10

Football for Hope Centres in Africa: Intentions, Assumptions and Gendered Implications

Jimoh Shehu

Introduction

The 2010 Fédération Internationale de Football Association (FIFA) World Cup Campaign launched on November 25, 2007 in Durban, South Africa was discursively constructed around the slogan '20 Centres for 2010'. The intent behind this spatio-temporal slogan is the construction of 20 Football for Hope Centres (5 in South Africa and 15 in other locations across Africa) to be used by local football organisations (Centre Hosts) for running their social development programmes within the framework of Football for Hope Movement (FFHM). According to FIFA President Joseph S. Blatter:

> This campaign emphasizes the power of football far beyond the boundaries of the pitch. With the help of football fans, celebrities and sponsors, we want to build 20 Football for Hope centres to deliver our promise to give back to Africa something substantial and leave a lasting legacy well after 11 July 2010 (FIFA, 2007a)

A similar view was expressed by Danny Jordaan, CEO of the 2010 FIFA World Cup Organizing Committee during the launch when he said:

> It is about leaving a meaningful legacy for the African continent for many years to come. 20 Centres for 2010 truly reflects our goal to make a real difference for all of Africa. This campaign is a very concrete step towards giving thousands of African youngsters the chance of a better future (FIFA, 2007a).

As the above quotations make clear, the '20 Centres for 2010' project is not just about leaving a post-event legacy, it is also about demonstrating FIFA's political

economic power to determine, assure and bestow homogeneous projects to homogenized recipients – projects whose impacts are presumed to be self-evident and unproblematic. Philosophically, the '20 Centres for 2010' project is emblematic of what can be termed 'footballism' - the unquestioned belief in the problem-solving power of football. Indeed, the project derives from the unwarranted pre-supposition (wrapped in the mantle of 'development') that:

> Due to its values, its popularity, its universal nature and its appeal, football (in all of its forms) can be seen as the ideal instrument for achieving social and human development targets and tackling many of the major problems faced by society today (italics added) (FIFA, 2007f).

This grand narrative of the inherent power of football rhetorically reduces society's problems to football reproduction, distribution and consumption, and divorces social development from the wider contextual factors, including gender and power relations. Footballism is a myth that creates false, unfulfillable promises, seductively highlighting society's aspiration for social transformation and the need for concomitant tools of social mobilization, while concealing complexities, hegemonic self-interests and the fact that football alone cannot foster social development. To be sure, football sells; and it has created a global market for manifold goods and services. But it is not a transcendental instrument of social change. Accordingly, the gospel or ideology that football, in all its manifestations, is *the* ideal 'technological fix' for contemporary social problems calls for deconstruction, along with the discourses that structure a footballist project like the '20 Centres for 2010'. Historical experience in Africa and elsewhere has shown that debate and critical analysis cannot come at the end of a social development project, but must be undertaken at the very beginning of such venture in order to highlight exclusive and repressive norms – and organise against them. Given that the '20 Centres for 2010' project is in its infancy, it is proper at this juncture to subject its embodied values, outcomes and ideologies to in-depth interrogations. Accordingly, this chapter is a preliminary attempt to critically analyze the issues foregrounded and silenced in FIFA's discursive constructions of the '20 Centres for 2010' project.

Methodologically, Critical Discourse Analysis (Weedon 1996; Fairclough & Wodak 1997) was used to examine the language used by FIFA on its website to create and support the '20 Centres for 2010' project. In other words, official statements and documents regarding the '20 Centres for 2010' were scrutinized for the kinds of social structures, relations and processes they promote or suppress. Certainly, the meanings of the texts analyzed in this may be constructed differently by other researchers. Consequently, the views expressed in this chapter cannot be regarded as definitive or conclusive. Nevertheless, they offer insights valuable for further studies and open up discussions about one instance of how FIFA

intended to give material weight to its rhetoric 'to harness the power of the beautiful game for positive social change across Africa' (FIFA 2007a).

Football for Hope Centres: The Political-economic Context

The '20 Centres for 2010' project cannot be judiciously appreciated without an exploration of its political economic construction and embeddedness. Issues of who owns, controls, and organizes an enterprise for efficiency and profit-making in relation to contexts, subjects and axis of oppression are central to political economic analysis (Barker 2008). Thus, consideration of the production, representation and reproduction of Football for Hope Centres (as sites of social development) inevitably leads to an analysis of power relations and their implications for equity, social justice and public good.

In 2005, FIFA added a third element to its mission. In addition to seeking to 'develop the game' and 'touch the world', the Federation also aspires to 'build a better future'. The third dimension to FIFA's mission is touted as representing a decisive break from 'charitable giving' to a post-humanitarian order characterised by 'development cooperation'. Politically, FIFA's aspiration to 'build a better future' is designed to capture the popular imagination and situate the Federation among organizations seeking to invest in solutions to social problems. According to Blatter (2005):

> FIFA has a long humanitarian tradition and has been supporting social and human development initiatives for decades. But in 2005, following the decision of the FIFA Congress to add a new pillar to our mission ('build a better future'), our organization was prompted to take its social responsibility even more seriously. Since then, FIFA's approach has seen a critical evolution: a change from 'charitable giving' to meaningful 'socially responsible, involved, and committed' development cooperation. We are convinced that the driving force of our social engagement can be – and must be – football itself and that is why the Football for Hope Movement is considered a topic of strategic importance at FIFA (http://www.fifa.com/mm/51/56/34/footballforhope_e_47827.pdf).

