



(ISSN: 2587-0238)

Seydioglu, C. & Yagci, İ. (2023). 2036 Summer Olympics Candidate Istanbul: Istanbul's Olympic History Istanbul And Sports Policies, *International Journal of Education Technology and Scientific Researches*, 8(24), 2899-2913.

DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.35826/ijetsar.691>

Article Type (Makale Türü): Review Article

## 2036 SUMMER OLYMPICS CANDIDATE ISTANBUL: ISTANBUL'S OLYMPIC HISTORY ISTANBUL AND SPORTS POLICIES

**Cüneyt SEYDİOĞLU**

Asst. Prof. Dr., Istanbul Topkapi University, Istanbul, Turkey, [cuneytseydioglu@topkapi.edu.tr](mailto:cuneytseydioglu@topkapi.edu.tr)  
ORCID: 0000-0002-4595-0574

**Ihsan YAGCI**

Dr., Ministry of National Education, Afyon High School, Afyon, Turkey, [ihsanyagci@hotmail.com](mailto:ihsanyagci@hotmail.com)  
ORCID: 0000-0002-3607-8585

Received: 18.02.2023

Accepted: 04.09.2023

Published: 01.10.2023

### ABSTRACT

In this article, the past and present candidacies, sports policies, pros and cons of the city of Istanbul, which has announced that it will be a candidate for the 2036 Summer Olympics, are evaluated. The Olympic Games organize educational programs to spread the Olympic movement for the local people of the host city and especially for the youth, thus creating sports awareness and informing the public and encouraging them to participate in sports. In recent years, Turkey's major sports organizations have enabled the workforce to gain experience, create new employment opportunities, change the perception towards sports, and enable Turkish athletes to achieve significant successes competing in front of their own audiences. In addition to all these benefits, national federations were able to establish close relations with international federations. In this way, the country's sporting potential was showcased and increased. During Istanbul's unsuccessful bid for the 5 Olympic Games, there was significant evidence that relationships with international federations were useful for creating opportunities to host individual sporting events. Our study examines Istanbul's Olympic Games candidacy journey from 2000 to 2020. It shows that the Olympics offer opportunities to host cities, but also pose threats to host cities if the post-event process is not designed. In addition, it is anticipated that this research will have a positive contribution to Istanbul's candidacy process for the 2036 Summer Olympics and to Turkish sports organizations planning to be candidates for large-scale sporting events.

**Keywords:** Istanbul, Olympics, City.

## INTRODUCTION

The ancient Olympic Games have been held for more than 1200 years in ancient Olympia, southwest of the Peloponnes peninsula in Greece, on a flat site where a temple of Zeus was built and surrounded by sacred walls that the Greeks considered sacred (Miller, 2004). It would be wrong to say that they began in 776 BC, because archaeological excavations show that these games took place much earlier. But if this date is taken as a basis, it is because they were first mentioned in writing in 776 BC. The first Olympic Games in history started with a small number of games in a small area, but in the following periods they were moved to much larger areas and new sports were included in the programme (Holt, 2004).

By organizing sports festivals in Olympia in honor of Zeus, the supreme god of Greek Mythology, it was aimed to show devotion and faith in Zeus and to ensure regional peace with this religious unity. Apart from the religious purpose of the Olympics, the political purpose of the Olympics emerged in the 8th century BC, when Iphitos, King of Elis, who wanted to prevent the 20 Greek site states, each belonging to different races and having separate administrations, from fighting each other, asked for the reorganization of the "games of religious origin that the gods loved so much". A truce was declared during this period. The text of the agreement was written on a disk: "Olympia is a sacred area. Anyone who attempts to enter here armed will be branded with the greatest of sins against the gods. And he who does not avenge such a wicked act, even if he is able to do so, will be considered godless" (Alpman, 2001).

Starting in 776, these games included running races, followed by wrestling and pentathlon in 708, boxing in 688, and four-horse wheeled competitions in 680 (Messinesi, 1973).

In 146 BC, Greece was occupied by the Romans, but the games continued to be held in Athens. In 392 A.D., the Byzantine Emperor Theodosius II demolished the sites where these games were organized and put an end to this tradition. Due to the earthquakes and floods that occurred in 522 and 551 A.D., most of the traces of the old Olympic Games have been erased as the areas where the festivities were organized were badly damaged (Tekin & Tekin, 2014).

The first modern Olympics was organized in Athens in 1896, under the leadership of Baron Pierre de Coubertin, who is today known as the founder of the modern Olympics. In 1892, Baron Pierre de Coubartin, speaking at the founding year meeting of the USFSA (Union of Athletic Sports Clubs), spoke for the first time about the resumption of the Olympic Games. In 1894, at the congress attended by 2000 people from 12 countries, the decision to restart the Olympic Games was accepted unanimously and with applause, and Citius, Altius, Fortius (faster, stronger, higher) became the first slogan of Olympism (Seçilmiş, 2004).

