Darnell, Simon C. "Development History and Politics: Investigating SDP." *Sport for Development and Peace: A Critical Sociology*. London: Bloomsbury Academic, 2012. 83–102. Globalizing Sport Studies. *Bloomsbury Collections*. Web. 26 Apr. 2023. <<http://dx.doi.org/10.5040/9781849665896.ch-004>>.

Downloaded from Bloomsbury Collections, www.bloomsburycollections.com, 26 April 2023, 14:10 UTC.

Copyright © Simon C. Darnell 2012. 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.

Development History and Politics*

Investigating SDP

Introduction

In the Introduction to this book, I explored some ways in which the current mobilization of SFD aligns with the history of using sport to facilitate the social good. Despite the understanding that sport in support of social progress has a long (and in some cases sordid) history, there nevertheless remains a sense that the SDP sector challenges, re-imagines or departs from the dominant approaches to international development of the past 60 years. As Levermore and Beacom (2009) have argued, SDP can be understood in its current incarnations to constitute a response to the failures of development orthodoxy. Complicating this perspective though is Levermore and Beacom's argument that the current mobilization of SFD is, in very specific ways, tailor-made for the dominant paradigms of development, namely modernization and neoliberalism. In this chapter, I explore whether SDP does indeed offer a new approach to international development.

To approach this question, I draw on a series of interviews ($n = 9$) I conducted with programme officials and managers from SDP organizations. These included representatives from two organizations concerned with SDP advocacy and facilitation, one celebrity athlete foundation, one charitable arm of a professional sports club focused on international development and SDP, one youth sport and coaching development organization and four SDP NGOs working in the Global South and focused on youth education and health. Interview questions focused on policy makers' understandings of the position and role of SFD and its political dimensions and challenges. I draw on the insights collected through the interviews – which are not fully representative of the ongoing changes and increasing diversity of SDP (see Giulianotti 2011) – to draw out some critical insights and reflections as to the political orientation(s) of SDP. These results are not hard and fast, but I suggest that this is largely the point; the results of this chapter serve as a reminder of the various political possibilities of development as

*This chapter draws on ideas and concepts from conference presentations at the 2010 International Sport Sociology Association/RC27, World Sociology Congress, Gothenburg, Sweden and the 2010 Canadian Political Science Association/International Studies Association Conference, Montreal, Canada.

well as the ethical dimensions of development and SDP that result (see Chapter 7). In this way, I follow Hayhurst (2009) in acknowledging the importance of asking *how* development and SDP works as much as *whether* it works.

The chapter proceeds in five subsequent parts. In the next section, I explore the tensions that stem from the goal of reorienting development and practicing it differently, as SDP is now often positioned. I then provide an overview of the structure and orientation of SDP practice and politics as understood from the perspective of SDP stakeholders. Next, I consider the implications of these political orientation(s) of SDP (such as they can be defined or theorized through this data) followed by three themes offered as the basis for an ongoing critical analysis of SDP. Some concluding thoughts are then offered.

Tensions in approaching development differently

The suggestion that sport offers a new approach to development begs for questions of the political orientation of development that SDP presupposes and imagines. Some recent research studies are useful here. For example, in Crabbe's (2009) analysis of the Positive Futures programme in the United Kingdom (UK), which uses sport-based programmes as a 'hook' for attracting marginalized youth and supporting their education and employability, sport is recognized as an attractive means by which to foster or facilitate the inclusion of the socially and economically dispossessed. In this way, SFD offers a generally acceptable, and largely non-threatening, means of reaching the excluded – particularly youth – in ways that are understood to be different than the host of programmes which to date have not proved unsuccessful in doing so. As Crabbe shows, though, this mode of SDP programming is not universal in its application and popularity but is politically palatable within the ubiquity of contemporary consumer/capitalist culture.

From this perspective, 'alternative' approaches to development in and through SDP are inevitably produced and constrained by the social, economic and political terrain in which SDP programmes regularly operate. SDP finds itself amidst tensions similar to those identified within other sectors of development, social change and philanthropy; the political orientation of activists and NGOs tends to be drawn towards anti-capitalism/anti-corporatism, but they often fail to institutionalize these mandates, given the broader practical limits of such an orientation (Littler 2009). I suggest that this kind of tension is not one that the SDP sector (or SFD scholars for that matter) has fully confronted, but it is visible, if not fundamental, to SDP. It can be seen in the ambivalent relationship between neoliberal, corporatized empowerment models versus a desire for sustainable and even radical social change in and through SDP.

Such tensions in reorienting development policy and practice are therefore not exceptional to SDP but are emblematic of the broader political dimensions of international development itself as well as those of critical development studies. Writing in the development journal *Third World Quarterly*, Frans Schuurman (2009) has argued that development studies as a paradigm or discipline is illustrative of the difficulty of reconciling studies of development policy with or against the critical theoretical analysis of development ideologies and practices. Schuurman's analysis applies both to the study of SDP as a subsection of development studies research and a subsection of sport sociology. He raises the question of whether we should be studying policies that move us closer to best practices of SDP, or even towards findings that can be generalized across various development contexts, or whether we are better to concentrate on conducting critical analyses of development practices, policies, politics and ideologies. How these approaches overlap is also an important line of inquiry.