In this discourse of legitimation, FIFA's new approach is linked to the concepts of 'socially responsible, involved, and committed development cooperation'. This requires the corollary framing of 'charitable giving' as socially irresponsible, uninvolved, and uncommitted in both commercial and developmental terms. Following FIFA's avowed ideological break from 'charitable giving', the 2006 FIFA World Cup fund-raising campaign raised over USD 30 million for the construction and running costs of six SOS villages in Brazil, Mexico, Nigeria, South Africa, Ukraine and Vietnam. Relatively, the 2010 FIFA World Cup Campaign is expected to raise USD 10 million for the construction of 20 Football for Hope Centres across Africa (FIFA 2007b). Ironically, 'charitable giving' is as much in

evidence in the former as it is in the latter project, considering that the core strategy of these projects is to not foster community self-sufficiency.

Embedded in the third pillar of FIFA's mission is the assertion that the 'driving force' of FIFA's 'social engagement can be – and must be – football itself' (http://www.fifa.com/mm/51/56/34/footballforhope_e_47827.pdf). This ideology begs a number of questions. For example, what are the broader developmental benefits that have been realized from the previous or extant FIFA's social engagements like the '6 villages for 2006' relative to the pre-engagement baseline? Is FIFA's development cooperation only sustainable to the extent that the operatives are able to deliver long-term football marketing and other efficiency benefits envisaged by FIFA and its corporate allies? To be sure, FIFA cannot successfully pursue its mission to 'build a better future' without paying due attention to sustainable football production, reproduction and consumption processes. It is vital however to ensure the externalities of football-driven projects and processes do not lead to market failure in social developmental terms due to opportunity costs, irrelevance, rent-seeking, social distraction, paternalism, inefficiencies, and inequities.

A crucial theme in the discourse of '20 Centres for 2010' is that of Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR). This is how FIFA frames its CSR:

> In 2005 world football's governing body was one of the first sports federations to create an internal corporate social responsibility (CSR) department to manage the organization's duties towards people, society and the planet, and to conduct programmes in the field of Development through Football (as distinct from its football development tasks). Following the United Nations' appeal to industrialized countries for development financing, FIFA agreed to assign at least 0.7 per cent of its total revenues to its CSR initiatives, which as of 2005 are grouped under the umbrella of Football for Hope.

Clearly, FIFA's notion of CSR foregrounds image construction (sensitivity, sense of duty, altruism), football economy (less than one percent of revenues), neoliberal discourse (development financing), a new sovereignty (FIFA as a supra-national organ of the industrialized countries), and suppresses CSR as an obligation (FIFA agreed to assign a fraction of its revenue following an appeal). Moreover, it offers targets of FIFA's CRS initiatives a sense of identity as members of Football for Hope Movement, conceptually packed as:

> The key element of the strategic alliance between FIFA and streetfootballworld, created to enhance dialogue and collaboration among football associations, committed clubs and players, professional leagues and commercial partners

as well as local organizations advancing social development (http://www.fifa.com/mm/51/56/34/footballforhope_e_47827.pdf).

According to FIFA:

> The objective of the Football for Hope Movement is to establish a quality seal for sustainable social and human development programmes focusing on football as the central tool in the areas of Health Promotion, Peace Building, Children's Rights & Education, Anti-Discrimination & Social Integration and the Environment, thus supporting best practice in the field. The programmes must be aimed at children and young people and use football as an instrument to promote participation and dialogue. The movement aims to fully utilize the power of football in society to contribute to the achievement of the UN Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) (http://www.fifa.com/mm/51/56/34/footballforhope_e_47827.pdf).

Ostensibly, the goal of Football for Hope Movement is to cater to children and young people in predetermined programmatic areas – areas that depends on a specialized knowledge base – the discipline of football. Thus, the objective is to scoop up potential football players before they turn to other sports. Not only does this focal strategy obscure issues of gender, race, class, nation, disability, and other social factors; it homogenizes children and youth by ignoring that these social groups vary widely in their sporting interests and material conditions. Although FIFA's programmatic areas are purportedly aimed at children and young people, it is questionable that this population has been excluded from the 'strategic alliance' that constitutes the Football for Hope Movement. It cannot be presumed that children and young people are subsumed under the unexamined and idealized categories of 'committed clubs and players'. The notion of Football for Hope Movement as currently articulated in FIFA's development rhetoric elides the distinction between football development and social development, and thereby also between broad developmental needs of children and youth and the vested interests of those privileged to participate and excel in football. Given that 'representation is policy' as much in development arena as elsewhere, the apparent exclusion of children and youth (as distinct from clubs, players and leagues) from the composition of Football for Hope Movement implies that germane developmental interests of specific groups of young people are unlikely to be represented in the policy decision-making processes that feed into FIFA's programme design aimed at them.

The Khayelitsha Development Forum reportedly spearheaded a request on behalf of the community to host the first of Africa's 20 centres. During the official ground-breaking ceremony held in Khayelitsha in Cape Town on May 25, 2009. Dan Plato, the Executive Mayor of Cape Town is reported on the FIFA's website to have said:

> The City of Cape Town is delighted that the Football for Hope Centre will form part of Cape Town's regeneration programme for Khayelitsha, which includes the 'Violence Prevention through Urban Upgrading' programme. 'Through these initiatives, we will make the Khayelitsha community a safer environment for young people to learn and play.'

Here, the language of the Football for Hope Movement was co-opted by the Mayor to further the neoliberal economic agenda which favors, amongst other things, free market and re-branding approaches to developing urban spaces of consumption and leisure (Sze 2009). The 'we' in the quotation and the explicit reference to making the 'Khayelitsha community a safer environment for young people to learn and play' discursively elide and tactically co-opt the needs, interests and difficulties of the various social groups and identities within the community. The Centre in Khayelitsha will be, according to FIFA (2009), managed by Grassroot Soccer, a South African-based non-profit organization that uses football to educate young people about HIV and AIDS and empower them with the knowledge to live HIV-free. Apparently, this particular Centre Host is experienced in a limited area of social development strategy.

