

Spring 5-2016

Re-imagining the South African Nation: Case Studies of the 1995 Rugby World Cup and the 2010 FIFA World Cup

Josh Tancer Giesler

Bates College, jgiesler@bates.edu

Follow this and additional works at: <http://scarab.bates.edu/honorsthesis>

Recommended Citation

Giesler, Josh Tancer, "Re-imagining the South African Nation: Case Studies of the 1995 Rugby World Cup and the 2010 FIFA World Cup" (2016). *Honors Theses*. 176.

<http://scarab.bates.edu/honorsthesis/176>

This Open Access is brought to you for free and open access by the Capstone Projects at SCARAB. It has been accepted for inclusion in Honors Theses by an authorized administrator of SCARAB. For more information, please contact batesscarab@bates.edu.

Re-imagining the South African Nation:
Case Studies of the 1995 Rugby World Cup and the 2010 FIFA World Cup

An Honors Thesis

Presented to

The Faculty of the Department of Sociology

Bates College

In partial fulfillment of the requirements for the
Degree of Bachelor of Arts

By

Joshua Tancer Giesler

Lewiston, Maine

March 28, 2016

Acknowledgements

I would like to express sincere gratitude to Professor Francesco Duina who worked tirelessly to motivate and inspire me to complete a project that goes far beyond what I ever thought I was capable of on my own. You encouraged me to think critically about my work and challenged me to find a deeper level of analysis and consider the implications of my findings. Words cannot express my appreciation.

To the Bates Sociology Department, particularly Professor Kane, Professor Rocque, Professor Taylor, and Professor Moodie, thank you for helping to shape my sociological lens and encouraging me to pursue research that aligned with my interests. I can say quite confidently, that I would not have pursued a major in sociology without your sustained enthusiasm and commitment to providing students with the tools to think critically about the world around us.

Mom, Dad, Eric, and Jasper, thank you for reading countless drafts, talking through ideas, listening to me complain about theories I could not quite wrap my mind around, and encouraging me to pursue this challenge. I love you guys.

Friends, particularly Ruthie and the boys of White plus Corky, thank you for talking through ideas, giving me an outlet to take my mind off of thesis, and keeping me sane throughout this process. You guys mean the world to me and I cannot wait to see what we all do next.

Lastly, I would like to dedicate this thesis to my cousin Mackenzie Forrest. She was taken away from us far too soon, but she meant more to her family and friends than she could have imagined. Mac, you will stay with me forever. Keep working on that crossover and step back jumper – 33 forever.

Table of Contents

Acknowledgements.....	ii
Abstract.....	iv
Chapter 1: Sports Mega-Events	6
Political Uses of Sports Mega-Events.....	8
Economic Uses of Sports Mega-Events	11
Ideological Uses of Sports Mega-Events	13
Nation Branding Through Sports Mega-Events.....	16
Chapter 2: South African Nationalism: Theories and Methods.....	22
Nationalism and National Identity	22
Shifts in Nationalism.....	27
Sports, Nationalism, and National Identity	29
The 1995 Rugby World Cup and 2010 FIFA World Cup as Opportunity Structures.....	30
Contextualizing the Case of South Africa.....	31
Positioning my thesis in the existing literature	33
Methods.....	34
Chapter 3: Policy and Rhetoric of the Apartheid Era	40
Chapter 4: The 1995 Rugby World Cup.....	47
1995 Rugby World Cup: Interviews and Speeches.....	47
1995 Rugby World Cup: Newspapers.....	56
Chapter 5: The 2010 FIFA World Cup.....	67
2010 FIFA World Cup: Interviews and Speeches.....	67
2010 FIFA World Cup: Newspapers.....	82
Chapter 6: Towards a New South Africa.....	92
References.....	101

Abstract

This thesis explores how South Africa, as host of the 1995 Rugby World Cup and 2010 FIFA World Cup, leveraged the events to re-imagine itself to both a national and international audience. Current research considers the relationship between nationalism, national identity, nation branding, and the contribution of sports mega-events to non-sporting objectives. However, it does not address how hosting sports mega-events can accelerate a fundamental shift in nationalism and national identity within a country undergoing democratization. Through incorporating existing literature on sports mega-events and theories of nationalism and national identity, this thesis finds that sports mega-events can be employed to devise new national narratives, underscoring the intersection between the international community, sports mega-events, and host nations. The selection of South Africa as host for these seminal events suggests an affirmation by international governing bodies that the 'Rainbow Nation' is being accepted as a modern, global player, poised to leverage the platform afforded by the events to re-imagine the country's sense of nation.

“Sport has the power to change the world. It has the power to inspire. It has the power to unite people in a way that little else can. Sport can awaken hope where there was previously only despair.”

– Nelson Mandela

Chapter 1: Sports Mega-Events

As a social institution, sports are a microcosm of their surroundings. They are affected by the social conditions of a country, serving as a lens through which a nation can be viewed. Our perceptions of sports and teams are easily influenced by the political, economic, or social context in which they exist. This ensures that national teams can be positioned as representative of a given country – imbued with the ideals of the nation – competing on an international stage for a shot at glory and an opportunity to engage in soft diplomacy. In the case of South Africa, where sports have long been an integral part of its culture, it is clear that elites have envisioned sport as one platform to achieve its nation building objectives concerning a transition from apartheid to democracy. To this point, Van Der Merwe (2007) suggests,

South African state elites have rather ingeniously, although sometimes with unintended consequences, looked to sport and sports mega-events to unite a divided society and provide a focus for national identity, and in particular, to pursue the much vaunted national agenda of national reconciliation – a related goal being the consolidation of South Africa’s young democracy and the realization of human rights for all citizens (69).

This thesis explores how, as host of the 1995 Rugby World Cup and the 2010 FIFA World Cup, South African elites and newspapers leveraged the platform of these events to propose and articulate rapid and dramatic shifts in nationalism and national identity. Studies have shown that sports mega-events possess great potential to contribute to nation building and branding, but there is more at stake. Integrating research on nation branding, sports mega-events, nationalism, and national identity, my thesis proposes that South Africa’s use of sports mega-events has helped shape the country’s sense of nation. The focus will be on South African stakeholders who envisioned these seminal events as platforms through which to promote their visions for a unified and democratic nation in which all South Africans would be fundamentally

equal in all realms of their lives. Through this I will consider how countries can transform and re-imagine themselves before national and international audiences.

My work does not intend to strictly analyze the case of South Africa, but rather how sports mega-events in general can be used to spin new national narratives. More specifically I analyze how reconstitutions of the social contract might happen in times of democratization. It is important to note that this thesis is not a study of how hosting these events facilitated change, but rather, how they served as a platform to introduce ideals of an integrated and egalitarian South Africa. That is, my research considers the increased opportunities, afforded by hosting these events and leveraged by the South African elite and media, in creating discourse and serving as a catalyst in promoting this fundamental shift in the social contract. South Africa can serve as a case study. To this end, I consider how South Africa has been able to transition from a collectivistic and ethnic form of nationalism to the individualistic and civic type in which all citizens are guaranteed full and equal participation in economic, political, and social life. The lessons learned from South Africa's experience can be applied to nations shifting from oppressive regimes to a democratic model and corresponding transformations in national identity and nationalism.

The existing literature demonstrates how national leaders and the media can utilize sports mega-events to achieve non-sporting ends, particularly in contributing to various socio-political objectives. With this in mind, in chapter one I focus on how sports mega-events can be leveraged for political, economic, and ideological purposes. However, I will also argue that these events can be used for a more fundamental purpose, the reconstitution of national identity and nationalism, which is the building block from which modern society develops. This more theoretical objective, and my methods, are explored in chapter two. Chapter three will discuss

the collectivistic and ethnic characteristics of South Africa's apartheid nation to understand how policy and rhetoric of the era marginalized the non-white population. Chapter four will evaluate political and athletic officials' speeches, and media narratives, pertaining to the 1995 Rugby World Cup. Chapter five will also consider political and athletic officials' speeches, and media narratives, concerning the 2010 FIFA World Cup. In both chapters four and five, I will analyze the extent to which South African stakeholders leveraged the events as an opportunity to facilitate South Africa's transition in nationalism and national identity. Lastly, chapter six will discuss the implications of my findings for future research.

Political Uses of Sports Mega-Events

Grix and Houlihan (2013) and Horne and Manzenreiter (2006) define mega-events as large scale, cultural occurrences which have a dramatic character, mass popular appeal, and international significance. They consider the Olympic Games and the FIFA World Cup to be top tier sports mega-events, with others such as the Rugby World Cup or UEFA European Championship comprising the second tier. As international events attract attention from a global audience, sports mega-events provide a unique platform for host nations to manipulate "sport to achieve non-sporting goals" (Grix and Houlihan 2013: 578). While sporting events still emphasize the competition itself, there are underlying political motives that increase the value of hosting sports mega-events. Black (2007) and Van der Merwe (2007) find that the pursuit of sports-mega events has become an increasingly popular political strategy as they serve as opportunities to position the host nation in a global context and pursue nation building objectives.

Cornellisen and Swart (2006) and Knott et al. (2012) find that sports mega-events are initiated and driven by social and political leaders as a means to satisfy diplomatic goals. These

goals might include enhancing the status of the nation in an international context. For example, the 2008 Olympics in Beijing were grounded in China's desire to present itself as a leader in the international community and to "integrate itself and its culture into the rest of the world" (Bodet and Lacassagne 2012: 5). Similarly, Xu (2006) finds that, leading up to the 2008 Olympics, "China, as a modernizing nation yearning for great power status, attached great political importance to the Beijing Olympics in terms of constructing national identity and pursuing international primacy" (104). The 2008 Olympic Games in Beijing were but a component of a larger Chinese agenda intent on showcasing the capacity of China as a global power.

Moreover, host nations use sports mega-events for diplomatic purposes as they strive to achieve foreign policy objectives. Cornelissen and Swart (2006), Jaksa (2011), Knott, Allen, and Swart (2012), Nauright (2013), and Xu (2006) find that sports are an important mechanism of diplomacy as they offer opportunities for national image enhancement and profiling. Specifically, nations "use mega-events to meet specific political or foreign policy goals: as a way of signaling particular messages to the international community; and as a means of engaging in international activities far beyond what objective measures of their international capacity would be (i.e. 'punching above their weight')" (Cornelissen and Swart 2006: 111). Host nations use this form of soft power, as a foreign policy tool, to articulate a message to an international audience about the capacity and strength of a nation – such as the successful management and execution of the event – to prove their worth and standing in an increasingly globalized and interconnected world (Knott et al. 2012; Youde 2009). Furthermore, Grix and Houlihan (2013) find that successfully hosting a successful sports mega-event can be leveraged to enhance a nation's international image. This emphasizes the diplomatic motives of hosting sports mega-events as a

means to position the host nation in a global context and foster a sense of unity and statehood amongst citizens.

Within the confines of the state, there is great potential for sports mega-events to contribute to the internal nation building of a country (Cornelissen and Swart 2006; Xu 2006). As Xu (2006) posited, the Chinese government envisioned the 2008 Olympics as a vehicle through which to unify the nation and all citizens of China. The 2008 Beijing Olympics was leveraged for identity formation and creating a sense of statehood among citizens (Grix and Houlihan 2013; Jakska 2011). This served to unite the vast, and scattered, Chinese population and establish a common symbol that could be embraced and celebrated by all members of the state.

This showcasing of national identity and statehood is an expression of pride. Politically, host nations can conceive sports mega-events to promote an undisputed identity that all citizens can feel good about. This, in turn, fosters a sense of unity that extends to all corners of the nation. One such example of sports being used to facilitate national unity and pride is the Iraq men's soccer team's dramatic run in the 2004 Olympics, where they finished fourth with a team comprised of the three main ethnic groups in the country: Kurds, Sunni Muslims, and Shia Muslims. This unprecedented sporting success provided Iraqis with a surge of pride that had the potential to be leveraged politically to promote a sense of unity across these divisive ethnic lines. On assignment for *USA Today*, Johnson and Crain (2004) wrote, "Iraq's early Olympic success is providing a rare moment of pride for a people engaged in a bloody search for their own identity." Because the diverse team members had integrated and overcome ethnic differences to inspire a nation, perhaps there was a blueprint for increasing national unity. In an effort to capitalize on this surge in national pride, Ahmed Al-Samarrai, the President of Iraq's Olympic Committee noted that he had received boundless calls from "savvy Shiite, Sunni, and Kurd

political leaders all wanting to feed on the goodwill generated by the nation's beloved Olympic Soccer team" (Johnson and Crain 2004). With this newfound sense of national pride, Iraq's political leaders hoped to leverage this surge as a means to work across these historically contentious ethnic boundaries. This illustrates yet another political by product associated with hosting, or excelling in, sports mega-events.

Economic Uses of Sports Mega-Events

Existing research suggests that sports mega-events also bear significant economic implications for the host nation. Black (2007), Cornelissen and Swart (2006), and Horne and Manzenreiter (2006) find that such events are often touted as economic catalysts by those who pitch for them. Bohlmann and van Heerden (2008) posit that hosting sports mega-events has become more competitive than ever, with the prospect of a large economic impact drawing potential hosts into the bidding process. In fact, nations can link their economic development strategies to the attraction of major international sporting events as they hope that increased exposure to a global audience will facilitate a surge in tourism income and outside business investment.

Concerning tourism, not only will fans from across the globe come to support their favorite teams during the event, if they leave with favorable impressions of the host nation, they are more likely to return in the future or recommend that nation as a vacation destination (Allmers and Maennig 2009; Lee and Taylor 2005). This emphasizes the long-term tourism aims of hosting sports mega-events and the role that visitors play in catalyzing economic growth. Moreover, through successfully hosting sports mega-events, scholars argue that nations display their capacity for planning and executing a major international event. The champion effect – the psychological boost in pride of winning or excelling in the event – can “increase economic

growth and give incentives to boost consumption” (Anton, Alonso, and Rodriguez 2011: 6941). To this end, corporations can exploit the pride and fervor surrounding the event, parlaying the success of the team, and hosting of the event, to demonstrate the nation’s capacity and potential as a means to attract future business and outside investment.

Moreover literature suggests there is an economic draw to host sports mega-events as a means to enhance, and add to, existing infrastructure. A country’s public transportation, energy, communications, and social infrastructures may be upgraded and expanded, which contributes to economic development and improved conditions for investment (Anton et al. 2011). Not only do public firms and government entities benefit from this, but private companies are positioned to become involved. Through this improvement of existing infrastructure, host nations become increasingly attractive to outside investment, one of the principal economic incentives of hosting sports mega-events.

The 2002 FIFA World Cup, co-hosted by Japan and South Korea, offers an interesting example of a host nation leveraging a mega-event to pursue economic objectives. This was the first time that the seminal event was to be co-hosted, which presented a number of logistical challenges for the host nations. However, South Korea took this unique opportunity to re-imagine itself as an advanced post-modern society and economy, prepared to engage with the world. Horne and Manzenreiter (2004) find that, prior to the 2002 FIFA World Cup, the 1988 Seoul Olympics had successfully showcased South Korea’s newly industrialized economy and the end of military dictatorship. In 2002, South Korea aimed to use the event to demonstrate their economic capacity in an increasingly globalized society. Despite having Asia’s third largest economy and one of the world’s best educated and most technologically-savvy populations, “South Korea remained better known for its dog eating customs than for its world-beating

broadband network” (Horne and Manzenreiter 2004: 193). Consequently, South Korean stakeholders conceived the 2002 FIFA World Cup as an opportunity to achieve legitimacy as a major economic player.

During the 2002 FIFA World Cup, international visitors were treated to “displays of the functional, variety, and designs of futuristic high-end gadgets and high speed internet technologies...South Korea managed to draw level with Japan, threatening to overtake it in the future” (Horne and Manzenreiter 2004: 194). In showcasing its advanced technology, South Korea fervently worked to be seen as Japan’s equal, particularly as a developed economy attractive to outside investment and trade. While “Japan appeared to be satisfied with becoming a recognized part of the world football family” (Horne and Manzenreiter 2004: 199), South Korea successfully leveraged the 2002 FIFA World Cup as a platform to promote its matured economy and potential as a viable site for investment, particularly in comparison to its neighbors Japan and China.

Ideological Uses of Sports Mega-Events

Just as sports mega-events can be pursued to achieve political and economic objectives, host nations have envisioned them as an opportunity to articulate and spread ideology. While this section is similar to the previous one considering political uses of sports mega-events, it is important to distinguish the two. This section differs in that it considers the ideology of the state and how host nations exploit sports mega-events to demonstrate the superiority of their beliefs. To this end, Berg (2008) posits, “The Olympics offer totalitarian or otherwise oppressive governments an opportunity to repurpose the publicity accorded to sport for the benefit of the state and its ideology” (17).

During the Cold War, a period marked by political and military tensions between the Eastern and Western blocs, “there was a widely held perception that the (Olympic) Games were a continuation of politics by other means” (Guttman 1988: 558). That is, both the United States and the Soviet Union, and their respective allies, used international sports as a means through which to express their polarizing ideologies. Guttman (1988) argues, “On the Soviet side, athletic triumphs over the ‘capitalist’ nations were an officially recognized goal, and every victory by a Soviet or Hungarian or Czech athlete was heralded as a sign of ideological superiority” (558). While not explicitly stated, we can assume that the United States also viewed athletic success over the Soviet Union as more than just a victory on the playing field.

Similarly, the 1936 Berlin Olympics is an example of a host nation leveraging a sports mega-event to further its ideological objectives: “In October 1933, Hitler had guaranteed to stage the Games in a grandiose fashion, irrespective of the cost involved. Together with (Joseph) Goebbels, his Minister of Propaganda, they wanted to conquer world public opinion with the help of the Olympic Games” (Kruger 1998A: 87). These Olympics were intended to demonstrate the might of the Third Reich and the extent it would go to produce a spectacle for a global audience. Hitler would spare no expense in exploiting increased international attention to frame the state of Germany following the fall of the Weimar Republic and the rise of the National Socialist German Worker’s Party. Kruger (1998B) argues that the 1936 Berlin Games “are best known as the Nazi Olympics, suggesting a strong state process that meddled in Olympic matters” (34). Kruger (1998A) also suggests, “The Nazis put even more emphasis on the role of sport in international relations, referring to athletes as ‘soldiers in track suits, fighting for the fatherland’” (92). This exemplifies the Nazi’s use of athletes as ideological pawns as Hitler worked to position the ‘new’ Germany in an international arena. In using these Games to spread Nazi

ideology, “the Propaganda Ministry was faced by the problem of the contradictory nature of the Nazi regime vs. Olympic ideals. The Nazis stood for German racial supremacy and militant nationalism, while the Olympics stood for international friendship and the brotherhood of nations” (Kruger 1998B: 37). However, as evidenced by the role of Goebbels and the Propaganda Ministry in the planning of these Games, there was never a question of balancing these competing principles. The Propaganda Ministry, through controlling the dissemination of news to the international community, was clearly establishing and manipulating the narrative of these Olympics around the ideology of Aryan superiority and the Nazi Party.

A more contemporary example of a host nation leveraging a sports mega-event to articulate ideology is the 2014 Winter Olympics, held in Sochi Russia. While the previous cases emphasized host nations framing the Olympics to spread ideology to an international audience, this case was more about Russian President Vladimir Putin’s desire to promote ideology domestically. Just six months before the Games were to begin, Putin signed into law Federal Code 6.21, an amendment that bans propaganda of non-traditional sexual relations (Van Rheenen 2014). The law prohibits public demonstrations in favor of gay rights, making it a criminal act to speak in defense of, distribute material related to, or to claim that gay relationships are equal to heterosexual relationships; it, in essence, inflicts second class citizenship on Russia’s LGBT community. Russia’s anti-gay legislation was used as a means to “defend traditional values in opposition of the West, where LGBT rights are generally advancing” (Friedman 2014). In enacting this law just before the start of the Olympic Games, with a global audience about to turn their attention to Russia, Putin leveraged this increased visibility to make a defiant stand against the West’s increasing support for the LGBT community. Furthermore, he attempted to galvanize Russian support in contrast to the West’s alleged liberal ideology. To this end, Anita DeFrantz,

the U.S. representative on the International Olympic Committee's (IOC) executive board, believes that the public would have known significantly less about these laws had it not been for the Games (White and Sonne 2014). The timing of this controversial legislation emphasizes the stark contrast between Western and Eastern ideologies and Putin's use of the Sochi Olympics to articulate Russia's position and promote this message domestically – lest any Russians embrace the liberal thinking of the West.

Moreover, Russia's anti-gay laws contradict one of the fundamental principles of the Olympics, that “the practice of sport is a human right. Every individual must have the possibility of practicing sport, without discrimination of any kind and in the Olympic spirit, which requires mutual understanding with a spirit of friendship, solidarity and fair play” (“Olympic Charter”). It is important to note that following the enactment of this controversial law, both Russia and the IOC, emphatically stated that “the legislation will not affect those attending or taking part in the Games” (Van Rheenen 2014: 131). While not directly affecting the athletes and visitors, this legislation created a climate that had the potential to make competitors and tourists uncomfortable and uneasy. The anti-LGBT rhetoric was enough to distract from the Sochi Olympics, as Russia's history of human rights and equality became a delicate point of conversation throughout the Games. In passing this legislation, Putin defied Western ideology in favor of furthering a Russian agenda fixated on marginalizing and disenfranchising the LGBT community.

