London 2012, 'Race', Community, and Legacy

This paper examines legacy claims made by a range of agencies and organisations involved in the London 2012 Olympic Development programme, and specifically the notion that this will *inevitably* lead to the regeneration of communities who are currently resident within the Olympic Boroughs. In highlighting the diverse nature of multicultural communities within these Olympic Boroughs we advocated the application of both Critical Race Theory (CRT) and critical human geography to provide a more focused evaluation of the capacity of those policy makers to deliver legacy promises. We identify the shortcomings of the rhetoric of *Olympic speak* and its dissonance with the micro-detail of accumulated historical factors, experiences and day-to-day routines for these communities. In detailing insights from inequalities in sports participation policies nationally for black and minority ethnic groups we suggest that diverse communities within the five Olympic Boroughs will not benefit in terms of increased chances for sports participation purely through the introduction of hard legacy infrastructure. If lasting legacy is to be achieved the concepts of community and sustainability need to be fully realised by policy-makers or policy gaps will be further perpetuated.

Key words: 'race'; community, sustainability; Olympics; legacy

Introduction

This paper explores some of the complexities and contradictions bound up in the consideration of 'race', sport, the East End and the London 2012 Games. In east London foregrounding urban renewal and legacy promises driven by one event there are enormous challenges in one of London's most established, multicultural, and resource deprived areas. This paper is written through the prism of Critical Race Theory (CRT) and critical human geography, in response to, and recognising that for academics engaged in the fields of sport and tourism respectively, there are prima facie seductive narratives as to why the 2012 Olympics will *inevitably* create lasting legacy benefits. This paper attempts to debunk some of those myths. In fact, it is difficult to find compelling empirical evidence of lasting community benefits from previous Olympics. The historical antecedents to assist in an assessment of claims of *inevitable* benefits accruing from the London 2012 Olympic Games, are not to be found exclusively within the lessons from past Olympic Games. Some of the lessons are to be found within past experiences of large-scale regeneration projects from within London, specifically with London Docklands offering contestable claims of lasting community benefits from the regeneration of Dockland Boroughs, in the 1980s and 1990s.

Pen pictures and ontology

Cooper (2008) reminds the academic community of the importance of communicating autobiographical details, as an important starting point, to inform choices of both theoretical and empirical perspectives, which might underpin scholarly activity. Within the context of this paper this is

particularly apposite. Lenskyj (2008) argues that most academic scholars with a market or institutional relationship with the Olympics, are as a result often less critical, and write from a relatively privileged position. As tenured academics this irony is not lost upon us. However the starting point for this paper emerged initially from a complementary set of circumstances. One of us (Author 1) was born in the east end of London (Hackney) in the early 1960s to Jamaican parents and for him his cultural context has always framed any 'privilege' in the academy. This hints at Author 1's ontological position in relation to his work on sport and critical race theory that has informed this analysis of 'race', sport and the Olympics in the east end of London (see Author 1, 2009; 2010; et al 2011). A central tenet of Critical Race theory (CRT) is that 'race' needs to be centred in academic work especially in sport where it has been marginalized (Burdsey, 2011; Hylton, 2009). Racism is also viewed as an insidious and pernicious factor in society that affects all aspects of our day-to-day activities and institutional processes, this includes sport. Sport is not in a bubble outside of this and neither is London 2012. For example, the presence of a diverse group of British athletes in the GB team belies the whiteness in the administration of most sports, including athletics, and the exclusionary institutionalized processes impacting upon black and minority ethnic groups more broadly in the UK. In relation to black and minority ethnic communities in the east of London, and the legacy promises especially in relation to urban regeneration, Maginn (2004) states that the over-riding view in the urban studies literature is that racism is institutionalized and endemic. Sport and the London 2012 project are contested arenas with the same issues that

play out in wider society. We emphasise the racialised nature of social inequalities and the challenges for all of us in terms of social justice and social transformation. Critical Race Theory 'takes sides', like Marxism or feminism it is a pragmatic political framework that encourages a direct challenge to institutional and personal arrangements that maintain, or reinforce intersecting racialised inequalities and subordination. The Olympic project in London signifies many of the issues we face in sport today.

The work of the second author (Author 2) has spent some time working in and with local communities in Moss Side, East Manchester, and East Middlesbrough, and has focussed on urban redevelopment in cities and issues of sustainability in local communities (see ----------- and Author 2, 1998; -------------and Author 2, 1999; Author 2, 2003; Author 1 and Author 2, 2009). The application of a critical human geography perspective within this paper, is informed by the work of Soja (1985). For Soja the key elements in this perspective are where:

> 'Spatiality and temporality, (where) human geography and human history, intersect in complex social process which creates a constantly evolving historical sequence of spatialities, a spatio-temporal structuration of social life which gives form not only to grand movements of societal development but also to

4

recursive practices of day-to-day activities'
(1985, p. 94).

Within the context of this paper we seek to bring to prominence these key elements of critical human geography in the treatment of the concept of community and in an understanding of the relationships and routines that are likely to characterise the everyday experiences of BME people living within the Olympic Boroughs in London.

Legacy

It is with this focus on the London 2012 mega-event in the context of the black community that we proceed to demystify the rhetoric of *Olympic Speak* and its potential to derail entrenched disenfranchising structural arrangements in sport. Part of the problem is the slippery way Olympic promises are made and the inability of urban and sport planners to learn from previous initiatives. For example the Greater London Authority 'Lasting Legacy for London' (LERI, 2007) states that "Cities assess legacy in their own terms and as an important part of the governance process" (2007:10). Whilst articulating a binary division between 'soft' and 'hard' legacy and an understanding that 'hard' legacy is about improved infrastructure and amenity (including a reconfiguration of city spaces); the recognition of what constitutes the measurement of 'soft' legacy is more problematic. Problematic in the sense that it is about the recognition of intangibles which might take longer to be measured. Despite these promises of regeneration in the east end of London, and Docklands there remain

overarching structural constraints that effectively undermine the symbolic gestures of Olympism. Community and ethnic differentiation based upon racialised, classed and gendered foundations predate the London 2012 Olympic developments and are prevalent aspects of society. The rhetoric of Olympism attempts to mask the presence of structural inequalities through utopian hyperbole, often ignoring them and rendering them invisible. However ignoring racialised processes and formations in sport and wider society neither renders them benign nor harmless.

