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This paper offers an overview, and critical reading, of the initial development promises and prospects of the 2016 Summer Olympics, recently bestowed to the city of Rio de Janeiro. The first Olympics to be awarded to a South American host, the Games continue the trend of a) sports mega-events moving to the Global South and b) the positioning of such events within a broader development policy agenda. The results indicate inconsistencies between the vision of sport-for-development laid out by the IOC and Rio 2016 organizers versus that of the broader cultural and political economy. This disconnect suggests the need for ongoing critical analysis about the ability of the Rio 2016 Games to contribute to or deliver sustainable and equitable change for the people of Rio and Brazil.
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Introduction

On October 2, 2009, the International Olympic Committee (IOC) named Rio de Janeiro, Brazil the host city for the 2016 Summer Olympic Games. The announcement saw Rio chosen from a group of world-class cities contending for the Games that also included Chicago, Tokyo and Madrid, and become the first city on the South American continent awarded the rights to host the Games.

Media reaction to the news was swift, focusing on the historic nature of the decision and the choice of Rio over northern cities in traditionally superior political and economic positions, particularly Chicago, which enjoyed the endorsement of United States President Barack Obama. At the same time, included in the early media narratives of the decision was the prospect for improvement, both economic and social, that the Games offered Rio, particularly amidst Brazil’s emergence as a world power. For example, Canadian media reported that Brazilian President Luiz Incio Lula da Silva told the IOC members that “his was a nation that was working hard to move out of poverty. He evoked images of a country where 30 million people had moved into the middle class and that owned the newest and richest offshore oil finds in the world.”

Such early narratives were not entirely surprising given two recent trends in the political economy of international sport: one, the invocation of sports mega-events like the Olympic Games (as well as the FIFA World Cup and Commonwealth Games) as part of, and even catalysts for, sustainable social and economic development models for host cities/nations in the Global South; and two, the broader institutionalization and mobilization of ‘Sport for Development and Peace’ which advocates for sport programs, policies, and infrastructure as a means of meeting international development goals, a movement of which the International Olympic Committee itself is a stakeholder.
This paper offers an overview, and critical reading, of the early development narratives and promises of Rio 2016 as espoused by the International Olympic Committee, the organizers of Rio 2016, and the dominant political and commercial interests as read through media and marketing texts. While much time and socio-political maneuvering remains before the delivery of the development prospects of Rio 2016 can be assessed, it is an important preliminary step to track, and consider critically, the expectations of Rio 2016 in and through development terms, particularly given ongoing critical analyses regarding the ability and likelihood of sport mega-events to deliver sustainable, tangible, and egalitarian development in the Global South, as well as the propensity for sport-focused development initiatives to align with modernization and/or neo-liberal approaches and philosophy that may fall short of challenging or redressing structural inequalities.

The paper is concerned then with two main questions: One, is there a broader development agenda attached to Rio 2016 and what are its main components? Two, how were the development promises of Rio 2016 interpreted and constructed within the dominant commercial media and the international business community immediately following the announcement given that they continue to be important development power brokers? Taken together, these questions allowed for an analysis of the notions of development as espoused by the IOC and the Rio 2016 organizers, as well as a comparative analysis of these prospects for development as understood within the political economy.

History and Theory

The development challenges of Rio de Janeiro and Brazil are complex and firmly rooted in the country’s history and politics. While a thorough overview of Brazilian political history is beyond the scope of this paper, some context is called for. An economic success in the 1960’s and 70’s with highly protected domestic markets, Brazil experienced significant social and political unrest and shocking inflation after the transfer from military to civilian government in 1985. The 1990’s saw neo-liberal policies employed that successfully stabilized the economy, but also allowed for increased foreign competition and exacerbated domestic inequality for workers now undefended by the state. As a result, despite strong recent economic growth, Brazil continues to have some of the world’s lowest rates of income distribution. Thus, while positioning 21st century Brazil as a ‘developing’ or ‘Third World’ country is contestable given that it is clearly an emerging power, recognized as a part of the ‘BRIC’ group of emerging nations (Brazil, Russia, India, China), it nonetheless continues to struggle towards sustainable political, economic, and social development. In turn, the awarding of the 2016 Games to Rio is not only an important moment in Olympic history, but also a significant part of the long-term political emergence and development of Brazil itself.

