

---

---

## Note

# Staged Cities: Mega-events, Slum Clearance, and Global Capital

Solomon J. Greene†

Somehow, when the fair became part of the city, it did not work like the fair.

—Jane Jacobs, *The Death and Life of Great American Cities*<sup>1</sup>

### I. INTRODUCTION

In 1991, the World Bank and International Monetary Fund (IMF) held their joint international conference in Bangkok, bringing over 10,000 delegates from more than 160 countries to the city. In the months before the event, the Thai government forcibly removed over 2,000 slum dwellers from the areas immediately surrounding the new \$90 million Queen Sirikit National Convention Center that hosted the conference.<sup>2</sup> Hundreds of shanties in informal settlements were destroyed and a huge metal wall was erected to conceal the devastation left behind.<sup>3</sup> Similarly, when the World Bank and IMF held their conference in the Philippines in 1976, President

---

† J.D. candidate, Yale Law School. I would like to thank Professor Amy Chua at Yale Law School, Professor David Dowell at the University of California at Berkeley Department of City and Regional Planning, and Barjor Mehta and the Urban and City Management Team at the World Bank Institute for their helpful guidance throughout my research and writing process. I am also grateful to Ying Ying Li and the editors of the *Yale Human Rights and Development Law Journal* for their enthusiasm, patience, and astute comments. As always, Ari Biernoff has been an indispensable source of encouragement, inspiration, and last-minute editing advice.

1. JANE JACOBS, *THE DEATH AND LIFE OF GREAT AMERICAN CITIES* 25 (1961).

2. See William Branigin, *IMF Conference Brings 10,000 to Bangkok*, WASH. POST, Oct. 16, 1991, at A7; Philip Shenon, *Bangkok Journal: Where Beauty Queens Preen, No Eyesores, Please*, N.Y. TIMES, Aug. 21, 1991, at A4.

3. See Branigin, *supra* note 2.

Marcos initiated a “beautification” campaign in which 400 families were evicted from slums in Manila during the months preceding the event.<sup>4</sup> Despite the array of slum improvement programs financed by the World Bank,<sup>5</sup> Thailand and the Philippines both relied on shortsighted strategies of forced removal in order to conceal the existence of slum dwellers and, in doing so, protect national claims of “development.”

In recent years, housing advocates and development scholars have criticized large-scale urban economic development projects for their adverse impacts on informal settlements. For example, in his World Bank Discussion Paper, *The Urban Environment and Population Relocation*, Michael Cernea suggests that “the frequency and magnitude of compulsory displacement are likely to increase in the developing world as the trend towards urbanization grows stronger.”<sup>6</sup> In response to research conducted by social scientists such as Cernea, the World Bank and other international aid organizations have required that plans to address population displacement be “part-and-parcel of policies for urban socioeconomic development, rather than a mere side-effect not requiring explicit policy and legal frameworks.”<sup>7</sup> Despite the increased attention to displacement associated with development projects, development scholars and practitioners have paid little attention to the impacts of international events on informal settlements in the developing world.<sup>8</sup> The World Bank and other international organizations, such as the International Olympic

4. See Shenon, *supra* note 2; ERHARD BERNER, LEGALIZING SQUATTERS, EXCLUDING THE POOREST: URBAN LAND TRANSFER PROGRAMS IN THE PHILIPPINES 6 (1996) (Univ. of Bielefeld, Sociology of Dev. Research Ctr., Working Paper No. 257, 1996), at [http://www.uni-bielefeld.de/sdrc/publications/working\\_papers/WP257.PDF](http://www.uni-bielefeld.de/sdrc/publications/working_papers/WP257.PDF)

5. For an overview of the types of slum improvement programs advanced by the World Bank, see Stephen K. Mayo & David J. Gross, *Sites and Services - and Subsidies: The Economics of Low-Cost Housing in Developing Countries*, 1 WORLD BANK ECON. REV. 301, 304-05 (1987); Elizabeth Kubale Palmer & Carl V. Patton, *Evolution of Third World Shelter Policies*, in SPONTANEOUS SHELTER: INTERNATIONAL PERSPECTIVES AND PROSPECTS 3, 11-15 (Carl V. Patton ed., 1988). In general, the World Bank and other international aid agencies officially condemn eviction and demolition as an ineffective, and ultimately economically inefficient, response to urban slums. See, e.g., WORLD BANK, OPERATIONAL POLICY 4.12 ON INVOLUNTARY RESETTLEMENT (2001) at <http://wbln0018.worldbank.org/Institutional/Manuals/OpManual.nsf/toc2/CA2D01A4D1BDF58085256B19008197F6?OpenDocument>

6. MICHAEL M. CERNEA, THE URBAN ENVIRONMENT AND POPULATION RELOCATION iii (World Bank Discussion Paper No. 152, 1993); see also Roli Asthana, *Involuntary Resettlement: Survey of International Experience*, 31 ECON. & POL. WKLY. 1468, 1468 (1996).

7. CERNEA, *supra* note 6, at iii; see also ASIAN DEVELOPMENT BANK, HANDBOOK ON RESETTLEMENT: A GUIDE TO GOOD PRACTICE (1998); INTER-AMERICAN DEVELOPMENT BANK, INVOLUNTARY RESETTLEMENT: OPERATIONAL POLICY AND BACKGROUND PAPER (1998) at <http://www.iadb.org/sds/doc/928eng.pdf>; ORGANIZATION OF ECONOMIC COOPERATION AND DEVELOPMENT, GUIDELINES FOR AID AGENCIES ON INVOLUNTARY DISPLACEMENT AND RESETTLEMENT IN DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS (1992); WORLD BANK, *supra* note 5. Nonetheless, critics have pointed out that official condemnation and resettlement guidelines have proven insufficient to prevent widespread evictions associated with large development projects. See, e.g., SCOTT LECKIE, WHEN PUSH COMES TO SHOVE: FORCED EVICTIONS AND HUMAN RIGHTS 29-30 (1995) at <http://www.cohre.org/lbframe>.