Given the extremely thin literature on the social decision-making processes that informed the '20 Centres for 2010', it is not clear whether the proposed initiatives are a substitute for, or a supplement to, government provision of social services and infrastructure in the concerned disadvantaged areas. In this sense, to what extent might the '20 Centres for 2010' project crowd-out government support or discourage redistribution to the people of these areas? In line with the neoliberal ideology that emphasizes a diminished role for the public sector on account of mismanagement and corruption, FIFA assumes that the local football organizations are more efficient, influential, self-motivated and altruistic than the public providers of the envisaged services (Besley 1997). Recent studies however point to counter-narratives, showing that many NGOs in developing countries are opportunistic rent seekers, far more incline to securing their own vested interests than modifying the political economic landscape of the disadvantaged areas to aid the particular groups in whose names funds are being raised and projects are being supplied to donor institutions that demand them (Verhelst 1990; Nelson 1995; van de Walle & Nead 1996). Instead of pre-defining local football organizations as the necessary and sufficient project actors or Centre Hosts, FIFA should have used public dialogue to determine community problems requiring actions, and thus arrive at a more participatory approach to managing the Centres.

Notions of development have been linked to the kinds of activities or projects that are given strategic importance by governments, NGOs and donor institutions. For example, development may be approached through (i) wealth creation

to bring about redistribution through economic growth; (ii) simultaneous focus on social and economic development to realize both growth and redistribution; and (iii) a focus on personal, social, political and environmentally sustainable services that maximize people's welfare and developmental needs (growth through distribution) (Amin 1990; Burkey 1993; Daly 1996; Mkandawire 1999; Dollar & Kraay 2000). FIFA, in its CSR rhetoric, seems to have adopted the third approach to development. Although other dimensions of social investments and services like water supplies, energy, transport system, communication, food security, and sustainable livelihood (Thirlwall 2006; Mizhirai 2009) seem to have been excluded from the Federation's development strategy, the selected areas of Health Promotion, Peace Building, Children's Rights & Education, Anti-Discrimination & Social Integration and the Environment are significantly correlated and can make some contribution to development. This is because anti-discrimination and recognition of rights can enhance equitable access to education and health services, create social harmony and integration, and thus generate positive externalities within the framework of environmental reforms and ecological economics (Daly & Cobb 1994). However, the personal and social development approach adopted by FIFA requires broadened resource bases for the sustainability of concomitant services. Without investments to boost economic activities in the community and generate the necessary capital to support social critical services, this approach can exacerbate social inequities; perpetuate dependency and the kind of limitless 'charitable giving' that FIFA seeks to abandon.

FIFA intends, as we have seen, to directly aim its programmes at children and youth. This is a valid approach so long as the developmental needs of the youngsters and the social-economic factors enabling or disabling their holistic development, are fully understood (Pezzullo 1994). It is vital however, to remember that any approach that minimizes the spread of public goods could contribute to negative externalities. Whenever the social-economic factors affecting the well-being of adults are not simultaneously addressed alongside developmental needs of children and youth, these youngsters become vulnerable to the spread of public 'bads' like diseases, ignorance, poverty, rights violations and social polarization. The challenge is to take into account the institutional context of, and constraints on development policies aimed at children and youth without discounting the need to substantially strengthen collective efficacy at family and community levels.

Clearly, the political-economic basis of the '20 Centres for 2010' opens up inter-discursive spaces (Gramsci 1971) for the civil society in Africa to inter-discursively reread the ideological framing of the '20 Centres for 2010' and to re-imagine alternative arrangements that recognize the subjectivities effaced by the FIFA's homogenising discourse of social development. The negotiation of these

spaces requires an awareness of the complex interests, needs, expectations and social relations in the target communities.

Football for Hope Centres as Texts

Following Jencks (1991 and the postmodernist stress on textuality, the proposed Football for Hope Centres can be read as texts with embodied signs and cultural codes that enable the construction of certain values (Baudrillard 1981; Lash 1994). In other words, the discursive construction of the '20 Centres for 2010' entails an interpretive imposition of what is valuable and the production of certain subjectivities, desires, perceptions and collective identity in political economic terms (Grewal & Kaplan 1994; Shapiro 1993; Peterson 2002). It is the deconstruction of this interpretive imposition that follows.

According to FIFA (2007c), each Football for Hope Centre:

> …will consist of a building with rooms to provide public health services and informal education, office space, common space for community gatherings, and a small-size artificial turf pitch (40x20m). The construction will be su-pervised by FIFA and streetfootballworld and implemented by Architecture for Humanity, a charitable organization that services communities in need, and Greenfields, a leader in the construction and development of synthetic turf systems.

Contrary to the increasing recognition within the discourses of globalization that space is fragmented and differentiated (Kayatekin & Ruccio 1998), the spatiality of the Football for Hope Centres has been conceived as homogeneous and uniform. Paradoxically, the Centre Hosts will receive the same kind of infrastruc-ture irrespective of their resource and client bases, types of development issues being tackled, and the extent to which they further or lessen inefficiencies and inequities. Thus, the structural contexts differentiating localities and local football organizations are ignored. Although the Centres are touted as having rooms for various functions, the 'legitimate' purposes have been hierarchically specified. The modernist assumption in the FIFA's definition of the Centres is that 'form fol-lows function', or 'space follows action' since the actions or events to be enacted in every segment of the Centres have been pre-determined. In other words, these Centres have not been conceptualized as both forms and functions in which the functions can be deconstructed by ways of juxtaposition, superimposition, alteration, accommodation, *ad hoc* programming and gendered relations to space (Tschumi 1996). Apparently, the 'communities in need' have been defined as fixed and stable rather than hybridized groupings with heterogeneous cultures and needs – hence it is assumed that the same space or form would be, in its substance, the appropriate one for all of them. The concerned communities in need' in this context should have been empowered through respectful negotiations to choose between using their portions of the earmarked $10 million for a football centre

or for needs-based projects like upgrading schools and hospitals, improving irrigation, making boreholes, establishing micro-credit schemes, agribusinesses or inclusive ventures.

