Harvey, Jean, John Horne, Parissa Safai, Simon Darnell, and Sébastien Courchesne-O'Neill.
"Sport and the Environmental Movement." *Sport and Social Movements: From the Local to the Global*. London: Bloomsbury Academic, 2014. 114–136. *Bloomsbury Collections*. Web. 26 Apr. 2023. <<http://dx.doi.org/10.5040/9781472544995.ch-006>>.

Downloaded from Bloomsbury Collections, www.bloomsburycollections.com, 26 April 2023, 13:34 UTC.

Copyright © Jean Harvey, John Horne, Parissa Safai, Simon Darnell & Sébastien Courchesne-O'Neill 2014. You may share this work for non-commercial purposes only, provided you give attribution to the copyright holder and the publisher, and provide a link to the Creative Commons licence.

Sport and the Environmental Movement

In 2012, in celebration of the fiftieth anniversary of its first publication, a new edition of Rachel Carson's *Silent Spring* was released. *Silent Spring* remains arguably the most influential book of the twentieth century to focus on issues of environmental degradation; it remains highly relevant today, underlines Canadian writer Margaret Atwood in her commentary (Atwood 2012), at a time when biodiversity, climate change and pollution are of central importance to citizens of the world. Indeed, concerns with the environment and sustainability are now at the core of all fields of human activity. In this chapter, dedicated to sport and the environmental movement, we argue that sport is no different than other domains of social and political life and, although it was late to pay attention to this issue, sport is now directly confronted and challenged by the issues raised by the environmental movement.

The chapter is divided into four sections. In the first section, we outline the history of the environmental movement through its different evolutionary stages. In the second section, we discuss how the question of the environment became a central issue for the Olympic Games and use this as a case study to analyse the increasing importance of environmental issues in sport. In the third section, we consider and contrast three actors that have been particularly active on the issue of sport and the environment both locally and globally: Greenpeace, Surfers against Sewage and the Global Anti-Golf Movement (GAGM). Before concluding this chapter, we discuss further the institutionalization of environmentalism in sport, and precisely how it has infiltrated the discourses and strategies of the sports industry.

A brief history of environmental movements

Nisbet (1983, p. 101) writes that 'it is entirely possible that when the history of the twentieth century is finally written, the single most important social movement of the period will be judged to be environmentalism'. Touraine (1983) saw the environmental movement as the driving force behind a shift in historicity, enabling a departure from modernity towards a 'new' post-industrial society. The environmental movement comprises '... networks of informal interactions that may include, as well as individuals and groups who have no organizational affiliation, organizations of varying degrees of

formality (including even political parties, especially Green parties) that are engaged in collective action motivated by shared identity or concern about environmental issues' (Rootes 2007, p. 1428). The key point here, and one that spans the entire study of social movements, is that the environmental movement has never existed as a singular protest or campaign undertaken by a specific group or association. Rather, the environmental movement is best conceived as the result of links created *between* those groups, associations and collective actions that form around concerns for the environment. As described below, the main issues that first drove the environmental movement were the devastating consequences of industrialization and the near complete disregard for the finitude of natural resources. Coupled with the critique of the New Left, these new concerns sparked the creation of organizations such as Friends of the Earth and Greenpeace, radical groups explicitly denouncing the harm done to the environment by capitalistic extraction and exploitation.

From this perspective, the identity of the environmental movement is relatively clear, although also hard to pinpoint because it embraces various local initiatives, rarely cited outside of particular *milieux*, as well as large, overarching international campaigns that touch the lives of millions of people. However, demonstrated within Rootes' definition of the environmental movement, these various groups share a common identity based around the defence of environmental issues. The opposition, or that against which the environmental movement has fought, is the deterioration of the environment, be that on a local scale or an international basis. The totality of the movement has been to steer contemporary society towards environmentally friendly practices and, more broadly, towards a general respect for the fragility of nature, ecosystems and the environment, all necessary conditions for the existence of life on this planet. Four major phases in the evolution of environmental movements can be identified as follows: (1) conservationism and preservationism; (2) environmentalism; (3) ecologism/grassroots environmentalism; and (4) global/transnational movements (Ford 2011; Rootes 2008, p. 33; Silveira 2001). Each of these phases is discussed in more detail below.

Conservationism and preservationism

In *American Sportsmen and the Origins of Conservation*, Reiger (1975 [2000]) illustrated how hunting came to be the first major activity responsible for drawing attention to environmental and ecological issues pertaining to land use in North America (Rome 2003; Rootes 2008). Game hunters were the first groups to issue public warnings relating to the destruction of natural habitats. Of course, this was a largely self-interested concern as hunters strove to keep the land pristine so that game remained available for hunting. Nevertheless, hunters and outdoor people made a conscious effort to preserve land in its original condition and later some of these parcels of land became protected

public parks (Rootes 2008). The first major academic study of the conservation movement was Hayes' *Conservation and the Gospel of Efficiency: The Progressive Conservation Movement 1890–1920*. In this work, Hayes argued that the driving force among conservationists in the United States 'was a commitment to scientific management of resources by experts' (Rome 2003). In the United Kingdom, David Evans (1996) described the specific context in which the conservation movement evolved in *A History of Nature Conservation in Britain*. The rapid development of industrialization in England left scars on the countryside and on nature in general; industrial growth was viewed in terms of profitability with almost total disregard for the possible impacts on nature and its conservation (Evans 1996). In this sense, the conservation movement progressed from an early disregard to environmental degradation linked to industrialization to a larger encompassing movement embracing such causes as the protection of natural predators and bird species.

In France, a conservation movement also emerged in the late 1800s with the involvement of several different parties. First, according to Lapoix (1976), the 'sociétés savantes' helped shape the context behind the movement by publishing scientific accounts detailing the impact of human development on nature. Second, specialized associations, mostly linked to local contexts, also played an important role, as they were able to establish a link between abstract scientific concepts and actual practice. This was the case for *La ligue française de protection des oiseaux* and *les Amis de la forêt de Fontainebleau*, who, at the turn of the nineteenth century, established ties with governmental authorities via different forms of legal backing (Lapoix 1976). The aim of these institutes was, quite simply, to fight for the conservation of the natural resources in place. In the case of *La ligue française de protection des oiseaux*, efforts were made to have certain species of birds recognized by governmental authorities in order to protect them against over-hunting and complete decimation. Beyond their respective roles, these associations had a mandate based around the circulation of information to the general population; they struggled over the recognition, by competent authorities, of the causes they defended (Lapoix 1976).

