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“Sport has the power to change the world… It has the power to unite people in a way that little else does.”

~Nelson Mandela

INTRODUCTION

The Olympics Games is a spectacle that attracts international attention. This focus comes with scrutiny and expectations for the host countries and its urban spaces. There are many constituents involved in the preparation and management of mega-events like the Olympics. The international event presents a stage where power and inequality in urban settings are on display. Dramatic transformations of urban space that make way for Olympic infrastructure are justified in the name of accelerated development. The existing power dynamics are magnified by this spotlight. Rio de Janeiro, the former capital of Brazil, is hosting the Summer Olympic Games in 2016 and the competing discourse surrounding the preparation foreground the urban challenges and power struggles within Brazil. Competing legacies exist in which the Olympic growth machine is promoting a legacy of positive development and an image of a progressive and global Brazil, while marginalized Brazilians are promoting a legacy of inequality. This conflict of meaning is played out in the historically, highly public and politicized arena of athletics. Using frame analysis, this project presents a sociological analysis of Rio de Janeiro’s urban transformation in preparation for the 2016 Olympic Games. In particular, this study focuses on the competing economic, social, and political discourses of various International-, State-, and local-level social agents (i.e., International Olympic Committee, Brazilian Government, and local grassroots organizations) working to shape the legacy of this mega-event.
Brazil’s History of Economic and Racial Inequality:

In order to address the urban transformation of Brazil and the context of the 2016 Summer Olympic Games, it is essential to briefly provide background on how Brazil and its cities emerged. The Olympic Games arrive in a country with a heavy history of colonization, imperialism, and authoritarianism whose economic, political, and social effects are still present. The history of Brazil is rich and complicated. Severe inequality has been a significant element of Brazil throughout its history and development. When the Portuguese first arrived in Brazil and began to settle in the 1500’s, they awarded significant land grants to the wealthy Portuguese elite. This established a system of hierarchy based on family lineage that dated back to this much earlier period. With the exploitation of land in Brazil came the exploitation of people through slavery. Thus, racializing the hierarchy of Brazil and embedding clear social stratification with white colonialists clearly on the top. Those that were awarded these land grants have dominated Brazil’s social, political, and economic history and continue to have a significant impact on what happens in Brazil. Land reform and agricultural reform, therefore, have played an important role in economic development in Brazil from slavery and an export-oriented economy to import substitution industrialization. “Land reform in Brazil today is not just one of the most pressing needs to make a clearly bourgeois development viable but also (and in the first place) our country’s oldest historical obligation” (Pinassi 2000:46). But why is it so important and what is its true impact on Brazil and its urban centers? The agricultural needs of Brazilians as well as the way in which land distribution is addressed have implications on the development of the nation. If rural Brazilians are unable to participate in agricultural production because they are landless and their resources are inefficient, they frequently move to cities. When urban environments do
not have the proper infrastructure, funds, or space to accommodate them, informal settlements or slums, called favelas in Brazil, materialize.

Favelas emerged as Brazil urbanized and industrialized. These processes involved the diversification of the Brazilian economy after being the last nation to abolish slavery in 1888. Rural people struggling to make a living off the land began to move to urban centers in Brazil like Rio de Janeiro in search of employment. This rural to urban migration is becoming an ever increasing problem not just in Brazil but around the globe. “This so-called urban explosion has been viewed as a threat to political, social, economic, and moral stability, and dire consequences have been predicted” (Perlman 2010:42). The urban explosion has resulted in the favelas and these communities have dramatic effects on Rio’s political, social, economic, and moral stability. The settlements are concerning as some lack many basic, human requirements. Not only urban conditions, but also human conditions have to be examined in the process of accommodating these migrants (Perlman 2010:41). Accommodating this migration is something Brazil along with many Latin American cities struggle with as Latin America is the most highly urbanized region in the global South. Brazil is expected to rise above ninety percent urban within the next twenty years (Perlman 2010:46-47). This is significant globally as Brazil is the sixth largest country in the globe in terms of population according to The World Factbook. Out of this immense population that is highly urbanized, about one third of the urban population is living in informal settlements like favelas. “According to Rolnick (1999), three times as many urban Brazilians reside in self-constructed and unregulated housing as those living in regulated housing produced by private entrepreneurs” (Telles 2004:208). The sheer numbers make it evident why favelas and their residents, favelados, are a significant component of the urban transformation of Rio de Janeiro in order to meet the international standards expected to host the Olympic Games.
Rio de Janeiro has the largest favela population in Brazil. It accounts for one-fourth of the entire country’s favela population. As deindustrialization occurred and attention was diverted to booming Sao Paulo and the new capital, Brasilia, employment disappeared in Rio and the rural migrants were not absorbed into the urban workforce. This contributed to the high degree of urban poverty in Rio and partly explains the strong favela presence in the city. The favelas have grown and expanded at a faster rate than the city itself. “Looking at the second half of the twentieth century as a whole, the city of Rio grew by 2.5 percent, and the favelas of Rio grew by 6.5 percent” (Perlman 2010:53). The population growth of Rio in 2010 was 7.4 percent while population growth in the favelas in the same year was 27.5 percent (Joychelovitch and Priego-Hernandez 2014: Table 2.1). Favelas represent the major source of population growth in Rio de Janeiro. Thus, it is crucial to incorporate them into the current urban transformation. The favelas and all of the challenges that come with them are starting to dominate the urban landscape of Rio. This has prompted Brazilian officials to incorporate them into the preparation plans ahead of 2016.

Urban theorists explore and attempt to explain the geographic layout of urban populations. The Los Angeles School identifies and acknowledges the importance of historical, economic, and political environments that create the context for urban development. “Dear and his collaborators have elaborated on the themes of an indefinite and plastic urban form in which ‘time and space define two axes of a ‘fabric’ (or ‘tapestry’) upon which are inscribed the processes and patterns of human existence, including political, socio-cultural, and economic activities’” (Judd and Simpson 2011:7). A city reflects historical processes and patterns through its physical and social environment. Rio’s urban physical and social attributes are distinctly tied to the processes and patterns that Dear mentions. The city is reliant on its nationally- and
regionally-specific context that the LA school highlights as important to and etched onto cities. These forces contribute to the current dynamic within a city. Today in Rio, specifically, it informs the motivation for and challenges behind the urban transformation in the context of a mega-event.

Brazil’s unique historical and political story is significant when considering its current income inequality. The economic history is tied to colonialism. The colonization of Brazil by the Portuguese was the dominant factor in the initial concentration of wealth and power in Brazil. Land, initially the most powerful asset available to the Brazilians, was given to a select few. “This excluded (along with the black population already excluded by slavery and the Indians…) the vast majority of the free population from any access to the only asset that could have given them a basis for economic stability and political power” (Amann and Baer 2009:28). This clearly defines Brazil’s foundation on concentration of wealth. The economy was organized in such a way from the onset that created a very unequal distribution of wealth and income. Even after slavery was abolished in Brazil in 1888 and free laborers had the ability to work for wages, the unequal distribution of income continued. The select group of landowners from the initial Portuguese plantation settlements now found it cheaper to pay wages than to maintain slaves, therefore, profiting more. The rich were getting richer. A system of production that was capitalist was combined with a land-renting system that was not capitalist (Amann and Baer 2009:29). The restriction of people’s access to land furthered the unequal distribution of assets. Even if land was affordable, the inequality was already significant enough that it would be difficult for common Brazilians to successfully work the land due to lack of resources and human capital. Inequality was embedded in Brazil from the initial economic and social structure created by the Portuguese.
The initial structure of assets was determined by economies of scale produced in Brazil from the fertile land and crop agriculture. The extreme specialization and concentration of land during colonization doomed Brazil to unequal asset distribution. “When income and power are in the hands of a few, institutions tend to reinforce that concentration and perpetuate a high degree of income inequality” (Quintin 2008:4). The people that control these institutions are those that have wealth and assets, therefore wanting to protect them. Educational opportunities are limited because “institutions focus on protecting the few rather than enriching the many” (Quintin 2008:4). While institutions may have an understanding of the benefits of education, they may be threatened by the potential of increased human capital to redistribute their assets and wealth. In this way, the interests of those in power may reinforce the income inequality that is caused by the historical and political situation that has developed in Brazil and which is most evident in cities like Rio de Janeiro. This situation is now being highlighted by the urban transformation occurring as the city and country prepares to host the Olympic Games.

The economic policies implemented by the Brazilian government in an effort to grow the economy post-Portuguese rule are important to understand when looking at economic policies and their ability to either improve or encourage income inequality. Understanding these historical policies is crucial to address the urban conditions which the Olympic Committee must now face. A large structural change that was implemented in Brazil was that of Import Substitution Industrialization (ISI). This effort to stimulate the economy was ultimately a failure both in terms of economic growth and income distribution. The 1930’s was a period in which Brazil’s economic focus shifted from agriculture to industry. Brazil closed off its economy, passed laws that supported laborers, and concentrated companies by making them state-owned. This closed economy successfully increased the growth rate of Brazil as they had to produce
what they had previously imported. Inequality, however, worsened. The closed economy and
subsequent increased growth rate created a demand for skilled labor. As there was a limited
supply of skilled laborers following slavery and the agriculture-centered economy, their wages
increased while unskilled labor remained with lower wages. This only furthered the unequal
distribution of income. Prices also were high during this ISI period due to the lack of competition
in a closed economy which only benefited the already wealthy owners of production. Labor
unions were strictly controlled which weakened laborers opportunity for improved conditions.
The structural changes during ISI only reinforced Brazil’s unequal distribution of income.

Brazil’s economic policies in the late twentieth century during the debt crisis and period
of high inflation also contributed to the great income disparity in Brazil that still exists today.
This period was detrimental to the lower classes. The more neoliberal policies that followed this
period opened up Brazil’s economy to the global market. Brazilian industry had to mechanize
and update its technology. This eliminated jobs, further hurting the lower classes. Privatization in
the 1990’s also did little to improve income distribution. Oligopolistic groups were buying
previously state owned businesses that allowed suppliers to control prices even more and keep
them high. While the Brazilian economy eventually became more stable due to the more
conservative policies of the Lula administration, elected in 2002 from the Worker’s party, that
attacked inflation and eliminated debt, the people of Brazil were still living with extreme income
distribution inequality. This administration also implemented the “Bolsa Familia” program in
2003 as a transfer social program aimed at addressing social inequalities such as education.