A major justification for the '20 Centres for 2010' is the assertion (without substantiation) that the project will provide local football organizations (Centre Hosts) with 'vital infrastructure' to pursue their social development objectives. What positive effects have these Centre Hosts had on their communities over the years? With which institutions have they been bench-marked? Would aiding local football organizations help produce better developmental outcomes at lower costs than funding the public sector? Currently, FIFA has no accessible database comparing the developmental activities of football and non-football NGOs to allow us estimate whether local football organizations are more efficient and effective than other NGOs or the public sectors in the areas of Health Promotion, Peace Building, Children's Rights & Education, Anti-Discrimination & Social Integration and the Environment, controlling for social factors like gender, age, class, race, location, ethnicity, disability, sexuality and religion. This lack of effort to generate counterfactuals is curious in light of the claim by Danny Jordaan (FIFA 2007a) that the Centres will 'make a real difference for all of Africa…, giving thousands of African youngsters the chance of a better future'.

FIFA (2007d) attempts to manage the centrality of the politics of the built environment by deploying the discourses of community empowerment and environmental protection:

> Community involvement and ownership are crucial for the success and sustainability of the centres. The local community will be involved in the entire process from the very first step, including the architectural design for the centre, construction and, whenever possible, the involvement of the local workforce and skill-building programmes. Architectural design and setup will also meet national environmental standards and make use of environmental innovations.

This quotation should give us pause, considering the fact that:

> The construction will be supervised by FIFA and streetfootballworld and implemented by Architecture for Humanity, a charitable organization that services communities in need, and Greenfields, a leader in the construction and development of synthetic turf systems.

The supervisors/implementers seem to have conducted an instrumental, means-end analysis of how to help the 'communities in need' and paternalistically decided on an ethnocentric '20 Centres for 2010' based on assumptions that ignore how material conditions shaping men and women's lives vary dramatically across space and time. Moreover, the Center Hosts and building contractors have been

problematically depoliticized – as raceless, genderless, disinterested and benevolent parties. But these are constellations of special interests seeking access to $10million dollars in design, procurement, construction and management fees!

In the currently circulating texts of the Football for Hope Centres as designed/produced by FIFA, there are no competing narratives concerning the size of public space required, ownership of the deed of title, impact on surrounding neighborhood in terms of displacement and gentrification; and who constitutes the 'local work force' or community representatives – all of which have implications for understanding how gender operates within the sphere of the 20 Centres for 2010. Here, again, it is essential to stress the importance of community agency and alternative discourses to reshape and transform the way the Centres are enacted at specific sites. Indeed, the counter-discourses of the civil society and disadvantaged communities are constitutive of how the proposed project is eventually organized and implemented.

Interpellation: Hailing 'Football for Hope Centres'

Names matter. As such, what the '20 Centres for 2010' are called require ideological unpacking. The naming of the '20 Centres for 2010' as Football for Hope Centres is a thoroughly paternalistic political act, made the more powerful by being couched in the historical symbolism of the 2010 FIFA World Cup and the moral rhetoric of hope (as social development). According to Haraway (1988), the practice of naming is body politics; the politics of controlling the named bodies. In his work on ideological subject formation Althusser (1989) gave an example of a policeman, hailing 'Hey You', and thus creating a 'You' to which, the passer-by answers, accepting the identity imposed by the policeman. The act of hailing or interpellation in the Althusserian logic is designed to subordinate others and prescribe what they should think, believe and practise. In this sense, FIFA has interpelleted not only the users of the 20 Centres (as football consumers/practitioners and members of a global football alliance), but also the Centres themselves. The politics of representing and interpellating both the 20 Centres and the recipient communities have implications for relations of production (the determination, legitimation, provision and evaluation of social services at the Centres) and the broader social relations in the project sites. In line with FIFA's favorite metaphors, the extant name of the Centres invokes football (as the driving force), with power far beyond the boundaries of the pitch, to catalyze social development (acknowledged as hope) in disadvantaged areas across Africa. These mechanical, chemical, and geopolitical metaphors implicitly cast football as a totalizing, limitless force capable of eliminating any adverse reaction or spatial barriers to linear development processes.

The trope of 'Football for Hope' feeds on the suboptimal material conditions in underprivileged areas and objectifies people of these areas as players in a

development game, perhaps, by the equation of children and youth with 'everybody'. It precludes the social change wrought by the disadvantaged areas with means other than football and suppresses the complexities and discontinuities that mark sources of hope. To be sure, the current name can mean that football could pave the way for a better or more tolerable life, offering real chances and new possibilities, enhancing mass realization of potentials and providing a wand to ward off personal and social miseries. However, viewed in its relation to soccer production, distribution and consumption, 'Football for Hope' also means 'Hope for Football'. In this sense the current name of the Centres has the effect of raising expectations that cannot be realistically accomplished, trapping the youngsters in disadvantaged areas in a perpetual game of catch-up – held in bond by the logic of transnational football capital and assigned subject statuses.