It is within this historical and political terrain that the announcement of the Rio 2016 Games, and the prospects and promises for development attached to it, are best understood. As stated, two broader trends in the sport/development relationship provide further context. First and foremost is the understanding that sports mega-events, including the Olympics and World Cup but also second order competitions, like the Pan American and Commonwealth Games, are increasingly positioned as contributing to the sustainable achievement of development goals when hosted by emerging powers or Low and Middle Income Countries (LMICs). The increasing movement of these mega-events to the Global South (most notably the FIFA 2010 World Cup in South Africa and the 2010 Commonwealth Games in Delhi, India, as well as the 2014 World Cup also to be held in Brazil) has heightened the focus and visibility of the development opportunities attached to such events. For example, the bidding strategy for sports mega-events in South Africa—dating back to the failed bid for the 2004 Summer Games in Cape Town through to the 2010 World Cup—used, from the outset, political and rhetorical
strategies to imbue these events with a developmental agenda.\textsuperscript{8} From this perspective, sports mega-events, like the Olympics, are intelligible and attractive in the Global South as a significant part, if not the centerpiece, of ongoing development policies, yet the movement of sports mega-events to the south cannot be considered merely the logical extension of the Olympic movement or industry, but a unique socio-political perspective on, or approach to, the challenges of development in the southern hemisphere. At the same time, it is important to note that these development prospects are espoused despite the fact that LMICs are clearly in a weaker position to bear the burden of hosting, while, at the same time, the symbolic importance of succeeding, and the opportunity costs for projects and development strategies not pursued as a result, are significantly higher for LMICs in the Global South.\textsuperscript{9}

This leads to the second issue of consequence when situating the development promises of Rio 2016, namely the political interpretation or orientation to development imagined in and through the deployment of sports mega-events to the Global South. A host of recent critical analyses have argued that while the emergence of the SDP movement increasingly positions sport as a means of contributing to development goals (through a ‘development-through-sport’ or ‘plus sport’ approach as opposed to a more traditional focus on ‘sports development’) sport may be particularly suited to align with modernization and/or neo-liberal approaches to international development given that sport-focused development projects tend to focus on improving the physical infrastructure, increasing employment opportunities to strengthen the socio-economic environment, and developing the business and private sphere.\textsuperscript{10} In turn, notions of sport as a tool for development have been found to privilege an individualized ethos that supports notions of upward mobility but stop short of challenging inequality and the hegemony of neo-liberal development.\textsuperscript{11} In other words, it can be argued that the global sport/development relationship continues to be primarily 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.\textsuperscript{12} While still arguably dominant, neo-liberal approaches to development represent just one of many development models, one that often overlooks struggles for workers’, women and indigenous rights, and a focus on inequality.\textsuperscript{13} For this reason, given that Rio 2016 represents the Olympics’ initial foray into South America and the Global South, the specific notions of development espoused or mobilized in and through the event, particularly from the perspective of dominant media and commercial interests, are worthy of further analysis.

Finally then, it is necessary to consider the development promises of Rio 2016 against the critical mass of research that questions the record, and by extension the likelihood or ability, of sports mega-events to deliver sustainable and egalitarian social and economic changes – often referred to as ‘legacies’ in Olympic vernacular – to the host city, region and/or country. These are development issues; critical analyses of the distribution of economic activity from sports mega-events\textsuperscript{14} connect directly to the study of development, which can be understood as the question of how to redress inequality.\textsuperscript{15} Typically, hosting sports mega-events are viewed as opportunities to unlock or expedite access to vast sums of public money\textsuperscript{16} and in turn, the success of sports mega-events is measured based on economic impact and media exposure, as well as social and economic development.\textsuperscript{17} This occurs despite the fact that most sports mega-events result in a net loss for the public account, one that is left to be made up through peripheral incomes or future benefits to local interests and infrastructure.\textsuperscript{18} In any case, it has been rare that notions of community wellbeing or more equitable public access to the social and economic benefits feature prominently as part of the legacy of sports mega-events.\textsuperscript{19} That is, while inequalities between states and the challenges of constructing a global identity offer insights as to why sports mega-events are pursued, the question remains as to how these events are positioned and organized in order to meet development goals, particularly when development is a reason used to justify hosting ambitions of LMICs and emerging powers.
In sum, “after a mega-event has finished, questions start to be raised about the popular belief that sport can have a positive impact on a local community and a regional economy.” I suggest that promises made before the Games, how they are interpreted and whose interests they are likely to serve, are also important for sport/development studies and the analysis of sport-for-development.