Severe income inequality continues today. “In Brazil, the average income of the highest-
earning 10 percent is twenty-eight times the average income of the bottom 40 percent” (Telles
2007:107). Brazil has a reputation for having particularly poor income distribution especially
given the level of economic growth it has now reached. It has persisted throughout Brazil’s
development even as their strategies for economic development and income distribution
management have changed over time. While the GDP has been steadily increasing in the past
decade, it has severely lagged behind that of developed countries. The gini coefficient of Brazil
is 5.47 which is very poor. Brazil has the thirteenth highest gini coefficient worldwide. In 2009,
the highest twenty percent of Brazilians, when ranked by income, received 42.93 percent of the
nation’s total income while the lowest twenty percent only received 2.85 percent. The lowest ten
percent of Brazilians does not receive even one percent of the country’s total income in 2009.
These numbers clearly demonstrate Brazil’s struggle with income inequality. Rio, specifically, is
also known for its inequality. The city’s gini coefficient in 2008 was 5.76, higher than that of
Brazil as a nation (Joychelovitch and Jacqueline 2013: Table 2.2). “Rio has the lowest rates of
social mobility among all the metropolitan regions of Brazil” (Perlman 2010:52). This statistic is
felt daily by favelados and is detrimental to the sustained development of Rio.

Brazil’s sheer size is a cause of income inequality. The different climates and
environments that Brazilians live under make it difficult for national policies to address all
different sectors of the country. The various regions of the country may specialize in specific
industries as the resources available locally differ. A large portion of the country is captured by
the Amazon. The large size makes it difficult for Brazil’s national government to address the
economic needs of the various populations that are exposed to very different environments.
These environments have varying standards of living simply based on the natural landscape that
may facilitate a certain lifestyle more so than others. Regions that are endowed with a plethora of

---

1 The gini coefficient, a measure of income inequality, has a range from zero to one. Zero is considered perfect
equality and ten is considered maximum inequality. Within this measurement, 4.0 is considered the breaking point
as to whether a nation has an income distribution that is relatively equal or unequal. The closer the number is to
one represents the higher portion of wealth that is held by high-income individuals.
natural resources also automatically have an advantage. As such, inequality is somewhat inevitable in Brazil given its size and geographic location.

The disparity in economic development by race is also significant in Brazil. To measure this disparity the human development index has been calculated by race. The human development index uses social conditions to suggest the degree of development in a nation. These social conditions include life expectancy, infant mortality, adult literacy, and school enrollment. In a ranking of 174 countries by human development, Brazil ranked 69th between Saudi Arabia and the Philippines (Telles 2004:111). When measured regionally and by race, the difference in human development is alarming.

Their [Santa Anna and Paizao (1997)] results, presented in table 5.1, revealed that the black and brown Brazilian population by itself would score 0.663, placing it between Guatemala and Honduras at 108th on the world scale. The white population, if it constituted a separate country, would score 0.784 and rank 43rd, alongside Costa Rica, the Bahamas, and Kuwait (Telles 2004:111).

In plain economic terms, however, the racial disparity in income is clear. Men of color in Brazil earn 40 to 50 percent of what white men earn (Telles 2004:107). Brazil’s high-level professionals are almost all white. Out of a total of about two thousand representatives in the federal congress, only about 28 were black between 1988 and 1995. Similarly, “approximately 2 of roughly 1,060 diplomats, 1 of over 100 generals, and 8 of 600 members of the Federal Public Prosecution are black or brown” (Telles 2004:110). These numbers have implications for power dynamics. It is important to see how this disparity is reflected throughout Brazil’s political, social, and economic institutions and also across space, specifically within the urban.

While the idea of a racial democracy often dominates the perception of residential segregation and casts it as simply economically determined, the reality is a certain degree of segregation by race. “Residential segregation among whites, browns, and blacks cannot be
accounted for only by socioeconomic status; moderate racial residential segregation occurs among persons of similar income in the five metropolitan areas” (Telles 2004:208). In Rio de Janeiro, favelas reside in close proximity to middle-class neighborhoods and their presence is significant and will not go unnoticed during the mega-events. The Los Angeles School of urban theory emphasizes fragmentation and the proximity in which individuals experiencing very different quality of lives are now residing. The LA School relates how the geographical reflection of severe income inequality in developing cities is also present in American metropolitan areas. Michael Dear even mentions Brazil when discussing the dynamic of class juxtaposed in a small environment (Judd and Simpson 2011). The lack of formal housing markets in many areas of Brazilian cities, especially Rio de Janeiro, implies that institutional discrimination, like that which previously existed in the United States, does not have a severe impact. “The institutional agents that largely produce extreme segregation in the United States, such as real estate agents, managers, lending banks, and insurers, are not involved in most of Brazil’s urban housing markets due to its largely makeshift and informal status” (Telles 2004: 206-207). Overall, residential segregation by class is much more evident as income inequality in Brazil is so severe. The favelas in Brazil, and specifically in Rio, are also notable for their prominent locations alongside affluent communities and commercial districts. This makes them unavoidable in preparing the city to host many international visitors for the Olympics.

Favelas:

The over 600 favelas in Rio house 1.5 million people, representing a third of the city’s population (Smale 2011). The problems of the favelas are the problems of Rio, and the problems of Rio stem from the problems that remain in Brazil from its history. This history involves
generations of marginalized Brazilians being constrained by immobility and invisibility. The favelas and the problems they originate from and entail are embedded in Brazil’s image. Brazil is known for its rich, diverse culture with exciting, bright traditions like Carnival. The country is also, however, known for its severe inequality and crime. Just as Brazil has both good and bad elements embedded in its global perception as a country full of contrasts and contradictions, so too have favelas been perceived by Brazilian society.

Rio’s first favela emerged from a poor group of individuals who looked at the city as an opportunity. A group of slaves were freed in the late 19th century and enlisted in the Brazilian army. To prove their worth and gain recognition, the former slaves defeated a group that was resisting the federal government. Upon return to Rio they expected to be welcomed with honor and glory. This was not the case, however, and the soldiers created makeshift houses and “christened their hill Morro da Favela, in honor of a weed that thrived in the rough terrain near the rebel outpost they had overrun” (Neuwirth 2006:58). This community gradually began to grow as more families moved to Rio and needed a cheap place to live. An American geographer witnessed the growth of the favelas and it made a stark impression on him. He observed, “Here, almost within a stone’s throw of the commercial core, clinging to the steep slopes is a community dwelling in the most primitive mud huts without light, water, or sewage, even without organized streets—a squatter settlement without order or organization” (Neuwirth 2006:59). This seems to defy Brazil’s motto and the statement on the national flag: “Ordem e Progresso” or “Order and Progress.” In fact, the establishment of favelas meant quite the opposite. “The first squatters were letting the government know that it had a new rebellion on its hands” (Neuwirth 2006:59). In 1930, people like this American geographer began to comprehend
the potential impact of favelas on Brazilian society. Today that impact is even more of a concern as Brazil, and specifically Rio, are under international scrutiny with the impending mega-events.

While the Brazilian government has attempted to provide alternatives, they are too expensive and the quality is not significantly better than that of favelas, if at all. The “conjuntos” or public housing projects in Brazil are just as damaging to human life, and some argue, provide less hope for residents. The Soviet-style buildings feel just as they look: dark and dull. “By contrast, up in Morro Da Providencia, people are still building, improving, planning for the future. One hundred years after the favela’s founding, without ownership, without authorization, without legal recognition, Carlinho [favela resident] has found that there’s still hope on the hill” (Neuwirth 2006:63). This would suggest that mobilization and economic development is more viable in a favela than in a conjunto. Current discourses surrounding the favelas are conflicting. The question of cost and benefits of favelas as well as the rights of favela residents is growing as Rio de Janeiro prepares to host an international mega-event and demonstrate that it is a world class city.

Unfortunately, this recognition has not significantly changed the perception or treatment of the favelas and their residents. Currently, the favelas are drawing global attention as Brazil prepares to host the World Cup in 2014 and the Olympics in 2016. The preparations have included occupying and “taking control” of the favelas. “With Marines taking control of favelas or shanty towns in Rio de Janeiro with the support of tanks and helicopter gunships, Brazil has certainly garnered some negative headlines around the world” (Smale 2011). Favelas are gaining recognition globally and “efforts to bring law and order to Rio’s favelas is winning widespread praise in the Brazilian media” (Smale 2011). It seems as though Brazil is finally addressing favelas but only with the short term goal of pacifying worldwide perceptions of Rio and
Brazilian violence. “The rates of violence were so bad in 2004 before the Pan American Games that the government proposed building a high, impenetrable wall around all the favelas—literally creating a walled fortress within the city, to ‘protect’ the city” (Perlman 2010:171). The Brazilian Government is promoting a legacy of development and security. Favelas are getting recognition, but the people and the struggles within them are still invisible. Economically viable options for the improvement of the favelas have not been considered which makes it appear as though nothing is being done to improve opportunities for social mobility. Instead, previously ineffective tactics are being considered. For example,

In a recent occupation or ‘pacification’ of the Rocinha favela, one of the largest in Rio, 3,000 marines and armed police officers took part. The aim of the operations is to regain control of the favelas from Rio’s drug gangs. In a marked contrast to the ‘arrest and pull out’ tactics of the past, the police are now establishing a permanent presence in the shanty towns. The hope is that this will prevent the gangs from re-establishing themselves, and lead to an improved quality of life for the residents (Smale 2011).

However, the presence of the armed militias has not been effective at all in the past. To tourists looking to attend the World Cup or the Olympics, especially those that do not have a cohesive understanding of the favelas and their history, this may look like a perfect solution that will ensure their safety and the security of the city. But this way of thinking does not address the implications these policies have on the livelihood of favela residents. The global perception of Brazil, however, is very important to the Brazilian government. The director of the international markets at the Brazilian Tourist Board says that “fear of crime should not be a concern for overseas visitors to Rio. ‘It is a distant perception, but not the real experience’” (Smale 2011). It is evident that to him the favelas, their residents, and their problems are invisible or that he at least wants them to be invisible to the rest of the world. The current situation for favelas is dynamic and unsettling. It will be interesting to see how the continuing preparation for 2014 and 2016 impact the favelas of Rio.
The image of favelas within public arenas has remained negative due to their lack of power, not due to their lack of effort or lack of voices. The communities have thriving cultural elements and economic potential. Many favela residents are driven, optimistic people that have gone against all forces acting against them, including immobility and invisibility, and ended up relatively satisfied with their lives. But they should not have to be just satisfied with their situations given the conditions they have experienced. They deserve the same chances as any other Brazilian to be mobile and have the same right as all Brazilians to be recognized as members and contributors to society. Favelados frame their communities and life circumstances in a very different light than those that live outside of the communities both in Brazil and around the world. The reality of favelas are grim, but there is still potential if one takes the time to see the vitality of the people that chose to exist and try to thrive in this reality. The perception and the reality may overlap in certain areas but using the image of favelas to stigmatize a huge population of Brazilians is not productive. Favela residents are consciously working to reframe their communities in a more positive and productive manner.