Part of the challenges of re-envisioning and re-connecting the Football for Hope Centres with the disadvantaged communities therefore is to have a series of public dialogues on how the Centres should be named, along with how their functions should be scripted, sustained and evaluated (Mathews 1999). The aim is to call attention to the mutability of any sign, code, imagery or text and their political economy – and thereby problematize and de-center dominant emblems and labels. Arguably, the Football for Hope Centres themselves are a form of what Althusser (1989) referred to as Ideological State Apparatuses (ISAs), and permitting the disadvantaged communities to exercise their agency by giving the buildings alternative or oppositional names is an act of 'hailing' or ideological 'interpellation' that may be resisted by FIFA. As Rosemblum & Travis (2000: 6) noted:

> Because naming may involve a redefinition of self, an assertion of power, and a rejection of other's ability to impose an identity, social change movements often lay claim to a new name, and opponents to the movement may signal their opposition by continuing to use the old name.

Needless to say, self-determined names would be empowering, inspiring the communities to socially reconstruct the discourses of the Centres according to specific cultural needs and aspirations, and to mobilize the identities and practices constituted around the projects towards germane developmental outcomes.

Footballization of the UN Millennium Development Goals (MDGs)

A number of international agencies like FIFA and the UN increasingly regard sport as a self-evidently effective technology of engendering social development and peace, using cliché-ridden tropes such as 'driving force' 'central tool' and 'powerful instrument' to make the relationship between sport and development

appear linear, natural and eternal. Regarding the praises often heaped on sport for promoting a multitude of developmental outcomes, Coatler (2008:48) argues that sport does not automatically engender the many social outcomes that are often associated with it, and that any 'decontextualized, romanticized, and communitarian generalizations about the value of sport for development' calls for wariness and scrutiny.

Currently, there are sport-based initiatives in various countries such as Kosovo, Palestine, Mozambique, Sierra Leone, Rwanda, Malawi, Uganda, Kenya, Colombia and Brazil (Ogi 2005; Sugden & Wallis 2007) designed to help children and youth play together, learn athletic and psycho-social skills, keep fit and have fun. The prevailing accounts rarely use interpretive, reflexive and longitudinal methodologies to enable us to appreciate the material and non-material impact of these initiatives across space and time. In other words, the use-values of these sport projects are asserted without any verifiable empirical demonstration. The barely concealed assumption in the current conceptualization of these projects is that if the children and youth in the zones of trouble and privation could play together, all would be well in political, economic and humanitarian terms. This romantic conception of the use-values of football or any other sport is not coincidental; rather it is emblematic of the political power of supra- or trans-national organizations to impose their own construction of what count as legitimate knowledge (Bourdieu 1977) in the social control and regulation of young people (Hartmann & Depro 2006; Spaaij 2009). Moreover, it is clearly in the interests of those organizations to ensure the domination of these reductionistic and anecdotal accounts, as they enhance the essentialism, inevitability and legitimacy of their pet projects.

Lexically, the Football for Hope Movement appropriates terms from the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs). Environmentally, it embraces ecological responsibility. Socially, it envisions a healthy, vibrant, peaceful and integrated society. Ethically, it endorses gender equality, anti-discrimination, and children's rights and education. Proactively, it supports the optimization of health promotion for disease awareness/prevention. Intrinsically, it seeks to develop a global alliance for football development and development through football. However, the forthcoming Football Hope Festival 2010, meant to showcase the achievement of the movement to the world, valorises competition at the expense of social development outcomes. According to FIFA (2007e):

> The Football for Hope Festival 2010 will showcase and promote best practice in the field of Social Development through Football. The teams, made up of boys and girls aged between 15 and 18 will represent local organizations that use football for positive social change in the areas of Health Promotion, Peace Building, Children's Rights & Education, Anti-Discrimination & Social

Integration and the Environment. Participants will be selected in recognition of their personal commitment to the work of their home organizations. These organizations are implementing partners in the Football for Hope Movement, the key element of the strategic alliance between FIFA and streetfootballworld.

The participating mixed-gender teams will demonstrate their silky skills in a fast-paced, high-intensity tournament to decide the 2nd Streetfootballworld Champion. A street football stadium will be constructed in the heart of Alexandra, providing spectators an up-close view of the five-a-side action. And there won't be a referee in sight - fair play rules mean that any disagreements between the teams are resolved through dialogue.

The use of tournaments to 'showcase and promote' best practice in the field of social development is symbolic of how the MDGs have been appropriated for footballist ends. The festival rests on the assumption that both football and development are competitive and 'a fast-paced, high-intensity tournament' to produce Streetfootballworld Champions will bring the fantasy of development to life. This is a fallacy of developmentalism - embedded in a globalist discourse - which measures social change in terms of universalization of production and consumption of certain material and symbolic commodities and tied to neoliberal theories of development which view performance as central to national competitiveness in the global marketplace (Palan 2000; Carrington & McDonald 2009). In effect, the Football Hope Festival 2010 would put the local football organizations under pressure to focus on producing winning teams in order to secure access to global circuits of money. To be sure, local football organizations will participate in the tournament festival while spouting social development fervour, but it does not follow that they care about the attainment of the UN Millennium Development Goals, which are to:

1. Halve extreme poverty and hunger
2. Achieve universal primary education
3. Empower women and promote gender equality
4. Reduce child mortality
5. Improve maternal health
6. Combat HIV/AIDS and other diseases like malaria
7. Ensure environmental sustainability
8. Develop a global partnership for development.