Crucially, though, Schuurman's analysis also speaks to the tensions within the SDP sector itself. As the data discussed in this chapter demonstrates, the political dimensions of SDP are such that the importance of challenging the dominant development model – that is of using sport as a way to practice development outside of neoliberal or economistic paradigms – continues to be simultaneously produced and constrained by the need to identify and enact specific policies by which to do SFD *effectively* and *within* the standards and logics set out within the current political economy. At its most basic level, SDP constitutes a site of tension as to whether the mobilization of sport for meeting the goals of international development should be constituted as a way to do development differently or a way to do development more efficiently and effectively than has been done in the past. This tension is not irreconcilable, but it is recurrent.

SDP: Organization, structure and orientation

In this section, I explore whether SDP is 'new' in development terms by providing an overview of the ways in which some SDP initiatives are organized and structured and the challenges of mobilizing SFD that result. I do not adjudicate the truth of such issues as understood by those in the field nor whether these results can be generalized to the entire SDP sector. Rather, I try and make sense of the political implications of the ways in which people in the field understand SDP, particularly when considered against the dominant historical narratives of international development. The analysis is organized into two subsections, sections that necessarily overlap.

SDP: Organization and structure

First and foremost, it is significant that the SDP sector itself is understood, by the people working within it, to be new. SDP tends to be seen as a burgeoning if still loosely knit network of stakeholders who are interested in supporting development initiatives in and through the opportunities, profile and momentum that sport affords. In this way, and even somewhat aside from the critical analysis of development politics within SDP, the sector can be understood as a new player in (and/or relative latecomer to) development (Black 2010). There are several organizational dynamics that follow from this. One is that the momentum of SFD is understood by SDP stakeholders to suffer at this current stage from a lack of external legitimacy. This leads people working in, or supportive of, SDP to recognize pressure to justify the importance and contributions of SDP.

I think it's still not accepted as a real serious movement. It still is 'just sport' or 'sport for fun'; it doesn't have the credibility that it deserves yet. So what we're seeking to do is really bring the facts and figures off the table, and that's one of the reasons we've created the association so the researchers and all of the research that is out there can feed into the thematic areas with which we concentrate on, to be an influence of policy work and governmental policy – Jennifer (SDP advocacy organization).

Second, SDP is seen to have emerged through a process whereby various sport stakeholders (organizations, athletes, clubs etc.) embraced the development possibilities of sport more so than one where the traditional development sector took up the opportunities presented by sport. Even though sport can now be understood as part of the emerging fourth pillar of development aid (see Develtere and De Bruyn 2009), much of the championing of the SDP sector has proceeded from the sports community (local, national and global) more so than from the traditional development sector.

Third, while traditional development actors are not at the foreground of SDP organization and promotion, there is increasing involvement of stakeholders from outside the world of sport, particularly corporate sponsors and charitable foundations interested in supporting SDP, or even committed to capitalizing on the novelty and momentum of SFD. The following excerpts are illustrative of these points:

It's been interesting to see the change of perspective (in our organization). If you ask someone at our headquarters? We're doing sports programmes. We're not doing international development. Ask somebody that works on our national programmes on our national side and ask them what we're doing internationally? It's sports programmes. But if you ask our international team, our core international team ... we understand that this is development work – Sally (Youth sport development organization).

So these big private sector partners are now getting on board with the sport-for-development initiatives. Which is quite a fairly big movement because previously,

there's been very limited, if any, private sector funding in this movement. There have been mainly Western governments involved, and you can name them on one hand – Jennifer (SDP advocacy organization).

These perspectives align with the analysis of SDP interns in Chapter 3, in which the intersections and compatibility of neoliberal development philosophy and class-informed notions of sporting meritocracy combine to position SDP as a means by which to 'give back' (see Darnell 2010a). From this perspective, it is not entirely surprising that stakeholders from sport would constitute the champions of SDP, but it does beg the question of the extent to which traditional sporting cultures, and traditional development politics, are reproduced in and through the discursive and geographical terrain of SDP (see Donnelly *et al.* 2011). It also begs for analysis of the increasing interest in SDP amongst corporations, particularly those connected to sports-related industry, and the opportunity that SDP affords such organizations to construct themselves as socially responsible (and politically non-radical) corporate citizens (see Levermore 2010).

Fourth, while there is recognition of the importance of challenging top-down development, or at the least reconciling the need for a bottom-up orientation alongside top-down approaches within SDP initiatives (Black 2010), SDP is also understood by some working in the field to be primarily a northern-led sector. Again, given the diversity of the activities under the SDP banner, I am not in a position to corroborate or refute the objectivity of such claims, but such perspectives do raise the issue of relations of power that constitute unequal development and in which sport is now implicated through SDP. At the least, it is significant (and largely progressive) that SDP stakeholders recognize northern stewardship in development as an issue germane to SDP (see Giulianotti 2011). While the challenges that this recognition presents are discussed further below, suffice to say here that the recognition of northern stewardship is only a first step towards reconciling the development politics of SDP and that, somewhat more importantly for the purposes of this chapter, the invocation or mobilization of SFD does not necessarily usurp or transcend the effects of a political economy that serves to place northern institutions at the fore of SDP policy and practice (see Hayhurst 2009).

