

Sociology

<http://soc.sagepub.com/>

Towards a Sociological Analysis of London 2012

Michael Silk

Sociology 2011 45: 733

DOI: 10.1177/0038038511413422

The online version of this article can be found at:

<http://soc.sagepub.com/content/45/5/733>

Published by:



<http://www.sagepublications.com>

On behalf of:



[British Sociological Association](#)

Additional services and information for *Sociology* can be found at:

Email Alerts: <http://soc.sagepub.com/cgi/alerts>

Subscriptions: <http://soc.sagepub.com/subscriptions>

Reprints: <http://www.sagepub.com/journalsReprints.nav>

Permissions: <http://www.sagepub.com/journalsPermissions.nav>

Citations: <http://soc.sagepub.com/content/45/5/733.refs.html>

>> [Version of Record](#) - Oct 12, 2011

[What is This?](#)



Towards a Sociological Analysis of London 2012

Sociology
45(5) 733–748
© The Author(s) 2011
Reprints and permission: sagepub.
co.uk/journalsPermissions.nav
DOI: 10.1177/0038038511413422
soc.sagepub.com



Michael Silk

University of Bath, UK

Abstract

Within this article, I focus on a number of productive scholarly avenues to which sociological analysis of London 2012 might want to attend. Understanding major sporting events – and thus the Olympic Games – as inextricably entangled with the media-industrial complex, I suggest London 2012 as a commodity spectacle that will emphasize gleaming aesthetics, a (sporting) city and nation collapsed into (simple) tourist images, and the presentation of a particular expression of self within the logics of the global market. In so doing, and by peeking behind the seductive, corporate-inspired veil of material and symbolic regeneration, image, strategy and legacy, we, as a field, can ask crucial questions about whose histories, whose representations and which peoples matter to, and for, the sporting spectacle.

Keywords

heritage, multiculturalism, London, Olympics, regeneration, spectacle, tourism

While the Olympic movement operated, for much of the 20th century, in a space somehow dislocated from the harsh realities of global tumult, the various Olympiads through which the movement became actualized have never been separated from their socio-political context. Indeed, the Olympic Games have been closely sutured with various socio-political-economic trajectories: the use of the Games as a platform for political posturing and the reshaping of the population (e.g. Berlin 1936, Beijing 2008), as part of the soft-core ideologies of the Cold War (e.g. Melbourne 1956, Moscow 1980, Lake Placid 1980, Los Angeles 1984), as a component in the re-imaging of place (e.g. Tokyo 1964, Barcelona 1992), as an element in the context of state and vernacular terrorism (e.g. Mexico 1968; Munich 1972), and in the post-9/11 reconstitution of US domestic and foreign relations (Silk and Falcous, 2005, 2010). Within this article, I centre on

Corresponding author:

Michael Silk, Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, University of Bath, Claverton Down, Bath BA2 7AY, UK.

Email: m.silk@bath.ac.uk

potentially productive avenues (far from prescriptive) to which sociological examination of London 2012 might attend.

There are, of course, numerous sociological questions to be asked, many of which will relate to the five priority themes (climate change, waste reduction, inclusion, biodiversity, healthy living) on which the bid to host the Games was won. These themes have been translated into key legacies: 'concrete' benefits (the physical regeneration of the industrial waste ground of the Lower Lea Valley area of East London); health benefits (through getting people active, especially through school sport); environmental benefits (through making the Olympic Park a footprint for sustainable living); and a socio-economic legacy that stresses that the UK is a creative, inclusive and welcoming place to live, visit and do business (DCMS, 2008; Evans, 2007; Falcous and Silk, 2010; London 2012, 2007). These themes and legacies raise a multitude of questions, not limited to those over the measurement of sustainable legacy and environmental impact; the endurance of participation health legacies (for example for children in school Physical Education or the 'swim for free' scheme); the role of multinationals and sponsorship in major events (and how 'success' may be measured by such organizations); global/national/local identity projects; the intra, inter- and supra-national politics ingrained within the Olympic movement; the ways in which gender, race and class relations are played out through events and media coverage; the role of social media in documenting the Games (and the differences between 'official' and unofficial [counter] imaged and written interpretations of the Games); whether 'success' (measured through medals) actually results in a national 'feel-good' factor or plays into measurement of well-being by the Office of National Statistics; debates over the logic of spending public monies on such an event in the context of cuts to public services; the securitization of London during the Games; shifts in labour before, during and after the Games; or, the various human rights protests and resistance movements against the Olympics (during the Winter Games in Vancouver 2010, for example, protests emerged around increased homelessness in the city, civil liberties, gentrification, the destruction of the environment, ballooning public debt, migrant labour, security, criminalization of the poor, corporate profiteering, and the repression of dissent).

Further, different groups will experience the Games, and be impacted by them, in different ways. Viewing the event via some form of electronic media or reading about the Games in national newspapers will likely offer a very different experience and be interpreted differently from being physically present at the event. The experience of those rehoused to make way for Olympic infrastructure will be qualitatively different from that of one of the many volunteers who temporarily inhabit the vicinity of the Games. The participants themselves will have markedly different experiences: will the athlete who supplements his/her body with (performance enhancing) substances that are deemed to be illegal by the International Olympic Committee be able to avoid detection; will athletes use the Games as a springboard for defection (Cuba, for example, lost five boxers through defection between Athens 2004 and Beijing 2008); or, how will the young athlete cope with the (often parasitic) media attention surrounding their heroic feat or apparently newsworthy celebrity status? (One can imagine that triple-gold medalist sprinter Usain Bolt experienced the 2008 Olympic Games rather differently than

Caster Semenya did the 2009 Athletics World Championships at which she was subject to gender verification testing following her gold-medal victory in the 800m.)