8. *But see* U.N. CENTRE FOR HUMAN SETTLEMENTS, AN URBANIZING WORLD: GLOBAL REPORT ON HUMAN SETTLEMENTS, 1996, at 245-246 (1996) [hereinafter UNCHS GLOBAL REPORT].

Committee and the World Tourism Council, have failed to look at what happens behind the scenes when global conferences, sporting events, and international expositions are held in cities in the developing world. In other words, the international development community has failed critically to examine what happens in the “backyard” of the mega-events they host or participate in.

The evictions that occurred prior to the World Bank and IMF conferences epitomize a much broader trend. According to the 1996 Global Report on Human Settlements prepared by the United Nations Centre for Human Settlements (UNCHS), five of the top thirty-four recent examples of massive evictions worldwide were related to mega-events.<sup>9</sup> The report suggests that “beautification” projects immediately prior to international events are one of the most common justifications for slum clearance programs.<sup>10</sup>

Since mega-events bring increased attention to host cities, they often inspire municipal or national governments to improve the appearance of the host city, usually on a very condensed timeframe. Under the logic of event-oriented development, the *visibility* of poverty becomes paramount in renewal schemes, and preparations often involve removing the poor from high-profile areas surrounding event venues, without significant attention to long-term solutions to slum problems. However, these evictions often leave lasting impacts on the host city by radically restructuring its social and economic geography. I describe these cities as “staged cities” in order to highlight the tension between the mega-event as a means of constructing an image of “development” and the actively concealed landscapes of the urban poor.

This Note will examine in detail slum clearance programs aimed at improving the appearance of high-profile areas immediately prior to two international mega-events: the 1988 Summer Olympic Games in Seoul and Santo Domingo’s celebration of the 500th Anniversary of Columbus’ voyage to the Americas in 1992. While the evictions preceding each of these mega-events have been well documented by the press<sup>11</sup> and advocates,<sup>12</sup>

---

9. See *id.* at 246.

10. See *id.* at 245.

11. For examples of newspaper accounts of the evictions prior to the 1988 Summer Olympics in Seoul, see David Bank, *Seoul’s Poor Could Find Plight Worsened After Olympics End*, SAN DIEGO UNION-TRIB., Sept. 18, 1988, at A38; Peter Leyden, *Olympic Fever Fizzles for These South Koreans*, ST. PETERSBURG TIMES, Sept. 11, 1988, at A19; Peter Maass, *City, Nation on the Upbeat Aim to Avoid Downside*, WASH. POST, Sept. 16, 1988, at E1. For examples of coverage of the 500th Anniversary in Santo Domingo, see Colin Harding, *Rocky Course for Lighthouse in Eye of Storm*, INDEPENDENT, Oct. 7, 1992, at 12; Manuel Jimenez, *They Threw a Party to Celebrate Columbus, But Nobody Came*, CHI. TRIB., Oct. 9, 1992, at 2; Kevin Rafferty, *A Gloomy Monument to Columbus*, FIN. TIMES, Aug. 29, 1992, at Travel XI; Joseph B. Treaster, *For Dominicans, Public Projects But No Light*, N.Y. TIMES, July 30, 1989, at A13; Cecile Holmes White, *Columbus Day Festivities: Lighthouse of Pride and Anger*, HOUSTON CHRON., Oct. 11, 1992, at A22; Amy Wilenz, *Belaguer Builds a Lighthouse*, NATION, May 21, 1990, at 702.

12. See, e.g., Asian Coalition for Housing Rights (ACHR), *Evictions in Seoul, South Korea*, 1 ENV’T & URBANIZATION 89, 92-93 (1989) [hereinafter ACHR]; Hyung-Hook Kim, *South Korea: Experiences of Eviction in Seoul*, in EVICTIONS AND THE RIGHT TO HOUSING 199, 223-231 (Antonio Azuela et al. eds., 1998); Edmundo Morel & Manuel Mejia, *The Dominican Republic: Urban*

these accounts fail to compare the two case studies or analyze more generally the impacts of mega-events on low-income and squatter communities in the developing world.<sup>13</sup> Although other examples of mega-events abound,<sup>14</sup> these two case studies most dramatically illustrate the tension between development goals and international events. Together, the “beautification” programs associated with these events precipitated the eviction of an estimated 900,000 low-income people.<sup>15</sup>

Part II will describe the growing importance of mega-events as an urban redevelopment strategy in a global economic system in which cities must vigorously compete with each other to attract increasingly mobile capital. Parts III and IV will describe the political and economic contexts in which the Summer Olympics in Seoul and the 500th Anniversary in Santo Domingo were developed and the impacts that these mega-events had on urban slum dwellers. In Part V, common themes from these two case studies will be examined. Finally, Part VI will propose alternatives to slum clearance and suggest how mega-events can function to improve the conditions of poor people in host cities, rather than simply—and violently—banishing them from sight.

## II. BIG KAHUNA CAPITALISM: MEGA-EVENTS AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

Mega-events, also referred to as “hallmark” or “landmark” events, are large-scale events intended to renew investment in host cities, usually in the tourism sector, by projecting a positive image of the city.<sup>16</sup> Mega-events can be distinguished from smaller events—such as routine conferences, celebrations, or sporting events—by the tremendous amount of resources

---

*Renewal and Evictions in Santo Domingo*, in *EVICTIONS AND THE RIGHT TO HOUSING* 83, 98 (Antonio Azuela et al. eds., 1998).

13. For the purposes of this Note, South Korea is treated as a “developing country” despite its admission to the Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) in 1996. By most accounts, South Korea was still considered a developing country during the 1988 Olympic Games, with an average yearly per-capita income of \$3000. See, e.g., Fred Hiatt, *U.S. Visitors Can't Say Enough About Koreans' Hospitality*, WASH. POST, Sept. 21, 1988, at D11. In fact, the country's emergence as a developed nation is often attributed, in part, to its selection as an Olympic host city. See, e.g., Trip Gabriel, *China Strains for Olympic Glory*, N.Y. TIMES, Apr. 24, 1998, § 6 (Magazine), at 30; Fred Hiatt, *Seoul: Where Skyscrapers, Squid Mix*, WASH. POST, Oct. 20, 1987, at A29; Lena H. Sun, *Threat to '88 Olympics Upsets S. Koreans*, WASH. POST, June 26, 1987, at A1.