Organizing in Favelas:

Brazil’s history is important to acknowledge as it informs how the urban environment, now facing changes in light of the upcoming mega-event, emerged. It also enlightens the understanding of various populations in Brazil and how their history and position in society may dictate their interests in the current context of Olympic developments. For those outside of Brazil looking to potentially attend the Olympics in Rio in 2016 or even comment on them, a comprehensive view of the city, its country, and its past are important. It is valuable to keep in mind which of these populations is benefitting from the hosting of the Games and which is
burdening the costs? Similarly, who is shaping and influencing the process? And finally, is the hosting of the 2016 Olympic Games, and the urban transformation of Rio associated with it, going to improve or facilitate the already significant economic and social inequalities?

The social costs associated with mega-events often motivate community organizers to bring emphasis to pre-existing inequalities and issues that become highlighted within the context of an athletic event. Community organizing in the favelas is impressive. Residents fight for their rights to safe, stable housing as well as other public services. “The objective is to make public agencies invest here so that we have quality services” (Noronha 2013). The lack of these basic, structural necessities often inhibits neighborhood associations from addressing the larger macro issues. “Generally, these institutions have the responsibility of fighting for residents’ interests, lobbying the government so the community can enjoy their rights to health, urban infrastructure, leisure, education… they must also act as if they were a sub-division of the government” (Noronha 2013). Some neighborhood associations in Rio have to unclog sewers and create a system to distribute the mail because their communities are operating outside of the formal, bureaucratic property system. This represents the larger problem, but favelados are addressing some specific issues as well.

While trying to construct and maintain a transparent public perception of the reality of favelas, community organizers are working to win on various issues that pertain to their communities specifically. A common theme behind these issues is the lack of transparency and dialogue with the Brazilian government as well as the lack of enforcement in regard to the existing laws that protect favela residents. Many favela communities have asked the Mayor of Rio de Janeiro for a public decree that recognizes the existence of the community and the rights of its residents to housing and public works.
In the context of the Olympic Games, many favela communities have been targeted as locations for Olympic infrastructure such as the Olympic Village or new roadways that will lead to the major stadiums. The evictions as well as the way in which they are carried out have explicitly been deemed against the law as residents are not given proper compensation or notice. In a letter to the International Olympic Committee (IOC), Amnesty International stated the violations of human rights and asked the international body to publicly condemn the Brazilian government. The letter demonstrated how the preparations are not consistent with the Olympic spirit that the IOC seeks to promote. How are organizers mobilizing around this issue of evictions? This study addresses how framing the Olympics and its impact on favela communities is an attempt to mobilize around a legacy of inequality.

Some community organizations have produced possible win-win solutions that have yet to be considered by Rio’s city government as they attempt to handle all of the preparations. “The People’s Plan’s technical designers drew up a response to the Mayor’s latest proposal that still allowed the same access to the Olympic facilities but without the risk of flooding, and with only the few residents who did indeed want to leave being removed, to be rehoused in new units inside the community itself” (Osborn 2013). Not only have community organizers within favelas employed professionals to produce studies that inform potentially improved situations for the favelas that still meet the requirements of hosting a sporting mega-event, but they have also learned from similar situations in the past. For example, from when the city was preparing to host the Pan American Games in 2007.

Favela community organizers have attempted to collaborate as well. “Municipal employees use the tactic of negotiating with individual families in an attempt to fragment resistance and cause it to fail” (Crumpler and Steiker-Ginzberg 2013). Residents are attempting
to organize as much as possible to gain power in numbers. Similarly, neighborhood associations are now coming together. In one region of Rio de Janeiro, these organizations are working very closely to frame the favelas and their concerns with great care. “Leaders participate in two collectives: The Mare that We Want, a project coordinated by the community organization Redes da Mare; and the Mare Neighborhood Associations League, in which only the leaders meet. The objective is to unite forces to achieve structural improvements for the 16 communities” (Noronha 2013). They have met with the Mayor of Rio to negotiate the implementation of various improvements to their community that have been done in other favela communities.

There is also a broader, city-wide movement called Favela Nao Se Cala. They are working to spread a consistent message and shape public discourse by demonstrating the unequal nature of the urban transformation. Members of the movement attend meetings of individual communities attempting to recruit them into the larger movement. “Throughout the meeting, one Favela Não Se Cala organizer passed out ‘Manifesto Against Removals’ pamphlets, a document written in powerful and accessible language that captured the spirit of the movement” (Crumpler and Steiker-Ginzberg 2013). This city-wide movement is defining the issue in order to create a uniform reality to present to the public and to present a unified front which could force the government to take notice and address them as part of the city improvements necessary to portray Brazil as developed and modern.

The organizers in Rio de Janeiro have experienced limited success, but they are using the context of the Olympics to mobilize favelados as well as international human rights organizations. By organizing favela residents city wide and creating a website like Rio On Watch as a forum for community reporting, favela organizers are making progress. They are using the mega-event as a global stage to launch a more formal movement and achieve real results. In this
way, they are attempting to use the leverage of the potential legacy of the Olympic Games in 2016 and its impact on the global image of Brazil to insist upon the acknowledgement of their communities and their rights. The discourse of this movement is captured by framing the mega-event as a contributor to Brazil’s existing inequality. If they are able to capitalize on the international stage and the scrutiny that compliments their movement, they may be able to hold authorities accountable and achieve some improved conditions.

On the other side of this discourse, is the “Olympic Growth machine” which aims to create a legacy of positive development through hosting the 2016 Olympic Games. The International Olympic Committee consists of 198 national Olympic organizations. Brazil’s Olympic Committee, with the support of the IOC, is driving the preparations for the event. There are many powerful players involved in the process as well. These players, all occupying influential societal positions, include government officials, sponsors, members of the media and academia. Together, this group hopes to promote Brazil internationally as a progressive, modern nation. By successfully hosting a great spectacle in 2016, Rio can establish itself as a world class city. Similarly, revenue is important to mark the event as successful. Promoting tourism and economic growth is at the forefront of this process. The “Olympic Spirit” and “Olympism” ideologies drive this machine of powerful players. Sociologists note: “Ideology is a political tool, not just an exercise in personal logic” (Bonilla-Silva 2006). The frame analysis employed in this project addresses how ideology and discourse are strategically mobilized around the Olympic Games.
LITERATURE REVIEW

The Olympic Games have been widely analyzed throughout history as they represent a stage where politics, national identities, and athletic prowess are displayed. This display continues to increase in terms of grandeur. The Games have become a spectacle increasingly visible to the global population as technology continues to improve and spread. Similar international events at such a scale have been coined “mega-events.” The scale of mega-events as well as their costs and benefits to the international community as well as to the host country have been broadly documented. The framing of these events by various agents involved often emphasizes the costs or benefits in a very distinct way in order to represent a particular interest. While the Olympic Growth Machine is emphasizing the positive developments to infrastructure and security, favela communities are emphasizing the costs of the projects and how they perpetuate already severe inequality.

Similar power dynamics between agents of all sporting communities exists. “While we recognize the diversity of constituents within every category of stakeholder, we argue here that these different institutions and agencies are each strongly associated with a corresponding set of specific collective interests, ideologies, and social, political and economic policies” (Giulianotti and Robertson 2012:217). It is important to recognize the interests of these various agents as they help to shape and influence athletics on a global, national, and local scale. These agents consist of international athletes and coaches, national Olympic committees, municipal governments etc. Each agent has a unique self-interest that they hope to pursue in light of hosting such an event. There are even more agents on an Olympic level where various nations and sport’s federations are involved.
Some agents represent “the top,” those managing the event, and others represent “the bottom,” those ensuring that the events and impacts associated with them are experienced in a just manner. “In a football or wider sport context, global civil society is best understood with reference to the growing ‘sport for development and peace’ sector, in which diverse institutions (IGOs, NGOs, new social movements, TNCs and others) use sport as an interventionist tool to address issues regarding peace, development and social justice” (Giulianotti and Robertson 2012:229). The role of global civil society in mega-events is crucial and often overshadowed. Many sporting events in history have served a political purpose. It seems that organizations and social movements are now recognizing the access that these events provide to global public discourse. They are beginning to tap into this access as a source of power and to use it as a means to introduce discourses surrounding inequalities and social movements. Framing the event with the purpose of creating a specific legacy is a source of potential power. This has occurred with many international tournaments, most notably the Olympics. The Games and their preparations are heavily scrutinized and monitored for the ways that they potentially highlight, address, or contribute to social problems. On a smaller scale as well, athletics bring recognition to various causes. For example, various professional leagues will sponsor a specific cause for a game by having all the players wear a special symbol to bring awareness to that cause.

Understanding the power of specific agents in the context of such international events, like the Olympic organization and body, is important to understanding how these mega-events are run. The International Olympic Committee represents one of the most powerful agents involved in shaping the mega-event as well as the discourse that surrounds it. “One neo-Marxist argument is that, in supplanting nation-states, a new ‘transnational state’ (TNS) has been created out of the globalization of capital, the restructuring of national state institutions, and the
expansion of supranational organizations like the IMF, World Bank, EU and WTO” (Giuliantti and Robertson 2012:226). It is important to consider how these “supra-state” organizations are held accountable. Who is responsible for enforcing a proper code of conduct? In some cases, these bodies were created to hold nation-states and similar organizations accountable. How were they awarded this power and how is it kept in check? The International Olympic Committee is an example of a very powerful supra-state organization.

Bringing to light the lack of accountability, Giulianotti and Brownell (2012) demonstrate how the International Olympic Committee and connected organizations are awarded the authority to hold nations to specific regulations and expectations. “Sport governing bodies such as the IOC and FIFA operate in a ‘no-man’s land where few supra-national governance structures exist’…Uniquely, international sports law derives not from treaties between sovereign states, but from agreements between constitutionally independent NGOs” (Giulianotti and Brownell 2012:206). An analysis of this governing system explores the role of the Olympics in international affairs and how host nations are held accountable for the preparation and management of Olympic events.

Prouse (2012) adds to the literature about the implications of hosting the Olympic Games and constructing a desired legacy. Many developing nations attempting to establish themselves as progressive, modern nations struggle to address security concerns. The capacity of a nation to control potential violence and ensure safety at a mega-event is crucial for a successful legacy. The framing of the favelas to a national Brazilian audience can rationalize the actions of the government to ensure such a secure environment. “The construction of threats to achieve legitimacy for military interventions is a prevalent theme in urban military literature” (Prouse 2012:4). By construing the favelas as unsafe environments controlled by harmful and dangerous
drug lords, officials justify occupying the favelas militarily. In the past, other nations have also had to address international security concerns when hosting mega-events which similarly focused on and affected informal settlements.