There are also important questions surrounding inclusivity and exclusion: who becomes part of the Games, which groups are excluded? Will certain groups, post-Olympics, have an altered sense of national identity or cohesion, or will others still feel further distanced from 'Britishness'? Will Stratford, the epicentre of the Games, be experienced in a qualitatively different way by different groups in society? And will population data, crime figures, the housing index and so on in this parcel of London be drastically altered as a result of hosting the Olympic Games? Sociological examination of the Games will clearly attend to questions ranging from the most global to the most intimate; I return to some of these concerns in the conclusion to this article. Those that I focus on in this article, however, are the avenues of inquiry endemic to understanding London 2012 as a mediated mega-event (Roche, 2006). Thus the potential lines of inquiry followed here are grounded in the implosion of sport into media spectacle (Kellner, 2003). The article is organized into four main sections. I begin through discussion of the sporting spectacle. Building on this discussion, the subsequent three sections address debates surrounding the façade of urban transformations around the Olympic site within the context of global capital, the role of historical knowledge in the Olympic spectacle, and the ways in which diversity, multiculturalism and difference are bound with national Games narratives.

The Sporting Spectacle

Grounded in Mandel's (1999) assertions about the intensified capitalization of ever more intimate realms of everyday life, cultural forms became central to the instantiation and experience of late capitalism (cf. Andrews, 2006, 2009; Jameson, 1991). Sport, as Andrews (1999, 2006) persuasively argues, as a legitimate cultural industry, is a particularly lucrative site for the accumulation of capital. He argues that professional sports are 'brazenly commercial enterprises, that make no pretense as to the cardinal importance of delivering entertaining products designed to maximize profit margins' (Andrews, 1999: 76). Indeed, with Kellner (2003), Andrews (2006) points to the centrality of the evolution of sport with the rhythms and regimes of an expanding media-industrial complex, such that there exists a seductive 'consumerist union of commerce, sport and television' (Rowe, 1996: 566). At least since the 1984 Los Angeles Olympics, the Olympic Games are a correlative to a consumer society that requires consumption and the appropriation of spectacle to reproduce itself (Kellner, 2003; see also Andrews, 1999; Billings, 2008; Boyle and Haynes, 2009; Tomlinson, 2002; Whannel, 1992). In this sense, and drawing on Debord (1994[1967]), the Olympic sporting mega-event is part of the broader social forces that nurture and sustain a consumption economy, a seductive spectacle that fascinates the denizens of society (Kellner, 2003). Therefore, and somewhat reworking Andrews (2006), the spectacular principles and practices advanced by mediated sporting mega-events reproduce the world of the commodity/consumer society, acting as a generative and unifying locus that exemplifies the 'historical moment at which the commodity completes its colonization of social life ... commodities are now all there is to see; the world we see is the world of the commodity' (Debord, 1994[1967]: 29).

When Debord (1990[1988]) returned to his earlier works through *Comments on the Society of the Spectacle* he emphasized the integrated spectacle. He suggested this as a new, heightened stage in the evolution of the society of the spectacle in which the ‘autocratic reign of the market economy’ has reached a new level of rational efficiency, such that the ‘spectacle has never before put its mark to such a degree on almost the full range of socially produced behavior and objects’ (Debord, 1990[1988]: 2, 9). In this regard, the integrated spectacle points to some of the contradictions inherent in the increased governance of the marketplace – in terms of the commercial direction of social practices and subjectivities: the Olympic Games, as sporting spectacle, then can deeply influence thought and action, acting as a tool of pacification and depoliticization (cf. Andrews, 2006, 2009; Kellner, 2003). Thus, following McCarthy et al. (2005: 138), the London 2012 Olympic Games is sutured into and through this context, an institution that actively works as a ‘pedagogical site to hegemonically re-inscribe and represent neoliberal discourses on sport, culture, nation, and democracy throughout the ascendant global capitalist order’.

It is perhaps nowhere more so than in the affectively charged realm of the ‘popular’ – of which sport is clearly a central component – that the intersecting vectors of race, national identity and cultural signification come together (cf. Giardina, 2005; Miller et al., 2001; Rowe et al., 1998). That is, understanding sport as a particularly ‘lustrous’ and affective cultural form which constitutes part of what Stuart Hall termed ‘narratives of nation’, sporting discourses, practices and experiences have often been mobilized and appropriated by dominant groups to (re)define the parameters of *the* ‘sanctioned’ identity (e.g. Tomlinson and Young, 2006). In Britain, re-examinations of British identities in the context of wide-ranging transitions associated with the post-imperial, post-Cold War era have featured sporting manifestations in varying ways (e.g. Abell et al., 2007). As Robinson (2008) notes, sport provides a tool par excellence for negotiating ideas of nation, class and race ‘after Empire’, and the apparent ‘void’ of Englishness given alienation and displacement following disruption to an accustomed place in the United Kingdom (see Aughey, 2010; Kumar, 2010).

In the balance of this article then, I focus on an understanding of the Games as a highly mediated commodity spectacle. As with any spectacular edifice, these ‘neoliberal politics of spectacle’ (Waitt, 2008) bear forth some uncomfortable truths. For, while such strategizing proffers gleaming aesthetics, a (sporting) city and nation collapsed into (simple) tourist images, and the presentation of a particular expression of self within the logics of the global market, important questions remain about the relevance and morality of such spaces and their symbolism for the wider urban and national citizenry. Thus, I offer tentative, yet productive, avenues for our scholarly investigations into London 2012, raising concerns about whose representations, whose histories and which peoples matter to, and for, the sporting spectacle.

The Façade of Glurbanization

Under the influence of the market-oriented dictats derived from neo-liberal policy regimes there has been a conclusive (re)turn (in economic and emotive senses, as well as materially) to the city, leading to the dramatic (re)capitalization of selected

city landscapes (Brenner and Theodore, 2002; MacLeod, 2002). One of the central infrastructural legacies to be delivered through London 2012 is the regeneration of an impoverished part of East London. The Games will be held in a concentrated geographic area: the Olympic Park. Located in the Lower Lea Valley area of northeast London, the area was previously known as a site for noxious industries, a perennial dumping ground for waste products, and a haven for artists and traveler communities (Gold and Gold, 2008). While there is contestation over the human cost (e.g. with regard to forced evictions, business removal, (un)employment for local workers, environmental impact), the Olympic Park and associated infrastructural and transportation developments in Stratford form the epicentre of one of Europe's largest regeneration sites (2008).

