The winter Olympics in Vancouver represented an opportunity for Canada to showcase itself at the global level. Not only did the international media descend upon Vancouver and Whistler, showcasing their natural beauty and famous sights, but Canadian athletes were also cast under a spotlight, and their victories and loses were seen to be correlated with the success of the Games and the health and vitality of the Canadian nation by the Canadian public. Sport and politics are intimately connected and have a long relationship, stretching back in history to the time of the Greeks. The Olympic Games have become the most obvious and wide-scale manifestation of the connection between sport and politics. Pierre de Coubertin, the founder of the modern Games, saw the Olympics as a vehicle for fostering world brotherhood and international goodwill, and this remains the rallying cry of the International Olympic Committee to this day. However, the Olympics are too often only assessed on their athletic merits, rather than on their lasting social legacies. This paper will attempt to critically assess some of the early legacies which have come out of the Vancouver Olympics in terms of their environmental impact, the relationship between Olympic organizers and Vancouver's aboriginal communities, and finally, issues associated with urban poverty which are directly related to the hosting of the Games.
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**Introduction**

The winter Olympics in Vancouver represented an opportunity for Canada to showcase itself at the global level. Not only did the international media descend upon Vancouver and Whistler, showcasing their natural beauty and famous sights, but Canadian athletes were also cast under a spotlight, and their victories and losses were seen to be correlated with the success of the Games and the health and vitality of the Canadian nation by the Canadian public. Because the Olympics are one of the most large scale sporting events in the world, they offer us a unique perspective on the connection between sport and politics. The Olympics also provide insight into the use of major sporting events as sites where what we conceive of as 'the international' is created, manipulated and observed. This paper will demonstrate that Olympic sporting events are about more than just entertainment and athletic achievement by acknowledging their explicitly political nature. Through the utilization of an 'everyday life' perspective on sporting events this paper will examine how specific social practices, reproduced at an event like the Olympics, need to be better understood from a broadly critical perspective.

With this in mind, this paper also examines the ways in which Canadian identity is constructed, marketed and (re)imagined at the Olympics, and through sport in general. It addresses questions about the impact of hosting the Olympics for 'middle' power like Canada and critically analyses the hosting of the Olympics as an opportunity for Canada showcase itself to the world as a place of athletic superiority. Importantly, this analysis critiques the realist emphasis on international relations as a struggle for power by examining the importance of prestige, particularly as it is related to sport. I argue that, in the absence of the kinds of political power games which typified the Cold War, prestige becomes the elusive marker which states strive for, and sport is one of the many ways through which prestige is garnered. Moreover, perception matters in international relations, and sport is a conduit for the ways in which these perceptions are manifested in what is considered to be the international political realm. In consideration of this, this paper examines how hosting the Olympics for the third time plays into Canadian notions of international prestige by promoting the perception of Canada as a site of fair play and equality, while also advocating for the inclusion of sport as a variable worthy of consideration in the study of international politics.

The paper, therefore, is split broadly into two parts. In the first half I examine the political nature of sport and point out the parallels which exist between sport studies and international relations. In the second half of the paper I consider some of the early legacies of the Vancouver Olympics while also considering these issues in other Olympic contexts.

**Sport and International Relations**

Sport is an inherent part of social and political culture in nearly every society on earth. The mixture of sport and politics has a long history, and the relationship between the two stretches back to the ancient Greeks. Therefore, sport plays a significant role in constructing, maintaining and re-imagining national identities. In other words, sport is clearly an arena where personal identities can be both examined and established … Sport has therefore become an important conduit for a sense of collective resentment and popular consciousness and has been used by different groups (be they established, emergent or outsider) to maintain or change identities.
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The Olympic Games have become the most obvious and wide-scale manifestation of the connection between sport and politics. Moreover, major sporting events like the Olympics have the ability to draw larger and more interested crowds than, for example, an annual meeting of the UN General Assembly, making the ‘parade of national achievement’ more visible through sport than through traditional political forms. In addition, because sports are a part of everyday life and popular culture they provide an access point through which ‘the international’ can be viewed and examined by the masses. From this point of view, sporting events are significant sites of international politics as they allow us to explore the everyday negotiations of various social codes upon which the ‘international’ is imagined.

