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Abstract
Apart from the known effects of sport in terms of physical and mental health, it is increasingly recognized as a tool for development and peace, which is embraced by the Sport for Development and Peace movement. NGOs and IGOs have emerged as promoters of sport as a means of achieving the MDGs. The aim of this study is not to demonstrate the intrinsic development advantages of sport, but to transcend the myths that exist concerning SDP. Since it is a relatively young movement, this study aims to give an overview of the SDP movement while highlighting its complexity. Moreover, the increasing relevance of NGOs and IGOs in the SDP context has been analyzed.

The theoretical framework outlined the link between sport and politics, and examined SDP in relation to the global civil society, transnationalism and cosmopolitanism. Data was obtained by travelling to the IOC headquarter in Lausanne on two separate occasions. The methodology comprised a combination of qualitative techniques. Interviews were conducted with IOC and UN officials and archives relevant to the SDP movement were consulted.

Further investigation demonstrated that SDP is often not underpinned by a sense of global responsibility and a desire for greater equality, but rather by an acknowledgment of the legitimacy of existing institutions and by the preservation of Western interests. As a legitimacy seeking agent, the IOC has entered into public-private partnerships with numerous IGOs, adopted the dominant development discourse and conducts SDP projects as an act of Corporate Social Responsibility. The disagreements related to the recent IOC’s observer status in the General Assembly, the lack of in-house expertise on development, and the struggle between sport for development and development of sport, demonstrate that the IOC has not yet fully adjusted itself to SDP and that such an adjustment takes time.
Nederlandse Samenvatting

Naast de bekende effecten van sport op vlak van fysieke en mentale gezondheid blijkt sport een potentieel ontwikkelings- en vredebevorderend instrument. Dit vertaalde zich in de Sport for Development and Peace beweging. NGOs, IGOs, IFs en TNCs hebben zich ontpopt tot promotoren van sport als middel ter realisatie van de MDGs. De theesisopzet is niet het beantwoorden van de vraag of sport daadwerkelijk bijdraagt aan ontwikkeling en vrede en op welke manier, maar om heersende mythes over SDP te doorbreken. Daar het om een jonge beweging gaat, wil deze thesis een overzicht geven van het SDP gebeuren en de complexiteit ervan belichten. Daarenboven werd de stijgende relevantie van NGOs en IGOs in de SDP context onderzocht.

In het theoretisch kader werd de link tussen sport en politiek geschetst en werd SDP bekeken ten aanzien van het mondiaal maatschappelijk middenveld, transnationalisme en wereldburgerschap. Data werden verkregen door tweemaal naar het IOC hoofdkwartier af te reizen. Als methodologie werd geopteerd voor een combinatie van verschillende kwalitatieve technieken. Interviews, zowel met (ex-)leden van het IOC en de VN, werden gecombineerd met het consulteren van archieven.

Nader onderzoek toont aan dat aan de basis van SDP vaak geen mondiaal verantwoordelijkheidsgevoel en een streven naar meer gelijkheid ligt, maar eerder een bevestiging van de legitimiteit van bestaande instellingen en een instandhouding van Westerse belangen. In zijn zoektocht naar legitimiteit heeft het IOC publiek-private partnerschappen gesloten met tal van IGOs, het dominant ontwikkelingsdiscours aangenomen en voert het SDP projecten uit als daad van Corporate Social Responsibility. Geschillen met betrekking tot de waarnemerpositie van het IOC in de Algemene Vergadering, het gebrek aan expertise over ontwikkeling en de strijd tussen sport for development and development of sport, tonen dat het IOC zich nog niet volledig heeft aangepast aan de SDP beweging en dat deze aanpassing tijd kost.
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1. Introduction

“Sport cannot cure the ills that afflict society. It cannot make peace. What sport can do is it can help cure the ills that afflict society. It can help foster peace.” Jacques Rogge, keynote speech 1st International Forum on Sport Development and Peace

Undoubtedly, these are volatile and turbulent times. Global challenges cannot be met by any government or institution acting alone, but increasingly require collaborative and coordinated action by governments, civil society and private actors. In addition to the known effects of sport and physical activity in terms of physical and mental health, sport would also appear to be a potential instrument for development and peace. Indeed, sport can be a catalyst for social change, as it is a universal language with the ability to cross cultural barriers. Sport is perceived as a non-political tool, which can act in a value-neutral way and, therefore, reach communities alienated from traditional development initiatives (Levermore, 2010).

Right To Play, one of the largest NGOs working on SDP, played a key role in building up sports initiatives in developing countries and in placing sport on the international development agenda (Meulders, 2007). Johan Olav Koss, the founder and CEO of Right To Play, encouraged the establishment of the UN Inter-Agency Task Force on Sport for Development and Peace. The report published by the Task Force in 2003 suggested that sport-based initiatives are practical and cost-effective instruments in the pursuit of the MDGs, and that sport is a powerful tool, the use of which should be increasingly considered by the UN as complementary to existing activities (United Nations, Inter-Agency Task Force on SDP, 2003). Later that year, the UN General Assembly adopted a resolution affirming the role of sport in relation to peace and development (United Nations, General Assembly, 2003). A significant milestone in SDP was the proclamation of 2005 as the “International Year of Sport and Physical Education” (United Nations, IYSPE, 2005). From that moment on, the potential of sport in achieving development goals has been acknowledged by important stakeholders and has paved the way to many SDP initiatives in the developing world.

---

1 There are many definitions of sport. In this master’s dissertation, sport is defined, as “all forms of physical activity that contribute to physical fitness, mental well-being and social interaction, such as play, recreation, organised or competitive sport, and indigenous sports and games.”. This definition adopted by the UN Inter-Agency Task Force on Sport for Development and Peace in 2003 has been widely accepted.

2 The MDGs were established by the international community at the UN Millennium Summit in September 2000 in an effort to focus world attention and resources on the eradication of global poverty. The MDGs comprise eight benchmarks with supporting targets that aim to eradicate or reduce poverty, hunger, child mortality, and disease, and to promote education, maternal health, gender equality, environmental sustainability and global partnerships.
Yet, for many others it remains difficult to consider sport as a means for development and peace because of what they see as a lack of evidence. While conceptualizations of the relationship between sport and development have started to emerge, the causal link between sport and development remains unproven (World Bank, 2006). Hayhurst (2008) mentioned that there is a “nagging pressure” to prove that SDP really has an impact, since there is currently merely an uncritical conviction of the positive role of sport. The aim of this study is not to demonstrate the intrinsic development advantages of sport, but to transcend the myths that rule over SDP.

The first objective is twofold. In a descriptive part, this study aims to provide a general overview of the SDP movement, while maintaining an awareness of its full complexity. What are the historical underpinnings and dynamics of the movement? Who are the main actors? A subsequent analytical analysis will follow. Why is the cooperation with the traditional development cooperation sector mired by great difficulty and distrust? What are the main challenges faced by SDP projects?

The second objective is to illustrate the increasing importance of NGOs and IGOs in international relations in the SDP context, and to focus on the power of NGOs such as the IOC, and IGOs such as the UN. What or who has encouraged the UN to give such a prominent place to sport in its global agenda? Why are the IOC and the UN such strong advocates of the movement, and is this motivated by a sincere sense of responsibility or does self-interest factor into the equation? Can sporting mega-events, organized by the IOC or IFs, be reconciled with the aims and principles of SDP?

The rationale behind this study can also be found in the unwillingness of the majority of scholars to assume the notion of sport being a fundamental human activity and being integral to political, economic and social evolution, and therefore worthy of study as such (Beacom, 2000, p.17). Especially important absentees in the SDP literature are the political scientists, since they are unwilling to assume precisely the aforementioned notion of sport as a fundamental human activity and as integral to political, economic and social evolution and therefore worthy of study as such (Bruyninckx, 2010). Political scientists have some catching up to do in recognizing this new situation of mutuality between the international state system and powerful NGOs such as the IOC (MacAlloon, 1997). This study aims to examine the SDP effort from a politicological viewpoint with due caution and a critical eye.

As a point of departure this study attempts to carve out a theoretical framework of SDP, by situating it in the context of global civil society, transnationalism and global citizenship. The
third chapter subsequently outlines the methodology, which is characterized by a combination of different qualitative techniques. The fourth chapter then looks more closely at the SDP movement, its historical underpinnings, the difficult balance between sport for development and development of sport, the existing research gap in this field of research as well as the key challenges confronting the movement. It attempts to identify the trends and milestones in the development of the SDP approach. The collaboration between the IOC and the UN, two important proponents of the SDP movement, is dealt with in chapter five. The main focus is on the IOC as the most powerful NGO in the SDP sector. The Committee’s quest for legitimacy over time is explored in more detail. As a result of the recent expansion in the number of developing countries hosting sporting mega-events, aiming to achieve social and economic development objectives by this means, the sixth chapter examines a potential link between these events and SDP. It seeks to answer the following three key questions: Why are developing and emerging cities competing to host such mega-events? How do these events influence local development policy? Who actually benefits from large sporting events? With the Beijing Olympics in 2008, the World Cup 2010 in South Africa, and future World Cup and Olympics in Brazil, a legacy component for the developing world has become the new norm for large sporting events.
2. Theoretical Framework

2.1. Politics and Sport

The promotion of Aryan superiority during the 1936 Olympics, the Soccer War between Honduras and El Salvador during the qualifications for the 1970 FIFA World Cup, the ping pong diplomacy between the United States and the People's Republic of China in the 1970s, protests leading up to the Beijing Olympics in 2008, etc. These examples reveal a political dimension to sport (Bruyninckx & Scheerder, 2010; Houlihan, 2000, p.213). The aforementioned episodes demonstrate that the relationship between politics and sport can be very diverse. Sport can be used as a tool for diplomacy, protest, propaganda, government policy, etc. In recent times, a shift has occurred from the traditional state and government-centered policy to multi-level governance (Scholte, 2010, p. 383). On the one hand, a transfer is noticeable in the type and number of actors involved in decision making. A wide array of non-state actors, known as the civil society, play an influential role in the decision making process. This differs from the past in the sense that nowadays there are more and more diverse non-state actors who influence policy making. Today’s society has too many dynamics that escape the traditional idea of territorial sovereignty. Examples include climate change, pandemics, migration, international trade, etc. Civil society has played increasingly important roles in transnational problem solving and governance. On the other hand, an increasing interdependence between various policy levels can be observed. Over the past decades multilateral, supranational, regional and local policy levels have gained importance, as a result of the realization that global problems cannot be solved on a domestic level (Bruyninckx & Scheerder, 2010). The organization of the Olympic Games is a good example of the shift from government to governance (Bell & Hindmoor, 2009). The IOC, a private body, relies upon the involvement of a range of non-state actors. The responsibility for the planning and development of the Games rests with the OCOG, but they also co-operate with NOCs, states and market players. Rules and norms resulting from these collaborations are the governance arrangement of the Olympics (Bruyninckx, 2010, p.129). The multi-actor character of the governance arrangement, for example, is borne out in the involvement of private actors in ensuring the security of the Games. The participation of a wide range of organizations and institutions operating on levels ranging from local to international further demonstrates this multi-level character.
Power is a crucial component of politics (De Vos, 2006). In recent times, non-state actors have gained a larger and larger share in the exercising of that power. The focus of this study will be on the power of NGOs such as the IOC, and IGOs such as the UN. Bruyninckx & Scheerder (2010) distinguish between three different forms of power concerning sports. The first, economic power, refers to the use of economic capabilities to exercise power in the context of sports. Indeed, as sports nowadays has become associated with increasingly large sums of money, many consequently assume that power relations must exist within the sporting world. In this sense, MNOs often have the power to influence and even change the rules of sport. Secondly, sport actors possess normative power in that they act according to certain norms and are able to influence others. Norms and values which are intrinsically embedded in the practice of sport, such as fair-play, conversely, can be a form of normative power, since they have the potential to change the behavior of others. The third form of power, political power, indicates the close connection between sport and the political elite. Many politicians, such as Obama and Putin, like to be associated with a popular sports team in the hope that this may benefit them electorally. Political power can also be used to attain certain goals in the context of sport, such as the construction of new sports infrastructure.
2.2. SDP and global civil society

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transnational corporations, corporate social responsibility</th>
<th>Governmental and Intergovernmental organizations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Neo-liberal</td>
<td>Governance/developmentalist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e.g. Nike, Coca-Cola</td>
<td>e.g. UN, UNESCO, UNICEF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nongovernmental organizations/community-based organizations</td>
<td>New social movements and radical non-governmental organizations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programme implementation</td>
<td>Social justice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e.g. Right to Play</td>
<td>e.g. Clean Clothes Campaign</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 1. Types of SDP institution within global civil society (Giulianotti, 2011b)

Like so many aspects of society, sport has crossed national boundaries and evolved tremendously on a global scale (Maguire, 1999). Giulianotti (2011a) situates ‘Sport for Development and Peace’ within the emerging global civil society. Like Kaldor (2003) he defines global civil society as a complex and politically contested field, marked by conflicts, partnerships and interactions between different stakeholders that shape global development. This contested field may be understood as a competitive network, established by various institutional and political actors, including nation-states, IGOs, NGOs and TNCs (Giulianotti, 2011c). Giulianotti divides SDP into four ideal-types: corporate social responsibility, nongovernmental and community-based initiatives, government programs, and critical social justice activities (see figure 1). However, these domains are not hermetically sealed off. Instead, individuals and institutions may oscillate between them, depending on financial support and their influence in shaping the SDP movement.

2.2.1. Corporate/neo-liberalism

Since the 1970s, a remarkable global change in attitude towards neoliberalism occurred, *a theory of political economic practices that proposes that human well-being can best be advanced by liberating individual entrepreneurial freedoms and skills within an institutional framework characterized by strong private property rights, free markets and free trade* (Harvey, 2005). Neoliberalism is the predominant approach to development in the SDP context. Indeed, the SDP field and the neoliberal approach have a lot in common (Burgess,
Firstly, the main actors – international institutions and private actors – are similar. They are viewed as key proponents of social and economic change through sport. Secondly, they both provide aid to the Global South through partnerships and private funding, whilst maintaining a focus on neoliberal principles such as the enlargement of the private sector, open markets and the need for rapid economic growth in order to encourage development. However, Kidd (2008) warns for a negative impact on social development, since it provokes competition among stakeholders and relies primarily on individual self-esteem rather than on community-based goals. In a similar vein, Darnell (2010) points out that the SDP movement is not always about sport-for-all since sport is often challenged by the hegemony of neoliberal development. He argues that the link between sport and development “continues to be constructed in and through the political economy of global competitive sport itself and therefore aligns with traditional top-down notions of development, despite the fact that sport is often positioned as a way to approach international development differently” (Darnell, 2010). For this reason, careful consideration of the social politics of sport and development within the SDP movement is of the utmost importance. In addition to this, Akindes & Kirwin (2009) note the domination of the Global North’s values in the SDP agenda as another aspect of the neoliberal focus of SDP.