Methodology
With these political and substantive questions in mind, a methodology was needed to a) capture the main components of the published development promises of Rio 2016 and b) critically analyze these promises against the dominant social and political economy. Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) offered an appropriate method because it allows for a reading of texts that considers their connection to hegemonic forms and ideologies. A three stage approach to CDA – analysis of content, consideration of intertextuality, and connections to hegemonic ideology – has proved useful for making sense of the meanings and contestability of contemporary media representations of the gendered body within the Olympics. Here, I suggest that the same approach to methodology holds for analyzing the dominant understandings of development within the plans for Rio 2016.

The initial research step was to explore what development promises are being made in and through the Rio 2016 games and the planning thereof. This was important not only because sports mega-events are increasingly understood to have a development agenda, but also because the development agenda itself, for practitioners and researchers of international development, remains open for analysis. A content analysis was therefore conducted of the online descriptions and understandings of development as published on the official websites of the International Olympic Committee and the Rio 2016 games, respectively. The second task was to explore the development promises of Rio 2016 as interpreted and constructed within the dominant social and political economy. For this, the Dow Jones Factiva (DJF) database was used. A search was conducted for texts that included all of the words Rio, Brazil, Olympics, and Development between October 1, 2009 and March 1, 2010. In all, 268 articles/reports were captured in the sample, and after duplicates were removed, 201 articles were read and coded against the critical issues identified in the literature and discussed above. The content of articles and reports was important, as was the recurrence of particular themes across the sample, but the articles were ultimately considered for the ways in which they illuminated the particular understandings and approaches to development connected to Rio 2016.

As with any choice of method, there were limitations. Principally, it is likely that the development promises of Rio in the mainstream commercial media and dominant institutions of the political economy are unique and differ from the state, development NGO’s or even the ‘voices from below’ that are a crucial part of the relations of power within sports mega-events and development studies more broadly. Such perspectives were not captured in this study but are certainly worthy of further analysis. Nevertheless, what this study did assess are arguably the most visible and intelligible development narratives of Rio 2016 and in turn are not only insightful as to what promises of sports mega-events are made to cities like Rio and countries like Brazil, but are also illustrative of the political and economic forces that push, and will likely continue to push, sports mega-events towards the Global South. The next section addresses these development narratives in more detail.

Results
The IOC and international development
The IOC’s official website lists six components of Olympism in Action that serve, according to the site, “To build a better world through sport.” One of the six components of Olympism in Action is
Development Through Sport (notably, the other five—grassroots sport, women, the environment, and peace and education through sport, respectively—could all be considered part of an international development mandate as well). This official stance, combined with the development profile of other mega-events in the Global South such as the 2010 FIFA World Cup, meant that the development aspects of the Olympics were largely intelligible, or on the IOC’s policy radar, prior to and during the announcement of Rio as the 2016 host city. Still, the IOC’s commitment to the development aspects of the Games, and to benevolent Olympism in general, was solidified in May 2010 at the first United Nations-IOC Forum, which resulted in UN Permanent Observer Status being conferred upon the IOC and the publication of 19 recommendations “on how to maximise the impact of various activities in the field of development through sport.” Of importance for this study is that several of the 19 recommendations ostensibly challenge both dominant development orthodoxy, as well as the generally intelligible sport/development relationship outlined by scholars like Levermore.