In sum, conservationists in the United States, United Kingdom and France campaigned for land, water and forests to be conserved in pristine shape. For the so-called preservationists, actions and goals went further: these groups reasserted the importance of maintaining a spiritual relationship between humans and nature (Rootes 2008). Wilderness was seen as an escape from the chaos of the city and the growing pains of mass industrialization. Roderick Nash's *Wilderness and the American Mind* (1967 [2001]) outlines how, for some writers and artists, the countryside came to be a romantic place replete with national pride (Rome 2003). The work of celebrated photographer Ansel Adams in capturing images of national parks, particularly Yosemite in Northern California, United States, in the twentieth century can be understood as part

of this development, as well as the earlier writing of Henry David Thoreau in *Walden; or, Life in the Woods* first published in 1854.

Contrary to conservationists, preservationists wanted the land to remain intact and free from human intervention. Rootes (2008) cites, as an example, the will of US authorities to dam the Hetch Hetchy Valley's river that meanders through Yosemite Park. The project was proposed in the first decade of the twentieth century and environmental hazards related to the damming of a river were not well understood. The growing opposition of preservationist groups, such as the Sierra Club, led to a massive struggle against the dam in order to preserve and protect wildlife. Even though their efforts ultimately failed (the dam was erected in 1923), the notion that environmental groups could mobilize to effect the outcome of large and environmentally unfriendly projects was increasingly evident. As noted by Rootes (2008), the conservationist and preservationist agendas were largely responses to particular issues, in the sense that they tended to become involved when specific situations required an intervention. Still, at this time, a broad definition or view of the relationship of humans with nature had yet to be developed within the movement, and thus a wider vision for the movement based on broader social change was rarely articulated and circulated.

Environmentalism and the formation of the environmental movement

If the conservationist and preservationist movements were the main proponents of environmental awareness at the turn of the nineteenth century and in the first decades of the twentieth century, much changed after World War II. Indeed, the public's consciousness about environmental issues was to be altered forever by the advent of new technologies such as the Atomic bomb. Increasingly, the public did not uniformly accept the so-called technological progress, especially if it came at a steep environmental price (Rome 2003). As mentioned above, Rachel Carson's influential book *Silent Spring* (1962/2012) can be cited as one of the first sources to galvanize the American public's perception about environmental issues:

Emphasizing the problems associated with industrial society, Carson argued that science and technology had been effectively removed from any larger policy framework and insulated from public input and opinion. Carson's controversial thesis not only made *Silent Spring* an epoch event in the history of environmentalism, but also helped to launch a new decade of rebellion and protest in which the concept of "nature" was broadly construed to include quality-of-life issues (Silveira 2001, p. 504).

Silent Spring (Carson 1962/2002) was first published in three serialized excerpts in the *New Yorker* magazine in June 1962. The book itself was

published in September of that year and the outcry that followed led to the banning of the use of DDT as an insecticide and stimulated changes in the laws affecting the environment in North America and around the world. For Rootes (2008), the growth in participation in higher education also contributed to the increase in public awareness about environmental issues at the time.

It is also important to understand the opening of new political spaces made possible by the efforts of the New Left and the student protests for the development of the environmental movement (Rootes 2008, p. 613). As a broad movement, the New Left regrouped activists, groups, intellectuals, members of political parties and others who viewed a decline in traditional Marxism and were interested in rekindling the spirit of the Left. At the forefront of the New Left voices was C. Wright Mills, an American sociologist who believed in abolition of the old leftist traditions. In his well-known *Letter to the New Left* (1963), he argued that the historical agency of the left, traditionally represented by the working class, had to be reoriented, as the grip it had on political powers susceptible to implement real, effective change had diminished to a point where its powers were obsolete. The long-established dichotomy dividing the owners of the means of production and the proletariat could no longer be applied to a rapidly evolving society, where the traditional lines of power structure were constantly blurred. This social climate also gave birth to the work of Alain Touraine. His understanding of the decline of the Old Left led him to formulate his first ideas about the existence of 'new' social movements, that is, movements created outside of the traditional workers movement and focused on a single issue. His studies of the French anti-nuclear movement were particularly important since they marked the transition towards the newfound importance of the New Left and its ramifications in the several different areas of society.

In this sense, the 1960s were the first time when students came to realize the power they could exert on social issues. While students of the social sciences and humanities focused on broader social and political issues and the denunciation of capitalist society, as the protests in Berkeley, California and Paris showed, it was arguably students in the natural sciences that had a more profound influence on the environmental movement (Rootes 2008). As the study of nature entails a deep and profound understanding of its functioning, at a macro or micro level, students of natural sciences understood the grave consequences behind the exploitation of nature and non-renewable resources.

Issues of mass pollution, woeful environmental management by major companies and general disregard of environmental issues by governments and corporations fuelled a growing counterculture. For Gottlieb (cited in Rootes 2008, p. 614) 'the counterculture, along with the New Left, served as a transition to a new environmental politics in which the question of Nature

could no longer be separated from the question of society itself'. Given the focus of conservationists and preservationists on specific environmental issues, and combined with the advent of the New Left and general social uprising of the 1960s and 1970s, the environmental movement developed a more inclusive framework in which environmental issues were to be tied to social issues.

Earth Day 1970, attended by more than 20 million Americans, can be seen as one of the outcomes of the environmental critique that developed in the 1960's (Rootes 2008, p. 614). As Jehlicka (1994, p. 114) suggests in a periodization of environmentalism from 1960, 'Two main peaks can be identified: one at the beginning of the 1970s and another at the end of the 1980s'. Moreover, Earth Day marked the transition to a more mainstream environmentalism in which the general public could participate. The mainstreaming of environmental issues also contributed to its institutionalization. The creation of the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) by US President Richard Nixon, which received no opposition in Congress, had a profound impact on the management of environmental issues in the United States:

With the establishment of the EPA and the passage of a variety of environmental laws and policies in the 1970s, environmental issues themselves became "mainstream." Primarily comprised of attorneys, engineers, and economists, the EPA developed a complex regulatory structure that categorizes and addresses environmental issues by pollutant and medium (Silveira 2001, p. 508).

While Earth Day 1970 and the EPA are both related to the American context, Rootes (2008) points out that many other Western countries were impacted by this new wave of environmentalism mainly through the increasingly clear demonstration of the ways in which environmental awareness could be mobilized through a nationwide day of action. Further, it showed how environmental issues could be institutionalized within a powerful (and right wing) government structure that was not necessarily inclined towards forms of change that inhibited business growth and contradicted capitalism.