Giulianotti (2011a) identifies neo-liberal social policies within the SDP sector, embodied by transnational corporations and forms of corporate social responsibility. Marsden and Andriof (1998) defined CSR as the satisfaction of the expectations of all societal stakeholders to enhance the company’s positive impact on its social and physical environment, while providing a competitive return to its financial stakeholders. As recently as fifteen years ago, hardly any professional sports organization was concerned with its CSR status. Now, however, they all increasingly participate in socially responsible programs and even have a community affairs department, which determines the organization’s image and legitimacy (Babiak & Wolfe, 2006).

Giulianotti (2011a) identified three forms of CSR within the SDP sector. Firstly, major publicly traded sportswear and equipment suppliers such as Nike and Adidas faced criticism by radical NGOs (cf. infra) and grassroots organizations, as well as academics and journalists, for relying on child labor and degrading working conditions in their factories in the Global South (commonly known as sweatshops). In response to this, the corporations started monitoring the working conditions in these factories and launched social responsibility
programs. The reason why they are putting so much effort in CSR strategies is not, however, because of a sense of global responsibility, but rather as a public relations ploy. Secondly, during the last decade a rising number of partnerships between TNCs and NGOs can be noted. For example, Samsung is the main partner of Generations For Peace – an NGO which brings together youth leaders who are influential in their communities and gives them the skills to provide organized peace-through-sport activities (http://www.generationsforpeace.org/). This can be regarded as an example of corporate philanthropy as this is an CSR initiative which is quite far-removed from the ingrained business practices of a company (Levermore, 2010). But what about sponsors of the Olympic Games like Coca Cola and McDonald’s? Are they not selling products which have a clearly adverse effect on health? Many TNCs engaged in CSR initiatives for SDP are food, soft drinks and tobacco companies, which have been criticized for supporting initiatives whilst simultaneously promoting unhealthy products. TNCs attempt to focus the public’s attention on their social responsibility through their contributions to the SDP sector by, for example, handing out substantial amounts of sporting material in communities in the Global South (Babiak & Wolfe, 2006). But the corporations are not the only ones concerned with this issue, the IOC is also working on its CSR through its project ‘Giving is winning’, and FIFA has similar aims with its Goal Program. Through this initiative, NOCs, IFs, sponsors, sports organizations, athletes, members and supporters of the Olympic Movement have donated sports and casual clothes for distribution by the UNHCR to several refugee camps worldwide (IOC, 2010).

Finally, a close collaboration exists between TNCs and (inter)governmental organizations within the SDP sector. Corporations such as Nike and Reebok joined the ‘Global Compact’ and were criticized for being examples of bluewashing. Since there are no screening methods to guarantee that the TNCs act in compliance with the accepted principles, some suggest that these UN partnerships are merely designed to improve corporations’ reputations.

2.2.2. Mainstream NGOs and CBOs / developmental interventionism

By striving to establish international standards, promoting the creation of new international organizations, lobbying in intergovernmental forums, transforming international law, and

---

3 “The UN Global Compact is a strategic policy initiative for businesses that are committed to aligning their operations and strategies with ten universally accepted principles in the areas of human rights, labour, environment and anti-corruption.” (http://www.unglobalcompact.org/)
fostering treaties, NGOs have exerted a profound influence on today’s politics (Charnovitz, 2006). As a result of the increasing geographic range and sophistication of the NGO sector, they have a key role to play in global decision making from international security to human rights and environmental issues. Unlike IGOs, whose mandates are agreed and delineated by states, NGOs gain influence through the commitment of its volunteers to the NGO’s cause (Charnovitz, 2006). As a result, NGOs claim to have greater legitimacy than governments (Willets, 2002, p. 1). Sometimes NGOs and CBOs are referred to as the traditional third sector agencies (Giulianotti, 2011a). The UN and the developed world have been promoting a tripartite structure between governments, civil society and the private sector, the interaction of which will constitute future global governance. Often NGOs are perceived as being the main actors within global civil society (Lechner, 2009).

The term mainstream NGO refers to an NGO that concentrates on the pragmatic implementation of SDP projects. In general, it remains aloof from political practices, such as social injustice, and focuses, in contrast to the radical NGOs (cf. infra), on the implementation of SDP initiatives. This apolitical and neutral approach can be useful in many SDP projects to create confidence among the actors in peace building projects.

CBOs, which implement SDP projects in grassroots settings, and mainstream NGOs are associated with developmental interventionist social policies. It is the only domain within the field of SDP where the SDP organization itself carries out sport-related interventions. In general, mainstream NGOs and CBOs that use sport as a tool for intervention receive support from powerful external institutions. SDP mainstream NGOs and CBOs are distinguished by scale, power, methods, objectives and relations with their donors. Small organizations do not usually hold strong political and financial ties with their donors, but a number of large NGOs and CBOs do have a close relationship with their donors. For example, a link exists between Streetfootballworld – a worldwide network of organizations that use football as a means of empowering disadvantaged young people by engaging private and public partners to incite social change (http://www.streetfootballworld.org) - and FIFA - the international governing body of football (Kaldor, 2003). For SDP organizations it remains a tough balance to strike between maintaining autonomy, commitments to initial objectives and close relations with recipients on the one hand, and benefitting from financial support from large IGOs or TNCs in return for participation in policies of the SDP organization on the other.

The international community has progressively recognized the potential of sport for the
promotion of peace and development. This has caused the development cooperation sector to shift towards a more sport-related approach. However, Beacom (2007) remarks that sports organizations engaged in SDP projects are necessarily also pursuing their own agendas. These relate variously to internationalization of new sporting forms, enhancement of international competition, product development, enhanced international profiling and securing additional resources. Officials with extensive experience in the development context have insisted on a certain degree of caution in relation to SDP practices, such as the appointment of high-profile athletes as campaign ambassadors or collaboration with TNCs that are primarily interested in salvaging their reputation with the general public. Although settled at rapid pace within the NGO sector, the SDP movement still lacks the programmatic and methodological sophistication of the older development cooperation industry (Cornelissen, 2011). The reticence of the development cooperation sector is mainly based on the ethical consideration that basic needs should have priority over leisure and pleasure. Another reason for the significant alienation of sport by ‘developmentalists’, may be the long-established malaise by which sport is perceived to be male-dominated, exclusive and problematic because of its ties with large-scale popular culture. Many core development agencies, such as the IMF and the World Bank, as well as mainstream development agencies, have been ignoring the link between development and sport (Levermore, 2008b). Levermore (2008a) points out that the principal institutions promoting SDP are either derived from the sports sector (such as governing bodies/ federations and clubs) or NGOs that establish sports programs. Often development remains of secondary interest to setting up a sports infrastructure. In this respect, the UN has called for an intensification of the collaboration with core development agencies (United Nations, General Assembly, 2006).

2.2.3. National and intergovernmental organizations/strategic developmentalism

National and intergovernmental organizations integrated the SDP sector into the mainstream global development field. Strategic developmentalist policies are divided into three categories, namely national, international governmental organizations and international sport federation (IFs). Interactions between the different categories exist, an example of which could be the strategic collaboration between the UN and FIFA since 1999. Top-down management and universalizing knowledge on the SDP field, are the main characters of strategic developmentalism. National and intergovernmental organizations try to span the SDP movement and the wider global civil society, but it remains difficult to ascertain the extent to which their social policies are.
National, international governmental organizations and IFs tend to emulate strategic developmentalist policies within the SDP sector on two levels. Firstly, SDP agencies often share and pursue the universal targets formulated by IGOs, such as the MDGs (United Nations, Inter-Agency Task Force on SDP, 2003). Moreover, some national and intergovernmental organizations have proclaimed sport as a human right. Article 1 of the Charter of Physical Education and Sport adopted by UNESCO in 1978 states: “The practice of physical education and sport is a fundamental human right for all.” It emphasizes that everyone is entitled to participate in sport, including and especially women, young people, the elderly and the disabled. In addition to this, the IOC has also proclaimed sport as human right (IOC, Olympic Charter, 2011). Secondly, strategic developmentalism is used by national governmental and intergovernmental SDP initiatives to facilitate the establishment of institutional networks and the spread of knowledge. A number of conferences have served to provide continuity, and to advance advocacy and coordination of the SDP movement. For example, the first International Conference on Sport & Development in Magglingen in 2003 was organized by the Special Advisor to the UN Secretary-General on SDP (cf. supra), the Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation (SAD) and Federal Office of Sport Magglingen (Coalter, 2008). During this conference many IGOs, NGOs and governments signed the Magglingen declaration, expressing their commitment to SDP. Another example is the International Forum on Sport, Peace and Development. The first edition of this forum was held in May 2009 in the Olympic Museum in Lausanne with the aim of debating the contribution of sport to peace and development. Peacock (2011) describes this as ‘a typically lavish affair with global elites from the worlds of sport, business, politics and nobility’. A final example is the Peace and Sport annual forums, held since 2007, that provide a platform for stakeholders to meet and exchange ideas. Peace and Sport is a neutral organization based in Monaco under the auspices of Prince Albert II of Monaco.

2.2.4. New social movements and radical NGOs/social justice

The final category is something of a misfit since the social justice field is not entirely defined by formal institutions, but also comprises political activists, critical reporters and academics. In recent years, they have developed an increasingly loud voice in international politics and have become champions in using mass media to promote their cause. TNCs, IFs and government bodies are under increasing pressure to act in a ‘socially responsible’ way (Brownell, 2012). New social movements, such as the ‘Clean Clothes Campaign’, aim to improve working conditions in the global clothing manufacture industry, and radical NGOs
advocate social rights and even conduct campaigns against TNCs, IFs and government bodies. In this respect, one could recall how when the IOC announced that Beijing would be the host city of the 2008 Olympic Games, Amnesty International and Human Rights Watch campaigned against the PRC and the IOC (Pomfret, 2008, July 28). Radical NGOs keep on pressuring the IOC to establish human rights standards and benchmarks for bid cities (Brownell, 2012). Another example is the recent call of Human Rights Watch to the IOC to take appropriate steps against Saudi Arabia, which systematically discriminates against women in sports by imposing an “effective ban” on women competing at a national level (Clarey, 2012, February 15). These demands place the IOC uncomfortably between ‘universal human rights’ on the one hand, and ‘respect for multicultural integrity’ on the other. One can argue that Human Rights Watch and Amnesty International are ‘regular/mainstream’ NGOs, but Giulianotti (2011a) classifies them under the category of radical NGOs since they focus their efforts in the area of social justice. According to Giulianotti, the difference between mainstream NGOs and radical NGOs is that the former do not interfere with politics, whereas the latter do.

During the last decades, transnational endeavors towards social justice featured public protests at top meetings of the world’s political and economic elite. New social movements and radical NGOs oppose neoliberal globalization and can, therefore, be categorized as ‘anti-systemic’ (Wallerstein, 2003). These movements aim to sustain those who are hit hardest by the failure of TNCs, nation-states and IGOs to eliminate their negative effects on human value and social justices. Some of these movements have tackled the abuse of young athletes within developing nations, as well as the corruption and human rights violations within IFs (Marcano and Fidler, 2002). Notably, many new social movements and radical NGOs located in the SDP sector concentrate on issues relating to the developed world, such as protests against expensive bids by cities to host big sporting events, bribes, hooliganism, homophobia and racism (Lenskyj, 2008). Identifying connections between these movements and those that focus on issues relating to the Global South, remains something of a challenge.

Giulianotti (2011a) stresses these movements’ ability to reflect critically both on the role of sport in achieving specific social policy objectives and on sport’s social side-effects, such as exploitative and oppressive practices in factories of TNCs that produce sport’s material. He discerns two weaknesses of social justice agencies in the SDP sector: firstly, they lack effective internal integration and coordination; secondly, they remain weakly positioned within the widespread global civil society.
2.3. SDP and transnationalism

The term "transnational" refers to any transboundary relationship, in which at least one of the actors is not a government (Willetts, 2002, p.3). Its adoption acknowledged that international relations consist of more than simply intergovernmental relations. Formerly small-scale movements, like ecology and feminism, have transformed into transnational actors who still root themselves in civil society, but are now capable of mobilizing and influencing national governments and IGOs, such as the UN (MacAlloon, 1997). The concept of transnationalism serves as a theoretical framework which encompasses the transnational dimensions of the SDP effort and is also helpful to further elaborate on the idea of global civil society. This concept includes processes through which individuals and social groups become interconnected across different borders (Giulianotti, 2011c). Modern sports underwent a swift transnationalisation in the way of sharing cultures, religions and languages, as European workers and settlers introduced the rules and set up competitions among indigenous peoples (Giulianotti & Robertson, 2007b). Furthermore, the transnational dimension of sport has expanded enormously through intensified migration and advanced mediatization. Nowadays, it is reflected in the (financial) outcomes and political conflicts induced by large sporting events together with their organizing and controlling bodies (Giulianotti & Robertson, 2007b). Consider in this respect the transnational status of the Olympic Games. The IOC marketing report showed that an estimated potential TV audience of 4.3 billion viewers worldwide tuned in to some of the televised coverage of the 2008 Beijing Olympics (IOC, 2008). In financial terms, the Olympic Games are a major transnational industry, the worth of which was totaled by BOCOG at $3 billion (Pennay, 2009, June 16). In political terms, membership of the Olympic Movement is more representative of the world’s nation states than membership of the UN (Henri & Al-Tauqi, 2008). Olympism has a global reach with 204 National Olympic Committees (NOC) linked to the IOC. Except for South Sudan, all UN-members have NOCs, as do 12 other territories, giving the IOC more national members than the UN. Newly independent states attach great political importance to the recognition of their membership of the Olympic Movement. In social terms, the IOC has proclaimed sport as a human right (IOC, Olympic Charter, 2011) and as a tool for development and peace.
2.4. Global citizenship

Tiessen (2011) defines global citizenship ‘as a way of understanding the world in which an individual’s attitudes and behaviours reflect a compassion and concern for the marginalised and/or poor and for the relationship between poverty and wealth – within and between communities, countries and regions’. Alongside the term global citizenship, other terms are used such as global cosmopolitanism or cosmopolitan governance. An aspect of global cosmopolitanism is the growing solidarity among individuals in the world through the internationalization of social life (Carey, 2003). It is the result of a cognizance to the fact that the entire world has been discovered, and that time and space have become increasingly compressed (Robertson, 1992). Global sport encourages more than a cosmopolitan consciousness, and also fosters feelings of ethnic identity (Maguire, 1999). NGOs can be considered large contributors to the development of a cosmopolitan world system because of their transnational competence and their moral legitimacy. Transnational competence refers to a solid capability to operate in a global environment. This competence is expanded by international membership, encouraging the exchange of knowledge and expertise in policy areas where diplomats and politicians have difficulties operating (Coolsaet, 1998). The high level of attention given by the international community to the Olympic Movement is due to its display of a world of multicultural co-existence, which encourages cultural biases to fade, and to use the perspective of a world citizen to look for common ground despite differences (Hua, 2009).

