

Open Research Online

The Open University's repository of research publications and other research outputs

The urban unbound: London's politics and the 2012 Olympic Games

Journal Item

How to cite:

Allen, John and Cochrane, Allan (2014). The urban unbound: London's politics and the 2012 Olympic Games. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 38(5) pp. 1609–1624.

For guidance on citations see [FAQs](#).

© 2014 Urban Research Publications Limited

Version: Accepted Manuscript

Link(s) to article on publisher's website:
<http://dx.doi.org/doi:10.1111/1468-2427.12147>

Copyright and Moral Rights for the articles on this site are retained by the individual authors and/or other copyright owners. For more information on Open Research Online's [data policy](#) on reuse of materials please consult the policies page.

oro.open.ac.uk

The Urban Unbound: London's Politics and the 2012 Olympic

Games

John Allen, Faculty of Social Sciences, The Open University, Milton Keynes,
UK, MK7 6AA. j.r.allen@open.ac.uk Telephone: +44 (0)1908 654448

and

Allan Cochrane, Faculty of Social Sciences, The Open University, Milton
Keynes, UK, MK7 6AA. a.d.cochrane@open.ac.uk Telephone: + 44 (0)1908
654537

Abstract

Global events such as London's 2012 Olympic Games throw up questions about the ways in which embedded political arrangements take their shape from relationships that stretch across and beyond urban boundaries. In this paper, the urban politics that we wish to capture is not one that is merely located in the city, but rather one that constantly has to take into account the mediated demands folded in, as it were, into the urban arena. In the first part of the paper, the corporate politics of an Olympic-related urban regeneration are outlined and then considered, first, as a staged setting for interaction, a kind of placeless political engagement, and, then as a more embedded spatial politics that takes into account the leverage of networked groups acting within and beyond the city. Following that, we explore the politics of regeneration when campaign groups and alternative coalitions of interest raise their own political demands by drawing on references outside of their immediate urban area and attempt to steer political dialogue in ways that extend the reach of urban politics. The urban politics at stake in this context, we argue, appears to work more through topology than a series of mapped connections; through actors registering their presence in ways that often dissolve the tension between inside and outside, rather than define it in terms of separate political spaces.

Key words: Urban politics; London Olympics; connectivity; topology; reach, spatial politics

Introduction

At least since Aristotle, the 'city' has been identified as the space of politics, a setting within which citizens are made and citizenship constituted. Indeed in some versions, it is precisely this that defines the city -as an imagined set of political relations.

Warren Magnusson explicitly develops this understanding to identify what he calls 'the "hyperspace" of politics' or 'the "global city" in which all of us live' (Magnusson 1996, p. 304), while Engin Isin interprets the city as a 'difference machine', 'that space which is constituted by the dialogical encounter of groups formed and generated immanently in the process of taking up positions, orienting themselves for and against each other, inventing and assembling strategies and technologies, mobilizing various forms of capital, and making claims to that space that is objectified as 'the city' (Isin, 2002, p. 283).

Within the broad urban studies tradition, by contrast, the analysis of urban politics starts from cities as they are, from the urban, setting out to understand and explain the nature of the political relations that are associated with the urban experience, rather than being defined through some pre-given set of administrative boundaries. This approach has generated a rich set of theoretically informed discussion, focused on the urban or urbanisation as the material base of a particular politics. So, for example, David Harvey has identified structured coherence as the frame for urban politics and pointed to a shift from managerialist to entrepreneurial governance (Harvey 1989a and b), Kevin Cox and others (Cox 1998, 2001, Cox and Mair 1989) have focused on issues of locality, local dependence, scale and the local politics of territoriality, Harvey Molotch and others (Logan and Molotch 1987, Molotch 1976, Jonas and Wilson 1999) have highlighted the significance of what they have called the urban growth machine, and Clarence Stone and a host of followers have sought

to capture the complexities of political negotiation through the concept of urban regimes (Stone 1993,1995, Cochrane 1999). The 'new urban politics', whose legacy is helpfully explored by Gordon McLeod and Martin Jones, falls squarely within this tradition (McLeod and Jones 2011).

From the former perspective, the city is defined by sets of political practices the city is an imagined space constructed out of the interaction and negotiation associated with those practices. From the latter, politics is seen to emerge out of the detailed practices of urban living, which are themselves the product of an explicitly urban experience. For one, the space of politics defines the city, for the other it is the city as it is experienced that defines the space of politics (some of these tensions are explored in a rather different context by Barnett et al 2009).

In both cases, the permeability of city boundaries, the range of economic and social activities which stretch across urban borders, is now more or less taken for granted. That tight territorial boundaries are rarely what they seem, however, has not diminished their significance as meaningful political entities through which institutional actors - from councils to mayors, chief executives to social workers, town planners to local community associations - define their day-to-day political practice. The spatial integrity that a fixed territorial dimension offers - that borders enclose, divide and exclude - sits uneasily, however, alongside the fact that the bounded spaces of the city are not at all what they appear to be. There is a nagging excess to the urban, where the political relations that construct the city as an urban political arena exceed the boundaries drawn. There is, in other words, a tension between the city understood as a political arena or figuration and the city as a bounded political space. Nowhere is this tension more in evidence than when it comes to accounting

for how global events such as London's 2012 Olympic Games can be understood in an urban political context.

In the next part of the paper, we explore some of the tensions that flow from London's 2012 Olympics, a global event explicitly identified with a particular city, yet widely understood to emanate from the demands of major corporate actors, seemingly with little relationship to the place. The politics of Olympic-related urban regeneration are outlined and considered, both as a staged setting for interaction - as a kind of placeless political engagement - and also as a more embedded set of spatial practices that reflect the leverage of networked groups and interests acting within and beyond the city. Following that, we explore further the politics of regeneration when local groups, rather than external actors, raise their own political demands by drawing on references outside of their immediate urban area and attempt to steer political dialogue in ways that extend the reach of urban politics. The urban politics at stake in this context, we argue, appears to work topologically through actors registering their presence in ways that often dissolve the tension between inside and outside, rather than defining it in terms of separate political spaces.

In what follows, our concern is not directly with Olympics as sporting spectacle (but see, e.g., Perryman 2012 for a critique and an attempt to offer an alternative vision), nor the way that London was (unproblematically) projected as a place of cosmopolitan multiculturalism in Danny Boyle's Opening Ceremony. Instead, more prosaically, the focus will be on the claims that have been made for the Olympics as a driver of regeneration. The purpose here is not to assess the extent to which the rhetorical claims of the boosters can be translated into reality, but rather to reflect in

broad terms on the urban politics that is at stake.