The relationship between sport and international relations (IR) has traditionally been neglected in the mainstream study of IR, mainly because of the persistence of realism as the mainstream IR theory. Realism can be divided into many different sub-categories, and indeed, Walker points out that it is inaccurate to speak of a single coherent realist tradition. Yet realist traditions all share some of the same general tenets. Classical realism, for example, of the type most often associated with Hans Morgenthau, emphasizes states as utility-maximizing self interested actors. With this in mind, therefore, competition, anarchy and security dilemmas are the result of the behaviour of states, not the behaviour of individuals. Realism thus reifies the state, and in so doing has been criticised by a number of IR theorists. From the preceding discussion it is difficult to see where sport fits and it becomes quite obvious that sport cannot be considered from a realist standpoint in IR.

Levermore and Budd point out that an analysis of sport requires a constant interrogation of the basic tenets of realism and thus was not accepted as an important variable until realism faced serious challenges by other theories of international relations. IR theorists are increasingly willing to see the connection between sport and power, sport and national prestige, sport and security. Levermore argues that, “…there are areas in which sport has some, if not a major, role to play in security studies… [and] conflict resolution.” Moreover, Lowe, Kanin and Strenk argue that “…sport can be identified as a phenomenon of international concern.” Because IR theory has shifted toward a consideration of the social habits and behaviours of individuals and societies, a more nuanced examination of their impact upon international relations is possible. In addition, a rejection of the strict, unsustainable and inaccurate delineation between public and private, in political terms, opens the door further to allowing for an analysis of sport as it is related to politics. In other words, “A focus on the politics in sport is predicated upon a view of politics which does not recognize the demarcation between the public and the private and which does not recognize the demarcation between the public and the private and which treats politics as a ubiquitous aspect of all
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social institutions, including schools, sports clubs and governing bodies.”

In light of Michel de Certeau’s work, it is understood that the Olympics are a combination of social practices manifesting heavy adaptations, distortions, negotiations and contestations of what the ‘international’ means and how it is practiced.

In the post Cold War world it is important to note that prestige can be separated from power and that they can be sought in different ways. Moreover, though it is incredibly difficult to generalize the role of the state in sport, this does not detract from the fact that such a relationship exists. States and other agents can seek out prestige on the behalf of nations and civil societies in a number of different ways. In other words, “The extent to which sport can generate ‘power’ must be marginal and elusive … but it is a natural source of prestige.”

What can be extrapolated from this is that, in the absence of the kinds of political power games which typified the Cold War, prestige becomes the elusive marker which states strive for, and sport is one of many ways through which prestige is garnered. In terms of how this fits into international relations theory, this is demonstrative of the fact that strict emphasis on the struggle for power is no longer reflective of the current state of international affairs. “Prestige that [can] be exploited domestically and internationally [can] come cheaply, but with apparently significant rewards.” Moreover, Lowe, Kanin and Strenk argue that, “If sport is a useful instrument in public diplomacy because of its public, politically peripheral nature, and unusual in intercultural relations because of its intrinsically competitive nature, it is also important in international relations…” Therefore, more analysis of the types of social rituals which contribute to the gaining of state or national prestige is important.

Despite this, sport is often ignored by those who study politics because it is presumed not to have a political angle at all. Allison and Monnington have referred to this as the “myth of autonomy”, which suggests that sport has little impact on human and social relations. Sport is often not viewed as a ‘serious’ party of the political culture of any given society. Sport, however, is a companion phenomenon to culture itself. It is not inferior to, or autonomous of culture, but rather it is a variety of it. Maheu argues that, “For nothing in the world today is younger or has greater potentialities than sport, and nothing is older and richer than culture, and it is of vital importance to us that there should be interpenetration and mutual understanding between the two.”

John Hargreaves also argues that sport must be considered to be a part of civil society (and can often be seen as a method through which ruling groups can exercise hegemony). Moreover, in an increasingly globalized world, the impact of sport on culture and identity needs considerably more analysis as it has undoubtedly grown more complex under these conditions.

In addition, mainstream IR theory has not interrogated the, “…implications of the ways in which hegemonic masculinity, embroiled in sport, reinforces nationalistic ideology and concomitantly ‘normalizes’ discourses on the position and practices of women in sport and
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society." Sextism, racism and chauvinism are deeply embedded in the conduct of many sporting organizations, and an interrogation of the problematic nature of these practices is required not only from a political international relations standpoint, but also from a sociological and sports studies perspective.