14. See, e.g., Poona Antaseeda, *Beggars Face Crackdown as Asiad Nears*, BANGKOK POST, Nov. 25, 1998, at 4 (describing police sweeps of panhandlers and squatters in Bangkok prior to the 1998 Asian Games); Fred Edwards, *Cute Panda Covers Up Beijing's Vicious Tiger*, TORONTO STAR, Sept. 6, 1990, at A23 (describing slum clearance in Beijing prior to the 1990 Asian Games).

15. UNCHS GLOBAL REPORT, *supra* note 8, at 246.

16. See J. R. Brent Ritchie, *Assessing the Impact of Hallmark Events: Conceptual and Research Issues*, 23 J. TRAVEL RES. 2, 2 (1984). C.f. Colin Michael Hall, *Hallmark Tourist Events: Analysis, Definition, Methodology and Review*, in *THE PLANNING AND EVALUATION OF HALLMARK EVENTS* 3, 4 (Geoffrey Syme et al. eds., 1989) (expanding the definition of “hallmark events” to include small-scale events that aim to secure the host city “a position of prominence in the tourism market”).

that go into their implementation and the physical legacies for host cities.<sup>17</sup> During preparations for a mega-event, the line between short-term events and ongoing urban development is blurred: hotels, stadiums, entertainment complexes, urban parks, and civic monuments are constructed to accommodate the event itself but often are connected with a broader urban revitalization agenda. Frequently, in the years prior to a mega-event, the host city will witness unprecedented rates of construction activity as the city gears up for a massive influx of visitors and heightened international attention.<sup>18</sup>

British sociologist Maurice Roche has laid out the critical characteristics that define mega-events and guide mega-event research:

Mega-events (large scale leisure and tourism events such as Olympic Games and World Fairs) are short-term events with long-term consequences for the cities that stage them. They are associated with the creation of infrastructure and event facilities often carrying long-term debts and always requiring long-term use programming. In addition, if successful, they project a new (or renewed) and perhaps persistent and positive image and identity for the host city through national and international media, particularly TV, coverage. This is usually assumed to have long-term positive consequences in terms of tourism, industrial relocation, and inward investments.<sup>19</sup>

Research on mega-events has focused on the role and impact of mega-events within Western, post-industrial cities.<sup>20</sup> Mega-events are increasingly used as a means of revitalizing depressed post-industrial city centers. In the American context, local governments adopted mega-events as one of the main "entrepreneurial policies for economic development" after federal aid was cut in the 1980s.<sup>21</sup> Civic leaders in host cities offer multiple justifications for public investments in mega-events. For example, event organizers often articulate a desire to restore "self-confidence,"

---

17. See Maurice Roche, *Mega-Events and Urban Policy*, 21 ANNALS OF TOURISM RES. 1, 1-2 (1994).

18. See, e.g., Pete Yoo, *Games Catalyst for Seoul Building Boom*, FAR E. ECON. REV., Mar. 16, 1989, at 59 (describing the role that the Games played in stimulating double-digit growth in South Korea's construction sector in 1988); MARIA ELENA PORTORREAL DE ALONSO, U.S. & FOREIGN COMMERCIAL SERVICE, FISCAL YEAR 1994 COUNTRY MARKETING PLAN FOR THE DOMINICAN REPUBLIC AND THE CARIBBEAN REGION, June 1993, LEXIS Country Reports, Dominican Republic (describing double-digit growth in the Dominican Republic's construction sector in 1991-1992, largely due to government projects associated with the 500th Anniversary celebration).

19. See Roche, *supra* note 17, at 1-2.

20. See, e.g., Colin Michael Hall, *The Effects of Hallmark Events on Cities*, 26 J. TRAVEL RES. 44 (1987); John A. Hannigan, *The Postmodern City: A New Urbanization?*, 43 CURRENT SOC. 155, 194-95 (1995); Harry Hiller, *The Urban Transformation of a Landmark Event: The 1988 Calgary Winter Olympics*, 26 URB. AFF. Q. 118 (1990); Roche, *supra* note 17.

21. See Greg Andranovich et al., *Olympic Cities: Lessons Learned from Mega-Event Politics*, 23 J. URB. AFF. 113, 113-14 (2001).

“dynamism,” and “civic pride” among residents of the host city.<sup>22</sup> Harry Hiller describes the role that the Calgary Olympics played in promoting “spirit-building civic interaction” through “pin-trading, pancake breakfasts, and people watching,” as well as creating an overall “party spirit” in the city.<sup>23</sup> More often, researchers focus on the political economy of mega-events and their role in generating both revenue and international prestige for host cities. On a national level, mega-events are typically part of a larger program to develop tourism and international investments.<sup>24</sup> On a municipal level, mega-events can play an important role in recasting downtown areas as sites for leisure activities and consumption, typically through the development of sports venues, hotels, and tourist attractions.<sup>25</sup>

Perhaps the most compelling explanations for the increasing popularity of mega-events situate them within the context of inter-city competition for capital in a postmodern, global marketplace.<sup>26</sup> The international attention that mega-events attract can help emerging global cities define or “re-image” themselves to both potential investors and tourists. Mega-events play a critical role in enabling local elites to offer “a coherent interpretation of a city’s ‘intentions’ and of its economic and political environment—in other words, its ‘image.’”<sup>27</sup> David Harvey describes the pressures on cities to undergo such an imaging process:

Cities and places now, it seems, take much more care to create a positive and high quality image of place ...[This process] is understandable, given the grim history of deindustrialization and restructuring that left most major cities in the advanced capitalist world with few options except to compete with each other, mainly as financial, consumption, and entertainment centres. Imaging a city through the organization of spectacular urban spaces became a means to attract capital and people (of the right sort) in a period (since 1973) of intensified inter-urban competition and urban entrepreneurialism.<sup>28</sup>

