions to the emerging issues like crime, poverty, and education in order to
improve the quality of life. Even if they do not have the resources to offer, every group who has a
stake have more tools to participate in policy making processes. Elections are as important as
resources to have a voice in governing decisions. More actors have power to manipulate the
governing decisions. Regimes are more complex and reaching an agreement is harder than before.
Therefore, the governing coalition needs to adapt itself to the changing conditions by providing
solutions to these issues. Future regime investigations should include these new groups into the
analysis. The composition of the governing coalition is more diverse with different needs and
expectations. In this regards, the interest of the old governing coalition in downtown Atlanta
declined as a result of the increased complexity of the community. Downtown Atlanta is not
dominating the region in terms of political and economic power, rather the region surpasses
downtown. The regime expanded its scope to the regional growth rather than focusing mainly on
downtown. Downtown Atlanta is not the dominant center of the metro area, it is just one of the
region’s urban centers.

As a result of the increasing influence of these new groups, the regime lost its primary interest in
downtown Atlanta and shifted its focus and orientation towards regional growth. The changing
dynamics in Atlanta case suggest that new groups in the community should be part of the regime
analysis and their needs and interests should be addressed in order to secure the voting power as
well as to keep the central city vibrant and attractive for more businesses, visitors, and residents.
Thus, the governing coalition members need to focus their attention more on the influence of the
new actors in order to accomplish their goals, maintain their governing capacity, and govern
effectively.

Moreover, the governing coalition no longer focuses mainly on city politics. Promoting growth is
still the main motivation of the regime in order to attract business investment, but the scale is
broader. Atlanta experience suggests that the business elites are mostly concerned with regional economy rather than local, since the economic development strategies are no longer concentrated within the limits of downtown. The entire Atlanta region is growing faster than the city itself, and the central city is no longer the focal point of economic activities. The competition occurs at both regional and international level for business relocation, convention and tourism, sports, and other entertainment activities. One major sector for Atlanta, hospitality industry, is shifted to suburban locations as well. Suburban hotels are accommodating the majority of the conventioneers and tourists. In this sense, downtown Atlanta’s future rests on solving its problems, such as poverty, crime, education, pollution, and homelessness in order to attract more businesses and dominate the region as it did in 1950s and 1960s. However, business elites have always weak incentives to solve these problems. Accordingly Stone (2001) stated, “Post-Olympics Atlanta shows definite signs of decline, and that decline rests on a flawed capacity to construct a program of action to address the city’s deepening social problems.” (p. 33)

Regarding regime theory’s usefulness for understanding the changes in regime dynamics, the findings suggest that the regime theory has limitations to explain the changes in local policy arena. In other words, regime theory is less applicable to explain the governing relations in post-Olympic Atlanta. Business is increasingly being globalized and the local growth politics are less significant for the elites. Thus, the governing coalition’s focus is more regionally- and internationally-oriented. In a broader sense, it suggests that urban politics are more complex and diverse to be explained by a single theory. As Stone (2015) indicates, “The age of urban regimes, as once understood, has now yielded to freshly reconfigured ways of how cities are governed. If so, this is not a matter of regret but simply a new chapter in a continuing effort to understand the ever-changing intricacies of how local political orders take shape and continue to change.” (p.
Regarding Atlanta’s Olympic experience, the finding of this study is consistence with the previous literature in a sense that Atlanta Olympics created negative social impacts and did not improve the urban-living conditions for the residents. This study showed that Atlanta’s Olympic strategy have produced results different than other Olympic host cities. Thus, the Atlanta Games are considered as a bad example of mega-event planning. However, as it is discussed in this study, Atlanta Olympics had no intention to create a legacy for its residents and transform the urban-living conditions. If we consider the initial strategy of Atlanta Olympic organizers, it was clear that the governing elites used the Olympics as a unique opportunity to accomplish their goals by overcoming the limitations of local government. The regime had its agenda with a set of purposes to accomplish. In conclusion, the local politics and context matter more than the fixed Olympic strategies. In other words, Olympics is not a “one-fits-all approach” for host cities, thus the outcomes differ from city to city mainly because of the different objectives, politics, and culture of each city.