London's Global Event: The 2012 Olympic and Paralympic Games

The literature on the politics of mega events and their significance for the settings in which they take place tends to emphasise the power of global neoliberalism. In that context the Olympics is identified as the ultimate free-floating festival of global capitalism, defined by its links to globalised cultural and business visions, with little serious connection to or interaction with the locations in which it takes place, except perhaps in terms of the damage it does to local communities and local environments (see, e.g., Greene 2003, Lenskyj 2009, Roche 2000, Shaw 2008). As Phil Cohen and Mike Rustin put it: 'the Olympics is in reality a global festival on its neverending tour, rather than by any means a local or even a national event set on an international stage' (Cohen and Rustin 2008, p. 296). And, of course, the International Olympic Committee helps to generate its own version of the same story making grandiose claims to a universal philosophy of 'Olympism' and (remarkably) suggesting that 'The Olympic Movement is the concerted, organised, universal and permanent action, carried out under the supreme authority of the IOC, of all individuals and entities who are inspired by the values of Olympism' (IOC 2011, p. 10; for a more critical engagement, see Shaw 2008, pp 57-66).

But, from the start, the London Olympics bid was explicitly justified in terms that stressed the potential for delivering a major programme of regeneration in an area of industrial wasteland with high levels of social deprivation in the East of London (Poynter 2009b).

'All development,' it was said, 'would form part of an enormous and tangible legacy,

ranging from sport and venues through to infrastructure and environment. [The Games] would form part of the most extensive transformation of the city for generations. And its legacy would transform one of the most underdeveloped areas of the country for generations to come . . . thousands of jobs would be created in construction, thousands more as the redevelopment moved ahead and created new businesses and communities' (*London 2012* 2004 quoted in Vigor et al 2004 p. 12). The broad ambition stated by the London Boroughs most closely associated with the Games was to ensure that 'Within 20 years the communities who host the 2012 Games will have the same social and economic chances as their neighbours across London' (Barking and Dagenham et al 2011).

And this remained a key aspect of the process as the Games, as the sporting spectacle, grew closer to delivery. In November 2008 Sir John Armit (Chair of the Olympic Delivery Agency) spoke to a conference sponsored by London First (a business based organization whose members include most of London's major employers) and confidently stated that 'London 2012 truly will be remembered as the 'Regeneration Games' due to the scale of change that is being delivered'.

Regeneration is, of course, a troubled and troubling concept. It promises a process through which run-down areas of cities can be brought back into (profitably) productive use at the same time as benefitting the usually economically disadvantaged who live in them. But the tensions between these two implicit and sometimes explicit promises are often all too apparent as the remaking of places also turns out to require the remaking or displacement of people who no longer fit (see, e.g., among many others, Cochrane 2007, Hatherley 2010, Minton 2012). One of the challenges for those driving regeneration is to find a means of generating a

coalition capable of overriding the objections of those being displaced while generating the financial and institutional resource necessary to underpin the development. In this context, an Olympics bid can be seen to deliver on all sides, as enthusiasm overrides the objections and plans are framed to meet the apparently irresistible needs of Olympic development. Even an unsuccessful Olympic bid can be successful in delivering this (see, e.g., Alberts 2009 on the legacies of Berlin's unsuccessful bid and Moses 2011 on the way that New York's unsuccessful bid was used as a platform on which to deliver classic forms of property led regeneration).

In London, plans for regeneration, as well as looking to the experience of previous Olympics, explicitly sought to draw on the US experience at the same time as building on already existing development partnerships, working across the public and private sectors. This was reflected in some of the appointments made to key posts in the first phase of the process (to mid 2012). So, for example, Andrew Altman was appointed in 2009 to head up the company responsible for delivering the legacy around the Olympic site in Stratford (the Olympic Park Legacy Company, now relabeled the London Legacy Development Corporation). His experience of large scale regeneration drawing in public and private sector interests comes from the US where he was Deputy Mayor for Planning and Economic Development and Director of Commerce in Philadelphia at the time of his appointment.

The earlier signature project on which his reputation was built is the Anacostia River waterfront regeneration project in Washington, on which he was director. The expectation was that this experience would transfer straight across to East London. His anointment as one of the global urban regeneration elite, was confirmed by Lord Richard Rogers, who acted as one of his referees. In his words, the Anacostia

project, 'which included the planning of a new stadium and arts centre, was nationally heralded by the American Institute of Architects, the American Planning Association and the American Society of Landscape Architects as one of the most innovative urban redevelopment initiatives in the United States. The Anacostia Waterfront has similarities with the Olympic Park site having been dominated by industrial sites and suffering from a history of deprivation' (LDA Press Release 27 May 2009).

David Higgins' route to his appointment as Chief Executive of the Olympic Delivery Authority in 2005 passed through a lengthy period as chief executive of Lend Lease, an Australia-based but globally active, property development company which was responsible for the development of Sydney's Olympic Park (as well as Bluewater Shopping Centre and more recently – although Higgins was no longer involved with Lend Lease by this stage – in large part for the Westfield Stratford City development, through which access to London's Olympic Park is gained). This may sound like a story of mobile professionals criss-crossing the globe, but it is also a story of the interpenetration of state and corporate interests, as Higgins (knighted in 2011) has seamlessly moved between sectors as well as countries – in 2003 he came to England to act as Chief Executive of English Partnerships (then the property development arm of government) before moving across to the ODA, and in 2011 he moved once more to become Chief Executive of the determinedly hybrid, quasi marketised, Network Rail, whose interests in property development are increasingly significant (see, e.g., Sheeres Davies Gleave, 2011).

Dennis Hone who succeeded Higgins as Chief Executive of the ODA may have had a less obviously global track record, but is linked into the strand of state sponsored

property development, where public agencies have defined themselves through their links with the property sector – having passed through the Commission for New Towns and English Partnerships. Meanwhile the Sir John Armitt (Chair of the ODA) was drawn from Network Rail (of which he was Chief Executive between 2002-7) as well as having links into major engineering, structural projects through Laing and Costain.

The legacy of the railway industry runs right through the Olympic development – much of the land was passed across to the privatized London and Continental Railways in 1992 and the area has been the subject of a series of proposals, linked to the projected, if until now rather elusive, development opportunities associated with the rail connections to the Channel Tunnel (with the promise of Stratford International as a hub). Following a series of commercial failures, London and Continental Railways (LCR) was renationalized in 2009, with a continuing commitment to the ‘regeneration’ of the area through property development (working with Lend Lease on Westfield Shopping City, and, continuing the relationship with Lend Lease, promising the development of the International Quarter, Stratford City as ‘an exceptional new metropolitan environment’). The ‘regeneration games’ have helped to ensure that the long term development vision (the vision of developers and the state) could be realized (Minton 2012 xv-xvii). Anna Minton draws attention to the ‘private nature of Olympic regeneration, predicated on the hope of rising property prices and land sales’ (Minton 2012 xxxi). In his own rather more poetic critique of the process Iain Sinclair places the Olympic developments in a longer term history of ‘grand projects’ proposed by planners and developers, state and corporate interests, for the Lower Lea Valley (Sinclair 2011).