In the early 1990s, *U.S. News and World Report* remarked on the explosive popularity of mega-events and large-scale spectacle-oriented development projects as a means of attracting global capital, describing this trend as the “Big Kahuna approach” to urban development: “building big projects and hoping that, like some Hawaiian witch doctor, they’ll magically bring cash and prestige.”<sup>29</sup> Similarly, Roche suggests that mega-

---

22. See Roche, *supra* note 17, at 9.

23. Hiller, *supra* note 20, at 126, 128.

24. See Roche, *supra* note 17, at 8-9.

25. See Hannigan, *supra* note 20, at 194-95.

26. See, e.g., Andranovich, *supra* note 21, at 113-15.

27. Dennis Judd & Michael Parkinson, *Urban Leadership and Regeneration*, in LEADERSHIP AND URBAN REGENERATION 13, 22 (Dennis Judd & Michael Parkinson eds., 1990).

28. DAVID HARVEY, THE CONDITION OF POSTMODERNITY 92 (1994).

29. Matthew Cooper et al., *If You Build It...They Might Not Come*, U.S. NEWS & WORLD REP., June 24, 1991, at 26.

events "are being produced by cities in the throes of transformation and in various sorts of crisis," and play an important role in assisting host cities "to renew their image, to restructure and reposition themselves as centers of capital and labor, production, and exchange in the national and global economy, and generally to 'modernize.'"<sup>30</sup> As Roche observes, mega-events have become increasingly popular tools for responding to the urban crises in the face of which many municipal governments feel they lack "realistic alternatives."<sup>31</sup>

Despite the renewed attention by academics to the efficacy of mega-events as a redevelopment tool, the existing literature on mega-events is largely limited to First World urban centers. Mega-events have also played an increasingly prominent role in the developing world, however, and in recent years several developing countries have aggressively pursued bids to host international sporting events, such as the Olympic Games.<sup>32</sup> Crucial differences between hosting mega-events in the developed and developing world have not yet been thoroughly evaluated.<sup>33</sup>

While the literature on mega-events in the developed world often focuses on the trend towards revitalizing post-industrial urban centers through "consumption-based" economic development,<sup>34</sup> mega-events in the developing world are often motivated, at least in part, by a desire to demonstrate that the host country embraces international legal norms.<sup>35</sup> In addition to recasting the image of the host city as a hospitable location for tourism and leisure activities through physical improvements, mega-events in the developing world can help the host country assure tourists and potential investors that it respects human rights and the rule of law.<sup>36</sup> The close connection between the Olympics and the promotion of the rule of

---

30. Roche, *supra* note 17, at 13.

31. *Id.* at 9.

32. See Victor A. Matheson & Robert A. Baade, *Mega-Sporting Events in Developing Nations: Playing the Way to Prosperity?* 1-3 (2002) (unpublished manuscript at <http://www.williams.edu/Economics/neudc/papers/matheson.pdf>) (discussing how "developing nations have increasingly demanded the right to host the [Olympic] Games" and pointing out that the finalists for the 2004 and 2008 Summer Games included Cape Town, Buenos Aires, and Istanbul, with Beijing "ultimately winning" the bid for the 2008 Games).

33. Matheson and Baade have begun to assess the advantages and disadvantages of hosting mega-events in developing countries in an unpublished paper. See *id.*

34. See, e.g., Andranovich, *supra* note 21, at 115-17.

35. See *infra* Part V.E.; see also Kyong Whan Ahn, *The Influence of American Constitutionalism on South Korea*, 22 S. ILL. U. L.J. 83(1997) (noting that "[h]osting the 1988 Summer Olympics may have provided a turning point in Korea's attitude toward the international legal community").

36. For an overview of the politics of international sporting events and the longstanding relationship between the Olympic Games and human rights promotion, see Paul Mastrocola, *The Lord of the Rings: The Role of Olympic Site Selection as a Weapon Against Human Rights Abuses: China's Bid for the 2000 Olympics*, 15 B.C. THIRD WORLD L.J. 141, 145-46, 152-59 (1995); Thomas R. Dominicyk, *The New Melting Pot: As American Attitudes Toward Foreigners Continue to Decline, Athletes Are Welcomed with Open Arms*, 8 SETON HALL J. SPORTS L. 165, 194-201 (1988). James Nafziger lists "diplomatic recognition or nonrecognition" and the "promotion of human rights or economic development" as among the principal reasons for government support of sporting competitions. James A.R. Nafziger, *International Sports Law: A Replay of Characteristics and Trends*, 86 AM. J. INT'L L. 489, 496 (1992); see also JAMES A.R. NAFZIGER, *INTERNATIONAL SPORTS LAW* 71, 80-96 (1988).

law dates back at least to the 1964 Olympics in Tokyo, when the Japanese government launched a massive five-year long campaign to “instill a respect and basic compliance towards the rule of law” among the Japanese citizenry prior to the Games.<sup>37</sup> By selecting a country to host their mega-event, international institutions such as the World Bank or the International Olympic Committee (IOC) seemingly place their stamp of approval on the host country’s legal and political institutions.<sup>38</sup>

The recent controversy surrounding China’s bid for the 2008 Summer Olympics powerfully demonstrates the ideological potency of international mega-events. It is widely recognized that China’s bid for the 2000 Games, initiated soon after the Tiananmen Square massacre in 1989, failed due to the nation’s dismal human rights record, whereas its successful bid for the 2008 Games reflected the IOC’s hopes that the Games would act as a catalyst for legal reform and serve as a constraint on state abuses.<sup>39</sup> As James Lilley, the U.S. Ambassador to Seoul during the 1988 Olympics, remarked during China’s bid, “Just as Chinese membership in the WTO will oblige Beijing to play by accepted international rules, the Olympics should keep hard-liners in the regime in check....[The Olympics] should afford the Chinese people an opportunity to broaden their limited political and economic freedoms.”<sup>40</sup> The use of mega-events as a means of showcasing political stability and legal maturity in developing countries promises to intensify as development scholars increasingly emphasize the links between economic development and strong legal institutions and as international aid organizations condition assistance on legal reforms.<sup>41</sup>