The most important reason behind the resumption of the Modern Olympic Games was to contribute to world "peace" and to open up possibilities for a strong communication based on friendship between nations. On the other hand, for Coubertin, the pioneer of the Modern Olympic Games, the Olympic Games also meant a chance for the youth to regain the values they had lost over time. Coubertin, who saw that positive decisions were taken unanimously for the beginning of these games, which he had been wanting to organize for years, used the words "Citius, Altius, Fortius" as the first symbol of the Olympic Games (Koryürek, 1996).

The Olympic Games of modern times do not differ from the ancient Games in their structure, which stands for excellence and high prestige. The most important feature that distinguishes the two eras is the fact that participation in the modern Olympic Games has reached an enormous level compared to the ancient Games. In Sydney 2000, for example, more than 10,000 athletes from 200 countries competed in about 300 disciplines. These are incredible numbers compared to the past. In contrast, the ancient Olympics had 14 disciplines and an average of 300 athletes. Also, the games that averaged 40,000 spectators in the ancient Olympics are watched around the world in the modern era. Of course, the development of technology has a great influence on it (Young, 2004).

While the old games were repeated in the same place every four years, the modern Olympics are organized in another corner and city of the world every four years, emphasizing that they are the common property of the whole world (Firatlı, 1988). The Olympic Games have gained the distinction of being the world's largest sports organization in terms of providing political, economic and social benefits to both organizing and participating countries, as well as appearing on international platforms within the framework of the universality of sports, and has managed to carry this achievement to the present day (Zorba, 2018).

#### **ISTANBUL AND OLYMPIC CANDIDACIES**

Istanbul is Turkey's most populous and economically important city. With the 34th largest economy in the world, it is the most populous city in Europe according to the ranking based on municipal boundaries. One of the oldest cities in the world, Istanbul was the capital of the Roman Empire between 330-395, the Eastern Roman Empire between 395-1204 and 1261-1453, the Latin Empire between 1204-1261 and finally the Ottoman Empire between 1453-1922. Istanbul was also the center of Islam from 1517, when the Caliphate passed to the Ottoman Empire, until 1924, when it was abolished (Elmas et al. 2013).

Looking at Istanbul's candidacy process for the Olympic Games, the Olympic Games adventure for Istanbul dates back to 1935. Henri Prost, a French urban designer who came to prominence with his urban planning proposals for Paris, was invited to Istanbul between 1930-1950 and designed projects for Istanbul. Prost proposed two sports parks for Istanbul in the Historic Peninsula and Maçka regions. The Mayor of the period, Lütü Kırdar (1938-

1949), wanted to put the Prost Plan into practice (Cana & Zelef 2011). Accordingly, he aimed for Park No. I to host the Olympics during the celebrations of the 500th Anniversary of the Conquest of Istanbul in 1953, but he was unable to realize the project due to the negative repercussions of World War II on the economy (Ak, 2015).

Turkey bid to host the Olympic Games in Istanbul in 2000, 2004, 2008, 2012, and 2020, and was granted candidate city status for the 2008 and 2020 Summer Olympics, but did not qualify to host the Games. For the 2016 Olympics, the bid was abandoned and no bid was submitted. In addition, other cities such as Izmir also tried to be nominated for the Olympics, but only Istanbul was officially nominated to host the Olympics (Güler, 2010).

When the IOC visited Istanbul, the committee met at Çırağan Palace because TMOK's office was not suitable for hosting international guests. This alone had a negative impact on Istanbul's candidacy process. In addition, according to the urban planning standards of the Ministry of Public Works and Settlement, there should be 3 m<sup>2</sup> of sports space per capita, whereas in the 1990s there was 0.94 m<sup>2</sup> of sports space per capita in Istanbul (Yıldızci, 1994). The aim of the first candidacy was to destroy the stereotypical negative opinions of foreign policies about Istanbul and to turn them into positive ones with the city's natural, geographical, historical and cultural potentials (Güler, 2010). For this reason, the candidacy remained superficial in this period and the IOC considered the candidacy only as an image project.

In November 1997, Istanbul officially declared its candidacy for the second time. Considering the negative evaluations in the IOC report, first of all, the lack of sports facilities and transportation infrastructure was tried to be eliminated. The search for a site for the Olympic Park also coincided with this period. The criterion in the search for the location of the Olympic Park was that "it should be located in a developing region of Istanbul, outside the main residential areas, close to the main transportation corridors, close to the city, preferably on the European side, with a close connection to the airport via the railway system" (Aksoy, 2004). During the first candidacy process, there was not a single sports facility in compliance with IOC standards, whereas in the 2004 candidacy process, Abdi İpekçi Sports Hall was found to be in compliance with IOC Standards and added to the city's plus side. In addition to this, Abdi İpekçi Sports Hall was evaluated positively by the Olympic Law IOC in both candidacy processes. However, the fact that Istanbul, which needed a total of 2400 hectares of sports fields in this period, currently has 369 sports fields clearly shows how far Istanbul is from the IOC Standards. (Erten, 2008).