In turn, it was sustainability, as a key environmental concept, that started to gather momentum with the publication, in 1987, of *Our Common Future*, a report focusing, for the first time, on the importance of sustainability in environmental issues and management. Issued by the United Nations World Commission on Environment and Development (WCED) and chaired by Gro Harlem Brundtland, the report notably argued that sustainable development should "... meet the needs of the present without compromising the ability of the future generations to meet their own needs" (Hollins 2011). The concept of sustainable development was launched by the WCED as a 'global objective' to guide policies orientated to balance 'economic and social systems and ecological conditions'. It is often represented by reference to the 'triple bottom line' of economy, environment and society.

For sustainability to be a realistic concept, the report specified that in practice, it should not inhibit economic growth. According to the report, sustainable ventures, linked to sport or other domains, could incorporate a framework based on sustainable development without compromising the quality of the product and the possible revenues to be generated. Sustainability was to be applied within the triple P triangle: Profitability, People, Planet (Seghezze 2009) and this 'triangle'/model is now incorporated in sport and business more broadly (Seghezze 2009). Indeed, in public policy making, the notion of sustainability can now rarely be overlooked, as a balance with ecological considerations must at least appear to be struck in order for most public policies to go forward. Even with the adverse conditions created by the financial crisis of 2008, capitalist growth (read: profitability before quality of life) remains the predominant system by which government, through neo-liberal thinking, operates. This, to a degree, reaffirms the importance of sustainable development as the main channel through which the grand meta-narrative that is capitalism remains beholden to environmental concerns.

Ecologism and grassroots environmental groups

Based on the assertion that the Earth contains finite resources and that pollution and the general misuse of nature could bring about grave consequences, the environmental movement developed in ways that the conservationists and preservationists had not achieved. Embracing the principles of ecological democracy while advocating for citizen participation as critical in environmental decision-making, grassroots environmentalism developed, in part, because of the reaction to the global rise of neo-liberalism and the grave environmental consequences it had on natural resources and the environment in general (Silveira 2001). With Margaret Thatcher taking over 10 Downing Street and Ronald Reagan, the White House, the tone was set for a full decade of conservative policy measures culminating, at the end of the 1980s, with the so-called 'Washington consensus'. As noted earlier in the book this encompassed a series of initiatives advocating the '... heightened privatization of public services, increased support for free trade, and the liberalization/deregulation of national and international markets, as well as drastic fiscal austerity with regard to government spending' (Harvey et al. 2009, p. 400). In this climate of austerity and of general disregard for environmental causes by government officials, grassroots groups emerged from a diverse set of ideologies and social backgrounds:

These new citizen-based groups reflect the evolution of environmentalism from a narrow, wilderness-centered philosophy to a richer, more inclusive ideology encompassing ... a spectrum of ideologies, including: deep ecology, social ecology, bio-regionalism, feminist ecology, spiritual ecology, native ecology, and Not in My

Backyard (NIMBY) groups. Moreover, grassroots environmentalism cuts across ethnic, racial, and class barriers to introduce a diversity previously absent from the environmental movement (Silveira 2001, p. 512).

Of these diverse points of views, one of the most radical was ‘deep ecology’. For the proponents of this ideology/method of action, every creature, every plant and every organic substance is part of a wider overarching natural system (Rootes 2008). All environmental degradation that humans perpetrate thus has an impact on this single system and disrupts the fragile balance that took thousands of years to achieve. One of the more popular deep ecology groups, *Earth First!*, reiterates, in their organizational mission statement, that it first existed in response to the:

... lethargic, compromising, and increasingly corporate environmental community. Earth First! takes a decidedly different tack towards environmental issues. We believe in using all the tools in the tool box, ranging from grassroots organizing and involvement in the legal process to civil disobedience and monkey wrenching (Earth First! 2012).

Earth First! can thus be considered a radical environmental group. Their motto is based on a no compromise approach. Confrontation, civil disobedience and group actions are all part of Earth First!’s arsenal against destructive environmental practices. Their worldview is radically different from that of the government, agencies and other, more moderate environmental groups. The co-founder of Earth First!, Dave Foreman, was a high ranked member of the Wilderness Society, a well-respected environmental lobbying organization (Lange 1990, p. 478). He left, disillusioned, after a failed attempt to implement change through a lobbying stance. Along with friends Mike Roselle and Howie Wolke:

... they hit the Mexican border running on beer and tequila and an agenda: preserve natural diversity by any means, legal or not, and reclaim lost ground – close logging roads, tear down dams, reintroduce grizzlies and wolves and elks. They united as a “disorganization” with no official members and no directors, and they called themselves “Earth First!” (Kane, cited in Lange 1990, p. 479).

Splinter groups were eventually formed by individuals leaving mainstream environmental groups to form their own variation(s) in accordance, usually, with a more radical ideology and the will to pose immediate action (Silveira 2001). One of the most famous examples remains David Browers’ Friends of the Earth (FOE), an organization he created after the Sierra Club fired him for being too ‘radical’ while entertaining a disagreement about the construction of nuclear power plants in the United States. Bower made it clear that in contrast with the organization he chose to quit, FOE would have an international scope. In addition, ‘... instead of delegating publications, as secondary to the

organization, they would be central, instead of being highly bureaucratized, establishing multiple oversights on individuals' activities, it would be decentralized and more anarchic; finally, it would take an unabashed stance against nuclear power and nuclearism more generally' (Wapner 1995).

FOE is now established worldwide, with an annual budget of over \$US 15 million, mostly derived from its multiple charitable foundations (Wapner 1995). Its presence worldwide is due to the flexibility provided by its 'central' authority. National chapters are tied to FOE only by name and general orientation. The concrete actions, campaigns, fundraising and spending are solely the responsibility of the chapters without the intervention of a central authority.

A further important illustration of grassroots environmentalism was the development of 'Not In My Back Yard' or NIMBY groups. The motivation to create NIMBY groups stemmed from local environmental concerns: the creation of a golf course, for example, or, as has been the case in Québec or in the United States, the digging of wells for shale gas exploitations (McEvoy and Foisy 2011). The close relationship between a local population and an environmental issue affecting their daily lives has often been enough to fuel the formation of NIMBY movements. Fundamentally, these groups want to address the unequal distribution of pollution and the benefits of environmental protection by situating environmental issues within the broader context of civil society, and connecting them to social justice, civil rights and the democratic process (Silveira 2001).