---

37. See Chan Jin Kim, *Korean Attitudes Towards Law*, 10 PAC. RIM. L. & POL’Y J. 1, 34 (2000).

38. See, e.g., Tracy Dahlby, *Award of 1988 Olympics Boosts S. Korea’s Effort for Political Security*, WASH. POST, Oct. 4, 1981, at H2 (describing how “winning the Olympic laurels” marked an “important step” in then President Chun Doo Hwan’s “efforts to restore political stability to South Korea and revive international confidence in its economy”); Nicholas D. Kristof, *Games Offering China a Chance to Polish Image*, N.Y. TIMES, Sept. 23, 1990, at 1 (describing the 1990 Asian Games as an opportunity for China to “win back international respect” and “rejoin the international community” after the violent crackdown of June 1989).

39. See, e.g., Steven Harris, *Now the World Accepts Us*, CHRISTIAN SCI. MONITOR, July 16, 2001, at 7; Melinda Liu, *All That Glitters...China’s PR Blitz May Win It the 2008 Games, But Even the Sunniest Face Can’t Entirely Obscure a Darker Reality*, NEWSWEEK, July 16, 2001, at 30.

40. James R. Lilley, *Beijing’s Risky New Game*, NEWSWEEK, July 16, 2001, at 32.

41. Numerous law and development scholars have observed that international investment will not thrive where rule of law institutions remain weak. See, e.g., Thomas Carothers, *The Rule of Law Revival*, FOREIGN AFF., Mar./Apr. 1998, at 95, 97 (“Without the rule of law, major economic institutions such as corporations, banks, and labor unions would not function, and the government’s many involvements in the economy...would be unfair, inefficient, and opaque.”); THOMAS L. FRIEDMAN, *THE LEXUS AND THE OLIVE TREE* 129-131 (1999) (identifying the rule of law as a necessary component of a successful modern economy); William B. T. Mock, *An Interdisciplinary Introduction to Legal Transparency: A Tool for Rational Development*, 18 DICK. J. INT’L L. 293, 304 (2000) (arguing that the rule of law lowers transaction costs associated with international business and investment). The connection between functioning legal institutions and sustained economic development underpins the legal reform programs funded by international aid organizations such as USAID and the World Bank. See Amy L. Chua, *Markets, Democracy and Ethnicity: Toward a New Paradigm for Law and Development*, 108 YALE L.J. 1, 17-18 (1989); Jason Gottlieb, *Launching the Phnom Penh Stock Exchange: Toward a Legal Framework for Launching a Stock Exchange in an Underdeveloped Country*, 14 COLUM. J. ASIAN L. 235, 271 (2000); Jacques de Lisle, *Lex Americana?: United States Legal*



Perhaps more surprising than the lack of scholarship on the role of mega-events in developing countries is the dearth of research on the impact of event-related development on low-income communities, either in wealthy or developing countries. Few researchers have asked critical questions about the ways in which mega-events impact the lives of the most economically and socially marginalized populations in host cities.<sup>42</sup> Instead, focus has been on narrow cost-benefit analysis to determine the worthiness of mega-event investments.<sup>43</sup> If low-income communities are acknowledged at all in mega-event research, they are usually treated uncritically, as beneficiaries of “trickle-down” economics.<sup>44</sup> Even assuming that mega-events are, in fact, profitable for host cities (an assumption that is highly contested),<sup>45</sup> disparities among urban populations and the marginalization of low-income communities in the city’s social and economic landscape are often exacerbated by mega-events, as the following case studies illustrate.

### III. SEOUL CASE STUDY

#### A. The Urban Context

In the second half of the twentieth century, Seoul rapidly grew to become one of the most densely populated cities in the world.<sup>46</sup> Between 1960 and 1983, the proportion of South Korea’s population living in cities grew from 36 to 72%.<sup>47</sup> During this period, South Korea developed from a relatively poor nation with an agrarian base to a leading global industrial

---

*Assistance, American Legal Models, and Legal Change in the Post-Communist World and Beyond*, 20 U. PA. J. INT’L ECON. L. 179, 217 (1999).

42. Examples of studies that have considered the impacts of individual mega-events on low-income populations in developed countries include CHARLES RUTHHEISER, *IMAGINEERING ATLANTA: THE POLITICS OF PLACE IN THE CITY OF DREAMS* 213, 263-74, 279-82 (1996); Kris Olds, *Mass Evictions in Vancouver: The Human Toll of Expo ’86*, 6 CAN. HOUSING 49 (1989) [hereinafter Olds, *Mass Evictions*]; Kris Olds, *Urban Mega-Events, Evictions and Housing Rights: The Canadian Case*, 1 CURRENT ISSUES TOURISM 2, (1998) [hereinafter Olds, *Urban Mega-Events*]; Solomon J. Greene, *Olympia Was Not A City: Poverty, Planning, and the Restructuring of Urban Space in Olympic Atlanta* (1996) (unpublished A.B. thesis, Stanford University) (on file with author).

43. See Colin Michael Hall, *Hallmark Events and the Planning Process*, in *THE PLANNING AND EVALUATION OF HALLMARK EVENTS* *supra* note 16, at 20, 22-26 (explaining that “the little analysis that has been undertaken [on mega-events] has tended to focus on the economic impacts of such events” and describing several studies utilizing misleading cost-benefit analyses).

44. See Brent Ritchie & Michael Hall, *Mega Events and Human Rights*, in *PROCEEDINGS OF SPORT AND HUMAN RIGHTS CONFERENCE* 102, 113 (Tracy Taylor ed., 1999), at <http://www.hrca.org.au/HOW%20YOU%20PLAY%20THE%20GAME%20fin.pdf>; Calvin Jones, *A Level Playing Field? Sports Stadium Infrastructure and Urban Development in the United Kingdom*, 33 ENV’T & PLAN. A, 845, 845 (2001).