**Politics and The Olympics**

When considering sport without the utilization of realist analysis it should become clearer that sport is important because, among other things, sport impacts our understanding of how agency/power dynamics are manifested through cultural forms, and that sport is used in foreign relations in a variety of ways. Unfortunately, when considering many of the examples in which sport and politics over lap, it appears to suggest that when the two are intertwined it is because, “…politicians have exploited sport for nationalist, racist or other dubious purposes, or that when sport and politics intertwine it is sport that has its ideals undermined and exploited.” However, in other instances sport has been a positive force which has helped improve international relations, an example being the experiment in ‘ping pong diplomacy’ when the Nixon administration sent a table tennis team to China to help open the door to trade and political diplomacy while easing cultural tensions. Sport can also have a positive effect on a national and local level, where the effects of political decisions about funding and administration of sports are felt locally. In essence, therefore, while “…sport serves as an object of political conflict or else as an arena for the furthering of political aims…” it is also a conduit for positive outcomes at both the state and local level. Internationally, however, sport diplomacy retains its attraction to state governments because it, “…adds to the repertoire of tools available for the pursuit of foreign policy goals [and] also because of the subtlety and malleability of sports diplomacy.” At an international level, sport can be used to bring relations between enemies to a cooperative meeting point, while also improving and strengthening relations between allies and neighbours.

Aside from football’s World Cup, there simply is no greater example of the connection between sport and politics than the Olympics. Events like the Olympics are, “[…] critical junctures where globally mediated urban identities are refashioned, future directions forged, and past lineages overwritten in a context of global inter-urban competition.” Given that the Olympics are the, “[…] largest, regularly scheduled meeting of people in the world…” the Games can be used as diplomatic tools, mainly through the use of sporting boycotts, to great effect. For example, the 1936 Berlin Olympics (also colloquially known as the ‘Nazi Olympics’) were the subject of major controversy and threatened boycotts, especially from the United States. While the US did, in the end, send a team (resulting in the famous Jesse Owens track victory), Canada stuck with the boycott and did not send a team. Both Canada and the US boycotted the 1980 Summer Olympics in Moscow to protest the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan. In retaliation, the Soviet bloc boycotted the
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The Seoul Olympics caused controversy from Pyongyang as they demanded that half of the Olympic event should be held north of the 38th parallel in North Korea. The IOC offered them table tennis, archery, and some cycling and soccer. Insulted, the North Koreans refused the offer and fully boycotted the Games. South Africa was banned from international rugby union and cricket tournaments, as well as from the Olympic Games from 1968 until 1992 because of global concern over the apartheid regime. With the recent Beijing Olympics, calls for a boycott were heard almost daily, though no country actually followed through on the threat and engaged in a boycott. The actual political effects of sporting boycotts are perhaps negligible, but the fact remains that sporting boycotts are an inexpensive and very public way for states to flex some muscle on the international political scene. Allison and Monnington point out that, while trade sanctions may impose high costs on workers and capitalists, sporting contacts are largely substitutable.

Moreover, governments use sporting events as diplomatic tools by seeking to apply sanctions upon other countries by influencing the allocation of major sporting events like the Olympics or football’s World Cup. Sporting boycotts or protests are a ‘soft’ form of diplomacy in which it is unlikely that any actual conflict will result, however, the public impact of this kind of diplomacy cannot be understated given the intense global interest in, and media coverage of, international sporting events.

Finally, sports diplomacy can also serve the function of signalling the re-entry of a state into the international community. The Tokyo Olympic Games in 1964 represented Japan’s return into the good graces of the West after the events of World War II. Munich’s Games of 1972 symbolised acceptance of West Germany while also lying to rest the ghosts of Nazism, while South Africa’s participation in the 1992 Barcelona Games demonstrated that South Africa was a ‘new’ country, ready to show the world it was eager to dispense with its apartheid past.