Atlanta’s Olympic experience also has some implications for planning practice. “Inside the fence” approach of Atlanta Olympic organizers showed that private planning initiatives are more likely to result in outcomes that is not necessarily consistent with the needs of the residents. Atlanta’s Olympic planning practice mostly benefited the business interests while the desires and needs of the residents mostly disregarded, mainly because of the privately-lead planning initiatives. The city transferred its decision-making power to profit-oriented private entities such as ACOG during the Olympic preparation process and as a result, the plans that are implemented mostly focused on meeting the needs of the business interests, not the residents. Public entities had limited money and/or support to implement major “outside the fence” development projects. Atlanta Olympic
planning practice showed that privatization of the Olympic planning results in limited effects in urban transformation.

Regime analyses mostly focus on economic development policies of downtown business elites and the institutional aspects of the policy development processes are mostly neglected. Although this study partially discussed the institutional aspects of Atlanta’s regime (e.g., CAP, Research Atlanta), future research should include public and private institutional features of the regime, their capacity and power to influence the policy decisions. Institutional analysis can be implemented to future Olympic research as well. Olympics require years of planning and the institutions are affected in some ways throughout the planning process. IOC requirements, fixed deadlines, other financial and political requirements force decision makers to agree on some items in order to sustain the planning process. This new policy and decision-making environment might affect the institution’s culture as well.

This study was able to provide evidence to the changing regime dynamics and the impact of Olympic hosting on Atlanta’s urban regime. However, the single-case study design limits the generalizability of this study’s findings. The government structure in Atlanta is unique in a sense and cannot easily compared with other cities. The leadership of individuals, long-term relationships between elected officials, business leaders, different ethnic and race groups create a unique policy arena in Atlanta. Future research should focus on comparative cases to see the changing regime dynamics on different government settings.

Regime theory is relatively a new theoretical framework compared to pluralist and elitist theory. It is still evolving and developing itself with revisions. As Stone (1976) stated, “revision is a constant process” in the instance of studies of local politics and public policy (p. 7). Therefore, this research offered one such revision to regime analysis and attempted to contribute to the body
of urban policy and mega-event literature by providing additional insights on Olympic strategy of
downtown Atlanta business elites.
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## ROSTER OF INTERVIEWEES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interviewe Category</th>
<th>Date of Interview</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City Official 1</td>
<td>April 17, 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Official 2</td>
<td>April 16, 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Agency Staff 1</td>
<td>February 4, 2014 and April 18, 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Agency Staff 2</td>
<td>April 15, 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Agency Staff 3</td>
<td>April 14, 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Agency Staff 4</td>
<td>February 7, 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Sector Representative 1</td>
<td>April 17, 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Sector Representative 2</td>
<td>May 29, 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Sector Representative 3</td>
<td>February 11, 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACOG Member 1</td>
<td>April 17, 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACOG Member 2</td>
<td>May 27, 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Representative 1</td>
<td>May 28, 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Representative 2</td>
<td>June 4, 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Representative 3</td>
<td>April 18, 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic 1</td>
<td>January 22, 2014 and April 10, 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic 2</td>
<td>January 21, 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic 3</td>
<td>February 5, 2014 and April 17, 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic 4</td>
<td>May 27, 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic 5</td>
<td>January 24, 2104</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX B

FSU's IRB APPROVAL and RE-APPROVAL MEMORANDUMS

Office of the Vice President for Research
Human Subjects Committee
Tallahassee, Florida 32306-2742
(850) 644-8673 · FAX (850) 644-4392

APPROVAL MEMORANDUM

Date: 09/19/2013
To: Tuna Batuhan [redacted]
Address: Department of Urban and Regional Planning, Florida State University Tallahassee, Florida 32306-2280
Dept.: URBAN AND REGIONAL PLANNING
From: Thomas L. Jacobson, Chair
Re: Use of Human Subjects in Research
    Analysing the impact of Summer Olympic Games on transportation planning institutions and their cultures: a case study of Atlanta

The application that you submitted to this office in regard to the use of human subjects in the proposal referenced above have been reviewed by the Secretary, the Chair, and two members of the Human Subjects Committee. Your project is determined to be Expedited per 45 CFR § 46.110(f)(7) and has been approved by an expedited review process.