Global/transnational reach

The next step, or, in Tarrow's (2003) vocabulary, the 'scale shift', in the environmental movement has been to that of 'transnationalism' or the emergence of transnational environmental movements establishing global cooperation based on similar goals and aspirations. The UN Conference on the Environment and Development (UNCED) held in Rio de Janeiro in 1992 is usually referred to as a 'watershed' moment for such transnational or global environmental movements (Ford 2011). For the first time, actors from around the globe representing NGOs, pressure groups, institutionalized organizations and social movements were at the same table, working towards establishing a comprehensive framework to guide post-Cold War decision makers towards a more environmentally friendly future. As Dalby (1996, p. 594) noted:

In the case of the Earth, quite how the post-Cold War order might be written was one of the themes for discussion, but with matters of development and environment clearly on the agenda of possible new "writings." It is precisely the conflation of the discursive themes of geopolitics, development, environment and the possibilities of a new departure in global politics that make this event particularly interesting

Also, as Ford (2011, p. 33) states:

transnational environmental movements are movements that are creating links and acting transnationally because they perceive the root causes of environmental degradation to be tied up with the forces of globalization, such as the increasing globalization of capital and with it the globalization of governance structure.

Reflecting the debate between Tilly and Touraine in the study of social movements, Ford (2011) refers to Tarrow (1994) to define the nature of transnational movements while McDonald (2006) is clearly inspired by the work of Touraine for his work on global movements. Whichever term is used, the strong link between the local and the global is of prime importance when thinking about global/transnational environmental movements. Indeed, 'rooted' action and the relation with the local environment, places or 'milieux de vie' are essential to achieve some form of connectedness between what is often seen, for the regular citizen, as large and abstract global environmental campaigns. Hence movements such as the *Transition Initiative* clearly attempt to articulate the local with the global.

By acting as a buffer or translator between global environmental concerns and concrete local gestures, the *Transition Initiative* offers the chance for people to take part in actions having an impact on both local communities and global campaigns. Small-scale initiatives are put together, and then coordinated by the *Transition Initiative* that is able to articulate the smaller local visions with coherent change at the macro level. As Griffiths (2009) notes:

Many people feel that individual action on climate change is too trivial to be effective but that they are unable to influence anything at a national, governmental level. They find themselves paralyzed between the apparent futility of the small-scale and impotence in the large-scale. The Transition Initiative works right in the middle, at the scale of the community, where actions are significant, visible, and effective.

At the same time, in 2012, a parallel conference to the first Rio environmental summit was organized that included alternative organizations and movements excluded from official talks and gatherings. Rather than build on the previous 20 years, however, the 2012 Rio Conference left environmentalists generally disappointed as the environmental challenges highlighted at the 1992 conference remain present in people's lives. As Monbiot (2012) noted:

The efforts of governments are concentrated not on defending the living Earth from destruction, but on defending the machine that is destroying it. Whenever consumer capitalism becomes snarled up by its own contradictions, governments scramble to mend the machine, to ensure – though it consumes the conditions that sustain our lives – that it runs faster than ever before.

In this section, we have briefly outlined the evolution of the environment movement. In the following one we will analyse how this movement has had an increasing connection with the Olympic Games and sport.

The Olympic games, sport and environmental sustainability

As shown in the previous section, while the roots of the environment reach as far as the 1890s, it was not until one century later that environmental issues started to become a concern for the Olympic 'movement'. Although the issue was raised periodically in the previous three decades, it was arguably deployed for the first time in conjunction with the 1964 Tokyo Olympics. (Holden et al. 2008; Hollins 2013). Still, there is a consensus among analysts (Cantelon and Letters 2000; Chappelet 2008; Holden et al. 2008; Hollins 2013; Karamichas 2013) that it was with both the 1992 Albertville Games and the 1994 Lillehammer Games that the environment and issues of sustainability forced their way onto the agenda of the IOC. Since then, a long series of landmarks followed that punctuated the increasingly important intermingling of the environmental issue with the Olympics, or in other words the increasing institutionalization of the environment within the Olympic 'movement'. Drawing extensively from Holden et al. (2008) and Hollins (2013), in the following pages we offer an overview of these events. Although other detailed inventories of references to the environment in the Olympic official literature are to be found, such as in Leopkey and Parent (2012), for the purpose of this chapter, we have adapted and updated the table first published by Holden et al. (2008) which serves as a road map through this recent history (see Table 6.1).

Although the organizing committee of the Lillehammer Games announced in 1991 that the 1994 Games were to be the first 'green Games', it was the environmental disaster of the 1992 Albertville Winter Olympic Games that is widely seen as the first important landmark in environmental awareness and non-sustainable development regarding the organization of sports mega-events. The 1992 Games were spread out over 1657 square kilometres of competition sites located within 13 different alpine communities (Cantelon and Letters 2000, p. 299). Each of these communities had to contend with the construction of several Olympic sites, according to strict International Federation regulations. The bobsleigh track in La Plagne, the ski jump facilities in Courchevel, the XC skiing and biathlon courses in Les Saisies and the downhill run in Val d'Isère were all the target of environmentalists protesting against the total disrespect for the fragile local fauna (Cantelon and Letters 2000). The environmental degradation at Albertville was significant to the extent that it forced the IOC to deal with the environment. As Cantelon and Letters (2000, p. 301) noted:

it should be stressed that the combination of the obvious environmental impact of the Albertville Games and the IOC denial of any serious environmental problem demonstrated a critical disjunction between the transnational ideology of Olympism and the pragmatic nature of IOC transnational operations.

Protests by environmental groups during the games, negative media coverage and the bad environment record of the Games meant that the lack of attention