Nation Branding Through Sports Mega-Events

These political, economic, and ideological aims pursued by the host nation are inherently involved in broader efforts to deliberately brand a country – an increasingly common practice. Similar to brands, nations must consider how various external stakeholders perceive them. The

American Marketing Association defines a brand as a “name, term, sign, symbol, or design, or a combination of them, intended to identify the goods and services of one seller or group of seller and differentiate them from those of the competition” (AMA). Brands, when well-conceived, incite a powerful reaction in consumers about the product in question. As Youde (2009) argues, “brands provoke certain responses amongst consumers... a successful brand evokes an image – an image to which others aspire or deem valuable” (130). Each brand carries with it certain associations, both positive and negative, that inform consumers about what the brand represents and its value relative to its competitors. This same approach can be applied to nations. Similar to brands, nations are competing for outside investment, tourism, prestige, and the right to host events, among other attainable goods. As a result, nations must work to distinguish themselves from the competition – other nations. Therefore, a nation’s brand is “the sum of all beliefs, ideas, and impressions that a person has of a nation” (Knott et al. 2012). The brand is a unique blend of the elements that comprise a nation – the culture, myths, history, language, etc. – and helps to distinguish each nation as its own. As a result, nations are responsible for associations that have the potential to add or subtract from its perceived value, or its products, as nationals and international populations attach meaning to each country.

Nation brands are rooted in the reality of the nation’s culture, which is the defining, differentiating feature that any nation, or brand could have. However, because brands are derived from a nation’s culture, they are subject to shift and transform as a result of cultural transformation. Thus, nation branding “represents an attempt by the state to consciously take control of these discursive narratives” to ensure that the brand reflects the current state of the nation (Youde 2009: 127). It is in a nation’s best interest to carefully construct its brand in an

effort to improve both internal and external perceptions of the country and its capacity in an increasingly interdependent world.

Moreover, nation brands are becoming increasingly important as states work to promote new identities and impress certain associations in consumers' minds (Viosca, Bergiel, and Balsmeier 2005; Youde 2009). Nation brands have become a valuable tool for states to assert a particular image or identity to the international community; it is a means through which to signal something important about the state of the nation. Consequently, a nation's brand is becoming a key asset in the international arena as countries compete for the attention, respect, and trust of investors, tourists, consumers, and foreign governments (Grix and Houlihan 2013; Knott et al. 2012). Governments have a vested interest in ensuring that their identities are interpreted correctly, underscoring the significance of shaping nation brands and the process through which it is to be disseminated and shared to a global audience. As a result, states have to "craft and deploy particular branded identities to further their foreign policy and international political goals" (Youde 2009: 127).

Just as sports mega-events contribute to various political, economic, and ideological objectives, Knott et al. (2012) and Lepp and Gibson (2011) find that hosting sports mega-events can be effectively used as nation branding tools. Grix and Houlihan (2013) postulate, "the potential positive impact on the nation's image or brand has moved from being a welcome consequence to a significant justification for investing in hosting sports mega-events" (573). As nations place increased significance on the importance of their brands, sports mega-events have been conceived as platforms through which nations can use the media's global reach to articulate and frame a socio-political shift that has affected their brand, such as a change in nationalism and cultural framework. Sports mega-events are a vehicle through which nations can imagine and re-

imagine themselves to a global audience. Black (2007) and Xu (2006) find that sports mega-events have provided countries with a platform to present and promote their national identities and cultures, while reinforcing key messages about what the host has become, or is becoming. In trying to position, and distinguish, themselves from other nations, countries actively work to ensure that their brand and image are representative of their society and shift with any transformations in national identity. In doing this, nations ensure that consumers and other countries understand what the nation stands for and represents, emphasizing the importance of their distinct brand.

Black (2007) and Knott et al. (2012) further suggest that sports mega-events provide unique opportunities to signal important changes in the direction of a nation. Using the platform afforded by hosting sports mega-events, national leaders can use the event to frame and articulate a shift in identity. Or, nations can reintroduce themselves to the rest of the world as they strive to enhance their standing and prominence in the international community. Thus, as Bodet and Lacassagne (2012) argue, “by being associated with a major sporting event, places in general and negatively viewed ones in particular, aim to modify their international image and obtain some positive associations” (1). Sports mega-events can be understood as valuable image and brand enhancers while serving as catalysts for increased respect in the international arena. The effective staging of these events give nations the opportunity to attract investment, tourism, and increased diplomatic prominence, through their brand, by projecting a well-crafted image and creating a favorable impression of the host nation. In the context of South Africa itself, the nation has used sports as an instrument for portraying the dramatic socio-political transition of the country in the past 20 years, while projecting the “image of an engaging and evolving society to the international community” (Van der Merwe 2007: 72).

Nation branding is also important in the role it plays in changing existing narratives and perceptions about a country. Black (2007) and Knott et al. (2012) find that sports mega-events provide unique opportunities to reframe dominant narratives about the host. It is a chance to dispel negative stereotypes, in favor of more positive perceptions, as the nation has an opportunity to showcase its capacity and strength in executing an event of this magnitude.

The 2008 Beijing Olympics is an interesting case through which to consider the capacity of nation branding through sports mega-events. For the 2008 Olympics, Beijing adopted a three-fold aim and slogan: ‘The People’s Olympics’, ‘The High-Tech Olympics’, and ‘The Green Olympics’. Manzenreiter (2010) finds that, ‘The People’s Olympics’ slogan referred to a successful blending of Chinese and Western cultures. ‘The High-Tech Olympics’ slogan was designed to dissociate China from low-quality goods and cheap services. Finally, ‘The Green Olympics’ addressed both the increasing worldwide concerns about China’s environment standards and criticism of its pollution issues. Through this concerted nation branding campaign, Chinese officials employed the Olympics as a vehicle to change the narrative surrounding China. Moreover, they attempted to frame China’s progress in these realms and improve external perceptions of the nation as a means to bolster their country’s position in the global arena.

Through deliberately establishing a national brand(s), host nations can leverage sports mega-events to engage in place promotion as a means to improve both internal and external perceptions. Horne and Manzenreiter (2006) and Knott, Fyall, and Jones (2013) postulate that interest in hosting sports mega-events has grown because nations view them as valuable promotion opportunities for cities and regions. With increased media exposure and the attention of a global audience, sports mega-events represent a unique publicity platform and opportunity for branding and place marketing. Lebedenko (2008) writes that “the hosting of international

sports events such as the Olympic Games or the FIFA World Cup have been effectively used to favorably publicize...a place on a global scale” (123).

To this end, we must consider the effect of the media on national branding during sports mega-events. Black (2007) argues, “There is the simple fact that sport mega-events in conjunction with the contemporary media-sports complex provide unmatched opportunities for visibility and exposure” (264). The sheer number of media outlets focusing their attention on the event provides the host nation with an opportunity to strategically project an appealing narrative to both national and international audiences. One manner in which national transformations in identity and branding are depicted and framed is through the media, particularly at mega-events, where there are unrivaled opportunities for exposure. Knott et al. (2013) claims, “the high media profile of mega-events can be harnessed to increase the awareness, prominence, and standing of places as well as serve as an agent of change in terms of imagery and place meaning” (576). That is, host nations can use the media advantageously to disseminate the image they’ve worked hard to create.

Current studies have done well to extrapolate the political, economic, ideological, and branding benefits of hosting sports mega-events and how host nations can leverage the event to achieve non-sporting objectives. However, most have missed the important role of sports mega-events in contributing to a change in the social contract of the host nation. Chapter two delves into an analysis of how these major events can serve a more fundamental purpose - allowing for reconstitutions of nationalism and national identity.

Chapter 2: South African Nationalism: Theories and Methods

Nationalism and National Identity

We must understand the concept of nationalism in order to analyze how South African political and athletic leaders imagined the 1995 Rugby World Cup and the 2010 FIFA World Cup as opportunities to articulate and promote rapid and dramatic shifts in national identity. Greenfeld and Eastwood (2005) theorize that nationalism is a “form of consciousness. It represents a comprehensive framework for seeing the world...and this constitutes the cultural blueprint for experiencing and constructing reality” (251). That is, nationalism is a perspective, or image, through which individuals can begin to understand and interpret a nation, its defining characteristics, and the populations that comprise it.

At their core, nations are cultural entities. The fact that nations have territorial boundaries or armies is because they are a cultural creation and these characteristics allow nations to be seen as legitimate political bodies. Everything physical – i.e. boundaries, armies, buildings, etc. – is simply a manifestation of those cultural ideas.

Greenfeld and Eastwood’s (2005) work is grounded in the argument that nationalism is characterized by three core principles: popular sovereignty, equality of membership, and a secular form of organization. Popular sovereignty signifies that living people, not a divine being, become the source of a nation’s laws and authority, indicating human capacity to directly influence the shape of a nation (Greenfeld and Eastwood 2005). Additionally, the secular form of organization – i.e. the modern nation-state – is removed from the influence of religious entities and, thus, subject solely to the creation and influence of its citizens. Establishing equality in a secular environment provides the foundation for modern society. Just as individuals assume

responsibility for creating the laws and authority of a nation, changes due to the state's dynamic political and social climate place new individuals in positions of power. This gives them the authority to establish laws and the framework for a nation; permitting a new form of nationalism to be articulated. Because nationalism is fundamentally secular and attributed to popular sovereignty, it is subject to shift and transform with the changing socio-political conditions of a nation.

However, there are variations of this cultural entity – the nation – that rely on a combination of the three principles of nationalism. To this end, Greenfeld and Eastwood (2005) argue that there are three forms of nationalism: individualistic and civic; collectivistic and civic; and collectivistic and ethnic. Individualistic and civic nations are defined as an association of individuals, with the criteria for membership being civic; that is, nationality is equated to citizenship. Members of individualistic and civic nations are “equal specifically in their liberty; their capacity and right for self-government and political participation and, therefore, legal rights and obligations” (Greenfeld and Eastwood 2005: 258). The United States of America, the United Kingdom, and Australia are all characterized as individualistic and civic nations. Collectivistic and civic nations are defined as polities organized by unique principles and the aforementioned civic membership criteria. Both France and Israel are examples of collectivistic and civic nations. Similarly, collectivistic and ethnic nations are based on ethnic, hereditary, or genetic criteria for membership. In *Nationalism: Five Roads to Modernity*, Greenfeld (1993) identified Russia and Germany as collectivistic and ethnic nations.

<p>Individualistic and Civic:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Criteria for membership is civic (i.e. nationality is equated to citizenship) • Citizens are fundamentally equal in economic, political, and social arenas as well as in rights and obligations • Emphasis on personal achievement • United States of America and United Kingdom 	<p>Collectivistic and Civic:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Criteria for membership is civic (i.e. nationality is equated to citizenship) • Citizens are fundamentally equal in economic, political, and social arenas as well as in rights and obligations • Emphasis on family and group achievement • France and Israel
<p>Collectivistic and Ethnic:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Criteria for membership based on ethnic, hereditary, or genetic traits • Citizens are equal only in that they are nationals of a particular nation. However, in economic, political, and social arenas they may be legitimately considered unequal (Greenfeld and Eastwood 2005) • Russia and Germany 	

Table 1: The three forms of nationalism

The three principles of nationalism (popular sovereignty, equality of membership, and a secular form of organization) are very powerful in that they make possible other components such as democracy, modern science and education, and capitalism amongst other social phenomena; all of which require modern ways of thinking about equality, secularism, and identity. Out of this, notions of personal and national identity develop as these three principals have ushered in modernity. This is only possible in the age of nationalism, where these three principles provide the foundation for modern society.

To begin to understand the complexities of one's nation is to identify a country's cultural composition. Under the three principles of nationalism, each nation develops its own smaller cultural components such as myth and traditions. Petkovic (2011) posits that culture, "in the sense of common tradition, myths, symbols, and values is of significant importance in the integration of people belonging to a particular nation" (144). That is, a nation is shaped by these smaller, specific cultural components, which serve to distinguish each individual nation state. Through the features articulated by Petkovic, each nation forms a distinct cultural model and thus, a unique sense of national awareness. This serves to unite the population around a shared identity. That is, the feelings of belonging to one's country – i.e. identifying with one's nation – are grounded in associating with shared cultural components.

Identity is often constructed in relation to the context and culture in which it is located. Just, as culture is derived from nationalism, so too is national identity. Greenfeld (2006) posits, "Identity, therefore, is a symbolic self-representation, an image a human has of oneself as a cultural being and a participant in a cultural world" (215). Expanding this to the macro level, we see that as cultures transform in response to shifts in nationalism, articulations of national identity change in relation to the evolving socio-political framework of the nation. Because

identity is tied to the image one has of oneself based on the context of his or her world, national identities are subject to change in light of national cultural transformations.

To this end, Smith (1992), similarly to Greenfeld, finds that national identity is “fundamentally cultural and social. It refers to a cultural and political bond, which unites a community...who share the same myths, memories, symbols, and traditions” (61). National identity directly reflects the cultural components of that distinct nation. By presenting and representing a particular identity discourse, a nation informs both a national and international audience about the state of the nation, while also engaging in a process that allows others to understand who that state is, and to a greater extent, what it represents.

Other scholars who would agree with Greenfeld and Eastwood, such as Lebedenko (2008) and Smith (1992), believe a nation to contain the following fundamental features: historic territory or homeland; common myths; historical memories; a common, mass public culture; common legal rights and duties for all members; and a common economy. These large groups of individuals are united by shared components that distinguish their nation. It is critical to note that the vast majority, if not all, of the aforementioned features are only possible in the age of modernity, which is defined by the three core principles of nationalism. As a result, identities are formed, which represent the culture, ideologies, and socio-political atmosphere while giving meaning to how each state is understood. Moreover, Lau, Lam, and Leung (2008) posit that national identity goes beyond the acknowledgment of these shared features, as it involves the population “imagining oneself to belong to a national community, having an emotional attachment to this national community, and understanding one’s rights and duties as a citizen of it” (2). When a population holds the nation as a cohesive unit, tied together by these features,

national identity manifests itself as the community can acknowledge and embrace the distinctive components that distinguish it from other nations.

Based on these theories of nationalism and national identity, South Africa's period of apartheid can be understood in terms of collectivistic and ethnic nationalism. In collectivistic nations, members "are equal only in that they share the essential nature of their nation, that which makes it a particular nation and them nationals of this particular nation. This equality is fundamental, but in everything else, including the nature of their political participation, they may be legitimately considered unequal" (Greenwood and Eastwood 2005: 258). Additionally, membership in collectivistic and ethnic nations is based on ethnic, hereditary, or genetic criteria. To this end, during apartheid, South Africa's social climate and cultural framework was dependent on one's genetics, namely race. In order to fully participate in economic, political, and social life, one had to be classified as white. All others, classified as 'black' or 'colored', were relegated to second-class citizenship and deprived of the basic rights afforded to white South Africans. Understanding how a collectivistic and ethnic nation is defined is critical, as this thesis considers whether South Africa has been able to transition from a collectivistic and ethnic form of nationalism to the individualistic and civic type in which all citizens – irrespective of race – are guaranteed full and equal participation in economic, political, and social life.

Shifts in Nationalism

As was previously extrapolated, modern society is crafted around the concept of nationalism. That is, nationalism is the cradle that allows society to develop, which subsequently allows for the establishment of national identity. Nationalism, a form of consciousness as posited by Greenfeld and Eastwood (2005), serves as the subjective and fluid perspective through which

individuals come to understand the nation. Subsequently, as that nation's social contract and national identity evolve, nationalism, the fundamental underlying factor, shifts too.

Because nationalism is indicative of a nation's cultural framework, it is understood that it is not static and constantly evolving in relation to economic, political, and social changes (Hogan 2003; Houlihan 1997; Lau et al. 2008; Youde 2009). That is, nationalism is stable, but not fixed. Because of its malleable nature in response to shifts in national identity, it must continually be articulated. Through framing, internal and external stakeholders gain an understanding of what the nation represents, or is becoming. To this end, rhetoric and understandings of nationalism and national identity are continuously shifting and being shaped – by changing social conditions – to reflect the state of a given nation. Considering this, Anderson (1983) finds that nationalism undergoes processes of “modulation and adaptation, according to different eras, political regimes, economies and social structures” (158). That is, as the economic, cultural, political, or social climate of a nation changes, there is a corresponding shift in nationalism and national identity.

The malleable nature of nationalism and national identity is important as this thesis explores transformations in national identity through sports mega-events. South Africa is a unique case in considering a shift in nationalism, as we can analyze the transition from an apartheid state to a democratic one, and the extent to which elites used sports mega-events to disseminate, frame, and articulate transformations in South Africa's national identity. Through this, we can learn something valuable about how countries can reconstitute their nationalism in accordance with shifts in national identity and cultural framework to spin new national narratives.

Sports, Nationalism, and National Identity

Just as sports mega-events can be leveraged for political, economic, ideological, and nation branding purposes, they can also serve a more fundamental function. Sports mega-events are as a powerful vehicle through which nations can imagine, and re-imagine, themselves to the international community. Hogan (2003) finds that mega-events “provide fertile grounds for articulations of national identity” (103). Due to the prevalence of the media, sports mega-events have the ability to transmit information to billions of people. There is great potential for leaders of host nations to articulate messages about the state of the nation, and perhaps more importantly, how the nation aims to be perceived, to a national and international audience. Houlihan (1997) posits, “sport, and particularly elite sport is used to provide the focus for the definition of national identity, which, once successfully established, is often projected back to foster the impression of cultural continuity” (124). As this sense of continuity and unity is projected to both an internal and external audience, it becomes increasingly easy to interpret and understand the state of the nation. This unique platform presents host nations with the potential to articulate, and frame shifts, in nationalism and national identity as they work to position themselves relative to other countries (Dzankic 2012; Hogan 2003; Houlihan 1997; Lau et al. 2008).

Furthermore sports serve as a manifestation of cultural elements of society, illustrating the extent to which they contribute to shaping national identity. To this end, Van der Merwe (2007) claims, “sports mega-events are increasingly being pursued...for their identity-building and signaling benefits” (68). Nations understand the capacity of sports mega-events in providing a platform to bolster, redefine, and ultimately express national identity, while framing any socio-political transformations that have transpired. More to this point, “sport becomes a catalyst of

national identity and pride, of culture and symbols, of identity and politics...therefore, sport has an important role, not only for understanding the construction of nations, but also for comprehending their changing citizenship regimes” (Dankic 2012: 2).

In considering how sports reflect broader social changes, Hunter (2003) finds, “the impact of sport, in a commercialized, increasingly global era, on nation and identity may be one of the most powerful factors to influence the shaping, indeed reshaping, of identities in the twenty-first century” (422). As a social institution, sports reflect broader social and political trends and are a microcosm of their surroundings and the context in which the team is located. As a society transforms, sports are an arena through which those changes manifest themselves as nations articulate discourses of identity. Houlihan (1997) argues that “sport and its relationship with global culture and with ethnic and state notions of identity creates an impression of a highly malleable source of cultural symbolism” (135). This is critical as the ability to leverage sports mega-events for the fundamental purpose of reconstituting nationalism and identity is the underlying framework that drives this thesis.

The 1995 Rugby World Cup and 2010 FIFA World Cup as Opportunity Structures

As I have mentioned, my research is not a study of how hosting these seminal events facilitated national change, but rather, how they provided South African elite and newspapers with a platform to introduce ideals of an integrated and egalitarian country. To this end, both the 1995 Rugby World Cup and the 2010 FIFA World Cup functioned as opportunity structures as these stakeholders framed these events to articulate their visions for progressive transformation of South Africa’s social contract and sense of nation. Kitschelt (1986) defines political opportunity structures as “specific configurations of resources, institutional arrangements, and historical precedents for social mobilization, which facilitate the development of protest

movements” (58). Furthermore, political opportunity structures offer movements opportunities for social mobilization, and where those mobilizations exist, to strengthen them (Benford and Snow 2000; Gamson and Meyer 1996; Koopmans 1999).

With this in mind, the aim of the South African stakeholders was to leverage hosting the events as a platform through which they could promote their visions for a unified and democratic nation in which all South Africans would be fundamentally equal in all realms of their lives, a distinct evolution from years prior. The tournaments served as opportunity structures in that they were a platform for social change – offering occasions to strengthen the African National Congress’ movement towards an integrated society through increased media attention and interest associated with the events – in which members of South Africa's elite incorporated rhetoric surrounding their intended shift in nationalism and national identity. Consequently, this thesis considers the increased opportunities, leveraged by the South African elite and media, in creating discourse and serving as a catalyst in promoting this fundamental shift in the social contract.

Contextualizing the Case of South Africa

The 1995 Rugby World Cup held in South Africa was a defining moment in the nation’s transition from an apartheid state to a democracy. This was the first major sporting event to take place in South Africa following the end of apartheid and one of the first events in which South Africa could compete, after being banished from international competition due to apartheid policies. Just a year into President Nelson Mandela’s first term as President of a democratic South Africa, the nation was trying to undertake a major social, cultural, and political shift that would leave the inequities of apartheid behind. During the tournament, President Mandela embraced the almost entirely white team. He used his platform and the event in an attempt to

unify the nation around supporting the Springboks, a name that held many anti-black and pro-Afrikaner connotations. President Mandela, seen wearing a Springboks jersey and hat, recognized the potential that the 1995 Rugby World Cup presented in galvanizing all citizens around a shared symbol. Consequently, when South Africa defeated New Zealand to win the championship, the entire nation joined together in celebrating the success of the team, paving the way for the development of the 'Rainbow Nation' and a new South Africa, in which multiculturalism was to be embraced and celebrated.

The 2010 FIFA World Cup, held in South Africa, was a second sports mega-event that proved critical for the nation's future. This was the first FIFA World Cup held on the African continent and, fifteen years into democracy, it was an opportunity through which the nation could frame its progress and further present the new South Africa to the international community. Though these events are separated by only fifteen years, they occurred at very different stages in South Africa's transition to democracy. This is reflected in how the events were used to articulate and frame shifts in national identity while signaling the capacity of a non-racial, democratic South Africa.