First and foremost, Recommendation #2 encourages the IOC to build better relationships with government authorities to leverage the opportunity that sport affords to achieve development goals. This is significant given that a) neo-liberal development policy tends to eschew state interference and that b) critical scholars have called for the sport/development relationship to be put more squarely on the public policy agenda (Kidd, 2008). The recommendations also acknowledge the importance of combating the spread of HIV/AIDS (Recommendation #7), speak to the role that sport can play in achieving gender equality (#2), outline a responsibility for protecting the environment through sustainable practices (#9), and assert the role of sport in creating a climate for peace (#15) and reconciliation from conflict and disaster (#17). Taken at face value, all of these recommendations can be considered alternatives to modernist, neo-liberal development and supportive of the notion of sport as a means to struggle for international development in ways that challenge the hegemonic socio-political order.

Of course, the recommendations do little to speak to how the IOC should, or will, go about facilitating or achieving such changes or development goals, particularly in the southern hemisphere where the social, political and economic stakes attached to the issues identified in the recommendations, like climate change and conflict, are much higher. Still, while not exhaustive, this analysis does illustrate that the IOC has an interest in supporting international development in and through the Olympic movement. With this context in mind, the next step for this analysis was to examine the extent to which the IOC’s approach to international development has found its way into the planning and promotion of the Rio 2016 Games. For this, an analysis of the Rio 2016 official public promises was conducted.

Rio 2016: Official development prospects
The candidature file of the Rio 2016 Games, entitled Live Your Passion: Rio 2016 Candidate City, is available for download on the Rio 2016 website. The 36-page document includes a host of development promises based on the notion that the Olympics, as a sport-driven event, will have benefits that accrue for the city and its residents. The document situates, from the outset, the 2016 Games as part of the broader development plan and outlook for the Brazilian state: “All investments will yield substantial, tangible, and meaningful legacies for the people of Rio and Brazil and are consistent with our long-term development plans.” — “The Games will help accelerate the city’s broader long-term aspirations, speeding the enhancement of its social and physical fabric.”

This explicit connection of the Games to a development agenda and plan echoes the ways in which the 2010 FIFA World Cup was constructed as central to South African development. The document also links Rio 2016 to the 2014 FIFA World Cup to be held in Brazil to highlight the opportunities for leveraging broader Brazilian development in and through the unprecedented hosting of the world’s two pre-
mier sports event within 24-months: “Indeed, Brazil will not only willingly fund Games investments, it will do so in the context of hosting the 2014 FIFA World Cup. This event will spread our capital expenditure across two great growth drivers and allow us to better prepare for the Games.”

Several other development categories or foci are also evident from the perspective of the Rio 2016 Games. Specifically, the targeting of youth through education initiatives and athlete scholarships is highlighted, as are environmental issues including the preservation of the largest urban forest in the world, the planting of 24 million trees by 2016 and the establishment of renewable energy and carbon neutrality as a focus of the Games’ organization and delivery. At the same time, corporate-oriented development benefits are also promised, including improvements to public infrastructure (particularly transit services) and the further development of Rio’s tourist facilities and reputation.

It is also important to note that strong claims are made about the economic security of Rio 2016 as a host city, which can be viewed as a preemptive response to its relatively new position as an economic force, the fragility of the global economy, and recognition of the relatively high stakes of hosting for southern states and cities: “We have committed to remove risk from Games delivery and have developed a powerful financial model that will benefit from the already approved funding of $240 billion from the existing Government Program for Growth Acceleration (PAC).”

On the one hand, these promises or prospects put forth by the Rio 2016 organizers are not unexpected, and by extension not particularly radical (or progressive) approaches to the development challenges of Rio and Brazil. The development promises align with some of the key tenets of development-through-sport laid out in the UN-IOC recommendations, particularly with regard to the environment and opportunities for youth. On the other hand, the development promises of the Games, according to the organizers, are still clearly part and parcel of an agenda of economic growth and the continued emergence and assertion of Brazil as a major economic and political force. As the next section shows, it was clearly these latter development prospects of the Rio 2016 Games that constituted the most intelligible and appealing components and narratives for the commercial media and corporate sectors in the days following the announcement.