Table 6.1 Landmarks in environmental sustainability and the Olympic games

Year	Event
1964	Citizens of Tokyo voice concerns about pollution and water quality
1974	Denver citizens turn down the Games for environmental reasons
1987	Release of the Brundtland Report
1991	Lillehammer decides to formally pursue a 'green games'
1992	Albertville Games criticized for causing massive environmental damage; International Olympic Committee (IOC) signs the Earth Pledge
1994	Lillehammer hosts the first 'green games'; the environment is adopted as the IOC third 'pillar' (along with sport and culture); United Nations Environment Program (UNEP)/IOC sign an agreement on sport and the environment
1995	Cities bidding to host an Olympics are officially evaluated on their environmental plans for the first time; UNEP/IOC host the first World Conference on Sport and the Environment
1996	Creation of the Sport and Environment Commission; the Olympic Charter is modified to refer to the environment
1997	UNEP/IOC host the second World Conference on Sport and the Environment
1999	Creation of Olympic Agenda 21
2000	Sydney sets a new global Olympic standard by hosting the 'green games'; Greenpeace releases its 'Greenpeace Olympic Environmental Guidelines'
2001	IOC begins the process of setting economic, social and environmental indicators
2003	Vancouver is selected as host city of the 2010 sustainability Games
2005	London Organizing Committee of the 2012 Olympic Games (LOCOG) wins the rights to the 2012 'one planet Olympics'; Beijing Organizing Committee of the 2008 Olympic Games signs agreement with UNEP for the 'greenest ever' Games and completes its initial Olympic Games Global Impact Study (OGGI) report
2006	Torino hosts the 2006 Winter Games in an urban setting for better use of city centres and a recycling of sports infrastructure, and purchases carbon credits; UNEP signs an agreement to make the 2008 Beijing Games 'the greenest ever'; London 2012's sustainability policy is approved and LOCOG submits the OGGI study structure; VANOC completes its initial OGGI report

Table 6.1 Continued

Year	Event
2007	UNEP names IOC and President Jacques Rogge 'Champions of the Earth 2007', citing Torino as a shining example. UNEP publishes 'An Environmental Review' of the Beijing Olympic Olympics 2008
2009	UNEP publishes report entitled 'Independent Environment Assessment' of the Beijing Olympic Games
2010	UNEP publishes 'SOCHI 2014, Report of the UNEP 2nd Expert Mission', as a result of its review of the construction of a combined road/railway, following protests from non-governmental organizations. The report calls for action to better protect the environment.
2012	London, the 'first sustainable Olympic games'?

Source: Adapted from (Holden et al. 2008, p. 888).

paid by the IOC to the environmental impact of the Games could not be repeated after Albertville. In a first gesture to offset the crisis and restore its image, the IOC signed 'The Earth Pledge' the same year (Holden et al. 2008).

This set the stage for new environmental policies for the organization and preparation of the Games. The Lillehammer organizing committee sensed that environmental concerns were to be put forward in the bid process in order to address a subject seldom touched on by the IOC and previous host cities and formally pursued 'green Games'. One of the main reasons behind this innovation was the fact that Norway's Prime Minister, Gro Harlem Brundtland, was the former President of the World Commission on Environment and Development whose landmark report introduced the notion of sustainability in 1987. As Cantelon and Letters (2000, p. 303) remark, 'Lillehammer must have been music to the collective ears of the IOC. Here was a bid city that was taking environmental issues seriously and in later years, the IOC would affectionately refer to the Norwegian Games as an "environmental-political showcase"'.

The 1994 Games in Lillehammer thus had an important effect on the IOC's capacity to capitalize on the organizing of 'greener games' and, for that matter, on integrating the environment as a key principle for the consideration of future host cities. In fact, Jean-Loup Chappelet (2008) argues that the Winter Olympic Games, and the Lillehammer games in particular, are more responsible for the establishment of sustainable development policies within the IOC than the Summer Olympic Games (Chappelet 2008). In 1994, a Cooperative Agreement between the IOC and the UN Environment Program (UNEP) was established. Since that landmark year, a host of sport and environment initiatives unfolded in the Olympic 'movement' (and in other sport mega events for that matter). Among the ones listed in Table 6.1, of particular note are the creation in 1996

of a Sport and Environment Commission, the modification in 1996 of the Olympic Charter to refer to the environment, the adoption of Olympic Agenda 21 and the appointment, for each Olympic Games, of a qualified environmental advisor (Hayes and Karamichas 2012, p. 9).

Another response to Albertville can be seen in David Chernushenko's book *Greening our Games* (1994). As Wilson (2012, p. xx) suggests of this text: 'one of its key contributions was, quite simply, raising awareness about sport related environmental problems – problems that received little or no attention in the years leading up to the book's publication and *problems that remain centrally relevant to this day*'. As a sports manager, Chernushenko was concerned with the negative impacts that sporting events were having on the environment and with how the creation of greener, more sustainable events, would, in return, prove to be a sound investment for the future of the planet and sport. The organization of major sporting events is not, by any means, an eco-friendly endeavour, but with some calculated efforts, Chernushenko argued that improvements could be made while retaining economic profitability. Echoing the definition of sustainability in The Brundtland Report, Chernushenko (1994) wrote that 'Sport is sustainable when it meets the needs of today's sporting community while contributing to the improvement of future sport opportunities for all and the improvement of the integrity of the natural and social environment on which it depends'. Through his consulting firm 'Green and Gold', he was able, for a host of events, to implement the general guidelines proposed in *Greening our Games*.

The managerial vision employed by Chernushenko, although applauded by many, was critically analysed by scholars, in particular, Helen Lenskyj, who accused him of being entrenched in corporate environmentalism by focusing on greening for-profit environmental practices that remain beholden to a capitalist paradigm (Wilson 2012). Lenskyj (1998) argued that Chernushenko's political position in environmental terms is one of 'light green'. His focus is to help organizers of sports events achieve financial stability and growth while simply showing some consideration for the environment. Conversely, a 'dark green' political position on the environment, explained Lenskyj (1998, p. 342), is one in which 'the natural environment is seen as having intrinsic worth and existing political and economic systems are to be challenged when they pose a threat'.

Importantly, the issues raised by Chernushenko, and critiqued by Lenskyj, have come to find their way into the policies of international sport organizations. For example, in a document entitled *Green Goal*, FIFA clearly states the importance of incorporating a sustainable framework in the organization of the 2006 World Cup in Germany:

Sustainable effects of the World Cup were at the centre of planning by the German Football Association and its Organizing Committee for the 2006 FIFA World Cup from the very beginning. A few months after the final in Berlin we notice

that Germany and German football profit from the sustainability of the World Cup as a result of newly-created jobs, the construction of spectacular stadiums and rekindled enthusiasm for honorary posts. (FIFA 2004).

Although this might be seen to exaggerate the achievements and legacy of the Football World Cup and the Olympic Games, the document states how sustainability is to be incorporated into the construction of the stadiums and other venues. The document does not acknowledge, however, that sustainable development might be achieved by avoiding such constructions in the first place, and if possible using what is already built. Equally as Blühdorn (2009) argues, sustainability policies are still developed within a 'growth' paradigm, limiting their effectiveness and reducing their ability or likelihood to question the negative effects on the environment of economic growth itself.