45. For accounts critical of the economics of mega-events, see Robert Baade & Victor Mattheson, *Sports Facilities and Development: High Octane? Grading the Impact of the Daytona 500*, 10 MARQ. SPORTS L.J. 401 (2000); Jan Borowy, *Big Bucks, Bad Sports: Olympics and the Labour Movement*, OUR TIMES, Dec. 1989, at 19; Cooper, *supra* note 29, at 26; Hannigan, *supra* note 20.

46. See Kwang-Joong Kim, *New Form, Classic Problem: Pseudo-Public Residential Redevelopment in Seoul*, 24 BUILT ENV’T 235, 235, 239 (1998).

47. See ACHR, *supra* note 12.

power.<sup>48</sup> Seoul's position as South Korea's primary city was reinforced by this economic shift, and, by the 1980s, one third of national GDP was generated by enterprises located in Seoul.<sup>49</sup> The city's population swelled from 2.5 million in 1962 to 10 million in 1988, largely due to rural-urban migration, and its share of the country's total population grew from 9.8% in 1960 to 22.3% in 1980.<sup>50</sup> By 1988, when the city hosted the Summer Olympics, planners in Seoul estimated that only 15% of the city's population had been born in the city.<sup>51</sup>

Rapid in-migration combined with a lack of developable land led to a persistent housing shortage in Seoul, despite efforts to expand and modernize the city's housing supply.<sup>52</sup> Since the late 1960s, much of the city has been rebuilt and the traditional housing stock of tile-roofed wooden structures has largely been replaced by modern high-rise developments.<sup>53</sup> The country's rapidly expanding economy has driven up land prices and created tremendous pressures to redevelop existing residential areas, many of which were already densely populated. Between 1960 and 1980, 117 km<sup>2</sup> of land was redeveloped, representing about one-fifth of the total area of the center city.<sup>54</sup>

Widespread evictions accompanied Seoul's explosive growth and frenetic urban development. Several factors contributed to evictions, including market pressures, lack of government programs to replace low-cost housing, and the absence of even the most basic tenant rights.<sup>55</sup> Most importantly, strong government control over squatter developments, typically built on public land with no public financing, enabled massive government-sponsored evictions.<sup>56</sup> Seoul's forced eviction program during the 1980s is estimated to be one of the largest government-sponsored eviction programs of any city in the world in recent decades.<sup>57</sup>

Large-scale evictions began in 1966, when the Seoul government undertook its first major slum clearance project, aimed at replacing 136,000 squatter units with 90,000 public housing units.<sup>58</sup> Four years later, over 50% of the squatter settlements demolished under this program had been removed, but less than 17% of the planned public housing units had been built.<sup>59</sup> Relocated households were forced to fend for themselves in

---

48. *See id.* at 89.

49. *See id.*

50. William C. Baer & Chamun Koo, *Housing Turnover in Developing Nations: The Case of Seoul*, 13 J. PLAN. EDUC. & RES. 104, 109 (1994).

51. Daniel Sneider, *Seoul: All Dressed Up and Raring to Go*, CHRISTIAN SCI. MONITOR, Sept. 2, 1988, at 16.

52. *See Baer & Koo, supra* note 50, at 109.

53. *See ACHR, supra* note 12, at 89.

54. *Id.* at 91.

55. *See id.* at 89-90.

56. *See id.* at 90.

57. *See id.* at 89; Scott Leckie, *When Push Comes to Shove: Eviction's No Fiction*, WHOLE EARTH REV., Sept. 22, 1991, at 88, 89; UNCHS GLOBAL REPORT, *supra* note 8, at 245.

58. ACHR, *supra* note 12, at 90.

59. *See id.*

outlying areas, far away from jobs and social networks.<sup>60</sup>

Throughout the 1970s, the municipal government continued to clear slums through its Residential Redevelopment Program. Under this program, the City was supposed to designate certain squatter areas as Substandard Housing Redevelopment Districts (SHR districts), rezone the designated land for residential use, expedite code approvals, and then sell the land to occupants at far below market price.<sup>61</sup> However, the SHR program lacked adequate funding, improvements proceeded slowly, and squatter settlements continued to proliferate. By 1980, some two million people lived in illegal housing, usually built on land unsuitable for development. According to the Asian Coalition for Housing Rights (ACHR), displaced households deliberately chose to occupy undesirable sites in order to avoid future evictions.<sup>62</sup>

#### B. The 1988 Summer Olympics

In 1981, the IOC announced that South Korea had been successful in its bid to host the 1988 Summer Olympic Games. Although the South Korean government had declared an end to forceful eviction programs in 1980, the successful bid for the Olympics sparked renewed interest in redevelopment projects.<sup>63</sup> In addition to the real estate pressures already threatening informal settlements in Seoul, the preparation for the Olympics created a heightened demand for land to construct sports venues, tourist facilities, and accommodations for athletes, the press, and over 250,000 visitors. The Olympics also transformed the spatial pattern of evictions by shifting the city's focus to providing land for venues and removing unsightly slums from high profile areas, such as along the route of the Olympic torch.<sup>64</sup>

Seoul spent approximately \$3 billion on new facilities and urban improvements in preparation for the Olympics.<sup>65</sup> In addition to sports stadiums, the City extended subway lines, constructed new highways and a new airport terminal, refurbished monuments and historic buildings, and developed a 122-building apartment complex to house athletes, journalists, and sports officials.<sup>66</sup> In 1983, the government designated 227 areas to be redeveloped by 1990.<sup>67</sup> During the five years preceding the Games, 48,000 buildings, housing 720,000 people, were destroyed for redevelopment.<sup>68</sup> Most of the demolished structures were single-story houses built with

---

60. *See id.* at 90-91.