After Istanbul was initially eliminated as a candidate for the 2000 Games, the Ministry of Youth and Sports decided to build ten new sports facilities in the city in addition to the Olympic Stadium to improve the sports infrastructure. Due to disputes between IBB and HDK and tensions between IBB and Bakırköy Municipality over the refusal to allow the construction of new sports facilities, Istanbul's candidacy was notified to the IOC at the last minute in March 1997. Nevertheless, in August 2000, Istanbul, along with Paris, Toronto, Osaka and Beijing,

passed the first stage for the first time and became a candidate for the 2008 Olympic Games. The construction of another sports facility, Ataköy Multipurpose Hall (Today's Sinan Erdem Sports Hall), started in 1992, but could only be completed in 2001 due to financial problems and zoning issues related to Bakırköy Municipality. (Erdem 2004) During the 2004 candidacy process, the IOC president criticized Istanbul by saying, "How will you organize the Olympics when you cannot complete the construction of an ordinary sports complex in 7 years?" (Erten, 2008). The then IOC president Jaques Rogge emphasized that there was no improvement in the Istanbul 2012 candidacy and that it was almost identical to the 2004 and 2008 candidacy files (Sabah 2004, May 24). This is the reason why Istanbul, which passed the first stage in 2008, was eliminated in the first stage in 2012 despite its progress. When the 2020 candidacies are evaluated, although 90% of the investments are made in the form of direct investments, 90% of which are sports facilities, the sports infrastructure is weak when the city as a whole is considered. In addition, the distribution of existing sports facilities is not homogeneous within the city (Erten, 2008).

Istanbul's latest bid for the 2020 Olympic Games differs from the first four candidacies in many respects. As in the previous candidacies, the 2020 candidacy emphasized Istanbul's location in the middle of two different continents and focused on the meeting of different continents in Istanbul for the Games. Compared to other candidacies, one of the most important conditions for the positive outcome of this candidacy is that the application is not only a product of a city, but also a product that is owned by all relevant units and the central government of the country where the city is located. This ownership is clearly visible in the 2020 candidacy. Istanbul's first four candidacies did not have a favorable environment for achieving the set objectives, and the impact of the process was limited due to insufficient cooperation and ownership, while the potential was largely utilized in the last candidacy. The situation in the first four candidacies is similar to that of Rome's bid for the 2024 Olympic Games; despite all the efforts of the Italian candidacy committee, the mayor's office did not want to incur the high costs and ultimately withdrew the candidacy (Baysal, 2013). On the other hand, Istanbul's 2020 candidacy was embraced at the highest level of the state, institutional and personal support was provided, and the relevant Ministries, Istanbul Metropolitan Municipality (IBB), public institutions, civil society organizations, TMOK and the private sector actually contributed to the process. As seen in the Olympic Games candidacies of many cities today, there needs to be total acceptance and cooperation between public institutions, civil society organizations and the public in order to run the candidacy efficiently or to create legacies through the candidacy.

In recent years, Istanbul has hosted more than 20 major international events, including world championships in many sports (Kılıç et al, 2009).

Istanbul hosted the FIBA basketball world championship in 2010. In 2010, the city was the European Capital of Culture and in 2012 it was named the European Capital of Sports. In 2012, Istanbul hosted the World Athletics Indoor Championships, in 2012 the World Short Course Swimming Championships, in 2011-2013 the WTA Tour

---

Championships, in 2012 and 2017 the Euroleague Final Four and in 2019 the Uefa Super Cup. The 2023 Soccer Champions League final will also be held in Istanbul.

Although Istanbul has been successful in all these events, the country has correctly analyzed why it was not successful in the Olympic Games process and has set the 2036 Summer Olympics as a new goal.

Burson Cohn & Wolfe Sports (BCW Sports) publishes the annual Sports Cities Ranking, highlighting the top 50 sports cities to find the city with the strongest relationship with sport. The ranking focuses on social media data analysis that reveals the relationship between sport and the city in the digital space, drawing on insights from international federation presidents and general secretaries, sports industry experts and more than 300 sports media representatives. The social media data analysis consists of the total number of times the word "sport" is associated with the city's name on social media platforms such as Twitter, Instagram or Facebook, as well as Reddit, blogs and websites. New York stands out in the ranking of sports cities, ranking 1st in 2020 and 2021. In 2021, London, Los Angeles, Barcelona and Paris are at the top of the ranking respectively. Other cities in the ranking are Tokyo 9th, Berlin 12th, Beijing 14th, Toronto 20th, Dubai 23rd, Rio de Janeiro 27th, Stockholm 34th and Istanbul 40th.