In South Africa, similar violations of human rights occurred in the name of preparing the nation to host the 2010 FIFA World Cup. A film called “Dear Mandela” (Nizza and Kell 2011) documents the success of an organization in combatting illegal evictions in informal settlements. The film looks at anti-eviction activism in South Africa and how they researched the constitutionality of the issue and eventually took it to court. The organization simply demanded an end to illegal evictions, but the demand was soon politicized by government officials to portray the group in a more controversial light. The lack of transparency was another factor illuminated throughout the film. When interviewed, an official in the Department of Housing in South Africa blamed the poor housing conditions on the high rate of urbanization and said it was “beyond what any government could handle” (Nizza and Kell 2011). Similarly, the Minister of Housing explained, “no one is thrown out, we provide alternative housing…everything is done within the constitution” (Nizza and Kell 2011). These alternative locations were meant to be temporary while houses were built in place of informal shacks, yet people interviewed at “the tins” shared how they had been there for six years. Throughout the process of analyzing the Slums Act and challenging the legality of evictions, events and messages were portrayed by the government in a manipulative manner that undermined the organization’s credibility. However, by going through the legal process, the group had success and the judge declared the evictions and the Slum Act unconstitutional.

The framing of informal settlements or favelas in Brazil surrounding the mega events has been explored specifically as well. Prouse focuses on issues of security at mega-events and how
the discourse surrounding security facilitates the urban transformation deemed necessary to host mega-events like the World Cup and Olympic Games. She explores the role of various agents and how they seek to frame the events and issues of security within Rio in order to justify military occupation of the favelas by Pacifying Police Units (UPPs). She addresses “how the state, activist groups, citizens, and international media create different truths about the UPPs through their respective framings of mega event projects in Brazil. These differential framings of social processes are as important as, albeit perhaps more subtle than, material infrastructural legacies of sport mega events” (Prouse 2012: 2). The UPP program was implemented in Brazil in 2008 and many have questioned if the efforts to control and improve the stability of favelas will continue after the mega-events. “The ‘problem of the favelas’ has (re)emerged as a potential security concern for the Brazilian state and for an international public” (Prouse 2012:3). The temporary need to secure the city has many questioning the motives of the UPP program. Funding for the program was only secured through 2016 when the mega-events will conclude. These conflicting “truths” are enlightened by frame analysis.

Current discourses surrounding the favelas are conflicting. The costs and benefits of favelas, as well as the rights of favela residents, are increasingly questioned as Rio de Janeiro prepares to host an international mega-event and demonstrate that it is a world class city. In preparing for the events, the discourse of various stakeholders involves oppositional framing. Harvey (1997) identifies how reform presents an opportunity for the framing of a city. “A radically different approach is one which sees the city not so much as a site of contestation but as something to be constructed and in which the contestation is over the construction, or framing, of the city itself” (Harvey 1997:234). The specific frame and image of Rio that wins the public and
international discourse has grave implications on the lasting legacy of 2014 World Cup and 2016 Summer Olympic Games on the city and the nation of Brazil.

David Harvey discusses how social processes, people, and space interact in the urban and produce contested cities. He understands cities as integral to understanding conditions of society. The power dynamics and inequality in Rio de Janeiro is reflective of larger social phenomena within the nation of Brazil. Harvey explores how place and time shape the conditions of the urban and vice versa. The physical and historical have certainly shaped favelas and are now shaping the focus of Rio’s transformation. This transformation in light of the upcoming, internationally scrutinized, athletic mega events in 2014 and 2016 is an opportunity for the city of Rio de Janeiro to redefine itself. As it engages in this process, Harvey’s analysis of the creation and construction of a city as being contested is relevant. The reconstruction of Rio, composed of multiple interventions including improvements in infrastructure and military occupation of favelas, imposes significant costs on specific populations.

Harvey’s analysis of previous interventions in American cities and their effects is applicable to the transformation of Rio in Brazil. He writes, “Inherent in these interventions was a visionary notion of an alternative city – a city beautiful with facilities and services that would, indeed, pacify alienated populations” (Harvey 1997:233). Brazil is currently attempting to beautify the city of Rio and project a global image of progress and modernity. In the process, through their pacifying police units aimed specifically at favelas, they are attempting to downplay the significant urban problems that the marginalized favelados represent. Simultaneously, however, the tension surrounding the problems seems to be heightening and the problems themselves seem worse. “We are producing marginalization, disempowerment, alienation, pollution and degradation” (Harvey 1997:232). Just as the reforms in American cities
in the 19th and early 20th centuries, the urban interventions in Rio are aimed at social control and are reinforcing social hierarchies.

Helen Jefferson Lenskyj has written a very comprehensive analysis of the “Olympic Industry” (2000) in which various cases studies show the possible costs of such mega-events like the Olympics. Defining the Olympic Family, Lenskyj furthers the idea of bureaucratic, international power present in the Games. She also documents the many locations in which “street sweeps” occurred in preparation for achieving a bid or actually hosting the Olympics. Similar actions have been taken across the globe, in which country’s attempt to do away with urban problems, without regard for the populations most affected, in order to “beautify” the urban. Lenskyj defines street sweeps when she writes, “On these occasions, homeless people, sex trade workers, and beggars were harassed by police, evicted from downtown neighborhoods, and often arrested. Such street sweeps have been documented during all Summer Olympics since 1984—Los Angeles, Seoul, Barcelona, and Atlanta” (Lenskyj 2000:108-109). Attempting to demonstrate a world class city spectacle, nations employ similar tactics in trying to eliminate urban problems as opposed to fixing them. Lenskyj brings to light various grassroots organizations that have focused on the plight of the populations affected by street sweeps in past host cities. Many organizations in more developed nations focused on environmental concerns. An anti-Olympic solidarity movement has also developed through which grassroots organizations unite to generally oppose the Olympic Industry and expose what it truly represents. The movement brings attention to the negative impact the Olympics often have on marginalized populations around the world.

In his theory of the city as a growth machine (1976), Harvey Molotch enlightens the power dynamics present in the physical and ideological changes currently underway in Rio. He
argues that economic growth in cities is integral to, and the focus of, the powerful. This machine includes those players that hold interests and investments that benefit from growth. These players are part of the political economy that shapes the urban. Controlling public discourse and framing urban issues in a manner to support economic development and growth is vital to the urban growth machine. “The issues which are allowed to be discussed and the positions which the politicians take on them derive from the world views of those who come from certain sectors of the business and professional class and the need which they have to whip up public sentiments without allowing distributive issues to become part of public discussion” (Molotch 1976: 257). This explains the motivations of the Brazilian elite to frame the urban transformation of Rio in light of the mega-events as a developed, modern city, not a city troubled by urban problems and inequality. The hosting of the athletic mega-events also inspires national pride and serves as a catalyst for growth. Molotch identifies the power of athletics and events to justify growth. He writes, “The athletic teams in particular are an extraordinary mechanism for instilling a spirit of civic jingoism regarding the ‘progress’ of the locality… [they] help build an ideological base for local boosterism and the acceptance of growth” (Molotch 1976:255). This ideological base for the urban transformation involved in Rio 2016 comes from the “Olympic Spirit” and promotion of Brazilian nationalism through athletics. This ideology is also fueling the frame of the event as an opportunity for economic and urban development.

Simon Darnell (2012) provides a critical discourse analysis of international development surrounding the Olympics in Rio. Darnell compares the rhetoric of the International Olympic Committee, the media, and the private sector. The actual development plans for the city in preparation for the Games are also explored. He notes how the Olympic related programs aim to advance social development. He found, after coding 201 documents, that the media and
corporate communications focused on three areas: infrastructure, investment opportunities, and economic development. The focus was expanding the Brazilian economy on a global stage. The IOC role in promoting development through sports is also highlighted. The collaboration with and support from the United Nations in promoting sport for development is significant. The two international bodies produced a publication called “Sport for Development and Peace” that includes recommendations about how to combine the two. The publication acknowledges how “the dominant discourse of elite sport is particularly susceptible to dependency theories of development whereby the success of the few constructs and affirms the dependence of the relatively marginalized” (Darnell 2012:877). Darnell, however, provides some criticism of the recommendations. The concrete strategies available to the IOC and national Olympic Committees seem to be missing. He also notes how one recommendation “also argues for the Olympic Movement’s ‘moral duty’ to international development, a potentially neo-colonizing discourse that positions development as the responsibility and stewardship of the privileged rather than the social and political struggles of the marginalized” (Darnell 2012:877). Brazil’s current situation with favelas seems to be a perfect example of this struggle.

Darnell’s literature makes note of what is excluded from the IOC, Media, and Corporate coverage of the current preparations for the Games which is a significant component of framing the event. He finds that

No mention was made about the potential role of the Games in building human security through equality, peace or justice for the citizens of Rio. Similarly, despite the lack of economic distribution in contemporary Brazil, no mention was made about the redistribution of wealth, or even the benefits to the poor and under-classes that the Rio 2016 Game might afford or allow (Darnell 2012:880).

Darnell identifies how the Games could be framed as an opportunity to address Brazil’s severe inequality, an idea that this project will expand upon. The critical discourse analysis looked at
official IOC and Rio 2016 publications along with a set of texts found using the Dow Jones-Factiva Database. Darnell searched for documents that included the words Rio, Brazil, Olympics and Development between October 1st, 2009 and March 1st, 2010. The methods of Darnell’s study inform the frame analysis completed in this project. The discourses identified by Darnell are strategically compiled to frame the 2016 Olympic Games with a specific legacy. This project looks at how social scripts and public discourse are mobilized into frames with powerful implications.

**METHODOLOGY**

Using the qualitative research method approach reflected in frame analysis (Goffman, 1974; Rohlinger, 2002; Saguy, 2013; Valocchi, 1996) I was able to identify the various stakeholders in Brazil and the legacies they aim to promote through the 2016 Olympic Games. By analyzing the discourse of various agents involved in the urban transformation of Rio, the underlying inequality and power dynamic within the city is illuminated. Identifying who dominates the discourse and how various agents position one another contributes to this illumination. “As Dimeo (2007: 7) argues, this discourse analysis methodology, ‘offers the chance to question the supposed truths that are being presented, while also recognizing the influence texts can have even if they are factually incorrect’” (Prouse 2012:5). The reception of the discourse locally, nationally, and internationally has consequences whether it is accurate or not. This discourse is strategically mobilized to create a frame. “Frames are principles of selection, emphasis and presentation composed of little tacit theories about what exists, what happens, and what matters” (Economic & Social Research Council :Gitlin 1980). Framing the
2016 Olympics and its legacy is simultaneously framing what exists, what happens, and what matters in Rio and in Brazil.