61. Kim, *supra* note 46, at 239.

62. ACHR, *supra* note 12, at 90.

63. Asian Coalition for Housing Rights (ACHR), *NGO Profile: Asian Coalition for Housing Rights*, 5 ENV'T & URBANIZATION, 153, 155 (1993) [hereinafter ACHR, *NGO Profile*].

64. *See* ACHR, *supra* note 12, at 92.

65. Fred Hiatt, *Dog Meat Out, Flowers In: Seoul Looks to Games*, WASH. POST, Aug. 18, 1988, at A33.

66. Maass, *supra* note 11.

67. Leyden, *supra* note 11.

68. Bank, *supra* note 11.

virtually no public investment; they were replaced with high-rise public housing projects widely criticized for disrupting the vitality and texture of the urban environment.<sup>69</sup> Ninety percent of the 720,000 evictees did not receive replacement housing within the redevelopment site.<sup>70</sup>

In the 1980s, Seoul adopted a “joint development” or “partnership renewal” model of slum improvement.<sup>71</sup> Responding to strong opposition from residents to previous evictions, this new model created a development “cooperative” between property owners and construction companies to redevelop land targeted for renewal. The joint development model gave homeowners a voluntary role in devising and implementing redevelopment plans and guaranteed displaced homeowners a new apartment in rebuilt developments.<sup>72</sup> The role of the City was reduced to that of a controller with minimal financial commitments.<sup>73</sup> Within Seoul’s flourishing housing market, this privatization approach was successful in creating much-needed housing for a burgeoning middle-class population but failed to create affordable housing for lower-income tenants.<sup>74</sup>

Although tenants accounted for a majority of the households in SHR districts, the joint development program did not recognize the interest of tenants and squatters in the redevelopment process.<sup>75</sup> Excluded from the partnership between property owners and developers, tenants were displaced from redevelopment sites and were not provided with any guarantees of return. Relocation subsidies, when provided, were insufficient to provide temporary housing even during the construction period.<sup>76</sup> Due to escalating land costs and rampant exploitation by real estate speculators, even homeowners often could not afford to move back into redeveloped units. Only an estimated 10% of homeowners were able to afford to return to the rebuilt housing in the SHR districts.<sup>77</sup> According to Korean urban planner Kwang-Joong Kim, “Seoul’s new housing produced by the SHR programme was in essence a commodity that was too remote for the displaced people to reach.”<sup>78</sup>

The process of redevelopment prior to the Olympics pushed low-income residents farther and farther away from the center city, often through multiple evictions in the course of only one or two years. For example, the neighborhood of Mok Dong was created when six squatter communities were evicted from the center city in the 1960s and moved to Mok Dong, which at the time was farmland. The population of Mok Dong increased in the 1970s as additional families evicted from other redevelopment sites moved in. By the early 1980s, Mok Dong housed

---

69. See Kim, *supra* note 46, at 242-49.

70. ACHR, *supra* note 12, at 91.

71. See Kim, *supra* note 46, at 241.

72. See ACHR, *supra* note 12, at 91.

73. Kim, *supra* note 46, at 241.

74. See Bank, *supra* note 11; Kim, *supra* note 46, at 246.

75. See Kim, *supra* note 46, at 246.

76. *Id.*

77. See Bank, *supra* note 11; Kim, *supra* note 46, at 246.

78. Kim, *supra* note 46, at 249.

around 7800 families, including 2600 homeowners and 5200 renters.<sup>79</sup> Finally, in 1984, Mok Dong itself became targeted as a redevelopment site and 3200 houses were demolished.<sup>80</sup> Although the public authority overseeing the project generated tremendous profits from the sale of the 23,000 apartments on the site, no compensation was provided to the tenants who were evicted, and the homeowners who had lived on the site prior to redevelopment could not afford to purchase the rebuilt units.<sup>81</sup> Instead, profits generated from redevelopment projects such as Mok Dong were used to finance the construction of Olympic facilities.<sup>82</sup>

Like Mok Dong, the Sang Kye Dong neighborhood was originally created to re-house squatters evicted from other redevelopment sites in the 1960s. With the development of a subway system as part of the preparations for the Olympic Games, however, the 1100 households in Sang Kye Dong once again became victims of redevelopment.<sup>83</sup> Residents of Sang Kye Dong resisted evictions but were subjected to a series of violent attacks by police and several hundred men hired by construction companies to intimidate residents.<sup>84</sup> The Asian Coalition for Housing Rights estimated that, between June 1986 and April 1987 residents of Sang Kye Dong were attacked 18 times.<sup>85</sup> Finally, on April 14, 1987, just over a year before the Olympic Games, 3500 movers and riot police forcibly removed the remaining residents of Sang Kye Dong from their homes.<sup>86</sup>

The Sang Kye Dong residents were temporarily relocated to a lot outside the Roman Catholic Myongdong Cathedral in downtown Seoul, then joined other evictees on plot of land purchased collectively in Puchon, a suburb of Seoul. Using carefully collected building materials, such as salvaged lumber, carpets, and blankets, they constructed makeshift residences on the plot in Puchon.<sup>87</sup> Within days, however, city crews tore down the modest homes, since, as it turned out, the plot in Puchon was immediately adjacent to the path of the Olympic torch. One evictee in Puchon criticized the Olympics movement for failing to meet its lofty goals of promoting human betterment: "even though [the Olympics Movement] is in the spirit of peace, in Korea [it] has been more oppressive than anything else. It has taken away the rights of the poor."<sup>88</sup>

The imbalances created by the Olympics extend beyond squatter evictions. For example, when the government built new roads connecting the international airport to Olympic venues, it failed to provide sidewalks, despite the fact that the vast majority of Seoul residents did not own cars.<sup>89</sup>

---

79. ACHR, *supra* note 12, at 91.

80. *Id.*

81. *Id.*

82. *Id.* at 92.