[Northern stewardship] is an issue because we can travel anywhere in the world, well not anywhere in the world, but particularly in Africa and Latin America and we will see that many of the Sports for Development organizations that have been created and yet are successful have been established by westerners. That's just a fact. But there is a real effort by the movement and by those who have established those NGOs to support the building of capacity for local ownership. It's quite noticeable – Jennifer (SDP advocacy organization).

Fifth, the recognition of northern stewardship and its limitations, particularly amidst the historical failures of traditional development, and resultant attempts

to transition away from this type of structure and organizing, mean that SDP is increasingly focused on partnerships between NGOs and funding bodies, on the one hand, and local organizations, on the other.

I would say that every single sport-for-development organization I've met in the last 4–5 years, they fundamentally rely on the strength of their partnerships, and we're absolutely no different in that. We're only as good as the partnerships that we have in place with the organizations that we're working with. Everything comes from them. If they want us to do something, we respond. We're not deliverers within these countries, we're simply supporting the delivery that they do. And I think every single good sport-for-development organization that I've come in contact with relies on exactly the same types of links – David (Professional sports club).

In this way, similar to findings in research conducted by Giulianotti (2011), SDP programme officials are clearly aware of the general criticism of development programming and aid as a form of northern stewardship or neocolonialism, and they respond through a focus on partnerships. SDP can be understood then to be challenging the historically intelligible paradigm of top-down international development.

At the same time, attention needs to be paid to the ways in which this partnership focus proceeds not only from a critical response to neocolonialism but also from a political economy characterized by scarce resources and, particularly given the financial crisis of 2008, financial limits placed upon the traditional sources of development funding. As one official explained to me, the need for funding continues to lead SDP NGOs back to the Global North because that is where relative financial security is enjoyed and funding is accessible.

There's tension around managing SDP the right way and not being too presumptuous and respecting the local affiliates and the expertise that they have. But the reality is, without a connection to the North and to the funding that's there, it becomes impossible to operate. So you really do rely on it. I mean that's where the funding is, y'know? There's a lot more decision-making at country level and a lot more collaboration with local governments in making decisions and driving policies, so it is a changing landscape; it's just that it's never going to be completely South–South if you will – William (SDP NGO).

This is difficult political terrain. Such reflections speak to the tension identified by Schuurman (2009) regarding doing development differently versus doing development more effectively. It also speaks to the aporia of development that recognizes its necessity and simultaneous capitulation to global capitalism (Wainwright 2008). In addition, the construction of northern subjectivity is implicated in a political economy of development that requires northern benevolence to support activities that respond to the inequalities that largely proceed from northern dominance (Biccum 2010).

In turn, then, and sixth, within this political economy, and amidst the spectre of neocolonial development and the need for critical self-reflection,

the monitoring and evaluation of and in SDP becomes of paramount importance.

I think one of the biggest challenges [is] it's still really difficult to get hard evidence-based data and studies and analysis that actually demonstrate the impact that sport has. That's something that I think we're going to have to continue to work on. It's something that we'll always be, maybe not battling, but it's something that we'll always be focusing on, in terms of finding out and demonstrating specifically how sport does make a difference and what that difference is in terms of achieving these greater development outcomes – Teresa (SDP NGO).

In an era and terrain of scarcity, proving that money is well spent becomes essential. In fact, interviews with SDP officials revealed a sense of embarrassment or frustration that the monitoring and evaluation of SDP is not robust or effective, a fact that they suggest puts SDP in relative subordination to other sectors or initiatives of international development.

One thing that I'm really interested in is about effectiveness. Y'know, what we can talk about and say is genuinely effective within the world of sport-for-development, right? I can't really imagine another [sector] of development ... where effectiveness or sustainability is not constantly being researched and tested and probed and analyzed? I don't think there is – David (Professional sports club).

Several implications can be drawn from these reflections. Not only does a neoliberal development terrain require hard numbers and data to 'prove' the effects of SDP, but also securing positive results of SDP likely goes some way towards assuaging accusations of paternalism and stewardship. In this way, the results that 'prove' SDP to be effective have a politically utility, not unlike popular discourses of 'sport as a universal language' or 'sport as a human right' that, in effect, depoliticize the sector and make it more palatable and attractive. This is not conspiratorial in nature, nor should any positive results of SDP initiatives be dismissed out of hand. Still, continued critical analysis is called for regarding ways in which research 'proving' what sport can do for development undermines critical investigations into why development (through sport) is needed in the first place. While some monitoring and evaluation of SDP has been criticized as largely functionalist, if not evangelical in its approach and philosophy (see Coalter 2009), I would, in addition, argue that a scholarly understanding of the pressure to evaluate SDP needs to situate this impulse for proof within development's transnational politics and relations of power. That is, if (as discussed in Chapter 2) the need for development initiatives proceeds from a global political economy that contributes to unequal development on an international scale, then the need to prove that SDP works in response to such inequality should similarly be understood as a product of this political economy. Such results start, I suggest, to provide some insights into the political orientation of SDP, which I explore in more detail in the next section.