The Olympic Delivery Authority (2007) and Zirin (2007) exemplify some of the contradictions and competing tensions to be explored in relation to black communities in the east end of London. When the ODA talk of their aspirations for the London 2012 Games they emphasise 'inclusion' and 'a sustainable legacy for London and the UK' (ODA, 2007, p. 2). Those who only have a fleeting knowledge of the Olympic project will be familiar with the tone of these sentiments. Zirin urges us to guard against being carried away by such claims. Sport and for that matter its Olympic Games flagship, can sweep us away on a wave of hubris and hope that it is often difficult for many to remain grounded. Many struggle to retain perspective about what is actually, or likely, to happen to communities in east London and the UK as a result of this mega-event affecting considerations of community, cost and housing, transport, employment and the availability of affordable sporting opportunities. Zirin's point remains that 'it's easy to forget how people in power use sport to advance their own narrow agendas' (Zirin, 2007, p. 171).

Further, Lenskyj (2008) uses the term 'Olympic industry' to emphasise the corporate characteristics of the Olympic organisers. By not using popular terms such as Olympic movement, 'family' or 'spirit' that engender a positive philosophical but ultimately uncritical acceptance of Olympism her use of language that reflects the 'power and profit motives that underlie Olympic-related ventures, retain a critical gaze. Yet there are always unintended consequences of such mega-events that it is a sobering opportunity in this paper to take a step back to view London 2012 using it. A cursory look at the developments involving London 2012 demonstrates the presence of popular Olympic narratives of legacy and sustainability and yet there is a plethora of counter-narratives in media and policy documents that contradict the institutional views of progress. It is important to note in the lead up to London 2012, that from a political perspective, concerns have been raised as to what this amorphous word, 'legacy', means. In a House of Lords debate, on the Olympic Games 2012: Legacy in 2008, Lord Mawson (www.gamesmonitor.org.uk/node/547) stated that:

> We worry about what we see taking place under what one experienced developer calls the smoke and mirrors of the Olympic Legacy. When you stay in one place for a very long time you watch successive government programmes. Their effect on people's lives is often quite different from the intention of the rhetoric that launched them.

Lord Mawson went on to say that,

> ...creating sustainable communities is not about the macro but about the micro. It is about the detail of local relationships between people and organisations on the ground. It is not ultimately about structures, systems and processes but about individuals' relationships and friendships. It is about people before structures. Many of us in east London are increasingly concerned that these crucial local details are still not understood by the more than 40 sector agencies involved in the regeneration of the area.

What is revealing within his statement are that the concepts of community and sustainability have become both misused and misunderstood and fuel the rhetoric of 'good intentions'. We explore in more detail the concept of community, it is important to note that the term sustainability, as with the term community, is contested.

Space, Sport, 'Race', Community

Though 'race' is a significant factor in any consideration of legacy benefits and promises the notion of community and how that community is regenerated and developed must be cognisant of a number of factors. CRT urges policymakers to avoid being colour-blind in their development and

implementation of policy and yet at the same time they challenge them to avoid reductionist and essentialist approaches. In each of the five boroughs and their strategic regeneration framework (SRF, 2009) it is important to consider the local context, history and needs in a way that incorporates some of the detailed conclusions from Maginn (2004: p.177) on the significance of 'race' in urban regeneration,

- There are distinct perceptions and constructions of who and what constitutes 'the local community' and this is structured by where people are socially located and how the urban regeneration process affects them;

- Communities may not be uniformly structured along particular socio-economic or cultural axes, such as class or 'race' or pertain shared motivations, values or interests;

- Communities are multifaceted and dynamic entities and are constantly being reconstructed around social and political issues within the local neighbourhood; and,

- Community politics can create perceptions of both community groupings and interests that may not necessarily be of continued relevance.

Maginn is conscious of how salient 'race' can be in relation to a number of critical intersecting factors. For each instance, class, gender, and community at the nexus of 'race' may be more salient than others at any time. The multicultural history of the east of London has imbued it with racialised

markers. These markers have demarcated sections of the city in such a way that communities and locations are symbolised in spaces and places, these are the spaces and places likely to be disrupted by the Olympic development process. An analysis of this requires an understanding of the reality of community and its complex social, psychological and geographical aspects that will determine the conditions for community action and inaction, on a range of issues. The term 'community' is not defined or used consistently and is given different treatment within a range of analytic works and operational situations, and Cooper (2008) reminds us that the term can appear to lack meaning. Recent work on racialisation has suggested that spaces are contested and their use is encoded by individuals and communities in complementary and divergent ways. Lefebvre's (1991, p. 292) view that the *'illusion of a transparent, 'pure' and neutral space has permeated Western culture'* is one of the main reasons offered by van Ingen (2003) for the lack of research in this area. This is consistent with Cooper and Hawtin's (1997, p. 112) view that in the absence of one single definition of community, that the concept should be interpreted through the prism of different ideological perspectives. Traditional views of 'community,' demarcated by the parameters of geographical location alone, and a sense of belonging to that locality (see e.g. Young and Wilmott, 1973) have been superseded by more complex analyses. Cooper highlights that: "Communities are not simply homogeneous formations built on shared values, but more often than not represent a local site where competing values are contested" (2008, p. 107).

The racialisation of spaces is commonly considered in relation to our lived spaces 'black', 'Asian', 'Chinese', 'white' areas (cf Andrews 1997, Lacy 2004) and we know too little about how spaces are conceived of or imagined by social groups. Further the creation, (re)creation and contestation of public spaces in terms of how our spatial practices structure how we experience sport (passively and actively) is under researched and under examined and makes us doubt that the London 2012 planners see more than simple places and people in making their claims about legacy and community. Miller and Ahmed (1997, p. 272) further identify the contradictory elements of community development, in that it allows planners and policy makers to legitimise the process of 'containing' marginalised sections of society, particularly in former industrial areas within the UK, not least communities within the east end of London. Clearly the mapping of an area by planners and policymakers is but one crude vision of a space that offers little insight into the dynamics and meaning of those spaces and the activities practiced in and around them (Hylton, 2009). Increases in the bricks and mortar stock in the five boroughs and not in the wider infrastructure of sport and related areas of social provision makes the unsubstantiated claims of the Olympic authorities to be pure window dressing, or the 'Olympic-Speak' that we have become accustomed to.