Law No. 3796 "Law on the Olympic Games to be Held in the City of Istanbul" enacted in 1992 set out the principles and procedures regarding the preparation of the city for the Olympics and the organization of the Games. Through this law, the "Istanbul Olympic Games Preparatory and Organizing Board" and the "Executive Board and Preparatory Committee" affiliated to this board were established to carry out the necessary processes for hosting the games, and the areas of authority of these boards and committees were determined. The existence of this law created a political basis for Istanbul's Olympic candidacy and made it necessary to apply every time the candidacy was possible, unless otherwise decided (Şahin, 2010).

When the French urban designer Henri Prost was invited to Istanbul by Atatürk in 1936, among the main requests of the city's rulers was a proposal for a large stadium and hippodrome area. For Prost, however, Istanbul promised much greater potential. Having experienced the 1924 Paris Olympics himself, Prost believed that the contribution of large-scale events to the development of the city was undeniable. In the Prost Plan, which had a say in the planning of the city for about 15 years starting from 1936, the approach to sports was to produce large parks and sports fields in order to increase the visibility of young people, the real owners of the republic, in the urban space. As a result, the plan, which was partially implemented, was completely shelved after a while. The project, which included a stadium, sports fields and an Olympic village where athletes could stay, was among those that could not be realized. In 1943, when the Governor of Istanbul, Lütfi Kırdar, commissioned Prost to prepare a 10-year plan (1943-1953) for the 500th anniversary of the conquest of Istanbul, the Olympic site was brought back to the agenda. However, this comprehensive project did not materialize and Istanbul did not

officially become a candidate for the Olympics at this time (Akpınar, 2010). In the Istanbul plans made from 1980 onwards, the view of sports at two different scales can be read more clearly. In the 1980 Plan, with the goal of hosting the Olympics, the upper scale view was included in the plan as "sportive uses, fair and Olympic village". In the 1995 Plan, similar to the previous plan, areas for sports purposes are seen as special project areas (Bilsel, 2010).

The 2014-2023 Istanbul Regional Plan, prepared by the Istanbul Development Agency (IDA), views sports in line with the objectives of its establishment, in harmony with other plans and policies, and at two different scales. With a view parallel to the MDP and with an approach from a higher scale, it sees sports as one of the tools that will make Istanbul stand out in the global city race. While stating that hosting the Olympics, World Championships and continental tournaments will have gains such as the development of tourism, international promotion, strengthening the sports infrastructure, and increasing the brand value of the city, it also states that plans should be made to prevent the facilities from remaining idle after the events (Saydam, 2021).

The first government to include sports in government programs was the 9th Government (1937-1938). Although the government programs that have included sports since the 9th Government (1937-1938) generally prioritize the dissemination of sports to the society, according to the data of the General Directorate of Sports at the beginning of December 2018, the number of licensed athletes is 4,907,955. According to data from the Turkish Statistical Institute, the population of Turkey is 84,680,273 as of 2021 (TÜİK, 2022).

According to the statistics on the number of athletes published by the General Directorate of Sports Services of the Ministry of Youth and Sports in 2021, the rate of licensed and active participation in sports in Turkey is quit low compared to other countries. The rate of licensed and active participation in sports in Istanbul constitutes 76% of the rate of participation in sports in Turkey (TÜİK, 2022).

Today, Istanbul, with its nearly 16 million inhabitants, has a total of 848 sports facilities spread over 39 districts. It can be seen that sports facilities are concentrated in the center of the city and along the Marmara coast on the Anatolian side.

Sports facilities are classified as football fields, fitness centers, swimming pools, basketball courts, tennis courts and other facilities. When the distribution of sports facilities by type is analyzed; there are 556 football fields, 150 fitness centers, 120 swimming pools, 119 basketball courts and 100 tennis courts in the province. There are 568 facilities in the other category, which includes branches such as horse riding, wrestling, pilates and boxing. When the ownership status of sports facilities is analyzed, it is seen that the majority of the facilities are owned by district municipalities. A total of 621 facilities are owned by Istanbul Metropolitan Municipality, district municipalities or other public institutions. The remaining 227 facilities are under private, foundation or other

types of ownership. There are a total of 41 sports fields in accordance with international standards throughout the province.

When the spectator capacities of sports facilities are analyzed, the sports facilities with the highest capacities are Intercity Istanbul Park in Tuzla (130,000 people), Türk Telekom Stadium in Sarıyer (52,650 people), Fenerbahçe Şükrü Saraçoğlu Stadium in Kadıköy (50,509 people), Vodafone Park in Beşiktaş (41,000), Büyükçekmece Municipality Atatürk Sports Complex in Büyükçekmece (22,000 people).

There are a total of 2634 recreational areas with sports facilities throughout Istanbul. These areas are categorized as football fields, basketball courts, tennis courts, instrumental sports and walking-running tracks.