Fully in line with a neo-liberal urban politics that stresses the aesthetics of place, the systematic renaissance, creation and tender management of specific landscapes in the resuscitation of their (symbolic and economic) value, the regeneration of the Lower Lea Valley of London is emblematic of the processes through which select parcels of urban spaces have become, and are in the process of becoming, spectacular consumptive environments predicated on capital leisure spaces (MacLeod, 2002; Silk and Amis, 2005; Waitt, 2008). Hosting the Olympic spectacle is, as Broudehoux (2007) has argued, essential to the survival of post-industrial cities and one of the most effective ways for a city to enhance their world image. Paraphrasing Debord (1994[1967]: 169), London 2012 can be seen as part of the process through which capitalism remakes the totality of space in its own setting, one which is directly regulated by the imperatives of consumption and in which the building of frenzied temples of consumption are leading the city to the point of consuming itself. Indeed, for Debord (1967: 169), tourism is 'merely human circulation considered as consumption, a by-product of the circulation of commodities' – as such, it is relatively unsurprising that competitive city re-imagining for the external tourist market has been central in the build up to the Games. Working in concert with the organizing committee (London Organising Committee of the Olympic Games, LOCOG) has been a number of semi-autonomous public-private partnerships (e.g. Visit Britain, Visit London, the Department for Culture, Media and Sport) attempting to capitalize on the immense possibilities the Games provide to showcase a specific image of place to leave a lasting tourist legacy (DCMS, 2007; Visit Britain, 2009).

The tourism strategy has been manifest in discussions between Visit Britain and Olympic rights holders (such as NBC) with regard to 'influencing' how Britain will be portrayed through the Games and by the provision of a 'stock of inspirational imagery that associates the destination with the 2012 Games while ensuring that Britain is seen as the ultimate star' (Visit Britain, 2010: 9). Further, as part of a new 'Brand Britain', Visit Britain has developed an Olympic Games strategy keyed on an essence that defines Britain as 'Timeless, Dynamic and Genuine'. Based in a desire to fully exploit the tourist benefits to be derived from the Games, the strategy sets out to describe the place, culture and people of Britain in a way that appeals to a new and younger market. The strategy positions Britain as a positive and engaging nation, at home with its rich cultural heritage but embracing change and open to new ideas, with a welcoming and world class capital city (Visit Britain, 2010: 16). The brand proposition to be played out through the Games suggests that while strength lies in Britain's diversity, one aspect rings true for all: Britain inspires. It does so through being 'timeless' (places and history such as the Lake District,

the Oxford and Cambridge Boat Race, castles, cathedrals, the Beatles and Harry Potter), having 'genuine' people (real stories from real people such as a friendly taxi driver or pub landlord), and through dynamism (culture, the energy of London fashion week, the Notting Hill carnival, an 'up for it attitude' that is the driving force behind the likes of Gordon Ramsey, Danny Boyle and Richard Branson) (Visit Britain, 2010: 20–21).

Drawing on Jessop's (1997) concept of glurbanization – an amalgam of globalization and urbanization – the pathways that London has taken towards maintaining its global city status appear centred on the presentation of a particular 'capital' (in both senses of the word) image. Collapsing the global and the local, the reconfiguration of the East end of London is relational to global understandings of what matters in, and for, a global city (Matusitz, 2010). In this sense, *the* local that matters is capital space and its valorized consumer, the citizen who is connected to the signifiers of the regenerated glocal community, the places of representation – 'the new monumentalities of spectacle and consumerism' (Harvey, 1993: 24) evident in the Olympic Park and Stratford. Middle-class consumers become 'synonymous with the well-being of the city' and any opposition to this 'general interest' (such as ongoing class and community divisions regarding the support and enjoyment of spectacular urban environments or critical voices about sporting spectacles) can be downplayed or ignored altogether (Gruneau, 2002; Horne and Manzenreiter, 2006). The danger here is that only specific local assets and resources – those conducive to the market and the tourist gaze – become exploited and selected consumerized representations of place take centre stage and are used temporarily to showcase place to the world. In this sense, *the* image of place that becomes abstracted from local culture and translated into marketable meanings of place is often sharply differentiated from the surrounding urban landscape (Judd, 1999). Indeed, for London, with questions over the availability of 'affordable housing' and increasing rental prices in and around the Lower Lea Valley (see e.g. Games Monitor, 2010), important issues arise with regard to '(dis)connections' to space (Castells, 1996). Specifically, will the presentation of this urban aesthetic mean that London (and by association, selected elements of Britain deemed relevant as part of the tourist marketing mix) is presented as an 'elitist landscape devoid of a local sense of place' (Yeoh and Chang, 2001: 1035)?

The Commodification of Pastness

For Debord, the annihilation of historical knowledge is central to the reign of the perpetual present (see Crary, 1989). Debord reasoned, in his discussion of spectacular time, that history is used as a form of irreversibility (a flat, motionless and fixed concept as opposed to a process in which participation and personalization is possible) by those who control and accumulate surplus capital; representations of the past sediment (or reorganize) power relations. In this sense, again paraphrasing Debord (1967: 158), through the paralysis of history and memory the spectacle is able to hold the present in perpetuity. The 'use' of history in the London 2012 spectacle thus raises important questions over the fixidity of historical representations, and, indeed, over the work of those who control capital and the agency of those who consume it. More accurately addressed as heritage – the meanings attached to the past in the present – institutional actors have come to see the careful use of the past as perhaps 'the most important single resource for international

tourism' and city remodeling (Graham, 2002: 1007; see also Chhabra et al., 2003; Poria et al., 2003; Waitt, 2000). Given the potential vacuity of the term and its often uncritical appropriation, in our sociological examinations of London 2012 we need to think of heritage as both a cultural product and an economic resource; one imagined, defined, articulated and exploited as a primary component of strategies to promote tourism, economic development and urban regeneration (Graham, 2002). Further, it is crucial for us to problematize heritage and think critically about how certain heritage narratives communicate the (g)local to the global and provide a mechanism whereby city authorities can refashion sites and direct the tourist gaze towards a (limited) range of interpretations (Waitt, 2000). Critically then, we need to understand how the use of heritage is imbued with power relations, reproduces the concept of a spatially constructed, localized, mnemonic unity, and legitimates power structures by symbolizing who belongs in specific places (cf. Graham, 2002; Zukin, 1995).