Sustainability

Successive UK governments post-1992, have attempted to articulate how the 'good intentions' of sustainability from a global perspective, can be translated into actions from the national to local level. Arguably, at the local

level, community visions of sustainability can create the notion of sustainable communities, which are underpinned by equity and social justice. Post-1992 Local Agenda 21 was the mechanism by which communities and local authorities could work jointly to ensure that local governance was guided by community inspired intentions and actions. Whilst early attempts by national government, to request that local authorities help to stimulate local communities to work with and express the language of sustainability in their everyday actions, it led to few local authority areas being able to identify progress in Local Agenda 21. There is nevertheless later evidence of a more concerted effort nationally to operationalise Local Agenda 21 in policy documents, and significantly in actions 'on the ground' (see ----------- and Author 2, 1999). Post 2000, what has emerged, is a corporatisation of local sustainability, with a move to embed sustainability within the corporatised processes of community plans and local strategic partnerships, displacing in the process, community actors from initiating actions for community based sustainability. The parallels with the London 2012 Olympic developments emerge in the sense that the Strategic Regeneration Framework (2009) of the five Olympic Boroughs is local authority led and offers corporatised goals for the benefit of communities.

The East End of London, 2012 and temporary fictions

There is a rich diversity in the five London boroughs in the east of London surrounding the Lea Valley where the bulk of the major Olympic 2012 facilities find their homes; Newham (East), Tower Hamlets (West),

Greenwich (South), Hackney (N. West) and Waltham Forest (North). Figure 1 demonstrates the diversity of London in relation to the UK and also the five host boroughs surrounding the Lea Valley. In the UK 8 per cent of the population is black ('non-white' sic) compared to London (29%) and the host boroughs at 42 per cent (ODA, 2007, p.10). Further, ethnic diversity in the five boroughs summarily reflect the UK's multicultural society but is much more a vision for the future of ethnic diversity for many locations outside of east London. In addition to the cultural complexities in the five host boroughs, three of the five score 11 or less on the index of multiple deprivation where 1 is the most deprived and 354 the least deprived. Incumbent with these statistics are the ancillary concerns around employment, education and social exclusion. There are approximately 1.25 million people in the five host boroughs and yet these residents are,

> Less likely to do well at school, get a good job, earn a living wage….you're more likely to live in a family in receipt of benefits, be the victim of violent crime, suffer from obesity and die early…the structural deficiencies didn't happen overnight – sadly the gap has existed for over a century.
> (Mayors and Leaders of the Olympic Host Boroughs, 2009, p. 4).

Mumford's study of the East End of London describes an area with the highest poverty levels in the capital where many communities relying upon social housing and related services feel disempowered. The traditional identity of an 'East Ender' is also disrupted as the contradictions of diversity 'insiderness' and 'outsiderness' all describe the postmodern condition of the East End. Clearly some communities are more established than others but they are not easily differentiated by traditional views of homogeneity of identity, 'race' or ethnicity, 'English or Britishness', but rather their differences and similarities lie in their experiences of living in this part of London, and living in England as racialised, classed and gendered individuals in social networks. Any legacy impacts or benefits from the London 2012 project will therefore impact neighbourhoods, individuals and communities of interest and cultural affinities in a variegated fashion. On this note the Olympic authorities' consideration of the complex ethnic communities in east London will dictate the long-term social capital accrued in this section of the capital.

Jenkins (1991) argues that

> all those old organising frameworks that
> presupposed the privileging of various
> centres (things that are, for example Anglo-
> centric, Euro-centric, ethno-centric, gender-
> centric, logo-centric) are no longer regarded
> as legitimate and natural frameworks, but
> as temporary fictions which were useful for

the articulation not of universal but of

particular interests (1991, p. 60).

Arguably, the staging of an Olympic Games requires a suspension of 'old organising frameworks' and the creation of 'temporary fictions'. The physical movement (resettling) of communities, often in the poorer areas earmarked for regeneration, in reality serves to sanitise the 'everyday routines' which characterise some of the most socially deprived communities within the UK. It would appear that the Olympic Delivery Authority (ODA) has 'sold' London to the IOC on the basis of the uniqueness of place, multiculturalism, community and history. With an idealised geography characterised by 'settledness, coherence and continuity' (Massey and Jess, 1993). 'Sold' on the promise of a sporting, cultural and community legacy. Analogous to this, Rose (1993) argues that the London Docklands Development Corporation (LDDC) of the early 1980s, made similar claims of regeneration and renewal but these claims ignored existing local identity and used the flummerical rhetoric of the colonisation of 'empty space', and new frontiers awaiting development.

The Olympic Delivery Authority: hegemony and legacy

Like Zirin (2007), MacClancy (1996) also argues that sport and its related activities cannot be understood outside of the power relations that constitute it. The Olympic Delivery Authority (ODA) has the responsibility for developing and building the new venues and infrastructure for the Games up to and beyond 2012. The ODA works in partnership with the

London Organising Committee, The Greater London Authority, the Department for Culture Media and Sport, the London Development Agency, the five host boroughs, transport agencies, employment agencies, national unions, the private sector and the voluntary and community sectors. They promise to do something in sport that has not happened with any deal of consistency in the past and that is for it to 'reach all communities and segments of the population...and leave a lasting legacy of equality...' (ODA, 2007: 3).

As one of the key agencies for London 2012 the ODA intends to ensure the east London communities are involved in the phase leading upto and post-Games through implementing an equality framework. This framework is planned to ensure the ODA is able to ask searching questions about <u>what</u> they build and leave behind; <u>how</u> they go about creating buildings and provision; <u>who</u> from diverse groups does the work; and <u>whom</u> the ODA listens to in making its decisions. In aiming to 'set a new benchmark for equality and diversity practice' (ODA, 2007, p. 5) they must consider the failures of sport in the UK public sector in achieving or even working towards this goal (Horne, 1995; Swinney and Horne 2005; Long et al 2009). Who plays, where they play, who organises, are all outcomes of relations socially constructed and played out in private and public (MacClancy, 1996). Agency and structure meld to the point that it becomes imperceptible how opportunity or constraint lead to decisions and outcomes affecting play and work. Sport providers have been notoriously ineffective in understanding and tackling these issues, especially where 'race' and diversity are

concerned (Hylton, 2009; Long et al 2009).