From the first nomination process in 2000 to the 5th nomination process in 2020, it can be said that the way the Olympic Games were handled changed depending on the stance of the changing governments and the physical and socio-cultural development of the city. In other words, Istanbul, which did not have a single facility in compliance with the Olympic Standards during the nomination process for the 2000 Olympic Games, has built facilities in compliance with the Olympic Standards and developed its sports infrastructure. Again, while the candidacy in 2000 did not go much beyond an image renewal, the candidacy file submitted to the International Olympic Committee during the 2020 candidacy process was prepared in detail. It transformed these advantages, which are geographical, geological and physical features, into cultural diversity, which is one of the most important issues in the Olympics, and applied with a motto such as Bridge Together. This motto also reflects the history, texture and architecture of the city. The city has been home to many different beliefs, identities and societies; even today, the heritage of diversity has been preserved (Istanbul 2020 Candidacy Booklet, 2013).

By being a candidate for 5 of the 6 Games between 2000 and 2020, Istanbul has shown that it wants to host the Olympic Games with great determination. In contrast, while a modest spatial strategy was adopted at the beginning of these 5 candidacy processes, by the 2020 Candidacy, the Games had become a national issue. In this respect, very wide-ranging powers based on the Olympic Law were defined and it was committed that the entire budget of the Games and all unforeseen expenses that may arise would be covered by the Government of the Republic of Turkey (Istanbul 2020 Candidacy Booklet, 2013).

### **Istanbul 2020 Criticism**

According to Yalçın (2014), when the candidacy booklet for the Istanbul 2020 Olympic Games and other data obtained were examined, it was determined that various aspects of the candidacy for the Istanbul 2020 Olympic Games were criticized. These criticisms were basically categorized under six headings within the scope of the study. It is possible to list these criticisms as follows;



- 1) The possibility that the projected high budget could lead to an economic crisis,
- 2) The transformation projects that started in the city with the Olympic Stadium lead to gentrification,
- 3) The (lack of) relationship of the proposed Olympic Facilities with the historical city center and natural resources,
- 4) Negative approach to the transience concept of the proposed Olympic Facilities as a solution to the overcapacity problem that emerged after 2000,
- 5) Failure to cooperate with competent institutions such as Professional Chambers and Universities during the candidacy phase of the Games,
- 6) Lack of sufficient and specific information on social inclusion and employment (Yalçın, 2014).

It was also mentioned in the previous section that a budget of 19.2 Billion US Dollars was foreseen for Istanbul 2020 and that the government has committed to cover the entire cost. Prof. John Lovering (2013), a lecturer at the Department of Urban and Regional Planning at Cardiff University, criticizes the budget for the Istanbul 2020 Olympic Games as follows; "Istanbul says the entire cost will be \$19.2 billion. This is considerably more than other cities have estimated: Tokyo has announced budgets of \$4.9 billion, Madrid \$1.9 billion. Meanwhile, Istanbul's announced budget is also higher than London's actual budget. London's total cost was 11 billion pounds (\$16.5 billion), but the London economy is three times the size of the Turkish economy. When London announced its candidacy, the total cost was actually 2.7 billion pounds; the total cost calculated after the Olympics took place was 11 billion pounds, an incredible deviation."

Lovering supports this criticism as follows: The deficit that the Olympics in Istanbul will create in the Turkish budget will be much larger. In London, it caused a deficit of only 3%. If we take the total cost of the Istanbul Olympics as a percentage of GDP, the cost or the financial deficit that the Istanbul Olympics will have on the Turkish economy will be 3-4 times higher than that of London. So what we know for sure is that the cost of the Olympics will be very high and that it will be incredibly financially straining; what we don't know is what the legacy of this organization will be (Lovering, 2013).

### **2036 ISTANBUL CANDIDACY**

The Olympic Games are a vehicle for generating a largely global media audience, offering perhaps the best stepping stone for a city to achieve global status and playing a major role in strengthening the cultural identity of the host city (Short et al., 2000).

With the realization that the Olympics are a serious income and development opportunity for the cities hosting the Games, the Olympics have entered another phase in which many elements of political, cultural, scientific and economic influence are shared. The biggest factor in this regard is that the budget allocated for the preparations

of the organization contributes significantly to meet the needs of a city such as infrastructure, transportation, open spaces, new buildings that can be completed in 50 years, and create a development plan to increase the social, economic and environmental value of the city (Doralp & Barkul, 2011).

Looking at the candidate city file procedures determined by the International Olympic Committee (IOC), it is seen that there are seventeen different criteria such as vision, heritage and communication; political and economic climate and structure, customs and immigration procedures; environment and meteorology, finance; marketing, sports and venues; Paralympic Games, Olympic Village, health services and doping control, security, accommodation, transportation, technology and media etc. (Ünlü, 2015).

Ekrem İmamoğlu, Mayor of Istanbul Metropolitan Municipality (İBB), introduced the 'Olympic Working Group', which he described as the 'Dream Team' that will prepare the city for the 2036 Olympic candidacy, on December 13, 2022 and made the start of the 2036 candidacy by saying, "This candidacy is not the end goal, but a means to introduce 16 million people in Istanbul to sports."