While the first links between sport and the environment were mainly tied to such large-scale sports mega-events, World Cups, Olympic Games, and World Championships continue to have serious environmental consequences. As such, the key characteristics of contemporary sports mega-events make them an easy target for a variety of environmentalist concerns. However, as Hayes and Karamichas (2012, p. 10) note: '[they] provide a platform for economic growth oriented approaches to environmental protection and amelioration [and facilitate] the creation and growth of new markets'. Thus, sports mega-events represent a difficult conundrum: the ideal solution for hosting completely eco-friendly sports mega-events would simply be to stop staging them; this would align with the 'dark green' position. But as they are deeply entrenched in society's collective consciousness, and they generate immense profit for some corporations, sports mega-events will likely continue to exist and environmental activism will continue in order to minimize the (inevitable) strain they put on the environment.

Environmental movements and sport

While the previous section discussed the progressive preoccupation of the Olympic movement with the environment in general and with the issues of sustainability and legacy in particular since the disaster of the Albertville Games, in this section we consider and contrast three examples of organizations and movements that have been particularly active on the issue of sport and the environment both locally and globally: Greenpeace, Surfers against Sewage and the Anti-golf Movement. These examples provide various angles through which the environmental movement can be seen to have influenced sport.

Ranging from Cousteau's crusade against nuclear bomb testing to the Detox movement, Greenpeace deals and has dealt with a host of issues during its long and dramatic history. As one of the world's most important international non-governmental organization (INGO), it also delves, through multiple avenues,

into the world of sport. The goal of this short section is to go a bit further into the relationship of Greenpeace with sports and to explain some of the ties fuelling this important relationship.

Perhaps the most widely known and oft-cited role of Greenpeace within sport was its actions regarding the environmental impact of the Olympic games (Lenskyj 1998). Starting in 1992, Greenpeace played an important role in what was to be Sydney's winning bid for the 2000 Games. Greenpeace arranged a proposition around an eco-friendly construction of the athletes' village and was selected by the SOCOG to deliver green guidelines to be implemented for the construction of this infrastructure (Greenpeace 2000). A set of environmental guidelines was also developed by Greenpeace and other environmental groups for the bid committee and SOCOG. And yet, to many, the Sydney Games did not meet its promises of environmentally protective practices and outcomes. Sometimes referred to as the 'Greenwash Games', the Sydney Games were, in a sense, the culmination of the light green position advocated by Chernushenko and other environmentally conscious organizers. In fact, Greenpeace itself, and other organizations, were critical about the impact of the Games; the IOC was to be blamed for the environmental mishaps that occurred during the Games:

Greenpeace's analysis of the Sydney Games highlighted the absence of involvement at a detailed level by the IOC and its failure to intervene to ensure that the Games' Environmental Guidelines were not breached. The IOC must increase its capacity to advise, direct and pressure bidding and host cities to ensure that their environmental commitments are met. (Greenpeace 2000, p. 2)

Somewhat ironically, Greenpeace ended up criticizing its own involvement in the organizing and bidding of the Games since, as stated earlier, they were directly involved with SOCOG by way of multiple projects. Lenskyj (1998) describes how Greenpeace activists actually cleaned barrels of toxic waste from a site situated near the Olympics stadium, thus pointing to an environmental mismanagement by SOCOG. The response from SOCOG to this was to criticize Greenpeace for being 'unpatriotic' and for interfering with the Games. An assessment of Greenpeace's involvement in the 2000 Games is complicated. On the one hand, Greenpeace states in official documents that they positively impacted the Games by pushing SOCOG to adopt strict environmental guidelines. On the other hand, they were criticized for undertaking actions that actually impacted the image and legacy of the 2000 Games.

Following this complex relationship with the Sydney games, Greenpeace has continued to be associated with the Olympic Games. In a report entitled *China After the Olympics: Lessons from Beijing*, Greenpeace focused on the positive and negative environmental issues related to the Beijing Games. While it praised BOCOG's environmental initiatives outlined in the bid documents and the fact that it ended up respecting some of them, Greenpeace also noted that the Beijing

Games could have ensured a better short-term and long-term 'environmental Olympic legacy' for the city (Greenpeace 2008, p. 3). Greenpeace clearly stated that, in environmental terms, Beijing surpassed Athens's 2004 performance and that for a city with enormous pollution problems due to exponential growth, the environmental legacy was not to be dismissed.

Given their profile, it is understandable that Greenpeace has had an involvement in sports mega-events. But Greenpeace has also undertaken other initiatives linked to sport over the years. Recently, for example, Greenpeace published a report criticizing outdoor clothing companies for their use of perfluorinated compounds (PFC), a toxic substance harmful to the environment and to health (Greenpeace 2012). Ironically, almost all the companies targeted in Greenpeace research have a clear environmental policy clearly stating how 'green' they are and how they oversee the manufacturing process. The report created quite a stir in the outdoor industry. ISPO's news site stated that 'Greenpeace had once again attacked outdoor brands for using toxic or even carcinogenic substances in their products'. (ISPO 2012). In a related manner, in Canada, Greenpeace has denounced the over-hunting of grizzly bears in British Columbia. If we were to summarize Greenpeace's involvement in the domain of sport, it could be divided into two main areas. First, there is a wider, more encompassing vision, relating to Greenpeace's participation in the Olympic Games and other sport mega-events. Second, there is a more localized approach, focusing on particular issues, such as outdoor clothing or wild life.

A second illustration of the relationship between sport and the environmental movement can be found in the campaigns of the UK pressure group Surfers Against Sewage (SAS). Initially concerned with the quality of the water at surfing locations in the United Kingdom, the organization now has a broader remit, focusing on a host of environmental issues linked to the practice of surfing (and wind-surfing). SAS is a registered charitable organization, meaning it officially receives donations, which are then funnelled into diverse programmes reflecting the organization's goals and priorities.

SAS was established in 1990 by a group of British surfers concerned with the gradual degradation of their local surfing spots. At that time, sewage and other waste were dumped directly into the sea, resulting in poor water quality, especially in densely populated areas. Some of SAS's first actions were the creation of a national campaign to improve water quality in the United Kingdom and this first 'campaign led water companies to invest approximately £5 billion in sewerage infrastructures, thus making a dramatic improvement in the cleanliness of our oceans and rivers' (SAS 2012). As the organization evolved, so did the outreach and goals of the campaigns. Now, SAS is involved in broader environmental campaigns tackling issues such as beach cleanliness, marine litter, climate change, offshore development, toxic chemicals and shipping lanes.