Tiessen (2011) observes that SDP NGOs have employed a global citizenship discourse in their projects as a strategy for creating a positive NGO image. Most SDP agencies refer to inclusion, citizenship and universal language. Nevertheless, this global citizenship discourse is dominated by a charity-centred approach of the Global North rather than an approach characterized by solidarity, sympathy and knowledge exchange. For example, SDP initiatives tend to be portrayed as well-off white people playing sports with poor black children. In an attempt to provide similar opportunities to children of the developing world, real local needs and dreams are forgotten. SDP agencies are particularly interested in the adoption of the global citizenship discourse because of its widespread reach, including youngsters, who constitute a group which is particularly to reach. Hence, image creation comprises an analysis of ‘othering’, neocolonialism, paternalism and inequality in the discourse of SDP initiatives. Maguire (2006) notes that the global flow of talented African athletes and the holding of
global sporting events, did not necessarily develop more cosmopolitan feelings within and between societies, and sometimes even encourages decivilizing counter thrusts.
3. Methodology

Data was obtained during two separate visits to the IOC headquarter in Lausanne. This master’s thesis draws upon a combination of different qualitative techniques. Several interviews were conducted with (former) IOC and UN officials. IOC historical archives relevant to the SDP movement were consulted at the Olympic Study Centre. The historical archives comprised pieces of correspondence, reports and minutes of meetings in English, French and Spanish. Given the lack of scholarly work concerning SDP, a bottom-up approach was used and an inductive categorization of the data was provided.
4. ‘Sport for development and Peace’ (SDP)

4.1. Description

Recently, an increasing number of initiatives using sport as a means for development have been implemented in the Global South and received a lot of support and recognition from the international community (Brunelli and Parisi, 2011). In February 2012, there were 143 projects and 367 organizations listed on the International Platform on Sport and Development. Donnelly et al. (2011) argue that the analysis of the scope of SDP, must extend far beyond organizations enumerated on the International Platform, since it is dominated by European and North American, secular, corporate and English speaking initiatives.

The SDP movement is principally driven by the Global North and implemented in the Global South. Nation-states, NGOs and IGOs, IFs, TNCs and grassroots CBOs are the main actors within the SDP sector (Giulianotti, 2011a). Sport is not an alternative vehicle for development, it is merely a potential component of the development assistance process. Although Beacom and Levermore (2008) call the movement ‘sport-in-development’, the IOC refers to ‘development through sport’ and the International Platform uses the concept ‘Sport & Development’. This study will use the term Sport, Development and Peace (SDP), as used and defined by Giulianotti. Giulianotti (2011a) distinguishes SDP as a particular social policy ‘sector’. Firstly, the term encompasses many institutions and their work, for example the United Nations Office on Sport for Development and Peace. The UNOSDP is located in Geneva and is supported by a Liaison Office in New York. The Office provides assistance to the Special Adviser to the UN Secretary-General on SDP in his global undertaking to harness the power of sport for development and peace. The Office does not conduct any projects itself, but is mainly concerned with advocacy and support for governments. The sensitization of national governments and the UN community for sport as a means for the realization of the MDGs, is its primary responsibility (http://www.un.org/wcm/content/site/sport/home/unplayers/unoffice).

---

4 “The platform, created by the Swiss Academy of Development, is a website dedicated entirely to the movement of Sport & Development” and provides “a hub for sharing knowledge, building good practice, facilitating coordination and fostering partnerships between and within different stakeholders in SDP.” (http://www.sportanddev.org/en/about_this_platform/vision_mission_goals22/)
Secondly, the SDP agencies seek increased coordination, reflection and communication among the different stakeholders. Apart from the International Sport for Development and Peace Association (ISDPA), the International Platform is also dedicated to pooling knowledge within the SDP sector.

The SDP sector is not an entirely new phenomenon, as sport has long been viewed as a means for inciting social change. However, the recent boost in using sport as a tool for development is the specific result of the acknowledgment that the traditional vehicles of development, such as trade and investment, are insufficient to fulfill their goals (Beacom and Levermore, 2008). The orthodox vehicles were unsuccessful because they focused on economic aspects to the neglect of social aspects. Accordingly, a call for new strategies, methods and institutions/actors emerged. Another reason for the fast expansion of SDP programs was the acknowledgement that sport positively influenced the fight against the HIV/AIDS pandemic (Coalter, 2008). Koss and Alexandrova (2005) demonstrated that the rationale behind the use of sport in HIV prevention programs is based on claims that sport can offer an approachable platform to distribute information concerning health and HIV, and that it can facilitate the development of life skills that are necessary to translate knowledge, attitudes and behavioral intentions into actual behavior. The Mathare Youth Sport Association (MYSA) is a renowned organization in grassroots HIV prevention for vulnerable young people. Research on the effectiveness of the MYSA HIV/AIDS Prevention and Awareness Project registered some positive effects on condom use, but this is unlikely to result in a large reduction in the amount of HIV cases among the youth in the Mathare slum of Nairobi (Delva et al, 2010). More research needs to be carried out to fully understand the effects of sport on reducing the number of HIV cases.

The UN served to legitimize the SDP sector across global civil society, encouraging participation by mainstream NGOs, CBOs and TNCs (Giulianotti, 2011a). In 2001, the first Special Adviser to the UN Secretary-General on Sport for Development and Peace was appointed. On Ogi’s advice, the UN Secretary-General authorized an inter-agency task force to report on the achievements in the SDP context (Kidd, 2011). This report led to a greater UN involvement in the expanding SDP movement. Annually since 2003 and bi-annually since

---

5 “The International Sport for Development and Peace Association is a professional organisation dedicated to advancing knowledge and enhancing practice within the field of SDP.” (http://isdpaonline.ning.com/)
In 2004, the Sport for Development and Peace International Working Group (SDP IWG) was established with the aim of promoting the integration of SDP policy recommendations into the national and international assistance strategies of national governments. A milestone in SDP was the proclamation of 2005 as the “International Year of Sport and Physical Education (United Nations, IYSPE, 2005). The General Assembly invited governments to take appropriate steps and to look for the assistance of sports personalities in this regard (United Nations, General Assembly, 2003). In 2008, the General Assembly asked the Secretary-General to present an action plan, a three-year road map which would formulate SDP policies, implement programs and projects by both Member States and the UN system (United Nations, UN Secretary-General, 2010). The objective was to encourage the UN and its partners to move from awareness to greater implementation and action. In the same year, the integration of the Secretariat of the Sport for Development and Peace International Working Group (SDP IWG) into the Office on Sport for Development and Peace (UNOSDP), under the leadership of the Special Adviser was accomplished (United Nations, General Assembly, 2008). The timeline in figure 1.1. highlights the key SDP milestones from the post-World War II period to the present. Due to the adoption of the MDGs by the UN General Assembly in 2000, SDP gained greater recognition from the international community.

Yet, much more needs to be done to maximize the capacity of SDP, and to bring about its effective integration with other forms of development (Kidd, 2011). The contribution of various actors is necessary in this respect. The commitment and actions of governments remain crucial, since they are key players in mainstreaming sport into development policies. The UN Action Plan on Sport for Development and Peace underscores that the responsibility for the achievement of the MDGs and maintaining peace rests first and foremost with Member States themselves (United Nations, report of the Secretary-General, 2006). So far, however, few national governments have adopted the role of sport in development and peace in their national legislation and policies. At a time of uncertainty, with financial markets beset by increasing risks and comprehensive public programs coming under continuous neo-liberal attacks, the race for obtaining public funding will remain difficult (Kidd, 2011). The UN is mainly involved in providing coordination and expertise, whilst the sports sector is also
involved through its global network and sport-specific knowledge. Finally, the contribution of NGOs and civil society at large should not be underestimated, given their ability to reach communities all over the world (Rogge keynote speech 2nd International Forum on SDP).

Figure 2. Sport for Development and Peace Timeline (SDP IWG, 2008)
4.2. Historical context

Giulianotti (2011a) discerns three particular stages in the context of sport and global society. In the first stage, ‘Sport, Colonization and Civilization’, sport played a considerable role in civilizing the indigenous non-European communities. This period converges with the European colonization from the late eighteenth to the mid-twentieth century. The next historical phase, ‘Sport, Nationalism, Post-Colonialism and Development’, took place between the Second World War and the 1990s. Colonized communities used sport as a tool to resist the occupier. After independence, many of its new elite groups joined the global governance bodies of sports, which embodied the development of sport (cf. infra). The third stage, ‘Sport, Development and Peace’, ensued after the implosion of the Soviet Union and is still going on today. However, the colonial, postcolonial, and development of sport subjects have remained on the background, the sport for development movement is now the central theme/axis. Giulianotti (2011a) argues that this phase can be subdivided into two main periods. The first period is featured in the expansive rise of short-term SDP initiatives in the aftermath of the Cold War and the dedication of the UN to sport. The second period was marked by greater attention in the SDP sector to sustainability, international coordination and monitoring, and evaluation in comparison with the first period. It is also characterized by the claim of the SDP IWG that sport has the capacity to assist in the realization of all MDGs. Table 1 illustrates the main contributions of sport to achieving the MDGs. Although sport in particular cannot compel mankind to achieve the MDGs, it can make valuable contributions because of its comprehensive approach to addressing the MDGs. The urgent call to meet the MDGs encouraged governments in developing countries to integrate SDP into their national development frameworks and strategies, and persuaded governments in developed countries to integrate sport into their global development assistance strategies (SDP IWG, 2008).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>THE MILLENNIUM DEVELOPMENT GOALS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. Eradicate extreme poverty and hunger | - Reduce by half the proportion of people living on less than a dollar a day  
- Achieve full and productive employment and decent work for all, including women and young people  
- Reduce by half the proportion of people who suffer from hunger |
| 2. Achieve universal primary education | - Ensure that all boys and girls complete a full course of primary schooling |
| 3. Promote gender equality and empower women | - Eliminate gender disparity in primary and secondary education preferably by 2005, and at all levels by 2015 |
| 4. Reduce child mortality | - Reduce by two thirds the mortality rate among children under five years of age |
| 5. Improve maternal health | - Reduce by three quarters the maternal mortality ratio  
- Achieve, by 2015, universal access to reproductive health |
| 6. Combat HIV and AIDS, malaria, and other diseases | - Halt and begin to reverse the spread of HIV and AIDS  
- Achieve, by 2010, universal access to treatment for HIV and AIDS for all those who need it  
- Halt and begin to reverse the incidence of malaria and other major diseases |
| 7. Ensure environmental sustainability | - Integrate the principles of sustainable development into country policies and programs; reverse loss of environmental resources  
- Reduce biodiversity loss, achieving, by 2010, a significant reduction in the rate of loss  
- Reduce by half the proportion of people without sustainable access to safe drinking water  
- Achieve significant improvement in the lives of at least 100 million slum dwellers by 2020 |
| 8. Develop a global partnership for development | - Develop further an open, trading and financial system that is rule-based, predictable and non-discriminatory, and includes a commitment to good governance, development, and poverty reduction — nationally and internationally  
- Address the least developed countries’ special needs. This includes tariff and quota-free access for their exports; enhanced debt relief for heavily indebted poor countries; cancellation of official bilateral debt; and more generous official development assistance for countries committed to poverty reduction  
- Address the special needs of landlocked and small island developing States  
- Deal comprehensively with developing countries’ debt problems through national and international measures to make debt sustainable in the long term  
- In cooperation with the developing countries, develop decent and productive work for youth  
- In cooperation with pharmaceutical companies, provide access to affordable essential drugs in developing countries  
- In cooperation with the private sector, make available the benefits of new technologies — especially information communications technologies |

Table 1. Contribution of sport to the MDGs (SDP IWG, 2008)
4.3 Development of sport versus sport for development

In recent times, the distinction between development of sport and sport for development sport has been widely discussed by academics. Development of sport refers to an activity designed to enhance participation and performance in sport as an end in itself, whereas sport for development\(^6\) refers to an activity designed to use sport as a vehicle to achieve a range of other social, economic and political objectives. Even though there are major differences between these aspects of ‘sport’ and ‘development’, they sometimes overlap. Sport development initiatives aimed at the development of sport performance may simultaneously contribute to overall development goals through sport. As illustrated in Figure 1, activities designed as sport for development may also conduce to the democratization and improvement of sport governance (Beacom, 2007).

Figure 3. Integrating development through and development of sport (Beacom, 2007, p.84)

The UN states that the purpose of UN programs involving sport is not the introduction of new sporting champions and the development of sport, but rather the use of sport in extensive development and peacemaking initiatives. They admit that such activities may lead to the development of sport, although the main aim is to contribute to broader development goals through sport-related projects (Unites Nations, Inter-Agency Task Force on SDP, 2003). The

\(^6\) Recently, the term development through sport has been replaced by sport for development, which is now much more commonly used (Levermore, 2011).
Second Plenary Session of SDP IWG emphasized that there is an ongoing focus on elite sports, rather than on sport-for-all (United Nations, UN-NGLS, 2011). A shift is needed to provide the opportunity for all groups to participate, particularly those with special needs, like women, children and the disabled.

Coalter (2007) distinguishes between two different rationales for engagement with the SDP sector: sport plus initiatives where sport is the core objective and development is a secondary priority (sport plus education, sport plus peace-building), and plus sport where development is the core objective. This allows all SDP agencies to be measured on a bipolar scale which stresses either the sport or the development aspect of their programs (Engelhardt, 2010). In both cases, sport serves as a segment of a planned strategy to achieve positive developmental outcomes (Coakley cited in Schinke and Hanrahan, 2009). Ingrid Beutler (personal communication, April 20, 2012) stresses the need for quality sports programs to be in place before a SDP agency is able to introduce the development perspective. Only a few NGOs that use games (e.g. Right To Play) focus more on the development aspect than they do on the sport. Meulders (2010) points to a difference between organizations who consider sports programs as their core business, called Non-Governmental Sport’s Organizations (NGSO), and more traditional development actors who consider sport an effective tool, but not a priority. He further stated that the IOC, IFs and professional sports teams form a separate category of SDP actors. The participation and contribution of these key institutions of the international sports landscape in SDP is mainly driven by self-interest (Horne & Whannel, 2012). As will be discussed further on, important questions remain about their social responsibility. Although these organizations profile themselves as a-political, it is worrying that they escape any form of accountability (Meulders, 2010)
4.4. Research gap

Research on the recognition of sport as a potential proponent of development is still in its infancy. Giulianotti (2011b) notes the existence of a research gap due to many single case-studies and calls for a comprehensive approach that situates the SDP effort within its transnational context. By examining the role of sport in peacemaking and conflict resolution, he contributed to tackling the existing research hiatus pointed out by the International Platform. Nevertheless, more published, peer-reviewed literature on sport and peace is required.

Coalter (2007) suggests two possible reasons for the lack of a ‘strong cumulative body of research evidence’: firstly, the high costs associated with academic research in SDP. Conducting large-scale research in several developing countries over many years and involving different SDP agencies is very expensive. Since grants to study SDP are almost nonexistent, academics necessarily compete for the limited resources available. Secondly, there is an uncritical belief in the efficacy of sport as a panacea to cure all ills to the extent that many feel evaluation is unnecessary (Coalter, 2007). Over time, local leaders have claimed unquestioned and unexamined beliefs in sport as a means for social change and development, and supported personal testimonials of athletes who idealize sport and sport experiences. These widespread beliefs and testimonials dominate the narrative in many cultures, making it challenging to obtain support for critical research (Schinke & Hanrahan, 2009). Moreover, the SDP sector is overshadowed by a vested interest not to publish studies showing that the influence of sport on development and peace is limited (B. Meulders, personal communication, 2012, April 2).