This means, of course, that certain activities have been targeted for removal, while attempts have been made to attract new ones that fit better with the new images, to the extent that it has been argued that the Olympic authority is able to act as a political 'hegemon' (Fussey et al 2011, p. 226). Mike Raco and Emma Tunney (2010) note the way in which the urban regeneration agenda pursued under the Olympic banner has worked to define the East End both as a 'problem' area and as an area of opportunity -currently a 'problem' area, to the extent that the business activities pursued within it are defined as low grade, but following regeneration with the potential to reflect and reinforce the features that make London such a successful global city. They suggest that the Olympics bid was organised around a vision of the area that identified it as so problematic that only an event on the scale of the Olympics could be expected to rescue it from the condition in which it found itself. Juliet Davis carefully tracks the way in which a rhetoric combining a negative vision of deprivation, existing functions and dilapidation with a positive vision of the Olympics and future development was put together to justify the compulsory purchase orders that were necessary to clear the site (Davis 2011).

So the promoters of the Olympics argued that 'the full transformation' associated with the Games is expected to create 'conditions to attract new housing, business development, tourism and inward investment which will place this part of London at the centre of the city's growth in the coming decades, This will benefit local people and attract new residents and businesses, and accelerate regeneration plans for a much wider area' (DCMS 2008, p. 37). In that context, it becomes difficult for communities to resist proposals which affect them directly because the success of the Games is identified as the overriding priority, and the post-Games legacy is supposed to bring benefits for the wider area – so, for example, in the case of the

Clays Lane housing estate, despite a public inquiry and despite some initial resistance, tenants were relocated and the estate was demolished in 2007 to create space for the Athletes' village (Fussey et al 2011, pp. 215-216).

The 'village' itself has been bought by Qatari Diar (the real estate arm of the Qatari Investment Authority, Qatar's sovereign wealth fund) and Delancey Estates (as UK based property development company with a view to further development as a residential neighbourhood based around long term private rental, rather than purchase or social housing (which is being delivered by another agency, Triathlon Homes). Although the scale may be different, the prospectus now being offered by the London Legacy Development Corporation for the Park as a whole is familiar enough from similar global urban development opportunities – perhaps not explicitly drawing on the language of the 'new urbanism' but unable to avoid its echoes, as the promises are made for urban villages alongside references to walkability and the longer histories of London's architecture, parks and public spaces, and even the 'vibrancy' of the new East End (London Legacy Development Corporation, 2012).

Circling around the Olympics, therefore, has been a whole set of mobile professionals seeking to sell a universally applicable model of success (Cochrane and Ward 2012). From this perspective, the story of Britain's Olympics bid has been put together to identify heroes and villains, celebrating the skills and vision of the negotiators and reflecting on the role of the International Olympic Committee, as well as the ups and downs of the process through the eyes of the bidding team (see, for example, Lee 2006, which presents itself as the 'inside story' of the bid). Although apparently a story of British and London success, this is also very clearly part of a globalising narrative, in the sense that it outlines a selling process that is replicable

for other countries and other cities.

In other words, the Olympics can be interpreted as a global mega event with the potential to undermine any narratives of place capable of generating alternative political possibilities. But even when viewed through the regeneration prism the Olympics story turns out to be more complex, since it is reliant on the more prosaic and familiar political practices that draw developers and state agencies together in place to deliver their grandiose visions and their grand projects. In other words, rather than simply being some free-floating (corporate) global festival of sport, the Olympics, as we go on to show, also have to be understood through a connected politics of development that locates them in place, and always has quite distinct and distinctive localised features.

But this begins to raise fundamental questions about the nature of the urban political arrangements that take their shape from relationships that stretch across and beyond London. How, then, is such an excess to the urban best characterised?

A generalized polis?

One way of conceptualising such arrangements is to draw a distinction between, on the one hand, the actual material city, the messy political associations and practices organized around, yet grounded in, the city, and, on the other, its virtual counterpart. Engin Isin (2002, 2005, 2007), does this by distinguishing between the actual city as *urbs* and the virtual city as *civitas* -a set of political associations which amounts to more than the sum of bodies which actually make up the city. The city is defined as a site through which the political lives of people are organized, assembled and administered, yet also rendered open to new possibilities and encounters. It is

understood to be an 'entity that is simultaneously both the concentration and diffusion of acts that are political' (Isin 2005, p. 377), defined through those acts and not any material or placed identity. As Isin puts it, 'Rather than reducing the polis to the city I elevate the city to a generalized polis. If we are to free ourselves from spatial fetishism and historical reductionism we must rescue the city from its modern and contemporary usage as a place' (Isin 2005, p. 377). This, in other words, is a city that is resolutely unplaced and, in certain respects, speaks to the actions of the mobile professionals who negotiate outcomes in a largely ungrounded manner.

Reference to the city as a 'site', however, is itself ambiguous in terms of spatiality. If taken literally, the meaning of site has territorial (or 'local') connotations, even if whatever happens within its boundaries is emergent and transformed through networked connections. For Isin, however, it is the civic and political engagement around a variety of issues which enables cities to be sites for the enactment and performance of rights to the city. The stress is upon the placeless qualities of political engagement, a milieu of sorts, a staged setting where all manner of events unfold which may owe little or nothing to the idea that there is an 'outside' to the city (see also Schatzki, 2002). It may seem odd at first sight to think of such 'global' corporate actors as part of a generalized polis, but the staged setting of the Olympics and the sense in which London acts as a medium for this kind of boosterism lends itself to such an interpretation. Dialogical encounters are no less that, even when the dialogue is about forms of property development and regeneration. Whether such politics is as placeless as that, however, is more debatable.

Ash Amin's (2004) relational reading of place and the city offers an alternative interpretation, in that he explicitly argues for a spatial register to the politics of the

city. For him, neither the local nor the territorial provide a ground to the politics of place, rather such a spatial register is to be found in the politics of propinquity and the politics of connectivity. Both raise the spatial, or rather specific spatial configurations, to the very heart of what a politics of the city entails.

Here, in contrast to Isin, it is the spatial juxtaposition of difference that matters, not merely the fact of difference. Politics in the city, for Amin, is a field of agonistic engagement, where claims and counter-claims are traded, temporary coalitions formed, and differences negotiated. The placement of different cultures, actors, needs and demands in close proximity produces a distinctive kind of place politics. But such a politics is not a mere stage setting for the formation of difference, it is in itself part of a wider set of relations which give shape to what happens and what is possible in the city.