The Olympic Games have become the most obvious and wide-scale manifestation of the connection between sport and politics. Pierre de Coubertin saw the Olympics as a vehicle for fostering world brotherhood and international goodwill, and this remains the rallying cry of the International Olympic Committee to this day. However, “This creed presupposes - - indeed, invites - - political involvement in the Games. Yet in the countless examples where sport between nations has attenuated, or in fact created, ethnocentric boundaries, rival nations have blamed each other for allowing politics to impinge on the sanctity of the Olympic arena.” Hatfield goes so far as to argue that, “Pointedly, Olympic sport has evolved from a politically naïve vision into a politically volatile reality, and from a socially innocuous phenomenon into an event capable of eliciting such ethnocentric behaviour as to plunge nations into all-out warfare.” Despite claims that the Olympics, and sport in general, are apolitical, the Games often act as a political platform upon which political messages can be sent to many more spectators than could otherwise be reached through traditional political means. Moreover, the cost of hosting the Olympics is well beyond the budgets of many states. Therefore, “For those nations that continue to dream of hosting a major international sporting tournament, the inevitable need to turn to external funding agencies to finance
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such a project will once more, for many, rekindle images of neocolonialism and economic dependency."

34 That the Olympics and politics are intimately connected is without doubt. In 1968 Summer Olympics in Mexico City became the sight of one of the most iconic images of the relationship between sport and politics when American track gold medalist Tommie Smith, along with bronze medalist John Carlos bowed their heads and raised their fists in a salute to the Black Power movement on the medal podium during the star spangled banner. The reaction was swift and harsh. Then IOC president Avery Brundage decried the attempt the athletes were making to demonstrate a political statement at the Olympics, which he believed, were ostensibly an apolitical event. Both athletes were expelled from the Games, only to face immense controversy and criticism back home in the United States. Likewise, the Munich Summer Games in 1972, as mentioned above, where not without major political consequence either after eleven Israeli athletes were taken hostage and eventually killed by members of Black September, a militant Palestinian organization in what has come to be one of the darkest marks in Olympic history. These events also changed the ways that Olympic security was undertaken after it was understood that the open and inclusive atmosphere that was being promoted by the West German organizers allowed the hostage taking to happen. Of course, the security dilemma reared its ugly head again at the Atlanta Summer Games in 1996 when Eric Rudolph set off a bomb at Centennial Olympic Park in the hopes of having the Olympics cancelled as a way to embarrass the American government on a world stage for what he saw as their sanctioning of abortion.

Indeed, as discussed above, concern for power and prestige are central themes in international relations, where international sporting diplomacy and the Olympic Games play into these themes nicely. Overall, “Success in sports events, and particularly the hosting of sports events, provides a benign and uncritical backdrop for the parade of national achievement.”

35 Canada and the Vancouver 2010 Winter Olympics

Given what has been established, it is clear that the hosting of the Olympics is not only a major sporting spectacle, but also that it is a political opportunity for the export of state prestige. The importance for Canada in the hosting of this event cannot be understated. The opportunity presented for the export and absorption of officially propagated “Canadian” ideology which exists in the hosting of the Olympics occurs in ways that cannot be replicated under any other circumstances. Canadian athletes in particular were under tremendous pressure to represent Canadian ideals and values through their performance. Guttman points out that, “Athletes continue to be perceived by the spectators as representatives of their race, religion, or nation rather than as symbols of human possibility.” From this perspective, therefore, the successes and failures of Canadian athletes will be used as barometers against which the vitality of the Canadian nation is measured. Moreover, Canada was under increased pressure in the wake of the 2008 Beijing Olympics to stage a Games where rules were respected and understood. The controversy surrounding the ages of the women on the Chinese gymnastics team has not yet been resolved, and indeed the symbolism of a communist host country engaging in rule bending harkens back to Olympic Cold War controversies of old. In addition, controversies surrounding the continuing use of illegal performance-enhancing drugs by athletes at the Olympics casts a major shadow over the IOC’s promotion of fair play and equitable access to sport. Canada prides itself (rightly or wrongly) as a site of equality and fair play, and therefore the Olympics offer an international stage upon which to ‘prove’ this to the world. As
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a middle power, Canada is not known globally for many things, and the global visibility the
Olympics allows for will give Canadian Olympic officials the opportunity to shape and manipulate
the vision of Canada which is shown to the world.