SDP: Political focus and orientation

In many ways, the question at the centre of this chapter – does SDP offer a genuine departure from the traditional approaches to international development? – comes to rest on how SDP stakeholders understand the work that they do in the field of development. In the previous section, I suggested that SDP programme officials keep the criticism and limitations of northern stewardship as a means of development top of mind in the work that they do. At the same time, interview results suggest that the political orientation of SDP – that is, the way in which they imagine and approach making change in the world in and through the mobilization of sport – continues to draw upon and perpetuate the logic of governmentality as the preferred *modus operandi* of international development (see Li 2007). In this way, the clearly laudable focus on partnerships and sustainability in and through SDP still occurs alongside a political orientation that focuses largely on the conduct of partners, rather than the structures of inequality that constitute the need for development in the first place.

For example, as one SDP NGO official explained:

We were founded by [athletes] who had friends and teammates die of HIV and AIDS and, wanted to do something about it and also saw that (sport) was a huge powerful force that could be tapped into ... the other key piece was developing a curriculum that was based on fun games and activities that kind of were experiential and would help young people kind of internalize the messages [of HIV/AIDS prevention] a bit more – William (SDP NGO).

I offer this quotation to draw attention to the ways in which this description of SDP programming pulls the political focus of the development struggle (in this case centred around the HIV/AIDS pandemic on the African continent) away from the history and political economy of African poverty, and/or the lack of political will among northern countries and corporations to support the securing of resources needed to combat HIV/AIDS (see Lewis 2005). At the same time, the description pushes the political focus towards the education (or lack thereof) of African children regarding the pandemic and the importance of supporting efforts by which they can ‘internalize’ messages and presumably modify behaviour. While such education programmes are no doubt useful and important, they stand apart from struggles to challenge the structures by which the people of Africa disproportionately suffer from HIV/AIDS. This is not to suggest that education efforts are mutually exclusive from attempts to redress broader structures of inequality, nor do they exist in a zero-sum power relationship. It is, however, my contention that the focus on the conduct of people is the preferred political orientation within SDP and one that tends to obscure a focus on the broader history and politics of unequal development. Another way in which this can be seen is the development

(through sport) of skills that are understood to serve those who suffer from marginalization:

We address issues of HIV and AIDS because it's very prevalent in all of the areas that we work. We also address issues of gender because it's become an issue within the community ... helping communities to understand and see the value for women to be participating and young girls to be participating in sport and extra-curricular activities. So the needs that we address in a social context come out of the direct result of our sporting interaction within the communities. Lifeskills has always been an integral component of our programme, so we've also worked with concepts of cooperation, teamwork, decision-making, conflict resolution, within the core structure even of our sporting context – Teresa (SDP NGO).

The notion of lifeskills as a focus for SDP has a bio-political dimension in the ways that building reservoirs of skills and capital stands as a productive and positive means of regulating the body as it is socially and politically produced. In the context of international development, such stakes are particularly high. In turn, the logic of governmentality cannot be separated from the preference towards partnerships, given that the focus on the 'conduct of conduct' facilitates a politics of non-interference on the part of northern NGOs. As one North American-based SDP official told me:

Another success would be that we've really been able to improve our materials and look at our [SDP] training and to really add a lot of support into those and to have a training that people go away with and [then] feel that they can take up [SDP programming] on their own. They don't need us to babysit them all the time. But yet they still feel open enough to communicate with us on a regular basis – Sally (Youth sport development organization).

In this way, partnerships facilitate governmentality but often do so in a way that can be difficult to sustain or reconcile against a critically informed ethos that recognizes the possibilities of neocolonialism. One SDP programme official described to me the ways in which governmentality served to compromise, or at least trouble, the notion of, or commitment to, partnership and local autonomy:

I'm sure to a certain extent we're still dictating what is going on in some of the communities [in which we operate]. I'm not sure you can necessarily ever eliminate that. But I think as best we can we try to have a collective approach, and I think it shows within some of our programming models and within our volunteer exchange programme; there's a constant and consistent exchange of ideas coming back and forth – William (SDP NGO).

At the least then, balancing the desire for positive change in and through governmentality against the importance of autonomy and indigenous rights speaks to the extent to which SFD constitutes fraught political territory. Still, it is reasonable to suggest that a focus upon the conduct of conduct continues to

offer the most palatable and productive means of imagining, approaching and mobilizing sport towards meeting development goals.

It is worth reiterating that these political understandings of development as understood in and through SDP are not malicious, misguided or wrong; indeed just the opposite is true. These approaches make perfect sense amidst the specific, contemporary challenges of international development, given the constraints of resources that limit the development sector and given the subject positions into which many SDP stakeholders are hailed in and through SDP service (see Chapter 3). What is key for critical analysis is to understand that this logic is a product of the political economy of unequal development. At the least, the political dimensions and implications of SDP need to feature in scholarly understandings of SFD and the SDP sector.

The political orientation(s) of SDP: Critical analyses

Given some of the current conceptualizations and challenges of mobilizing SFD from the perspective of those working in the field of SDP, it is called for to explore the implications of the results. This is an ongoing project in the study of SDP and not one that can, or should, be considered complete in this chapter or text. Rather, I suggest that a critical scholarship of SDP, focused in this case on the experiences of those working in SDP but also attuned to other data sources, would be well served if approached through three theoretical lenses: bio-politics, social capital and inequality. Each is discussed here.