On this view, the urban represents a distinctive nodal formation around which sets of relationships overlap, settle and come together. Some of the relationships that matter politically will be stretched across space, yet generate the co-existences and juxtapositions that fuel a politics of propinquity. Other sets of relationships may simply arise through living together in close proximity, but even the demands raised by groups may be less place-based in a simple territorial sense and more networked as a form of mobilization which is able to influence political agendas from the 'outside', as it were. The politics of cities and its negotiable forms, in this context, reflects a politics of connectivity; one that registers its presence through the intersection of relationships drawn from far and wide, yet which combine and settle in cities in very specific ways. In the global policy language of regeneration, however, the tendency has been to gloss over how such a combination actually works and to

stress instead the network of connections that underpin local outcomes.

Amin's politics of connectivity is effectively another way of talking about the 'excess' of the urban, the political relations that exceed the territorial boundaries drawn, yet give shape to city politics through a distinctive spatial register (see also Amin and Thrift, 2002). As with Isin, his account represents an attempt to sidestep the tension between the bounded, material city and the messy political practices organized around and through the city, whilst retaining a spatial politics that makes a difference to what happens in cities. In the case of London's urban regeneration, however, it would seem that the spatial politics of the Olympics can be traced more through the overlapping connections and ties which cut across institutional and corporate formations, than to any relationships materially rooted in place.

Massey's (2007) account of London as a world city offers a similar impression of an interconnected urban politics, but with a political responsibility for the excess, for the 'outside', built into the equation. The wider geographies of place that she develops start from the assumption that places are essentially arenas for political engagement which draw in others elsewhere, yet in doing so take on political responsibility for the connections drawn. In the case of the range of global corporate actors involved in London's Olympic-led regeneration, it would be difficult to argue that any responsibility they feel to the city's redevelopment has the interests of those displaced uppermost in their minds. For Massey, the unequal power relations that lie behind the interconnections between places reflect the different positions and capabilities of those involved at both ends of a connection, and point in this case to those engaged in property development and real estate, finance and sovereign wealth funds, benefitting economically at the expense of local interests and

community associations (see also Massey 2004).

There is a sense in which a kind of globalized polity can be identified behind mega-events like the Olympics because of the way in which they are accompanied by international developers and property interests, financiers, architects and engineers. They constitute a powerful coalition of actors able to negotiate outcomes with state or quasi-state agencies, whose purpose is often explicitly to work with them to achieve their development aims, in a context where governments are wholly reliant on them to deliver regeneration programmes of whatever kind. This may not be quite the politics of connectivity that Amin, or indeed Massey, had in mind, but the dominant leverage of those involved in corporate regeneration acting within and beyond the city is expressive precisely of the wider geographies that bind cities into a wider web of unequal interdependencies (see Allen, 2010).

But that does not mean to say that local coalitions of interest are always erased from the process. Nor that global events such as the Olympics can only be mobilised by actors of a similar global, corporate character. Local urban alliances have also been part of the Olympic legacy of London 2012, with their own distinctive spatial politics stretching beyond the city's boundaries.

Beyond Regeneration

As already indicated, it is important to register that the language of 'legacy' was a 'local' as much as a 'global' one, as London's politicians sought to draw in the Olympics as a weapon in their own strategy, using international claims to draw down resources locally. Cochrane et al (1996) similarly note the extent to which an apparently 'global' set of claims to win the Olympics for Manchester might better be

understood as part of a grant coalition seeking to draw down national funding. The spatial politics involved on such occasions points to a more active, entangled political process; that is, to attempts to mobilise both material and ideological resource drawn in from outside to redefine the 'local', but also in the process redefining how the Games may be conceived (see also Cook and Ward 2011, who chart the way in which, in the case of Manchester, the city officials involved in developing bids for first the Olympics and then the Commonwealth Games sought to learn through visits, meetings and networks).

In this context, Ken Livingstone (then London's mayor and a key actor in the process) claimed that: 'The Olympics will bring the biggest single transformation of the city since the Victorian age. It will regenerate East London and bring in jobs and massive improvements in transport infrastructure' (Livingstone 2003, quoted in Vigor et al 2004, p. 10). He went on to argue that 'I didn't bid for the Olympics because I wanted three weeks of sport. I bid because it's the only way to get the billions of pounds off of the government to develop the East End' (Livingstone 2008, quoted in Raco and Tunney 2010, p. 7). And the bid was always mediated through the wider sub regional strategy for the regeneration and development of the Thames Gateway, itself another attempt to mobilise resource and transform a part of London even if the Gateway 'may be perceived as a patchwork of speculative developments rather than as a well specified and integrated plan for urban renewal' (Poynter 2006, p. 28).

Alongside the many official statements and proposals have run a series of attempts and campaigns to fold political demands into the Olympics, to suggest how they might be reworked and reinterpreted to deliver, what Raco has called, 'a socially oriented development agenda' (Raco 2004, p. 40), even if he may himself now take

a rather more sceptical position (Raco 2012). The collection of papers in which Raco's argument is to be found – *After the Gold Rush* – is just one example of an attempt to set out a programme for the Olympic legacy, which goes beyond the vision of state sponsored, privately driven regeneration (Vigor et al 2004. See also Cohen 2012, Poynter 2006). The New Economics Foundation similarly used the promise of the Olympics to fold in a series of demands focused on finding ways of enhancing 'local public goods' (MacRury and Poynter 2009, p. 320, nef 2008 cited in MacRury and Poynter 2009, pp. 320-323).

But there here has also been scope for other forms of political and policy engagement, ones that reach out beyond local situated politics to draw in different sets of understandings. From the start, the apparently global politics of London in seeking to attract the Games always involved explicit claims making around support from local communities, even if some community groups went on to suggest that the claims misrepresented the nature of in 'consultation' event, raising complaints that particular voices were not heard (Fussey et al 2011, pp. 212-3).

Mike Raco and Emma Tunney (2010) point out that the high media and political profile of the Olympics helped to create opportunities for local groups to raise their own profile, to make new political demands and to draw on references from outside their immediate area. Indeed, in some cases, to mobilise universal languages of social justice to make particular claims, as well as seeking to open up different ways in which the legacy can be conceived politically. Raco and Tunney explore the role of groups representing small businesses in challenging some of the logics of redevelopment and regeneration. Even if their demands can often be met through enhanced forms of compensation or models of relocation, the vision being mobilised

is one that points to different forms of community and different business models (see also Davis 2011, Ch. 4).