The working group of the 'Dream Team', which was introduced at a press conference held at the Istanbul Planning Agency's (İPA) Florya Campus, included Oya Ünlü Kızıl, the first Turkish recipient of the 'Global Leader Award' from Yale University, Seda Domaniç Sökmen, Prof. Dr. İtir Erhart, Naz Aydemir Akyol, Oğuz Uçanlar, Sinan Güler, Alican Kaynar and Alper Kasapoğlu.

Istanbul's candidacy concept is based on emphasizing the city's geographical and cultural characteristics. In this context, it is aimed to use the city as a backdrop for the games by positioning the Olympic venues on two continents. The vision for Istanbul's 2036 candidacy is that the Olympics will be seen as an opportunity for the transformation and modernization of the city, more active participation of new generations in sports and an opportunity to increase cultural diversity. Turkey is also emphasizing its claim to be the first Muslim country to host the Olympics on its own soil. "Environment", together with "sport" and "culture", constitutes one of the three pillars of Olympism and is one of the IOC's most important evaluation criteria. While Istanbul's candidacy dossier includes statements that the natural and cultural heritage will be protected and developed, it is impossible not to question the authenticity of these statements when current practices and the positioning of the Olympic venues are taken into account. The weak emphasis on environmental sensitivity and the absence of any promises in terms of the use of renewable energy facilities leave Istanbul behind the other candidates in terms of the environment (Özfiliz, 2013).

Traffic appears to be Istanbul's biggest problem in its Olympic bid and is also the issue most emphasized by board members in the IOC evaluation report, along with "security." It is estimated that there are 2 million vehicles on the road today and that number will quadruple by 2036. In its nomination dossier, Istanbul commits to solving

the traffic problem with the Integrated Urban Transportation Master Plan proposed for the period 2009-2023. In this context, it says that metro lines will be extended by 43 km, another 7 km line will be built in Marmaray to serve the Olympic city, and airports will be connected by an efficient metro network. The opening of the Eurasia Tunnel and the Bosphorus Tunnel, the 3rd Bridge and the 3rd Airport, which were commissioned independently of the Olympic Games, are also considered added value for Istanbul during the bidding process, as they will facilitate transportation and access to the city. By 2036, the IOC will also be presented with the goal of increasing the use of public transportation from 20% to 70% (Özfiliz, 2013).

One of the important elements of becoming an Olympic city is the people's perspective on sports and their predisposition to sports culture. Regardless of the 2036 candidacy, Istanbul is a small country of more than 16 million people.

In Istanbul, the rate of participation in sports is similarly low to that of Turkey. According to the Istanbul Physical Activity Survey Report, 14.6% of men and 11.8% of women in Istanbul engage in regular physical activity (IBB, 2020).

Bringing as many people together with sports, integrating them into sports organizations and creating a sports culture is an issue close to the hearts of Istanbul city leaders. The vision laid out in the Istanbul City 2021 Sports Master Plan report is: "An active Istanbul with a high quality of life that has embraced sports as a way of life." The slogan is "Active, Fit, Happy City".

The importance of the Olympic Games not only for Istanbul but also for the Turkish state was made clear to the IOC with the state assurances in the bid for 2020. In the document "Annual Programme 2019" prepared by the Directorate of Strategy and Budget of the Presidency of the Republic of Turkey for 2019, the importance of the Olympic Games is mentioned in the main objectives and actions in the sports section.

In the 11th Development Plan prepared by the Presidency of the Republic of Turkey Strategy and Budget Directorate in 2019, policies and measures related to "Sports" were determined under the goal of "Qualified People, Strong Society".

In its 2036 nomination process, Istanbul is looking at three international plans as examples: the Toronto Parks and Recreation Facilities Master Plan (2019-2038), the Hamburg Sports Strategy and Active City Master Plan, and the Barcelona Sports Strategy Plan (2012-2022).

In the study conducted by Yalçın in 2014, 80% of the participants stated that Istanbul, which has been a candidate for the Olympic Games 5 times, should be a candidate and host the Games in the future, whereas only 13% stated that Istanbul should not be a candidate in the future and 7% preferred not to answer the question.

In 2012, Recep Tayyip Erdoğan implied that being a Muslim country also had a negative impact on the IOC's decision: "London did it three times, Madrid twice. Tokyo did it twice. While these countries have done it 2-3 times, Turkey has reached the finals 5 times and they still refused to host such an Olympics. An Olympics has never been organized in a country where the majority of the people are Muslim. They ask you: For what?". Contrary to this statement, former TMOK President Togay Bayatlı and TMOK Board Member Neşe Gündoğan argued that being an Islamic country did not influence the IOC's decision (Özfiliz, 2013).

## **CONCLUSION and DISCUSSION**

There are some shortcomings that sports people generally see as missing in Turkey's failure to win the Olympic Games, rather than the fact that Turkey is a Muslim country.