The bio-politics of SDP

In lectures at the Collège de France, Foucault (2008) argued that the increasing entrenchment of bio-politics emerged from a particular political economy, one in which the state wielded less and less direct control over citizens and in which the market increasingly took on a measure of irrefutability. The governing of the populace was led, via the political economy, to the market in such a way as to ‘uncover’ the intelligibility of the truth of governmental practice. Bio-politics and governmentality, as constituted through the production and regulation of bodies and securing of conduct, were therefore an appropriate response to the conundrum of how to structure the exercise of power while still respecting the truths of the market. In Foucauldian terms, this was not constitutive of a social or political conspiracy but rather the ‘logic’ of social and political organization.

Two implications for the current political organization of SDP proceed from this understanding. One, the application and mobilization of sport to meeting development goals is not, and cannot be, an apolitical activity given

that the logic of securing social change, particularly along the axes of the body and subjectivity, proceeds from the particularities of the political economy. As discussed, this political economy in the twenty-first century continues to be one in which the state is regularly and routinely impoverished or disparaged, and/or in which market logic retains a hegemonic status in policy and practice. The universality of sport does not result in SDP being free of these political implications. There is little or no political terrain in which SDP could be mobilized that would transcend the bio-political implications to which Foucault drew attention. Even the most ostensibly supportive, politically non-threatening or seemingly benign understandings of social change in SDP regularly invoke the regulation of bodies and construction of preferred subjectivities in ways that secure a bio-political logic of neoliberalism. The entrenchment of such logic can be seen in the ways in which SDP officials like Julia describe the changes that they aim to secure through SFD.

Through our programme, we find that investing in ‘young people’ has a greater and more long-term impact, and I think one of the advantages of being a sport programme and a coaching programme is that people get involved because they want to and because they love to and because they are passionate already about what they do. We’re actually developing this whole cadre of really passionate, empowered, informed individuals who are then transferring their knowledge and who are sharing that knowledge and also being advocates on a regular basis for the people that they’re working with – Julia (SDP NGO).

This understanding of the importance of investing in people, as opposed to infrastructure or materials, is a crucial one within progressive development struggles (see Sen 2000) and is not to be dismissed out of hand, particularly as it supports a politics of self-determination for the world’s marginalized peoples. Yet it remains crucial to attend to the politics of the subjectivities imagined in such descriptive accounts of SDP politics, ones that I suggest are constructed through the positive corporeality of the preferred sporting experience and that have bio-political implications that are both inescapable and particular.

Two, then, despite the tendency to eschew development based on stewardship for development through partnership, it is reasonable to argue that bio-power connects sport to development in SDP in such a way that neoliberal practices are regularly secured, rather than inequalities challenged (Darnell 2010b). That is, the machinations of the contemporary political economy, underpinned by bio-political logic, are hegemonic to the degree that even the most progressive or radical SDP initiatives tend to understand the central chore of SDP as one of securing neoliberal conduct that eschews state support and chooses not to challenge structural or transnational inequality. I am pointing here both to the constitutive political and social elements of the logic of SDP but also to the limits or borders that are enacted around it and that come to mark its political palatability. While SDP stakeholders are clearly committed to avoiding a repeat of the mistakes or failings of traditional development, the hegemony

of a competitive political economy regularly serves to secure the neoliberal bio-politics of SDP and its productive capacities as normative.

Social capital

The bio-political implications of SDP in turn hold purchase for making sense of the conceptualization and application of theories of social capital. This is an important strand of critical analysis given that social capital is increasingly a theoretical tool used to understand the logic of change conceptualized and championed in and through SDP (see Coalter 2008, 2010b; Spaaij 2009, 2011). In general terms, social capital has offered SDP practitioners and scholars an entry point to explore how sport participation facilitates improved social connectivity and resources for persons and populations that participate in sport (or SFD initiatives) in ways that eventually lead to better lives. For example, youth who participate in sport are found to be more likely to participate in community activities outside of sport as adults given the social capital that sport participation facilitates (Perks 2007). When applied to SDP, in theory as well as practice, sport can facilitate social capital in ways that support people's ability to challenge development inequality and secure their own self-determination (see Spaaij 2011). From the most optimistic perspective, increasing sport opportunities and participation increases social capital and leads to improved and sustained development. Such notions of the importance of social capital emerged through the interviews with SDP officials:

We also do a community development process whereby we help to create and assist with organizing sports structures within the community, linking to existing sports structures, linking on to those. We give individuals and groups training in order to help build capacity for them to um, do more sports administration or to set up more efficient leagues or in terms of coaching and refereeing ... what happens is leaders are trained within the community, and their leaders are past participants from the programmes and they will help younger youth in the community with their lifeskills on and off the field – Teresa (SDP NGO).