The extent to which it is possible (and helpful) to understand these politics as 'more than local' is apparent in the experience of particular mobilizations, such as the campaign in the first half of 2012 against the building of a basketball training centre on Leyton Marsh, an area defined in planning documents as metropolitan open land which means that it cannot usually be developed. Because of the Olympics it was determined by the ODA that those rules could be overridden. But the campaign (*Save Leyton Marsh*) continued, protesting that there had been no proper consultation, no environmental impact assessment, and highlighting fears about what might be lost. They turned the language of the Games against those seeking to use it against them, questioning the interpretation of legacy: 'The Games have been sold on the back of the legacy it promises to leave and we have already lost the entire East Marsh to a coach park and now we stand to lose Leyton Marsh as well. How much more open, green space must we give up for the Games?' (*Save Leyton Marsh* 2012). 'Even if the building itself goes, the land will no longer be greenbelt and therefore cannot be protected from development' argued a member of the Save Leyton Marsh group (Bartholemew 2012). An apparently modest local campaign (whose demonstrations involved up to 70 or so) was nevertheless confident enough explicitly and directly to draw on a wider set of understandings in the process – going so far as to link with the Occupy movement to help deliver a blockade against the vehicles of the developers in the form of Community Support Camp (eventually evicted on April 12th). Although campaigners remain unconvinced, the ODA has agreed to return the area to its original use and to contribute £65,000 to improving

access and wildlife habitats.

While alternative agendas to those of corporate regeneration have had mixed success, they have been incorporated into wider political narratives. The Manor Gardens allotments (first created in 1900) were finally removed in 2007, to be replaced by landscaping in the Olympic Park, although, following a lengthy campaign the allotment holders were relocated to a temporary site and it was promised that they could return following the Olympics (for a series of clips relating to the Allotments, the campaigns around them, and allotment holders' visions of the future, see *Spectacle* 2012. The story, in all its ambiguities and uncertainties, is also told in Bishop 2011, pp. 213-216). Meanwhile the Clays Lane Housing estate (initially a fully-fledged housing cooperative opened in 1984, but after 2005 operated under the aegis of the Peabody Trust) was ultimately demolished to make way for the Athletes' village in 2007, despite a successful campaign leading to a public inquiry into the compulsory purchase order. The main direct effect of tenant action (through the tenants' forum *Clays Lane on the Move*) was that levels of compensation were raised (although still to rates below that many thought were appropriate) and a 'significant minority' of those who were rehoused 'felt badly treated' (SNU 2008, p. 15).

However, the politics of the process (like that of the Manor Garden Allotments) cannot be reduced to these details. What is remarkable is the way that the experiences of those involved have been picked up as part of a continuing critique of 'legacy' claims for the Olympics and the associated regeneration industry, as part of a much wider political challenge. They have, for example, been incorporated into a

series of arts based initiatives which set out to express the detailed and everyday experience of living locally with the Olympics, while also seeking to offer different ways of thinking about what might be possible. Art practices are mobilised to deliver 'spaces of dissent', providing ways of actively resisting the (seductive) attractions of the 'consensual icons and language' associated with the Olympics (Powell and Marrero-Guillamón, p. 19). In the case of Clays Lane itself, for example, this found an expression in the *Clays Lane Live Archive* brought together by Adelita Husni-Bey in an exhibition at the Supplement Gallery in August 2012, as well as in the writing of Ian Sinclair (see also Hatcher 2012; Husni-Bey 2012). In this context, the particular is quite explicitly re-imagined as having an almost universal significance – somehow symptomatic of a globalised phenomenon.

London Citizens, a broadly based umbrella organisation of community and faith based groups (incorporating the East London Communities Organisation (TELCO)), provides another example of an initiative that identifies locally but reaches beyond the local in defining the nature of its politics – or, as Michael Keith puts it, 'foregrounds the familiar 'local' but stretches transnationally', appealing 'to a global universalism that privileges a politics of identification with the familiar causes of concern and the *known local*' (Keith 2005, p 170; see also Somerville 2011, pp. 50-51).

The origin story of London Citizens is itself quite explicitly concerned with drawing in practices from elsewhere, and specifically from the model of Alinskyite community organization and visits to Chicago organized in the wake of the *Faith in the City* report published in 1985. This led to the formation of the Community Organising

Foundation along the lines of the US Industrial Areas Foundation, taking on the mission of generating (and training) a cohort of community leaders (Brickley 2008, Eversley 2009, Jamoul and Wills 2009). At the core of the political vision is the notion of 'broad based organising', of 'alliance building across and beyond faith institutions' (Jamoul and Wills 2008, p 2041). As Keith sums it up: 'faith based neighbourhood mobilisations have been transported to East London' (Keith 2005, p; 170). What is stressed is the importance of 'doing' in its own right, the benefit to communities of taking action on specific issues, in order to develop their own collective identity as much as to achieve particular ends (Jamoul and Wills 2008, p. 2049).

In the context of the Olympics, London Citizens succeeded in gaining agreement with the Olympics Delivery Agency that an attempt would be made to ensure that those employed by contractors will be paid at least the London Living Wage (LLW) (a 'wage' whose level is itself determined through London Citizens) (see, e.g., Poynter 2009a, p.145, Fussey et al 2011, p. 122). Jane Wills stresses the importance of seeing this as the product of longer term 'strategic intervention' by London Citizens, 'to make the most of the investment and development that was already going to happen' rather than simply a reaction to events (Wills 2013, p. A2). Of course, such an agreement is not easily enforced or policed, and caveats were immediately apparent. As then ODA Chief Executive David Higgins said: 'We cannot make the London Living Wage a blanket condition. However, for those tenders within London's boundary, we will make it clear that we support the London Living Wage, and we will make it clear in the invitation to tender for ODA contracts that we want to see contractors adopting the best employment practices including trade union recognition, absolute commitment to health and safety and sufficient wage levels.'

These factors will be considered when we decide which contracts offer best value for money' (ODA Press release 2007). But this did not mean that these issues simply went away or remained restricted to the Olympic event. On the contrary, the agreement made it possible to return to them on a regular basis.

So, for example, it became the focus of close questioning at a meeting of the London Assembly and David Higgins in 2009 when he both had to explain why outcomes were not as good as promised and to indicate how better outcomes could be achieved. He went on to stress that 'we have targeted those parts of the construction industry which are most prevalent not to pay the London Living Wage; for example the security guarding industry, typically, is an industry that does not necessarily cover the London Living Wage. We have over 400 employees on our site now in the overall guarding contracts, the 24-hour contracts, but we spend a lot of time negotiating with our contractors and suppliers in that area to ensure that everyone was paid the London Living Wage' (London Assembly Plenary 21 October 2009). In June 2011, according to the ODA, 64% of the workforce on the Athlete's village received the LLW, 9% did not, and 27% prefer not to say; 81% of the workforce on the Olympic Park received the LLW, 9% did not, and 10% prefer not to say (ODA 2011).