In using South Africa as a case study to understand how political and athletic leaders, and the mass media, used sports mega-events as a platform to articulate and promote rapid and dramatic shifts in national identity, we must also consider the role sport has played in South African society. Historically, during colonialism and apartheid, sport was "influenced by the prevailing power relations within society. It therefore played a prominent role in the formation and reinforcement of racially and ethnically plural communities" (Van der Merwe 2007: 70). In South Africa, sports have long been a frontier through which dominant ideologies and expressions of identity have manifested themselves. The conflict over white minority rule in

South Africa expressed itself with “racial separateness in domestic sports leagues and boycotts in the international arena” (Hoglund and Sundberg 2008: 807). Particular sports soon became identified as representative of certain racial groups. Cricket and rugby were seen as bastions of white superiority and created unity amongst that population, while soccer established itself as the sport of the black population, which comprised the vast majority of South Africa. Thus, the widespread support for the Springboks during the 1995 Rugby World Cup was a defining moment, not only for South Africa to reintroduce itself to the international sporting community, but also for national reconciliation as whites, blacks, and coloreds collectively embraced the national rugby team. Cornelissen and Swart (2006) suggests, “Victory of the Rugby World Cup seemingly united the highly divided and racialized society. This provided the impetus for a clear political (i.e. nation building) objective around sports mega-events that were to continue beyond the Rugby World Cup” (112).

Positioning my thesis in the existing literature

Current research focuses on the relationship between nationalism, national identity, nation branding, and sports mega-events’ contributions to non-sporting objectives. However, it does not address how a country in transition can alter its sense of nation over the course of two major sporting events in a delicate period of national change. In analyzing how stakeholders leveraged sports mega-events to disseminate, frame, and articulate transformations in South Africa’s nationalism and national identity, we can learn something valuable about how sports mega-events have been conceived and positioned as opportunity structures. Fundamentally, it is about reconstitutions of the social contract in times of democratization. Thus, lessons learned from analyzing South Africa’s use of these events can be applied to nations shifting from

oppressive regimes towards democracy and the extent to which hosting sports mega-events might facilitate their transition.

Methods

In order to answer this question, my data collection includes a qualitative content analysis of speeches and interviews given by South African political and athletic leaders, and articles by leading South African newspapers. This indicates how each of these spheres conceived these two events as a vehicle to articulate a dramatic shift in national identity and nationalism. It is important to include an analysis of South African newspapers as “there is an increasingly close relationship between media, the nation, and sport, with the media playing a key role in producing, reproducing, and amplifying discourses around sport and the nation” (Farquharson and Marjoribanks 2003: 29). That is, including a brief analysis of the media’s representation of each event, will allow me to evaluate the extent to which this driver of public opinion agreed or disagreed with South African elites’ vision for these seminal events in aiding South Africa’s national transformation.

Chambliss and Schutt (2010) define content analysis as “a method for systematically analyzing and making inferences from text” (85). That is, I am methodically analyzing speeches, interviews, and newspaper articles, to find themes and patterns that illustrate a shift in national identity and nationalism – particularly from the collectivistic and ethnic framework to an individualistic and civic model. The samples for my research are speeches, interviews, and newspaper articles from both the 1995 Rugby World Cup and the 2010 FIFA World Cup. When analyzing media depictions, I was limited to using English language media sources, which restricted the depth of my research, as I do not speak Afrikaans, isiZulu, isiXhosa, or any of the other national languages of South Africa. My sample will be confined to the time that South

Africa was chosen as host nation of the respective event up to a week after the last day of competition. Thus, for the 1995 Rugby World Cup, my analysis ranges from 1992 to July 1st, 1995.¹ Similarly, for the 2010 FIFA World Cup, my analysis encompasses May 5th, 2004 to July 18th, 2010. Solely considering these periods allows me to analyze perspectives and opinions of the events in the years leading up the competition – important for considering how individuals and the media envisioned the significance of each event for South Africa – through just after the completion of each event, so as to capture takeaways from the event and the degree to which South African leaders and the media felt the country was able to leverage each event to transform and re-imagine themselves before national and international audiences.

For the 1995 Rugby World Cup, I used Lexis Nexis, an electronic database, to find sources that quoted political and athletic leaders of the time speaking about the significance of the 1995 Rugby World Cup and what it meant for a nation in the midst of democratization, trying to leave the vestiges of apartheid behind. Setting the date range to January 1st, 1992 to July 1st, 1995, I searched the database for keywords that related to the 1995 Rugby World Cup: Rugby World Cup; Rugby World Cup and rainbow nation; Rugby World Cup opportunity; South African reconciliation; Rugby World Cup unity; Rugby in South Africa; South African nation building; Rugby World Cup nation building; and new South Africa. I also used the advanced search tools on Google to set the date range to January 1st, 1992 to July 1st, 1995, and used the same keywords to find additional speeches and interviews from South African political and athletic leaders to consider the extent to which the 1995 Rugby World Cup was leveraged to promote South Africa's re-imagined national identity. Through these searches, I found 15

¹ I could not find a specific date that South Africa was chosen as host of 1995 Rugby World Cup. Black and Nauright (1998) write that the International Rugby Board selected South Africa as hosts in 1992, a data I use for the purpose of my thesis.

speeches and interviews to analyze. While this number is smaller than what I procured for the 2010 FIFA World Cup, this is to be expected as a limited number of documents from 1995 have been digitized and made available on online databases in the last 20 years. The opinions of the following individuals are included in my analysis: Nelson Mandela, President of South Africa from 1994-1999; Edward Griffiths, then Chief Executive of the South African Rugby Union; Steve Tshwete, then Minister of Sports and Recreation; Francois Pienaar, captain of the 1995 Springboks; Chester Williams, sole black player on the 1995 Springboks; and Morne du Plessis, manager of the 1995 Springboks.

Similarly, for the 1995 Rugby World Cup I used Lexis Nexis to find media depictions of the event to evaluate the extent to which South African newspapers portrayed the significance of the event, validating or contradicting the messages articulated through the aforementioned speeches and interviews. Employing the same date range – January 1st, 1992 to July 1st, 1995 – I limited the output generated by Lexis Nexis to only include South African media sources. While it would be valuable to consider international media depictions of the significance of the 1995 Rugby World Cup, my research aims to solely evaluate South African newspapers and their analysis of the tournament in contributing to South Africa’s dramatic transformation in national identity and nationalism. Using Lexis Nexis, I searched the database for keywords that related to the 1995 Rugby World Cup: Rugby World Cup; Rugby World Cup and rainbow nation; Rugby World Cup opportunity; South African reconciliation; Rugby World Cup unity; Rugby in South Africa; South African nation building; Rugby World Cup nation building; and new South Africa. However, I only found two articles using this approach as very few South African newspapers from that time are archived in this database. Thus, I went to both the *Cape Times* and the *Mail and Guardian* websites and used their search functions to explore their archives for additional

articles. Using the same keywords listed above, I found 17 South African news articles to analyze. While I only include the *Cape Times* and the *Mail and Guardian* in my analysis, these were two of the largest English language South African newspapers in circulation during this period.

For the 2010 FIFA World Cup, I again used Lexis Nexis to find sources that quoted South African political and athletic leaders of the time discussing the significance of the event in further articulating South Africa's new national identity fifteen years after the transformative Rugby World Cup. Setting the date range to May 5th, 2004 to July 18th, 2010, I searched the database for keywords relating to the 2010 FIFA World Cup: FIFA World Cup; South African nation building; FIFA World Cup and democracy; FIFA World Cup African Renaissance; FIFA World Cup nation building; FIFA World Cup infrastructure; FIFA World Cup development; FIFA World Cup an African event; FIFA World Cup opportunity; and Africa's renewal. Again, I used the advance search tools on Google to set the date range to May 5th, 2004 to July 18th, 2010 to find additional speeches and interviews from South African political and athletic leaders that illustrate the significance of the 2010 FIFA World Cup in contributing to South Africa's transition to an individualistic and civic framework of nationalism. Additionally, the South African government has a section on their website archiving politicians' speeches, from 1997 to today. Thus, from May 5th, 2004 to July 18th, 2010, I found all speeches concerning South Africa's hosting of the 2010 FIFA World Cup and the significance of the event for a South Africa sixteen years in the democratic era. Through these searches, I procured 33 speeches and interviews to analyze. The opinions of the following individuals are included in my analysis: Danny Jordaan, the leader of the South Africa's 2010 FIFA World Cup bid and the President of the South African Football Association; Jacob Zuma, then President of the African National

Congress and elected as President of South Africa in 2009; Thabo Mbeki, the President of South Africa until 2008; Irvin Khoza, Chairman of the 2010 FIFA World Cup Organizing Committee; Phumzile Mlambo-Ngcuka, Deputy President of South Africa from 2005 to 2008; Aaron Mokoena, captain of the South African national soccer team; Dlamini Zuma, former Minister of Foreign Affairs; Amos Masondo, Mayor Johannesburg from 2000 to 2011; and Bareng-Batho Kortjaas, an influential sports columnist and talk-radio host.

For the 2010 FIFA World Cup, I also used Lexis Nexis to find media depictions of the event to understand the extent to which the South African media's portrayal of the significance of the event validates or contradicts the messages articulated through the aforementioned speeches and interviews. In maintaining the same date range – May 5th, 2004 to July 18th, 2010 – I limited the output generated by Lexis Nexis to only include South African media sources. I used the same keywords as my search for speeches and interviews addressing the significance of the 2010 FIFA World Cup in contributing to South Africa's national transformation: FIFA World Cup; South African nation building; FIFA World Cup and democracy; FIFA World Cup African Renaissance; FIFA World Cup nation building; FIFA World Cup infrastructure; FIFA World Cup development; FIFA World Cup an African event; FIFA World Cup opportunity; and Africa's renewal, I found 22 South African news articles to analyze. The following publications are included in my analysis: *Cape Times*, *Daily News*, *Mail and Guardian*, *Saturday Star*, *The Independent*, *The Times*, and *The Sunday Times*.

Through analyzing speeches, interviews, and news articles from both the 1995 Rugby World Cup and the 2010 FIFA World Cup, I coded for certain themes and concepts: African Renaissance; apartheid; Bantu; capacity of the African continent; capacity of South Africa; democracy; development; equality; inclusion; inequality; integration of South Africa into global

arena; nation-building; national pride; new South Africa; non-racialism; patriotism; rainbow nation; reconciliation; segregation; unity; and white superiority. Coding for these themes and concepts allowed me to analyze how the language used and messages articulated on the 1995 Rugby World Cup and the 2010 FIFA World Cup. This analysis informs us of how these seminal events were leveraged by South African political and athletic leaders, and newspapers, to re-imagine a nation. One, where, historically, there was fundamental and legislated inequality, to one in which all citizens, irrespective of race, are guaranteed full and equal participation in economic, political, and social life.

Lastly, it is imperative to note that as an American who studied abroad in South Africa, has learned about South Africa's complex history of racial segregation and stratification, and traveled throughout the country living with families from a variety of backgrounds, I inherently bring certain biases to this research. However, throughout the process, I remember that, as a researcher, I must be aware of the biases and perspectives that I bring to the project and remain open to my analysis and findings.

Chapter 3: Policy and Rhetoric of the Apartheid Era

This chapter considers the collectivistic and ethnic characteristics of South Africa's apartheid nation to understand how policy and rhetoric of the era marginalized the non-white population and fractured society along racial boundaries. As a collectivistic and ethnic nation, there was a fundamental inequality pervading South African society. During the apartheid era, the National Party expanded racial segregation and exclusion policies, which solidified the racial hierarchy that permeated, and continues to affect, South Africa. The ethos of apartheid was grounded in notions of white superiority and systematic inequality. Consequently, rhetoric from National Party officials and public discourse was based on widely accepted notions of separateness. It is important to note that what differentiates South Africa's apartheid era from racial segregation that has occurred elsewhere is the systematic way in which the National Party formalized it through law. These legal guidelines of racial isolation and exclusion were designed to maintain white Afrikaner supremacy and dominance in all aspects of society.

Segregation permeated all realms of South African society: housing, education, the economy, and more. As Afrikaners assumed power and gained control over the British, they implemented exclusionary practices to assert their influence and social standing. This was achieved through The Population Registration Act No. 30 of 1950, which "required people to be identified and registered from birth as one of four distinct racial groups: white, colored, Bantu (black African), and other" (Glucksmann 2010: 7). One's classification determined their social standing and greatly affected their livelihood. As a collectivistic and ethnic nation predicated on segregation, this systematic categorization served to marginalize Bantu, colored, and other South Africans at the benefit of the white Afrikaners, and by association all whites, under the apartheid model. Various other policies were systematically implemented to further segregate South

African society and maintain white racial purity while diminishing the value and agency of other groups, particularly blacks. One such policy was The Group Areas Act No. 41 of 1950, which “forced physical separation between races by creating different residential areas for different races. The act led to forced removals of people living in wrong areas” (Glucksmann 2010: 8). Speaking in support of forced relocation in 1964, Minister for Colored Affairs and future President of South Africa, P.W. Botha stated, “I am one of those who believe that there is no permanent home for even a section of the Bantu in the white area of South Africa and the destiny of South Africa depends on this essential point. If the principle of permanent residence for the black man in the area of the white is accepted then it is the beginning of the end of civilization as we know it in this country” (Boddy-Evans “Quotes”). No longer could South Africans of different races live side by side: they were assigned to various locations, of varying quality, dependent on their race with whites living in the nicest areas and blacks being relegated to the worst. Botha’s harsh stance, and public declaration of the uncivilized nature of black South Africans, illustrates dominant social thinking under the framework of collectivistic and ethnic nationalism.

Additionally, the following legislation further entrenched apartheid South Africa as a collectivistic and ethnic nation, as defined by Greenfeld and Eastwood (2005), in which South Africans, depending on their race, were legitimately considered unequal. The Bantu Building Workers Act No. 27 of 1951 “made it a criminal offense for a black person to perform any skilled work in urban areas except in those sections designated for black occupation” (Glucksmann 2010: 8). As a means to maintain white minority rule, and by extension, Afrikaner dominance, The Separate Representation of Voters Act No. 46 of 1951 “led to the removal of coloreds and Asians from the commons voters’ roll in the Cape and placed them on a communal

roll. Africans in the Cape had already been removed from the common roll by the Representation of Natives Act No. 12 of 1936” (Glucksmann 2010: 8). Perhaps the most severe legislation designed to marginalize the Bantu population was The Blacks Act No. 67 of 1952, commonly known as the pass laws. This policy “required all black persons over the age of 16 in all provinces to carry identification with them at all times...It was a criminal offense to be unable to produce a pass when required to do so by any member of the police or by an administrative official. No black person could leave a rural area for an urban one without a permit from the local authorities” (Glucksmann 2010: 8). To this end, Seidman (1999) notes that most legal and political rights were tied to racial status and that “public facilities – from schools and libraries to parks and restaurants – were strictly divided along racial lines” (422). Not only were facilities divided, those made available to blacks and coloreds were distinctly second class and did not benefit from the same funding and resources as White South Africans. This inherent inequality symbolized the bounded citizenship that divided South Africa along racial lines.²

It was this appalling context that caused leaders of the liberation movement to speak out about what they saw as a deeply flawed, unjust, and unequal society. Arguing that white South Africans had deliberately created a national framework in which blacks had no political, economic, or social capital, Mandela reasoned, “In 1960 the Government held a referendum which led to the establishment of the Republic. Africans, who constituted approximately 70 percent of the population of South Africa, were not entitled to vote, and were not even consulted about a proposed constitutional change. All of us were apprehensive of our future under the

² In this context bounded citizenship means that one’s rights and privileges were defined by their racial classifications: that whites benefited from privileges and opportunities that the marginalized black and colored communities did not.

proposed white Republic” (African National Congress 1964). This statement paints a picture of apartheid South Africa as a nation solely concerned with the wellbeing of her minority white population. Similarly, Alfred Nzo, Secretary General of the African National Congress, expressed a similar sentiment, suggesting that apartheid South Africa was a white nation which robbed all others of their rights as South African citizens:

The negotiations between white South Africa and the U.K. Government to vest all political power in the white minority was a conspiracy to rob the majority of the people, the African, black and indigenous people of their country, the whole country, their birthright and right to self-determination... Independence means the right of a people to determine their own destiny and not to have it earned and shaped by some alien force. Like every other right in South Africa ‘independence’ is the exclusive monopoly and prerogative of the alien white minority. It is they and they alone who have the right to self-determination. But what is even more, they have reserved for themselves the right and power to determine the destiny of the indigenous people of South Africa (African National Congress 1971).

More to this point, in a paper presented to the Organization of African Unity Council of Ministers, Nzo further illustrates the stark divide which points to the South African nation as one solely for whites: “The South Africans white minority Government itself claims that the white nation is separate and distinct from the African people” (African National Congress 1971).

Just as legislated and politically endorsed inequality permeated apartheid South Africa’s political, economic, and social realms, it also was evident in sport – particularly rugby. During the rise of apartheid and white superiority, rugby was embraced as indicative of what it meant to be an Afrikaner male and patriot as it was a game that they could excel at while blacks and coloreds did not have access to the necessary resources required to play. Thus, as time went on and the National Party, and subsequently, white Afrikaners, gained power, rugby and the Springboks were held as a symbol that represented their social standing and power; the sport

became closely associated with ideological links to Afrikaner nationalism (Dunn 2009; Grundlingh 1996; Kriel 2010; Lapchick 1979). There was certain ideology associated with rugby that reflected the superiority of the Afrikaner race, as this subset of the population excelled on the field due to their abundant resources – left unavailable to black communities – and positions of power within the sport and government. Dunn (2009), Farquharson and Marjoribanks (2003), and Kriel (2010) argue that rugby during the apartheid era was used to promote nationalism in addition to the notion that all white Springbok teams symbolized the ‘bounded citizenship’ that divided South Africa along racial lines. This only served to establish rugby as a reflection of the nation’s social landscape, which segregated races and inherently privileged whites at the expense of black communities.

As rugby further divided South Africa along the racial classifications established by the National Party during apartheid, it only grew as an exclusive symbol that unified the Afrikaner community. Playing or following rugby was an integral part of Afrikaner life, as important as various cultural, religious, and social traditions (Dunn 2009; Kriel 2010; Lapchick 1979). Moreover, it was a way for the Afrikaner community, which comprised the majority of the Springbok team, to display their strength and value to the rest of the world through international games and tournaments. During the apartheid era, in the Afrikaner community, “support for the Springboks was on the same continuum as membership to the National Party” (Kriel 2010: 41). This only further emphasizes the deep association South African rugby had with the apartheid government and the reality that the Afrikaner’s dominance on the pitch reflected their power and standing in society. Consequently, it is imperative to consider how South Africa’s elite aimed to leverage the 1995 Rugby World Cup, a sport historically characterized as one of the oppressor,

to facilitate a transition towards an individualistic and civic framework of nationalism in which equality is a fundamental pillar.

As a collectivistic and ethnic nation, we see that notions of separateness were rampant in South African society as various forms of inequity permeated and divided the country, providing space for discourses and rhetoric emphasizing racial segregation and white superiority – and perhaps more notably a nation shaped for its white citizens. Thus, as we consider South Africa’s effort to transition towards an individualistic and civic framework of nationalism, we expect discourses of the re-imagined nation to emphasize equality, unity, reconciliation, democracy, and non-racialism as the country worked to reintegrate itself into the global arena. This very transition is apparent in the preamble of South Africa’s democratic constitution, approved in 1996, which reads

We the people of South Africa...believe that South Africa belongs to all who live in it, united in our diversity...establish a society based on democratic values, social justice, and fundamental human rights; lay the foundations for a democratic and open society in which government is based on the will of the people and every citizen is equally protected by law; improve the quality of life of all citizens and free the potential of each person; and build a unite and democratic South Africa (“Constitution”).

Similarly, F.W. de Klerk, the Afrikaner South African president who worked with Mandela to transform the nation into a democracy, stated, “we must abandon apartheid and accept one united South Africa with equal rights for all, with all forms of discrimination to be scrapped from the statute book” (Boddy-Evans “Apartheid”). It is this fundamental shift in language that signifies the beginning of the transition from a collectivistic and ethnic framework of nationalism to the individualistic and civic model in which all citizens are inherently equal, in all realms of society.

With this understanding of policy and rhetoric surrounding apartheid South Africa, we can consider the extent to which the country's political and athletic leaders, and media, leveraged hosting the 1995 Rugby World Cup and the 2010 FIFA World Cup to articulate their visions for a dramatic shift in national identity as they worked to shape a new South Africa. The analysis in the following two chapters explores a large consensus of discourses around widespread optimism surrounding each events' capacity to facilitate the country's revival. Yet, the hopefulness concerning the capacity of these events in aiding the nation's transformation, were not uncontested, with stakeholders challenging the interpretation of the capacity of both events in facilitating the re-imagining of South Africa. Throughout chapters four and five, you will note instances of opposing views in the footnotes.

Chapter 4: The 1995 Rugby World Cup

This chapter will evaluate how South African elites and newspapers leveraged hosting the 1995 Rugby World Cup as a platform to facilitate a transition in South Africa's sense of nation at the dawn of democracy. That is, how did stakeholders conceive the event as an opportunity to entrench notions of egalitarianism and equal opportunity? Beginning in 1995, we begin to see the initial movements from the collectivistic and ethnic framework of nationalism to the individualistic and civic model. The following themes were dominant in my analysis of speeches, interviews, and newspaper articles on South Africa hosting the Rugby World Cup: nation building through reconciling and unifying South Africa's diverse population, developing and facilitating a more inclusive national pride, and establishing a newfound sense of equality that pervaded society. These themes help us understand various South African stakeholders' visions for the 1995 Rugby World Cup as an opportunity structure that might further the transition towards a democratic and integrated nation which falls in line with the more egalitarian model of nationalism, that is, individualistic and civic.