The ODA, like the DCMS, has developed a strategy that draws on the discourse of valuing diversity, active communities, partnership and devolution (DCMS 2001). On many levels the voice of organised black voluntary groups is being courted to provide knowledgeable points of reference for public bodies. Further, the Home Office recognises that policy analysts and policy makers need to consider more fully the structural constraints and power dynamics pressing upon black groups and black and minority ethnic group participation in society. Where the new Olympic bodies are doing this we must be thankful and wish them every success because an area for concern for the Home Office (2001a) was a need to recognise that there needs to be a 'race'-centred approach to policy, as a 'colour-blind' approach only reinforces racial disadvantage in policy formulation. Otherwise, marginalising 'race' and ethnicity causes inconsistencies and fragmentation in service delivery (Gardiner and Welch, 2001). This has been underlined by the emphasis placed upon the importance of working with black communities by the Home Office (2001b), Race on the Agenda (ROTA, 2001) and Maginn (2004).

A hypothetical case to illustrate the difficulties in the often contested claims of integration, community bonding and increased motivation for, and participation in, sport can be emphasised in the following scenario: What would happen if Lord Coe (Chair, London Organising Committee for the Olympic Games) were to be visited by the spirits of Olympics past, present

and future and offered a spell to once and for all put an end to racism, sexism, classism and ablism? If this spell was so powerful that by the end of the London 2012 closing ceremony there was no discrimination or inequalities in sport of any kind. If the peace, love and harmony of Olympic promises took hold, how would that affect the communities of east London, and the nation as a whole? Critical Race Theorists would argue that there are often ideological and material lenses through which to view this (Delgado and Stefancic 2001; Dixson and Rousseau 2006). The idealist is likely to accept the results of the spell and the consequent radical shift in beliefs. They would see the result of the Olympic Games as a job well done in terms of 'levelling the playing field' and an opportunity to move forward in the east end and in wider social domains. The social construction of racial differences in effect being outflanked by a greater power that has now unmasked bigoted behaviours and laid them bare. The materialist, or realist however is likely to acknowledge that although there has been a significant social transformation in public treatment and perception of the 'other', the material differences in access, opportunity and power would still remain. Materialists, or realists are likely to recognise the presence of racial privilege and hierarchies. They will also accept that there are racialised processes and formations that, if left unchecked, continue to perpetuate the differential treatment of, and opportunities for people dependent upon their location in the social pecking order. These social and economic inequalities are further compounded by the intersections of 'race', class, gender and the situated histories of the east end communities that London 2012 is having an everyday effect on. This structural backdrop is often disregarded in the

legacy promise firmament. Sport's ability to include people outside of the middle class white majority is highly variable. Sport is racialised in the UK. Sport can be viewed as a white racial formation where administrators, managers, coaches are more likely to be heavily represented and powerful where black and minority ethnic groups under-represented (Long and Hylton, 2002; Long et al 2009). Participation is also variable but heavily influenced by ethnicity, gender and class, this debate needs to pervade Olympic legacy plans if there is the intention to sustain effective participation from the diverse communities of east London and across the UK.

Interest Convergence and the Olympic Project

Interest convergence is a process of mutual gain between power elites and their subordinates (Delgado and Stefancic, 2001). In effect interest convergence describes how advances can sometimes be made in favour of disenfranchised groups that simultaneously benefit those with greater economic and political wealth (Delgado and Stefancic, 2001; Gillborn, 2009). The Greater London Authority (LERI 2007) identifies that the planning of an Olympic legacy should be part of an existing regeneration plan, a plan for urban renewal within the London Borough's hosting the Olympics. This is not surprising given that the five host boroughs account for the greatest cluster of deprivation in England and Wales (SRF, 2009: 11). Using the notion of interest convergence Gillborn (2009) outlined how gains in the Brown v Board of Education ruling on educational racial segregation in 1954 were tied to Cold War public relations and US competition with the

Soviet Union to win hearts and minds in Africa. The interests of power elites in this instance resonating with a cause for racial harmony and justice at home as a consequence of larger aims elsewhere. The five boroughs' strategic framework (2009), itself entitled 'convergence' announced that,

> The true legacy of 2012 is that within 20 years the communities who host the 2012 Games will have the same social and economic chances as their neighbours across London
>
> (SRF, 2009, p.2)

There is no denying the significance of this promise, nor those emerging from Brown v. Board of Education though Gillborn reveals how these gains can disappear over time as even today more African Americans attend segregated schools than they did when Brown v. Board of Education was decided. However, Gillborn (2009) was conscious of these 'contradiction-closing cases' of which the ruling in Brown was seen to be one; countless equality statutes in the UK could be viewed in the same light, and similarly London 2012 could fall into this category (see also Dixson and Rousseau 2006). Contradiction-closing cases are examples where the pressure for social change has built up to such a point that it becomes untenable to maintain the status quo. For instance the inequities between east and the rest of London, and deprivation indices signalling critical issues in particular geographical areas and affecting specific communities. To use a sporting

analogy these issues become 'political footballs', broader social and political pressures necessitate a fantastic, symbolic gesture. It could be argued that the Olympic developments in the east end of London are an opportunity for the gentrification of the east end while providing opportunities to benefit many entities from private retail and social providers, to multimillion pound football clubs. As a contradiction-closing case London 2012 becomes the symbolic marker of initiatives to tackle social objectives, and potential social transformation for many cross-cutting agendas and 'joined-up' [convergence] strategies. Increased sport participation, urban regeneration, and many other social, economic and political objectives become tied into these promises. The less common story is one that describes the Games being paid for largely by taxpayers, displacing low-income residents, and destroying working class communities (Lenskyj 2008).