The extent to which the six 'People's Promises'¹ set out by London Citizens and TELCO, and broadly endorsed (if not actually agreed in detail) by the 2012 bid team (Coe et al, 2004), will be met remains uncertain, but they provided a focus around which it was possible to organize, particularly on the living wage and the delivery of affordable housing, while a National Skills Academy for Construction centre (one of

the stated 'promises) has been set up in Waltham Forest. Increasingly, London Citizens and TELCO emphasize their role in delivering jobs to local residents, working with the Olympic authorities, acting as a 'conduit between the community groups and the Olympic authorities'. There are tales of success with particular groups and particular employers using 'relational networks to screen and select candidates for ...recruitment events' set up for contractors hiring in bulk (Jamoul 2012). Over 1200 people are said to have gained employment through this process - 'the tried and tested method of relational organising' (Jamul 2012).

The aspiration for a community land trust actually in the Olympic Park (identified as one of the promises) may not have been achieved, but the East London Community Land Trust, actively sponsored by London Citizens, is to be the first urban community land trust in England and is located in Bow, in one of the Olympic boroughs not far from the Park. Neil Jameson, Executive Director of London Citizens, commented that 'we share [the mayor's] ambition to see it used to build a lasting legacy of affordable housing at the Olympic Park' (Wrelton 2012). Phil Cohen has taken this a step further to argue for a wider vision in which effectively residential and other development in the Park would 'be handed over to a Community Land Trust through which strategic management powers can be vested in an annually *elected* board, with all residents *and* workers entitled to vote...The Land Trust decides development policy and its AGM becomes a popular assembly with a plebiscitary function more akin to what the Guild Socialists had in mind than the glorified committee cum business meeting it usually is' (Cohen 2012).

The urban politics of the London Olympics can thus be seen in many respects to

have been shaped by ideas and practices of social justice and community action drawn from elsewhere that are quite distinct from those that have a global corporate brand. They are rooted in London, indeed a particular part of London, but they are also connected into wider sets of relationships that stretch far beyond London as a territorial entity and can be seen to reach out beyond the city, to fold in agendas, as it were, in an attempt to shape events within.

A Relational Politics of the Urban

This kind of spatial politics perhaps comes closer to the politics of the city identified by Amin, as one of agonistic engagement, where demands are raised, temporary coalitions formed and relationships mobilized that stretch beyond city boundaries. A politics of propinquity fuelled by demands that are place-based but do not reflect a simple territorial politics. The wider geographies involved are likewise placed within a series of unequal interdependencies, but they also connect with agendas that can lessen that inequality and create new spaces of political opportunity. The manner, however, in which local actors have been able to reach out beyond the city to draw in practices that redefine the local, and for groups situated outside the immediate area to reach into London's politics in an attempt to steer political dialogue, is suggestive of more than a politics of connection. The sense in which political claims and demands from elsewhere have been lifted out and re-embedded in this part of London point to a spatial politics that is not simply about an 'outside' that is distant or separate from the city. There is a sense that not all politics is about physical face to face proximity or between actors who are either located in London or based elsewhere, and that sense raises the possibility of a politics mediated through distanced relationships that are already part of an urban polis (see also Allen and Cochrane 2007, 2010).

Interestingly, Amin, has spoken about a spatial politics that cannot simply be mapped and about the need to read the city 'simultaneously as a site of spatial circulation and radiation, and as a site of difference placed in close proximity' (2007, p.104). This is suggestive of more than a straightforward cartography or topography of urban politics. Rather, it implies a topological politics in which physical distances are not necessarily a good indication of either the separation or proximity of the actors involved; where demands for a living wage for instance emanate from the 'outside', yet are already part of direct negotiations within the city. Such a relational politics suggests a different spatial register for the politics of the city; one that does not merely imagine that what happens elsewhere is connected to the polis, but rather conceives of the 'outside' as already folded into the political practices of the polis. This is not to argue that a politics of connections does not have its place in an understanding of the polis. In isolation, however, it makes it just that much harder to capture the range of political interactions that lie behind the demands and claims that are registered within the city: the composed spaces of engagement that reach beyond the urban, involving temporary coalitions formed through the interplay of lobby groups, consultancies and think tanks, as well as that of more conventional political groupings and interests. Political connections, as such, do not have to be conceived as lines which cut across territorially bounded areas, as much as mediated relationships which create the distance, near or far, between political actors (see Allen, 2009). In this topological take on urban politics, it is possible to think about the spatial reach of political actors as something which enables them to make their presence felt in a variety of relational ways.

Some urban entanglements may draw political actors, corporate as much as campaigning groups, within close reach to broker negotiations directly, rather than across a spatial boundary that places them outside of the city. What may look like the politics of connection in this context is perhaps better understood as a drawing together of corporate interests and government authorities, for instance, that are involved in distanced or real-time claims-making and negotiations. Equally, part of the urban political interplay may take place indirectly by such corporate players reaching into the politics of the city in an attempt to steer the development dialogue or shape it in such a way that only a narrow range of economic or social interests are served. The ability of such actors to make their presence felt through the legitimisation of their interests may work, in this instance, through consultancy or lobby groups lifting out and embedding regeneration agendas formulated elsewhere. In such a way, events may be shaped within places like London by professionals practising elsewhere or by local actors reaching out beyond the city to fold in policy agendas formulated beyond their immediate locality (see also, Young and Keil, 2010). The urban politics at stake in this context thus works through actors registering their presence in ways that may actually dissolve the tension between the inside and the outside the city, rather than simply connect the two or treat them as discrete spaces.

Conclusion

The purpose of this paper has been to reflect on the relevance of global events such as London's 2012 Olympic Games for urban politics when many of the relationships involved stretch across and beyond the city. The regeneration of parts of London on the back of the Olympic Games, and its associated politics, can be thought about as a staged setting for the interaction of global corporate interests and government authorities at a range of administrative levels, but the almost placeless nature of the political engagement involved makes it difficult to perceive the embedded nature of a spatial politics that took its shape through a wider network of unequal connections, in the manner than Amin and Massey have outlined. Such unequal interdependencies, however, are not simply restricted to corporate agendas; they may also connect with agendas that offer new spaces of opportunity for politicians, campaigning groups and alternative coalitions of interest that not only draw upon established connections, but also reach out to events and practices elsewhere to bring them into the political dialogue in an immediate and more direct manner. This, in our view, is suggestive of more than a cartography of connections that criss-cross the globe which come together in a place like London; it is suggestive of a relational urban politics that is mediated through distanced relationships that are already a part of an urban polis, not separated from it by the barriers of distance. This is a politics that draws different actors within reach to make their presence felt in the urban arena; one that arguably is best captured through the lens of topology, rather than topography (Allen, 2003, 2009, Cochrane 2011).