The Human Subjects Committee has not evaluated your proposal for scientific merit, except to weigh the risk to the human participants and the aspects of the proposal related to potential risk and benefit. This approval does not replace any departmental or other approvals, which may be required.

If you submitted a proposed consent form with your application, the approved stamped consent form is attached to this approval notice. Only the stamped version of the consent form may be used in recruiting research subjects.

If the project has not been completed by 09/18/2014 you must request a renewal of approval for continuation of the project. As a courtesy, a renewal notice will be sent to you prior to your expiration date; however, it is your responsibility as the Principal Investigator to timely request renewal of your approval from the Committee.

You are advised that any change in protocol for this project must be reviewed and approved by the Committee prior to implementation of the proposed change in the protocol. A protocol change/amendment form is required to be submitted for approval by the Committee. In addition, federal regulations require that the Principal Investigator promptly report, in writing any unanticipated problems or adverse events involving risks to research subjects or others.

By copy of this memorandum, the chairman of your department and/or your major professor is reminded that he/she is responsible for being informed concerning research projects involving human subjects in the department, and should review protocols as often as needed to insure that the project is being conducted in compliance with our institution and with DHHS regulations.

This institution has an Assurance on file with the Office for Human Research Protection. The Assurance Number is IRB00006446.

Cc: Jeffrey Brown <jrbrown3@fsu.edu>, Advisor
HSC No. 2013.11210
RE-APPROVAL MEMORANDUM

Date: 07/03/2015

To: Tuna Bathan [REDACTED]

Address: Department of Urban and Regional Planning, Florida State University Tallahassee, Florida 32306-2280

Dept.: URBAN AND REGIONAL PLANNING

From: Thomas L. Jacobson, Chair

Re: Re-approval of Use of Human subjects in Research:
   Analyzing the impact of Summer Olympic Games on transportation planning institutions and their cultures: a case study of Atlanta

Your request to continue the research project listed above involving human subjects has been approved by the Human Subjects Committee. If your project has not been completed by 09/01/2015, you are must request renewed approval by the Committee.

If you submitted a proposed consent form with your renewal request, the approved stamped consent form is attached to this re-approval notice. Only the stamped version of the consent form may be used in recruiting of research subjects. You are reminded that any change in protocol for this project must be reviewed and approved by the Committee prior to implementation of the proposed change in the protocol. A protocol change/amendment form is required to be submitted for approval by the Committee. In addition, federal regulations require that the Principal Investigator promptly report in writing, any unanticipated problems or adverse events involving risks to research subjects or others.

By copy of this memorandum, the Chairman of your department and/or your major professor are reminded of their responsibility for being informed concerning research projects involving human subjects in their department. They are advised to review the protocols as often as necessary to insure that the project is being conducted in compliance with our institution and with DHHS regulations.

Cc: HSC No. 2014.13475
APPENDIX C

CONSENT FORM FOR THE INTERVIEWS

Agreement to Participate in Research

Responsible Investigator(s): Tuna Bahnhan

Title: Analyzing the impact of Summer Olympic Games on transportation planning institutions and their cultures: a case study of Atlanta

1. You have been asked to participate in a research study investigating the impact of Summer Olympic Games on transportation planning institutions and their cultures.

2. You will be asked to answer questions about the overall MPO planning process, start of the Olympic bidding process, motivation for an Olympic bid, your usage and expectations of the Olympics, your view of the consequences of Olympic hosting/bidding process, the easy/difficult tasks and challenges during those processes, and the degree of your institution’s involvement on Olympic planning during a one-time, one-hour interview conducted during 8 months period with the responsible investigator.

3. No foreseeable risks are expected to arise from your participation in the study. Benefits will be contribution to understanding ways to make transit institutions more efficient and more effective. You will be contributing to knowledge, as this is academic research on Summer Olympics not on individuals. There are no risks to you given that your identity will remain confidential to the extent allowed by law.

4. We will provide you with a copy of the final research report. The research will provide insights for regional transit institutions, cities, and state transportation departments, which are interested in ways to improve their institutional capacity. Policymakers, transit institutions and their managers may gain some insights into alternative institutional cultural changes. This information will be presented in the form of a guidebook.

5. Although the results of this study may be published, no direct quotations will be included without your express, written permission. You will be identified merely to your general role, but not to you individually.