1995 Rugby World Cup: Interviews and Speeches

The first major theme espoused by South African political and athletic leaders surrounding the 1995 Rugby World Cup is one of nation building. The seminal event was used to reconcile and unify the South African nation around ideals of democracy and equality as the country aimed to leave behind the legacies of apartheid. Addressing what an international audience might take away from South Africa's hosting of the Rugby World Cup, following years of apartheid induced isolation, President Mandela claimed,

They will see a spirit of a nation building and reconciling, manifesting itself in every section of our community. They will see that we now have thrown the doors of education

open for every child, irrespective of his color... They will see programs of renewal which we are now introducing – water-borne sewage, fresh and clean water for rural communities which have never enjoyed these privileges... All these will indicate to everybody that we are now in a new South Africa (Cleary 1995b).

To Mandela, serving as the face and voice of a transforming nation, the 1995 Rugby World Cup was about far more than the competition on the field; it was, instead, a time to showcase a new South Africa in which one's race was no longer indicative of their rights and access to opportunities. Similarly, Springbok captain Francois Pienaar noted, "this (the 1995 Rugby World Cup) is a huge opportunity for us... we have to work together" (Cleary 1995a). Pienaar recognized the capacity of the event in uniting a historically divided population and showcasing a new South Africa. But this could only be achieved through all South Africans, who were collective stakeholders, coming together towards a common goal of moving forward as an individualistic and civic nation. To this end, Mandela proposed that hosting the Rugby World Cup "adds impetus... to our nation building program" (Staff 1995).

To achieve this, Mandela needed a shared symbol to galvanize society. Leading up to the 1995 Rugby World Cup, the nation was momentarily poised on the brink of a civil war as the Afrikaner population braced for retribution they feared blacks and coloreds would seek after years of injustice. Instead, understanding the unifying power of sport, Mandela turned to the Springboks, historically a bastion of Afrikaner patriotism, and presented them as something that all South Africans could embrace. Through publicly voicing support for the team and urging black and colored South Africans to support the team, Mandela signaled the beginning of non-white acceptance of their previous white oppressors as equals in a new, democratic South Africa. The Springboks now belonged to all South Africans. This marks a dramatic shift from years prior in which the team was predominately supported by the white minority. Consequently, Mandela's

support of the Springbok transformed something long associated with white superiority into a symbol of the new South Africa. It was to be collectively embraced and shared by the country's diverse population – effectively serving to unite South Africans of all races and contributing to South Africa's nation building objectives.

Aware of their role in delivering this powerful unifying effect, Springbok Manager Morne Du Plessis, noted, “we would not throw away what is one of the most important contributions this World Cup has given to South Africa: uniting the people” (Bale 1995b). Similarly, Edward Griffiths, Chief Executive of the South African Rugby Union at the time, articulated the role of the event in contributing to this critical component of nation building: “it is a healing process for the country if everyone can unite behind the team” (Bale 1995c).³ One way of achieving this was to try to distance the Springboks from associations with Afrikaner patriotism. To accomplish this, each of the Springboks players had to practice the words to a new, additional national anthem *Nkosi Sikelel' iAfrika* – God Bless Africa – formerly the song of black resistance. Noting the value of the Springboks publicly singing this song, Du Plessis claimed, “most of the guys can't even remember the words of pop songs, but they will know the

³ This contradicts the actions of Louis Luyt, the President of the South African Rugby Union, who, in 1992, allowed *Die Stem* (the apartheid era anthem) to be played before a match between South Africa and New Zealand. This was in defiance of the terms set forth by the ANC in allowing the match to occur. In doing so, Luyt emphatically brandished a symbol of the past injustices and hatred that characterized South Africa, just as the nation was working to reintegrate itself into the international community. For South Africans looking forward to the new democratic era, the manner in which the Springboks returned to competition was deplorable. It led former Robben Island detainee and then South African Rugby Union Vice-President Mluleki George to claim, “We were moving towards a united South Africa in 1992 but there was still this arrogance among white people that rugby was their sport. Most blacks at the time would have been quite happy to see them lose. We were definitely stuck in the old days” (Rogers 1995). This controversial act incensed the ANC and raised questions as to whether South Africa, and rugby officials, were ready to host an event of this magnitude, and more specifically, how the event might aid the nation's transformation.

words of the anthem” (Unknown 1995d). The Springboks’ open embrace of the song of the liberation movement, further illustrates the team’s understanding of their role in contributing to the nation building of a new South Africa. They were becoming a symbol that could be collectively claimed and embraced by all citizens – irrespective of race.

Attune to the importance of the Springboks in uniting the diverse South African population through the 1995 Rugby World Cup, Du Plessis held that the team was “very proud to have been a catalyst of nation building. We don’t want to make a big deal out of it but everyone has experienced that something has happened. Rugby has made a difference in this country” (Bale 1995c). More broadly, South African Minister of Sport and Recreation, Steve Tshwete, aware of the unifying power of sport in aiding South Africa’s progression towards a democratic and fundamentally equal society, argued, “sport brings kids, black and white, on to the track, the pitch, the field, and to defend their goal line as South Africans. To bring our people together on that score, we welcome the privilege of staging the tournament (1995 Rugby World Cup) in our city” (Cowley 1994).

A second theme invoked by South African political and athletic leaders’ was leveraging the 1995 Rugby World Cup to facilitate an inclusive national pride. This saw South Africans rallying around their shared support of the Springboks and the accomplishment of hosting the tournament – as well as the play of the Springboks – in giving all citizens something to be proud of and collectively claim as a triumph for all of South Africa. Successfully hosting the Rugby World Cup was to serve as a valuable opportunity, a catalyst to promote ideals of an integrated and egalitarian South Africa striving to shift their sense of nation and national identity. To this point, Du Plessis envisioned the event as one that would “focus the energies and attentions of many groups of people on one event...it’s rare for us to have mass events, like the inauguration

of President Mandela or the (first democratic) election, to pull interest groups together and form one nation. Maybe people will look at this event and say, this is our country, we're doing quite well" (Thomsen 1995). The Springboks manager also noted that the team "felt the surge of the nation" in rallying behind the squad and collectively embracing them as a symbol of the new South Africa (Thomas 1995). Similarly, Pienaar, the Springboks' captain, on the widespread support the team had received, commented, "it's the first time the whole country is behind us. In the past it would have been 2 million people; now it's 40 million. The support from all races in South Africa is fantastic" (Thomsen 1995). Such language helped break down traditional stereotypes long associated with the Springboks and positioned the team as a symbol for the entirety of the population to embrace and take pride in. Political and athletic leaders aimed to capitalize on this and use the event to promote ideals of a united and inclusive South Africa. The green and gold of the Springboks had become an emblem of reconciliation and civic pride. No longer was the team tied to notions of white superiority, but, rather, represented the inclusive pride of a nation in which whites, blacks, and coloreds could openly embrace the team and their success.

Addressing the new, encompassing pride pervading all corners of South Africa, Tshwete posited, "The tournament is giving the people of South Africa encouragement in what we are doing now. It will be a boost in morale for all South Africans" (Cowley 1994). Likewise, Griffiths claimed, "A lot of people are still wary of the new dispensation in South Africa but now they can genuinely say 'here we are, all in it together'" (Bale 1995c). These examples, emphasizing the word 'all', implies a newfound sense of equality and opportunity that pervaded the democratic nation as all citizens – irrespective of race – were responsible for working

together to shape South Africa's future, highlighting a transformation to an individualistic and civic model of nationalism.

The third major theme emphasized in South African elites' aims for the Rugby World Cup was employing the platform of the event to facilitate national transformation through increasing equality in, and access to, opportunities in rugby. More broadly, this corresponded with hope for a newfound ability to equitably participate in all realms of the new South Africa, regardless of skin color. In addressing the almost all-white composition of the 1995 Springboks, Mandela argued,

I am informed by Steve Tshwete that this is the last time in which a team that we field will not represent the overwhelming majority of the population. It is, of course, a pity that Chester Williams will not be playing because of injury. The team will now appear as being simply lily-white. It is true that many observers will be examining a composition of the country's team and comments will touch on the lily-white nature of the team from Africa, when even teams from Europe will be featuring people of color. It is quite clear that our team is selected on merit not on color. However, it is not easy to train and bring up to standard people who have been denied opportunities for more than three centuries and especially during the last 45 years (Cleary 1995b).

In acknowledging the past roadblocks preventing black and colored participation in rugby at the national level, Mandela recognized past inequity but also a transition. In South Africa's new society, there would be a commitment to open avenues for athletic participation to those who were once rejected; no longer would rugby players be denied opportunities due to their race. Moving forward, South Africa would be a society in which merit determined one's standing and there would be a commitment to ensuring equal access to opportunities and resources in a conscious effort to level the playing field. This can be expanded more broadly outside of sport, to illustrate a transition in nationalism and suggest that under the individualistic and civic framework embraced by the new South Africa, all citizens were to be considered fundamentally

equal and given the same opportunities to achieve success in political, economic, and social realms. Further to this point, Griffiths intended to leverage the event to promote rugby in previously marginalized communities in South Africa:

We look at the World Cup as a four-week advertisement for rugby. The challenge if we are to grow as a rugby power is to broaden the base of the game, to bring in people who have felt rugby was part of something apart from them because they were neglected by rugby... what we wanted to do was put the World Cup as a defining moment in rugby when it would stop being the white game, elitist and exclusive, and rather make it inclusive, a national sport available to everyone (Bale 1995c).

This campaign to take rugby into non-white communities – in which players were historically relegated to lower leagues and prevented from competing with, or against, their white counterparts – was aimed at emphasizing increased equality and access to opportunities that were notably absent during the apartheid era. Du Plessis, discussing the role of the Springboks and, more broadly the event, noted, “the World Cup has come at a very critical time for our rugby in trying to spread the game beyond the traditional population and support barriers, and this is exactly what our ‘One team, one country’ slogan has been directed to. The World Cup is an ideal vehicle to launch our campaign and it has been successful” (Bale 1995a). Through creating development programs and providing fields and the equipment necessary to play, South African elite aimed to use rugby as a means to bridge the divisions along racial lines that long plagued society. Explaining this transition Chester Williams, the one non-white player on the 1995 Springboks, discussed a fundamental shift in rugby leading up to the Rugby World Cup:

It’s (rugby) different even in our community...they’re putting in more money towards our facilities. Now we’re seeing scrumming machines, rugby poles, fields – there is money for all the people of South Africa...I am happy because now people are realizing that everyone can play rugby – and not only rugby. A lot of people want to play soccer, golf, basketball – they know now that any fellow can play any sport. That is why I always try to stay in the Springbok side, to motivate other people (Thomsen 1995).

His presence as the only non-white player on the team served as an inspiration to previously marginalized populations. He was proof that opportunities were becoming increasingly accessible to all South Africans.⁴ Moreover, just as rugby was expanding beyond the traditional boundaries of the game, this newfound access to opportunities, enjoyed by all South Africans, extended beyond sports.⁵

To this end, it is imperative to consider how South Africa's political and athletic stakeholders envisioned the 1995 Rugby World Cup leaving a legacy that would further serve as a catalyst for national transformation. Thinking broadly about how the event would function as an opportunity structure and position the new South Africa in a global context, Mandela viewed the World Cup as a way to re-imagine South Africa after years of isolation: "The tournament will boost our own industry and our own economy in that it will lead to a robust program of construction in hotels and bring tourists and foreign exchange into the country. It is a very exciting moment for us" (Cleary 1995b). Moreover, the South African President aimed to leverage the World Cup as a means to demonstrate the capacity of a new, unified nation, claiming, "the Rugby World Cup is very important because it indicates the acceptance of South Africa by the international community" (Cleary 1995b). Consequently, Mandela conceived the

⁴ This is a dramatic transition from the apartheid era in which South African nationalism was predicated on an inherent, legislated inequity aimed at relegating blacks and coloreds to second class citizens in all realms of life.

⁵ Such progress is illustrated through social programs such as Black Economic Empowerment. Implemented in 2003, the program was launched by the South African government to give previously disadvantaged populations (i.e. non-whites) economic privileges they were previously denied. While its inception came after the conclusion of the Rugby World Cup, the emphasis on national unity and equality created an impetus in which such meaningful social and economic programs could be conceived as a means to address apartheid's legacies of inequality and exclusion.

event as a means to present the newly democratic nation, open for business, to both a national and international audience through showcasing the capacity of a united South Africa.

At the domestic level, Pienaar, discussing the historic link between rugby and Afrikaner patriotism, claimed that “we know we have weaknesses. If we didn’t acknowledge these weaknesses, then we would be really stupid. We have changed, our values are different now” (Cleary 1994). Pienaar, the captain of the Springboks and at the pinnacle of what it once meant to be an Afrikaner male, conceded the role of rugby in cementing white superiority during South Africa’s apartheid era. Yet he deliberately emphasized a dramatic shift in values that corresponded with a new sense of nationalism committed to ensuring fundamental equality and rights to all citizens. Furthermore, Du Plessis, discussing the capacity of the World Cup in aiding a new South Africa, working to undergo a dramatic shift in the country’s social contract and national identity, observed that “this World Cup is more than blood and guts and points on the board” (Hands 1995). To many stakeholders, the seminal event represented far more than a rugby tournament, but an opportunity to unite the population around a shared entity that would help usher South Africa into a democratic era, underscoring a dramatic transition in nationalism and national identity.

The 1995 Rugby World Cup was certainly leveraged, then, as a platform to promote the capacity of a unified nation and to establish a legacy that would benefit South Africa in years to come. But it was also perceived as a watershed moment in moving away from the apartheid state in which certain opportunities were afforded solely to white South Africans. In considering this critical transition, as South Africa worked to find itself as a democratic nation, Minister of Sport and Recreation, Steve Tshwete, noted that “our selectors (of the 1995 Springboks) represent the last vestiges of apartheid” (Mitchell 1995). Moving forward, there was to be a fundamental shift

in the nature of access, opportunities, and privileges to ensure that all South Africans – irrespective of race – were deemed equals not only in sport, but also South Africa’s social, political, and economic realms. Speaking to this point and recognizing the power of the Rugby World Cup in contributing to this shift, Griffiths posited,

We must become a truly national sport, and a truly national sport does not field the team including 14 whites in front of a crowd of 98 percent whites... This is the first step of a 100 mile journey. It will be facile to pretend that four single weeks of rugby can unify the country, but the Webb Ellis trophy is the single most valuable marketing tool we have. It’s our responsibility to go out into the community and make the spark lit here into a flame (Miller 1995a).

1995 Rugby World Cup: Newspapers

The previous section evaluated the manner in which South African elites aimed to leverage hosting the 1995 Rugby World Cup as an opportunity structure that would facilitate a dramatic transition in nationalism and national identity. However, as Farquharson and Marjoribanks (2003) posit, the media are a potentially powerful site for framing discourses of the relationship between sport and nation building. Thus, it is imperative to investigate South African newspapers and the extent to which they envisioned the hosting of the 1995 Rugby World Cup as contributing to South Africa’s nation building objectives; agreeing or disagreeing with the opinions of the South African elite in working to shape public opinion around the significance of the event. Similar to my analysis of South African elites, an exploration of South African newspapers indicates that the Rugby World Cup was conceived as an opportunity to help South Africa’s transformation in nationalism and national identity. The following themes were predominant in my analysis of the South African newspapers: nation building through reconciling and unifying the population, employing the event to develop comprehensive pride,

and expanding rugby beyond its traditional bounds to make it a truly inclusive experience to be embraced by all South Africans. The presence of these themes suggest that South African newspapers largely agreed with the South African elite about the significance of the 1995 Rugby World Cup in facilitating to a dramatic transition in nationalism and national identity.

The first major theme invoked by South African newspapers concerning the tournament was that of nation building, particularly as it pertained to reconciliation and unity. Regarding reconciliation, South African newspapers conceived the event as a seminal moment in integrating a historically divided population, working to establish themselves in a newly democratic society: “It is ironic that a game which was for so long considered a symbol of the repression of the aspirations of this country’s citizens should have assumed such an importance for all of South Africa” (Swift 1995b). Moreover, South African newspapers found the act of Mandela wearing the Springbok emblem, in a public display of an entire nation’s support of the team, to be quite significant. The *Cape Times* posited,

For Nelson Mandela, it (wearing the Springbok jersey) was a touch of genius. To take hold of the very colors of your historic enemy, of your cultural, social, and political oppressor, and to raise them aloft as a symbol of brotherhood, was more powerful than a million words...this unique statesmen’s gesture has overturned a former hated bastille of racist privilege and created, instead a talismanic club of equality (Miller 1995b).

Similarly, the *Cape Times* also wrote, “Mr. Mandela said the time had arrived for all South Africans to support the Springbok emblem as this would help cement the spirit of unity and reconciliation forged by the team’s World Cup triumph” (Unknown 1995b).⁶ Here, the

⁶ Similar to George, the *Mail and Guardian* was skeptical about the capacity of hosting the Rugby World Cup in contributing to South Africa’s national transformation. In response to Luyt’s controversial playing of *Die Stem* during the match against New Zealand in 1992, Jon Swift expressed bewilderment: “Luyt flew in the face of what seemed at the time to be common sense by playing *Die Stem* before the start of the All Black game at Ellis Park...He refused to

newspaper emphasized the significance of Mandela embracing a symbol – historically associated with the oppressor – to demonstrate non-white support for the Springboks. This was an emblem that was to be collectively claimed by all South Africans, not just whites, which served to galvanize and unite the nation’s diverse population.

On this point, the *Mail and Guardian* articulated the significance of this act in facilitating reconciliation and nation building, “even President Mandela wore the leaping Springbok and the green and gold. And Archbishop Tutu – as unlikely a candidate as a lock forward you probably couldn’t hope to find – walked the streets of Cape Town in a national rugby jersey which reached down almost as far as his more accustomed ecumenical robes” (Swift 1995c). The very figures that led the liberation movement and stood against the social implications of rugby during the apartheid era were publicly supporting the team as a means to encourage blacks and coloreds to rally around the Springboks, effectively uniting the population, and reconciling the nation.

The *Mail and Guardian* further suggested the significance of efforts geared towards reconciliation led by Mandela, in aiding South Africa’s dramatic transition in nationalism and national identity. Reconciliation “has been led from the front by our state president, who embraced the South African team as ‘my sons’, donning a cap adorned with the leaping Springbok emblem and putting his unreserved support behind the side – when in the past, as he admits, he would always have supported the other team” (Swift 1995e). This illustrates a

apologize...despite the insensitivity of it all” (Swift 1995g). While the 1995 Rugby World Cup was envisioned by many stakeholders to facilitate the transition towards democracy, the architect of the 1995 Rugby World Cup and President of South African Rugby Union, Louis Luyt, emphatically disregarded the conditions set forth by the ANC, to which he had previously agreed. This promoted doubt about the potential of rugby in aiding South Africa’s nation building objectives and the significance of the Rugby World Cup in contributing to the nation’s transformation as some believed the Springboks continued to be representative of Afrikaner patriotism.

deliberate action by Mandela to galvanize nationwide support for the Springboks, recognizing the importance of a collective symbol, and shared source of pride, in integrating and uniting the country. This increased support and attention towards the Springboks meant that, sidelined by a hamstring injury, “‘Chessie’ will be missed by both the fans worldwide and the wide of which he has become such a popular and integral part...it is a mark of the progress that the game – and along with it the country – has made...it is an indication that national considerations are indeed starting to override the narrow thinking of the dark days of our recent history” (Swift 1995b).

The fact that a black player, Chester Williams, had become such a ‘popular’ and ‘integral’ member of the team, exemplifies the dramatic transition in national consciousness. Previously, he would not have even been considered for the squad just years earlier during the apartheid era – evidence of nation building and the ongoing transition to an individualistic and civic society in which equality and equitable access to opportunities are paramount.

This shift in national consideration included learning the song of black liberation, an important step in the reconciliation process, something similarly articulated by the South African elite:

Francois Pienaar’s insistence as captain that all the members of the team know the words of *Nkosi Sikelel’ iAfrika* as well as they do *Die Stem* (the national anthem of apartheid South Africa) has put the game beyond the pale...this has been a cause for celebration, an indication that our internal emphases are indeed changing from the narrow constraints of the old towards an all embracing acceptance of the new (Swift 1995e).

As captain of the Springboks, Pienaar was representative of what it meant to be an Afrikaner male during apartheid. His insistence that the team not only learn *Nkosi Sikelel’ iAfrika*, but be able to sing it during the national anthem component of the pregame pageantry further emphasized that the team represented a united and integrated society. This new sense of nation

would ensure that all South Africans were fundamentally considered equals at the dawn of the democratic era. Summarizing the importance of all these efforts aimed at reconciling the population, the *Cape Times* wrote that “even before the whistle was blown for the kick-off at Newlands, South Africa had already won the hearts of the nation. When the final whistle blew a month later, the foundations for reconciliation and nation building had truly been strengthened” (Unknown 1995c).