Leaving open the possibility that future impact assessments of the Football for Hope projects in the areas of Health Promotion, Peace Building, Children's Rights & Education, Anti-Discrimination & Social Integration and the Environment will

be aligned with the achievement of the MDGs, it is unfortunately the case that the current manner of showcasing the best practice in the field of social development by FIFA promotes the footballization of the Millennium Development Goals through the strategy of high-stake competition, spectacular consumption and place marketing. Instead of a grand football tournament, evaluation of best practices might include a scrutiny of how gender, race, class and other subjectivities are mobilized, restricted or excluded in the local football organizations' conceptions and practice of social development. The civil society is in the unique position to call attention to the transgression and transformation needed in this sphere, armed with research evidence about the norms, practices, incentives, capabilities, achievements, constraints, and special interests surrounding the '20 Centres for 2010' in different locales.

Power of Legacies and Legacies of Power

As alluded to earlier in this chapter, the '20 Centres for 2010' have been represented by FIFA as post-event legacies for catalyzing development across Africa. Without doubt, event legacies have symbolic and material benefits, including the ones alluded to on the FIFA's website, such as providing facilities for recreation, community gathering, informal education and health services. Indeed, research evidence has demonstrated that post-event legacies like the Football for Hope Centres and stadiums can help promote sport growth, social order, tourism, social interaction, income generation, place attachment, community identity, urban regeneration, 'normalization' of at-risk youth, cultural celebration, place marketing, generation of social capital, shared architectural heritage and sponsors' public image. Nonetheless, these legacies could negatively impact the community in terms of opportunity costs, displacements, expropriation, essentialization/naturalization of one sport, gentrification, privatization of public space, environmental racism, gendered co-optation and exploitation; place–based class conflict and exclusion (Matheson & Baade 2004; Freeman 2006; Sze 2009; Tranter & Lowes 2009). What this research evidence implies is that event legacies carry symbolic and material power. The challenge is to make this power count for equitable and sustainable development.

As a globalization-driven project (characterized by strategic alliance of transnational networks, development financing, and restructuring of selected local football organizations) the '20 Centres for 2010' provide opportunities for Centre Hosts to benefit technically, financially and infrastructurally. But attempts to strengthen local football organizations may not necessarily transform the disadvantaged communities in palpable ways. Disadvantaged areas are so-called due to demographic and economic characteristics that increase poverty rates (Massey & Denton 1993; Fox & Porca 2001; Pezzini 2001; Guinness 2002; Peters 2009), such as:

- Economic dislocation
- Unemployment/underemployment
- Housing problem
- Infrastructural decay
- Increased crime rate
- Dysfunctional families
- Environmental degradation
- Less diversified industrial base
- Low levels of educational attainment
- Subordinated, poorly educated and unskilled women
- Higher number of minorities and immigrants
- Inadequate social services
- High percentages of abused, neglected, poorly educated and abandoned children
- Overpopulation
- Segregation/racial isolation

In this context, disadvantaged areas not only need strategic infrastructure, enhanced public services, and bureaucratic structures to create jobs, but also in-ward investments to sustain endogenous development in a synergistic manner.

The challenge for post-event legacy developers and their partners therefore is to select programmes and processes that can prudently and strategically promote equity and improve the well-being of the community as a whole. In this context, the Football for Hope projects can help (en)gender development in the disadvantaged communities to the extent that their discourses are deconstructed and reconstructed to promote agency, empowerment, and self-determination; and to the extent that provision of infrastructure for local football organizations and youth-focused programmes are strategically complemented with mutually-reinforcing mechanisms aimed at achieving enterprise and institution building outcomes.

Gendered Implications of the Football for Hope Centres

Rhetorical tropes of 'change', 'hope', 'legacy' and 'development' have been in-voked by FIFA to 'naturalise' the '20 Centres for 2010' and infuse them with social desirability and neutrality. But institutionally, these Centres are products of FIFA's hegemonic prescription and thus constitute potential sites of domination and subordination. Viewed from the perspectives of Foucault's (1991) concept of 'govermentality', that the state and transnational organizations are constituted by discourses and paradigms that allow, sustain, promote, reproduce or on the contrary repress, hinder and marginalize certain forms of identities, strategies,

goals and gender regimes, the proposed '20 Centres for 2010' cannot be re-garded as an innocent and neutral community improvement project. Accord-ingly, the '20 Centres for 2010' project needs be scrutinized for the kind of gender regime it promotes and what that means in terms of social justice.

How does the '20 Centres for 2010' project reinforce relations of power and hierarchy between the sexes? The texts found on the FIFA's website do not give gender issues the extended consideration they deserve. Discussions about the status of women in the proposed project is extremely rare and references to the girl-child are sketchy when they occur, like the Centres will 'improve gender equal-ity', 'football for education ... focusing on the female gender', and 'teams, made up of boys and girls aged between 15 and 18 will represent local organizations that use football for positive social change' (FIFA 2007e & 2007g). However, a number of implicit gendered assumptions could be discerned from the current articulations of the project, including:

1. The local football organizations (Centre Hosts) are versed in gender issues and have integrated gender concerns into their policies and procedures;

2. Mere mention of boys and girls as project beneficiaries implies that their situated perspectives and voices have been acknowledged;

3. Children and youth have the same needs regardless of gender, class, reli-gion, (dis)ability, ethnicity and geographical location; therefore pre-deter-mined policy areas will meet their developmental needs equally;

4. Documented experiences of men/women, boys/girls regarding FIFA's previous humanitarian initiatives are not necessary to foreground new projects;