Contradiction-closing cases are more significantly characterised by these symbolic actions/commitments serving as a cloak against stymied structural change; protecting those responsible for maintaining these inequities and reinforcing the racialised differentials in communities and sporting opportunities. The Olympic Games in effect being used as an exceptional case where all of the social problems within sport and beyond become ameliorated. Much is made of the capacity of the Olympics to engage and stimulate local communities. The impacts of previous Olympic Games have been widely advertised through bidding committees as benefiting local communities (London, 2012). LERI's more sober evaluation of these benefits is such that it challenges this view, and in particular the 'legacy' effect for the

people of east London. In summary they argue that employment growth is inconclusive and for those in east London who are long term unemployed or 'workless' the message is that there is no evidence of things changing for them in the post-Games period. This advice is also a rider to arguments that there is likely to be an increase in social capital as a result of the fantastic influx of volunteers to the Games 'family'. *There is little evidence of volunteer skills transferring to the post-Games economy* (LERI, 2007, p. 9). Lenskyj (2008) argues that far from bringing communities together estimates of the Olympic cities of Seoul, Barcelona, Atlanta, Athens, Beijing, and London have been responsible for the displacement of 2million people. One of her major concerns is the channeling of public funds from affordable housing and social service programs to over-budget sporting facilities and 'window dressing projects' designed to impress visitors to the city. In the context of east end communities, some of the warnings issued by Lenskyj are becoming apparent in the run-up to London 2012. There have been numerous accounts of the 5 Olympic areas' house prices rising faster than anywhere else in the city (London Evening Standard, 2010) and this is tied in with trends from other host cities of tenant evictions from low rent housing to make space for tourists and gentrification, temporary or permanent privatization of what once was the public sphere (Holland, 2006; Lenskyj, 2008, p. 17). From the point of view of the SRF (2009) the 'next 20 years' promise becomes an opportunity to field community problems and sporting inequalities with the caveat that the Olympic project has taken these issues into consideration. Even though the history of the east end of London has remained consistently diverse, deprived and under-served for a

much longer period than this with much more funding than London 2012 is likely to muster. The Olympic project could be viewed as an opportunity for a diet of excuses to be read in defence of racialised inequalities in sport and wider social domains.

Lessons for London 2012: Regeneration in London Docklands

In the UK there are historical antecedents to contested discourses about the manner in which forms of regeneration can benefit host communities within London. The development of London Docklands in the 1980s and 1990s, has exercised politicians, practitioners and the academic community in their appraisal of the role of the London Docklands Development Corporations in tandem with the Conservative government administration of the day, in the physical redevelopment of 'Docklands Boroughs'. The recurring theme of this regeneration are claims of community benefit. However, these historical antecedents of regeneration in London provide important, if nevertheless contested learning points, in anticipating the legacy claims made about the capacity of Olympic-led regeneration within the five Olympic Boroughs.

The LDDC in their Strategy for Regeneration (1998) were unfaltering in their argument that:

> Opinions have varied considerably but the successful completion of the LDDC's remit from Government to secure the regeneration of the abandoned area of the docks is there for all to see. (1998, p. 1).

Whilst this view of the success of Docklands as an activity in regeneration of Docklands, was shared by some academics, with Al Naib (1990, p. iii) describing it as an outstanding success and a "model for the future", others were more cautious, and indeed critical of claims of success. Ogden noted that:

> Certainly, whilst the development of Docklands impresses it also depresses: for some commentators, change has been of benefit to outside interests rather than to those of local benefits for residents; the lack of a clear overall plan and 'spontaneity' of development is a curse rather than a blessing; the architecture is gimmicky and un-coordinated and the flashiness of the new blocks of housing and offices a façade behind which the original problems of poverty, unemployment and poor housing still lurk (1992, p. i).

Edwards was both able to recognize, London Docklands as both "the bravest experiment in urban design and architecture undertaken in Britain since the demise of the new towns programme in the early 1970s" (1992, p. i), whilst questioning whether Docklands was a regenerated place or landscape of speculation. Deakin and Edwards were under no illusion, highlighting how the iconic landmarks such as Canary Wharf and the new commercial premises were under-occupied, in Olympic parlance the term 'white

elephant' is used to reflect such a lack of activity in new facilities (1993, p. 120). Revealingly, this so called iconic building also informed Deakin and Edwards (1993) in their analysis of the impact of the London Dockland's development, asking the pertinent question as to whether "the glittering towers of Docklands alleviate urban deprivation?"

This type of question had clearly exercised the thoughts of the Conservative Administration in their thinking about 'Actions for Cities', when in 1987 the then Minister for Housing and Construction, John Patten praised the role of the LDDC, in tackling the problems of urban deprivation which local authorities had been unable or unwilling to resolve. Critics argued that this approach to regeneration did not have the capacity to respond to the complex human and physical geographical features of the east end of London, and the resident communities who were living cheek by jowl to the more affluent City of London. As a consequence they failed to understand what community based regeneration might entail. What is redolent in the evaluation of Olympic-led regeneration in east London is the notion that organisations instead of local authorities should take the lead in deciding the nature of both visions and actions for regeneration. The big assumption is that these organisation and agencies are better placed to understand the needs of communities to be regenerated and the manner of what this regeneration might entail. In the case of the Docklands led development they took away local authority planning and development powers of Southwark, Newham and Tower Hamlet and were resourced by central

government funding to do so. In this sense there is a direct parallel between Docklands led regeneration and Olympic led regeneration.

What also emerged from the London Docklands regeneration was the artificiality of the linking of diverse communities. As Deakin and Edwards stated "The relation of local people is to neighbourhoods – Wapping, Beckton, Isle of Dogs, Poplar, Limehouse, North Southwark – with substantially different traditions and social and ethnic compositions" (1993, p. 100). What is pertinent to observations of Docklands development (and the work of Deakin and Edwards) and our observations about the effects of Olympic-led regeneration, is the question of how these styles of development/regeneration, assist or otherwise in enhancing life chances of communities. Further parallels exist in the notion that Docklands as a 'flagship' development project "simply couldn't be allowed to fail" (1993, p. 128) and likewise Olympic-led development has the same unshakeable claims made for it.

In terms of community consultation and participation, the LDDC noted that: "What we know however is that the physical and social infrastructure now in Docklands matches any in London. In seeing through the programme we have striven to ensure that improvements were not just imposed but that they reflected the expressed wishes of the people of Docklands" (1998, p. 14). Claims also by the LDDC that the redevelopment of Docklands also helped raise community aspirations as well as expectations remain anecdotal in nature. The claims above therefore remain moot and

26

contestable, and provide a timely reminder of the lessons to be learnt in the capacity of local communities within the five Olympic Boroughs to influence the Olympic led development process in these Boroughs.