Several implications are important to draw out here. First and foremost, what is arguably the preferred notion of social capital in the practice of SDP does not constitute the only way to understand the concept. For example, Coalter (2010b) references Coleman (1998) and Putnam's (2000) use of social capital in understanding social change through SDP – and MYSA in particular – given that these two approaches focus on the relationship and networking aspects of social capital, particularly compared to the broader sociological use of social capital in the tradition of Pierre Bourdieu. As Coalter (2010b: 1377) describes, 'In terms of our concerns with sport-for-development, Coleman and Putnam are the most relevant.' That Coalter makes this assertion and choice is both accurate and logical, given that Coleman and Putnam indeed align more closely with the logic of SDP, but it is precisely this point that makes

the Bourdieusian perspective important and illuminating for critical scholars.¹ Bourdieu's notion of social capital offered a means to make sense of and theorize the structural and personal distinctions within the social milieu and to understand how these differences come to be, whereas Coleman's notion of social capital, which Coalter (2010b: 1381) applies to make sense of the development benefits of MYSA, draws attention instead to "rationally devised material and status incentives" needed to compensate for the weakening of family, community and local government structures'. This suggests that for critical scholars, there may be a tendency to match our understanding of social capital in the *analysis* of SDP to the understandings of social capital such as they are mobilized in the *practice* of SDP. While this may be useful in some cases, it may also limit the imaginative possibilities of critical analysis.

In this way, and second, we can understand the attractiveness of social capital in SDP to derive from the ways in which it proceeds and/or connects to the intelligibility of SDP's bio-politics. Unlike Bourdieu, within the dominant logic of SDP social capital can be compatible with theorizing social engineering of marginalized people, particularly through encouraging a regulated body politic or facilitating social control (see Spaaij 2009). The practice of facilitating improved social capital by and through SDP offers a micro-solution to macro-problems in ways that potentially serve to normalize and/or depoliticize the weakening of the public sphere. That sport is susceptible and compatible with such logic is not surprising, but it needs to be understood for what it is and perhaps more importantly for what it is not. The improvement and mobilization of social capital through sport is not necessarily an approach based on deconstructing relations of dominance and supporting equality of condition. This is because the bio-political social engineering of social capital through SDP does not attend to inequality as much as it professes to help people succeed within an increasingly competitive cultural and political economy. This is fundamentally bio-political in the tradition of Foucault.

The issue I am raising is not whether social capital is important for self-determination but rather how we imagine it being constructed and/or bestowed in and through sport and SDP. The tradition of Bourdieu suggests that social capital is not something to be built or bestowed through international development initiatives as much as it is a theoretical means by which to understand the organization and stratification of society. This theoretical difference is important given recent research that suggests that the issue for successful development is not one of how to intervene in such a way as to produce social capital because even the people in the most dire and desperate situations around the world construct and utilize social capital through effort and agency on a daily basis (Saunders 2010). Rather the issue is how to provide the opportunities or structures in and through which marginalized people can mobilize social capital towards sustainable change. From this perspective, it is reasonable to ask whether a lack of social capital stands as the major

development problem to which sport can or should attend through SDP. In turn, is the political economy of unequal development structured in such a way that inequality is produced *yet then rendered an individual failure or lack* to which the facilitation of social capital through sport offers an attractive solution?

Of course, it is not necessary for critical understandings of SDP to argue against the benefits of improved social capital such as they are facilitated in and through SDP. I concur that any production of motivated citizens within 'such difficult economic and cultural circumstances is clearly a major achievement' (Coalter 2010b: 1383). Nevertheless, it is crucial to recognize the specificity of such a political orientation and the resultant limitations. Indeed, Coalter (2010b) does make reference to the limits of social capital, particularly Portes and Landholt's (2000) critical contention that facilitating social capital is likely to yield only limited impact in the absence of state support. To this, I would argue for continued critical scholarship that attends to the issue of whether promoting or championing social capital in SDP potentially constitutes a tacit justification of the antecedents of development inequality and/or the retrenched, neoliberal state.

Third, then, a Bourdieusian approach reminds that social capital is culturally specific, a crucial dimension that we potentially overlook if and when social capital is mechanistically applied or transferred through sport and in support of development. Again, recent research has highlighted the importance of such understandings. As Guest (2009) has illustrated, SDP programmes are susceptible to misalignment between northern notions of the preferred or requisite cultural tools for successful development versus local demands regarding what constitutes the appropriate skills, resources or opportunities for success. While facilitating improved self-esteem to enable self-actualization among poor people is an attractive model, particularly for middle-class stewards in SDP, Guest (2009) found focusing on one's self so openly to be understood as selfish and childish in an Angolan community. This work suggests that social capital is cultural and contextually specific. In response, social capital might be more explanatory rather than offering a stable means by which to theorize the engineering of change in understanding SDP. This does not mean that social capital cannot or should not be invoked in support of struggles towards an equality of condition, but it does call into question the notion that capital can or even should be constructed or engineered through sport for the people who are deemed to be in need of such social resources.

The politics of inequality

Finally then, it is important to connect the political orientation of SDP to the broader politics of inequality to which development attends, particularly if we understand development to be, fundamentally, a process by which attempts are

made to redress inequality (Greig, Hulme and Turner 2007).² While changing the development focus from, for example, macroeconomic policy or foreign aid to social or community phenomena like sport offers an important opportunity to rethink or practice development differently, the importance of attending to inequality in development remains paramount. I argue that the data in this chapter, and others, suggests that many SDP initiatives in their current incarnation overlook the question of inequality by subordinating it in relation to projects of modernity and the conduct of citizens. Despite the novelty of SFD, then, SDP needs to be understood, politically and sociologically, as a site in which the politics of inequality are played out and contested.