Canada was awarded the 2010 Winter Olympics after being voted in over PyeongChang,
South Korea and Salzburg, Austria. Canada has twice hosted the Olympics before; winter of 1988 in
Calgary, and summer of 1976 in Montreal. Walmsley and Heine point out, in their discussion of the
1988 Calgary Olympics that, “[…] Calgarians were encouraged by organizers, through various
aspects of participation, to identify with particular aspects of the games, thereby aligning them closer
with officially produced significations.”37 By the time the games were over, “The legacy promised by
the organizing committee – facilities, civic and national pride, and general Olympic hype – was
delivered.”38 Montreal had a more mixed legacy. Financial problems plagued the Games, plunging
the city into extreme debt. Montreal’s Olympic Stadium is seen by many to be a blight on the
skyline of the city, and serves as a constant reminder of the financial mismanagement and
incompetence which surrounded the Games. In addition, 28 African countries boycotted the
Montreal Games over issues associated with South African apartheid. However, few will ever forget
Romania’s 14 year old Nadia Comăneci and her six “perfect 10” gymnastic performances.

Regardless of the legacies provided by all three of Canada’s host cities, the fact remains that
the Olympic product is highly marketable in any case. The ‘product’ under consideration here, however,
needs to be critiqued further. The ‘product’ being sold in Vancouver is nicely summed up by the
Vancouver Olympic Organizing Committee’s (VANOC) mission statement: “To touch the
soul of the nation and inspire the world by creating and delivering an extraordinary Olympic and
Paralympic experience with lasting legacies.”39 Further, VANOC’s chosen slogan for the Games is,
“With Glowing Hearts”. However, this obviously neglects the controversies surrounding
Vancouver’s Olympic legacy with regard to the environmental degradation the Games will cause,
problematic reconciliations among carefully chosen aboriginal communities, along with the issues
affecting the displacement of homeless and poor people living in the poverty stricken Downtown
East Side of Vancouver. All of this makes it clear that a more critical lens of analysis must be
employed when we consider the Olympics. Segrave points out that, “[…] while the Games
themselves have thrived, the Olympic idea, the ideology that undergirds the entire Olympic
movement, Olympism, has not.”40 In other words, the Games have become about the fostering of a
manipulative marketing strategy which promotes commercialism, corporatism and nationalism.
Occasionally is can also promote problematic gender, race and national stereotypes. The issue under
consideration here, however, is that these issues exist underneath the ‘Games’, out of sight of those
who tend to view the Olympics with a less critical eye, and therefore compromise the ideals
put forward by the original founders of the modern Olympics.

In the remainder of this paper I will examine three important issues which are affected by
the Olympics and demonstrate the need to think critically about the real motives of those who
promote the Olympics. They are – the environment, aboriginal concerns and poverty.

37 K.B. Walmsley and Michael Heine, “‘Calgary is not a Cowboy Town’ – Ideology, The Olympics, and the
38 Ibid., p. 81
http://www.vancouver2010.com/more-2010-information/about-vanoc/organizing-committee/mission--vision-and-
values/vision--mission-and-values_88080aO.html
40 Jeffrey O. Segrave, “The (neo)modern Olympic Games: The revolutions in Europe and the resurgence of
Vancouver 2010 and the environment

The environmental impact of the Games cannot be understated. Regardless of this, the Olympic Charter makes it clear that part of the IOC’s mandate is: “to encourage and support a responsible concern for environmental issues, to promote sustainable development in sport and to require that the Olympic Games are held accordingly.”\(^{41}\) In the case of any major sporting event, a city’s infrastructure will require some adjustment including the alternation of the physical and environmental landscape of the city, improvements to air, land and water transportation, and alterations to the design of the city. No city is capable of handling the massive influx of athletes, spectators and media as they stood prior to the Games. New buildings to house athletes, provide a space for members of the media to work, and new sporting facilities need to be constructed. Often roads and public transit need to be updated or expanded. The Olympics attract large numbers of people, thus causing a considerable increase in a city’s population. These sudden increases put a strain upon municipal infrastructure like water supplies and sewage waste management. In addition, there is an increase in the amount of garbage produced, while more motor traffic results in more gridlock, hence, more idling vehicles emitting harmful gas vapours into the atmosphere. In Beijing, Olympic organizers even tried to combat the intense traffic and smog problems in the city by legislating certain days upon which people could drive. It did little to alter the air quality in Beijing, and concerns were being echoed about the athletes who were participating lengthy outdoor events, such as the marathon and cycling. The city even went so far as to control the weather, using a technique known as cloud seeding to ensure that no rain would fall into the open roof of the Bird’s Nest stadium on the night of the Opening Ceremonies. The environmental issues which surround the Olympics were not unique to Vancouver alone, but there were, however, environmental issues which were unique to the city’s preparation which will be examined a little further here.