Through reconciliation, the aim was to unite the population around ideals of democracy and equality in an effort to leave behind the legacies of apartheid and build a new South Africa. Emphasizing the importance of the unification of South Africa as a means to transition to an equitable society, the *Cape Times* posited, “Mr. Mandela said the time had arrived for all South Africans to support the Springbok emblem as this would help cement the spirit of unity and reconciliation forged by the team’s World Cup triumph” (Unknown 1995b). This spirit of unification was encompassed in the term ‘Rainbow Nation’ which was often attached to Springboks during the 1995 Rugby World Cup.⁷ Leading up to final match, the *Mail and Guardian* published an article describing the success of the Springboks and what it meant for South Africa’s efforts in transitioning to an increasingly egalitarian model of nationalism: individualistic and civic. It was titled ‘All Blacks v The Rainbow Nation’ (Swift 1995d). In characterizing the national team as ‘The Rainbow Nation’, and not the Springboks, we see a major South African newspaper advocating a national team that represented an entire nation and could be claimed by all South Africans, irrespective of race. Through these efforts at reconciliation, the Springboks “final victory, without losing a single match throughout the

⁷ The term ‘Rainbow Nation’ was coined by Archbishop Tutu to describe post-apartheid South Africa and was meant to encapsulate the unity of South Africa’s diverse multiculturalism in a nation long categorized as white and non-white.

tournament, had lifted the nation's spirits and achieved a unity that can be compared with Nelson Mandela's election as President" (Unknown 1995da). In claiming that the Springboks success, representing all of South Africa, was on par with the unity and hope associated with Mandela's election, the *Cape Times* gives credence to the capacity of the 1995 Rugby World Cup in unifying South Africa and provide hope for a future in which democracy and equality would take root in a society long missing such principles. On this very point, the *Mail and Guardian* found that "the present leads directly to a better and brighter future. The Rugby World Cup has been an enormous success as a catalyst for the kind of national unity which is possible in South Africa" (Swift 1995e). This future, espoused by a major South African newspaper, was one in which all South Africans could embrace their nation as one and were inherently equal, in all realms of society: "The final whistle of the Rugby World Cup on Saturday which established the Springboks as the rugby champions, unleashed a night of celebration that united South Africans across the country... 'Forget about the old South Africa', said Mr. Morena Kgosana of Soweto. 'This is the new South Africa. We are united now'" ("SA" 1995).

Capitalizing on the fervor sweeping a unified nation galvanized by the success of the Springboks and their contributions to ushering in a new South African nationalism, the team adopted the slogan 'One team, One Country' aimed at further reconciling and unifying the country around a shared symbol – rugby, which had long been characterized as an exclusive sport for white South Africans. One writer posited that "Francois Pienaar and his squad...clearly they were one team one nation" (Swift 1995f). This slogan was immediately picked up by the media and became something that both the *Cape Times* and the *Mail and Guardian* referenced when talking about the significance of this event: "The slogan 'One Team, One Country' had been the adopted rallying cry at the start of the campaign" (Swift 1995c); "the one country

behind its one team” (Swift 1995b); “one country, one side” (Swift 1995a); and “the one team for this one country this far” (Swift 1995d). This further positioned the Springboks as representatives of reconciliation, reflecting the widespread support and hope associated with the team. By plainly establishing themselves as a team representing a unified country and the broad interests of a dynamic and multicultural nation transitioning from apartheid to democracy, the *Mail and Guardian* insinuated that inequality and racial hierarchies – long associated with rugby – would no longer be the dominant social determinants. To this point, the *Mail and Guardian* found, “the World Cup has brought the white minority closer to the ideals of our new democracy, by the almost unreserved support of all sectors of the community for the squad who espouse the ethic of ‘one team, one country’, than any past political assurances” (Swift 1995e).

The second major theme emphasized in South African newspapers was the capacity of the event in facilitating a new, inclusive national pride. Through the aforementioned efforts aimed at reconciling and uniting a long divided nation, and the solidarity that emanated from the World Cup, a surge of national pride swept South Africa. With the Springboks serving as a collective symbol, embraced by all South Africans, “the waves of patriotic emotion from the terraces have carried the team” (Swift 1995d). The *Mail and Guardian* wrote that “the sudden outpouring of patriotic pride during the opening...is headed only by the national hysteria which greeted the 15-12 triumph over the All Blacks in the final” (Swift 1995f) and that “the hearts of a nation which had willed them (Springboks) on” (Swift 1995c). The emphasis on an inclusive national pride carrying the team implied a transition, facilitated by the opportunity structure that was the 1995 Rugby World Cup. Whereas during apartheid, the Springboks were widely embraced by South Africa’s white population, we see a shift towards a team representing an entire country, encouraging the unified population to share in their collective success and derive

pleasure from the event. For the first time since the democratic elections a year prior, all South Africans could take pride in the capacity of the nation in embracing a common entity and supporting a common cause: “the South Africans...propelled ever onwards by the hopes of a nation have surpassed all realistic hopes by getting as far as they have” (Swift 1995d). These depictions by South African newspapers position the 1995 Springboks as representative of something far more than just a rugby team, but a symbol of the new, integrated South Africa. This encompassing national pride is critical in conceptualizing South Africa’s nation building and national transformation as it provided hope that inspired individuals of a brighter future, and more specifically, the promise of a new South Africa under an individualistic and civic model of nationalism.

The third major theme invoked in South African newspapers concerning the capacity of the 1995 Rugby World Cup in ushering in an era of democracy and equality, was the deliberate goal of spreading the game of rugby beyond its traditional bounds to make it a truly inclusive experience. This is critical if the World Cup was to facilitate South Africa’s transformation in nationalism and national identity as the sport had long represented that of the oppressor. As such, the South African newspapers recognized the capacity of the sport, and World Cup, to bridge South Africa’s racial divides and grow the sport amongst previously marginalized populations as a means to sustain the Springboks, and rugby, as representative of the entire nation. If rugby was made accessible to non-whites, perhaps this newly established equality in the sport, coupled with greater success, would be indicative of a transforming nation in which there was to be fundamental equality and greater access to opportunities in all realms of society. The *Mail and Guardian* featured the work of the South African Broadcasting Company which, leading up to the tournament,

Spent a week training the rugby commentators from each of the black radio stations on the rules, which areas of play to look for and terminology. As a result the opening game between South Africa and Australia at Newlands on May 25 will be the first rugby match ever to be given full radio commentary in all 11 official languages (Spender 1995).

In that same article, the author assumed the role of a visitor descending on South Africa for the Rugby World Cup:

In days of yore, it was tough enough for overseas strays that commentary was split 50/50 English/Afrikaans, but now imagine their consternation when after 15 minutes of English – and all seemingly going well – the commentary switches to Xhosa. And then, after 10 minutes of that, when our two potters might be thinking that it will switch back to English any moment, the final 15 minutes of the half comes their way in Afrikaans... The confusion of overseas visitors (in listening to radio broadcasts) is in itself a triumph for rugby in South Africa, an indication of the growing interest among the black and colored communities in the game and the tournament (Spender 1995).

This highlights a dramatic transition from the apartheid regime. Now visitors would have to contend with rugby matches being broadcast in 11 different languages, rather than solely Afrikaans as would have been customary in years past. Yet this dilemma was to be embraced, as it was emblematic of a transforming nation working to make the sport more inclusive and expand the game beyond its traditional bounds.⁸ To this point, the *Mail and Guardian* acknowledged the importance of expanding the game if it were to contribute to South Africa's nation building objectives, "the World Cup is a major stepping stone in breaking the traditional black South African view that rugby is a white supremacist sport" (Spender 1995). The paper also noted, "Indications are that the TV sets have been switched on to rugby as often in Soweto as in

⁸ In broadcasting the sport in all 11 national languages for the first time, the intention was seemingly to unite all South Africans around a shared entity as the country worked to distance itself from the historical social stigma of rugby, and more broadly, inequalities and racial hierarchies of the apartheid era.

Sandton” (Swift 1995e). Such findings are important as Soweto is one of South Africa’s largest townships⁹ and Sandton is an affluent, predominately white neighborhood of Johannesburg. South Africans from disparate backgrounds were embracing and supporting the team at the same rate, an unimaginable development under the auspices of apartheid. This underscores the success of spreading the game and building interest in communities where individuals were previously denied the right to play rugby with their white counterparts or benefit from the same training and privileges afforded to white South Africans. Furthermore it emphasizes the power of including the entire population in a social experience and rallying their support around a team that everyone could collectively claim and take pride in. This was a critical component of the 1995 Rugby World Cup in serving as an opportunity structure aimed at facilitating South Africa’s transition in nationalism and national identity.

Lastly, the South African newspapers were also concerned with the legacy of the Rugby World Cup and what it meant for a new South Africa, transitioning into a democratic era in which race was no longer indicative of one’s standing and opportunities. The *Mail and Guardian* wrote, “The Rugby World Cup is going to be a very hard act to follow. It is a point of national focus...it has been as if the game which once typified white domination had magically drawn all sectors towards the center and opened a new path, shown a new direction” (Swift 1995e). According to the *Mail and Guardian*, the Rugby World Cup had laid the groundwork for what could be accomplished in a democratic and integrated South Africa. There was optimism and hope surrounding the future of a society in which all South Africans were inherently equal and guaranteed the same rights and privileges under the new individualistic and civic framework of nationalism. Observing the power of the tournament in aiding South Africa’s fundamental shift

⁹ Townships are suburbs or cities designated for black occupation by apartheid legislation.

of its social contract, “the game, the people, and the country as a whole have benefited enormously from the whole experience...More important than the eventual bottom line, though, has been the thread which has drawn the diverse interests of this rainbow nation towards the fortunes of 15 men in green and gold jerseys” (Swift 1995e).

Chapter 5: The 2010 FIFA World Cup

The previous chapter evaluated the manner in which South African elites and newspapers leveraged the 1995 Rugby World Cup as a platform to accelerate a transition in South Africa's sense of nation at the dawn of democracy. That is, how did stakeholders of the 1995 Rugby World Cup conceive the event as an opportunity structure to promote ideals of a democratic and equitable nation? Similarly, this chapter will evaluate South Africa's hosting of the 2010 FIFA World Cup – fifteen years in to the democratic era – and the extent to which South African elites and newspapers regarded the event as a catalyst to further their visions for an integrated and egalitarian society. During the 1995 Rugby World Cup we first saw initial movements indicating a dramatic shift in South Africa's sense of nation. 15 years later, we find many stakeholders working to further entrench notions of an individualistic and civic model of nationalism.

The following themes were dominant in my analysis of speeches, interviews, and newspaper articles concerning South Africa's hosting of the FIFA World Cup: nation building through unifying the South African population and facilitating an inclusive national pride, showcasing the capacity and development of the new South Africa, while also working to integrate Africa – as a whole – into the international community. Similar to my analysis of the 1995 Rugby World Cup, these themes help us understand various South African stakeholders' visions for a democratic and integrated nation, which falls in line with the more egalitarian model of nationalism, that is, individualistic and civic.

2010 FIFA World Cup: Interviews and Speeches

The first major theme invoked by South African elites who envisioned the 2010 FIFA World Cup as an opportunity structure in which they could further underscore South Africa's

national transformation, was employing the event to unify the historically divided population. This was meant to facilitate nation building. Similar to the 1995 Rugby World Cup, South African political and athletic leaders intended to employ the unifying nature of sport to galvanize the diverse South African population around a collective effort that all South Africans could claim as their own – successfully hosting the 2010 FIFA World Cup. In speaking about the power of the 2010 FIFA World Cup in providing a unifying effect, Chief Executive Officer of the 2010 FIFA World Cup Danny Jordaan argued that the World Cup would “provide massive scope for nation building and social cohesion” (McRae 2010) and, “South Africa’s hosting of the 2010 FIFA World Cup represents one of the greatest and grandest nation-building initiatives we have undertaken since the death of apartheid” (Jordaan 2010). It is clear from the outset that Jordaan, and by extension, many South African stakeholders, conceived the tournament as an opportunity to unite a multicultural population around shared goals and symbols as the nation continued its efforts to establish itself as an egalitarian and inclusive society. To this end, Bafana Bafana captain, Aaron Mokoena, proposed, “It’s incredible, we have absolutely pulled people together, (from) different races and that means a lot. That’s what this World Cup had to do. It’s not only about football. I always said that this World Cup was going to give the opportunity to South Africa as a whole to showcase what we have in the country and pull people together” (Hytner 2010). Such sentiments of unity and ‘pulling people together’ are reminiscent of visions for the 1995 Rugby World Cup, indicating that perhaps the unifying effect the Springboks offered was momentary. Nevertheless, it is clear that South African elite aimed to use the 2010 FIFA World Cup as a means to unite South Africa’s population to catalyze nation building objectives and showcase the capacity and potential of a cohesive South Africa.

To this end, the extent to which South Africa could re-imagine itself as a country was predicated on what South African President Jacob Zuma described as “our ability to come together” (Zuma 2010a). Similarly, Jordaan believed that the 2010 FIFA World Cup was “delivered by black and white coming together”, emphasizing the power of sport in unifying the South African population (Jordaan 2010). This was intended to showcase the strength of the ‘Rainbow Nation’ as the World Cup further facilitated a national transformation towards an equitable and inclusive society. Thabo Mbeki, South African President from 1999-2008, echoed this belief that the 2010 FIFA World Cup signaled the achievement of a common goal, one in which all South Africans were stakeholders in a nation committed to re-imagining itself as an egalitarian society: “I am confident that...our hearts, spirits, minds, and bodies will talk, live, and breathe in unison towards the achievement of the common goal of helping to define 2010 for all humanity as eminently the year of celebration of the fulfillment of the dreams of an entire population about their dignity, that have taken centuries to realize” (Mbeki 2006b). This common goal, referenced by Mbeki, is one that ensures fundamental equality and opportunity for all South Africans, guaranteeing their dignity and self-worth, a new reality in the fifteen years since the Rugby World Cup. Thus, for Mbeki, South Africa’s hosting of the 2010 FIFA World Cup was intended to further a transition in nationalism, under which all South Africans would benefit from collective fundamental rights and privileges, an effort that began in earnest in 1994 and aided by the nation’s hosting of the 1995 Rugby World Cup. Echoing this objective, Jordaan noted, “We want to move to a united future. What you need are projects that bind a nation, that carry a common and shared vision. I think that is what the World Cup will do” (Longman 2009).

In terms of nation building and unifying the population, Jordaan claimed, “I think that in this regard the impact is going to be massive, much more than the 1995 (rugby) World Cup”

(Moody 2010). The 1995 Rugby World Cup is widely accepted as a significant moment at the dawn of democracy, as it reconciled and unified a population on the brink of civil war. For the first time, blacks and whites collectively embraced the Springboks, a stark transition from the past. Yet, the CEO of the 2010 FIFA World Cup was optimistic that the latter event would have an even greater unifying effect in terms of social cohesion and moving South Africa forward as a re-imagined nation predicated on equality and inclusivity.

Similarly, Zuma proposed that the 2010 FIFA World Cup

Is undoubtedly the biggest marketing event in the history of the country. Our logo takes its guidance from our flag, and serves as a symbol of a united Team South Africa, a nation that works together for success and progress. The logo symbolizes our vibrancy and energy, coupled with the spirit of Ubuntu and resilience. The logo emphasizes our message, that indeed, working together we can do more to build a great country (Zuma 2010b).

To the South African elite, the event took on the form of a coming out party of sorts for a transformed nation. Fifteen years after the fall of apartheid, the world once again turned its attention to the southern tip of Africa to see what progress had been made since the end of the apartheid era, a time marked by racial hierarchies and inherent inequalities. It was an opportunity to demonstrate the capacity of a united and collective population, ‘working together’ to set a course for the future South Africa in which all citizens of the ‘Rainbow Nation’ would benefit from innate equality and access to opportunities, rights, and privileges. To this end, Jordaan proposed that the tournament “has brought great unity since we were awarded the FIFA World Cup. Our nation was separated for 300 years and has rediscovered itself in ten years through football. The FIFA World Cup is the strongest unifying factor in our country” (FIFA 2005). It is clear that South Africa’s hosting of the World Cup was leveraged as a platform to pursue nation building objectives through strengthening social cohesion and demonstrating to the international

community that a united South Africa could achieve far more than under the divisive features of its past. Emphasizing the progress that South Africa had made, and the extent to which this event was conceived as a platform to promote a re-imagined South Africa to the rest of the world, South African Minister Dlamini Zuma suggested,

Indeed we are impatient for the dawn of 2010 to highlight to the peoples of the world progress made thus far in consolidating our democracy, in pushing back the frontiers of racism and sexism while showcasing what has been done to ensure the young of our country have the best that mankind has produced, in which they are being taught to love the people of all races, to defined the equality of the peoples (Zuma 2009).

The second major theme found in my analysis of South African elites' expectations for the 2010 FIFA World Cup in accelerating South Africa's national transformation is the role of the tournament in facilitating an inclusive national pride. That is, moving away from the ethnic nationalism and ethnic pride that divided South Africa for so long. Just as with the 1995 Rugby World Cup, notions of national pride are important in nation building – i.e. creating a new South Africa characterized by integration and equality – as it demonstrates collective support of Bafana Bafana, or hosting the event, that can be claimed as a success for all of South Africa. This newfound national pride can then serve as a catalyst to promote the ideals of an integrated and egalitarian nation to a global audience coming to terms with the new South Africa. To this point, Zuma claimed that the 2010 FIFA World Cup,

Has been an important component for our nation building. It is for the first time in South Africa that we have seen this 'Rainbow Nation' really coming together in a manner we have not witnessed before. For the first time, I have noticed that every South African is now flying our national flag. Everybody is just crazy about this tournament, both black and white. This tournament proved that sport is a tool for nation building (FIFA 2010b).

Likewise, Jordaan proposed, “we’re seeing something we’ve never seen before – black and white South Africans driving with the national flag hanging out their windows” (McRae 2010). Unlike

teams during the apartheid era, Bafana Bafana represented a united, single South Africa. They were an entity that could be shared and claimed by all South Africans who derived pleasure from their success. More broadly, the fact that South Africa was in the midst of successfully hosting the most watched sporting event in the world, was enough to give South Africans something to collectively take pride in, knowing that, united and working together, they could execute an objective of such magnitude. With this in mind, perhaps the new, more encompassing national pride, and achievement of South Africans, associated with hosting the FIFA World Cup, would mark a defining moment in South Africa's transformation towards an egalitarian society under the framework of an individualistic and civic nation. Expanding on the fervor sweeping the nation, Zuma noted, "South Africa has never experienced such a vibrancy and jubilation since the release of President Nelson Mandela and other political prisoners in 1990. We are truly excited by the success and spirit engulfing the country. For the first time ever in the 16 years of freedom and democracy, we see black and white South Africans celebrating together" (Staff 2010f). The success of hosting the tournament offers promises of a brighter future in which all South Africans are to be stakeholders in the country's development and proudly work to position the re-imagined nation in a global context: "we call on all South Africans to ensure that this greatest sporting event further strengthens national pride and patriotism and further secures our country's place in the hearts and minds of the world" (Mlambo-Ngcuka 2005).

In addition to leveraging the 2010 FIFA World Cup as an opportunity to unify and facilitate inclusive national pride in an effort to achieve its nation building objectives, the South African elite envisioned the event as a platform to showcase South Africa's development and infrastructure – the product a unified and egalitarian nation – in an effort to position itself as a global player. In discussing the significance of the 2010 FIFA World Cup, Jordaan claimed, "our

time has come. For 16 years we have been eagerly waiting for this moment. A single moment that presents to the world a collective effort of the South African government, private sector and people” (FIFA 2010a). Jordaan, cognizant of the platform afforded to the nation hosting the World Cup, acknowledged the collective work of South African stakeholders, from all backgrounds, in presenting a modern, developed, and transformed nation. While the emphasis on the development and infrastructure is important, it is more significant that Jordaan’s message encapsulated the collective effort of South Africans. It was linked to the capacity of a united citizenry, benefiting from equality and the ability to collectively move South Africa forward. Similarly, Zuma envisioned the World Cup as “an opportunity to present South Africa to the world...to project the rainbow nation in its true colors and glory, and to the help the country to achieve its development goals” (Zuma 2010b). The 2010 FIFA World Cup was a coming out party of sorts. It was a time for South Africa to demonstrate its progress in positioning itself in the global community as a place for business, investment, and trade.

Showcasing South Africa’s capacity, underscored by an egalitarian and unified society, Deputy President Phumzile Mlambo-Ngcuka noted that South Africa “has world class stadiums, infrastructure, skills, and expertise in place to take up this challenge” (Mlambo-Ngcuka 2005). This challenge, successfully hosting the FIFA World Cup, was made possible by the collective efforts of all South Africans working towards a common goal. The world class stadiums and infrastructure come as a product of collective efforts by countless stakeholders, a stark transition from apartheid era South Africa in which whites would have assumed responsibility for the success of the event without including blacks in the process, other than to exploit them for labor. Further to this point, Mbeki acknowledged the collective nature of South Africa’s planning: “preparation of the required stadia, the development of the transport system, the establishment of

the most modern communication system, the building of the safety and security infrastructure, and the cultivation of a positive public mood in the nation, fully supportive of all of our efforts, and confident in our collective success” (Mbeki 2006b).¹⁰ Not only does this underscore the collective efforts of South African stakeholders, working together towards shared objectives, but it also emphasizes modern and advanced technology and infrastructure – aimed to showcase the capacity of the new South Africa – required to host an event of this magnitude: “we have delivered stadiums required by FIFA on time, four months before the event... we have come up with stadia that’s a piece of art” (Staff 2010c).