Which (his)stories form part of the 'timeless' Britishness expunged by Visit Britain remains to be played out. Following previous work on sporting spectacle, it is likely that the deployment of selective histories for use in the present will be a central component of the 'cultural presentation' segments of the London 2012 opening ceremony. For example, in Salt Lake City in 2002, certain histories that supported the US geo-political-military trajectory featured prominently (Silk and Falcous, 2005), while in Beijing 2008, the past – in the form of ancient parts of the city – was, quite literally, destroyed to ensure a modern, vibrant and forward thinking (pseudo-capitalist) China was presented to the world (Zhang and Silk, 2007). Insights emerge from the 8-minute presentation given over to London 2012 at the closing ceremony of the Beijing Olympics. Beginning with an animated clip, a London bus wound through the streets of London (and indeed morphing in places into a tube map), passed iconic buildings such as the London Eye, Houses of Parliament, Big Ben, St. Paul's Cathedral, the Swiss Life Building, the Royal Albert Hall, the Tate Gallery, and meandered along the Embankment prior to emerging in front of Buckingham Palace where a punk coolly points to the camera while two 'bearskin' Guards march off camera. In the Bird's Nest Stadium in Beijing, following this short animation, a 'real' bus circled the stadium, accompanied by dancers in bowler hats who queued at a bus stop and lined up to cross the famed Abbey Road crossing. As the bus toured the stadium, it gradually changed in shape and form to resemble a London skyline cut out of hedgerow, out of which winner of a reality television show (*The X-Factor*) Leona Lewis – from East London – emerged (accompanied by guitarist Jimmy Page) to sing a version of the Led Zeppelin classic, 'Whole Lotta Love'. As the song reached its conclusion, English 'icon' David Beckham emerged from the roof of the 'bus' (accompanied by a 10-year-old girl who had won a *Blue Peter* competition to be part of the ceremony) and duly kicked a football into the crowd. A blend of old and new, a vision of tradition spliced with youth, diversity and 'cool', it is difficult to know quite what to make of the handover and how this will be translated into the London 2012 spectacle. Suffice to say, the 'iconic' images chosen as part of the Visit Britain Olympic strategizing offer few surprises: the White Cliffs, Stonehenge, a cup of tea, Nelson's column, Windsor Castle, a taxi, the Houses of Parliament, the Angel of the North, the London Eye, and a telephone box give the impression that 'tradition' will, at least, form part of the mainstay image of London 2012. Further, the images of London, and indeed of 'lifestyle', being

made available to the world's press and rights holders in advance of the Games do little to challenge established hierarchies, traditions and power relations (see <http://www.britainonview.co.uk/gallery.html>). This initial reading is bolstered by the use of heritage sites by LOCOG as central elements in the hosting of certain events. As part of discussions between the organizing committee, the Department for Culture Media and Sport, and sectoral organisations (including English Heritage, Historic Royal Palaces and the Commission for Architecture and the Built Environment), it is clear that iconic heritage sites will form the backdrop for many events. The image of certain Royal Parks and open spaces will thus offer dramatic 'scenery' for the mediated London spectacle. The Royal Parks will host a number of events including the triathlon in Hyde Park, cycling in Regent's Park and beach volleyball in Horse Guards Parade (Gibson, 2010). Further, drawing on the template devised by Sydney in 2000, LOCOG are currently in discussion with the Royal Parks about the use of giant screens in Hyde Park and other locations for live screening of the Games, and as venues for the festivals and other events planned for the Cultural Olympiad. Indeed, Greenwich Park will be the location for the equestrian competition; a decision made about 'image' – that of the backdrop of the park and Buckingham Palace – over history and environment, the removal of 3000 trees and the construction of a temporary 23,000 seat stadium which will disturb, if not destroy, historical artefacts, 300-year-old sweet chestnut trees, bat habitats and the wildlife chain (Gibson, 2010).

Therefore, it is pertinent for sociologists to ask questions over what is marketed as 'history', the political dimensions of heritage, whose version of the past is rolled out during London 2012 and, by corollary, whose is silenced, marginalized or destroyed (see Sumner, 2009). A central question emerges: to whose past does such imaging bear resemblance (Ashworth and Tunbridge, 1990; Waitt, 2000)? While it is recognized that such environments are polysemic, and will be experienced, consumed and, indeed, performed differently (Poria et al., 2003), sociological examination of London 2012 must address the relative power to control historical knowledge (and forget or silence other histories), the power to disseminate such knowledge, and the distortion, disappearance, or staging of the 'authentic' in the name of capital (Chhabra et al., 2003). We must then recognize how the use of the past in the London sporting spectacle is more about a political or ideological appropriation of history (for Debord, the 'fixing' or 'paralysis' of the past) than with conveying historical veracity. Following Graham (2002), this can help sociology understand how very selective material artefacts, mythologies, memories and traditions (which fail to move beyond the ephemeral and contingent) in the London 2012 spectacle might play a functional role in social and structural inequalities and mask long-term social and political continuities (2002).

The Quest for Sameness

The glurban focus on the spectacular aesthetic environment and the paralysis of the past finds its corporeal corollary in the engineering of (local) identities that are tied to, or functional for, the neo-liberal politics of spectacle. In the reinvention of tradition and the reshaping of the past, cultural producers often engage in processes that refurbish the ethnic core of the people (Featherstone, 1995), leading to a reconstitution of collective

identities along pluralistic and multicultural lines that reformulate regional and ethnic differences and diversity. Such place-making often involves a search for the comforts of sameness in terms of shared identity (instead of plurality) (Sennett, 1999). In this regard, and as demonstrated at the Kuala Lumpur Commonwealth Games (Silk, 2002), at the Sydney 2000 Olympic Games (Hogan, 2003), at the Salt Lake City Olympic Games (Silk and Falcous, 2005), and at the Delhi 2010 Commonwealth Games (Bhan, 2009), every aesthetic power of illusion was mobilized in an attempt to mask existing class, racial and ethnic cleavages. These are processes then which often consolidate power relations and ask very important questions about which peoples matter, and thereby which do not, to the sporting spectacle. 'Citizens' antithetical to market 'logics' become erased (at least from the mediated spectacle), hidden from view, subject to new penal codes, or physically moved to the urban peripheries – as with the forced evictions, displacement and compulsory purchasing orders on the Clays Lane Estate (among others) in the build up to 2012 (Porter et al., 2009). In this sense, there emerges a bifurcation of the (urban) social formation, in which those who are different, those who threaten the 'normative universality' of the society of the (sporting) spectacle become subject to measures that will secure the extension, maintenance, reproduction and management of the consequences of market rule (Silk and Andrews, 2008). Of course, difference exists and is often incorporated, but in the construction of unity or sameness, difference is often reduced to a stylized exotic (Hall, 1991), packaged and palatable for a global audience, a surface aesthetic that 'elides the real significances of material difference into mere symbolic novelty, producing the comforting sense that we are all under one skin' (Banjeree and Linstead, 2001: 705).