A topological politics, in that respect, runs alongside a territorially-based politics, yet helps us to come to terms with a changing political landscape where the city as a political arena is not only part of a wider set of political geographies, but is continually defined and redefined by decision makers, interest groups and coalitions in a co-present fashion. The differently mediated nature of urban politics that enables agendas to be folded in from the outside matters in this context because it changes *what* can be demanded and *how* it may be negotiated. When the 'outside' is not distant in terms of mile and kilometres and real-time demands are commonplace, the city as a setting for political interaction and engagement may open up new voices and name new demands that previously were unable to gain a place. It is in this sense that a topological approach to the urban, we would argue, can make a difference to how we understand the place of urban politics.

.

References

- Aitchison, G. (2009). What can London Citizens teach the left? *Our Kingdom. Power and Liberty in England*. www.opendemocracy.net/ourkingdom/guyaitchison/what-can-london-citizens-teach-left accessed 8 February 2010.
- Alberts, H. C. (2009) Berlin's failed bid to host the 2000 Summer Olympic Games: urban developments and the improvement of sports facilities, *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 33, 2: 502-516
- Allen, J. (2003). *Lost geographies of power*, Blackwell, Oxford.
- Allen, J. (2009). Three spaces of power: territory, networks, plus a topological twist in the tale of domination and authority, *Journal of Power*, 2, 2:197-212.
- Allen, J. (2010). Powerful city networks: more than connections, less than domination and control, *Urban Studies*, 47,13: 2895-2911.
- Allen, J. and Cochrane, A. (2007). Beyond the territorial fix: regional assemblages, politics and power. *Regional Studies*, 41, 9: 1161-1175.
- Allen, J. and Cochrane, A. (2010) Assemblages of state power: topological shifts in the organization of government and politics. *Antipode*, 42, 5: 1071-1089.
- Amin, A. (2004). Regions unbound: towards a new politics of place. *Geografiska Annaler*, 86B: 33-44.
- Amin, A. (2007). Re-thinking the urban social. *City*, 11, 1: 100-114.
- Barking and Dagenham et al, (2011) *Convergence framework and action plan 2011-2015*. Barking and Dagenham, Greenwich, Hackney, Newham, Tower Hamlets and Mayor of London, London.
- Barnett, C., Cochrane, A. and Rodgers, S. (2009) Mediating urban politics *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 33, 1: 246-249.
- Bartholemew, E. (2012) Protesters haven't given up the fight against Leyton Marsh

Olympic basketball hall, *Hackney Gazette*, 5th March.

Bernstock, P. (2009) London 2012 and the regeneration game, in Poynter, G. and MacRury, I. (eds.)

Brickley, A. (2008) *The Alinsky method of participation and social change: the East London Communities Organisation*. Falmer: Institute for Development Studies.

www.drc-citizenship.org/system/assets/1052734722-brickley.2008.alinsky.pdf?1299824954.

Cochrane, A. (1999). Redefining urban politics for the 21st century, in Jonas, A. and Wilson, D (eds).

Cochrane, A. (2007) *Understanding urban policy. A critical approach*. Blackwell, Oxford.

Cochrane, A. (2011) Urban politics beyond the urban. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 35, 4: 862–863

Cochrane, A., Peck, J. and Tickell, A. (1996). Manchester plays games. The local politics of globalization. *Urban Studies*, 33, 8: 1317-1334.

Cochrane, A. and Ward, K. (2012) Researching the geographies of policy mobility: confronting the methodological challenges. *Environment and Planning A*, 44. 1: 5-12.

Coe, S., Livingstone, K. and Biggs, J. (2004) Letter to Rev Paul Regan and Trustees of London Citizens. 9 November 2004.

Cohen, P. (2012) Towards a good enough legacy: the long term impact of London 2012, *Our Kingdom, Power and Liberty in Britain* 10 August 2012.

www.opendemocracy.net/ourkingdom/phil-cohen/towards-good-enoughlegacy-long-term-impact-of-london-2012

Cohen, P. and Rustin, M. (2008). After London's turning: prospects and legacies for Thames Gateway, in Cohen, P. and Rustin, M. eds. *London's Turning: The Making*

of *Thames Gateway*. Ashgate, Aldershot.

Cook, I and Ward, K. (2011) Trans-urban networks of learning, mega events and policy tourism: the case of Manchester's Commonwealth and Olympic Games projects. *Urban Studies* 48, 12: 2519-2535.

Cox, K. (1998). Spaces of dependence, spaces of engagement and the politics of scale, or: looking for local politics, *Political Geography*. 17, 1: 1-23.

Cox, K. (2001). Territoriality, politics and the 'urban'. *Political Geography*, 20: 745-762.

Cox, K. and Mair, A. (1989). Urban growth machines and the politics of local economic development. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 13, 1: 137-146.

DCMS (2008). *Before, during and after: Making the most of the London 2012 Games*. Department for Culture, Media and Sport, London.

Davis, J. (2011) *Urbanising the event: how past processes, present politics and future plans shape London's Olympic legacy*. PhD thesis. London School of Economics and Political Science, London.

Davis, R. (2009). Reporting back from the Citizens' assembly. *Liberal Conspiracy*.

www.liberalconspiracy.org/2009/11/26/reporting-back-from-the-citizensassembly/

accessed 8th February 2010

Eversley, J. (2009) *Direct action and grass roots democracy. The legacy of Saul Alinsky*. Goldsmiths University of London, London Civic Forum, London Metropolitan University, London.

Fussey, P., Coaffee, J, Armstrong, G. and Hobbs, D. (2011) *Securing and sustaining the Olympic city. Reconfiguring London for 2012 and beyond*. Ashgate, Farnham

Greene, S. (2003). Staged cities: mega-events, slum clearance, and global capital.

Yale Human Rights and Development Law Journal, 6: 161-187.

Harvey, D. (1989a). From managerialism to entrepreneurialism: the transformation in urban governance in late capitalism. *Geografiska Annaler*, 71B, 3-17.

Harvey, D. (1989b). *The urban experience*. Blackwell, Oxford.

Hatcher, C. (2012) Forced evictions: legacies of dislocation on the Clays Lane Estate, in Powell and Marrero-Guillamón (eds.).

Husni-Bey, A. (2012) Clays Lane Live Archive, in Powell and Marrero-Guillamón (eds.).

IOC (2011) *Olympic Charter* (in force as from July 2011). International Olympic Committee, Lausanne.

Isin, E. (2002). *Being political: Genealogies of citizenship*. University of Minnesota Press, Minneapolis, MN.