**Rio 2016, media, and corporate communications**

The most frequently recurring theme in media coverage and corporate communications of the development prospects for Rio and Brazil following the announcement of Rio as the 2016 host city, was the opportunities for improved infrastructure, investment in the Brazilian economy and increased economic activity that the Games would afford. Of the 201 articles analyzed in this study, 44 spoke directly about infrastructure, 39 to investment, and 37 to economic development. The dominant narrative of development attached to the Games was that it would serve as an economic engine and a part of the ongoing growth and international establishment of the Brazilian economy. The following excerpt is exemplary:

*Brazilian stocks jumped on Friday as Rio de Janeiro's successful 2016 Olympics bid boosted expectations for development in Latin America's largest economy. Airlines were among the biggest gainers with investors seeing a potential increase in air traffic as Rio was set to become the first South American city to host the summer games.*

In turn, it was also clear from much of the corporate communications surrounding the announcement that the Games were understood to represent an opening up of Brazilian markets to global investment and economic partnerships. Press coverage picked up on the opportunities for foreign investment that the Olympics would facilitate for organizations like the Gauteng Economic Development Agency (GEDA) that represents the economic interests of the richest province in South Africa:
Says GEDA spokesperson Barba Gaoganediwe. ‘With (Brazil and South Africa) also signing a sports cooperation agreement, the stage is set for us to explore concrete business opportunities related to the 2010 and 2014 FIFA World Cups and the 2016 summer Olympics games which will take place in Rio de Janeiro.’ GEDA’s main objective with this work is to secure mutually beneficial business and investment opportunities across the two countries.31

In this sense, the announcement of Rio 2016 was recognized, by both the press and business community, as a signal for increased investment and economic partnership. This dovetailed with the second major theme of the media and corporate communications of the announcement, that of Brazil’s emerging power and prestige internationally. Sport has regularly offered states an opportunity to improve and secure their international stature or reputation32 and a number of commentators and scribes viewed the Rio 2016 announcement as an important part of the construction of Brazil’s new international reputation.

This Brazilian city’s historic win to host the 2016 Olympics follows a long, impassioned and at times frustrating campaign by Latin America’s largest nation to reposition itself on the world stage. The effort by Brazil’s most spectacular city is seen as part of a broader effort in which Brasilia is also aiming to become a permanent member of the UN Security Council and take a lead role in global efforts to slow climate change.33

It might be argued that the attempts to secure an improved international status speak more to a traditional struggle for political legitimacy as opposed to issues of domestic development policy but it is still significant for the purposes of this study that the intelligibility of the benefits of the Rio 2016 Games rested on improved international prestige more than the direct improvement of the well-being of citizens. This is not to say that social development was absent, though, as it constituted the third most prevalent theme in the press and corporate communications. In particular, the Games were interpreted as an opportunity to improve social integration and cohesion and attend to the needs of the city at a community level:

(The IOC) said that Rio de Janeiro’s bid "is centred on the vision of using sport as a catalyst for social integration" and the Games for "celebration and transformation" of the city, the region and the country. The bid is driven by the Brazilian Government and Rio 2016’s vision incorporates the government's plans for improved social integration through investment in sports programs involving social inclusion through sport and leisure, elite sports training, expansion of infrastructure, the promotion of major events and its commitment to bring the Games to South America."34

This type of rhetoric regarding the benefits of hosting the Games employed the traditional approach to Olympic legacies, such as new sports facilities and increased public spending for sport and physical recreation, and extended it to the broader development agenda of social integration and cohesion. Though not as prevalent as the themes of investment and status, it did reference, though not explicitly, the increasingly recognized, and sometimes mythologized, relationship between sport and the softer development goals of community building, social cohesion and integration. Rio 2016 was, in other words, viewed as more than simply an engine of economic development, even if this was clearly the most prevalent interpretation. It is also important to recognize that media coverage did capture some critical or dissenting voices regarding the development promises and prospects of the Rio 2016 Games though, these were few and far between. For example, questions about who will benefit from the development of Rio in and through the 2016 Games were raised, particularly by activists concerned about the plight of the large populations of Rio citizens who live in poverty:
‘This is all for the real estate people to help them push the remaining poor out of the city,’ agreed Craig Althage, a library assistant, who also joined the rally. Around him protesters held banners blazoned with messages like Hands Off My Home, Land Grab and Eminent Domain Abuse, a reference to the power of municipalities to seize properties to make way for development deemed to be for the public good.35

While not a new criticism of the hosting of Olympic Games, nor a new focus for political activism, the issue of whether and/or how economic development surrounding the hosting of sports mega-events benefits the most vulnerable members of the population can be understood, like the hosting of the Games at the level of the state, to be of relatively higher stakes in the context of Rio and Brazil where economic disparities are so pronounced.