Legacy, 'Race', and Sport Participation

The necessity for governing bodies of sport to focus on diversity, equality and specifically in relation to this paper on 'race', London 2012 and the East End can be demonstrated through research by the Government's sport development body, Sport England who showed for the first time that there are many unmet needs amongst minority ethnic groups in comparison to their white peers and from this it is hard to see how the legacy promise of increased participation is somehow going to affect these structural fractures as a result of London 2012 (Sport England, 2000). For instance, a glance at the Sport England Sports Equity Index (2002) would reveal a hierarchy of participation symptomatic of a public sports development system that reinforces patterns of inclusion and exclusion on the intersecting issues of ethnicity, class, gender and disability (Sport England, 2002). Curiously Sport England's (2000) survey's 'light touch' on the racialised processes causing these outcomes made very little of the one in five respondents who experienced racism (p.6). This 'silence' on racism is typical of institutional responses to such issues and even in the midst of such groundbreaking research on sport and ethnicity and the promise of Olympic salvation the hegemonic values and assumptions underpinning public sector sport remain unproblematised and undisturbed. The barrier of racism(s) was highly significant as forms of personal, cultural and structural racism impacted the

sporting experience. Porter (2001) reported that it is the fear of racial discrimination – real or perceived – that is the core issue keeping BME groups away from sport. Though the SRF outlines a plan to tackle barriers to a range of groups the Olympic promise of more and better facilities is likely to be flawed unless lessons are learned from the facility explosion in the 1970s. The increase in facilities in the 1970s did not lead to a more diverse participation base, but facilitated better facilities for those who were already active or could afford to pay. These errors gave way to more sensitively targeted sports development initiatives in the following decades. Analogous to this, a lack of data today relating to who participates as player or coach, material and cultural barriers, will make promises from the Olympic hosts on participation and employment in sport ring hollow as the system will not have sufficient intelligence to make good on them. A case in point was the lack of available examples of robust good practice in relation to sport participation for BME groups found in the Long et al (2009) systematic review of the literature on black and minority ethnic communities in sport and physical recreation. The review covered the previous ten years of research and reports. The danger of a lack of data and evidence has not been lost on the five host boroughs in planning sport for the diverse communities in east London. They state that,

> Without full understanding and evidence about the structural, systematic and historical barriers which equality groups have faced, it will be possible that this once in a lifetime opportunity to

tackle them will not be fully harnessed. (SRF,

2009, .p 13)

In the systematic review for Sporting Equals and the UK Sports Councils by Long et al (2009) a number of barriers to participation for black and minority ethnic groups were revealed as systematically affecting ethnic group participation in sport. Many of these structural and material barriers remain undisturbed in the London 2012 discourse and threaten to undermine the most sensitive of action plans. Those plans that have a narrow focus on bricks and mortar rather than people and infrastructure are likely to suffer even further. For example, in the systematic literature review the diversity of coaches was viewed as very poor and seen as a major hurdle in understanding the needs of different populations beyond the mainstream (Lambourne and Higginson, 2006). Lambourne and Higginson (2006) also revealed the under representation of coaches in sport – 3% mixed background, 2% Asian, and 2% black, compared to 93% of coaches who were white. Lambourne and Higginson recommended that Sports Coach UK gather further research with coaches from BME communities to discover and address the barriers they face. Volunteers have been a central factor in the success of sport in the UK and volunteering and coaching has been identified in the SRF as a key pillar of the plan to cater for elite sport and encourage mass sport participation. The review by Long et al (2009) highlighted how little is known about BME volunteers and their contribution, or potential, to sport. The study also suggested that any new developments in sport must consider the diverse cultural and religious

needs of Black and minority ethnic communities. Currently there is a lack of awareness of these specific cultural needs and strong leadership from the Sports Councils and the DCMS is required to push this agenda forward. These issues should be more closely considered, especially in policy development.

The ODA rhetoric of monitoring for ethnicity, encouraging partners and reflexivity must contend with the inability of Sport England a much longer constituted public sector sport agency to police itself. In 1999 Sport England's research into its own activities found that minority ethnic communities, similar communities to those in east London (Derby, Leicester and Nottingham), did not have equal access to them. To counter this problem they identified a need for greater coordination of sports opportunities, a need for community groups to work together, and a need for racial equality support for local governing bodies of sport/sports clubs (Wheeler, 2000). These are long-term strategies that Olympic authorities must incorporate into their plans if the legacy promises are to succeed. Stark warnings from Carrol (1993) and Horne (1995) and Swinney and Horne (2005) have concluded from their research into public sector sport that there is often a policy implementation gap between the formulation and implementation of race equality strategies. This in itself has implications for the prospects of success in any organisation.

Documented experiences of sport and recreation organisations' inability to work consistently towards racial equality lead writers and practitioners to

look in more detail at the reasons for this lack of success in the provision and service of sport for black and minority ethnic people. What is clear in sport for black people in east London is that they have the same chance to win when on the pitch, court or poolside as anyone else though the political, economic and cultural resources available to them are invariably unequal (Jarvie, 1991a, 1991b, Hylton/ILAM 1999, Carrington and MacDonald (2001), Spracklen, Hylton and Long 2006). Lenskyj (2008) argues that legacy promises are not that [promises] at all but are more messages of indirect benefits…delayed gratification. Perhaps this pragmatic view is one that should be more conspicuously and honestly adopted by host cities and IOC representatives?

Conclusions

This paper initially highlighted the need for academics to be steadfast in applying critical perspectives to the evaluation of mega-events such as the London 2012 Olympics, and not be seduced by its apparent *inevitable* legacy benefits. In the words of Cooper there is an obligation for academics to "revisit core concepts, and, in doing so, expose myths and contradictions which accompany them" (2008, p.4). He argues strongly that the academic should not create distortions or misunderstandings. We wanted to bring to prominence the lacuna between rhetoric and legacy outcomes for the diverse communities of east London. In applying perspectives of Critical Race Theory (CRT) and Critical Human Geography, we wanted to bring to prominence the relationships between the micro details of physical locality, accumulated histories of communities, and the importance of the day-to-day

experiences of these communities. In doing so we argued that the policy-makers selling the promise of legacy benefits have historically been unreceptive to the everyday experiences of multicultural communities in sport, that are not likely to disappear because of a huge event. Furthermore, the lessons from the historical antecedents of the purported regeneration of London Docklands, at best will leave a hard legacy of physical infrastructure for London 2012. London 2012 should be expecting this in addition to more long-term structural issues in sport and urban planning. It is revealing that in advance of London 2012 the controversy over the post-Games Olympic stadium is portentous of future contestations over the use and colonisation of Olympic space. What we have revealed in our paper is the policy gap that has already emerged in terms of the implementation of sports participation, coaching and administration opportunities for black and minority ethnic groups nationally. The rhetoric of Olympism is unlikely to redress these inequalities, particularly within Olympic Boroughs.