Frames are representations or interpretations of reality that may not be consciously constructed, but are internalized through various forms of communication and socialization (“Frame Analysis: Theoretical Preliminaries” n.d.). “She [Judith Butler (2010)] argues that what is left outside of the frame – the frame’s ‘constitutive outside’ – is always available to be mobilized for discursive resistance” (Prouse 2012:6). This study will look at the frame presented by the Olympic Growth Machine in Brazil as well as the counter-frame constructed by the local resistance. This project identifies local, national, and international players and employs coding to identify common trends in framing by each group of players involved. The frequency of codes for specific discourses within specific stakeholder’s publications illuminate the legacy that they support and promote. The decision to use qualitative data analysis enabled a more subtle exploration of power and inequality within Brazil and also internationally. Using publicly available data, I was able to quantitatively inform the context within which the frames were constructed.

Valocchi (1996) informs how framing is a form of discursive resistance. The choices made in what to include and not include when presenting a potentially influential message is a source of “resource mobilization”. Valocchi identifies the political use of frames and, specifically, counter-frames within social movements. He refers to framing as the “schemata of interpretation” that helps redefine individuals and groups involved in a cause. Valocchi cites Snow and Benford’s (1992) contribution to the meaning of frames. “Framing ‘refers to an interpretive schemata that simplifies and condenses the ‘world out there’ by selectively punctuating and encoding objects, situations, events, experiences, and sequences of actions
within one’s present or past environment” (Valocchi 1996:119). The culturally shared and familiar meanings embedded with purpose in a frame serve as leverage to gain entrance into public discourse. “They [frames] must resonate with existing cultural symbols if they are to serve as effective recruiting devices” (Valocchi 1996:120). Cultural symbols are resources available for mobilization by selecting and including specific language or ideas to construct a specific reality.

In Brazil, the cultural repertoire may be different from other nations, but hosting an international mega-event like the Olympics requires the Brazilian government to frame the events and preparations in a “universal” manner. Framing the event locally for residents of Rio de Janeiro, however, is very different as the audience interpreting the discourse is listening with a distinct Brazilian perspective that may be additionally shaped by race and class. A counter-frame aims to make local meanings and concerns universal. Rohlinger (2002) identifies the power of public discourse which enlightens the desire to frame a cause in terms intelligible to all cultures. “For social movement organizations that can get their messages into mainstream media there is the potential for great rewards” (Rohlinger 2002:479). The leverage of a global audience is very significant and serves as a political opportunity for both the Brazilian government internationally and the residents of Rio de Janeiro locally.

Frame analysis allows one to explore language and words as a means to understanding various agents’ role and interest in a particular situation. The way one agent portrays another can greatly affect outcomes. Perceptions and manipulative depictions can determine the reality that the public understands. It is important to recognize how frames may overlook certain groups and what this oversight means for those communities. The legacies articulated by various stakeholders in the 2016 Rio Olympic Games reflect the power dynamic and inequality already
present in the city. Contested legacies reflect contested meaning. “‘Meaning’ making is a contested process that is influenced simultaneously by oppositional groups, structures of media, social events, and bystanders” (Rohlinger 2002:479). By analyzing the frames presented, one can gain insight into these pre-existing circumstances and understand the implications of the event with more clarity.

With the assistance of Atlas.ti, a computer assisted qualitative data software (CAQDS), I coded forty primary documents and used analytic memos to elucidate frames and counter-frames. The documents consisted of publications by the International Olympic, the Brazilian Government, Rio On Watch (a community reporting organization), and international media sources (The New York Times & The Washington Post). (Figure 1) I noted how issues of security, infrastructure development, investment, and inequality were spoken about to identify what each frame included and excluded. These decisions create meaning and have real implications for the understanding of society and events.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pacifying Police Unit (UPP)</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brazilian Government</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Olympic Committee (IOC)</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rio On Watch</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Media</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>40</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figure 1: Distribution of Documents Sampled by Source*
DISCUSSION

During this research two dominating frames became apparent which seemed to either promote the Olympic Games as an opportunity for economic and urban development or as a contributor to inequality and marginalization. I found that two levels of framing exist. One in which the Brazilian government is attempting to demonstrate Brazil’s abilities as a nation in light of the heightened scrutiny and skepticism of international powers which is termed the “legacy of positive development.” The counter-frame termed the “legacy of inequality,” promoted by residents of Brazil’s favelas and their advocates, attempts to ensure that all are included in Rio’s transformation and that the developments are long-term improvements for all. The first frame promotes and defends the position of Brazil within the international hierarchy of nations and regions, while the second promotes and defends the position of favelas in the national and urban hierarchy. Power is at stake in these competing frames and, regardless of which dominates public discourse, the legacy of the month long mega event will have changed Rio and its urban population forever.

**Frame: A Legacy of Positive Development**

The investment and costs required to host such a mega-event are understood by Brazilian officials as well worth the improved global image and position of Brazil. The preparations are framed as productive for the long run welfare of the nation. “It is a choice for a new Brazil, a new Rio de Janeiro, which has proven to the world that it is capable of changing for the better” (“Cabral: uses of mass transport in Rio” 2012). How successful has the Brazilian Government
and IOC’s promoting been? The code “legacy of positive development” was recorded 53 times. Of the 53 quotations, 21 were from official Brazilian government documents, 15 were from Rio on Watch documents, 8 were from official International Olympic publications, and 5 were from international media sources. (Figure 2) Clearly, the Brazilian government is the main promoter of this framing of the Olympic Games in Rio. The IOC supports this legacy as the International Olympic Committee’s mission and website make several references to the potential for athletics to bring peace and progress. The codes “athletics for development” and “athletics to improve inequality” were coded most frequently in the official Olympic publications.

![Figure 2: Frequency, by source of publications, of code for a “Legacy of Positive Development”](image_url)
Giulianotti and Brownell shed light on the important element of “legacy” that endures following the lived experience of an Olympic spectacle. With the justification of shaping a positive and lasting legacy, host nations are emboldened to take on projects that may otherwise be questioned on the basis of financial or social concerns. They also argue, however, that nations are conscious of their ethical perception in the process of legacy development. Giulianotti and Brownell cite other studies that discuss specific measures implemented in host nations in the name of shaping a positive legacy to improve the nation’s international reputation. “Haggerty and Boyle observe that major events enable local authorities to push through security measures that might otherwise be contested by local publics, while also affording commercial opportunities that stimulate the growth of a global security-industrial complex, with direct legacy effects for host cities” (Giulianotti and Brownell 2012:207). In Rio, this is certainly the case. An example of such an intervention is when Google received a request by Brazilian officials to diminish the existence of favelas on their maps of the city of Rio. They requested to either not label the areas where favelas are located or to change the name to “morro”, hill in Portuguese. Rio On Watch, the community reporting organization, has referred to this request and compliance as “virtual removals.” Currently international Olympic followers looking to either check out the city map before visiting or for context about the Games will not see how many favela communities really exist as they are no longer present on the map. (See Image 1)
During the preparations for the World Cup and Olympic Games the references to favelas by Rio’s municipal government have focused largely on the efforts of Pacifying Police Units. The UPPs have been employed as a demonstration of Brazil’s intolerance of drug gangs and violence. In attempt to negate any security concerns, Brazil has called in military units to take control of many of the favelas in Rio. In a speech to a group of businessmen in London, the host of the 2012 Summer Olympics, the governor of the state of Rio de Janeiro, Sergio Cabral, shared
how “the deployment of Pacifying Police Units (UPP) in poor communities has improved the quality of life and peace has returned to more than one million people, including 300,000 who once lived directly under the control of criminals in these areas” (“Cabral: ‘Rio de Janeiro’” 2011). The UPPs, as reported by Cabral, are integral to the positive development of the city for the Games. The one million poor people that Cabral refers to, however, may feel differently about having their communities militarily invaded. This military program is an effort to demonstrate to potential international spectators that Rio will be safe to visit and experience in 2016.

The UPPs are the most contested part of the urban transformation currently underway in Rio. The goal is to recover the favelas and ensure that they remain out of the hands of drug lords. This, along with community policing and increased public services, is meant to improve the lives of favelados. The definition and measure of the UPP program’s “success,” however, is different depending on one’s perspective. To understand the military occupancy as a successful strategy to pacify favelas, one must perceive them as dangerous and violent. The depiction of favelas as threatening, helpless, impoverished, and dangerous communities by the municipal government of Rio De Janeiro facilitates the acceptance of military intervention. As such, of the 14 codes labeled “crime in favelas” 7 were in publications by the UPP official website and 6 were by the international media. (Figure 3) It was only coded once in the Brazilian government documents which is logical due to their desire to downplay criminal activity in the host city. Images of favelados in the UPP publications depict the prominence of criminals and violence in favelas before the arrival of the pacifying police units. (See Image 2)
Figure 3: Frequency, by source of publications, of code for “Crime in Favelas”

Image 2 (“UPP Book” 2013)
It is hard to know exactly how much the pacifying police units are accomplishing as the descriptions vary so greatly depending on the source. For example, of the 50 “UPP as improvement” codes, 29 of them were from the official UPP publications, 11 were from Brazilian Government documents, 9 were from international media sources, and only 1 was from a Rio on Watch document. (Figure 4) This reveals how those that represent the voice of the occupied favelas do not understand the military occupation as an improvement to their communities. The UPP publications barely mention how the occupancy was received by favelados. The code for “reception of UPPs” was present only 6 times in UPP publications compared to 25 times in Rio on Watch documents and 9 times by international media sources. (Figure 5) Those representing the favelas are concerned with the reaction of favelados to the program and how the communities are responding to the program. The Brazilian government and UPP officials, however, seem less concerned with the implications of the military occupancy, or at least they fail to report it.

![Figure 4: Frequency, by source of publications, of code for “UPP as Improvement for Favelas”](image-url)
Figure 5: Frequency, by source of publications, of code for “UPP Reception”

The UPP official website focuses on the reduction in crime rates in the occupied favelas and the surrounding areas as the ultimate measure of success. Their “about” page on the official website states, “The pacification process has also contributed to the decrease in the number of killings of police officers” (“About” n.d.). The lives and safety of police officers are highlighted as opposed to the lives and safety of favela residents. In addition, the website states, “It is important to notice that before the UPPs people were not aware of their civil rights and neither had their rights as citizens preserved” (“History” n.d.). The UPP publications claim that through the military occupancy, favelados have realized that they have rights as citizens of Rio. The military units are seen in pictures as seamlessly integrated into the community and received warmly. (See Image 3) The cover of a book published by the Brazilian Government about the UPPs has a picture of an older, black man smiling with the caption “the thugs are away from us now” (“UPP Book” 2013).
Figure 6: Frequency, by source of publications, of code for “Security”
The UPPs represent how a frame can be mobilized to gain support or justification for an intervention. The data was coded for “security” and of the 17 quotations, 11 were from official Brazilian government documents, 5 were from international media sources, and one was from Rio on Watch publications. (Figure 6) Security threats were clearly emphasized by the Brazilian government. By framing favelas as violent, threatening, and unsafe, the UPPs seem like a logical intervention on the part of the Brazilian government to stabilize the city and make it safer for residents and visitors. Military occupancy would surely seem like an improvement to the alternative that the UPP publications present. The book published on UPPs also states how “the UPPs already mobilized the attention of other Brazilian states and other countries, all interested on the true revolution that is happening in Rio” (“UPP Book” 2013). Governor Cabral justified the success of the program, measured internationally, through his story about President Barack Obama’s visit to a UPP occupied favela. Cabral shares with an audience in New York City, “When he arrived in Rio, President Obama said he wanted to know why the city won over his own (Chicago) in the competition for the right to stage the Games. Three days later, when he left, and after visiting a UPP (Ciudade de Deus), he told me: ‘now I understand’” (Cabral in New York 2011). The UPPs are just one element of the urban transformation of Rio, but they represent one of the most contested interventions. They also clearly demonstrate the frame through which the Brazilian government views favelas.