5. Gender experiences and expectations do not impinge on narratives and discourses of sport-based development projects;

6. Children/youth/women/men view and encounter sport-based project the same way.

An indication that the Football for Hope project and its management is highly gendered is the fact that all the spokespersons for the project have been male-bodied, for there is not a female among those touting the 20 Centres' means and ends. In other words, the widely circulating discourses and narratives of the Football for Hope Centers have been dominated by men, very elite ones at that, while women's voices and standpoints on the project have been muted. Clearly, the '20 Centres for 2010' project is female co-optative, leaving untouched the unequal gender relations and matrix of domination masked within local football organi-zations and the Football for Hope Movement. By implication, the '20 Centres for 2010' project, designed as an institutional solution to 'disadvantage' is gendered in just the same way the political and socio-economic processes that result in social disadvantage are gendered. Thus, in-depth explorations of gender in the Centres

are necessary to reveal and counter hegemonic, disciplinary, structural, and inter-personal matrix of oppression (Foucault 1977; Crenshaw 1991; Collin 2009).

Conclusion: Football for Hope Centres and Africa's Development

This chapter has explored a range of discourses structuring the '20 Centres for 2010', highlighting their implicit gendered assumptions. The chapter argues that the grand narratives of continuous community betterment through football overlook or ignore discontinuities and dissonances that belie the disciplinary strategies and functions of sport as a modernization project. As a developmental model, the '20 Centres for 2010' provides a framework for tackling social problems in selected disadvantaged African communities and evaluating cross-sectional changes in the dimensions that the model prescribed as socially desirable. The framework of this developmental model causally links football to improvements in Health Promotion, Peace Building, Children's Rights & Education, Anti-Discrimination & Social Integration and the Environment. Although the model implicitly assumes that '20 Centres for 2010' project will benefit everyone, its underlying structures and relations suggest otherwise. As currently conceived, the Centres may maximize private goods at the expense of public ones (i.e. increase inequities) due to several reasons, including paternalism, rent-seeking by local football organizations; a narrow focus on one sport, and dominance of masculine perspectives. Thus, appropriate mechanisms are needed to ensure a level playing field that will yield equitable developmental outcomes. In this context, the local governments are needed to prevent failure of the Centres by means of policies to increase incentives to sustainability and gender equity. The role of the civil society is also critical in providing research-based evidence as to what football-based interventions and alternative developmental frameworks lead to what kinds of effects. As mentioned at the outset, the '20 Centres for 2010' project is work in progress. Only holistic and sustained gender analysis will help bring into clear relief the ways the Centres's strategies, goals and activities enhance public good or reproduce domination and subordination.

References

Althusser, L., 1989, Ideology and ideological state apparatuses in *Lenin and Philosophy and Other Essays,* London: New Left Books. pp. 170-86.

Amin, S., 1990, *Delinking: Towards a Polycentric World*, London: Zed Books.

Barker, C., 2008, *Cultural Studies: Theory & Practice*, London: SAGE.

Baudrillard, J., 1981, *For a Critique of the Political Economy of the Sign*, St. Louis, MO: Telos Press.

Besley, T., 1997, Political Economy of Alleviating Poverty: Theory and Institutions, in Bruno M. & B. Pleskovic, eds., *Annual World Bank Conference on Development Economics 1996*, Washington: The International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, pp. 117-134.

Bourdieu, P., 1977, *Outline of a Theory of Practice*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Burkey, S., 1993, *People first: A Guide to Self-reliant, Participatory Rural Development*, London: Zed Books.

Carrington, B., and McDonald, I., 2009, *Marxism, Cultural Studies and Sport*, London: Routledge.

Coatler, F., 2008, Sport-in-Development: Development for and through Sport?, in Nicholson M. and R. Hoye, eds., *Sport and social capital*, Oxford: Elsevier Butterworth-Heinemann. pp. 39-67.

Collins, P.H., 2009, *Black Feminist Thoughts*, New York: Routledge Classics.

Crenshaw, K.W., 1991, Mapping the Margins: Intersectionality, Identity Politics and Violence against Women of Color. *Stanford Law Review*, Vol. 43, No. 6, pp. 1241-1249.

Daly, H.E., 1996, *Beyond Growth: The Economics of Sustainable Development*, Boston: Beacon Press.

Daly, H.E., and Cobb, J., 1994, *For the Common Good: Redirecting the Economy Toward Community, the Environment and a Sustainable Future*, Boston: Beacon Press.

Dollar, D., and Kraay, A., 2000, *Growth is Good for thePoor*, Washington, D.C.: The World Bank Development Research Group.

Fairclough, N., and Wodak, R., 1997, Critical Discourse Analysis, in T.A van Dijk ,ed., *Discourse as Social Interaction*, London: Sage. pp.258-284.

FIFA, 2005, *Football for Hope: Football's Commitment to Social Development* - jointly published by FIFA and streetfootballworld.org

(http://www.fifa.com/mm/51/56/34/footballforhope_e_47827.pdf). June 29, 2009.

FIFA, 2007a, Official '20 Centres for 2010' campaign launched at Preliminary Draw in Durban. http://www.fifa.com/aboutfifa/worldwideprograms/footballforhope/news/newsid=641383.html#a+perspective+global+game. July 03, 2009.

FIFA, 2007b, *20 Centres for 2010*. http://www.fifa.com/aboutfifa/worldwideprograms/20centres2010.html. July o3, 2009.

FIFA, 2007c, 20 Centres for 2010: What are the Football for Hope Centres?

http://www.fifa.com/aboutfifa/worldwideprograms/20centres2010.html. July 03, 2009.

FIFA, 2007d, 20 Centres for 2010 Owned by the Community http://www.fifa.com/aboutfifa/worldwideprograms/20centres2010.html. July 03, 2009.