For Ward (1996), SAS remains one of the first civil-society organizations, in Britain at least, to intelligently utilize the 'new politics of pollution' approach. By using unconventional methods of awareness, such as inflatable pieces of faeces with the SAS logo to raise consciousness about the presence of coli forms in water. In this sense, SAS succeeded in their actions through irreverence and humour, and by employing tactics inspired by other well-known environmental campaign groups such as Greenpeace. Their actions helped define the beach as not only a place fit for leisure and sporting activities, but also a battleground where serious issues affecting the health of thousands of people could be brought out and exposed in a humorous way.

Wheaton (2007) argues that SAS started during a period when NSMs were in their infancy. As discussed in earlier chapters, NSMs were often attached to a single cause while being removed from the old workers party political formations; women's rights, LGBT rights, anti-racism, as well as the environment were of great importance during that era. SAS fits the NSM description well, in that they were involved in diverse environmental causes, but were also confined to a particular national setting. As noted the original focus of SAS was the beach. However, as the issue evolved, so did the methods of outreach, and with efficient technologies of communication, SAS was able to establish worldwide ties to other beach communities, thus extending local concerns to a global audience: '... environmentalism's inherent trans-nationalism leads to questions about the need for new (cosmopolitan) global conceptions of democracy and citizenship such as the ideas of 'ecological' or 'environmental citizenship' (Wheaton 2007, p. 297). This perspective highlighted by the work of Wheaton is now of prime importance because of the steady decline of NSMs and the evolution of a few overarching global social movements, including the global environmental movement (Wieviorka 2004). It is precisely this shift from the local to the global that is of interest when looking at an example like SAS. Environmental organizations are now prone to establish worldwide ties but will often try to localize the impact, meaning that in an effort to grasp the public's attention, they will link the cause to a local environmental concern. Such is the approach taken by SAS: 'UK survey research has indicated that people are more likely to show environmental awareness when they conceive of issues in concrete and local ways' (Wheaton 2007, p. 290).

The two organizations discussed so far have aimed to raise awareness about different environmental issues. They are tied to a sporting practice, which, in return, serves as a launch pad to highlight diverse environmental issues. What they are not though is anti-capitalist. In this way, the Global Anti-Golf Movement, our third example, is different. Struggles against golf development in the 1990s led groups such the Asian Tourism Network (ANTENNA) based in Thailand, the Asia-Pacific People's Environmental Network (APPEN) in Malaysia and the Global Network for Anti-Golf Course Action (GNAGA) to join together on a worldwide day of action entitled 'World No-Golf Day' in

April 1993 (Wheeler and Nauright 2006, p. 434). That date also saw the launch, by those three organizations, of the Global Anti-Golf Movement (GAGM). The GAGM website explains the rationale behind its development:

At the heart of the golf industry is a multi-billion-dollar industry involving transnational corporations, including agribusiness, construction firms, consultancies, golf equipment manufacturers, airlines, hotel chains, real estate companies, advertising and public relations firms as well as financial institutions. . . . The bulk of the foreign exchange earned from golf courses and golf tourism does not stay in the local economy. The benefits which do remain, are reaped by a few business people and their patrons. (Anti-Golf Movement 2010).

The unofficial leader of GAGM is Gen Moriata, also known as the 'golf killer'; he claimed responsibility for the cancellation of the construction of more than a hundred golf courses in Japan after 1988 (Horne 1998). The tactics employed to thwart golf course construction were diverse: '... electing an anti-golf mayor; raising local awareness about the impact of golf course construction on local people's lives; or adopting a standing tree trust'. (Horne 1998, p. 178).

Looking at the history of organized opposition against the construction of golf courses leads us back to the 1990s when people from North America to Asia first began assembling to challenge golf-related development and its adverse consequences on the environment. Local communities were frequently overcome by the interests of the very same developers seeking to turn local fauna into green alleys of lush, well-trimmed, grass. While shutting down opposition is common in developed countries (see: Andriotis 2008; Briassoulis 2010; Kalant 2004), Wheeler and Nauright (2006, p. 434) rightly point out to the even more unequal distribution of power regarding local communities in developing countries:

These problems are more pronounced in developing countries where there are few laws or regulations requiring full disclosure of information. After losing their battle against developers, local residents often lose their land next. They end up either working as laborers on the course or moving to big cities, as there are no other employment opportunities available. These types of changes can wreak havoc on rural communities while also exacerbating urban problems of slums, pollution and congestion.

Briassoulis's (2010) analysis of the anti-golf movement concentrates on the discourses used by a local population against the construction of a golf course. The site studied at Crete's Cavo Sidero peninsula appeared to be an important part of how the population reacted to the construction of the golf course. The value given to the place, as a qualitative and tangible good, had a profound impact on the people's reaction:

Opposition does not arise in a vacuum; it concerns specific proposals for golf development in often ecologically and culturally valuable locations. Specialist

and nonspecialist signees alike did not react to abstract images but to an elitist, exclusionary image of golf and golf tourism *in conjunction with* the negative environmental, social and economic impacts of golf development *at the particular location*. (Briassoulis 2010, p. 308)

Interestingly, Andriotis (2008) also points to local resistance to the same Cavo Sidero golf resort development, but contrasts the often positive aims of the resort developers with the stark local reality they leave behind. The local population, while mostly aware of the general impact of such a project, is often ignorant of the environmental damages that can arise from such an endeavour. It is thus hard to evaluate the amount of resistance competent enough to be linked to the wider anti-golf movement, for those issues are often new to the population.

One population that famously resisted a golf course expansion is the Mohawk population of Kahnawake, in Oka, near Montreal, in Canada. In what would become a watershed example of resistance against the construction of golf courses as well as of native-government relations (Kalant 2004), the crisis, dubbed the 'Oka crisis', pitted members of a native community against golf developers. The proposed expansion of the golf course would have encroached on a traditional Mohawk cemetery, and the mayor of the city of Oka awarded a permit to the developers without a formal consultation process with the Mohawks, the population of Oka and competent environmental authorities (Kalant 2004). This resulted in a heated standoff between members of the Mohawk community and the provincial police, leading to violent altercations and important political repercussions. The proposed expansion was never developed, and the federal government finally bought the land making it off limits to potential developers.

The evolution of the GAGM clearly transcends the local-global dialectic, as the issues fought over are essentially localized in different areas all over the world but are highlighted by the work of the people behind GAGM and different organizations. Local resistance regularly occurs in response to the construction of a golf course. Although most people taking part in these forms of resistance are not official members of a worldwide anti-golf movement, they are undertaking an important task, namely to put forward some form of resistance. The challenge for GAGM is now one of coordination: finding local resistance and elevating them to a worldwide standard so they are heard and seen on an international platform.