Sporting contexts have served as spaces through which assertions of devolved multicultural 'Britishness' have been played out (Carrington, 1998, Garland, 2004; Robinson, 2008). As Garland (2004) notes, these post-imperial re-anchorings are not necessarily more inclusive and egalitarian; they are frequently underscored by myopic and jingoistic xenophobia. Somewhat in line with the tourist strategy, London 2012 has been seen as an opportunity to rebrand a post-imperial, multicultural Britain under the aegis of global terror (both state and non-state) and neo-liberal globalization. Indeed, the opening paragraphs of the official documents submitted to the International Olympic Committee by the London 2012 bid emphasized London's role as a beacon for world youth, diversity and cultural experience (London 2012, 2005: 1). During the bidding process, there was a concerted focus on a vibrancy keyed on diversity, harmony and multiculturalism, much of which played on the multicultural character of the five 'Olympic boroughs' (Greenwich, Hackney, Newham, Tower Hamlets, Waltham Forest). Visual imagery focused heavily on representations of multi-ethnic youthful diversity and the apparent regenerative power of sport and Olympism. Most prominent were athletes and former athletes who were bestowed the title 'London 2012 Ambassadors'; the most notable and repeatedly at the forefront of promotions were black-British and Asian-British athletes. This presence was, it appears, seen as important with regard to global competitive advantage; a powerful pedagogical space to assert a 'successful' multiculturalism as Britain's distinctive, and *highly marketable*, marker in the current world order (Newman, 2007; cf. London 2012, 2007). This is especially the case for:

... people who are not currently as fully engaged as they might be in *our* economic, sporting, social and cultural life: women, people from Black, Asian and minority ethnic (BAME) groups, older people, disabled people, lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgendered (LGBT) people, and people from different faith communities. (London 2012, 2007: 40, emphasis added)

Taking 'our' social and cultural life as 'normal' (and my reading of this suggests that 'our' refers to the white middle class) clearly distinguishes an 'other' who 'we invite' to the party. Yet, under what conditions? Returning to the presence, indeed foregrounding, of black-British and Asian-British athletes in the bid process asserts a 'multiculturalist nationalism' (Fortier, 2005: 560) in which citizens are not only 'let in', but redefined as integral to the self-image of the nation as 'tolerant' and 'inclusive'. Critically, their role is contingent on toeing the line(s) in several ways – corporate, nationalist, conservative and gendered – as 'appropriate' national subjects. This particular observation is not new, having been made by both Burdsey (2008) and Carrington (2001), who capture the contingent nature in which black and Asian Britons have been 'allowed' to signify the dominant conservative (white) sporting national culture. Following Fortier (2005), an exceptionally interesting sociological direction in analysis of London 2012 concerns the representation of 'familiar others' and how race forms part of a spectacle that symbolizes conservative, corporatized 'Britishness'. In other words, will the 'other' be 'included' as legitimate multicultural racialized subjects, or will that inclusion be contingent; 'difference' might be allowed, but will it only be 'allowed' in bounded ways? Indeed, as Waitt (2000) argued in relation to the Sydney Olympics in 2000, while cultural difference was celebrated through distinctive cultural artefacts and around a cohesive unity and social equality, there was far less acceptance of cultural difference when framed in terms of spatial concentration, social injustices (unemployment, displacement and drug abuse), or where different land uses were perceived as threats to dominant norms. Following Waitt (2000), our work thus needs to consider if and how the sources of greatest conflict (religious spaces such as mosques, or ethnic separation) become part of a celebration of a successful British multiculturalism, or, indeed, if such differences are silenced.

The London 2012 bid's representation of a harmonious multicultural Britain – no matter how contingent, ephemeral or mythical – is also entangled with material and discursive constitutions of (global) terrorism. The day following the announcement that London had been awarded the Games (met with huge celebrations in Trafalgar Square), a series of coordinated suicide bombs were detonated on London's transport system which gave weight to ongoing reassessments of 'Britishness' and a quest for core national values. The fact that three of the four suicide bombers were young, middle-class, British citizens intensified media and political commentaries (from all points of the spectrum) surrounding security, national identity and multiculturalism (Falcous and Silk, 2010). When juxtaposed with the bidding rhetoric, the response to the bombings revealed the ambiguities and limitations of the strident assertion of inclusive multicultural Britain that the bid had promulgated. Following Gilroy (2004) and Stephens (2007), there was a return to a Blitz narrative that conjured an image of a distinctly white, wartime London and the deployment of a binarism centred on good (us) and evil (the bombers) – those who do not get to play a role in defining 'our way of life' and who are not deemed to be *properly British* (Stephens, 2007). In this way, and even though the Olympic narratives

celebrated difference, threat continues to lie with division; the appeal remains to a foundational unity, a nationalist narrative that asks 'us' to recover a lost moment of harmony (Stephens, 2007).