The Olympic Games also serve as an exhibition and physical spectacle. Paradis (2010) describes the Olympic Games as an opportunity for host countries to demonstrate modernity, progress, and development to the rest of the world. The Olympic village, stadiums, transportation networks, and much more are required investments. In the process, physical environments and usually urban environments are transformed. The Olympics are used as a vehicle for rapid urban
development in the name of legacy construction. A large part of this construction is through Olympic infrastructure like stadiums.

Sports have evolved as central to the world’s idea of leisure and identity. International and national sporting events continue to expand in scale while still staying relevant at the local level. Stadiums, however, have shifted from being inclusive environments that allow for the participation of the general public to inaccessible entertainment experiences geared towards an appearance of order, security, and amenities. “Regardless of your experience, you have stadium stories to tell” (Gaffney 2010:1). These experiences could range from being displaced by the development of a new stadium to sitting in a VIP box to watch the World Cup finals. Stadiums represent the spectacle of sport and serve as reflections of social relations and values within a city, a nation, or a society.

Maracana, once the largest stadium in the world built to host the 1950 FIFA World Cup in Rio, is representative of this evolution of stadiums around the world as it is currently renovated to host the 2014 FIFA World Cup and the official ceremonies of the 2016 Olympic Games. “The stadium [Maracana] symbolized Brazilian passion for sport and highlighted the role of monumental architectural forms in communicating political and sporting ideologies” (Gaffney 2010:13). These physical structures represent much more than just a space for sport. With the emergence and dominance of Capitalism and Consumerism, came dramatic changes to sports, the stadium experience, and the profile of spectators. This experience targeted a more affluent crowd and shifted the spectator’s expectations as well as the definition of a spectator. This change in stadium experience is reflective of the shifting urban experience. In 1950, when the stadium was built, its capacity was 179,000 which represented approximately one-tenth of Rio’s population at the time. Over time it was reduced to 89,000 in 2005 to comply with FIFA’s
all-seater standards. The price of tickets for the cheapest seats in the stadium increased from 3 reales to 20. “Contrary to the democratic ideologies that were at the forefront of the 1950 World Cup, the discourses surrounding the 2014 World Cup reflect the exigencies of an increasingly globalized and neo-liberal political economy” (Gaffney 2010:20). The physical changes to the stadium reflected the shifts in global ideologies.

Stadiums both house and facilitate the grandeur of sports. “As Eduardo Galeano suggests, even when the stadium is empty, it communicates power, history, and meaning” (Gaffney 2010:3). A world class stadium is a symbol of a world class city. The conditions and period under which a stadium is built, as well as the events that it will host, create the legacy of a distinguished monument. Hosting an event and building such structures is a tool for the host country or city to demonstrate its greatness to the world. This tool is being employed right now by Brazil and Rio. The investment in stadium and urban infrastructure secures a modern, developed global image. Using the discourse of progress and development, Brazil has attempted to transform its urban environment and stadiums to achieve such an image. The urban transformation is attempting to improve city amenities, but who has access to these amenities? Favela residents may not have the opportunity to enjoy or experience the actual event that is significantly shaping their daily lives.

But what does participation actually mean or provide? Stadiums serve as places where the capitalist and the state can dictate their control over the masses. The collective experience of events at stadiums can serve a purpose as “Durkheim argues that shared rituals arouse individual emotions and (may) result in collective emotions, are essential for the stability, cohesiveness and self-affirmation of social collectives” (Schafer and Roose 2010:234). However, this cohesive experience can also be used as a tool to promote a certain ideology. Maracana was built under an
Authoritarian regime in Brazil and the collective experience allowed the Brazilian government to diminish resistance. “The cavernous space of the stadium required participation en masse, reducing individual agency in the public sphere in a seemingly neutral political environment while at the same time diminishing the potential for oppositional politics” (Gaffney 2010:15). The stadium served as an indirect form of social control even when everyone could participate. The urban development projects are also promoting a specific discourse surrounding a legacy of positive economic and social development.

Reflective of these projects, stadiums became “fortified enclaves” that portrayed a city’s development and power. These enclaves entailed security and modernity. The spectacle of a stadium creates a legacy that reflects a nation’s power and values. In preparation for the World Cup in 2014 and in promotion of a legacy of positive development, the Brazilian authorities have plans to renovate Maracana. These renovations include building an extended roof, a 10,000 car parking garage, and a shopping mall to be connected to the stadium.

This is reflective of a long-standing discourse surrounding sport and social development in Brazil. The discourse suggests that by investing heavily in sporting infrastructure and social programs aimed at the development of athletes, Rio will be able to extricate itself from chronic problems of socio-economic polarization and drug-related violence” (Gaffney 2010:17). The changes, however, have done nothing to decrease economic disparity and division.

Brazil succeeded in using the Pan American Games in 2007, an analogous sport-based mega-event, as a demonstration to FIFA and the International Olympic Committee that it was capable of hosting such a mega-event, but the investment in sporting infrastructure left little behind in the form of economic or urban development. “The 2007 Pan American Games was used much more as a familiar and internationally oriented strategy of city marketing than as a way to face and solve daily problems of urban life” (Curi, Knijnik, and Mascarenhas 2011:150). stadiums and other sporting infrastructure, while powerful tools for nations to demonstrate
supremacy, entail social costs. These costs are the basis to the counter-frame that emphasizes how the event’s lasting legacy will be about inequality.

**Counter-Frame: A Legacy of Inequality**

The counter-frame aims to bring awareness to the unjust elements of the Olympic Movement, Olympic events, and associated preparations. Specifically, the counter-frame is promoting a legacy of inequality. The inequalities that these stakeholders identify in Rio stem from the inhumane evictions, lack of transparency, and lack of recognition. The “legacy of inequality” was coded a total of 35 times in the data sample. Of the 35 quotations, 22 were from the Rio on Watch publications, 10 were from international media sources, and 3 were from Olympic publications. (Figure 7) Significantly, there was not a single quotation from the Brazilian government or UPP documents that referred to a legacy of inequality. This clearly demonstrates the frame/counter-frame dichotomy. The favela residents, marginalized Brazilians, and their advocates are presenting a very different reality than the Brazilian government and Olympic officials.

![Figure 7: Frequency, by source of publications, of code for a “Legacy of Inequality”](image-url)
In Rio, Maracana and everything that it represents stands in stark contrast to the urban conditions of many Brazilians. The investment in stadiums and mega-events result in significant consequences for the urban population, including those who are impassioned by such an event and those who are unaware of or simply do not value its significance. “The heavy investiture in sporting infrastructure channels money from the development of social and educational programs perpetuating cycles of poverty and disassociation that contribute to the chronic problems of violence, drugs, and marginalization in Rio de Janeiro” (Gaffney 2010:17). The urban conditions in Rio have been questioned around the globe. Stadiums and urban sporting infrastructure serve as tools for the Brazilian government to demonstrate that it can handle its urban problems. It seems, however, that the strategy is to shield spectators from the real urban issues and challenges by distracting them with the spectacle of the structure and the event. “The walls around the stadium signified a border between the colorful and modern spectacle that met international standards and the normal city with its Third World grievances” (Curi et al. 2011:152). Stadiums imitate the dynamic of urban social inequalities.

Favela residents in Brazil are certainly not accepting the developments that defy their presence and input. Brazil has the second-largest number of Twitter users after the United States. With the help of organized bodies like Catalytic Communities, the organization that runs the Rio on Watch community reporting website, marginalized Brazilians are using social media to ensure that their experience is not excluded by the frame of Brazilian and IOC officials or in the legacy they aim to promote. Internationally, they are struggling to get their counter-frame recognized, however. After an article on the occupation of Complexo de Mare, it was revealed how little focused on the residents of the community. “On Yahoo!, of 624 words, just 71 were spent
acknowledging the people who call Maré home, largely stating how residents seemed irritated by the security forces and journalists’ presence: “Few wanted to speak with reporters” (Clark 2014).

Lenskyj sheds light on the process of the Olympic Bid and the role of the Media. She deconstructs the discourse surrounding the “Olympic spirit” and explains how and why the Anti-Olympic Movement needs to demystify the Olympics, “The goal of this enterprise would be to demonstrate that, behind all the rhetoric, the so-called Olympic movement is simply a transnational corporation that in many instances exploits young athletes’ labor and aspirations for its own aggrandizement and profit” (Lenskyj 2000:195). This movement is a counter discourse that aims to frame the event from the perspective of marginalized populations and through a lens of inequality. There is even a twitter account titled “CounterOlympics” that uses an image of the interlocking Olympic rings as handcuffs in place of the traditional rings. In the data, the code “anti-mega-event reactions” was recorded 17 times. Of the 17 quotations, 11 were from Rio on Watch documents and 6 were from international media sources. This implies that the Olympic publications and Brazilian government documents fail to mention any presence of opposition.

The counter-frame incorporates the power of discourse into their argument and states how the government’s lack of transparency is an intentional effort to manipulate public discourse. The code “issues of transparency and accuracy” was meant to document the acknowledgement of unclear information and mixed messages. The code was recorded 36 times, 21 of which were quotations from Rio on Watch documents, 9 of which were from international media sources, and only three times in official Brazilian government and Olympic documents.