The International Platform indicates that the participation of people with disabilities in SDP projects remains unexplored and that longitudinal studies are needed to prove the long-term benefits. More in-depth investigation is also required into the contribution of sport towards reproductive and sexual health, as well as on the role of sport in combating stigma and discrimination, particularly in relation to HIV/AIDS (International Platform on sport and development, n.d.). An SDP program aimed at combating HIV/AIDS should be able to set up baseline and subsequent measures. Baseline measures are essential to determining the incidence of HIV/AIDS before the project commences, and subsequent measures determine the effects of the program at certain intervals (Donnelly et al., 2011). Since it is improbable that the SDP program is the only intervention in the area, it is difficult to claim that the SDP program has had a positive effect on reducing HIV/AIDS in that area. Often different
programs are carried out at the same time, which makes it impossible to determine the precise effect of the SDP program.

In addition to the research gap concerning SDP, sport has been an under-explored domain of research in general for mainstream social scientists and global studies specialists (Giulianotti & Robertson, 2007a). A possible reason could be the emergence of ‘sport studies’ as a distinct and comprehensive discipline, within which globalization has been included in research and discussions since the mid-1990s. Conversely, communication between sport specialists and social scientist has been limited. Important absentees in the SDP literature are political scientists, since many of them categorically place sport in the realm of the ludic, or leisure, or idealistic, or strictly commercial domains of life (Bruyninckx, 2010; MacAlloon, 1997). Sociologists are showing a growing interest in this field of inquiry, and, accordingly, their publications concerning SDP are on the increase.
4.5. Key challenges of SDP projects

Giulianotti (2011c) identified three general types of weaknesses within SDP projects. First of all, technical weaknesses may occur during project effectuation. A concern with the recent increase of SDP initiatives is the sustainability of these programs and projects (Boyle, 2010). Boyle (2010) defines sustainability as, ‘the ability of a program to survive, or for changes to remain once the initial catalyst (in this case the SDP initiative) is removed.’ Up to this day, there has been no large-scale evaluation of the sustainability of SDP organizations. Sustainability needs to be ensured by the state, since SDP programs encompass educational and health aspects, which are usually conducted under the auspices of the state. Boyle has developed a sustainability rubric which consists of three evaluative levels assessing seven criteria (evaluation, funding, goals, social integration, volunteers, volunteers preparation, and exit strategies). She conducted a pilot study to test this sustainability rubric and to determine its abilities to assess a group of SDP agencies, randomly selected from the International Platform. Boyle (2010) demonstrated that many SDP agencies do not live up their claim of sustainability. Coalter (2009) defined two criteria, a fluid monitoring & evaluation (M&E) process and an outsider exit strategy, essential for a long-term sustainable SDP project. The first criteria includes a dynamic M&E process which is able to adapt to changing circumstances. It needs to move away from accountability and to focus more on sustainability by ceasing to pander to donors. A combination of qualitative and quantitative approaches to M&E is increasingly recognized as having the potential to obtain a broader set of outcomes, and as the provider of a more complete picture of the effects of the intervention (International Platform on sport and development, n.d.). However, methodological problems arise, as it is difficult to determine outcomes such as ‘empowerment’ and ‘social cohesion’ and define how they are to be measured in a research study. Therefore, donors should pay attention not only to quantifiable outcomes, but also to processes that are taking place. The second criteria involves an exit strategy for any form of interference from the developed world. Currently, too many SDP programs are characterized by excessive dependency and full reliance on Northern donors. Subsequent cessation of programs after the loss of external funding could be counteracted by implementing a strategic funding plan that minimizes external financial support and maximizes local financial input. This would heighten the sense of ownership and credibility of SDP programs.
Secondly, **intersubjective or practical shortcomings** refer to poor communication between donors and recipients. Sometimes, service providers are not familiar with the local conditions and customs, or they are isolated and have little involvement with client groups and other development programs that are not related to sport. Furthermore, relationships with peers in similar agencies are characterized by fragmentation, in terms of dialogue, knowledge transfer and complementary partnership. NGOs competing for legitimacy, funds and participants results in an organizational disunity which is extremely divisive and counter-productive for the developing world (Kidd, 2011).

In terms of gender, a difficult balance exists between the transnational development objectives of gender equality and full female participation, and respect for local cultural values (Giulianotti, 2011c). Many gender-based interventions resulted from assumptions, made by service providers from the developed and more gender-equitable nations that female empowerment through sport is good, and that all women desire to be treated more equally (Donnelly et al, 2011). This might be seen as neocolonialist if programs are launched without community consultation or attention to the current status of gender relations. In some nations it is essential to keep sports away from the public to provide a safe environment for girls and women to do sports. Another vital aspect is that gender is about relationships between sexes, and that, therefore, female empowerment through sport that endeavors to change women without also attempting to change men, is likely to fail. MYSA is one of the providers of good SDP programs which include both sexes in the process (Donnelly et al., 2011).

Thirdly, **political or critical weaknesses** emphasize how SDP initiatives reflect imperialistic and neocolonial relationships between Global North and South. The methodology preferred in the execution of these initiatives is defined as an attempt to help the Third World ‘catch up,’ as it were, to western standards (Peacock, 2006). Often SDP projects have been introduced to communities without any form of consultation, reinscribing a patronizing principle reminiscent of colonialism (Donnelly et al., 2011). The Accra Call for Action on SDP (SDP IWG, 2007) indicated that SDP initiatives can aggravate North-South inequalities through the predominant use of Northern sports rather than indigenous sports. For example, FIFA only uses football in its SDP programs. In a country such as South Africa, where football is largely a black sport and rugby is mostly performed by white men, football can aggravate social tensions rather than alleviating them. Moreover, the majority of SDP initiatives is implemented in urban areas, since they are perceived as important centers where development will take place more easily and ‘trickle down’ to rural areas. Many children in urban slums...
have multiple encounters with different SDP agencies, while there is no sign of NGOs in rural areas. The ongoing SDP initiatives are largely driven by neoliberal perspectives on development and ignore Southern alternative approaches. In addition to this, the SDP IWG called for a complete integration of all disadvantaged social groups, both urban and rural, as well as for the use of traditional and non-traditional sports in SDP initiatives (Levermore, 2010).
5. The collaboration between the IOC and the UN

5.1. Historical perspectives

In 1915 Coubertin set up the IOC, which he called the “little older brother”, in Lausanne to be closer to its “big younger sister” or the League of Nations in Geneva (Chappelet, 1997). He believed there was a unique relationship between these two organizations. A declaration of 1926 in which the League outlines its position towards sport in its international relations reads as follows: “La développement du sport a de plus en plus eu pour effet d’attirer la jeunesse de tous les pays dans une collaboration internationale. La Société des Nations reconnaît que ce mouvement international renferme des possibilités de la plus grande valeur pour le développement de la bonne entente entre les nations. La Société des Nations désire contribuer au développement de ce mouvement et empêcher que certaines influences et tendances en diminuent l’importance internationale.” However, a note by Secretary-General Drummond reveals that he was not at all in favor of a resolution concerning the League’s attitude to sport (E. Drummond, personal communication, 1927, 28 June). He wondered if it would be worthwhile for the League to pass a resolution on this subject if it did not call for action by governments.

Coubertin, who was also a member of the Greek delegation to the League, maintained good relations with the first President of the League of Nations, the Belgian Paul Hymans (Peacock, 2010), and promoted the same values of universalism as the precursor to the UN. As early as 1920, he wrote to Paul Hymans about the importance of the Olympic idea in fostering peace (P. Coubertin, personal communication, 1920, November 15). Coubertin was aware that there was no way forward without the support of political powers. Moreover, Lord Killanin, president of the IOC from 1972 until 1980, kept in very close touch with Kurt Waldheim, UN Secretary-General at that time (Lord Killanin, personal communication, 1982, March 5). However, Killanin wrote in a personal letter to Samaranch, the next president of the IOC, that he was rather skeptical about the UN as a body. Samaranch answered “I shall of course proceed carefully with the UN. If we can succeed with this resolution, it will be of the great assistance to the IOC, NOCs and IFs. At that time, Samaranch first attempt comprised an attempt to obtain a resolution by the General Assembly for the protection of the Olympic Games (IOC, Department of International Cooperation, 2002). A lot of correspondence took place between Samaranch and the UN Secretary-General, Javier Pérez de Cuellar, and the IOC set up an IOC Committee. However, the resolution was not adopted and the Committee
was dismantled. Nevertheless, Samaranch did not give up and continued to promote the Olympic Movement across the world.

As early as 1922, a first milestone was reached with the establishment of an institutional cooperation between the ILO and IOC in the mutual signing of a Memorandum of Understanding (IOC, 2010). The ILO was interested in the question of utilizing workers’ leisure, which had become more important with the reduction in hours of labor. In a letter to the Secretary-General of the French Olympic Committee, M. Frantz-Reichel, he asked the Director of ILO if sport could not be subsumed in the program of the League of Nations (M. Frantz-Reichel, personal communication, 1929, 19 March). His letter expressed the belief that “le rôle du sport dans l’ordre social tend à prendre une place prépondérante, puisque les industriels, les commerçants, les grandes compagnies n’hésitent pas à favoriser et à provoquer, même parmi leur personnel, l’organisation de groupements d’éducation physique et sportive. Les organisations ouvrières ont créé elles-mêmes des groupements particuliers, dont l’ampleur pour ne pas atteindre celle des associations sans tendance, n’en est pas moins significative”. This was the beginning of a series of partnerships between the IOC and UN system partners. In 1991, the UN Security Council established a Sanctions Committee against Yugoslavia, which was to prevent its athletes from taking part in the 1992 Barcelona Olympics (IOC, Department of International Cooperation, 2002). In 1992, the UN Security Council adopted a resolution in which sport was acknowledged as a component of the imposed sanctions. After negotiations between the IOC and the UN, the Security Council approved the IOC’s call to allow Yugoslavia’s athletes to take part as individuals (IOC, Department of International Cooperation, 2002). In 1994, the IOC was assisted by UNHCR in facilitating the evacuation of the NOCs leaders and athletes from Sarajevo so that they could participate at the Lillehammer Olympics (Beacom, 2000). Subsequently, prior to each edition of the Summer and Winter Olympic Games, a resolution has been adopted, entitled “Building a peaceful and better world through sport and the Olympic ideal”. From then on the UN General Assembly urges Member States to observe the Olympic Truce or cessation of all hostilities around the world throughout the duration of the Olympic Games. It is a reminder that the Games have always been a platform to support the pacifist cause. As a symbolic gesture, the UN flag has been flown at all competition sites of the Olympic Games since the 1998 Nagano Olympic Winter Games. The General Assembly has affirmed its belief that international sporting contacts based on the Olympic principles can play a positive role in promoting peace and in the development of friendly relations among nations. The General
Assembly named the year 1994 the “International Year of Sport and the Olympic Ideal”, following a UN General Assembly Resolution (48/10) adopted in 1993 which acknowledged the role of the Olympic Movement as building a peaceful and better world by educating the youth of the world through sport and culture (United Nations, General Assembly, 1993). In 1996, the IOC and the World Bank decided to unite their efforts and to cooperate in development projects throughout the world by signing a cooperation agreement (IOC, Department of International Cooperation, 1999). The WB also supports the Olympafrica development project through its West Africa office. This project aims to create sports infrastructure in a way which involves the contribution of the local authorities and communities in rural areas of big cities in Africa, as well as collaboration of the Olympic Movement, IGOs, NGOs and the private sector. Moreover, it is a member of the International Olympic Forum for Development (IOFD), a new body established by the IOC in 1996 aimed at strengthening collaboration and coordination between sports organizations and nations which provide technical assistance in the field of sport at an international level.

The UN General Assembly sealed this longstanding partnership by granting the IOC Observer Status on 19 October 2009. According to current IOC President Jacques Rogge “This is a huge recognition of the role sport can play in contributing to a better and more peaceful world. The Olympic values clearly match the UN’s philosophy. The decision further strengthens the partnership between the IOC and the UN system. The IOC already works with a wide array of UN specialised agencies and organisations around the world to benefit young people and communities.”(IOC press release, 2009). The observer status provides the IOC with the opportunity to increase its political and sports network, and to defend its interests worldwide (IOC, 2010). It has strengthened the level of partnership between sports organizations around the world as a whole, and has brought the political leadership of nations to a position where more resources are provided for sport by governments and by sport in order to deliver on development commitments (IOC, 2010). Permanent observers have permission to address the UN General Assembly without prior invitation and to sponsor draft resolutions, but they cannot vote on substantial matters (Peacock, 2011). So far, it is the only fully NGO to have obtained such a status apart from the ICRC, whose Geneva Conventions make up international humanitarian law.

At the time, some IOC members supported this, but many were opposed to an advisory status within the UN, feeling that the IOC had little to gain from collaboration with the UN. He Zhenliang, Honorary President of the Chinese Olympic Committee, stated that “the IOC felt
that it certainly had to maintain good relations with the UN but that it should pursue its own policy of autonomy from governmental institutions.” (Zhenliang, 2009, p.33). Verbruggen, former IOC member, was also against this observer status (H. Verbruggen, communication, 2012, May 9). He argued that by simply becoming a part of a political structure, the IOC gives up a part of its room for maneuver. In his view, the collaboration between the IOC and the UN is a necessary one, but forming part of the UN is just a step too far. Still the decision of Rogge to accept this status is understandable since it is underpinned by path dependency. He could not go back on decisions made by his predecessors and Committee members. Christoph De Kepper (personal communication, 2011, October 24), IOC director General, underscored that the status is only a symbolic gesture. The autonomy of sport is of the utmost importance for the IOC. The IOC is not a political organization nor does it defend political interests, even though it is influenced by politics. However, the observer status does give the IOC the opportunity to defend its interests and strengthen its future. Tommy Sitholé (personal communication, 2012, May, 3) agrees and notes that this observer status enhances the seriousness of the two organizations as well as their collaboration.