The London 2012 spectacle provides sociology with important questions surrounding how 'diversity' will be reconciled with unity and harmony, whether the Games act as a beacon for such harmony and a pillar of humanity, what Kundnani (2007: 27) has termed 'a new doctrine of 'community cohesion', or whether the Games serve as the new foci imaginarii (Bauman, 1991) for a society that is premised on the reassessment of diversity as an extraneous and disruptive element causing a crisis of nationhood. Raising questions over sameness, plurality, multiculturalism and difference will allow for sociological examination of identity through the 'soft' and 'benign' forms of nationalism (Stephens, 2007) ingrained in the sporting spectacle. Our work should be sensitive to the role of corporatized, mediated sporting spectacles in the symbolic promotion of a multicultural nationalism. How, through the London spectacle, will narratives, ceremonies and rituals of multicultural Britishness play out in a civic multiculturalism (Modood, 2007) that emphasizes strong multicultural or minority identities that complement a framework of vibrant, dynamic, national narratives? Will we witness a proliferation of performative representations of hyphenated persons and culture(s) occupying leading spaces in corporatized mediated (sporting) spectacle? Will these be positive and progressive artefacts subverting the status quo, or will the majority of these iterations commonly efface the harsh realities witnessed in the everyday interactions of a diverse population? Will such representations speak more to what Giardina (2005) – developing hooks' notion of stylish nihilism – terms a stylish hybridity in which multicultural performers take centre stage, yet offer but a thin veneer obscuring a (social) structure, that essentializes and stereotypes difference, and ignores the historically entrenched 'race'-based inequalities responsible for (masked) social divisions (Troyna and Carrington, 1990); little more than a marketable 'boutique multiculturalism' (Fish, 1997)? While it would not be expected that the complexities of everyday life – hostility towards British Muslims; feelings of disillusionment and resentment; 'Islamophobia' and urban segregation; disproportionate levels of unemployment, health, and poverty; and differential immigration statuses and the concomitant restrictions of rights, links between foreign and domestic policy (Modood, 2007; Pitcher, 2009; Rehman, 2007; Stephens, 2007; Vertovec, 2007) – will necessarily be played out through the Games, our critical understanding of the Games must attend to such complexities in the 'presentation of self'.

Concluding Thoughts

In explicating and indexing scholarly directions for the sociological analysis of London 2012, I have focused on the tensions inherent when the spectacle stresses a sterile (commodity) aesthetic, a refashioning or paralysis of the past, and a presentation of unity. The aim has been to raise questions that inform a sociological examination of the London Olympics; allowing for sociology to explore the 'emergent fissures' (Horne and Manzenreiter, 2006) inherent in the presentation of Britain, through the Games, as a politically progressive nation. Our efforts need to ensure that we peer behind this veneer,

allowing us to understand and intervene in the various forms of inequality and social and economic polarizations that are, necessarily, endemic to the sporting spectacle. Further, and as Waitt (2000) argued in relation to Sydney 2000, we need to explore the silences, alternative stories, and readings inherent in the sporting spectacle. Such exploration leads towards thinking about the diverse ways in which the Games will impact on different people and groups. While some, in Debordian terms, may be seduced by the spectacle, as sociologists, we are in a unique position to address the multiple impacts of the Games. The questions raised in this discussion will lead some to think carefully about the commodification of the Games and the role of the media in emphasizing certain images and marginalizing others, or to explore the contested notions of British sameness and difference. However, there will be other social, political and economic impacts and implications that begin to form a sociological agenda for examining London 2012. Taken together, this discussion and the questions raised in the introductory comments provide a starting point for such examination.

Getting beneath London 2012 will, as Kellner (2008) suggests, allow us to think about passivity and activity, consumption and production. For, following Kellner (2008), rather than viewing the spectacle as an all encompassing, totalizing and monolithic society, sociological explorations can force a focus on the contestations, ambiguities and contradictions of the spectacle (what Kellner terms the reversal of the spectacle). For, as opposed to thinking of the 'spectator' as scripted and passive, consuming the 'spectacle as an alienation from human potentiality for creativity and imagination' (Kellner, 2008), our investigations can, following Kellner (2008), be attuned to the differential (passive and active) impacts of London 2012. This will require a variety of methodological approaches (ranging from the most traditional of sociological methods to the more 'avant-garde') that will enable us to gain critical insight into the ways in which such events are negotiated, enacted, performed, lived in and lived through, contested and representative (MacLeod, 2002). These are questions about which social groups actually benefit, which images and peoples are excluded from such a gaze, and what scope there is for contestation. We need to ensure our sociological agenda for London 2012 is peppered with diverse and different voices, from diverse and different places, about the contestation of spaces, histories and identities. That is, it is important to consider those bodies, histories and institutions constituted as antithetical to the workings of the market and thereby systematically, materially, physically and discursively excluded from the London 2012 spectacle. In this way, our investigations will not be an over-deterministic and reductionist vision of sporting spectacle as a cataclysm of some homogenous neo-liberalism; rather, it will allow sociology to investigate the how the Games are a process that is being shaped, reshaped and challenged by the social and spatial practices of various groups and individuals (McCann, 1999). This is an opportunity to bring new value to identities and experiences that are marginalized and stigmatized by sporting spectacle; a sociological approach that understands the multiple and intersecting social cleavages of London 2012 and does not imagine any one person, any one body, any one history, any one space as being more important than anyone else's. Indeed, for some groups not incorporated as part of the spectacle, the urban spaces popularly represented as dystopias (and thus subject to renewal, silencing, or marginalization) may actually be practised as transgressive lived spaces of escape, refuge, employment and entertainment. Yet

we know little of such spaces or of the practices and experiences therein. In sum, and while the spectacle may well generate sameness, historical paralysis and a particular urban aesthetic, our sociological agenda need not do the same. Rather, through attention to production and consumption, passivity and agency, sociological analysis can, following Kellner (2008), position us to decipher the trends, social and political conflicts, and the fears and aspirations of London 2012.