1. **Infrastructure Deficiencies:** Infrastructure facilities, transportation network and accommodation facilities required for the Olympics may be missing or inadequate. Appropriate stadiums, sports halls, swimming pools, athletics tracks and other sports facilities are required for the Olympic Games. Hotels and residences are also needed to comfortably accommodate international athletes and visitors.
2. **Security Concerns:** As the Olympic Games are a major international event, security becomes a major priority. If the country's security infrastructure is inadequate or there are security concerns at the international level, it can reduce the chances of winning the Olympics.
3. **Financial Problems:** Organizing the Olympics imposes a huge financial burden. Construction, organization, security, promotion and other costs can put a heavy strain on a country's financial resources. If a country is unable to bear this financial burden or is experiencing economic difficulties, its chances of winning the Olympics may be reduced.
4. **Political Instability:** Political instability in the country organizing the Olympics or problems in international relations can reduce the chances of winning the Olympics. International organizations may have security concerns or boycott the Olympics.
5. **Competition** There is intense competition among the many cities and countries interested in organizing the Olympics. If other cities and countries have better bids or more experience, it could reduce the chances of cities like Istanbul winning the Olympics.
6. **Lack of Publicity:** It is important to develop an effective promotional strategy to win the Olympic Games. Istanbul may not have had a sufficiently effective promotional campaign for the Olympics or may not have emphasized the attractiveness of the event enough.

As a result, major cities such as Istanbul may need to upgrade infrastructure, improve security measures, secure financial resources, maintain political stability, and develop an effective promotional strategy to increase their chances of winning the Olympics. It is also important to consider international competition.

For example, in its bid for 2020, Istanbul proposed a total of 38 facilities, 11 of which were already in place. Tokyo, the winning city, proposed 36 facilities, of which 25 were ready, while Madrid proposed 35 facilities, of which 28 were ready. Istanbul should definitely develop its infrastructure during the bidding process and leave these facilities as a legacy for the city.

Istanbul's plan for the Olympics includes elements that will allow athletes to perform at their best, but the distance of the Olympic Village from some locations was considered a problem in previous bids. Since transportation will be critical to the success of the 2036 Games, major infrastructure needs to be built urgently to ensure reasonable travel times.

Istanbul's greatest strengths in its bid for the 2036 Games appear to be strong government support at all levels and strong public support.

#### **ETHICAL TEXT**

The present is a review article, and as such does not require approval by an ethics committee. "This article complies with journal writing rules, publication principles, research and publication ethics, and journalism ethics. Responsibility for any violations that may arise regarding the article belongs to the author.

**Author(s) Contribution Rate:** In this study, the contribution rate of the first author was 51% and the contribution rate of the second author was 49%.

#### **REFERENCES**

- Ak, D. (2015). *Olimpiyat oyunlarının ev sahibi kente etkileri açısından değerlendirilmesi*. Pamukkale Journal of Eurasian Socioeconomic Studies, 2(1), 1-19.
- Akpınar, İ., (2010), *İstanbul'u (Yeniden) İnşa Etmek: 1937 Henri Prost Planı," 2000'den Kesitler II: Cumhuriyet'in Mekânları/Zamanları/İnsanları*, Doktora Araştırmaları Sempozyumu Kitabı, ed. Elvan Ergut, B. İmamoğlu, Ankara: Dipnot Yayınları ve ODTÜ Yayınevi, s.107-124.
- Aksoy, A. (2004). *Between the global and the local*. Istanbul: Rowman and Littlefield Publishers.
- Alpman, C. (2001). *Eğitimin bütünlüğü içinde beden eğitimi ve çağlar boyunca gelişimi*, Ankara: Can Reklam Evi Basın Yayın Ofset Matbaacılık.
- Baysal, C. U. (2013). *Olimpiyat kenti olursa İstanbul'u neler bekliyor*, [http://www.academia.edu/3764978/Olimpiyat\\_Kenti\\_Olursa\\_Istanbulu\\_Neler\\_Bekliyor](http://www.academia.edu/3764978/Olimpiyat_Kenti_Olursa_Istanbulu_Neler_Bekliyor), erişim:06.12.13.
- Barkul, Ö., & Doralp, B. (2011). *Olimpiyat yerleşkeleri tasarımında bir girdi olarak sürdürülebilirlik*. 6 (2), 123-137. MEGARON, 2(6).
- Bilsel, F. C. (2010). *İmparatorluk başkentinden Cumhuriyet'in modern kentine: Henri Prost'un İstanbul planlaması*
-

(1936-1951).

Burson Cohn & Wolfe (2020). 2020 Ranking of Sport Cities, Lausanne, <https://bcw-sport.com/wpcontent/uploads/2020/02/BCW-2020-Ranking-of-Sports-Cities.pdf>.