The IOC adopted the MDGs and collaborated with a wide array of UN specialised agencies and organisations in the fields of youth, gender equality, education, health, environmental sustainability and the combating of HIV/AIDS. For example, the IOC and UNAIDS have published the first Toolkit for HIV & AIDS prevention through sport (IOC, 2010). For the time being, fifteen UN system organizations have established agreements with the IOC. In May 2010 the first UN-IOC forum, entitled “The importance of Partnerships”, was held in Lausanne and was co-organized by the IOC and the UNOSDP. It consolidated the IOC’s commitment to the development aspects of the Olympics, and to Olympism in general. It resulted in the publication of 19 recommendations “on how to maximize the impact of various activities in the field of development through sport” (IOC, 2010). One year later, a follow-up meeting took place at the UN headquarters in Geneva. The forum is intended to become a recurring event in order to sustain the collaboration between the UN and the IOC.
5.2. The IOC: a powerful NGO in the SDP field

5.2.1. An atypical NGO

The IOC represents only a part of the larger Olympic Movement. The Olympic Movement consists of the International Olympic Committee (IOC), International Federations (IFs), National Olympic Committees (NOCs), Organizing Committees for the Olympic Games (OCOGs), national associations and sports clubs, sporting officials, coaches and administrators, and athletes (IOC, Olympic Charter, 2011). NOCs and national associations are usually non-governmental associations. The IOC governs the Olympic Movement, owns the rights to the Olympics and is the supreme authority of the Olympic Movement (IOC, Olympic Charter, 2011). The IOC defines itself as an international non-governmental not-for-profit organization (IOC, Olympic Charter, 2011). Nevertheless, it is very different from traditional international NGOs such as SOS Children’s Villages and Greenpeace. Although there is no generally accepted definition of an NGO, Willets (2002) identifies three key features: value-driven, independent from governmental control and non-profit-making. Bruyninckx (2010) asserts that the IOC is a value-driven organization, since it is established around the fundamental principles of Olympism written down in the Olympic Charter. “The goal of Olympism is to place sport at the service of the harmonious development of humankind, with a view to promoting a peaceful society concerned with the preservation of human dignity” (IOC, Olympic Charter, 2011). The IOC conforms to the second characteristic since the Olympic Charter allows the IOC to assert independence from political and governmental control (IOC, Olympic Charter, 2011). The third characteristic is somewhat more sensitive. Although the IOC identifies itself as a not-for-profit organization, the committee entered the global market to sell its symbols to the highest bidder and the Olympic Charter explicitly refers to economic and financial affairs. “All rights to any and all Olympic properties, as well as all rights to the use thereof, belong exclusively to the IOC, including but not limited to the use for any profit-making, commercial or advertising purposes. The IOC may license all or part of its rights on terms and conditions set forth by the IOC Executive Board” (IOC, Olympic Charter, 2011). Peacock (2011) indicates that the IOC is a not-for-profit organization since the profits do not come into the possession of investors or shareholders, but instead go towards the maintenance of the Olympic Movement. Even in the past, the massive profits gained have already caused major problems. While the Olympic Games grew and higher profits were made, its organizational structure did not keep up with
the pace of change. After the big bribery scandal of the Salt Lake City Olympic Bid Committee in 1998, the IOC decided to implement fundamental structural changes to increase its accountability and financial transparency in order to ensure that these types of problems should never occur again (Mallon, 2000). The IOC made its financial revenues and expenses public, conducted audits, and even made efforts to have the IOC designated by the OECD as a public international organization. When the OECD refused, the IOC adopted the authorized international accounting practices for MNOs to restore its credibility (Peacock, 2011).

If this was not convincing enough, membership, rights and privileges, and its powerful position also differ from traditional NGOs (Bruyninckx, 2010, p.107). In comparison with traditional NGOs, the IOC’s membership is exclusive and undemocratic. As opposed to other organizations, it consists of a maximum of 115 self-selected ‘natural persons’ (IOC, Olympic Charter, 2011). Members of the IOC are representatives of the Olympic Movement in their respective countries. They are not delegates to the IOC (IOC, Olympic Chapter, 2011). Although membership is independent of any specific nations-state (Maguire et al., 2002), representatives from powerful states are likely to have more influence than others within the Committee. Most of its members are elite figures who hold great sway within the global sports world. However, an increasingly loud voice is calling for the Olympic Games to be determined by a democratically elected global sport meeting (Zhenliang, 2009). After all, what is the legal basis for the fact that all sport games related issues should be determined by the IOC?

Peacock (2010) points out that the IOC, with its very public-oriented mandate and quasi-governmental form, enjoys many of the rights and privileges traditionally reserved for IGOs. The IOC is the only NGO to have obtained an observer status at the UN General Assembly so far. This provides the IOC with opportunities to defend its interests on a global scale (cf. infra). The IOC also enjoys a certain amount of extraterritoriality, which exempts entities operating in a foreign country from the jurisdiction of the host country. During the period of the Games, the host city will not be considered part of the host nation but serves as an extraterritorial zone, or as to a certain extent belonging to Olympia, where the IOC can impose rules in the same way as a state would do. For example, in 2008, the IOC demanded that the sovereign Chinese government should allow the Taiwanese delegation to enter the PRC under credentials not recognized by the Chinese government. Moreover, the IOC perceives itself as an a-political and neutral organization that will not take a position on political, social and economic matters in both the host country and between participating
countries (Bruyninckx, 2010, p.125). Another privilege of the IOC is its legal status. Ettinger (1992) stated in this respect that “the IOC cannot compel governmental compliance, however, the Olympic Charter exemplifies current international practice and has the effect of customary international law. Therefore, the authoritative force of the rules and regulations of the Olympic Charter are recognized by state and international law.”. It has been widely acknowledged that the IOC has an international personality and the Olympic Charter has been recognized as customary international law (Peacock, 2010). The Committee even played a predominant role in defining a broader framework for international sporting law. The Court of Arbitration for Sport (CAS), established in 1984 by the IOC and reformed in 1994 to make it definitively independent of the IOC, is a private international arbitral institution that is subject to Swiss law (http://www.tas-cas.org/history). One of the main reasons for its foundation was to provide a relatively simple, inexpensive and rapid procedure for solving international sports disputes. Although the CAS is able to settle international sports disputes, it does not mean that national courts have lost their jurisdiction. A dispute can only be submitted to the CAS if there is an arbitration agreement between the parties which dedicates resources to the CAS. Since the CAS consists of sport law experts, who are expected to give better judgment than ordinary lawyers, there are many instances of national courts deferring to the CAS on sports-related matters (Reeb, 2006). By hosting the First World Conference on Doping in Sport in Lausanne in 1999, the IOC encouraged the establishment of a public-private international legal body to intensify the fight against doping in sport. The World Anti-Doping Agency (WADA), another rule-generating body of the Olympic Movement, was established in the same year (Peacock, 2010).

A final difference pointed out in this respect is the powerful position of the IOC in international politics in contrast to the position of other NGOs. Rosenau & Wang (2001) elucidated that the Committee can sometimes act and “be treated by other political actors as a world government unto itself”. The Committee’s laws and norms, written down in the Olympic Charter, are heeded more than those of other such organizations (Peacock, 2010). The aforementioned rights and privileges of the IOC treated in this section all contribute to the IOC’s autonomy and power in world politics.

5.2.2. An underestimated power in world politics

“World politics is no more just about power and states; it also involves non-state actors, specialized in different issues, such as the IOC. Each one of these actors act as a separate group and operate and lobby on world level on behalf of their members, in the name of the
ideal or interests they represent. The case of the IOC proves that when an organisation is structurally able to fit in the arena of world politics, when it can adapt to the changing international environment and when it strongly supports and promotes the ideals it represents, it may acquire its own position not only in the agenda of world interdependent politics but also, and maybe most importantly, in the hearts and minds of people.” (Chatzigianni, 2006, p.99-100).

Since it is impossible to speak about power without taking social interaction into account, it is important to clarify the existing relationships between the IOC and other actors such as the 204 NOCs, 35 IFs, 4 OCOGs and the many NGOs and IGOs (Bruyninckx, 2010). Moreover, the IOC has power in certain problem areas. Its power is nearly always bound to its power to award the Olympic Games, but often goes beyond sports and has a wider reach into the economic, environmental and security field. Bruyninckx (2010, p.109) uses the three dimensions of power identified by Steven Lukes and applies them to the IOC. The first is the capacity to influence decision making. Organizing the Olympics has a major impact on decision making in the host city and host country. During the selection process which determines the allocation of the Olympics, the IOC expects the candidate host cities to take measures in terms of positive lasting legacies. This does not only include sports infrastructure, but also encompasses social development. The decision making process is largely dependent on the local interpretation of the general rules and expectations of the IOC. At any time, the Committee maintains control over the organization of the Games so as to ensure that it is proceeding as is expected by the IOC. Hein Verbruggen (personal communication, 2012, May 9) remarks that this no mean feat for the IOC. The choice of a new host city is extremely important for the IOC and contains a number of risks. Since the last decade, the IOC’s choice is largely underpinned by the promised legacies of the games and by the vision of the candidate host city on the societal role of the games. The host city contract, therefore, contains a whole host of issues that are relevant for the IOC. But once the host city is chosen there is no way back for the IOC and the host city has the overall responsibility for the execution of the host city contract. In case of non-compliance with the host city contract, a binding agreement between the NOC of the host country and the host city, the IOC can withdraw the organization of the Games from the host city, the OCOG and

---

7 Legacy’ in Olympic vernacular refers to the ability of sports mega-events to deliver sustainable and egalitarian social and economic changes to the host city, region and/or country (Darnell, 2010).
the NOC (IOC, Olympic Charter, 2011). However, this punishment has never been imposed because it would also reflect badly on the reputation of the IOC.

**Determining the political agenda** is the second dimension of power. The IOC attempts to put items on the political agenda and prevents certain delicate affairs from getting put on the agenda. The IOC can put pressure on the decision making agendas of states and other actors by sanctioning them or even excluding them from participation in the Olympics. If the IOC estimates that an NOC is not working independently, but instead is exorbitantly interfered in by national government, the NOC risks expulsion from the Olympic Games and Movement (Peacock, 2010, p.48). The most important item the IOC put on the sports as well as on the non-sports agenda is the fight against doping in sport (Bruyninckx, 2010).

The last dimension, **ideological power**, refers to the way in which the IOC influences other actors in determining their perceptions and preferences according to the IOC’s agenda. It is difficult to imagine another platform than the Olympic Games that organizes sports competitions on a global scale. It is generally accepted that the IOC is the most powerful body within the sports movement although it only serves as a representative of the Olympic sports. Its ideological power is expressed in various ways such as changing host cities and admission requirements based on nationality rather than on athletic performance. While the Olympics could be hosted at a fixed location which is cheaper and more favorable in environmental terms, the system of changing host cities is considered normal. Logically, every four years the Games take place in another city. Since this is such an ingrained concept, it is difficult to change the IOC’s hegemony. The next example illustrates international co-operation for the recognition and respect of the IOC's power to make decisions concerning the Olympics. In 1987, the Supreme Court of the US prohibited the use of the word “Olympic” when the San Francisco Arts and Athletics organization tried to stage the “Gay Olympic Games” (Ettinger, 1992). The US Supreme Court decided that the USOC owned the exclusive rights to the word “Olympic” in the US, which exemplifies the recognition by the US judiciary of the IOC and its NOCs. The US Supreme Court even referred to the IOC as ”a highly visible and influential international body”. Ettinger (1992) argues that the IOC’s visibility and influence was enough to convince the US Supreme Court that domestic laws could be overruled by the Olympic Charter.

Power may be wielded through the use of resources of power (Bruyninckx, 2010, p.119). As the largest regularly held gathering of citizens from different parts of the world, the Olympics are an attractive target for political expression and activity. The Olympics are not only used as
a means by with the IOC can achieve its goals, but are also used as a resource of power by others. An Olympic boycott is a first example of such a resource of power. In protest against the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan in 1979, president Carter called for a massive boycott of the 1980 Summer Olympics in Moscow (Macintosh & Hawes, 1992). This was followed by a counter-boycott of the Soviet Union and fourteen of its allies during the 1984 Olympics in Los Angeles. So far, however, boycotting the Olympics as a whole has never succeeded. Liu (2007) argues that a boycott can displease or enrage a target country, but its effectiveness remains limited by its limited occurrence, every four years for a period of seventeen days. Propaganda is another form of a resource of power. The Berlin Olympics of 1936 served as a propaganda tool for the Third Reich government (Chalkley & Essex, 1999). More recently, the Chinese government sought to use the Olympic Games as a propaganda tool to promote national cohesion and rally divided communities around a common cause (Broudehoux, 2007). The consummate organization of the Beijing Olympics has acted as a means to distract the world’s attention from the shortcomings of China’s rapid economic transformation, accompanied by rampant land speculation, corruption, and uneven development. The modern Olympic Games were also frequently used as a platform for protest. As the world is watching, the Olympic Games can also serve as a useful platform to express dissatisfaction. Individual athletes have engineered protests, such as medalists Tommie Smith and John Carlos of the United States, who raised their glove-covered fist in the Black Power salute during the national anthem to protest against racial segregation (Delaney & Madigan, 2009). During the Olympics in Munich in 1972, the members of the Israeli Olympic team were taken hostage and eventually killed by a Palestinian terrorist group. The Munich massacre, the most violent form of protest the Games have ever known, has drastically changed the safety aspects of the Games (Bruyninckx, 2010). In addition to boycotts, propaganda and protest, the Olympics are often considered to be a form of symbolic power. For example, the Seoul Olympics of 1988 were to demonstrate the ability of the Asian Tigers to integrate in the international community fully, rather than simply for their ability to produce economic growth. The Beijing Olympics of 2008 were supposed to confirm the capacity of emerging countries to organize the Games successfully. The number of medals won by a nation during an Olympiad represents another form of symbolical power. This was mainly prevalent during the Cold War between the United States and the Soviet Union. Winning Olympic medals is a source of national pride and an objective that all nations aspire to (Moosa & Smith, 2004). The core states in the world system are expected to win most of the medals in large sport competitions (Maguire et al., 2002). They are likely to have hegemonic power in the sports
world too. Kuper and Sterken (2003) demonstrated that the economic status of a country is the key factor in Olympic medal winnings, followed by population size. The ranking of nations according to total medals won is not only a reflection of the existing power relations between countries, but also an illustration of the growth and loss of power over a certain period of time (Van Reusel & Meulders, 2010). At the first modern Olympiad in Athens in 1896, nine West-European countries dominated the top ten of Olympic medal totals, while at the Beijing Olympics in 2008 only four West-European countries were in the top ten. This reflects the shift in the balance of power in the world today.

5.2.3. IOC’s quest for legitimacy

5.2.3.1. Three historical periods with three different social missions

The history of the IOC is characterized by continuous adjustments to its agenda to match a changing institutional environment (Peacock, 2011). Peacock (2011) sees the IOC as a legitimacy-seeking agent which acts according to rationalized structures and behaviors in order to survive. As these structures are subject to change, the IOC needs to adapt its social mission to the dominant societal discourse. Three historical periods, distinguished by Peacock, demonstrate how the social mission of the IOC has changed over time. The growing time and space compression of the world pressured the IOC into correspondence with the contemporary norms and principles that were accepted at the different times.