Human rights violations are closely related to the restriction of information and lack of transparency, as the speakers showed. Carlos [an urban planning professor] pointed to the corrupt relationship between the government, media, and private interests that collectively work to control information at the expense of the city’s poor communities. There is not only a lack of information; there is a systematic, organized, and deliberate politics of disinformation (Steiker-Ginzberg 2013).
This passage presented by the Popular Committee of the World Cup and Olympics in Rio is part of a larger text meant to document the human rights violations occurring during the preparations. It specifically addresses the power of framing and how it is being employed by the Brazilian government. Information is a resource and can be used as leverage. The counter-frame presented by the Popular Committee aims to acknowledge not only the human rights violations occurring in correlation with the mega-event preparations, but also the Olympic and Brazilian officials’ lack of transparency. In the most recent UPP operation in Complexo de Mare, Rio’s largest favela complex and home to 130,000 people, there was outrage over discrepancy between what is considered legal and what actually happened. “One of the most controversial aspects of the Maré operation has been the collective warrant authorized by the courts on Saturday, March 29. Legally questionable, the warrant meant any home could be broken into by police” (Clark 2014). During the operation there were also several incidences of violence and unlawful arrests. Yet these instances are never documented in the official UPP publications which declare that the ultimate goal is peace and that the reception of UPPs is seamless. Many favela residents and advocates are shocked by the clear violation of rights and also the negation of violations.

Favela residents have frequently stated the lack of clear information surrounding evictions in particular. For example, one Rio On Watch article documents,

Jorge Bittar, former Municipal Secretary of Housing who Carlos Vainer playfully labeled ‘Secretary of Removals,’ informed the community that they would be receiving important improvements through the municipal favela upgrading program Morar Carioca and that no one would be forced to leave. Simultaneously, the Municipal Secretariat of Housing (SMH) began marking houses for removal, citing area of risk (Steiker-Ginzberg 2013). Either Rio’s municipal officials are not on the same page, or they are purposefully manipulating favela residents. Either way, the insecurity and constant threat of removal is detrimental to the favela communities. The legality of the evictions has also been questioned. In Amnesty International’s letter asking the IOC to denounce the human rights violations and evictions, they
note how “residents endured months of pressure and harassment from city workers who-often without proper identification—threatened families by saying they would be kicked out without any compensation if they didn’t accept resettlement in a remote area 60km away, far from schools, jobs and basic services” (Steiker-Ginzberg 2013). The Popular Committee also stated in its dossier that 40,000 people have been affected by illegal evictions and that this number is an underestimate because official data has not been disclosed by the Brazilian government (Steiker-Ginzberg 2013). In the data analysis, 28 instances of the code “evictions” were logged. Of the 28 quotations, 17 were from Rio on Watch documents, 6 were from international media sources, 5 were from the Amnesty International letter, while it was coded zero times in official Brazilian and Olympic publications. (Figure 8) This clearly demonstrates how the evictions do not exist within the frame that the Brazilian government and IOC are promoting surrounding the 2016 Olympic Games. This is representative of a larger pattern of exclusion. The implications of the urban developments in preparation for the mega-event for marginalized, poor Brazilians are not defined or emphasized.

Figure 8: Frequency, by source of publications, of code for “Evictions”
Lenskyj extensively discusses the international resistance to the Olympic industry both in nations attempting to win a bid and nations that actually host Games. She explores the various grassroots organizations that worked to highlight the immoral behavior of various Olympic agents and the negative implications on already marginalized populations that hosting the mega-event create. She cites various instances of repression for protesting in the context of the mega-event. “Rule 61 of the IOC Charter (1997) requires the host city to guarantee that there will be no demonstrations or ‘political, religious, or racial propaganda’ in or near Olympic venues. The IOC rule, however, is more concerned with maintaining law and order than with combating racism” (Lenskyj 2000:108). Lenskyj attempts to expose how the Olympic Industry works to protect its interests using discreet rhetoric.

Lenskyj also exposes the challenges faced by Olympic resistance. The power and connections of the Olympic industry to both the media and academia severely limits the access of resistance groups to powerful or influential outlets. In preparation to host such a large scale event, university facilities are often recruited for renovation in order to host specific athletic events and also to house participants or visitors. In addition, Lenskyj gives examples as to when the university may receive perks throughout the event such as tickets to events. “These outcomes have benefited the small and mostly privileged sector of the population who were university students, staff, and faculty, at a significant cost to the public purse” (Lenskyj 2000:126). In addition, a potential outlet for exposing the downfalls of the Olympic Movement and promoting societal welfare becomes tied to the Olympic organization. Many universities associated with the IOC offer courses that are consistent with how the IOC desires the organization to be framed. This relationship limits oppositional discourse in academia. The Olympic Industry has succeeded
in building a relationship with the media that also inhibits the resistance movement by solidifying the public discourse of positive development through sporting events.

Anti-Olympic supporters struggle to gain recognition and play a role in framing the events. Lenskyj describes in detail the rhetoric of the Olympic industry that promotes their mega-event and overshadows any negative effects or capitalist motivations. She writes,

The pseudo-religious rhetoric of the Olympic industry, while obscuring the negative social, political, and environmental impact that has been the fallout of most recent Olympic Games, delivers a clear ‘Olympic spirit’ message: to criticize or oppose Olympic bids and preparations is to be unpatriotic, to lack civic pride, and, most seriously, to betray the young athletes who are the ‘heart and soul’ of the Olympics (Lenskyj 2000:131).

The public discourse that the Olympic officials and associates encourage presents any anti-Olympic supporters in a negative light. By positioning the grassroots organizations and their counter-frame as against progress and against the development of their nation, they are perceived poorly by the general public. “Olympism,” the Olympic ideology, is mobilized to politically alienate opposition. In reality, the resistance cares just as much about the future of the nation and city. The Anti-Olympic Movement wants to ensure that everyone benefits from the progress that the Olympic Spirit evokes.

Lenskyj explains how the Olympic Industry “manufactures consent” and employs “necessary illusions” to ensure that they are perceived as adhering to the Olympic spirit and that events are portrayed smoothly. The media plays a critical role in the Olympic Industry’s controlling of public discourse. The press with which the industry has no association or connection poses a threat to the industry and what it represents. “These are the journalists who often look for nonsport, human interest stories—urban poverty, racism, etc.—that might embarrass the host city in the world press. Indeed, by the 1990’s it became axiomatic in Olympic circles that world media coverage could make or break an Olympics” (Lenskyj 2000:176).
Lenskyj demonstrates the power of discourse in the context of the Olympic Games specifically. She provides several success stories of grassroots organizations tapping into the public discourse and exposing corruption in the Olympic organization. The organization, Catalytic Communities, that runs the Rio On Watch community reporting website, was specifically created to give favelas a voice to ensure that they are depicted accurately in the media. The framing of favelas is integral to creating a positive legacy for the 2016 Olympics.

The portrayal of favela residents is a crucial element in framing the city and in understanding the implications of the urban transformation. The common perception of favelas is that they are crime ridden and full of extreme poverty. Yet, there are elements of favela communities and informal settlements around the globe that are valuable. “The virtues of these slums are many. They are almost entirely self-organized and they are a testament to the ability of people to collectively solve problems without the help of large organizations like government, NGOs, or private firms” (McQuarrie 2013). The diverse and lively street life that attracts many to urban life is present in many informal settlements in developing nations and it is what makes them thrive. While slums may be innovatively built and lack order or proper infrastructure, they seem to foster positive community values and interactions better than public housing projects equipped with modern infrastructure.

For example, while the living conditions of the favelas in Brazil may make one ponder why anyone would ever migrate to a city and chose to live in these communities, the answer is that the alternatives are too expensive and the quality is not significantly better if at all. The public housing options in Brazil are not appealing in comparison to the many lively favela communities. This would suggest that while these slum communities exist outside an official legal framework, they are still functional and that the “culture of poverty” which implicates a
lack of self-efficacy is not a given that follows poverty. “The ideology of marginality with its moralistic, victim-blaming narrative has persisted in the face of blatantly contradictory evidence” (Perlman 2010:150). The poor population is working hard to make the best of a system they are excluded by. Favelados in Brazil do not receive the same services and respect as a person living in a formal settlement. Discrimination is just one more barrier that favela residents face. They are invisible as people, yet visible as a problem, as the dangerous, poor of society. Why and how does this discrimination and image matter? “Stigma, social exclusion, and the lack of opportunity to fulfill one’s capabilities perpetuate poverty, thereby perpetuating the belief in the inferiority of the poor” (Perlman 2010:153). Yet many people living in informal settlements in developing nations have created closely knit communities that are functional using innovative strategies and responding to circumstances collectively. The Olympic preparations are stimulating even more innovation and empowerment in favela communities and new resources like the Rio On Watch community reporting website have emerged.

“A recent study of 92,000 people across six pacified favelas showed 95 percent of homes were brick and concrete, 75 percent had tile floors, 44 percent had computers, and 90 percent of working-age residents were employed. As the Chinese diplomat Sha Zukang exclaimed on a recent visit, “‘This is not a slum!’” (Williamson “A Missed Opportunity” 2013). I coded observations of the favelas similar to this one as “favela potential.” In the 40 documents I coded, this code appeared only 9 times and only in documents published by Rio on Watch or international media sources. (Figure 9) This implies that both the Olympic and Brazilian officials do not frame favelas in terms of their assets, but recognize favelas as security threats and eye-sores. Favela communities and their advocates are framing the World Cup and Olympic Games as highlighting existing inequalities in Rio. The legacy that they are promoting is one of
inequality. This element of the counter-frame was not coded in a single Brazilian Government publication. (Figure 7) Again this demonstrates the clear polarity in the promotions of these Olympic legacies. The counter-frame that emphasizes inequality was clearly defined by the Popular Committee’s dossier on human rights violations. The frame acknowledges both the global and local forces at play in the mega-event preparations as well as the larger implications of hosting such an event.

The dossier shows that preparation for these mega-events in Rio de Janeiro extends beyond upgrading sports facilities and transportation infrastructure. The document illustrates both a reconfiguration of the built environment and shifting socio-political power structures in ways that benefit the elite at the expense of the urban poor. Forced and arbitrary evictions, lack of transparency and democratic participation, shifting institutional arrangements as power is subordinated to FIFA and the International Olympic Committee, and the militarization of poor communities, are all part of an ongoing process of ‘limpeza social’ (‘social cleansing’) which delineates who has access to the city of Rio de Janeiro (Steiker-Ginzberg 2013).

![Figure 9: Frequency, by source of publications, of code for “Favela Potential”](image-url)
Sub-Frame: Reflections of Global Inequality

The Olympics is a global event that attracts significant international attention. Giulianotti and Brownell explore the ways in which Olympic mega-events contribute to the growing concept of transnationalism and glocalization. They discuss the important connections that Olympic Games facilitate. The transnational elements of individual sports like soccer during the World Cup have been discussed extensively. “Robertson’s theory of glocalization highlights the mutual interdependencies between local and global social forces, and also between global trends towards cultural convergence and cultural divergence” (Giulianotti and Robertson 2012:220). This cultural convergence and cultural divergence reflects a contradiction. The increase in nationalism from the establishment of new nations throughout the 20th century impacted the increased emphasis on national identity in sporting events.