Finally, it is important to note that several of the key development issues identified by the IOC and present within the literature on international development were largely absent from the media coverage and corporate communications captured in this analysis. At least three are worth mentioning: the environment, human security, and equality. Little to no media coverage of the announcement positioned the Rio 2016 Games as an opportunity to attend to major environmental challenges, even though the IOC and the Rio bid documents do recognize this as a crucial issue for host cities. Security was referenced but primarily in terms of the protection of privileged persons, notably tourists, and the combating of Rio’s reputation as a city of violence. Little mention about the potential role of the Games in building human security through justice for the citizens of Rio was addressed. Similarly, despite the lack of economic distribution in contemporary Brazil, no mention was made about the redistribution of wealth, or even the benefits to the poor and under-classes that the Rio 2016 Games might afford or allow. This is not to suggest that the media and corporate communications surrounding the announcement would have been expected to attend to these crucial issues of development in its interpretations, but rather that despite the increased attention and effort paid to connect sport to international development by the IOC and the Rio 2016 organizers and the broader international community, this development is still understood primarily in capitalist terms, not with reference to social or environmental justice. In the discussion, I consider the implications of these findings.

Discussion

Clearly, the IOC and Rio 2016 organizers have ascribed importance to issues of development. Yet the results of this study illustrate a disconnect between these understandings and the broader cultural and political economy. This is not entirely surprising given that the DJF database captured primarily a business orientation towards the development prospects of Rio 2016, as opposed to the more social orientation of development espoused by the IOC and Rio 2016 organizers, but this disconnect is not insignificant. It suggests, at the least, that the broad social development envisaged, promoted, and indeed traded upon as a means of expanding the Olympics to the Global South is largely absent, if not overrun, by the hegemony of neo-liberal development philosophy based on economic growth and expansion. It also lends further credence to the argument that sport is ‘tailor-made’ for neo-liberal development and that the expansion of the IOC’s development agenda, the increased recognition of the SDP movement, and the awarding of the Games to host cities in traditionally marginalized states, may do very little to challenge this neo-liberal orthodoxy.

This disconnect might also point to a divergence between the development mandate of Olympism and the goals of actually hosting an Olympic Games as a form of creating sustainable change. In this sense, even if sport offers a new way to approach development, and the development implications and importance ascribed to the hosting of the Olympics are heightened for cities in the southern
hemisphere, it may be the case that the softer development agenda promulgated by the IOC is still considered to be secondary to the hard economic and growth orientation intelligible in traditional approaches to international development.

It may also be possible to read the IOC’s commitment to the development aspects of sport and the Olympics as a form of ‘development education’ which, similar to other notions of northern development within popular culture (such as the LiveAid concerts and the Product RED campaign) strives to ‘educate’ northern residents, those who benefit disproportionately from the global political economy, about what they can do to give back without challenging the largely colonizing relationships that sustain inequality. From this perspective, development of the kind championed by the IOC is not designed to challenge the political economy in any radical way as much as to create space – materially and discursively – for northern corporations, institutions and residents to maintain a sense of progressiveness despite their privilege. Given the results of this small study, such issues are worthy of further analysis.

Finally, the implications of the disconnect described in this study is important to the extent that if the IOC and Olympic movement are serious about enacting the type of social change and development that it describes and advocates, then it faces a significant challenge of reconciling these goals with the neo-liberal approaches to ‘development as growth’ that continue to be the most politically palatable and intelligible. At issue is the understanding that the constant or infinite growth of the world’s emerging economies, particularly the four BRIC countries, is incompatible, if not diametrically opposed, to the achievement of sustainable development, particularly in relation to the environment, climate and natural resources. Considering the extent of the commercialization of the Olympics, and the opening of new markets that the Games in the Global South represent, delivering sustainable and equitable sports mega-events for the benefit of all is a daunting task.
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