Sport mega-events and the attitude towards government

The perception of Rio de Janeiro's forced eviction
Forced evictions in Rio de Janeiro

• The largest number of evictions and displacements in the City’s history

• Over 67,000 people from 2009 to 2013

• Evictions of over 13,000 families directly linked to mega-events
6 month research in 2014 in Rio de Janeiro

Evicted residents and such in high risk of eviction

20 qualitative interviews conducted

Residents of four different *favelas*

*Field work*
Main questions

- How do they perceive these changes and who do they hold accountable?

- What strategies do they develop to fight back, resist and gain visibility?
Accountable Parties

- Economic elite and event operators
- Local and national government
- Established media
- Their own community
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Not a constant that applies to all

Can be bought or forced by public pressure
Established media

• Leads the public discourse with their coverage
• Stirs up society against favelas by bias reporting
• Public opinion is easily manipulated
Sport mega-events not the reason for evictions

- Justification
- Intended time pressure
- Avoid public consultation
Internal disagreement has a huge impact on the resistance: it complicates the communication between the residence and a collective mobilization.
Implementation of the resistance

Disclose argumentative inconsistencies

Public relations and image care

Publicity friendly and media effective events

Self published on different internet platforms
Implementation of the resistance

- Create own logos, slogans, *favela* specific battle cries, „merchandise“ (like stickers and t-shirts)
Difficulties with Resistance

• No adequate information, transparency and possibilities of participation

• Impossible to contact responsible players and institutions

• No possibility of a meaningful counter-argument, the actual motives are not presented openly

• Energy and resources are wasted to (legally, publicly, scientifically) argue against „false allegations“
Resume

- Democracy does not work in their favor
- Justice system does not treat them equally
- Media tries to manipulate the public
- Only a broad social support could prevent a planned eviction, that’s what the worked on
Conclusion

• They lost their trust in the different parts of government, formal society and media.

• Magnitude of exclusion more severe than expected

• Hidden ambiguity main point that discourages residents
Conclusion

• How much responsibility do consumer and audience have?

• How can they influence this development?

• Might boycott be the right answer?
• Create sport mega-events with positive impact?

• Is change intended or are the unwanted side effects not as unwanted as suggested, but rather the true objectives?