We turn finally to the voice of the 'Flaneur', in drawing lessons from this paper to apply to future mega-events, and evidence of more realistic promises of 'community legacy'. The flaneur challenges us to question the majoritarian rhetoric of events like the Olympic Games in London 2012 for ones that reflect more accurately the critical observer, but more importantly, the experiences of communities in the east end of London. In this respect, Delgado argue that,

> For the realists, attitudes follow, explain, and
> rationalize what is taking place in the material
> sector (Delgado and Stefancic, 2001, p. 11).

Olympic research has only recently warmed to the idea of long-term social research (LERI, 2007). Much research has missed the micro-social changes within communities and has offered few opportunities for community voices to share their experiences and opinions on the legacy promises and sustained benefits of Olympic projects. Flaneurism (an ethnographic approach) as advocated by Bairner (2006) and Jenck and Neve (2000) may provide opportunities for 'softer' legacy benefits to become manifest and therefore useful markers for realistic promises and future developments in sport. Bairner's analysis of leisure spaces in Belfast drew upon the use of flaneurism based upon his knowledge of the city and ongoing observations of change within the cities economy, demographics, and politics. A flaneur is one who 'reads' phenomena in the way that Bairner attempted to read Belfast, or Jencks and Neves (2000) attempted to read urban life through the textual and real. They go on to suggest that flanerie involves the observation of people, and social types and contexts; a way of reading the city, its population, its spatial configurations whilst also a way of reading and producing texts (2000: 1). Though Bairner draws upon whimsical and philosophical turns in his outline of the city his realist analysis of Belfast kept the facts of inequality, exclusion and marginalisation in sharp relief. His observations of population movements, gendered, ethnic and classed consumption revealed consistencies and contradictions that only this level

of ethnography could provide. The role of the flaneur as observer is one that can make sense of the *relative random*, as the east end cityscape and people evolve and change to reflect the Olympic developments and growth. The flaneur as storyteller may offer insight into lives as yet rarely seen in sport research, challenging the myths of Olympic speak.

References

Al Naib, S.K (1990) London Docklands: Past, present and future. London: Ashmead Press Ltd.

Andrews, D. et al (1997) Soccer's Racial Frontier: Sport and the suburbanization of contemporary America, in G. Armstrong and R. Giuliannoti, Entering the Field: New Perspectives on World Football Oxford: Berg.

Bairner, A. (2006) The Flaneur and the City: reading the 'new' Belfast's Leisure Spaces, Space and Polity, 10(2) pp.121-134.

Burdsey, D. (2011) in Applying a CRT lens to sport in the UK: the case of professional football, Hylton, K., Pilkington, A., Warmington, P., Housee, S. (eds) (2011) Atlantic Crossings: International Dialogues on Critical Race Theory, Birmingham, CSAP/Higher Education Academy.

Carrington B, McDonald I (2001) *'Race', Sport and British Society*. London: Routledge.

Cooper, C (2008) Community, Conflict And The State: Rethinking Notions of 'Safety', 'Cohesion' and 'Wellbeing'. London: Palgrave

Cooper C and Hawtin, M. (eds.) (1997) Housing Community and Conflict: Understanding Resident Involvement'. Aldershot: Arena

------------------ and Author 2 (1998) '----------------------'. Urban Studies, ----------------

Deakin, N. and Edwards, J. (1993) the enterprise culture and the inner city. London: Routledge

Delgado R, Stefancic J (2001) *Critical Race Theory: An Introduction*. New York: NYU Press.

Dixson, A., and Rousseau, C. (eds) (2006) Critical Race Theory in Education: All God's Children Got a Song, New York: Routledge.

Edwards, B (1992) London Docklands: Urban Design In An Age Of Deregulation. Oxford: Butterworth-Heinemann.

Gardiner, S. and Welch, R. (2001) 'Sport, racism and the limits of "colour-blind" law'. In B. Carrington and I. McDonald, (eds), *'Race', Sport and British Society*, pp. 133–149. London: Routledge.

Gillborn D (2009) *Racism and Education: Coincidence or Conspiracy?* London:

Routledge.

Hodgson, N (1995) Local Agenda 21 and the 'Implementation Gap'. Proceedings of the International Sustainable Development Conference, 27th-28th March, Manchester Conference Centre, UK

Holland (2006) Taken for a Ride by a Rail Link we don't Need, Guardian Wednesday 30 August 2006, http://www.guardian.co.uk/society/2006/aug/30/transportintheuk.travelandtransport [Accessed 16.5.11]

Home Office (2001a) Strengthening the Black and Minority Ethnic Voluntary Sector Infrastructure, www.homeoffice.gov.uk/acu/strng2.html

Home Office (2001b) Strengthening the Black and Minority Ethnic Voluntary Sector Infrastructure; Foreword by Paul Boateng, www.homeoffice.gov.uk/acu/strng1.htm

Horne, J. (1995), 'Local authority black and ethnic minority provision in Scotland'. In M. Talbot, S. Fleming and A. Tomlinson, (eds), *Policy and Politics in Sport, Physical Education and Leisure*, LSA Pub. 95, pp. 159–176. Edinburgh: Moray House Institute/Heriot-Watt University.

Author 1 (2009) --. London: Routledge.

Author 1. (2010) ---

International Review for the Sociology of Sport, ----------------------

Hylton, K./ILAM (1999) 'Where are the black leisure managers?' *Leisure Manager*, September, 32–34.

Author 1 et al (eds) (2011) ---------------------------------, Birmingham, CSAP/Higher Education Academy.

Author 1 and Author 2 (2009) ------------------------------, in ----------------------------------, London: Ashgate.