Acknowledgements

The author would like to thank the anonymous reviewers and the editors of the special issue for their feedback and guidance

References

- Abell J, Condor S, Lowe R, Gibson S and Stevenson C (2007) Who ate all the pride? Patriotic sentiment and English national football support. *Nations and Nationalism* 13(1): 97–116.
- Andrews D (1999) Dead and alive: Sports history in the late capitalist moment. *Sporting Traditions* 16(1): 73–83.
- Andrews D (2006) Disneyization, Debord, and the integrated NBA spectacle. *Social Semiotics* 16(1): 89–102.
- Andrews D (2009) Sport, culture and late capitalism. In: Carrington B and McDonald I (eds) *Marxism, Cultural Studies and Sport*. London: Routledge, 213–41.
- Ashworth G and Tunbridge J (1990) *The Tourist-historic City*. London: Belhaven.
- Aughey A (2010) Anxiety and injustice: The anatomy of contemporary English nationalism. *Nations and Nationalism* 16(3): 506–24.
- Banjeree B and Linstead S (2001) Globalization, multiculturalism and other fictions: Colonialism for the new millennium. *Organization* 8(4): 683–722.
- Bauman Z (1991) *Modernity and Ambivalence*. Cambridge, MA: Polity.
- Bhan G (2009) ‘This is no longer the city I knew’: Evictions, the urban poor and the right to the city in millennial Delhi. *Environment and Urbanization* 21(1): 127–42.
- Billings A (2008) *Olympic Media: Inside the Biggest Show on Television*. London: Routledge.
- Boyle R and Haynes R (2009) *Power Play: Sport, the Media and Popular Culture*, 2nd edn. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Brenner N and Theodore N (2002) Cities and the geographies of ‘actually existing neoliberalism’. *Antipode* 34(3): 349.
- Broudehoux A-M (2007) Spectacular Beijing: The conspicuous consumption of an Olympic metropolis. *Journal of Urban Affairs* 29(4): 383–99.
- Burdsey D (2008) Role with the punches: The construction and representation of Amir Khan as a role model for multiethnic Britain. *The Sociological Review* 55(3): 611–31.
- Carrington B (1998) ‘Football’s coming home’ but whose home? And do we want it? Nation, football and the politics of exclusion. In: Brown A (ed.) *Fanatics! Power, Identity & Fandom in Football*. London: Routledge.
- Carrington B (2001) Postmodern blackness and the celebrity sports star. In: Andrews D and Jackson S (eds) *Sport Stars: The Cultural Politics of Sporting Celebrity*. London: Routledge.
- Castells M (1996) *The Rise of the Network Society*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Chhabra D, Healey R and Sills E (2003) Staged authenticity and heritage tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research* 30(3): 702–19.
- Crary J (1989) Spectacle, attention, counter-memory. *October* 50: 96–107.

- DCMS (2007) *Winning: A Tourism Strategy for 2012 and Beyond*. London: Department for Culture, Media & Sport.
- DCMS (2008) *Before, During and After: Making the Most of the London 2012 Games*. 2012 Legacy Action Plan. London: Department for Culture, Media & Sport. Available at: http://www.culture.gov.uk/reference_library/publications/5161.aspx/
- Debord G (1990[1988]) *Comments on the Society of the Spectacle*. Transl. Imrie M. London: Verso.
- Debord G (1994[1967]) *The Society of the Spectacle*. Transl. Nicholson-Smith D. New York: Zone Books.
- Evans G (2007) London 2012. In: Gold J and Gold M (eds) *Olympic Cities: City Agendas, Planning and the World's Games 1896–2012*. London: Routledge, 298–317.
- Falcous M and Silk M (2010) Olympic bidding, multiculturalist nationalism, terror and the epistemological violence of 'making Britain proud'. *Studies in Ethnicity and Nationalism* 10(2): 167–86.
- Featherstone M (1995) *Undoing Culture: Globalization, Postmodernism and Identity*. London: Sage.
- Fish S (1997) Boutique multiculturalism, or why Liberals are incapable of thinking about hate speech. *Critical Inquiry* 23(3): 378–95.
- Fortier A-M (2005) Pride politics and multiculturalist citizenship. *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 28(3): 559–78.
- Games Monitor (2010) *Debunking Olympic Myths*. Available at: <http://www.gamesmonitor.org.uk/>
- Garland J (2004) The same old story? Englishness, the tabloid press and the 2002 football World Cup. *Leisure Studies* 23(1): 79–92.
- Giardina M (2005) Bending it like Beckham in the global popular: Stylish hybridity, performativity and the politics of representation. *Journal of Sport & Social Issues* 27(1): 65–82.
- Gibson O (2010) *London Olympics Row over Greenwich Park Role Reaches Climax*. Available at: <http://www.guardian.co.uk/uk/2010/mar/23/london-2012-olympics-greenwich-park>
- Gilroy P (2004) *After Empire*. London: Routledge.
- Gold J and Gold M (2008) Olympic cities: Regeneration, city rebranding and changing urban agendas. *Geography Compass* 2(1): 300–18.
- Graham B (2002) Heritage as knowledge: Capital or culture? *Urban Studies* 39(5–6): 1003–17.
- Gruneau R (2002) Foreword. In: Lowes M *Indy Dreams and Urban Nightmares*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Hall S (1991) The local and the global: Globalization and ethnicity. In: King AD (ed.) *Culture, Globalization and the World-system*. London: Macmillan, 19–39.
- Harvey D (1993) From space to place and back again: Reflections on the condition of postmodernity. In: Bird J, Curtis B, Putnam T, Robertson G and Tickner L (eds) *Mapping the Futures: Local Cultures, Global Change*. London: Routledge.
- Hogan J (2003) Staging the nation: Gendered and ethnicized discourses of national identity in Olympic opening ceremonies. *Journal of Sport and Social Issues* 27(2): 100–23.
- Horne J and Manzenreiter W (2006) An introduction to the sociology of mega-events. *The Sociological Review* 54(2): 1–24.
- Jameson F (1991) *Postmodernism, or, the Cultural Logic of Late Capitalism*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Jessop B (1997) The entrepreneurial city: Re-imagining localities, redesigning economic governance, or, restructuring capital? In: Jewson N and Macgregor S (eds) *Transforming Cities: Contested Governance and New Spatial Divisions*. London: Routledge, 28–41.
- Judd D (1999) Constructing the tourist bubble. In: Fainstein S and Judd D (eds) *The Tourist City*. New Haven, CT: Yale, 35–53.