6. There is no compensation for participation in the study.

7. Questions about this research may be addressed to Tuna Bahnhan, Contact: [Redacted]. Complaints about the research may be presented to Jeffrey Brown, Faculty Advisor, (850) 644-8519; Timothy Gruen, Department Chair, Department of Urban and Regional Planning, (850) 644-8515; and to Julie Halsewanger, Florida State University Office of Research, (850) 644-7900.

8. No service of any kind, to which you are otherwise entitled, will be lost or jeopardized if you choose to “not participate” in the study.

9. Your consent is being given voluntarily. You may refuse to participate in the entire study or in any part of the study. During the interviews, you have the right to not answer questions you do not wish to answer. If you decide to participate in this study, you are free to withdraw at any time without any negative effect on your relations with the Florida State University or with any other participating institution or agency.

10. At the time that you sign this consent form, you will receive a copy of it for your records, signed and dated by the investigator.

The signature of a subject on this document indicates agreement to participate in the study.

The signature of a researcher on this document indicates agreement to include the above-named subject in the research and attestation that the subject has been fully informed of his or her rights.

Signature __________________________ Date ____________

Investigator’s Signature __________________________ Date ____________

FSU Human Subjects Committee approved on 9/19/2013. Void after 9/18/2014. HSC # 2013 11210
APPENDIX D

GENERIC INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

- What is the vision of Atlanta (particular moments and time and how did it evolve?)
- Who (actors/organizations) articulate this vision? (Also who has tried to do so unsuccessfully and why so?)
- How has this vision been implemented (to what degree)?
- From your point of view, what was the main motivation of Atlanta for an Olympic bid? Did the outcome match with the expectations?
- How do you describe the policy environment before the Olympic bidding? Who are the key/powerful players (individuals and organizations)?
- What are the fundamental changes in policy/vision that occurred within the time period starting with the declaration of bidding and ending when the Games are over?
- How do you describe the policy environment after staging the Games to the present? Who are the key/powerful players (individuals and organizations)? Do you see any long-term changes on policies after the Olympics?
- Did the Olympics provide an opportunity to bring forward long-term plans that would otherwise remain in the ‘pending file’ for implementation later? If so, can you give some examples?
- What are the lessons learned from Atlanta’s Olympic experience? What should have been done differently, if any?
APPENDIX E

KEY MOMENTS IN THE HISTORY OF ATLANTA

(Sources: Compiled by author from variety sources, principally ARC, 1997; MARTA, 1997; Atlanta Convention and Visitors Bureau Website; and ARC, 2007)

1837: The area now comprising the city was chosen as the site for a new railroad terminus connecting Georgia with Chattanooga, TN and points west, including the Chattahoochee and Tennessee Rivers. The city was dubbed “Terminus,” and the termination point is now Five Points in downtown Atlanta.

1843: “Terminus” was renamed “Marthasville” in honor of Martha Lumpkin, daughter of Georgia Gov. Wilson Lumpkin. The town spread out around the train depot.

1845: “Marthasville” was renamed “Atlanta,” a feminine form of Atlantic, probably created by Steven Harriman Long, a Western & Atlantic Railroad engineer.

1847: Atlanta was incorporated as a city.

1857: Atlanta was first dubbed the “Gate City of the South” for its increasing importance as a railroad center.

1868: Atlanta replaced Milledgeville as Georgia’s capital. The Atlanta Constitution was founded.

1871: The Atlanta Chamber of Commerce was organized.

1883: The Atlanta Journal was founded.

1886: Atlanta was chosen as the site of Georgia Institute of Technology.
1891: Entrepreneur Asa Candler paid $2,300 to own Coca-Cola. The next year he founded The Coca-Cola Company.

1895: The Cotton States and International Exposition was held in Piedmont Park, focusing national and international attention on Atlanta.

1897: Built as the English-American Building, the Flatiron Building, Atlanta’s first skyscraper, was completed.

1913: Atlanta Convention and Visitors Bureau was founded.

1919: Ernest Woodruff and the Trust Company of Georgia headed a syndicate that bought The Coca-Cola Company for $25 million from the Candler family.