FIFA, 2007e, Football for Hope Festival 2010 http://www.fifa.com/aboutfifa/worldwideprograms/footballforhope/news/newsid=641385.html#football+hope+festival+2010. Accessed July 03, 2009.

FIFA, 2007f, Brand - Our commitment. http://www.fifa.com/aboutfifa/federation/mission.html.

December 26, 2009.

FIFA, 2007g, Football + Responsibility + Sustainable Programmes + Commitment = The Football for Hope Movement. http://www.fifa.com/aboutfifa/worldwideprograms/footballforhope/mission.html. July 03, 2009.

FIFA, 2009, *First Football for Hope Centre breaks new ground. http://www.fifa.com/aboutfifa/worldwideprograms/releases/newsid=1062058.html#first+football+hope+centre+breaks+ground.* July 03, 2009.

Foucault, M., 1977, *Language, Counter-memory, Practice*, Ithaca, Connell University Press.

Foucault, M., 1991, Governmentality, in G. Burchell, C. Gordon and P. Miller, eds., *The Foucault Effect: Studies in Governmentality*, Hemel Hempstead: Harvester Wheatsheaf. pp. 87–104.

Fox, W.F., and Porca, S., 2001, Investing in Rural Infrastructure, *International Regional Science Review*, Vol. 24, No. 1, pp. 103-133.

Freeman, L., 2006, *There Goes the 'Hood: Views of Gentrification from the Ground Up*, Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Gramsci, A., 1971, *Selection From the Prison Notebooks*, London: Lawrence & Wishart.

Grewal , I., and Kaplan, C., eds., 1994, *Scattered Hegemonies: Post-modernity and Transnational Feminist Practices*, Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.

Guinness, P., 2002, *Migration*, London: Hodder & Stoughton.

Haraway, D., 1988, Situated Knowledges: The Science Question in Feminism and the Privilege of Partial Perspective, *Feminist Studies*, Vol. 14, No. 3, pp. 575-599.

Hartmann, D., and Depro, B., 2006), Rethinking Sports-based Community Crime Prevention: A preliminary Analysis of the Relationship between Midnight Basketball and Urban Crime Rates, *Journal of Sport & Social Issues*, Vol. 30, No. 2, pp. 180-196.

Jencks, C., 1991, *The Language of Modern Architecture*, London: Academy.

Kayatekin, S.A., and Ruccio, D.F., 1998, Global Fragments: Subjectivity and Class Politics in Discourses of Globalization, *Economy and Society*, Vol. 27, No.1, pp. 74-96.

Lash, S., 1994, *Economies of Signs and Space*, London: Sage.

Massey, D.S., and Denton, N.A., 1993 *American Apartheid: Segregation and the Making of the Underclass*, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Matheson, V.A., and Baade, R.A., 2004, Mega-sporting Events in Developing Nations: Playing the Way to Prosperity? *The South African Journal of Economics*, Vol. 72, pp. 1085-1096.

Mathews, D., 1999, *Politics for People*, Urbana: University of Illinois Press.

Nelson, P., 1995, *The World Bank and NGOs: The Limits of Apolitical Development*, New York: St. Martin's.

Ogi, A., 2005),*Opening Address* at the first International Forum on Sport & Development, held at Bad Boll, Germany on February 13-15.

Palan, R., 2000, *Global Political Economy: Contemporary Theories*, London: Routledge.

Peters, D. J., 2009, Typology of American Poverty. *International Regional Science Review*, Vol. 32, No.1, pp.19-39.

Peterson, V.S., 2002, Rewriting (Global) Political Economy as Reproductive, Productive and Virtual (Foucauldian) Economies, *International Feminist Journal of Politics*, Vol. 4, No. 1, pp. 1-30.

Pezzini, M., 2001, Rural Policy Lessons from OECD Countries, *International Regional Science Review*, Vol. 24, No. 1, pp. 134-145.

Pezzullo, S., 1994, The IAF and Youth Programmes in Latin America and the Caribbean. *Grassroots Development*, Vol. 18, No. 2, pp. 13-18.

Rosemblum, K.E., and Travis, T.C., 2000, *The Meaning of Difference*, Boston: McGraw-Hill.

Shapiro, M., 1993, *Reading 'Adam Smith': Desire, History and Value*, Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Spaaij, R., 2009, Sport as a Vehicle for Social Mobility and Regulation of Disadvantaged Urban Youth, *International Review for the Sociology of Sport*, Vol. 44, No. 2-3, pp. 247-264.

Sugden, J., and Wallis, J., eds., 2007, *Football for Peace: Teaching and Playing Sport for Conflict Resolution in the Middle East*, Aachen: Meyer & Meyer.

Sze, J., 2009, Sports and Environmental Justice: "Games" of Race, Place, Nostalgia, and Power in Neoliberal New York City, *Journal of Sport & Social Issues*, Vol.33, No.2, pp.111-129.

Thirlwall, A.P., 2006, *Growth and Development with Special Reference to Developing Economies*, Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan.

Tranter, P.J., and Lowes, M., 22009, Life in the Fast Lane: Environmental, Economic, and Public Health Outcomes of Motor Spectacles in Australia. *Journal of Sport & Social Issues*, Vol.33, No.2, pp.150-168.

Tschumi, B., 1996, *Architecture and Disjunctions*, Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.

Van de Walle, D., and Nead, K., eds., 1996, *Public Spending and the Poor: Theory and Evidence*, New Haven, CT: Yale University.

Verhelst, T. G., 1990, *No Life without Roots: Culture and Development*, London: Zed Books ltd.

Weedon, C., 1996, *Feminist Practice and Poststructuralist Theory*, Oxford: Blackwell.