In addition, rather than a focus solely on sport as a tool to be applied to the myriad of development challenges, attention needs also to be paid to inequality as it is constructed and maintained in and through the organization and culture of sport itself. In a 'state of the union' style address to the North American Society for the Sociology of Sport association in 1994, Bruce Kidd argued for sport scholars to renew their engagement with issues of inequality, including social issues like race, class and gender, but also macro-political issues such as governance, globalization and corporatization. In the nearly 20 years since Kidd's address, the meanings, organization, practice and consumption of sport have shifted, particularly influenced by online technologies and the rapidity of commercialization and globalization of the sporting world, but the importance of a sustained analysis of inequality has not abated. I suggest that SDP is an important new opportunity to review and revise Kidd's focus on inequality.

At the least, scholars of SDP are now faced with the challenge of coming to terms with the ways in which the cultural and political economy, particularly the hegemony of neoliberal development, produces and constrains the political orientations available within SDP. While all SDP stakeholders want for the organization and institutionalization of sport to be in the service of the social good, particularly through its connections to international development and the formalization of SDP, the dominant political economy of development and of sport clearly puts constraints on the extent to which SDP can subscribe to, and mobilize, a radical development politics.

SDP practice and politics: Three theses

Based on the preceding discussion of the political orientation of SDP, three theses can be put forth regarding the current mobilization of SDP and its political orientation, particularly when considered against the historical trajectory of international development. While these theses are not fully transferable across the spectrum of SDP policy and practice, they do offer a contribution to an

ongoing and critically informed analysis of the struggles and implications of organizing and mobilizing SFD.

First and foremost, based on the interviews and other recent critical analyses, it is reasonable to argue that a modernist residue clings to, and influences, current understandings and conceptualizations of SFD within SDP, particularly as it positions SDP as a way to facilitate improvement amongst marginalized persons and populations. Despite the sustained critical perspectives that SDP stakeholders bring to bear on their work and on the sector in general, the tendency to reduce development to a process of improvement, and of securing modernity for those currently denied its benefits, remains an attractive political platform from which to mobilize SFD. As one SDP programmer told me:

We recognize that sport has the power to make a difference in the basic communication, confidence, self-esteem, empowerment of people, and we want to enable people to access sport and then tack on these additional development goals – Julia (SDP NGO).

The importance of self-esteem or empowerment is not debated here, for these are clearly important and laudable goals. However, the ways in which such conceptualizations of development refer to, and solidify notions of, improving the conduct of persons within development rather than challenging the relations of politics and power that lead to marginalization in the first place suggests a modernization ethos. Such notions of personal empowerment as the building blocks of sustainable development, notions particularly amenable to hegemonic notions of sport as meritocratic and oriented towards the building of character, are not representative of a universal humanism and can in fact stand at odds with the demands of local people struggling towards sustainable development (see Guest 2009).

Such a political orientation towards SDP has social implications as well, particularly in the maintenance of social hierarchies along lines of race, class and gender. As I have explored elsewhere, the Foucauldian notion of bio-power – the productive power to encourage regulation of the body – has implications for race and racism (Darnell 2010b). A bio-political state is one more ‘open’ to racism as race comes to stand as a marker of modernity (Foucault 1997; Goldberg 1993). From this perspective, modernization as a mandate for SDP closes many of the opportunities for imagination, self-determination and indeed resistance to development inequality at the same time that it opens up spaces, both discursive and geographical, to the justification of social hierarchies as symbols of achieving modernity. Such critiques speak to the importance of sustained analyses of modernization and stewardship in theorizing SFD as well as ongoing critical analyses of whether sport challenges or secures a modernizing politics and ethos.

The second thesis speaks more directly to the focus of this chapter, namely that it remains a challenge within SDP to reconcile critical theoretical

understandings of development and ways to do development differently, against the practical challenges of how to implement new approaches and the myriad of conundrums that this constructs. Specifically, attempts to do development differently have led SDP practitioners and champions, particularly from NGOs, to focus purposively on local ownership of development programmes as a means of challenging traditional development hierarchies. This, though, produces a set of new challenges in SDP. As one SDP NGO manager explained, given the focus on partnerships and local empowerment,

I find a lot less identification to the programmes and to what we do now than before because the programmes are not ours. Precisely what people say is wrong with development; you work for others and the rewards are for others – Henry (SDP NGO).

The initial implication here, and an important one for any policy analyses of SFD, is that doing SDP work within a critical framework is clearly difficult praxis, especially from a managerial perspective. Amidst a political and economic terrain characterized by scarce resources and the importance and mounting pressure of monitoring and evaluation in order to prove the effectiveness of SFD programming, retaining managerial influence of SDP programmes at the same time as yielding control in support of grassroots development that is locally driven is extremely difficult. Even the most sceptical critical scholar needs to take such tensions into account.

Still, there is evidence from the perspective of those working towards development goals through sport-focused NGOs of a disconnect between the goals of (a) the broader international development community, (b) the civil society of SDP, often northern-led organizations, and (c) local programmes and people for whom SDP is designed and intended to be most beneficial.