1925: The first Forward Atlanta Commission, chaired by Ivan Allen, Sr., was established to promote the city’s advantages in location, climate, labor supply, and natural resources. Between 1926 and 1928 the campaign brought more than 700 new businesses to Atlanta.

1926: William B. Hartsfield selected the site of Candler Field, south of the city, for the Atlanta airport.

1929: The city purchased Candler Field (now the site of Hartsfield-Jackson Atlanta International Airport).

1935: Techwood Homes, dedicated by President Franklin D. Roosevelt, became the nation’s first federal public housing project.

1941: Delta Air Lines moved its headquarters to Atlanta from Monroe, La.
1947: The nation's first publicly supported, multi-county planning agency in the U.S. was created as the Metropolitan Planning Commission (MPC) for the City of Atlanta, Fulton County and DeKalb County.

1952: MPC created “Up Ahead,” the region's first comprehensive development plan.

1954: Now ... For Tomorrow, a revised regional plan, recommends more expansive growth, study that would result in DeKalb General and South Fulton Hospitals and improvements to the bus transit system including express buses on new expressways when completed.

1959: Region reaches the 1 million population mark.

Atlanta Mayor William B. Hartsfield described Atlanta as the “city too busy to hate,” which emphasizes the racial harmony and growing economy of the region.

1960: Clayton, Cobb, and Gwinnett counties were added to the MPC, which was renamed the Atlanta Region Metropolitan Planning Commission (ARMPC). ARMPC was charged with creating a master plan for the orderly growth and development of the district as a whole.

1963: Atlanta Mayor Ivan Allen, Jr. was the only Southern mayor to testify before Congress in support of the pending Civil Rights Bill.

1964: Martin Luther King, Jr. won the Nobel Peace Prize.

1965: The $18 million Atlanta-Fulton County Stadium was built in 364 days despite the fact that it had not signed any teams to play there. Next year, the Braves moved to Atlanta from Milwaukee, and the Atlanta Falcons became a new National Football League expansion team.

1966: Metropolitan Atlanta Rapid Transit Authority (MARTA) becomes an operating agency.
1968: ARMPC adopts an updated regional development plan that for the first time includes plans for major activity centers like Buckhead and Perimeter Center.

1969: The opening of Underground Atlanta put downtown Atlanta on the entertainment and social map.

1970: Metropolitan Atlanta Rapid Transit Authority (MARTA) purchased the Atlanta Transit System and began extending its routes, replacing its old buses and engineering a rapid rail system.

1971: Act 5 is passed by the Georgia General Assembly combining several agencies into a new planning authority to become Atlanta Regional Commission (ARC).

The MARTA referendum passes in Fulton and DeKalb counties, leading the way for a mass transit rail and bus system.

1972: MARTA purchased the Atlanta Transit System for $12.8 million.

Local 1% Rapid Transit Tax became effective

ARC is officially created, with Dan Sweat as the first executive director.

1973: Maynard Jackson was elected Atlanta’s first black mayor.

1975: ARC's adopts its first Regional Development Plan.

1976: The State of Georgia opened the Georgia World Congress Center – the second-largest convention center in the United States.

MARTA construction began in the downtown area for the rapid rail system

1979: First MARTA rail line opened.
1980: Hartsfield Atlanta International Airport’s new terminal opened.

Cable News Network (CNN) went on the air.


1989: Following a $142 million renovation, Underground Atlanta reopened in downtown Atlanta.


The International Olympic Committee (IOC) named Atlanta as host city for the 1996 Centennial Olympic Games.

1992: The Georgia Dome, the largest cable-supported stadium in the world, opened.

1995: Olympic venue construction is finalized.


1999: Philips Arena was built.

2000: Atlanta hosted Super Bowl XXXIV.

2002: Atlanta hosted NCAA Men’s Final Four basketball championships.

2003: Atlanta hosted NCAA Women’s Final Four basketball championships.

The new Georgia International Convention Center (GICC) opened.

2005: The Georgia Aquarium opened.

2006: Atlanta History Center opens Centennial Olympic Games Museum.
2007: Relocated and expanded World of Coca-Cola opens, adjacent to Centennial Olympic Park and the Georgia Aquarium.

Atlanta hosted NCAA Men’s Final Four basketball championships.

2008: Atlanta hosted NHL All-Star Game.
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