Isin, E. (2005). Engaging, being, political. *Political Geography* 24: 373-387.

Jamoul, L. (2012) Community organisers help 1,200 people into Olympic jobs. IPPR, London www.ippr.org/articles/56/9726/community-organisers-help1200-people-into-olympic-jobs

Jamoul, L. and Wills, J. (2008) Faith in politics, *Urban Studies*, 45, 10: 2035-2056.

Jonas, A. and Wilson, D. eds. (1999). *The urban growth machine. Critical perspectives two decades later*. Albany NY: State University of New York Press.

Keith, M. (2005) *After the cosmopolitan? Multicultural cities and the future of racism*. Routledge, Abingdon.

Lee, M. (2006). *The race for the 2012 Olympics: The inside story of how London won the bid*. Virgin Books, London.

Lenskyj, H.J. (2009). *Olympic industry resistance: Challenging Olympic power and propaganda*. State University of New York Press, Albany, NY.

Livingstone, K. (2003). *London's Olympic bid – Good news for the Thames Gateway*, accessed at www.thamesgateway.org.uk/news/newsrels/2003/2003-05-16.shtml

Livingstone, K. (2008). *My bid was to snare billions of pounds for London*, accessed at <http://www.thisislondon.co.uk/standard-mayor/article-23480071-details/Livingstone:+My+2012+bid+was+to+snare+billions+of+pounds+for+London/article.do>

Logan, J. and Molotch, H. (1987). *Urban fortunes. The political economy of place*. University of California Press, Berkeley, CA.

London 2012 (2004). *New businesses and jobs, Homes and facilities*, accessed at www.london2102.org/en/bid/regeneration

London Assembly (Plenary) 21 October 2009 Minutes
http://www.london.gov.uk/assembly/assemmtgs/2009/plenaryoct21/minutes/a_pp1-transcriptODA.rtf accessed 8 February 2010-02-08

London Legacy Development Corporation (2012) www.londonlegacy.co.uk/ accessed 8 August 2012.

MacRury, I., and Poynter, G. (2009). Olympic cities and social change, in Poynter, G. and MacRury, I., eds.

Magnusson, W. (1996). *The search for political space: Globalization, social movements and the urban political experience*. University of Toronto Press, Toronto.

Massey, D. (2004). Geographies of responsibility. *Geografiska Annaler* 86B: 5-18.

Massey, D. (2007). *World City*. Polity, Cambridge.

Minton, A. (2012) *Ground control. Fear and happiness in the twenty-first century City*. 2nd edition. Penguin, London.

Molotch, H. (1976). The city as growth machine. *American Journal of Sociology*, 82, 2: 309-330.

- Moses, M (2011) *How New York City won the Olympics*, Rudin Centre for Transportation Policy and Management, New York University, New York.
- ODA (2007) *Olympic Delivery Authority and London Citizens agree to work together on London Living Wage* 15th February 2007(press Release)
<http://www.london2012.com/press/media-releases/2007/02/olympic-delivery-authority-and-london-citizens-agree-to-.php> accessed 13th February 2010.
- ODA (2011) *Jobs, skills, futures. Employment and skills update July 2011*. Olympic Delivery Authority, London.
- ODPM (2003). *Sustainable communities: Building for the future*. Office of the Deputy Prime Minister, London.
- Perryman, M. (2012) *Why the Olympics aren't good for us, and how they can be*. OR Books, New York.
- Powell, H. and Marrero-Guillamón, I. (eds.) *The art of dissent. Adventures in London's Olympic state*. Marshgate Press, London.
- Poynter, G (2006) *From Beijing to Bow Creek*. London East Institute Working Papers in Urban Studies. University of East London, London.
- Poynter, G. (2009a). The 2012 Olympic Games and the reshaping of East London, in Imrie et al eds.
- Poynter, G. (2009b). London: preparing for 2012, in Poynter, G. and MacRury, eds.
- Poynter, G. and MacRury, I. eds. (2009). *Olympic Cities: 2012 and the Remaking of London*. Ashgate, Farnham.
- Preuss, H. (2004). *The economics of staging the Olympics – A comparison of the Games 1972-2008*. Edward Elgar, Cheltenham.
- Raco, M. (2004). Whose gold rush? The social legacy of a London Olympics, in

Vigor et al, eds.

Raco, M. (2012) The privatization of urban development and the London Olympics 2012. *City*, 16, 4: 452-460.

Raco, M. and Tunney, E. (2010). Visibilities and invisibilities in urban development: small business communities and the London Olympics 2012. *Urban Studies*, 47, 10: 2069-2091.

Roche, M. (2000). *Mega-events and modernity. Olympics and expos in the rowth of global culture*. Routledge, Aldershot.

SNU (2008) *Moving on from Clay's Lane. Survey of former tenants. Final report. Residents' survey report commissioned by London Development Agency*. Safe Neighbourhoods Unit, London.

Shaw, C. (2008). *Five ring circus: Myths and realities of the Olympic Games*. New Society Publishers, Gabriola Island, BC.

Sheeres Davies Gleave (2011) *The Value of Station Investment. Research on Regenerative Impacts*. Network Rail, London.

Sinclair, I. (2011) *Ghost milk. Calling time on the grand project*. Penguin, London.

Somerville, P. (2011) *Understanding community. Politics, policy and practice*. Policy Press, Bristol.

Spectacle (2012) London Olympics 2012. Allotments Video clips, www.spectacle.co.uk/projects_page.php?id=176 accessed 8 August 2012.

Stone, C. (1993). Urban regimes and the capacity to govern: a political economy approach. *Journal of Urban Affairs*, 15, 1: 1-28;

Stone, C. (1995). Political leadership in urban politics, in Judge, D., Stoker, G. and Wolman, H. eds. *Theories of Urban Politics*, London: Sage.

TELCO (2011) TELCO makes its mark! 15 years of organising in East London.

www.citizens.uk.org/2011/12/telco-is-15 accessed 8 August 2012.

Vigor, A., Mean, M. and Tims, C. eds. (2004a). *After the Gold Rush. A sustainable Olympics for London*. IPPR and Demos, London.

Wills, J. (2013) London's Olympics in 2012. The good, the bad and an organizing opportunity. *Political Geography*, 34, A1-A3.

Wrelton, S. (2012) Mayor announces major step forward for the capital's first Community Land Trust as developer is announced. GLA Press Release 16 July. Greater London Authority, London.

Vigor, A., Mean, M. and Tims, C. (2004b). Introduction, in Vigor et al eds,

Young, D. and Keil, R. (2010) Reconnecting the disconnected: the politics of infrastructure in the in-between cities. *Cities*, 27: 87-95.