The widening of the Sea To Sky highway which connects Vancouver to Whistler is the most obvious site of controversy over the legacy of the Games. The highway was previously a two-lane stretch of road which twisted and meandered along the water and the mountains through the 125 kilometre journey between the two host cities. Not only was it not capable of bearing the extreme loads of traffic which are expected during the Games, but it is also a dangerous road which has been the site of numerous vehicle accidents. The widening of the highway, therefore, was presented to the residents of British Columbia not only as something which the Games required, but also as something which would have long term safety benefits to the residents who use it as part of their daily life. What has been hidden in this message, however, is the incredible level of environmental destruction that a project of this scope necessarily entails. The widening of the highway destroyed the Eagleridge Bluffs, a rare and highly sensitive ecosystem which is a nesting area for bald eagles, a refuge for an endangered frog species, and home to centuries old Douglas fir trees. In addition, significant and unique plant diversity existed in the area. In 2006 a small number of protesters camped out on the land for 39 days in an attempt to halt construction crews from continuing their work.\(^{42}\) The issue reached the BC Supreme Court, who ultimately sided with VANOC and ordered the protesters off the land. Similar calls from environmental activists to build a tunnel through the area, rather than widening the over land road way, was dismissed by the BC government because of the prohibitive costs which were involved.


The destruction of the environment comes in direct contrast to the arguments VANOC made when it was bidding for the Olympics. Part of the reason the Games were awarded was based on the argument that Vancouver could stage one of the cleanest, greenest and most sustainable Games ever held. Vancouver is also considered, by other Canadians at least, to be a city with an environmental conscience. Because of the natural beauty which surrounds the city, the assumption has been made that both the provincial and local governments in the area are keen to make decisions which protect and preserve the environment. The destruction of the Eagleridge Bluffs needs to be considered when assessing the legacy of the Games.

**Vancouver 2010 and Canadian Aboriginal communities**

Given that most sporting mega events are not profitable, often mega event marketers are keen to point out not the economic benefits of hosting the Games, but the social ones which are presumed to be long lasting. With this in mind, the Olympics are often marketed as a way to bring people together by bridging ethnic, national or racial divides. Furthermore, sport is often seen as a mechanism through which reconciliation and compromise can take place. Sporting mega events, like the Olympics and the World Cup, are particularly couched in the narratives of cooperation and fair play because there simply are no other global events which attract as many participants and which have such a hold on the global (non-sporting) audience. The two Koreas, for example, frequently enter the Olympic Stadium in a symbolic showing of the desire to see Korea united, if not politically, at least in sport. (It should be noted here that the two Koreas did not enter the Vancouver Olympics under the same flag). A popular World Cup example of the peacefully transformative nature of sport came in 2006 when civil strife in Ivory Coast ceased during the tournament. As was noted by the BBC, “The team were aware they had a unique opportunity to plead the cause of unity. Dropping to one knee in the changing room after the decisive match, the captain, Chelsea star Didier Drogba, led his team-mates in a plea for peace. ‘Ivorians, we ask for your forgiveness,’ they said. ‘Let us come together and put this war behind us.’” Because the members of the Elephants – as the national team is called – came from both sides of the civil conflict, the assumption was that he team could serve as a model for the rest of the country by demonstrating that cooperation is possible. However, this notion neglected the stark reality that was summed up by one protester: “We stopped so we can watch the Elephants at the Nations Cup. When they get knocked out, we will be on the street again.” And they were.