--------------- and Author 2 (1999) ------------------ Journal of Current Issues in Tourism. ----------------

Jarvie, G. (1991a) *Sport, Racism and Ethnicity*, London: Falmer.

Jarvie, G. (1991b) 'There ain't no problem here?', *Sport and Leisure*, Nov./Dec., 20–21.Jenck and

Jencks, C., and Neves, T. (2000) A Walk on the Wild Side: Urban Ethnography Meets the Flaneur, Cultural Values, 4(1), pp1-17.

Jenkins, K. (1991) Re-thinking History, London: Routledge.

Lambourne, E. and Higginson, G. (2006) collection of baseline data on Coaches in South East England: Draft Report. Manchester, ORC International.

Lacy, K. (2004) 'Black spaces, black places: strategic assimilation and identity construction in middle-class suburbia'. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 27(6), 908–930.Lefebvre, H. (1991) *The Production of Space*, Oxford: Blackwell.

Lenskyj, H. (2008) Olympic Industry Resistance: Challenging Olympic power and propaganda, Albany: State University of New York Press.

LERI (2007) A Lasting Legacy for London? Assessing the legacy of the Olympic Games and Paralympic Games, London, London Assembly.

London Docklands Development Corporation (1998) A Strategy For Regeneration: The Planning And Development Strategy Of The London Docklands Development Corporation. London: London Docklands Development Corporation.

London Evening Standard (2010) Property price rise double in east thanks to the Olympics effect, Mira Bar-Hillel, 4th October 2010, www.thislondon.co.uk/standard/article-23884406-property-price-rise-double-in-east-thanks-to-the-olympics-effect.do [Accessed 16.5.11]

Long, J., Hylton, K., Ratna, A., Spracklen, K., Bailey, S. (2009) A Systematic Review of the Literature on Black and Minority Ethnic Communities in sport and physical recreation; Conducted for Sporting Equals and the Sports Councils by the Carnegie Research Institute, Leeds Metropolitan University

Long, J. and Hylton, K. (2002) 'Shades of white: an examination of whiteness in sport'. *Leisure Studies*, 21, 87–103.

MacClancy, J. (ed.)(1996) Sport, Identity and Ethnicity (Oxford: Berg).

Maginn, P. (2004) Urban regeneration, Community Power and the (In)significance of 'Race', Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing Limited.

Massey, D and Jess, P. (eds.) (1993) A Place in the World? Oxford: Open University.

Miller, C. and Ahmed, Y (1997) Community development at the crossroads: A way forward. Policy and Politics. 25(3) pp. 23-38

Author 2 (2003) The opertaionalisation of the principles to tourism at the local level. Unpublished thesis. Loughborough University

Ogden, P. (ed.) (1992) London Docklands: The Challenge Of Development. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Olympic Delivery Authority (2007) Equality and Diversity Strategy, London, Olympic Delivery Authority.

Porter, S. (2001) [SCOTT PORTER RESEARCH] *Sport and Ethnic Minority Communities: Aiming at Social Inclusion.* Edinburgh, sportscotland.

Rose, G. (1992) Local resistance to the LDDC: community attitudes and action. In P.Ogden (ed) London Docklands: The Challenge Of Development. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Rose, G. (1993) Place and Identity: a sense of place. In D. Massey and P. Jess (1993) A Place in the World? Oxford: Open University Press.

Race on the Agenda (ROTA, 2001) Briefing No. 5; Supporting the Black Voluntary Sector, www.rota.org.uk/briefing/support.html

Soja, E.W. (1985) The Spatiality of Social Life: Towards a Transformative Retheorisation. In D. Gregory and J, Urry (Eds.) (1985) Social Relations and Spatial Structures. Basingstoke: MacMillan.

Sport England (2000) Sports Participation and Ethnicity in England:
National Survey 1999/2000 (London: Sport England).

Sport England (2002) Sports Equity Index for Regular Participation,
(London: Sport England).

Spracklen K, Hylton K, and Long J (2006) Managing and monitoring equality and diversity in UK sport: An evaluation of the sporting equals racial equality standard and its impact on organizational change. *Journal of Sport and Social Issues* 30(3): pp.289–305.

Strategic Regeneration Framework (2009) An Olympic legacy for the host boroughs, London: 5 Olympic Authorities/ Mayors and Leaders of the Olympic Host Boroughs.

Swinney, A. and Horne, J. (2005) 'Race equality and leisure policy:
discourses in Scottish local authorities', *Leisure Studies*, 24(3), July, 271–289.

Van Ingen, C. (2003) 'Geographies of gender, sexuality and race: reframing the focus on space in sport sociology'. *International Review for the Sociology*

of Sport, 38(2), 201–216.

www.gamesmonitor.org.uk/node/547. House of Lords Debate, Olympic Games 2012: Legacy, 22/1/2008,

Young, M. and Wilmott, P. (1973) The Symmetrical Family: a study of work and leisure in the London region, London: Routledge.

Zirin D (2007) *What's My Name, Fool? Sports and Resistance in the United States*. Chicago, IL: Haymarket Books.

Figure 1: The five boroughs surrounding the Lea Valley:

		UK	London	Five Host Boroughs
White		**92.1%**	**71.2%**	**58.0%**
	White British	*	59.8%	49.2%
	White Irish	*	3.1%	2.2%
	White Other	*	8.3%	6.6%
Mixed		**1.2%**	**3.2%**	**3.3%**
Asian or Asian British		**4.0%**	**12.1%**	**20.0%**
	Indian	1.85%	6.1%	5.3%
	Pakistani	1.3%	2.0%	4.0%
	Bangladeshi	0.5%	2.2%	9.0%
	Other Asian	0.4%	1.9%	1.7%
Black or Black British		**2.0%**	**10.9%**	**16.1%**
	Black –Caribbean	1.0%	4.8%	6.4%
	Black –African	0.8%	5.3%	8.4%
	Other Black	0.2%	0.8%	1.3%
Chinese or other		**0.8%**	**2.7%**	**2.7%**
	Chinese	0.4%	1.1%	1.1%
	Other ethnic group	0.4%	1.6%	1.5%

Table 1: Percentage of each ethnic group in total population of UK, London and the five Host Boroughs (Source: ONS Census 2001)

(cited, ODA, 2007: 10)