In addition to emphasizing South Africa’s success in providing the required number of modern stadiums, prior to the event, something not every host nation can claim, to demonstrate the capacity of the new South Africa, Zuma proposed, “the World Cup provides an excellent opportunity to promote our country as a place of dynamism, growth, and opportunity... (It) has also enabled us to lay foundations for our economic future with a massive investment in

¹⁰ While the world class stadia and infrastructure were no doubt impressive, they came at a steep cost. Opinions that challenged the attitudes of numerous elites in terms of the capacity of the FIFA World Cup in aiding South Africa’s national transformation, emphasized the stark economic inequality that continues to divide society and inhibit the nation’s growth and transition towards the egalitarian society coveted by many. In response to these exorbitant costs, South African sociologist Chris Bolsmann believed the cost of the event to be outrageous, “in excess of 30 billion South African rand, double what was predicted in 2006” (Bolsmann 2010). This, in a nation where there GINI coefficient had “risen from 0.66 in 1993 to 0.70 in 2008” indicating that “racial apartheid has been replaced by class apartheid” (Boslmann 2010). In the eyes of Bolsmann, public resources were inexcusably being diverted from social projects aimed at alleviating the inequality pervading South Africa. To Bolsmann, and other stakeholders skeptical about the significance of the FIFA World Cup in aiding South Africa’s national transformation, the steep costs of hosting the event – a sporting spectacle – were unjustifiable. Rather, funds should have been alternatively appropriated for social programs that would help the majority of the population increase their standard of living. This emphasizes the belief that hosting the tournament would do little to alleviate the stark inequalities that permeate society, suggesting that the re-imagined South Africa had not followed through on its promises of an increasingly equitable society.

transport, energy, telecommunications, and other infrastructure” (Zuma 2010b). Not only was the event leveraged to present the advancement of South Africa’s infrastructure, but it was conceived as an opportunity to establish South Africa in an increasingly globalized marketplace and position itself as a place open to investment, trade and tourism. To this point, Jordaan suggested, “we want to attract more tourists, more foreign direct investment, (and) greater trade” (Moody 2009b). The South African elite believed that successfully hosting the World Cup, and showcasing the advanced stadiums, communication and transportation systems, and other major advancements – the product of a united citizenry working together – would generate an influx of investment and trade as South Africa re-integrated itself in the global community following years of isolation incurred during the apartheid era.

But perhaps more important than any stadium or transportation system, is South African elites conceiving the 2010 FIFA World Cup as a platform to accelerate the country’s transformation through improving the lives of South Africans, effectively investing in and augmenting the future of the nation. This developmental effort was very important to Zuma, who stated,

Our investment in infrastructure goes far beyond football. We are not only investing in bridges and roads. We are also investing in our people. We have placed education and training at the center of this government’s priorities of this term, and are undertaking measures to improve the quality of learning and teaching. We are therefore pleased to be associated with 1Goal: Education for All Campaign which links the global effort to ensure access to education for all children to the 2010 World Cup (Zuma 2010b).

Zuma, and by extension South Africa, leveraged the platform of the 2010 FIFA World Cup to bring attention to this critical issue and emphasize the importance of education in the new South Africa in which all citizens are fundamentally equal and benefit from the same opportunities and privileges. Zuma further advocated,

We have the Millennium Development Goal Two, to achieve universal primary education and the Education for All initiative, to bring the benefits of education to every citizen in every society. We are today using the power of football to promote the achievement of these goals because the status quo in education, especially in Africa, is cause for concern (Zuma 2010d).

This is particularly important considering blacks were once denied the right to a quality education, and, following the end of apartheid, education in some black communities remained inadequate. Thus, if the South African elite truly want to re-imagine the nation as individualistic and civic, in which all citizens are guaranteed equal participation in social, economic, and political realms, an emphasis on quality education for all is imperative. Moreover, enhanced education for all South Africans serves to increase the nation's productivity and competitiveness in the future.

Through showcasing an integrated and inclusive South Africa's capacity in building state of the art stadiums, advanced communication and transportation systems, and various other infrastructure projects completed for the 2010 FIFA World Cup, in addition to an emphasis on the development of South Africa's population, South African elite intended to leverage hosting the World Cup to reposition the nation in a global context. With billions of Rand devoted to improving South Africa's infrastructure linked with the potential enhancement of international investment and tourism, the 2010 FIFA World Cup was a defining moment for South Africa. It was a branding moment for the new South Africa, a time to display itself – to both a national and international audience – as a modern, democratic, technologically advanced, business friendly, tourist destination. To this, Jordaan proposed that the tournament, “must herald an era where our country becomes a major driving force and an active participant in the global economy” (Jordaan 2010). Moreover, through demonstrating the capacity of an egalitarian South Africa moving South Africa into the future, the CEO of the 2010 FIFA World Cup emphasized, “this World

Cup must reintegrate South Africa as part of the global community” (Staff 2010b). To many South Africans, hosting the World Cup was about far more than tournament. Fifteen years since the world last turned its attention to the nation during the 1995 Rugby World Cup, South Africa was determined to dispense a new narrative about the inclusive and egalitarian nation it was becoming. Consequently, successfully delivering the FIFA World Cup was thought to have immense potential to change perceptions of the country, and more broadly, the continent.

The fourth major theme invoked in speeches and interviews given by South African elites was positioning the 2010 FIFA World Cup as a truly African event, effectively using the platform of hosting the event to integrate Africa into the international community. Satisfied with their own progress towards a democratic, inclusive, and egalitarian nation, South African elites aimed to boost the profile of the entire region, effectively strengthening not only South Africa’s international standing, but that of the continent. On the 736 players competing in the tournament, Jordaan proposed, “South Africa is their stage and the African continent is their theatre” (Jordaan 2010). Similarly, Johannesburg Mayor Amos Masondo claimed, “this is an African World Cup and South Africa is just the stage” (Masando 2010). South Africa, while doing the legwork of installing infrastructure and delivering the FIFA World Cup, aimed to leverage the event to showcase the capacity of the rest of the continent, challenging notions that South Africa was the only African nation capable of carrying out an event of this magnitude. To this, Zuma offered, “it is indeed a rare privilege that we have the great honor of using this momentous occasion of the beautiful game to promote the continent” (Zuma 2010c). Furthermore, Irvin Khoza, Chairman of South Africa’s 2010 FIFA bid, believed the awarding of the tournament to the transformed nation to represent far more than the progress of a democratic South Africa: “this is the people of the world voting for Africa’s renewal” (Longman 2004). In Khoza’s mind, South Africa being

named host of the 2010 FIFA World Cup would open all of Africa to the international community. Recognizing the uniqueness of this opportunity, Zuma aimed to capitalize on making this event one for all of Africa: “we have an opportunity to change perceptions and to challenge stereotypes about the African continent” (Zuma 2010b).

In leveraging the capacity of a democratic South Africa showcasing its potential in successfully hosting the most viewed sporting event in the world, Jorjaan aimed to include the continent in this campaign of re-imagination: “We are talking about an African World Cup that’s world class. People will see Africa not as a continent of woe, but a continent of hope which can host a world class event, a tourism destination, an investment destination” (Jorjaan 2010). Moreover, Zuma similarly conceived the 2010 FIFA World Cup as an opportunity to integrate the continent in a global context, and proposed, “this is an African World Cup...we have an opportunity to promote foreign investment, tourism, and trade” (Kimenyi 2010). Just as South Africa worked to re-imagine itself through a dramatic shift in nationalism, positioning the event as an opportunity to demonstrate the capacity of the region, Africa aimed to shift perceptions of the continent from that of distress to, one of promise: Africa is ready to engage with the international community.

Further advocating the World Cup as an event to not only mark South Africa’s dramatic national transformation, but to challenge existing rhetoric surrounding the African continent, Mbeki offered, “the 2010 Soccer World Cup will stand out as a unique event that celebrates Africa in all its magnificent splendor, richness, vibrancy, diversity, and glory...we see hope, connections, and prosperity merging between the ancient roots and the infinite possibilities of tomorrow” (Mbeki 2006a). The FIFA World Cup was conceived as a defining moment, not just for South Africa, but for the entire African continent aiming to present a new face to the world.

Employing the capacity of South Africa's hosting of the event as a gateway to showcase the entirety of Africa, Mlambo-Ngcuka, suggested that at the international level the World Cup, "should put Africa on the world map to reverse the negative perceptions associated with the continent, especially in the global and domestic media discourses" (Mlambo-Ngcuka 2005).

Emphasizing the collective African nature of the tournament, Mbeki proposed,

I can say with great certainty that all of us will win in 2010, and not just the players and teams that will compete – provided that we talk the same language of confidence in ourselves and our continent, of winning in Africa, with Africa, of the united resolve of the peoples of Africa from the Mediterranean Sea to the confluence of the Indian and Atlantic Oceans to ensure that in 2010 our continent makes that unequivocal statement that – Africa's time has come (Mbeki 2006b).

This stresses the aim of South African elite to regenerate Africa through the tournament, emphasizing the collective stake all African nations had in ensuring the successful hosting of the FIFA World Cup as a means to boost the profile of the entire region. Not only did South Africa have something to gain, but the entire continent was positioned to demonstrate all that they had to offer as they worked to establish themselves in an increasingly interdependent world. Content with their own progress as a democratic, inclusive, and egalitarian nation, South African elites aimed to dispel negative rhetoric surrounding the region through employing African nations as stakeholders in the event. This effectively fortified not only South Africa's international standing, but that of the continent. Consequently, Mbeki, when discussing the significance of the 2010 FIFA World Cup, adopted the following closing message in his speeches, reinforcing this shared African event: "We invite you to win in Africa, with Africa" (Mbeki 2006a); "We all win in Africa, with Africa" (Mbeki 2006b); "We too invite you to win in Africa, with Africa... Africa is ready. Africa's time has come. Africa is calling. Come home to Africa in 2010" (Mbeki 2006a). Through this, Mbeki and, by extension, the nation's elite, envisioned the FIFA World

Cup as signaling not only the arrival of South Africa as a full participant in the global community, but of the African continent as a whole.

Speaking after the start of the FIFA World Cup, Zuma claimed, “I think we have proved that not only South Africa, but Africa is capable of hosting any major event” (FIFA 2010b). Continuing to situate the World Cup as an event to be claimed by all Africans, we can surmise that South African elites were distancing themselves from notions of South African exceptionalism, an issue that has long divided the African continent.¹¹ Rather, continually stressing the event as benefiting the entire region, South African elites aimed to use the FIFA World Cup as a symbol of unity, not just for its historically divided population, but the continent as a whole. Consequently, this framing of the event, as truly African, is significant in strengthening ties between South Africa and the rest of the region. Reinforcing the importance of framing the event as truly Africa, influential sports columnist and talk-radio host Bareng-Batho Kortjaas proposed, “The World Cup is an opportunity to show that Africa and excellence belong in the same sentence” (Longman 2009). South Africa’s hosting of the FIFA World Cup provided all of Africa with the opportunity to challenge pervasive rhetoric of despair and conflict; it was leveraged by stakeholders as an opportunity structure to feature the potential and optimism pervading the continent.

Lastly, South African elites were clear about the role of the event in creating a lasting legacy for both the nation and the continent. Jordaan, reflecting on what the event would mean moving forward, offered, “Along with people like Archbishop Desmond Tutu and so many others, Nelson Mandela struggled for a free and democratic South Africa that could compete

¹¹ South Africa often positioned itself as being culturally, politically, and economically distinct from other African countries.

equally with the best in the world – a country of hope for a better and brighter future. The 2010 FIFA World Cup will help bring that goal even closer to reality” (Jordaan 2010). Similarly, Zuma envisioned a lasting effect that would be felt years after the final whistle: “we view the tournament not as an end in itself, but as a catalyst for development whose benefits would be felt long after the final whistle” (Staff 2010f). Furthermore, considering the windfall the continent might benefit from as a result of a successful tournament, Zuma proposed:

Since the very beginning of those long and arduous journey, our conviction has been that this has to be an African event – an event of international magnitude – that will help spread confidence and prosperity across the entire continent... (it) signifies the birth of a new era of hope and prosperity, as opposed to the evil forces of colonialism, apartheid, and backwardness... The FIFA World Cup process has truly been an African journey of hope... South Africa promised a world class event, and we tell you today, that South Africa has made good on that promise (Zuma 2010c).

Further emphasizing the significance of the FIFA World Cup, Bafana Bafana captain Aaron Mokoena claimed, “I’m sure that people will look back and say ‘well done’ to South Africa and ‘well done’ to Africa as a whole, because we need these kinds of tournaments to develop the African continent” (FIFA 2009).

Focusing specifically on the what the 2010 FIFA World Cup would mean for a South African nation establishing itself as an individualistic and civic nation, characterized by inherent equality and inclusivity, Jordaan posited, “the world will see a beautiful, resource-rich country at the southern tip of Africa, home to a warm and welcoming people that have the potential to work together to ensure that even our most difficult challenges can be overcome. 2010 is not an end, but a beginning” (FIFA 2010a). In the eyes of the South African elite, the FIFA World Cup could not afford to be momentary in its unifying effect and in positioning the new South Africa in the global community. South Africa must not get complacent with the progress it has made

since the fall of apartheid. As such, the 2010 FIFA World Cup must be a catalyst for continued growth and advancement for both the nation and the continent. Furthermore, Jordaan argued, “The next 16 years is when the teenager that is South Africa becomes an adult. We must continue to mature as a democracy, with strong infrastructure in place and good support for all our country’s social endeavors. We must be a strong economy that can create jobs and alleviate poverty, thanks to, and inspired by, the World Cup” (Jordaan 2010). As radio host John Robbie articulated, “The rugby World Cup signaled the end of apartheid. We want the soccer World Cup to celebrate the new South Africa” (Clayton 2010).

2010 FIFA World Cup: Newspapers

The previous section evaluated the way in which South African elites envisioned the 2010 FIFA World Cup as an opportunity structure to further establish South Africa’s new sense of nation. However, as Farquharson and Marjoribanks (2003) posit, the media are a potentially powerful site for framing discourses of the relationship between sport and nation building. Thus, it is imperative to investigate South African newspapers and the extent to which they envisioned the hosting of the 2010 FIFA World Cup as contributing to South Africa’s nation building objectives, in working to shape public opinion around the significance of the event. Similar to the analysis in the previous section, an exploration of articles from the *Cape Times*, *Daily News*, *Mail and Guardian*, *Saturday Star*, *The Independent*, and *The Times* invoke the following themes in assessing the significance of the event in aiding South Africa’s national transformation: nation building through unifying the population and facilitating an encompassing and civic national pride, showcasing the development and capacity of a new South Africa positioning itself to be a global player, and portraying the event as an African World Cup. Akin to the 1995 Rugby World Cup, the presence of these themes indicates that South African newspapers largely agreed with

the nation's elites about the significance of the 2010 FIFA World Cup in contributing to the country's shift in nationalism and national identity.

The first major theme espoused by the South African newspapers is that of employing the event to unify South Africa's population around a shared goal – successfully hosting the 2010 FIFA World Cup. While the past fifteen years had seen the birth of a democratic nation, there was inherent debate amongst politicians about how best to ameliorate the injustices of apartheid and equitably serve all South Africans under the egalitarian model of nationalism: individualistic and civic. Yet, regarding the 2010 FIFA World Cup, *The Times* found that “for one moment, politics and differences are being put aside to ensure the nation presents a unified front in its support of the national squad” (Staff 2010e). The fact that the nation had to ‘put on a unified front’ indicates that the national unity and goodwill facilitated by the seminal success of the 1995 Rugby World Cup did not have the lasting effect that some had envisioned. Yet, once again, the country rallied behind the power of sport to unify themselves around a collective symbol – one that could be claimed and embraced by all South Africans. Similarly, the *Mail and Guardian* posited, “the World Cup could have some unifying effect” (Moody 2009a). Yet while these newspapers appear a bit skeptical about the capacity of the FIFA World Cup in uniting the South African population, one reporter for the *Mail and Guardian* found South Africans on the street to be quite optimistic about the coalescing nature of the event: Gretchen Holzpfel argued, “All South Africans were united, there were no barriers of colors, black, white, we were South Africans” (Gevisser 2010). Similarly, in the same article, Antoinette Lazarus claimed, “I think the World Cup is one of the steps that... unites (us) as a country” (Gevisser 2010). Along these lines, in discussing the symbolic significance of Mandela donning a Springbok's uniform and forging a symbol of national unity, the *Mail and Guardian* claimed, “the nation has come a long

way since then...in a sports mad nation, successful staging of the most watched competition on earth (FIFA World Cup) could mark a new watershed moment” (Moody 2009a). That is, the optimism associated with a nation hosting any mega-event, much less the most popular one, was enough to inspire hope amongst South Africans that the successful hosting of the tournament would mark a defining moment in moving South Africa forward as a nation, further leaving behind the legacies of apartheid and bringing together a historically divided population.

Emphasizing the potential of the FIFA World Cup in serving as an opportunity structure that could inspire a nation and facilitate its national transformation towards an egalitarian society, “politicians speak of the World Cup in the same breath as the victory over racial apartheid 16 years ago” (Staff 2010a). According the *Mail and Guardian*, the event had immense potential in contributing to South Africa’s nation building objectives. As with the 1995 Rugby World Cup, a powerful moment of reconciliation and unification occurred when the Springboks sang *Nkosi Sikelel’ iAfrika*, formerly the song of the liberation movement. One author, writing for the *Mail and Guardian* during the 2010 FIFA World Cup, found the incorporation of this song in South Africa’s new national anthem to be an indication of the progress made by the country:

In the spirit of the reconciliatory Mandela era, the (national) anthem is an amalgam of the liberation hymn, *Nkosi Sikelel’ iAfrika* and the apartheid era *Die Stem*. I have not been able to bring myself to sing the latter, but as I watched the Afrikaners around me trying to twist their mouths around *Nkosi Sikelel’* and black South Africans in turn belting out *Die Stem* with unfettered delight, my stand seemed ridiculously churlish, and so I joined in, exalting along with everyone else (Gevisser 2010).

That black South Africans could readily sing part of *Die Stem* and similarly, whites could easily sing *Nkosi Sikelel’ iAfrika*, standing side by side, illustrates just how far the democratic South

Africa had come in integrating its society under an individualistic and civic framework of nationalism. Similarly, *The Independent* depicted a nation captivated by the soccer tournament,

Across the length and breadth of the country, everything will shut down as anxious, hopeful eyes narrow in suspense. At Loftus, in Pretoria, in Joburg, in Bloemfontein, in Durban, in Cape Town, in tiny little dorpiess, in townships and leafy suburbs, in bars and shebeens, in living rooms, at braais and football get-togethers, the eager Bafana faithful are ready to cheer their team to victory (Reineres 2010).

The article's juxtaposition of nearly every manner of living imaginable, paints a picture of a captivated nation, from all walks of South African life, coming together to support Bafana Bafana, unified by the collective symbol representing an integrated South Africa. *The Independent* further emphasized the capacity of the FIFA World Cup, and more specifically Bafana Bafana, in bringing together South Africans from all backgrounds, finding, "every hue of the 'rainbow nation' rooting for Bafana Bafana at the World Cup" (Staff 2010d). This positioned the team as representative of the entire, integrated South Africa, emphasizing the inclusivity that pervaded national symbols and entities, a dramatic transition from the exclusive nature of the apartheid era. Perhaps the most powerful example about the nation building associated with South Africa's successful hosting of the 2010 FIFA World Cup was *The Mail and Guardian* proposing, "we won most of all, because we could finally say we" (Gevisser 2010).

The second major theme espoused by South African newspapers concerning the capacity of the 2010 FIFA World Cup in aiding South Africa's intended national transformation, was leveraging the event to enhance an inclusive national pride for the re-imagined country. This is critical in facilitating South Africa's new sense of nation, as civic pride emphasizes a shared sense of accomplishment and success that can be claimed as a triumph for all of South Africa and harnessed moving forward as an equitable society. The *Saturday Star* deemed the FIFA

World Cup an opportunity to “boost national pride” (Naik 2010). The *Mail and Guardian* postulated, “For the first time in South Africa’s history, it seemed, patriotism was not a political statement. South Africans were waving flags, and supporting their team out of a sense of joy and belonging, rather than the deficit driven pride that has fueled both Afrikaner and African nationalism for so long” (Gevisser 2010). The inclusive national pride that was sweeping the nation during South Africa’s successful hosting of the FIFA World Cup was seen as a catalyst that could further integrate South Africans across racial boundaries as the nation continually worked to entrench notions of equality and the ‘rainbow nation’ into all realms of society. This was made possible in the absence of ethnic driven pride that long separated the nation. Emphasizing a transition from the ‘deficit driven pride’ of the past, when whites and non-whites were at odds with one another, underlines South Africa’s transformation to a nation in which individuals did not feel marginalized on the basis of race. Rather, this comprehensive national pride for the re-imagined nation, a product of the FIFA World Cup indicates the success of the event as something to be claimed by all South Africans, and emblematic of the progress they had made in the past 15 years and the power and capacity of an integrated and united South Africa.

Moreover, in describing what it meant for whites and non-whites to share in the collective optimism of successfully hosting the World Cup, a journalist for the *Mail and Guardian* wrote, “a black friend felt that by taking pride in the country having run a successful tournament, white South Africans were finally affirming their black compatriots’ ability to govern” (Gevisser 2010). This exemplifies a major transition from the apartheid era in which most whites would have scoffed at the notion of non-whites effectively governing themselves, much less successfully hosting the FIFA World Cup, one of the most viewed and prominent international events in the world. Furthermore, South African Antoinette Lazarus, in an interview

with the *Mail and Guardian* expressed her thoughts on the capacity of the 2010 FIFA World Cup in aiding South Africa's national transformation: "I think the World Cup is one of the steps that has made people most proud to be South African and that's made us grow as a country" (Gevisser 2010). Echoing this claim, *The Times* argued, "our national pride must be bigger than our social ills...as a nation we are stronger than any obstacles in our way" (Ntyintyane 2007). The realization of the promise of an inclusive and unified South Africa, working together towards common goals as one entity, reveals the continued efforts to transition the nation from a collectivistic and ethnic framework of nationalism to the individualistic and civic model which is based on notions of irrefutable equality and inclusivity.