Like the situation in Ivory Coast, the Olympics have come to represent not only a space within which international conflicts and disagreements can be set aside, but also where subnational reconciliations can take place. In the case of the Vancouver Olympics, acknowledging Canada’s aboriginal communities was seen as an important part of the Games. Likewise, the 2000 Olympics in Sydney were promoted as an important site upon which aboriginal and colonial histories would be acknowledged, reconciled and intertwined. According to Chalip, the Sydney situation was, “[…] well demonstrated by Cathy Freeman’s participation and eventual victory in the 400 meters at the Sydney Olympics. Her participation became symbolic of the effort that Australians are making to seek reconciliation between Aboriginal and White Australia. The symbolism was used and furthered by the Sydney organisers’ decision to have her light the flame during the Opening Ceremonies. Her subsequent victory enabled extensive public discourse about the past and future of relations between
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Aboriginal Australia and White Australia.” This was especially important in Australia given the political climate of the time. Controversy surrounding the Prime Minister’s refusal to apologize for land treaty abuses and the residential school system were making major headlines in 2000.

The Olympic Opening Ceremonies have become a space within which the ‘nation’ can be put on display, where subnational nations and communities can be made part of the ‘imagined community’ within which they reside. However, examining Olympic ceremonies through a more critical lens makes it clear that, “Globalized sporting spectacles construct gendered and ethnicized discourses of national identity that have the capacity to mirror, sustain, or challenge the subordination of women and ethnic minorities in a variety of national settings.” Hogan argues further that the multicultural narratives which are presented at the Olympics happen against a backdrop of white hegemonic masculinity. Likewise, Ellis, Pratt and Elder argue that the Sydney Olympics were used as a, “[…] way of disciplining Indigenous people and maintaining a particularly conservative understanding of reconciliation; one that did little to change the unequal power relations between Indigenous and non-Indigenous peoples.”

Sydney was also plagued, before the Games started, with the threat of aboriginal protest. “In the years leading up to the Sydney Games, the threat of protests at the Olympics had become a familiar feature of Australian political life. Most memorable among these warnings was the Indigenous activist Charles Perkins’ April 2000 declaration that Sydney would ‘burn, baby, burn’ during the event.”

The Olympics in Vancouver were also characterised by a somewhat tenuous relationship between the organizers and British Columbia’s aboriginal communities. The issue was prominent in the bidding process Vancouver went through in order to acquire the rights to hold the Games. According to O’Bonsawin, “[…] as explained in the Vancouver 2010 Bid Book, organizers claimed that the four political institutions of Canada include the federal government, the provincial and territorial governments, the municipal/regional governments, and the ‘First Nations’. However, a national policy has yet to be developed that recognizes First Nations as an official political institution within Canada. This leads one to question the integrity, or at the very least, the organizational creditability of an international movement that permits a few individuals, normally members of the political and corporate elite, to provide the IOC with an abridgment of complex national structures.”

Concern over the participation of Vancouver’s aboriginal communities permeated the bidding and building process of the Games. The ‘No Olympics on Stolen Native Land’ movement, for example, pointed out that the Games would take place on, “[…]unceded and nonsurrendered indigenous lands” and threatened massive protests which would disrupt the Games. The opening ceremonies
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in Vancouver were leaden with aboriginal motifs, however, there was little acknowledgement of the brutal nature of the colonial history of Canadian First Nations, nor was there much acknowledgement of the fact that many aboriginal groups claimed that the Olympics were in violation of land treaties and were therefore taking place on stolen land.

This was contrary to the story being told by the Olympic organizers in Vancouver, however. Jack Poole, the chairman of VANOC has said that, “If it hadn’t been for the full support of the Four Host First Nations in our bid, we likely wouldn’t be talking about Vancouver 2010 today.”

Although VANOC, through statements such as these, has been very public in its proclamations that it has the full support and co-operation of the Four Host First Nations (the Lil’wat, Musqueam, Squamish and Tsleil-Waututh First Nations on whose grounds the Olympics are being held), this neglects those aboriginal communities who remain opposed to the Games and concerned about their environmental impact upon their lands. Moreover, some have argued that aboriginal involvement in the Games is merely a disingenuous ploy to make it appear as though aboriginal groups were given a real stake in the Games. The fact remains that aboriginal Canadians make up a disproportionate number of those living in poverty in Vancouver, and that little has been done since the Olympics were awarded to improve the general living conditions of all aboriginal Canadians. Therefore, the claim that aboriginal groups are the “hosts” of these Games ignores the fact that it is only a few, carefully selected members of aboriginal communities who have been given the title of “host”. We can see again clearly that the Olympic product that Vancouver is selling is a political one with political ramifications.