A contradiction exists with the world is becoming increasingly globalized, with a growing consciousness of the world as a single place, while at the same time intense nationalism continues to flourish. This contradiction is visible in international athletic tournaments. For example, the World Cup brings together people from all over the world and facilitates global connections through physical contact and also media coverage. Simultaneously, these tournaments provide a space for a display of intense nationalism as fans cheer and players fight to represent their nation. Fans will paint their faces as the flag of their nation and players always carry flags during the post-game celebration. In this way, soccer and other sports contribute to and display the global processes of cultural divergence and cultural convergence. The transnational interactions and processes are only magnified at the Olympics.
Guilianotti and Brownell also mention the unique way in which the Olympic Games inspire social and political awareness in participating and, especially, host countries. Nations that host the Games find their physical spaces, social relations, politics, and people heavily influenced by the Olympic expectations and international standards. Immanuel Wallerstein informs the dynamic of global relations in the capitalist-world economy. Wallerstein writes and defines hegemony. “Hegemony in the interstate system refers to that situation in which the ongoing rivalry between the so-called ‘great powers’ is so unbalanced that one power can largely impose its rules and its wishes in the economic, political, military, diplomatic, and even cultural arenas” (Wallerstein 1983:449). This is part of Wallerstein’s larger World-Systems Theory which identifies international economic relationships between three groups of nations: “core”, “semi-peripheral”, and “peripheral.” Core nations consist of those nations within the above defined hegemony, which does not include Brazil. While the global economic and social position of Brazil may be transitioning and improving, history reveals the clear exploitation of Brazil by core nations. The high level of scrutiny and skepticism that Brazil faces is enlightened by this understanding of the nation’s global position. This position is important in order to make sense of the significant investment that the Brazilian government has in legacy construction. The data analysis included a code for “Skepticism in the Abilities of Brazil.” This code was documented 19 times. 8 of the 19 quotations were in official Olympic publications, 5 were from Brazilian government documents, 3 were from international media sources, and 3 were from Rio on Watch publications. (Figure 10) This reveals how much of the pressure on the Brazilian government’s “performance” is coming from abroad.
Figure 10: Frequency, by source of publications, of code for “Skepticism in Abilities of Brazil”

To what extent does the IOC represent the international perception of Brazil? Some may argue that it does so by verbalizing doubt in Brazil’s ability to be prepared on time because of its "developing nation” status. How does the Olympics and public discourse not only represent power dynamics and inequality within Brazil, but also internationally between nations and international regions/bodies? What does it mean that Brazil is the first South American nation to host an Olympic Games? The 2016 Olympic Games is a global mega-event and every nation will be watching and invested as their athletes compete for their nation. For this reason, Brazil’s relationship to all other participating nations is significant for the coverage and expectations of the event. A recent military occupation of one of Rio’s largest favela communities, part of the larger UPP program’s efforts, was documented across the globe. “According to Google News the event was reported over 270 times in the international press, with agency reports published
widely by media outlets all over the world. AFP’s coverage, published by *Al Jazeera, Yahoo!, Australia’s news.com.au, China Post* and many more” (Clark 2014). The Olympic Games and the attention that they bring with them, is a potential source of leverage for the Brazilian government. The frequency distribution of the code “Brazil and Rio’s Global Position” enlightened how the Brazilian government has something very different at stake in the 2016 Olympic Games. Of the 27 times that “Brazil and Rio’s Global Position” was coded, 20 of them were located within Brazilian Government publications, 5 in international media publications, and 2 in Rio on Watch publications. *(Figure 9)* It is significant to note that the global dynamic and Brazil’s role within that dynamic was never mentioned by the official international Olympic publications.

![Frequency, by source of publications, of code for “Brazil/Rio’s Global Position”](image)

*Figure 11: Frequency, by source of publications, of code for “Brazil/Rio’s Global Position”*
There seems to be less of an Anti-Olympic sentiment and more of an anti-government/anti-elite Brazilian society sentiment among those resisting the Games in Rio, however. The IOC and the Olympic Industry are not blamed for the events and urban transformation that is disrupting the lives of the most marginalized in Rio, while the Brazilian officials actually moving the project forward are. While it may be understandable that favela residents do not necessarily see or comprehend what is driving and underlying the actions of these officials, the misplaced blame may have some implications. The Brazilian government is not irrelevant by all means, but the pressure of the IOC is a powerful force acting on the favela communities as well. A relationship exists between the Brazilian marginalized and the Brazilian officials as well as between the Brazilian officials and the IOC, but there seems to be no connection or communication between the Brazilian marginalized and IOC. The nonexistence of this relationship may actually benefit the IOC. It simultaneously allows the developed world or global North to escape any fault or role in the negative occurrences related to the mega-event by implicating the Brazilian government.

The international stage created through the mega-event and Brazil’s desire for a positive global image seemingly justifies urban changes in Rio that may have otherwise been highly questioned and scrutinized. However, Brazil’s interest in promoting a progressive, modern national image internationally through the Olympic Games is challenged by marginalized Brazilians, especially favela communities’, interest in promoting justice and recognition. These interests, shaped by important global and national contexts, drive the construction of frames that, in turn, serves to dictate the lasting legacy of the 2016 Olympic Games.
There were several limitations to this project and the methodology employed specifically. The nature of Goffman’s incomplete elaboration of frame analysis is challenging as there is no clear set of steps to follow to complete a frame analysis. Coding and writing analytic memos was used in this particular study as a means to identify frames and the process of framing. The selected group of documents used in the analysis may not capture all available discourse to those experiencing the event. Many documents were translated from Portuguese which may impede the coding of the intended meaning. Languages often convey meanings in different ways and direct translations may skew these meanings. Some significant documents were not translated which proposed another challenge. It is also impossible to measure to what degree the frames or media sources are reaching a global audience. These international readers’ analysis of the frames will be influenced by their particular cultural repertoire. One can argue about the degree to which a truly “universal” discourse exists. The international media sources used in this data sample were based in the United States and, therefore, are not necessarily representative of international media more broadly.

Another limitation involves the difficulty of operationalizing or measuring which legacy ultimately “wins”. It is still valuable, however, to analyze the legacies presented as they reflect the existing dynamic of both the event and the city. It is important to note that this urban transformation is an ongoing project. The frames that this project identifies may shift in the next two years leading up to the summer of 2016. This was challenging as I became aware of new articles and occurrences after I finished my data analysis. It will be interesting to reflect two years from now, during the events, to see if the frames identified by this project are still relevant and to what degree they shape the legacy of the event.
The nature of frame analysis is interpretive and it is impossible for my analysis of the documents not to have been affected by my own cultural perspective. Conscious of this bias, I attempted to let the data speak for itself. It was often tempting to interpret the documents in terms of what I think is true or what I believe is actually happening. This temptation is reflective of how powerful frames can be. Those not actually living or experiencing what is going on in Rio can only look to media sources and decide for themselves which frame is most accurate. The challenges I faced during the analysis demonstrate the significance of frames in creating meaning. Additionally, if one frame gains access to a broader audience, the reality that it presents will live on as truth until others are uncovered or the reality is redefined. I am subject to the limitations of available sources and information and, therefore, the legacies that I present may not be representative of the true lived experience. This project does, however, remind those concerned with the Olympics and their urban impact in Rio to be aware of how they interpret any news, knowing the context within which it is presented and by who it is presented.

The study’s analysis clearly demonstrates the existence of a frame and counter-frame which reflect the promotion of competing legacies. However, it is not clear which legacy will ultimately mark the 2016 Olympic Games in Rio. Looking at the international media sources, the “legacy of inequality” code was recorded twice as many times as the code for “legacy of positive development.” This implies that the unequal distribution of the costs required in preparation for the Olympics is not going unnoticed and that the Brazilian government may be losing control of public discourse. The opportunity for Brazil and Rio to emerge from the mega-event empowered and respected may be slipping away. The International Olympic Committee has recognized what is at stake for Brazil.
‘Over recent months, the social and political environment in which Rio 2016 and their government partners are operating has significantly changed,’ she [Nawal El Moutawakel, head of the IOC Evaluation Commission] said. ‘There is now a need more than ever before that all stakeholders work in an open way and place legacy at the very heart of all decisions – including those of the Olympic Games’ (Wade “IOC Members” 2013).

While the favelas face and represent significant challenges, acknowledging the potential and innovation in favelas, instead of evicting residents or removing their communities from Google maps, will inspire economic development without the squalor that exists today. The value of property within informal settlements around the globe in terms of real estate represents untapped capital. The neighborhoods and individual assets within them can be converted to capital that holds true economic potential. “In the midst of their own poorest neighborhoods and shantytowns, there are—if not acres of diamonds—trillions of dollars, all ready to be put to use if only the mystery of how assets are transformed into live capital can be unraveled” (Desoto 2000:37). Considering the large share of the population that the poor occupy, planning for growth and integrating poor and informal communities seem central to the economic future of urban centers in the developing world. Rio, representing a city in a developing or semi-peripheral nation, has an opportunity to integrate the favelas into the urban transformation. Their example could potentially bolster Brazil’s global position and image and provide a template for nations facing similar urban challenges. Brazil would also do well to acknowledge the International Olympic Committee’s role in driving the urban changes through their expectations of the event. Integrating favelas into Olympic infrastructure plans could be a win-win outcome for both the Brazilian government and favela residents. It could also bring attention to necessary adjustments to future Olympic operations.

The Brazilian government’s current framing of favelas must change for progress to be made. The pressure regarding the international image of Brazil is significant, but acknowledging
the challenges that Brazil and Rio face, and how they are inextricably linked to their historically marginalized global position, presents an opportunity to highlight the historical and current exploitation of developing countries by “core” nations. Brazil, just like Rio’s favelas, has assets and mobilizing them in order to host a successful 2016 Olympic Games could lead to a life changing transformation of not only Rio, but also Brazil. The Brazilian people, including the most marginalized populations, must be respected as stakeholders in the event, however. There is an opportunity for the rhetoric of the Olympic Spirit to become reality in Rio. The Games should be a positive experience for not just those that attend or participate, but for the hosts, favelados included, as well. The legacies identified in this study may no longer be in competition if the Brazilian government embraces inequality and works concretely to address it, with the support of the IOC, through Olympic preparations. The World Cup this summer will be a good test for Brazil. The international mega-event will have a legacy of its own. The focus of this legacy will give Brazil an idea of the positive and negative experiences that shape mega-event legacies. The contestation that surrounds the framing of Rio 2016’s legacy reflects the contestation within the city itself. Hopefully, Brazil will be able to make adjustments following the 2014 World Cup to ensure that the legacy of Rio de Janeiro and the 2016 Olympic Games is one that all Brazilians can be proud of.
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