Pax Olympica

Pax Olympica, the philosophical claim that sport has a unifying power that could lead humanity to a more peaceful world, underpins the Olympic Movement founded by Pierre de Coubertin. At the end of the 19th century, the majority of the honorary members of the IOC were peace activists and some of them were even Nobel Peace Prize winners. Coubertin emphasized the involvement of these individuals in the attempt to legitimize the IOC and its social purpose. The foundational environment of the Committee was marked by democratic, progressive internationalism. Coubertin was not a cosmopolitan but a supporter of a kind of nationalism which commended all nations for their distinctive and typical values. Although this interaction between nationalism and internationalism seems paradoxical, it was widely accepted at that time. The focus on formally equal and peacefully competing nations was the first step to ‘doing good’ by using sport. The importance of this primary form of ‘doing good’ throughout the history of the Olympic Movement can be seen in the enduring influence of its foundational legacy.
All games, all nations

In the post-war period, many IGOs and NGOs encouraged the introduction of the former colonies into the international community and disapproved of colonial and imperialist undercurrents. Newly independent nations called for ‘international arenas’ in which they could be recognized (Roche, 2002). Roche stated: “They needed recognition by the Olympic Movement - particularly participation in the periodic ceremonies and sport of the Olympic Games events - almost as much as they have needed recognition by and participation in the [UN]”. This demonstrates that the young nations perceived the IOC as a legitimate power. Notwithstanding that the IOC advocated sporting independence, the IOC’s position was in agreement with that of the IGOs, because of their increasing significance in world politics. The IOC recognized a nation mostly in accordance with the principles applied by IGOs. Since many polities gained political independence, the number of recognized states rose immensely and thus caused some difficulties, such as the disjunction between juridical sovereignty, based on principles of self-determination and non-interference, and empirical sovereignty, based on states having legitimacy and control over their citizens and within their territories (Barnett, 1995). To skirt around these problems, the new discourse of key actors at the time was to ‘modernize’ these juvenile nations so that they were able to take part in international society integrally, and defend their interests on a global scale. When Northern governments rushed into modernize these newly formed countries largely through large-scale, technocratic development projects, the IOC followed by assisting new NOCs and domestic sports structures. The Committee for International Olympic Aid (CIOA) was founded in 1961 by Jean de Beaumont to support the newly independent countries in terms of sport (Henri & Al-Tauqi, 2008). During the 61st IOC Session in Baden-Baden in 1963, a full report, addressing the needs of the young countries, was presented. The members, though opposed to providing subsidies to the new countries because of a lack of funds, did accept the proposal to appoint a “special ad-hoc commission” to examine the feasibility and follow-up of the actions proposed in the report. Ten years later, CIOA was transformed into Olympic Solidarity by Lord Killanin. He wrote in one of his letters to the NOCs “The IOC believes that these initiatives will contribute to the development and reinforcement of its relations with the NOCs and assure a further promotion of Olympism and amateur sport in the world, and of course will be carried out with the closest cooperation with the IFs.” (Lord Killanin, personal communication, 1973, 7 March). Peacock (2011) notes that this was an attempt by the IOC to unite the Olympic Movement by taking the criticism of the NOCs to heart and provide them
with a greater role in the decision making process of the Olympic system. The establishment of Olympic Solidarity boosted the development of the global network of the Olympic Movement (Henri & Al-Tauqi, 2008). Notwithstanding, it was underpinned by the modernization theory, which called to help newly independent nations in functionally catching up with the industrialized nations. The founders of Olympic Solidarity believed that development and social change would ‘trickle down’ to even the most marginalized within these societies (Peacock, 2006, 2011). One of the main purposes of Olympic Solidarity is to ensure better representation of developing countries in the Olympic Games. The underlying idea is that distributing resources aimed at elite success will eventually reach all levels of society and that winning gold medals will stimulate grassroots development. During this period an IOC questionnaire was sent to all NOCs for the purpose of developing knowledge of the assistance requirements of the NOCs (G. Onesti, personal communication, 1973, September 5). Following the results of this questionnaire, the action of Olympic Solidarity was to cover the following areas: assistance in the training of specialists, the elaboration and dissemination of sports documentation, and assistance in the field of sports infrastructure. A plan was launched which led to the creation of an IOC Olympic Foundation, which was to provide the funds needed for the Olympic Solidarity program. As a result of the fast expansion of NOCs in combination with a very limited IOC budget, Olympic Solidarity consisted of ad hoc forms of support rather than a sealed and well-funded foundation. This was all to change with the arrival of J.A. Samaranch, the new president of the Committee.

**Sport for development and peace**

In the early 1980’s, the IOC was characterized by uncertainty concerning the survival of Olympic Solidarity, political boycotts of Olympic Games and financial difficulties following a decreasing number of cities applying to host the Games. The IOC under Samaranch adapted itself again to the changing climate in order to maintain its legitimacy. Peacock (2011) identified three trends to demonstrate this. First and foremost, the IOC has entered into public-private partnerships with numerous IGOs, mainly with UN bodies, in an unprecedented fashion. It reflects the IOC’s commitment to engaging with development, human rights and other ‘good works’. The end of the Cold War also marked the end of the relative distrust with which the Committee sometimes viewed IGOs. The fall of the Berlin Wall and the implosion of the Soviet Union created optimism and a sense that anything was possible among scholars and policy makers (Mearsheimer, 1990). They believed in the relaunch of IGOs in ‘good’ causes which had been impeded by the Cold War. The IOC was
relieved by the end of the Cold War and its disastrous impact on the Committee, and shared in this optimism with regards to IGOs by seeking public-private partnerships. Since the 1980s, IGOs collaborate increasingly with NGOs as partners in global governance (Andonova, 2006). According to Börzel and Risse (2005), this way of collaboration does not only enhance the effectiveness but also the legitimacy of transnational policy networks. The IOC’s partnerships with IGOs specialized in peace and development issues and increased the Committee’s ability to attain its social objectives. Moreover, it contributes to having its ‘good works’ approved by legitimated IGOs in the development field.

Apart from partnerships, the IOC particularly seeks for recognition by the UN. In the early eighties, Samaranch canvased for a draft resolution for the protection of the Olympics by influencing NOCs to instruct their UN representative to request the inclusion of ‘protection of the Olympic Games’ on the agenda of the next General Assembly (Esaafi M’Hamed, personal communication, 1982, 29 June). Since 1994, prior to each edition of the Olympic Games, the UN General Assembly adopts a resolution calling for Member States to observe the Olympic Truce (cf. supra). Nevertheless, Samaranch persisted and sought to gain official recognition as a permanent observer within the UN, because this would acknowledge the IOC’s authority in global sport and in using sport for the achievement of universal human development and peace between and among nations. Rogge’s predecessor pursued the idea of the Olympic Charter constituting a form of international sports law that would be respected by member states. His wish became reality in 2009 under the presidency of Jacques Rogge. The IOC also shares and pursues the universal targets formulated by the UN, such as the MDGs. Mario Pescante, Permanent Observer for the IOC to the UN, is confident that sport can help to realizing the MDGs. The principles of the Olympic Movement (education, sustainability, non-discrimination, universality, humanism and solidarity) are also the principles at the heart of the MDGs (IOC, 2010). Often the IOC publishes press releases about its contributions to the MDGs that have prevailed in the development discourse of the 21st century (IOC, 2010). At the MDG Summit in 2010, the IOC, by using its right to address the General Assembly, convinced the General Assembly to adopt a resolution that recognized ‘sport, as a tool for education, development and peace, can promote cooperation, solidarity, tolerance, understanding, social inclusion and health at the local, national and international levels.’ (United Nations, General Assembly, 2010).

Secondly, the **dominant development discourse** had a major influence on the Committee’s ‘good works’. It assimilated buzzwords like ‘empowerment’ and ‘grassroots’ in its vocabulary
and provided community-focused assistance by using sport as a means to approach the challenges of society. The IOC’s website is packed with examples of projects that promote SDP ‘at grassroots level’ (http://www.olympic.org/grassroots-olympism). This stands in contrast to the neoliberal/modernization theory, where materials and infrastructure of sport are provided at the national and elite level on the assumption that its benefits will trickle down to all levels of society. The IOC has abandoned its nearly exclusive focus on development of sport, in the hope that benefits will trickle down, and now relies on development through sport (sport for development). However, this point is objected to by Kidd (2011), who argues that the Olympic Movement’s focus is still much more on development of sport than on sport for development. The IOC remains a supporter of development of sport, since the Committee believes that sport in itself contributes to a better world. Darnell (2010) stated that if the IOC and the Olympic Movement are indeed seeking to pursue sport for development, it faces the difficult challenge of reconciling these objectives with the traditional neoliberal approaches of development which are still supported by the dominant political and economic elite. But how can ‘development as growth’ ever be compatible with ‘sustainable development’?

Finally, the Committee’s outreach to the Global South and focus on social development is now an act of Corporate Social Responsibility. According to President Rogge “Sport has a high social and educational value. We use this potential in the framework of our CSR Strategy.”(http://www.olympic.org/news?articleid=54839). Although the IOC defines itself as a not-for-profit organization, the huge profits it makes currently underpin the pressures to conform to the institutions of CSR. This period is more than the two prior periods characterized by a diligent effort of the IOC not to lose its legitimacy. As the holder of the Olympic brand, the IOC is expected to use its power to play a leading role in tackling global challenges, or at least to make them discussable (Bruyninckx, 2010, p.133). The acknowledgement of CSR in international conventions and guidelines made the IOC realize that they have responsibilities beyond organizing the Olympics (Babiak & Wolfe, 2006). Merely being a sports organization is no longer accepted as an argument for societal inaction. The Lausanne-based organization is increasingly facing an image problem with regards to the question of CSR and ongoing efforts outside the Olympic Movement. The IOC’s non-interference position in domestic affairs is now more than ever under fire. It realized when it was under such attacks during the Olympic Games in Beijing that it needed more proactive communication about its efforts outside the Olympic Games (S. Brownell, communication, 2012, November 21). Nonetheless, the core business of the IOC is to organize successful
Olympic Games (C. De Kepper, personal communication, 2011, October 24). By focusing on other targets, it is concerned about being pulled into other agendas that might distract the organization from its main objective (S. Brownell, personal communication, 2011, November 21).

5.2.3.2. The way forward: patience required!

Bruyninckx (2010) urges the IOC to regard the societal expectations for CSR as a challenge instead of a threat. If the IOC accepts the challenge, it can use its power and platform to establish itself as a socially conscious organization and to become a global actor with a sincere responsibility in tackling transnational issues. If it does not accept the challenge, it will continuously be criticized for contributing to the maintenance of social evils by misusing or not using its power. According to Zhenliang (2009) the IOC is standing at a crossroads and has to take a decision with regards to its main responsibility. He believes that the time has come for the IOC to decide whether it will be a promoter of a social movement by distributing Olympic ideals and values, or whether it will give priority to marketing above all else and turn itself entirely into the organizer of Olympic sports performance?

Hein Verbruggen (personal communication, 2012, 9 May) emphasizes the importance of placing the SDP movement in a certain context. He distinguishes three stages in global sport’s history. In the 19th century sport transformed into an organized movement. The main focus in the next century was on the promotion of sport in relation to health. In the 21st century the societal contribution of sport is underscored. Sport is promoted as a means for development, peace, environment, gender, etc. Politicians are responsible for placing sport on their national agendas. So far, he does not know of a country that earmarked a large amount of money for SDP. But he argues that the importance of SDP is increasingly recognized. The problem at the IOC is that it is still primarily run by people of the second stage. For them, SDP is something new and it takes time for the Committee to adapt itself to this new mindset. Nuria Puig (personal communication, 2012, May 7), head of the Olympic Study Centre, concurs by saying that it takes time for an organization such as the IOC to adjust to this change of focus. According to Verbruggen, the IOC is an organization of ideas rather than of practical organization. Its influence on the NOCs and IFs is rather limited and it is increasingly dependent on others for the implementation of projects. Rogge mentioned in his opening speech at the Olympic Congress in 2009 in Copenhagen that the world had become more
complex and globalized and that the IOC was now under the obligation to set up partnerships in order to contribute to finding solutions to global problems (Wassong, 2010).

Recent efforts of the IOC to enhance its CSR, are the establishment of the Olympic Youth Development Centre in Lusaka, a Sport for Hope program that provides access to sports and offers educational programs and health services (http://www.olympic.org/Documents/Commissions_PDFfiles/sports-for-hope-brochure.pdf). A similar project will be completed in Port-au-Prince in 2014. It remains unclear what the underlying reasons were for the IOC’s choice of Zambia and Haiti for the setting up of a big sports complex. Katia Mascagni (personal communication, 2012, May 3) named the stability of these governments as a potential explanation, but this was contradicted by Tommy Sitholé (personal communication, 2012, May 3). The latter mentioned that it was a choice by the president of the IOC.

For grassroots projects of community development through sport, the IOC can participate at different levels, be it as a donor, a contributor or a convener of the project itself. (IOC, 2010). Katia Mascagni (personal communication, 2012, May 3) explains the differences between these participation levels. At the lowest level, where the IOC is seen as a donor, it provides financial resources, but someone else will spend this contribution. So there is no further involvement of the IOC than financial involvement. The next level, is the one where the IOC functions as a facilitator. The IOC is particularly involved in visibility, co-branding, technical influence and distribution of funds. At the highest level, where the IOC takes up the role of convener, it jointly initiates the project with other partners. For example, in the Centre in Lusaka the IOC’s role is more that of a convener.

Furthermore, the Olympic Movement is involved in environmental efforts, such as the recognition of the environment as the third pillar of Olympism. It is also involved in humanitarian aid efforts, such as the donation of basic goods to the victims in Darfur. Peacock (2011) regards this as an example of the IOC’s shift in its outreach to the developing world and an example of philanthropy. Given its high revenues in recent times, the IOC has become aware of its social responsibility to financially support disaster relief efforts, sometimes without a specific connection to sport. The movement also makes concerted efforts to elevate the status of women in sport. The Women and Sport Commission was established in 2004 and aims to increase female access to sports; and to enhance the quota for women in sports administration and management. The most recent realization is that Saudi Arabia will be sending its first female athletes to the London Olympics (IOC, 2012, July 12). This is a
milestone in the fight for more gender equality in sport since the London Olympics will be the first games where every NOC will have been represented by women. The IOC also decided to contribute to a peaceful world through sport by reviving the concept of the Olympic Truce. In collaboration with the UN, the International Olympic Truce Foundation (IOTF) was established and promotes peaceful and diplomatic solutions worldwide. For example, the NOC of Haiti organized “Games for Peace” with its neighbor, the Dominican Republic (http://www.olympic.org).

In conclusion, SDP is the most recent externalization of 'sport for good' launched by Pierre de Coubertin more than a century ago to place sport in the service of humanity (MacAloon, 1981; Kidd, 2011). Coubertin was convinced that international sports competitions could make a positive contribution to the norms and values of the Olympic Movement: peace, intercultural education, and international understanding (MacAloon, 1997). Although strong similarities exist between the efforts of the end of the 19th century and the SDP movement of today, SDP distinguishes itself from earlier activities by adopting a much more persistent and determined focus on widespread social development and change; and by entering into partnerships with IGOs and NGOs (Kidd, 2011). This can be seen in the light of the struggle by the IOC to justify itself as a socially responsible organization.