- Kellner D (2003) *Media Spectacle*. London: Routledge.
- Kellner D (2008) *Globalization and Media Spectacle: From 9/11 to the Iraq War*. Available at: <http://www.thefreelibrary.com/Globalization+and+media+spectacle%3A+from+9%2F11+to+the+Iraq+war-a0197106153>
- Kumar K (2010) Negotiating English identity: Englishness, Britishness and the future of the United Kingdom. *Nations and Nationalism* 16(3): 469–87.
- Kundnani A (2007) Integrationism: The politics of anti-Muslim racism. *Race & Class* 48(4): 24–44.
- London 2012 (2005) *Candidate File*. Available at: <http://www.london2012.com/documents/candidate-files/theme-17-olympism.pdf>
- London 2012 (2007) *Sustainability Plan: Towards a One Planet 2012*. London: LOCOG.
- McCann E (1999) Race, protest and public space: Contextualizing Lefebvre in the US city. *Antipode* 31: 163–84.
- McCarthy C, Giardina M, Park J and Harewood S (2005) Introduction: Cultural inter/connections. *Cultural Studies ↔ Critical Methodologies* 5: 135.
- MacLeod G (2002) From urban entrepreneurialism to a ‘revanchist city’? On the spatial injustices of Glasgow’s renaissance. *Antipode* 34(3): 602–24.
- Mandel E (1999) *Late Capitalism*, 6th edn. London: Verso Classics.
- Matusitz J (2010) Collapsing the global and the local through interscalar strategies: A glurbanisation perspective. *Planning Theory* 9(1): 6–27.
- Miller T, Lawrence G, McKay J and Rowe D (2001) *Globalization and Sport: Playing the World*. London: Sage.
- Modood T (2007) *Multiculturalism, a Civic Idea*. London: Polity.
- Newman P (2007) ‘Back the bid’: The 2012 Summer Olympics and the governance of London. *Journal of Urban Affairs* 29(3): 255–67.
- Pitcher B (2009) *The Politics of Multiculturalism: Race and Racism in Contemporary Britain*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Poria Y, Butler R and Airey D (2003) The core of heritage tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research* 30(1): 238–54.
- Porter L, Jaconelli M, Cheyne J, Eby D and Wagenaar H (2009) Planning displacement: The real legacy of major sporting events. *Planning Theory & Practice* 10(2): 395–418.
- Rehman J (2007) Islam, ‘War on Terror’ and the future of Muslim minorities in the United Kingdom: Dilemmas of multiculturalism in the aftermath of the London bombings. *Human Rights Quarterly* 29(4): 831–78.
- Robinson J (2008) Tackling the anxieties of the English: Searching for the nation through football. *Soccer in Society* 9(2): 215–30.
- Roche M (2006) Mega-events and modernity revisited: Globalisation and the case of the Olympics. *The Sociological Review* 54(2): 25–40.
- Rowe D (1996) The global love-match: Sport and television. *Media Culture & Society* 18(4): 565–82.
- Rowe D, McKay J and Miller T (1998) Come together: Sport, nationalism and the media image. In: Wenner L (ed.) *Mediasport*. London: Routledge, 119–33.
- Sennett R (1999) Growth and failure: The new political economy and its culture. In: Featherstone M and Lash S (eds) *Spaces of Culture: City-Nation-World*. London: Sage, 14–26.
- Silk M (2002) Bangsa Malaysia: Global sport, the city and the refurbishment of local identities. *Media, Culture & Society* 24(6): 775–94.
- Silk M and Amis J (2005) Bursting the tourist bubble: Sport and the spectacularization of urban space. *Sport in Society* 8(2): 280–301.
- Silk M and Andrews D (2008) Managing Memphis: Governance and spaces of inequality. *Social Identities* 14(3): 395–414.

- Silk M and Falcous M (2005) One day in September / One week in February: Mobilizing American (sporting) nationalisms. *Sociology of Sport Journal* 22(4): 447–71.
- Silk M and Falcous M (2010) Sporting spectacle and the post 9/11 patriarchal body politic. In: Morgan M (ed.) *The Day that Changed Everything: The Impact of 9/11 on the Media, Arts and Entertainment*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Stephens A (2007) 'Seven million Londoners, one London': National and urban ideas of community in the aftermath of the 7 July 2005 bombings in London. *Alternatives* 32(1): 155–76.
- Sumner J (2009) *LDA's Destruction of Century Old Evicted Allotment Community*. Available at: <http://www.gamesmonitor.org.uk/node/799>
- Tomlinson A (2002) Theorising spectacle: Beyond Debord. In: Sugden J and Tomlinson A (eds) *Power Games: A Critical Sociology of Sport*. London: Routledge.
- Tomlinson A and Young C (eds) (2006) *National Identity and Global Sports Events*. New York: SUNY.
- Troyna B and Carrington B (eds) (1990) *Education, Racism and Reform*. London: Routledge.
- Vertovec S (2007) Super-diversity and its implications. *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 30(6): 1024–54.
- Visit Britain (2009) *Maximising the Tourism Benefits of the London 2012 Olympic and Paralympic Games: The Story So Far*. London: Visit Britain.
- Visit Britain (2010) *Britain Marketing and 2012 Games Global Strategy 2010–2013*. London: Visit Britain.
- Waitt G (2008) Urban festivals: Geographies of hype, helplessness and hope. *Geography Compass* 2(2): 513–37.
- Waitt G (2000) Playing games with Sydney: Marketing Sydney for the 2000 Olympics. *Urban Studies* 36(7): 1062–73.
- Whannel G (1992) *Fields in Vision: Television Sport and Cultural Transformation*. London: Routledge.
- Yeoh B and Chang T (2001) Globalising Singapore: Debating transnational flows in the city. *Urban Studies* 38(7): 1025–44.
- Zhang T and Silk M (2007) Recentering Beijing: Sport, space, subjectivities. *Sociology of Sport Journal* 23(4): 438–59.
- Zukin S (1995) *The Culture of Cities*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Michael Silk is a Senior Lecturer at the University of Bath. He is interested in the relationships between sport and physical activity, urban space, the governance of bodies, cultural pedagogies, and identity politics within the context of neo-liberalism. He has completed a number of mega-event related projects, including work on the 1988 Commonwealth Games, the 2002 Salt Lake City Olympics, Beijing 2008, and the Super Bowl. His work has appeared recently in *Media, Culture & Society*, *Cultural Studies* ↔ *Critical Methodologies*, *Sociology of Sport Journal*, *Leisure Studies*, *Social Identities*, *International Journal of Media & Cultural Politics*, *American Behavioural Scientist*.

Date submitted July 2010

Date accepted February 2011