SD: What will happen in the future for you to be able to say we've met our goals?

SALLY (Youth sport development organization): If the kids in our programme today volunteered to continue to be in our programme tomorrow. I think there's a lot to be said about volunteerism, and in some of these communities that we work with, volunteerism is a very strange term. We advertise that we want volunteers and we'll provide you training, but then they want to know what are they going to get paid? And our programmes don't work that way. We can't. We can't pay all of our community coaches. But if the kids that are in our programmes come back and they want to do it as they get older and volunteer in our sense of the term, that's a positive benefit and that's how we know that the programme has been a success.

This quotation illustrates the intractability and omnipresence of relations of power and politics within sport, development and SDP. If, for example, northern NGOs desire a volunteer culture to support SDP programmes and the meeting of development goals, this should be understood, first and foremost, as a reflection of *their* development priorities and not necessarily of the universality or applicability of volunteerism. This does not mean that such perspectives are inherently misguided or even malignant in their politics but do speak to their palatability within the current political economy. At the very least, such perspectives demand to be recognized for what they are: a political orientation and world view of sport, development and social organization that is largely individualized and competitive as well as hegemonic and therefore continuously contestable.

I also suggest that the above reflection illustrates that in SDP, like development more broadly, every practice is challenging and contestable in managerial but also social and political terms. The goal of SDP NGOs as described above – to support local initiatives and to eschew stewardship in favour of partnership – does not ‘solve’ the problem of development politics as much as produce new sets of challenges. In other words, the novelty of SFD and the challenging of development orthodoxy through SDP create a new, yet no less contestable, political terrain. Even though sport may be positioned as a new form of development and even though SDP practitioners are working to do development differently, development remains fraught political territory and is best understood as such.

This leads directly to the third thesis that I put forth here, that there is evidence that some SDP practitioners are indeed working directly to protect the development novelty that sport affords, even though this is very difficult to do within the political economy of development and within the pressures to effect and measure, if not prove, sustainable change. That is, for some SDP policy makers, sport is indeed a response to the failure of dominant development orthodoxy as Levermore and Beacom suggest. As was described to me:

Those people who started local organizations were realizing that the state, the international aid programmes, the football federations, the corporations, they were not fulfilling their role in the society, and that is why they started [SFD] programmes – Sven (SDP advocacy organization).

This counter-hegemonic approach constitutes an ethos of development that I would argue is rarely championed or celebrated through the most visible SDP rhetoric. That is, rarely is the ‘power of sport’ to support development positioned *against* the activities of governments, institutions or corporations that have failed to support equitable development for decades or even participated directly in exacerbating global inequality. Nor does this political approach to SDP seem likely to stand as an attractive means to invite partners in positions of economic and geopolitical privilege (the same corporations, government,

international aid organizations, IFIs) into the SDP fold because it suggests that these organizations are part of the problem of unequal development. However, such a perspective does position SDP as explicitly political work, and understood as such by those in the field, and also suggests that there may be a glimpse of SDP connecting to, or aligning with, sport and radical social movements that seek to challenge the political economy and relations of power that sustain inequality (see Chapter 7). For these reasons, understandings of such an ethos of SDP and its implications are worthy of sustained inquiry in the critical study of SFD and SDP.

Conclusion

Two broad conclusions can be drawn from this chapter. One, while the SDP sector in its current incarnation may be new, the use of sport for social change is not. More importantly, however, the politics of conceptualizing and implementing development initiatives through SDP are not new. In fact, I suggest that they map quite closely onto the politics of development identified within critical development scholarship over the past several decades. Balancing modernization and stewardship versus self-determination remains a political challenge in SDP.

As a result, and two, the challenges and politics of development preclude the mere application of sport as a solution to or panacea of international development struggles. Sport is not an answer to development, though it may be part of the process of re-imagining and in some cases challenging international development and its political economy.

To a large degree then, while the popular rhetoric of SDP regularly does not hold up to careful scrutiny – to the extent that it champions social change but change limited to the structures and possibilities laid out within dominant cultural and political economy – there is some evidence to suggest a commitment to challenging development amongst those most intimately involved in the day-to-day operation of SDP organizations. This is clearly difficult work as SDP is consistently implicated in, and beholden to, the constraints of the social and political economy. From this perspective, while the invocation of sport for the social good is not new, perhaps more important to recognize for critical scholars is that the political challenges of, and political orientation to, international development are not inherently challenged in and through the deployment of sport. This is not the same as arguing that sport cannot or should not be involved in struggles for sustainable and just development, only that the issue comes to rest on the political orientation and palatability of development, much more so than assessments of the relative ‘effectiveness’ of sport to meet development goals. The most legitimate novelty

of SFD may be in the ways in which it offers a renewed political approach to, and engagement with, the broader challenges of international development. At the least, if we take the argument that nearly all of the suffering endured amidst the world's unequal development is undeserved, yet those who suffer are regularly asked to make up for these gaps in inequality (Gasper 2004), then our attention should be drawn to the need to be careful about, and committed to, the political orientation embraced through the mobilization of SFD. This chapter demonstrates any such commitment to be an ongoing challenge in SDP.