Sport and corporate environmentalism

In the second section of this chapter, we outlined the relationships between the environmental movement and the Olympics, and the landmarks listed in Table 6.1 illustrate how environmental issues have been institutionalized in the

Olympic movement as a result of the actions of environmentalist organizations such as Greenpeace. In this final section, we attend to another facet of the institutionalization of the environment movement, corporate environmentalism. We argue that issues of environmental degradation, protection and sustainability have reached such prominence that they have now infiltrated the sport culture industry and new corporations can market themselves as being part of, or inspired by, environmentalism.

One example of this is *Deeper* (2011) a snowboarder movie featuring the adventures of professional snowboarder and self-described environmentalist, Jeremy Jones. It portrays the life of snowboarders taking on the challenge of riding some pristine and untouched mountains. The narrative sounds very similar to any other ski or snowboard movie, but it differs in one important respect. The protagonists vow never to use any form of motorized transportation (for example, a snowmobile, helicopter, float plane, chairlift, or snow cat) to access the peaks and mountains. They set out on foot from a set location, proceed to camp in the wilderness while ascending and descending peaks under their own power (a practice called 'skinnying' in reference to the skins employed underneath the skis or splitboard used to ascend the mountains). Ironically, the movie never reveals how the riders get to the actual spot where they can walk to the mountains, and virtually all ski, snowboard and surf movies with a strong environmental theme avoid this question. Teton Gravity Research (TGR), the company behind the movie, stated that the movie was 100 per cent carbon neutral, again using an environmentalist discourse. Of note is that *Deeper* and its sequels *Further* and *Higher* are all, in some way, illustrative of Jones' commitment to the environment, further shown through an organization created in 2007, *Protect our Winters* (POW).

POW presents itself as dedicated to climate change issues while fusing these to the practice of alpine winter sports (like snowboarding). POW is a non-profit foundation funded by donations from both corporate sponsors and individuals. They claim to address the climate change issue by taking it to the forums of authorities that they believe retain the power to make effective changes. For example in a video posted on their website entitled 'Jeremy goes to Washington', Jones dons a suit, along with hiking boots and a toque, to lobby politicians in Washington DC. As he states:

When I started Protect our Winters, like, the last thing I wanted to do is get into the political side of things. But it became really apparent to me that in order to really move the needle in climate change, it needs to be won on Capitol Hill (POW 2012).

Sherpas Cinemas' ski movie *ALL I CAN* (2011) is another illustration of the institutionalization of environmental values into corporate sport, in this case freestyle skiing. Promoted as an environmentally concerned ski movie, *All I CAN* combines the traditional elements of the genre, that is, technical prowess

executed by professional skiers, with a strong emphasis on the ever-changing environmental conditions regulating the practice of skiing. Hence the studio claims:

The film strives to unite global mountain culture and bind us together as the leaders of a revolution. We must be inspired to do all we can for the environment, and must learn how to take that first tiny step in the right direction (Sherpas Cinema 2011).

Clearly Sherpas Cinema, while not associated themselves with any particular environmental group, utilize discourses influenced by the environmental movement to promote the film.

As we saw in the first part of this chapter, the evolution of the environmental movement has been marked by many trajectories, leading to the creation of different political tendencies. The biggest success arguably, however, has been the mainstreaming of environmental issues into public consciousness. Skiers in this movie effectively see themselves as agents of global change. J. P. Auclair, a famous French-Canadian skier, is shown skiing a run where he dodges cars, slides on handrails and jumps over driveways, all that in an urban context, far away from the mountains. This segment appears to try to raise awareness about global warming and the gradual disappearance of ski areas due to a systematic depletion of snow. In addition, some of the athletes featured openly target environmental change as the most important social and political issue of the day: 'Every generation in history has had their own big problem to deal with, and this is ours' (ALL I CAN 2011). The pre-eminence of the topic among the skiers in the film suggests an acute form of involvement towards environmental causes; an involvement made possible by a blend of environmentalist preoccupation meshed with sports.

Dubbed the 'Cold Revolution' by Alpine winter sport pundit Auden Schendler (2011), environmental awareness in winter sports has influenced the entire winter sports equipment and apparel manufacturing industry:

The explosion of consciousness and advocacy on climate change is . . . increasingly backed by savvy, and booming, outdoor businesses, like Black Diamond and The North Face. . . . The North Face, through its support of groups like Protect Our Winters and All.I.Can, has quietly become the leader in climate advocacy in the apparel industry. The vibe they've helped create is palpable.

Another illustration of this development of 'green consciousness' or what some might argue is industrial greenwash, is the alliance between the Surfrider Foundation and POW:

The Surfrider Foundation, the leading name in beach and coastal protection, has teamed up with Protect Our Winters, the top non-profit from the world of snow sports to offer a combined membership that will allow boardsports enthusiasts to protect where they play (Surfrider.org 2011).

Another surfing-related company, Green Foam Blanks, exemplifies the will to put into practice environmentally friendly production methods in order to reduce the amount of toxic waste produced in the manufacture of boards. Along with other surfboard companies such as Lost Enterprises, Green Foam Blanks aim to produce a cleaner, greener product. 'Surfing would seem to be the ultimate environmentally friendly industry, what with its nature-boy image and surfers' passion for keeping the ocean and beaches clean and green' (Woody 2009).

Conclusion

As awareness of the environment has changed over the years, so has the environmental movement and so too has its relationship with sport. Is there a single, definitive, environmental movement within sport? The answer for now is uncertain. With Greenpeace activism associated with the Olympic Games, we can see an example of a major actor within the global environment movement challenging sports mega events to become more environmentally friendly. However, with the examples of SAS and the GAGM, we witnessed two movements that are environmentally sport specific. Yet with the various landmarks in the evolution of the relationship between the Olympics and the environment, as well as the development of a so-called environmentally friendly sports culture industry, we have noted the extent of the institutionalization of the environmental issue in sport.

In Tourainian terms, it is possible to identify a unity of sport, environment and social movements in a global identity, that is, an identity clearly oriented towards the defence of environmental causes as they are related to sport in one way or another. The totality of these organizations, groups, foundations and spokespersons is aimed at ensuring the long-term habitability of the planet. This suggests that the environment is bound to occupy yet a more central role in political debates, including within sport, especially with regard to the staging of sports mega-events, as actors associated with the environmental movement keep challenging sport around that issue.