**Vancouver 2010 and Poverty**

The Olympics have a fairly dismal track record when it comes to renewing urban space or alleviating poverty. New housing and infrastructure is often called ‘urban renewal’ by Olympic planning committees, however it could be argued that this is simply another term for ‘Olympic gentrification’. Some of the most striking examples of this come from Atlanta and Beijing. In Atlanta participants and spectators were saddened to find that outside of the main event areas, Atlanta remained a city beset with crime, urban poverty and significant and obvious class divides. Many of the new homes that were built for Atlanta residents were situated around the Olympic stadium, highly visible to the international media and spectators. What this masked, however, was that in 1996 Atlanta was the poorest city in the United States, and the Olympics did little to alter this sad statistic. The city did not regenerate itself or its more run-down areas as a result of the Games and as a result the legacy of Atlanta was not a good one for the Olympics. Aside from the bombing at Olympic Park, there were serious complaints about inadequate transportation in the city and a general feeling of insufficient preparation. Most troubling, however, was the legacy of poverty and racialized housing displacements which were carried out in the name of urban renewal and Olympic excitement.

In Beijing the consequences for those living in poverty were much more severe mainly because there was little tolerance for dissent and consideration for human rights in the lead up to the Games. Thus, the legacy of the Beijing Olympics is complicated. In terms of the spectacle of Olympic bravado, it was incomparable to anything which had come before. From the spectacular
‘Bird’s Nest’ stadium to the over the top Opening and Closing Ceremonies, it was a Games that will not be forgotten. In addition, the athletic ability that was showcased at the Games was second to none, the performances of Michael Phelps at the Watercube being a prime example. However, controversy plagued, and continues to plague the Beijing Games. There was concern that the international community was rewarding, and ipso facto, sanctioning Chinese human rights abuses by choosing to hold the Games there. In addition, anti-Olympic voices and dissent were not tolerated in China and there was even concern regarding internet access for foreign media outlets while in the city. In addition, allegations against cheating Chinese gymnasts and document falsification have not yet been proven or cleared. Importantly for the argument being made here, however, the Beijing Olympics had a serious and problematic impact upon the urban poor. It was difficult to watch the news in the run up to those Games without seeing a story about the bulldozing of slum and shanty town areas and the forced displacement of the urban poor.

Likewise, Vancouver’s Olympic organizers have faced, and continue to face criticism about the Games legacy for the urban poor. The displacement of people from Vancouver’s downtown East Side is a continuing concern. Home to some of Canada’s poorest people, overwhelmed with drug and mental health issues, the area is sandwiched between two very popular tourist destinations, Gastown and Chinatown, and as such was highly visible during the Games. While the Olympics could have offered an opportunity for marked change in the area, the concern leading up to the Games was that the people who live there would instead be either jailed, hospitalized or moved out of the area for the duration of the Games. As many as 1.5 million were displaced as a result of the Beijing Games, and over 2,700 Roma were displaced in Athens prior to the 2004 Games. VANOC wants these Games to be the first ‘socially sustainable’ Games, and as such was committed at the outset to ensure that housing affordability was protected, that money would be put into better mental health and addiction facilities in Vancouver, and that no one would be forcibly displaced as a result of the Games. However, VANOC is unable to control landlords who have evicted tenants in order to renovate and re-lease their properties for much larger rental fees, and the Vancouver Police Department who some argue have been given increased authority to crack down on aggressive panhandling and open drug use. The fact remains that the Vancouver Olympics will not better the conditions for those living in poverty in the city.

**Conclusion**

This paper has demonstrated that a) sports are political; b) the Olympics are the most wide scale manifestation of the political nature of sport; and c) the Olympic product being sold for the 2010 Vancouver Games needs to be critically analysed. By acknowledging the explicitly political nature of sport we are better able to critique the political and social outcomes which result from the hosting of a major sporting event like the Olympics. Canada’s third time as host of the Olympics gives the country the chance to showcase itself to the world as an international site where fair play and equitable access to sport are held in high regard. VANOC’s commitment to holding an environmentally and socially sustainable Games, however, needs to be examined further. From the brief examples under discussion here it is clear that the political and social outcomes of the Games will extend far beyond medal counts and the great dramas that major sporting events always entail.

---
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