5.2.4. Recommendations

The UN possess in-house expertise in development, but not in sports and mega-events. Contrarily, the IOC possesses in-house expertise concerning the organization of sporting events, but is not equipped with the knowledge and expertise in terms of development. If the IOC wants to proceed in the development field, more in-house expertise on development will be necessary. Nuria Puig (personal communication, 2012, May 3) concurs and remarks that the departments tackling the Olympic Games have grown enormously throughout the years, as opposed to the department of International Cooperation and Development. The goal of Olympism is to place sport at the service of the harmonious development of humankind, with a view to promoting a peaceful society concerned with the preservation of human dignity. Therefore, it is not only about the Games but also about spreading Olympism in other ways. Hein Verbruggen (personal communication, 2012, May 9) suggests that the IOC, as the leader of the Olympic movement, needs to take more of a leadership role. It is a limited organization in terms of conducting projects on SDP, but it possesses much more potential to guide first of all the NOCs, but also the IFs and OCOGs in recognizing and implementing SDP. For them
sport is still associated with competition above all. Verbruggen is convinced there is room for improvement for the IOC, but because of the nature of the organization it will require time. Kidd (2011) agrees and suggests that the IOC should cooperate more intensively concerning SDP with all members of the Olympic Movement. For example, NOCs should be incentivized to establish SDP objectives, in consultation with its constituencies and other partners, so that the progress of the targets could be observed and communicated at future forums. Above all, a revision of the rules for the bid process should be conducted by the IOC. The rules need to guarantee and standardize sustainable SDP through the staging of the Olympic Games. The bid book should provide a detailed image of the commitments to sustainable legacies in terms of development and social change, so that these commitments could be evaluated and publicly discussed. In particular, urban development needs to be better integrated within event planning from the very start, beginning with the bid process. The applicant and candidate cities from the developed world should establish SDP programs in consultation with intended developing country partners that will become subject to monitoring and evaluation in Olympic Games Impact reports. Each edition of the Olympic Games should become a lasting example of long-term SDP. Cornelissen (2011) also states that some IFs suggest that bidding cities need to assess the potential long-term socioeconomic impact of hosting an event and add this to the application file. But the problem is that the IFs and the IOC do not possess adequate evaluation mechanisms to corroborate these prognoses. She suggests SDP evaluation methods should be implemented not only in terms of the impacts of SDP projects but, above all, in terms of the generated expectations among targeted populations. The IOC should also enhance its key position in the promotion of SDP via sponsorship and the manning of the Sport and Health thematic working group in the UNOSDP (Kidd, 2011). In this way, the IOC will be able to show its commitment to using sport as a tool for peace and development, and using the power of sport to tackle global challenges.

In 2005, the IOC established an in-house database on the hosting of the Olympic Games called the Olympic Games Knowledge Management (OGKM). OGKM is an integrated platform of services and documentation, where best practices are shared by transferring knowledge and expertise from one edition of the Games to the next (IOC, 2010, June 1). It aims to assist candidate cities and OCOGs in creating their own concept of a sustainable impact of hosting the Olympics while dealing with both the opportunities and the risks of such an event. Since the IOC has been the core organization in regulating global sport over the past 118 years, it can draw on a tremendous amount of information and training (Peacock, 2010). Peacock (2010) shows that the scale and scope of its knowledge and expertise is a major
aspect in preserving the continuing autonomy of the organization. Given the perception of the Games as a catalyst for sustainable social and economic development, the OGKM should include data on expertise of urban development, community wellbeing and more equitable public access to socio-economic benefits. So far, Rio is learning nothing whatsoever from Beijing in terms of urban planning and social change.

Tommy Sitholé (personal communication, 2012, May 3), IOC director of the department of International Cooperation and Development, refers to numerous projects at all levels within the sports community as a result of the recognition of sport for development and its place on the agenda of the UN and the international community (IOC, 2010). Nevertheless, he underscores that much more needs to be done. Moreover, he adds that the process needs to start with a universal adoption of sport in the overall national development plans of nations. The appointment of a Special Adviser on SDP by the UN Secretary-General and the grant of a Permanent Observer status to the IOC by the UN General Assembly, indicate that nations and the international community are already acknowledging the critical role of sport in development. Few governments, however, make active use of sport on a large scale as a means for advancing their domestic and international development and peace goals (SDP IWG, 2010). One cannot expect the sports movement to succeed where social and political movements have failed. International institutions or governments are the competent authorities in addressing mankind’s socioeconomic problems. However, where sport can contribute, it shall strive to do so and will continue to work in this direction. This is and will remain at the core of the IOC mission in society. As the leader of the Olympic Movement, it will continue to act as a catalyst for collaboration, with the ultimate objective of making the world a better and more peaceful place through sport (IOC, 2010, p.23).

SDP initiatives should be integrated into the broader development cooperation sector to fully harness the potential of sport (SDP IWG, 2010). Moreover, the necessary national policies, investment, and capacity must be in place to permit programs to be scaled-up on a national basis. So far, there is not really any hard evidence for a broad increase in investment by governmental actors in SDP programs (United Nations, UN Secretary-General, 2010).

Yet, the incorporation of sport in Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers⁸ (PRSP) was only

---

⁸ Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers are prepared by the IMF member countries through a participatory process involving domestic stakeholders as well as development partners, including the WB and IMF. Updated every
undertaken in few cases. The resolution adopted at the end of the 2\textsuperscript{nd} International forum on Sport for Development & Peace in 2011 encouraged governments and international organizations to include sport in ODA (United Nations, 2011). This is also one of the objectives of Olympic Solidarity. The OECD states that the promotion of sports training facilities and venues counts as ODA, whereas sponsoring concert tours or athletes’ travel costs does not (OECD, 2008). The forum also recommended that the UN include access to sport and physical education as an indicator in its human development indexes (HDI) (United Nations, 2011). The UN HDI is a weighted mix of indices that show life expectancy, knowledge (adult literacy and education) and standard of living (GDP per capita) (\url{http://hdr.undp.org/en/statistics/}). At the third International Conference of Ministers and Senior Officials Responsible for Physical Education and Sport (MINEPS III), the ministers acknowledged this need, and requested UNESCO’s support in the adoption of physical education and sport as Human Development Indicators by UNDP on the same level as education, health and environment (United Nations, UNESCO, 1999). Katia Mascagni (personal communication, 2012, May 3) points out that SDP in the UN is quite informal and not formalised because there are no budgets for SDP. It is seldom the case that governments provide a budget for SDP. By integrating sport in the HDI it would become much more compulsory.

During the busy schedule of the UNOSDP, it was impossible to conduct interviews with UN officials. Nevertheless, it remains very important to gain insight into the UN’s stance on the collaboration with the IOC. In this study, data has been collected through interviews with IOC officials and a former official from the UNOSDP. To truly understand the UN-IOC relationship, however, interviews with UN officials are necessary.

\footnotesize{three years with annual progress reports, PRSPs describe the country's macroeconomic, structural and social policies and programs over a three year or longer horizon to promote broad-based growth and reduce poverty, as well as associated financing needs and major sources of financing.}

\url{http://www.imf.org/external/np/prsp/prsp.aspx}
6. SDP in context of sports mega-events hosted in the Global South

During the last decade, a significant increase can be observed in the number of developing and emerging countries bidding to host sports mega-events (Black & Van der Westhuizen, 2004). They are keen on hosting such events since it provides them with two opportunities: first the capability to react to foreign pressure of international competitiveness for investment capital, businesses, tourists, at the risk of increasing national inequalities, and second a possibility to strengthen national identity, at the risk of harming international reputation if those things that do not go according to plan are disseminated by the foreign media. Large sporting events have become very attractive for developing cities seeking to create or invigorate a global image. Matheson and Baade (2004, p.1085) point out that the main motivation for staging a mega-event is the “promise of an economic windfall”. Yet this idea is criticized by many authors. Humphreys and Prokopowicz (2007, p.496) indicate that “mega-events may not be effective regional economic development vehicles in transition economies”.

The UN consider the Olympic Games and the FIFA football World Cup as effectuating a long-term legacy in terms of sustainable social, economic and environmental development for the host city and country at large. As the world is watching, large sporting events provide useful opportunities for promoting SDP initiatives and their potential contribution to achieving the MDGs (United Nations, Inter-Agency Task Force on SDP, 2003). These events expanded the role of athletes, turning them into ambassadors, generating awareness for key issues on a global and local level. To this very day, however, the link between large sporting events and SDP remains unproven (Cornelissen, 2011). The two research domains have developed rather separately from each other, with little knowledge exchange. Cornelissen (2011) highlights the differences between SDP and mega-events. Firstly, mega-events focus on the effective delivery of the event, a short-term target, while SDP programs are aimed at meeting long-term objectives. Secondly, they both conceive of development in a different way. In terms of developmental consequences of large sporting events, the underlying idea is that investments in infrastructure will eventually reach all levels of society and that it will stimulate long-term economic, tourism growth and employment legacies. Moreover, the ‘trickle down’ effect refers to a “process by which mass sports participation is stimulated by public exposure to elite sport” (Frawley, Veal, Cashman, & Toohey, 2009, p.3). Thus, a widespread belief exists that medal-winning performances by athletes with the same
nationality as the spectator are an inspiration for more sports participation. The relationship between mass sport participation and elite sport performance is often used to justify the large expenses of hosting a sports mega-event. Nevertheless, this presumed (cost)effectiveness remains unproven. The lack of strong evidence makes it impossible to argue that hosting a mega-sport event inspires additional sport participation (Kidd, 2010).

Research into large sporting events indicates that the benefits of hosting the event tend to be overestimated and the cost tends to be underestimated (Horne, 2010). Table 2 demonstrates the estimated costs of staging sports mega-events. The amounts confirm the very large scale and high costs associated with hosting an event of this nature. Matheson and Baade (2004) demonstrate that spending on infrastructure is considerably higher in developing countries. Therefore, less public money can be spent in other public areas, where it is needed the most.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year of Event</th>
<th>Location (Country)</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Host status awarded</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Beijing (China)</td>
<td>Summer Olympic &amp; Paralympic Games</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>US$ 15 – 40 billion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Delhi (India)</td>
<td>Commonwealth Games</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>US$ 6.8 billion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Sochi (Russia) 7-23 February</td>
<td>Winter Olympic Games</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>US$ 14 billion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coastal zone: Sochi Mountain zone: Krasnaya Polyana</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>FIFA World Cup Finals</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>US$ 12 billion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>Rio de Janeiro 5-21 August</td>
<td>Summer Olympic &amp; Paralympic Games</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>US$ 14.4 billion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7-18 Sept. Paralympic Games</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>FIFA World Cup Finals</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: BRICs hosting sports mega-events (Horne, 2010)

A sports mega-event leaves a large mark on a host city. There are many ongoing discussions and controversies about the impact of large sporting events (Cashman, 2002). The first one is the decision to bid for the large sporting event. Although a bid needs to be made on behalf of all residents of a city, the majority is only indirectly consulted. In general, it is formulated in terms of community benefits, such as urban regeneration, improved sporting and transportation infrastructure, to supposedly meet potential costs and encumbrances to the
community. There is not only a lack of community consultation about the bid process, but also about the impact of the event itself. According to Kidd (1992, p.77), each bidding city of the Olympics should carry out a social impact assessment and a widespread public consultation prior to the submission of its bid. Candidate cities should conduct an in-depth investigation of the probable impact of the Games, otherwise Olympism risks losing legitimacy, since its goal is to place sport in the service of the harmonious development of humankind (Olympic Charter, 2011). Therefore, it is of the utmost importance for the IOC to guarantee that an Olympic Games bid represents more than the elites.

Secondly, there is much debate about who benefits most from hosting the event. Lenskyj (2002, p.131), a critical scholar, argued that “the legacy benefits of large sporting events accrue to the already privileged sectors of the population while the disadvantaged bear a disproportionate share of the burden”. The development projects fit the interests of local business or established institutions, while the benefits to local inhabitants fell far short. It is an example of the Matthew effect, where the rich get richer and the poor get poorer. She focused on the harsh realities of the most marginalized residents who find themselves directly caught up in the turmoil when cities bid on or host sports mega-events. The most vulnerable are hopeful that the large sporting event will bring positive change for them, but instead they are confronted with urban sanitization programs, labor strife, attacks on the homeless, and the power of the media. Since large sporting events are mostly in the interest of global financial flows and technology rather than local communities, they symbolize a shift of public funds to private interests (Horne, 2010). As critics have argued, providing ‘circuses’ when people need ‘bread’ is a dubious use of public money (Andranovich, Burbank and Heying, 2001; Cashman, 2002). Matheson and Baade (2004) consider this displacement of public funds as a significant problem. National government’s expenditure on projects and maintenance related to the mega-event often imply that budget cuts are made in other areas such as health, welfare and environment. These cuts concern those “who were least likely to enjoy benefits from the mega-events”. 
6.1. Beijing: the first BRIC-Olympic city

The election of Beijing to be the host of the Summer Olympic Games in 2008 marked the end of the era in which sports mega-events were nearly exclusively hosted by the developed world. It was only the third time the Summer Olympic Games were hosted outside the West and its former colonies (Brownell, 2008). Industrialized countries had to make room for an emerging country which is part of the so-called BRICs. The Olympic Games provided the PRC with the opportunity to showcase the nation’s achievements and to be recognized as a prominent international actor. Emphasis on environment and human rights reached a new level through the notorious reputation of the PRC (Zemel, 2011).

In environmental terms, Beijing, one of the highest polluting cities in the world, had to become paragon of environmental sustainability by collaborating intensively with UNEP and Greenpeace (Brownell, 2012). Initially, the IOC was not particularly concerned about environmental sustainability. The negative environmental impact of the Winter Olympics in Albertville was one of the historical benchmarks for the IOC to reconsider environmental policies. It took the IOC until 1994 to officially designate ‘environment’ the third pillar of Olympism after sport and culture (Cantelon and Letters, 2000). Still, many academics contest that hosting the Olympic Games has a positive and sustainable influence on the environment. Some argue that the delineated timeframe, impact and cost of the Olympic Games run contrary to environmental sustainability (Frey, Iraldo and Melis, 2007). The environmental legacy of the Beijing Olympics is rather contradictory. On the one hand, $20 billion was spent on the improvement of the environment and usage of green technologies. On the other hand, it is often perceived as a form of “greenwashing” - claiming environmental sustainable efforts for political reasons, instead of attaining any real environmental benefits. Even though the so-called “Green Olympics” may have raised public awareness about the environment, the air quality remains hazardous and the goal of achieving potable water in Beijing was not met. To achieve its environmental commitments for a blue sky during the Olympics, Beijing undertook drastic measures such as closures of factories throughout and in the vicinity of the city. Since economic growth remains the main policy of the Chinese government, these efforts could not be sustained and the smog returned (Brownell, 2012). As stated by Greenpeace China climate change and energy campaigner Yang Ailun “It changed the public mentality and made people remember the clear days we had 20 years ago and wonder why can’t we have that again. That’s a big achievement.” (AFP, 2009, August 4). Many Chinese observers
argue that environmental sustainability would never have gained such great recognition in the PRC without the Olympic Games (Brownell, 2012).

In human rights terms, although the Chinese government was under extreme pressure to improve the human rights conditions, it did not stick to its official promises of reforming the death penalty system and tolerate a complete media freedom in the run-up to the Beijing Games (Amnesty International, 2008). A lot of ink flowed in service of the pre-Olympic “clean-up” of Beijing through forced evictions of homeowners and tenants. Brownell (2012) regrets that the media and the NGOs did not reflect the generous compensations the majority of them received, but instead only highlighted single cases of those who felt they had been mistreated. Often, Western media and NGOs do not pay attention to the turbulent Chinese history of property ownership underpinning current eviction conflicts. After the revolution in 1949, the PRC took control of all the land until 1978 when private property rights were systematically restored through the ‘land use rights reform’ introduced as a part of the economic liberalization program of Den Xiao Ping (Wai Chung Lai, 1995). The conflicting real estate claims from different time periods, make it difficult for outsiders to judge orderly evictions accurately.