Another major theme proposed in my analysis of South African newspapers' depiction of the 2010 FIFA World Cup's significance is that of showcasing the nation's development sixteen years into the democratic era. This was meant to emphasize the capacity and potential of an integrated South African citizenry. *The Times* posited, "we are about to showcase our gleaming new stadiums and the world-class infrastructure to the world, and a clear sense of pride pervades our society across all walks of life" (Taljaard 2010).¹² The *Mail and Guardian* and *The Times* further articulated the World Cup's role in aiding South Africa's growth and advancement as

¹² Yet, once again, it is important to consider the costs of development required for the 2010 FIFA World Cup. While South African newspapers were optimistic regarding the significance of the FIFA World Cup, these same newspapers seemed skeptical at times to address issues plaguing South Africa – most notably economic inequality. There was a belief that the vast sums of money spent on the FIFA World Cup could have been better used to address the drastic economic inequality that hinders South Africa's potential for growth and transformation: "Questions are being asked about how will really benefit from the promised bonanza in a country still bearing the social and economic scars of apartheid" (Nullis 2005); *The Times* questioned "how a country in which a large portion of the population survives on less than \$2 a day could host an event that costs upwards of \$4 billion to finance. Surely...there were more pressing needs than arranging a football tournament" (Shapiro 2010); "(it is) morally indefensible for more than 12 billion rand to be spent on a month long party in a country primarily populated by black poor...15 years into democracy, the poor can wait no longer" (Mbuyisa 2009).

they strove to become players in the global arena: “the World Cup as a tool for development” (Staff 2006) and “the World Cup is a massive chapter in the development of the democratic South Africa” (Slot 2010). One of the manners in which the nation’s hosting of the World Cup was to be leveraged for development was to present the world-class stadiums and vastly improved infrastructure that had been erected and implemented in the brief period since the Rugby World Cup, the product of collective efforts and contributions from stakeholders of all backgrounds.¹³

Taking advantage of the vastly increased media attention during the World Cup, South Africa further aimed to showcase their development and growth over the past 15 years, the result of a unified and inherently equal population, as a means to attract foreign investment and tourism to this untapped region. The *Mail and Guardian* proposed, “The World Cup will boost investment and tourism in the longer term – as long as South Africa gets the organization right and takes advantage of the two month global spotlight” (Nullis 2005). Similarly, *The Times* envisioned a World Cup, that if hosted successfully, could facilitate an era of growth and advancement that was previously unprecedented: “we need to unlock long term investment, new trade and new sources of tourism through this event to secure its legacy and to truly justify the significant expenditure of public resources it has entailed” (Taljaard 2010). Leveraging the 2010

¹³ Rather than appropriate the funds for the FIFA World Cup, the *Mail and Guardian* proposed that, at least a portion of the money “could have been spent on bringing water and electricity to impoverished townships” (Staff 2010a). This emphasizes the belief that hosting the FIFA World Cup would do little to alleviate the stark inequality that continues to inhibit South Africa’s transformation towards an equitable society where all citizens have access to basic services. In the face of this persistent inequality, “the only real way to bring South Africans closer is to end the stark wealth disparities”, not a sporting event (Moody 2009a). Without social programs, the poor – predominately black South Africans – remain marginalized on the periphery of society. This only hinder the nation’s efforts to re-imagine itself as an individualistic and civic nation in which the entire population is fundamentally equal and benefit from the same rights, privileges, and opportunities.

FIFA World Cup to achieve this would ensure that the international community recognized the power and capacity of the new, integrated and democratic South Africa in which all citizens have the potential to contribute to the nation's swift advancement. After years of apartheid-induced isolation, South Africa was positioned to present its growing economy and notable technology sector as indicative of a modern nation eager to gain the respect of the international community. To this point, hosting a successful World Cup would ensure that "those stale images of cable cars ascending Table Mountain, or lionesses playing with their cubs, used so often to attract visitors to South Africa, will one hopes, be replaced by the lively exposure of a dynamic economy, complemented by visions of bustling sports arenas, hi-tech commuter trains and modern shopping malls" (Shapiro 2010). Through increased national and international visibility due to the media's widespread coverage of the event, South Africa aimed to position itself as not only an incredible vacation destination in which one might explore the natural world. But perhaps more importantly, as a nation ushering in a new era defined by economic growth and advancements in infrastructure and technology, working to establish itself in a global context. To this point, Yvonne Johnston, of Brand South Africa¹⁴, proposed, "for a democracy as young as ours, whose history was rooted in social injustice, there needed to be something that accelerated the world's correct understanding of South Africa" (Johnston 2007). For many, the 2010 FIFA World Cup was that 'something' that could introduce a re-imagined South Africa to the global community.

In furthering Johnston's message, *The Mail and Guardian* argued that through successfully hosting the FIFA World Cup, "we (all South Africans) proved to a skeptical world –

¹⁴ Brand South Africa is an organization established in 2002 that works to create a positive and compelling brand image for the new South Africa.

and thus ourselves – that we could host a World Cup, a hopeful corrective against the negativity that keeps tourists and investment away...if our government could deliver the world's biggest mega-sporting event so efficiently, surely it could tackle South Africa's social and economic wills with similar resolve" (Gevisser 2010). The *Mail and Guardian*, one of the most respected South African newspapers, extrapolated the success of the tournament to emphasize the sheer capacity of a united and egalitarian South Africa. Furthermore, South Africa was leveraging the World Cup to position themselves as partners ready to engage with the international community working to achieve its goals for a transformed society in which all South Africans – irrespective of race – were fundamentally equal and could collectively claim and embrace their re-imagined nation: "let us support Bafana Bafana, fly our flag, live every moment and revel in being part of a unique nation and a unique South Africa as we proudly impress the world" (Taljaard 2010).

The final major theme invoked by my analysis of the newspapers concerning the role of the 2010 FIFA World Cup in South Africa's national transformation was framing the event as a truly African World Cup. Similar to South African elites, this was intended to establish a legacy and emphasize the capacity of an oft overlooked continent with a multitude of resources that might be attractive to the international community. While the newspapers did not discuss this theme to the same degree as the South African elites, they seemed to find some merit in characterizing the tournament as an African event: "the 2010 FIFA World Cup won't only leave a lasting legacy for South Africa, but for the entire continent" (Barnes 2008). That same article, from the *Daily News*, advocating the unifying power of sport in advancing the interests of a nation, or in this context the region, proposed, "Football has the power to unite Africa" (Barnes 2008). Moreover, emphasizing the extent to which South Africans viewed the World Cup as an expression of African pride, "after the Bafana were knocked out, it did not take long for South

Africans to transfer their allegiances to Ghana, the one remaining African team in the competition: ‘We are all Black Stars now’¹⁵ trumpeted one Johannesburg newspaper, aptly capturing the national sentiment” (Gevisser 2010). Recognizing their increased capacity as an egalitarian and inclusive nation – a major transition from the past – South Africa had begun to position itself in the global arena. Yet, beyond this, South Africa seemingly acknowledged the capacity of the FIFA World Cup in highlighting all of Africa and overcoming notions of Afro-pessimism – that had come to dominate discourses surrounding the region – as a means to elevate the entire continent in the global context. To this point, the *Cape Times* proposed, “a third legacy (of the FIFA World Cup) would be to debunk notions of Afro-pessimism. We’re telling the world we’re capable and that will be encouraging to other African countries. The message is not one of...hopelessness” (McKune 2009).

¹⁵ The Black Stars are Ghana’s national soccer team

Chapter 6: Towards a New South Africa

South Africa is valuable in demonstrating how host nations might leverage sports mega-events to re-imagine themselves to both national and international audiences. Current research explains the relationship between national identity, branding, and sports, but there is limited literature on how a country in transition can shift its fundamental sense of nation over the course of two major sporting events in a period of dramatic national change. To this point, Lepp and Gibson (2011) suggest, “During South Africa’s apartheid period, the state was increasingly characterized as a rogue nation and was the subject of boycotts, embargos, and sanctions. Clearly, at the end of the apartheid period, a significant challenge of the ‘new’ South Africa and its iconic President Mandela was re-imaging the nation” (216).

South Africa provides an interesting example in terms of sports, national identity, and nationalism, as the 1995 Rugby World Cup was leveraged by stakeholders as an opportunity to unite and reconcile South Africans of all races around ideals of democracy and equality. Similarly, the 2010 FIFA World Cup was conceived as a vehicle to further unite South Africa’s population and facilitate an inclusive civic pride. This event was a coming out party for the re-imagined nation: an opportunity to demonstrate the capacity of a united South Africa, working together to transition to the individualistic and civic framework of nationalism that is predicated on fundamental equality. Little has been done in evaluating the role of these two events in terms of their significance and contributions to South Africa’s intended transformation in nationalism. The intent of this thesis is to help us understand how hosting major international sporting events contributes to the creation and transformation of national identity – particularly in delicate periods of national change, as with transitions from authoritarian rule to democracy. Fundamentally, it is about South Africa’s reconstitution of the social contract in a period of

democratization. Consequently, lessons learned from South African elites' and newspapers' leveraging of these events can be applied to other nations shifting toward democracy, who might be seeking opportunities to re-imagine themselves before both national and international audiences.

The 1995 Rugby World Cup was successfully leveraged by South African elites and newspapers to facilitate a national transformation at the dawn of democracy. Beginning in 1995, we first see initial movements from a collectivistic and ethnic model of nationalism to the individualistic and civic framework as stakeholders exploited the tournament to promote ideas of egalitarianism, inclusivity, and equitable access to opportunities. This was a major transition from years prior in which inequality and segregation were inherent in all realms of life, legislated in apartheid era policy. While there were some concerns about the capacity of rugby to be a catalyst for change – due to its historical association with Afrikaner patriotism and white superiority – there was undoubtedly a pervasive optimism amongst stakeholders concerning the significance of the event in serving as a platform to usher in an era of democracy. Both South African elites and newspapers indicated the same dominant themes concerning leveraging the 1995 Rugby World Cup as a platform to promote a dramatic shift in nationalism: nation building through reconciling and unifying South Africa's diverse population, developing and facilitating a more inclusive national pride, and establishing a newfound sense of equality in all realms of society. The correlation in themes espoused by South African elites and newspapers suggests an agreement in how these stakeholders conceived the Rugby World Cup as a platform to articulate their visions for a dramatic shift in national identity as they worked to shape a new South Africa under the individualistic and civic model of nationalism in which equality is paramount.

Fifteen years following the Rugby World Cup, the world once again turned its attention to South Africa, as the host of the 2010 FIFA World Cup. The tournament was another opportunity for a transforming nation to demonstrate the progress it had made since the fall of apartheid. There was a collective effort by South Africans to set the course of the future of the nation in which all citizens would benefit from inherent equality and access to opportunities, rights, and privileges. South African elites and newspapers invoked the same dominant themes regarding the capacity of the 2010 FIFA World Cup to further stimulate South Africa's national transformation: continued nation building by unifying the population and facilitating an inclusive national pride, showcasing the capacity and development of the new South Africa, and a concerted effort to integrate Africa into the international community. Just as with the 1995 Rugby World Cup, the similar themes expressed by South African elites and newspapers indicates a mutual understanding in how stakeholders perceived the FIFA World Cup as a vehicle to promote their visions for South Africa's sustained shift in nationalism and national identity towards the individualistic and civic model.

That there was a sustained emphasis on using sport to unify the South African population during the 2010 FIFA World Cup, suggests that perhaps the coalescing power of sport is temporary – a finding substantiated by Van Hilvoorde, Elling, and Stokvis (2010). By nature, sports mega-events facilitate a surge in national unity and inclusive national pride during the event as the general population is energized by the patriotic emotions associated with watching their national team compete, and potentially win, against another country. Yet, after the conclusion of the event, this influx in national pride might diminish as patriotic sentiments are not sustained at the center of national discourse and rhetoric. In the case of South Africa, this is not to suggest that both the Springboks and Bafana Bafana failed to contribute to nation building

objectives through unifying the nation and facilitating an encompassing civic pride. We see evidence that both events were conceived as opportunities to not only achieve these goals, but to entrench notions of equality and position the nation, and more broadly, the region, in the international community. Yet we must acknowledge that their contributions may have been temporary and not have had the lasting affect envisioned by the nation's stakeholders.

The case of South Africa hosting the 1995 Rugby World Cup and the 2010 FIFA World Cup is a story of a country recovering from the appalling historical period of apartheid, working to re-imagine its sense of nation through the platform of sports mega-events. The 1995 Rugby World Cup was awarded to South Africa in 1992 by the International Rugby Board (IRB) whose delegates "voted with their hearts in taking this decision despite the violence and uncertainty of the South African transition" (Black and Nauright 1998). The IRB took a leap of faith, recognizing the capacity of hosting the event in uniting South Africa's population and facilitating an inclusive civic pride. But more importantly, it was seen as a unique opportunity to showcase a newly democratic South Africa to the world. Similarly, when South Africa was awarded the 2010 FIFA World Cup, it signified an opportunity for the transitioning nation to showcase its transformation to a democratic society, fifteen years after the world last turned its attention to the southern tip of Africa. As Irvin Khoza proudly noted, awarding the FIFA World Cup to the new South Africa was emblematic of "the people of the world voting for Africa's renewal" (Longman 2004). This gives credence to the relationship between sports mega-events, the international community, and host nations. Such events serve as platforms to reintegrate transforming nations into the international community.

My thesis is not a study of how hosting these events facilitated change, but rather, how they served as a platform to introduce ideals of an integrated and egalitarian South Africa. I am

interested in the increased opportunities, afforded by hosting these events and leveraged by the South African elite and media, in creating discourse and serving as a catalyst to promote a fundamental shift in the social contract. The analysis explored a large consensus of widespread optimism surrounding each event's capacity to facilitate the nation's re-imagination. Yet, the hopefulness was not uncontested, with some stakeholders challenging the prevailing expectant interpretations of the significance of the events in contributing to South Africa's transformation. To this end, I have considered how South African stakeholders leveraged both events to aid their intended transition from a collectivistic and ethnic model of nationalism to the individualistic and civic type in which all citizens are guaranteed full and equal participation in economic, political, and social life.

It is important to consider the limitations to my research, and potential areas of focus should this topic be studied again. First and foremost, this thesis only considered South African elites and newspapers. It would behoove someone doing similar work to analyze the opinions of everyday South Africans concerning the significance of the 1995 Rugby World Cup and the 2010 FIFA World Cup in contributing to the nation's transformation. It would be worthwhile to consider whether they bought into the messages articulated by the elite and newspapers regarding the capacity of the events in contributing to a shift in nationalism and national identity. My research was also constrained by an inability to obtain a wide array of South African newspaper articles evaluating the significance of the 1995 Rugby World Cup during the time period in question. Because many of these articles were not digitized nor entered into online databases and archives, it was quite challenging to obtain a diverse collection of articles to analyze. Thus, my findings for South African newspapers' aim of leveraging the 1995 Rugby World Cup to facilitate a national transformation might have varied in the presence of a greater

number of publications. Moreover, it is worth asking whether sports mega-events are catalysts for transitions in a country's sense of nation, or if they are simply reflective of change taking root in other realms of society. Put differently, was this transformation reinforced through hosting the events, or were they merely accelerants for change?

The current literature does not do a thorough job evaluating the adaptable nature of nationalism and how it can shift. We know that at its core, nationalism is a perspective through which we can begin to understand and interpret a nation's defining characteristics. It is the cradle that allows society to develop, subsequently establishing national identity: "it represents a comprehensive framework for seeing the world, both social and, in some vaguer way, natural, and this constitutes that cultural blueprint for experiencing and constructing reality" (Greenfeld and Eastwood 2005: 251). Nationalism, a perception of reality – the framing perspective through which we understand the nation – evolves in accordance with a shift in a country's social contract and national identity. It is not static and subject to transform relative to economic, political, and social changes (Hogan 2003; Houlihan 1997; Lau et al. 2008; Youde 2009). Consequently, rhetoric and understandings of nationalism and national identity are continuously shifting and being shaped by changing social conditions to reflect the state of a given nation. That is, nationalism undergoes processes of "modulation and adaption, according to different eras, political regimes, economies, and social structures" (Anderson 1983: 158).

With this in mind, it is critical to think about what we can learn from this thesis moving forward in terms of how nations might leverage sports mega-events as platforms to pursue nation building objectives, or more specifically, a transformation in nationalism and national identity. One such instance of this is Germany's hosting of the 2006 FIFA World Cup, which facilitated a surge in German patriotism and pride. While not directly shifting German nationalism, the

increased expressions of encompassing national pride were unprecedented and contributed to Germany's evolving national identity – a product of hosting the tournament. On this point, MacMillan (2010) proposed,

It was during the 2006 World Cup that something very interesting took place in Germany. A renewed sense of patriotism gripped the nation, which up to this point was a controversial issue as many thought the idea of 'German patriotism' would stir up memories of Hitler's 'nationalist regime' – Germany's darkest period...the psyche of the nation seemed altered after the end of the World Cup. It seemed some negative preconceptions were dissolved due to the successful hosting of the event (1).

And in the years since World War II, "Germany sought to rebuild after their darkest hour following the fall of the Nazi regime. The denazification process, which began shortly after the war concluded, was a thorough and lengthy process, with the intent of ridding all remnants of the Nazi regime" (MacMillan 2010: 2). Hosting the 2006 FIFA World Cup was an opportunity for Germany to express sweeping national pride, something that had evaded them in the past. Moreover, it was an opportunity to change the narrative surrounding the nation, as successfully hosting the tournament served to dispel negative stereotypes and position the country in a global context.

Richard Bernstein, reporting for *The New York Times*, proposed that the "German flag, long weighted by the country's postwar reluctance about open displays of national pride, is flying again, an expression of exuberance as Germany plays host to the World Cup" (Bernstein 2006). Similarly, the 2006 FIFA World Cup "was a catalyst in helping to galvanize the entire country and allowing Germany to feel a sense of national pride...(it) helped unite a country still searching for a national identity and brought together Germans from all backgrounds" (MacMillan 2010: 7). This underscores the transcendental nature of sports mega-events in facilitating shifts in national identity and nationalism.

Another example of a nation aiming to leverage a sports mega-event to pursue its nation building objectives, is Qatar, poised to host the 2022 FIFA World Cup. While not overcoming a traumatic event – such as apartheid or the Holocaust – this small Arab nation has, until recently, rarely been seen as a major global player. However, that has changed as it now controls some of the world’s largest natural gas and oil reserves. Leveraging its immense resources, Qatar is working to position itself in the international community, aiming to be seen as a modern nation positioned to engage with the developed world: “Qatar is never going to be a superpower. But it has ambitions to be a player on the world stage, and in the international business community. The World Cup is an amazing opportunity, and Qatar will do everything to make sure it works” (Gregory 2013). Seemingly aware of the potential for sports mega-events to serve as platforms to facilitate new national narratives, Qatar bid for, and ultimately won the right to host the 2022 FIFA World Cup.

While Qatar’s World Cup is shrouded in bribery scandals and international outrage over the country’s treatment of migrant laborers, it is being framed by Qatari elites as a unique platform to position the nation as a major player in the international community and facilitate an encompassing national pride. Robert Booth, reporting for *The Guardian*, proposed, “the nation’s ruling family, the Al Thani clan, has decided to pour cash into football in the hope that it will prove a passport to international credibility, as well as building a new sense of national identity and purpose” (Booth 2015). Through this, we see the power of sport, particularly sports mega-events, in enhancing international status and domestic self-confidence. To this point, Nate Silver, of *The New York Times*, wrote, “many of the arguments made by Qatar’s representatives centered around the potential for the 2022 World Cup to rehabilitate the Middle East’s troubled and turbulent image before a world stage” (Silver 2010). Such tournaments provide unparalleled

media attention and opportunities for stakeholders to spread messages of growth, advancement, and showcase the nation's capacity. To this point, being awarded the distinct opportunity to host a sports mega-event – particularly on the scale of the Rugby World Cup, FIFA World Cup, or Olympics – is a sign that the international community is accepting you as a modern, global player.

We see, then, that sports mega-events can, in fact, be leveraged to spin new national narratives concerning transformations in nationalism and national identity, underscoring the intersection between the international community, sports mega-events, and host nations. The stories of South Africa, Germany, and Qatar are accounts of countries transitioning from legacies of the past, leveraging the hosting of sports mega-event(s) to contribute to their re-integration into an increasingly interconnected world. Their selection as hosts is seemingly an affirmation by international governing bodies that the nation is being accepted as a modern, global player, poised to leverage the platform afforded by the events to re-imagine themselves to both national and international audiences.

References

- African National Congress. 1964. "Nelson Mandela's Statement from the Dock at the Opening of the Defense Case in the Rivonia Trial." Retrieved Feb. 16, 2016. (<http://www.anc.org.za/show.php?id=3430>)
- African National Congress. 1971. "The Racist South Africa Regime is Not a Sovereign and Independent State." Retrieved Feb. 16, 2016. (<http://www.anc.org.za/show.php?id=4841&t=Organisation>)
- Alegi, Peter. 2008. "A Nation to be Reckoned With: The Politics of World Cup Stadium Construction in Cape Town and Durban, South Africa." *African Studies* 67(3): 397-421.
- Allmers, Swantje and Wolfgang Maennig. 2009. "Economic Impacts of the FIFA Soccer World Cups in France 1998, Germany 2006, and Outlook for South Africa 2010." *Eastern Economic Journal* 35: 500-519.
- AMA. n.d. "Dictionary." *American Marketing Association*. Retrieved October 2015 (<https://www.ama.org/resources/Pages/Dictionary.aspx?dLetter=B>)
- Anderson, Benedict. 1983. *Imagined Communities*. London: Verso.
- Anton, Antonio Monroy, Juan Jose Mendez Alonso, and Gema Saez Rodriguez. 2011. "Mega-Events Impact on Economic Growth: Analysis of the South African World Cup." *African Journal of Business Management* 5(16): 6940-6948.
- Bale, Steve. 1995a. "S. Africa to Set Sail on Tide of Goodwill; The Big Kick-Off: Hosts Challenge Holders Australia in Opening Match Worthy of Final Itself." *The Independent*, May 25.
- Bale, Steve. 1995b. "Pienaar Shoulders the Demands of a Nation." *The Independent*, June 17.
- Bale, Steve. 1995c. "Springboks Are Poised on the Springboard; Success on the Field is Playing an Important Role in the Development of the Rainbow Nation." *The Independent*, June 23.
- Barnes, Clayton. 2008. "'2010 Will Unite'." *Daily News*, November 28.
- Benford, Robert and David Snow. 2000. "Framing Processes and Social Movements: An Overview and Assessment." *Annual Review of Sociology* 26(1): 611-639.
- Berg, Chris. 2008. "Politics, Not Sport, is the Purpose of the Olympic Games." *IPA Review*. 15-18.