Cana, B. ve Zelef, H. (2011). *Mega events in İstanbul from Henri Prost's master plan of 1973 to the twenty-first-century olympic bids, planning perspectives*,26:4,621-634

Elmas, B., Türkan, Y., Yakut, E. (2013). *Uluslararası finans merkezi olma yolunda İstanbul*. Bingöl Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi, 3(5), 7-28.

Erdem, S. (2004). *Adanmış Bir Hayat: Spor ve Olimpizm'li Yıllar*, İstanbul: Dünya Kitapları

Erten, S. (2008). *Spatial analysis of mega-event hosting:olympic host and olympic bid Cities*, yayınlanmamış doktora tezi, Orta Doğu Teknik Üniversitesi.

Güler, G. (2010). *Başarılı bir olimpiyat için olimpiyatlara ev sahibi olmuş kentlerden alınacak dersler ve İstanbul örneği*, doktora tezi.

Holt, T. (2004). *Olimpiyat İstanbul*: Literatür Yayınları.

İstanbul 2020 Adaylık Kitapçığı, 2013.

Kılıç, H., Yılmaz, S ve Şahin, İ. (2009). *Beden Eğitimi Öğretmenlerini Olimpiyatlar Hakkındaki Farkındalığı*, Hacettepe Üniversitesi Spor Bilimleri Dergisi, 20(2), s.51-58.

Koryürek, C. (1996). *Rüzgar Gibi Geçti*, Olimpiyat Dünyası Dergisi, İstanbul, Grafik Sanatlar Matbaacılık.

Lowering, J. (2013). *Olimpiyat oyunları İstanbul için fırsat mı tehdit mi?* İstanbul: MSGSÜ Hakkı Eldem Oditoryumu.

Messinesi, X. L. (1973). *A Branch of Wild Olive: The Olympic Movement and the Ancient and Modern Olympic Games*, Exposition Press.

Miller, S., G. (2004). *Ancient greek athletics*. New Haven, CT, and London: Yale University Press.

Özfiliz, S. (2013). *Hangi olimpiyat?* Mimarlık; 373: 35-42.

Saydam, Ç. (2021). *Türkiye'de spor politikaları ve İstanbul planlarında spor 1*.

Seçilmiş, K. (2004). *Antik zamandan günümüze olimpiyat oyunları*, İstanbul: İlpress Basım Yayın.

Short, J. R. Breitbach, C. Buckman, S., & Essex, J. (2000). *From world cities to gateway cities: Extending the boundaries of globalization theory*. City, 4(3), 317-340.

Şahin, Y. (2010). *Olimpiyat kentinden olimpiyat devletine*. KMÜ Sosyal ve Ekonomik Araştırmalar Dergisi, 12(18), 73- 80.

Tekin, A. ve Tekin, G. (2014). *Antik Yunan Dönemi: Spor ve Antik Olimpiyat Oyunları*, Tarih Okulu Dergisi XVIII/ Journal of History School XVIII, İzmir, 121-140.

Tinaz, C., Leopkey, B., & Salisbury, P. (2018). *Kaybederken kazanabildik mi? İstanbul'un Başarısızlıkla sonuçlanan olimpiyat adaylıklarının çıktılarının incelenmesi*. SPORMETRE Beden Eğitimi ve Spor Bilimleri Dergisi, 16(4), 205-224.

TÜİK. (2022). *Eğitim, kültür, spor ve turizm spor istatistikleri*

---

<https://data.tuik.gov.tr/Kategori/GetKategori?p=egitim-kultur-spor-ve-turizm-105&dil=1> Erişim

Tarihi: 02.10.2022.

Ünlü, H. (2015). *Olimpiyat oyunlarına adaylık ve ev sahipliği sürecinde olimpik eğitimin yaygınlaşmasında üniversitelerin rolü* (Master's thesis, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü).

Yalçın, F. A. (2014). *Ev sahibi kentler ile olimpiyat oyunları'nın etkileşimi ve adaylık sürecindeki istanbul değerlendirmesi*, doktora tezi, İstanbul Teknik Üniversitesi.

Yıldızcı, A., C., (1994). *İstanbul olimpiyat organizasyonu'nda çevre düzenleme sorunları*, Türkiye ve Olimpiyat Sempozyumu, s:102, Editör: Yalçın Aköz, İTÜ Beden Eğitimi Bölümü Yayını 1995,17-18 Kasım 1994, İTÜ, İTÜ Vakfı, HDK, TMOK, Maçka-İstanbul.

Young, David C. (2004). *A Brief History of the Olympic Games*, Malden, Blackwell Publishing.

Zorba, E. (2018). İstanbul'un olimpiyat süreci. Akademisyen Kitabevi.

<https://www.sgm.gov.tr/Sayfalar/rapor.aspx?RaporID=3>

<http://www.tuik.gov.tr/HbPrint.do?id=10736>

<https://spor.istanbul/istanbulun-spor-haritasi>

İstanbul 2020 Adaylık Kitapçığı, 2013