The IOC responded to the accusations by stating that human rights are a political matter outside of its mandate and that it carried out “silent diplomacy”, the only kind of diplomacy that works in the PRC. The IOC has the capacity to facilitate dialogue and reconciliation among hostile nations, but has not yet evolved into an organization that tries to influence issues under national sovereignty itself.
6.2. The South African World Cup Soccer 2010: much more than a sports tournament

“As hosts need to understand what the World Cup is: a party. It leaves nothing behind except a hangover, good memories and a large bill.” (Kuper, 2010, October 30, p.2)

“In reality, sports tournaments rarely do much to transform the fortunes of the countries that host them – at least not for the better – let alone change the fate of whole continents. But they can tell us a lot about where power really lies.”(Runciman, 2010, May 22, p.2-3)

In 2010, a momentous and historic FIFA World Cup took place because it was held, for the first time, on African soil. The African continent wanted to show that it was capable of organizing an event of this magnitude. Never before were expectations in terms of multiple positive legacies through hosting a FIFA World Cup so high. The Mbeki doctrine consisted of an implicit claim that the 2010 tournament was a catalyst for an ‘African Renaissance’ in which South Africa would play a leading role in an African rebirth (Schoeman, 2003). The well-publicized slogan, 'It's Africa's Turn', underlines that the 2010 World Cup is not limited to South Africa but belongs to the entire African continent (Meulders, 2010). Other members of the African Union remained skeptical about South Africa’s pan-African solidarity and saw through its strategy to export its profit-driven business model under the guise of development (Meulders, Vanreusel, Bruyninckx, 2010).

Cornelissen (2011) argues it is too early to perceive the permanent impact of the Soccer tournament in South Africa in relation to SDP. Nonetheless, she identified the 2010 World Cup in South Africa as the center for both a global and a local discourse that focused on SDP in the context of large sporting events hosted in the Global South. Firstly, the UN’s involvement and support for this event was made clear. The UN General Assembly acknowledged the use of large sporting events to promote and support SDP initiatives in resolution 64/5 (United Nations, General Assembly, 2009). Special Advisor to the UN Secretary-General on SDP, Lemke, expected the World Cup to provide a lasting legacy for Africa through the use of sport as a tool for development (United Nations, UNOSDP, 2010, June 8). Secondly, this edition was characterized by a fast growth of SDP projects in South Africa as implemented by a wide and varied range of actors. The boost in SDP projects harmonized with FIFA’s international social responsibility agenda. All these initiatives have in common that they aim to use the mega-event and the sport linked to the event as a strategic opportunity to create awareness for social change (Burgess, 2011). Keim (2008) highlights
that time pressure to meet FIFA requirements often forces policy makers to deliver top-down development initiatives. This kind of strategy is problematic since it leaves no room for the voices of local communities. Therefore, many SDP initiatives were unable to reflect local needs and requirements.

Cornelissen (2011) examined the contributing or impeding nature of the position of the main actors regarding the sports mega-event. The national government had the ability to promote partnerships and to encourage directing programs according to development goals. However, public spending on infrastructure related to the tournament was extremely high, while a comparatively small amount was spent on social development initiatives. The intended and existent patterns of public spending do not match the South African government’s focus on social development in relation to the 2010 tournament. International sports federations bore a great social responsibility, inter alia, by defining the overarching institutional framework for the pursuance of goals of SDP projects. However, various components of FIFA’s ‘Win in Africa’ program were not fulfilled, belying its claim of using the World Cup to ensure social development for the African continent in its entirety.

All South Africa’s bids were characterized by legitimating narratives and promotional rhetoric which emphasized the role of large sporting events as a potential means for widespread social development (Cornelissen & Swart, 2006). The South African bid mentioned that the tournament would serve as a catalyst for improving the standard of living of the historically disadvantaged people. This was consistent with the commitment of the government to halve poverty and unemployment by 2014 (http://www.undp.org.za/millennium-development-goals/mdgs-in-south-africa). However, because South Africa has long been involved in a drawn out bidding process, for the hosting of sporting mega-events, this can be seen as a part of the macro-economic strategy of the country (Cornelissen, 2011). In light of the country’s difficult balancing act between pro-growth and pro-poor objectives, pro-growth mega-events are often associated with redistribution. But Pillay & Bass (2008) pointed out that development in relation to the 2010 tournament is not about widespread and sustained poverty alleviation. The focus on the alleged benefits of sports mega-events serves merely to justify the voluminous expenses on a luxury sporting event in the context of increasing poverty and inequality. Therefore, it can be interpreted as an opportunistic gesture instead of a widely supported target (van Eekeren, 2008).

A large gap existed between the expectations of the South Africans versus the objectives of the organizers of the tournament (FIFA, the LOC and the national government). A Human
Sciences Research Council survey demonstrated that 85% of the South African population was optimistic and hopeful that the World Cup Soccer would bring about a combination of job creation, economic growth and global image (Pillay & Bass, 2008). Neither the organizers of the tournament, nor the sponsors put sustainable development and poverty alleviation high on their respective agendas (van Eekeren, 2008). The partial decentralization of the South African policy towards the regions impeded a consensus concerning a realistic legacy for the 2010 tournament (Pillay & Bass, 2008). Notwithstanding, a public debate on the distribution of benefits related to the mega-event is necessary. Otherwise, the benefits risk coming entirely under the control of the elites (Meulders, 2010). With the desire of becoming world-class and globally-competitive, South African cities promoted a neo-liberal economic growth-centered model of development based on the belief that benefits will trickle down to the poor and marginalized in society.
6.3. Rio: a new chance to meet the developmental expectations?

Will the mega-events in Rio simply be a force of economic development or will it actually address issues of inequality? Can Rio take into account the important lessons from the Beijing Olympics and the South Africa World Cup Soccer? Will all stakeholders be able to recognize that sports mega-events and its associated benefits belong to the entire population? Even though there is still a lot of time and room for political maneuver before the assessment of development outcomes of the Rio Games, it is necessary to critically analyze the development expectations of Rio 2016 (Darnell, 2010).

Rio is another example of the shift in the international geography of hosting large sporting events towards the Global South. By winning the bidding process to host the Summer Olympics against world-class cities like Madrid, Chicago and Tokyo, Rio will be the first South American and second BRIC host city. The public, even those who are living in slums, are hopeful that the World Cup and later the Olympics will change Brazil in a positive way (Brownell, 2012). However, this will not happen, since urban planners and politicians spend public money for sports projects in a way that will not provide social benefits for those who need them the most. The IOC will have to be better prepared than it was during the Beijing Olympics. Brazil and the IOC should be ready with substantiated arguments to reply to the growing criticism leveled at them by the radical NGOs.

Darnell (2010) argues that a contradiction exists between the IOC’s and the Rio 2016 OCOG’s perception on SDP versus the dominant political and commercial vision as read in media and marketing papers. On the one hand, the official development prospects perceive the sporting event as a part of the broader national development agenda. President Dilma Rousseff stated in her inauguration speech that “the investments planned for the World Cup and the Olympics will be conceived to ensure permanent gains in terms of quality of life for all” (Lee, 2009). At first glance, many similarities exist with the South African bid to host the 2010 World Cup. Rio’s bid was also underpinned by the society’s development exigencies and by the wish for the events to leave a lasting legacy. On the other hand, the media coverage and corporate communications exposed the Rio 2016 games as an opportunity for enhanced foreign investment and economic partnership. It was also clear for them that hosting the Olympics would improve and secure Brazil’s international reputation. The 2014 FIFA World Cup and the 2016 Olympics fit into the broader effort in which Brazil endeavors to become a permanent member of the UN Security Council and to expand its voting power.
within the IMF (Rabuffetti, 2009, October 3). Nevertheless, environment, human security and equality were lacking from the press and business communications, even though the IOC and the Rio 2016 organizers acknowledged the importance of these development issues for the host cities and country. Darnell (2010) suggests that despite the growing attention to social development by the IOC, Rio 2016 OCOG’s and the international community, the main focus of the development promises remains part of a neo-liberal economic growth-centered agenda of development. This is unsurprising, given that sustained unlimited growth is the main objective of emerging countries, but it is unsuited and inconsistent with sustainable development goals, particularly in terms of environment, climate and national resources (Ciochetto, 2010). As a result, it is unlikely that expectations with regards to social development will be met by the 2016 Rio Games.

To summarize, in recent times, large sporting events are more than ever perceived as potential means of inciting sustainable social and economic development in developing countries and, therefore, functioning as a means for meeting the MDGs (Darnell, 2010). They serve as a stimulus to, and a justification for, local development. But the overestimation of their benefits and underestimation of their costs, the resulting uneven interior development and the shift of public funds to private interests, make the hosting of large sporting events one of the most political acts in our time (Horne & Whannel, 2012). A review of the international literature demonstrates that sports mega-events are not the right instrument for poverty alleviation and urban development in relation to socioeconomic benefits (Pillay & Bass, 2008). Dreams induced through forms of development related to sports mega-events tend not to be those of poor, immobile and local inhabitants, but those of wealthy, mobile, and transnational corporations (Rutheiser, 1996). In the context of neoliberal globalization, BRICs will dominate the organization of future large sporting events (Curi, Knijnik & Mascarenhas, 2011). Yet, a difficult balance remains to be struck by these emerging countries between unlimited growth and sustainable development.
7. Conclusion

Notwithstanding the significant expansion of the SDP movement in recent years, it is necessary to go beyond the hype of international goodwill to reveal the true nature of SDP initiatives and large sporting events. This study has aimed to open eyes to precisely this reality, rather than perpetuate the existing myth. In a descriptive part, a general overview of the SDP movement was provided. SDP is not a cohesive movement, but is instead a mixture of different approaches united by the undisputed belief in the intrinsic capacity of sport ‘to do good’ (Cornelissen, 2011). The SDP movement is underpinned by the UN recognition of sport on the global agenda for peace and development. Nation-states, NGOs and IGOs, IFs, TNCs and grassroots CBOs are its main actors (Giulianotti, 2011a). An analytical part discerns that the reticence of the traditional development cooperation sector towards SDP is based on the ethical consideration that basic needs should have priority over leisure and pleasure, and on the malaise by which sport is perceived to be male-dominated, exclusive and problematic because of its ties with large-scale popular culture. The main challenges faced by the SDP projects are technical weaknesses, intersubjective or practical shortcomings, and political or critical weaknesses.

Furthermore, the study has aimed to illustrate the growing importance of NGOs and IGOs in international relations in the SDP context, and to focus on the power of NGOs such as the IOC, and IGOs such as the UN. Since the traditional vehicles of development are insufficient to achieve the MDGs, the UN actively pursued the concept of sport as a tool for development and peace. The increasing time and space compression of the world pressured the IOC into corresponding to contemporary norms and principles. We are now in a transitional period in which the IOC and the Olympic Games are adapting to a new world order that requires new levels of public accountability and social responsibility (Brownell, 2012). In its quest for legitimacy, the IOC has entered into public-private partnerships with numerous IGOs, adopted the dominant development discourse and conducts SDP projects as an act of CSR on different levels (donor, facilitator and convener) (Peacock, 2011). The disagreements related to the recent IOC’s observer status in the General Assembly, the lack of in-house expertise on development and the struggle between sport for development and development of sport, demonstrate that the IOC has not yet fully adjusted itself to the SDP effort and such an adjustment does, and indeed will, take time.

According to global democratic trends, there has been a growing attention paid to legacy in the host city of a large sporting event and in the country at large. Three examples of
developing countries who were and will be host of a sports mega-event demonstrated the misuse of promises and prospects of social change in the bid procedure. The focus on the alleged benefits of sports mega-events serves merely to justify the unethical practices related to the event. Public spending on infrastructure related to the event was extremely high, while a comparatively small amount was spent on social development initiatives. This mega-event strategy, which assumes that a single event of such a large scale provides a way to generate future economic growth, aggravates the division within sport and society between the ‘haves’ and the ‘have nots’. With the desire of becoming world-class and globally-competitive, the host cities promote(d) a neo-liberal economic growth-centered model of development based on the belief that benefits will trickle down to the poor (Darnell, 2010). Nonetheless, a difficult balance remains to be struck between pro-growth and pro-poor objectives. In this regard, the IOC and IFs bear a great social responsibility by showing their commitment to use sport as a tool for peace and social change concerning sports mega-events.

Finally, it is important to note that many achievements have already been made regarding SDP. The recent progress in terms of gender equality and peace building should not be neglected or ignored. Even the sports mega-events have unquestionably positive legacies, such as enhanced national prestige and growing environmental awareness. The question remains to what extent the positive impacts outweigh the negative ones. This study does not intend to jeopardize the SDP movement, it merely aspires to a more critical assessment of the socio-political impact and expectations of SDP initiatives. Only then, and with a lot of patience, will the movement be able to fully develop itself. Sport is indeed a powerful tool, but indeed only so when it used in the right way and with the right intentions.
8. Bibliography


Burgess, M. (2011). The Sport for Development Legacies of the 2010 FIFA World Cup. *Thesis presented in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree Master of Arts in International Studies at the University of Stellenbosch*


International Olympic Committee, Department of International Cooperation (1999). *The IOC and the UN system: Building a peaceful and better world through sport and the Olympic ideal*. Lausanne: IOC.

International Olympic Committee, Department of International Cooperation (2002). The IOC and the UN system: Building a peaceful and better world through sport and the Olympic ideal. Lausanne: IOC.


joins-brunei-darussalam-and-qatar-in sending-female-athletes-to-london-2012-all-nocs-will-now-have-been-represented-by-women-at-olympic-games/167962.


UNESCO, International Charter of physical education an sport, Adopted by the General Conference at its twentieth session, Paris, 21 November 1978


**Websites:**


UNOSDP: [http://www.un.org/wcm/content/site/sport/](http://www.un.org/wcm/content/site/sport/)

International Platform on Sport and Development: [www.sportanddev.org/](http://www.sportanddev.org/)
## Appendix 1

List of interviewees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beutler Ingrid</td>
<td>Manager Sports' Social Responsibility Department of SportAccord, former head of UNOSDP</td>
<td>Interviewed in Lausanne at Maison du Sport</td>
<td>24 October 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De Kepper Christoph</td>
<td>IOC Director General</td>
<td>Interviewed in Lausanne at the IOC headquarter</td>
<td>24 October 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mascagni Katia</td>
<td>Project Manager, IOC Department of International Co-operation and Development</td>
<td>Interviewed in Lausanne at the IOC headquarter</td>
<td>3 May 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tommy Sitholé</td>
<td>IOC Director of Department of International Co-operation and Development</td>
<td>Interviewed in Lausanne at the IOC headquarter</td>
<td>3 May 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nuria Puig</td>
<td>Head of the Olympic Study Centre</td>
<td>Interviewed in Lausanne at the Olympic Study Centre</td>
<td>7 May 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hein Verbruggen</td>
<td>Director SportAccord, former IOC member</td>
<td>Interviewed in Lausanne at Maison du Sport</td>
<td>9 May 2012</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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