- Black, David, John Nauright. 1998. *Rugby and the South African Nation*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- Black, David. 2007. "The Symbolic Politics of Sport Mega-Events: 2010 in Comparative Perspective." *Politikon* 34(3): 261-276.
- Boddy-Evans, Alistair. "Apartheid Quotes – Bantu Education." Africanhistory.about.com. Retrieved February 2016. (<http://africanhistory.about.com/od/apartheid/qt/ApartheidQts1.htm>)
- Boddy-Evans, Alistair. "Quotes P.W. Botha." Africanhistory.about.com. Retrieved February 2016. (<http://africanhistory.about.com/od/biography/a/QtsPWBotha.htm>)
- Bodet, Guillaume and Marie-Francoise Lacassagne. 2012. "International Place Branding Through Sporting Events: A British Perspective of the 2008 Beijing Olympics." *European Sport Management Quarterly* 12(4): 1-33.
- Bohlmann, Heinrich and Jan van Heerden. 2008. "Predicting the Economic Impact of the 2010 FIFA World Cup On South Africa." *International Journal of Sport Management and Marketing* 3(4): 383-396.
- Bohlmann, Heinrich and Jan van Heerden. 2005. "The Impact of Hosting a Major Sport Event on the South African Economy." *University of Pretoria Working Paper Series*. 1-12.
- Booth, Robert. 2015. "'We Will be Ready, Inshallah': Inside Qatar's \$200bn World Cup." *The Guardian*, November 14.
- Chambliss, Daniel and Russell Schutt. 2010. *Making Sense of the Social World: Methods of Investigation*. 3rd ed. Los Angeles: Pine Forge Press.
- Clayton, Jonathan. 2010. "New South Africa Shows its Rainbow Colors in Welcoming World Cup." *The Australian*, June 7.
- Cleary, Mick. 1994. "Rugby Union: Boks No Longer the Bogeymen." *The Observer*, October 16.
- Cleary, Mick. 1995a. "Twanging Nerves and Hamstrings on Eve of the Big Party." *The Observer*, May 14.
- Cleary, Mick. 1995b. "Lily-White Springboks Are a Thing of the Past." *The Observer*, May 21.
- Constitution of The Republic of South Africa, 1996 – Preamble.

- Cornelissen, Scarlett and Kamilla Swart. "The 2010 Football World Cup as a Political Construct: The Challenge of Making Good on an African Promise." *Sociological Review*. 108-122
- Cowley, Michael. 1994. "S. African Fears Over World Cup Hosed Down; Rugby." *Sydney Morning Herald*, April 15.
- Dunn, John. 2009. "Reconciliation and Rugby in Post-Apartheid South Africa." *Levitt Summer Research Fellowship: Hamilton College*. 1-33.
- Dzankic, Jelena. 2012. "London's Olympics Show That the Links Between Sports, Citizenship, Politics, and National Identity Are As Tangible As Ever." Retrieved Sep. 12, 2015 (<http://blogs.lse.ac.uk/politicsandpolicy/londons-olympics-show-that-the-links-between-sports-citizenship-politics-and-national-identity-are-as-tangible-as-ever/>)
- Farquharson, Karen and Timothy Marjoribanks. 2003. "Transforming the Springboks: Re-imagining the South African Nation Through Sport." *Social Dynamics* 29(1): 27-48.
- FIFA. 2005. "Football: The Unifying Force." *FIFA*, July 28.
- FIFA. 2009. "Mokoena: No Place Like Home." *FIFA*, May 14.
- FIFA. 2010a. "Ke Nako. Celebrate Africa's Humanity," *2010 FIFA World Cup Update Magazine: Tournament Edition*. 1-66.
- FIFA. 2010b. "Zuma: Tournament has Inspired Africans." *FIFA*, July 2.
- Friedman, Uri. 2014. "How Sochi Became the Gay Games," *The Atlantic*, January 28.
- Gamford, William and David Meyer. 1996. "Framing Political Opportunity." Pp. 275-290 in *Comparative Perspectives on Social Movements: Political Opportunities, Mobilizing Structures, and Cultural Framings*, edited by D. McAdam, J.D. McCarthy, and M.N. Zald. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Gevisser, Mark. 2010. "'We Did It, We Showed the World'." *Mail and Guardian*, July 10.
- Glucksmann, Ralph. 2010. "Apartheid Legislation in South Africa." Hamburg.
- Greenfeld, Liah. 1993. *Nationalism: Five Roads to Modernity*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Greenfeld, Liah. 2006. *Nationalism and the Mind: Essays on Modern Culture*. Oxford: Oneworld.

- Greenfeld, Liah and Jonathan Eastwood. 2005. "Nationalism in Comparative Perspective." Pp. 247-266 in *Handbook of Political Sociology: States, Civil Societies, and Globalization*, edited by T. Janoski, R. Alford, A. Hicks, and M. Schwartz. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Gregory, Sean. 2013. "Why Qatar is Spending \$200 Billion on Soccer." *Time*, July 11.
- Grix, Jonathan and Barrie Houlihan. 2013. "Sports Mega-Events as Part of a Nation's Soft Power Strategy: The Cases of Germany (2006) and the UK (2012)." *The British Journal of Politics and International Relations* 16(4): 572-596.
- Grundlingh, Albert. 1996. "Playing for Power? Rugby, Afrikaner Nationalism and Masculinity in South Africa, c. 1900-1970." In *Making Men: Rugby and Masculinity*, edited by J. Nauright and T. Chandler. London: Frank Cass.
- Guttman, Allen. 1988. "The Cold War and the Olympics." *International Journal* 43(4): 554-568.
- Hands, David. 1995a. "South Africa Sees Union as Unifying Force." *The Times*, May 25.
- Hands, David. 1995b. "Future Beckons for Game and Host Nation." *The Times*, June 27.
- Hogan, Jackie. 2003. "Staging the Nation: Gendered and Ethnicized Discourses of National Identity in Olympic Opening Ceremonies." *Journal of Sport and Social Issues* 27(2): 100-123.
- Hoglund, Kristine and Ralph Sundberg. 2008. "Reconciliation Through Sports? The Case of South Africa." *Third World Quarterly* 29(4): 805-818.
- Houlihan, Barrie. 1997. "Sport, National Identity, and Public Policy." *Nations and Nationalism* 3(1): 113-137.
- Horne, John and Wolfram Manzenreiter. 2004. "Accounting for Mega-Events: Forecast and Actual Impacts of the 2002 Football World Cup Finals on the Host Countries Japan/Korea." *International Review for the Sociology of Sport* 39(2): 187-203.
- Horne, John and Wolfram Manzenreiter. 2006. "An Introduction to the Sociology of Sports Mega-Events." *The Sociological Review* 54(s2): 1-24.
- Hunter, John. 2003. "Flying the Flag: Identities, the Nation, and Sport." *Identities* 10(4): 409-425.

- Hytner, David. 2010. "World Cup 2010: Aaron Mokoena: South Africa Must Get Behind its Clubs." *The Guardian*, June 23.
- Jaksa, Kari. 2011. "Sports and Collective Identity: The Effects of Athletics on National Unity." *SAIS Review of International Affairs* 31(1): 39-41.
- Johnson, Kevin and Charles Crain. 2004. "Soccer Team's Olympic Success Thrills Troubled Iraq." *USA Today*, August 19.
- Johnston, Yvonne. 2007. "Country Case Insight – South Africa." Pp. 5-13 in *Nation Branding: Concepts, Issues, Practice*, edited by Keith Dinnie. New York: Routledge.
- Jordaan, Danny. 2010. "Let the Games Begin Danny Jordaan Describes – With Joy – Why South Africa Should Bask in the Glory of the World Cup, and Why the Doubters are Now the Believers." *Daily News*, June 10.
- Kimenyi, Mwangi. 2010. *The 2010 World Cup in Africa: Scoring Beyond the Soccer Field*. Brookings Institution.
- Kitschelt, Herbert. 1986. "Political Opportunity Structures and Political Protest: Anti-Nuclear Movements in Four Democracies." *British Journal of Political Science* 16(1): 57-87.
- Knott, Brendon, Dennis Allen, and Kamilla Swart. 2012. "Stakeholder Reflections of the Tourism and Nation-Branding Legacy of the 2010 FIFA World Cup for South Africa." *African Journal for Physical, Health Education, Recreation, and Dance*. 115-125.
- Knott, Brendon, Alan Fyall, and Ian Jones. 2013. "The Nation Branding Legacy of the 2010 FIFA World Cup for South Africa." *Journal of Hospitality Marketing and Management* 22: 569-595.
- Koopmans, Ruud. 1999. "Political. Opportunity. Structure. Some Splitting to Balance the Lumping." *Sociological Forum* 14(1): 93-105.
- Kruger, Arnd. 1998A. "The Role of Sport in German International Politics, 1918-1945." Pp. 79-93 in *Sport and International Politics: The Impact of Fascism and Communism on Sport*, edited by Pierre Arnaud and James Riordan. London: E & F.N. Spon.
- Kruger, Arnd. 1998B. "The Ministry of Popular Enlightenment and Propaganda and the Nazi Olympics of 1936." *Fourth International Symposium for Olympic Research*.
- Lapchick, Richard. 1979. "South Africa: Sport and Apartheid Politics." *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science: Contemporary Issues in Sport* 445: 155-165.

- Lau, Patrick, Michael Lam, and Beeto Leung. 2008. "National Identity and the Beijing Olympics: School Children's Responses in Mainland China, Taiwan, and Hong Kong." *David C. Lam Institute for East-West Studies, LEWI Working Paper, Series No. 78*. 1-32.
- Lebedenko, Valdamir. 2008. "Nation Branding and National Identity." Pp. 105-127 in *Nation Branding: Concepts, Issues, Practice*, edited by K. Dinnie. Oxford: Butterworth-Heinemann.
- Lee, Choong-Ki and Tracy Taylor. 2005. "Critical Reflections on the Economic Impact Assessment of a Mega-Event: The Case of 2002 FIFA World Cup." *Tourism Management* 26: 595-603.
- Lepp, Andrew and Heather Gibson. 2011. "Reimagining A Nation: South Africa and the 2010 FIFA World Cup." *Journal of Sport and Tourism* 16(3): 211-230.
- Longman, Jere. 2004. "Soccer; South Africa is Named Host of 2010 FIFA World Cup." *The New York Times*, May 16.
- Longman, Jere. 2009. "Scrutiny For South Africa Year Before World Cup." *The New York Times*, June 27.
- MacMillan, Joel. 2010. "2006 World Cup: Changing Internal German Perceptions." *Institute for Cultural Diplomacy* 1-9.
- Manzenreiter, Wolfram. 2010. "The Beijing Games in the Western Imagination of China: The Weak Power of Soft Power." *Journal of Sport and Social Issues* 34(1): 29-48.
- Masando, Amos. 2010. *The Handover of Soccer City Stadium to the City*. City of Johannesburg. Retrieved January 29, 2016. (http://www.joburg.org.za/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=4900&Itemid=114).
- Mbeki, Thabo. 2006a. *Address by the President of South Africa, Thabo Mbeki, on the Occasion of the Unveiling of the FIFA Soccer World Cup South Africa 2010 Emblem*. Department of International Relations and Cooperation: Republic of South Africa. Retrieved January 28, 2016 (<http://dfa.gov.za/docs/speeches/2006/mbek0708.html>).
- Mbeki, Thabo. 2006b. *Welcoming Remarks of the President of South Africa, Thabo Mbeki, at the 2010 FIFA World Cup South Africa Kick-OFF Workshops*. Department of International Relations and Cooperation: Republic of South Africa. Retrieved January 28, 2016 (<http://www.dfa.gov.za/docs/speeches/2006/mbek1024.htm>).
- Mbuyisa, Sifiso. 2009. "Surf This Wave of National Pride: Hosting the World Cup is Costing us Billion – and its Worth Every Cent if it Improves our Much-Battered National Psyche." *Daily News*, March 17.

- McKune, Craig. 2009. "2010's 'Biggest Legacy' is SA's Growth Model." *The Independent*, December 3.
- McRae, Donald. 2010. "Danny Jordaan: This is Going to be the Best World Cup We've Ever Seen." *The Guardian*, May 31.
- Mitchell, Kevin. 1995. "Inside Edge." *The Observer*, May 14.
- Miller, David. 1995a. "Du Plessis Delights in Realization of a Dream." *The Times*, June 24.
- Miller, David. 1995b. "Mandela's Touch of Genius." *Cape Times*, June 6.
- Mitchell, Brittany. 2015. "Rugby at the Heart of National Reconciliation." *ESPN*, June 24.
- Mlambo-Ngcuka, Phumzile. 2005. *Address by Deputy President Phumzile Mlambo-Ngcuka on the Occasion of the 2010 Final Bid Banquet*. Department of International Relations and Cooperation: Republic of South Africa. Retrieved January 28, 2016 (<http://www.dfa.gov.za/docs/speeches/2005/mngcuk0810.htm>).
- Moody, Barry. 2009a. "Will World Cup Bring South Africans Closer?" *Mail and Guardian*, June 26.
- Moody, Barry. 2009b. "World Cup Will Bring Growth and Harmony." *Sowetan*, August 5.
- Moody, Barry. 2010. "World Cup Will Build South African Unity: Jordaan." *Reuters*, March 4.
- Naik, Sameer. 2010. "We're a Nation That is High on Pride." *The Independent*, June 26.
- Nauright, John. 2013. "Selling Nations to the World Through Sports: Mega Events and Nation Branding as Global Diplomacy." *Public Diplomacy Magazine*. pp. 22-27.
- Ntyintyane, Luca. 2007. "Let's Turn Our Country into a Sea of Gold." *The Times*, November 23.
- Nullis, Clare. 2005. "World Cup Benefits for SA 'Not so Great'." *Mail and Guardian*, August 15.
- "Olympic Charter." 2015. *International Olympic Committee*.

- Petkovic, Jelena. 2011. "Cultures, Nations, and Nationalism." *Scientific Journal Facta Universitatis: Philosophy, Sociology, Psychology, and History* 10(2): 141-152.
- Purcell, Alex, Richard Sprenger, and Mustafa Khalili. 2013. "Nelson Mandela, 1964. 'I Am Prepared to Die' – Audio Recording of Speech at Sabotage Trial," *The Guardian*, December 5.
- Reiners, Rodney. 2010. "An Inspired Nation Awaits..." *The Independent*, June 16.
- Rogers, Douglas. 1995. "The Birth of a New Attitude." *The Independent*, May 20.
- Seidman, Gay. 1999. "Is South Africa Different? Sociological Comparisons and Theoretical Contributions from the Land of Apartheid." *Annual Review of Sociology* 25(1): 419-440.
- Silver, Nate. 2010. "Qatar a Questionable World Cup Host." *The New York Times*, December 2.
- Shapiro, David. 2010. "New Start After Final Whistle." *The Times*, June 14.
- Slot, Owen. 2010. "World Cup Fever has South Africans Transfixed." *The Times*, April 21.
- Spender, Barney. 1995. "What Does a Scrum Mean in Zulu." *Mail and Guardian*, May 19.
- Smith, Anthony. 1992. "National Identity and the Idea of European Unity." *International Affairs* 68(1): 55-76.
- Staff Reporter. 1995. "S. Africans Put Aside Past For World Cup Opener." *Hamilton Spectator*, May 26.
- Staff Report. 2006. "World Cup 2010: Africa is Calling." *Mail and Guardian*, July 7.
- Staff Reporter. 2010a. "World Cup Fires SA's Dreams of Riches and Identity." *Mail and Guardian*, January 5.
- Staff Reporter. 2010b. "Jordaan: South Africa Still Has Challenges to Meet Ahead of World Cup." *Guelph Mercury*, April 8.
- Staff Reporter. 2010c. "LOC: We Have Delivered." *Mail and Guardian*, June 2.
- Staff Reporter. 2010d. "'We Shall All be Cheering for Bafana'." *The Independent*, June 9.
- Staff Reporter. 2010e. "The Hope of the Nation." *The Times*, June 11.

- Staff Reporter. 2010f. "World Cup a Success So Far, Says Jordaan." *Mail and Guardian*, June 22.
- Swift, Jon. 1995a. "A Versatile Team to be Proud of." *Mail and Guardian*, May 5.
- Swift, Jon. 1995b. "Waiting for the Wallabies." *Mail and Guardian*, May 19.
- Swift, Jon. 1995c. "A Cup for SA a Cut for the Players." *Mail and Guardian*, May 26.
- Swift, Jon. 1995d. "All Blacks v the Rainbow Nation." *Mail and Guardian*, June 23.
- Swift, Jon. 1995e. "How Rugby Scored a Try for the New South Africa." *Mail and Guardian*, June 23.
- Swift, Jon. 1995f. "Now for the Burden of Being the Best." *Mail and Guardian*, June 30.
- Swift, Jon. 1995g. "The Good the Bad and the Luyt." *Mail and Guardian*, June 30.
- Taljaard, Raenette. 2010. "Let's Create Cup Legacy." *The Times*, May 31.
- Thomas, Clem. 1995. "'We Had 43 Million Behind Us'." *The Independent*, June 24.
- Thomsen, Ian. 1995. "A Big Day Dawns for Rugby – and for South Africa." *The New York Times*, May 25.
- Unknown. 1995a. "A Rugby Triumph for National Unity." *Cape Times*, June 26.
- Unknown. 1995b. "Bok Emblem Gains Extra Time." *Cape Times*, June 1.
- Unknown. 1995c. "Mandela Praises Rugby for its Nation Building." *Cape Times*, June 3.
- Unknown. 1995d. "SA United in Triumph." *Cape Times*, June 3.
- Van Der Merwe, Justin. 2007. "Political Analysis of South Africa's Hosting of the Rugby and Cricket World Cups: Lessons For the 2010 Football World Cup and Beyond" *Politikon*, 34(1): 67-81.
- Van Hilvoorde, Ivo, Agnes Elling, and Ruud Stokvis. 2010. "How to Influence National Pride? The Olympic Medal Index as a Unifying Narrative." *International Review for the Sociology of Sport*, 45(1): 87-102.

- Van Rheenen, Derek. 2014. "A Skunk at the Garden Party: The Sochi Olympics, State-Sponsored Homophobia and Prospects for Human Rights Through Mega Sporting Events." *Journal of Sport and Tourism* 19(2): 127-144.
- Veith, Marine. 2010. "Thousands Protest Against World Cup Spending." *Mail and Guardian*, June 16.
- Viosca, R.C., Blaise Bergiel, and Phillip Balsmeier. 2005. "Country Equity: South Africa, a Case in Point." *Journal of Promotion Management* 12(1): 85-95.
- White, Gregory and Paul Sonne. 2014. "As the Winter Olympics Open, Putin Showcases a Defiant Russia," *The Wall Street Journal*, February 7.
- Xu, Xin. 2006. "Modernizing China in the Olympic Spotlight: China's National Identity and the 2008 Beijing Olympiad." *The Sociological Review* 54(s2): 90-107.
- Youde, Jeremy. 2009. "Selling the State: State Branding as a Political Resource in South Africa." *Place Branding and Public Diplomacy* 5(2): 126-140.
- Zuma, Dlamini. 2009. *Minister Dlamini Zuma's Address at the Launch of the MTN FIFA World Cup Campaign*. Department of International Relations and Cooperation: Republic of South Africa. Retrieved January 28, 2016 (<http://www.dfa.gov.za/docs/speeches/2009/dzum0303.html>).
- Zuma, Jacob. 2010a. *State of the Nation Address by President JG Zuma, President of the Republic of South Africa*. Department of International Relations and Cooperation: Republic of South Africa. Retrieved January 28, 2016 (<http://www.dfa.gov.za/docs/speeches/2010/jzum0211.html>).
- Zuma, Jacob. 2010b. *Address by his Excellency, President Jacob Zuma at the Reception Hosted by High Commissioner DR Zola Skweyiya on the Occasion of the State Visit to the United Kingdom, also Marking the 100 Day FIFA World Cup Kick Off and Launch of the International Marketing Council Logo*. Department of International Relations and Cooperation: Republic of South Africa. Retrieved January 28, 2016 (<http://www.dfa.gov.za/docs/speeches/2010/jzum0302.html>).
- Zuma, Jacob. 2010c. *Address by his Excellency, President Jacob Zuma on the Occasion of a Sport Match in Celebration of the 47th Africa Day*. Department of International Relations and Cooperation: Republic of South Africa. Retrieved January 28, 2016 (<http://www.dfa.gov.za/docs/speeches/2010/zuma0601.html>).
- Zuma, Jacob. 2010d. *Opening Remarks by his Excellency, President Jacob Zuma at the Heads of State and Government 2010 Soccer World Cup Education Campaign Summit*. The Presidency: The Republic of South Africa. Retrieved January 28, 2016 (<http://www.thepresidency.gov.za/pebble.asp?/reid=400&t=79>).