83. *Id.*

84. *Id.*

85. *Id.*

86. *Id.*

87. Leyden, *supra* note 11.

88. *Id.*

89. *Id.*

Judge Krishna Iyer, a former justice of India's Supreme Court and a participant in Habitat International Coalition's fact-finding mission to Seoul, said that the city's obsession with "beautification" for the Olympics had accelerated Korea's "neurotic development" by promoting rapid economic growth while leaving behind the urban poor.<sup>90</sup>

#### IV. SANTO DOMINGO CASE STUDY

##### A. The Urban Context

Like Seoul, Santo Domingo was a site of rapid population growth and urban primacy in the second half of the twentieth century. The proportion of the Dominican Republic's population living in cities increased from 23.8% in 1950 to 52% in 1981.<sup>91</sup> Santo Domingo, the nation's capital, disproportionately absorbed the Dominican Republic's growing urban population. By 1981, Santo Domingo contained 30% of the national population and 50% of the nation's urban population.<sup>92</sup> The city's economic importance also grew exponentially; by the 1980s, between 70 and 90% of the nation's industry, commerce, services and administration were located in Santo Domingo.<sup>93</sup>

During this period of rapid growth, Santo Domingo lacked a coherent urban development plan and the city grew in a "helter-skelter" manner, largely driven by land speculation.<sup>94</sup> Economic growth in the Dominican Republic during the import substitution period in the 1960s and 1970s led to the creation of a new urban middle class and increased demand for luxury housing in the capital city.<sup>95</sup> This demand drove up land prices in Santo Domingo, and new exclusive residential neighborhoods emerged in the 1970s. At the same time, conglomerations of slum dwellings and squatter settlements expanded north of downtown and east of the Ozama River, which was later to become the site of the Columbus Lighthouse constructed for the 500th Anniversary celebration.<sup>96</sup> By the 1980s, about 70% of the population of Santo Domingo lived in the "informal sector" of working-class barrios and poor shantytowns.<sup>97</sup> This sector produced 85% of the housing in the city, typically built on state-owned, under-serviced land and constructed using household savings, with little or no public investment.<sup>98</sup>

In the late 1980s, President Balaguer sought to restructure the Dominican Republic's national economy towards increasing dependence

---

90. Bank, *supra* note 11 (quoting Krishna Iyer).

91. Morel & Mejia, *supra* note 12, at 89.

92. *Id.*

93. *Id.*

94. *Id.*

95. Alejandro Portes et al., *Urbanization in the Caribbean Basin: Social Change During the Years of Crisis*, 29 *LATIN AM. RES. REV.* 3, 21 (1994).

96. *Id.*

97. Morel & Mejia, *supra* note 12, at 103.

98. *Id.*

on tourism and manufacturing in free-trade zones.<sup>99</sup> The tourism sector in the country grew to become the country's largest foreign exchange earner in the 1980s, yielding \$570 million in 1988, almost double the combined income from the country's three traditional mainstays: sugar, coffee, and cocoa.<sup>100</sup> By 1991, tourism was generating \$800 million in revenue.<sup>101</sup>

In order to promote tourism, Balaguer's government adopted a massive public works program in the late 1980s.<sup>102</sup> In the first eighteen months after Balaguer returned to office in 1986, \$250 million was spent on public works projects, including roads, bridges, schools, housing, libraries, museums, theaters, parks, and sports complexes.<sup>103</sup> This amount was 34% more than had been spent in the previous eight years.<sup>104</sup> By 1988, the state's expenditures on massive public works and hotel construction far surpassed earnings in tourism and the country was saddled with a foreign debt of \$3.5 billion, due in part to its excessive expenditures on large development projects.<sup>105</sup>

With the proliferation of development projects, the pace and scale of evictions exploded in the late 1980s. In Santo Domingo, entire neighborhoods were devastated by the central government's push for tourism-related development.<sup>106</sup> Despite the critical importance of informal housing in the development of the city, squatters were denied legal recognition and were excluded from negotiations and planning.<sup>107</sup> While the state had previously adopted a permissive attitude toward squatter development on public land, squatters faced eviction in the late 1980s by state agencies that cited illegality as grounds for removal.<sup>108</sup> Entire neighborhoods were relocated, either voluntarily or under compulsion, to new state-owned lands farther away from the urban center and lacking in basic services.<sup>109</sup> In these new outlying areas, low-income households started the informal urbanization process all over again.

#### B. 500th Anniversary of the Columbus Voyage

At the center of President Balaguer's urban development strategy was the promotion of Santo Domingo's tourism potential through the celebration of the 500th Anniversary of Columbus' voyage to the Americas in October 1992. The 500th Anniversary added a sense of urgency to the existing construction program, driving up costs and magnifying the

---

99. Marie Michael, *The Dominican Republic: Political Economic History and Growth*, DOLLARS & SENSE, Mar. 1, 2001, at 34.

100. Joseph Treaster, *Santo Domingo Journal: At 80, Master Builder is Busy (and Boastful)*, N.Y. TIMES, Apr. 7, 1988, at A4.

101. Rafferty, *supra* note 11, at XI.

102. Morel and Mejia, *supra* note 12, at 91-92.

103. Treaster, *supra* note 100, at A4.

104. *Id.*

105. *See id.*

106. *See* Morel & Mejia, *supra* note 12, at 95-96.

107. *See id.* at 103.

108. *See id.*

109. *See id.* at 95.

disruption associated with infrastructure projects. During the years preceding the celebration, peripheral settlements burgeoned as people were driven from the more visible central districts.<sup>110</sup> Although there was no reliable official registry of displaced families, it is estimated that between 1986 and 1992 approximately 30,000 families (or 180,000 people) were evicted from areas undergoing urban renewal in Santo Domingo.<sup>111</sup> The majority of families evicted were not offered resettlement.<sup>112</sup> Many families did not have proper homes for three or four years and were constantly shuffled from one part of the city to another.<sup>113</sup>

By 1990, the state had run out of money and inflation had reached the triple digit level, forcing the pace of construction to slow.<sup>114</sup> However, despite the lack of funds for new development, evictions continued to occur. In 1991, the state sent the army into several *barrios* and announced immediate evacuation. The state justified this action as a response to the “need to open up space for business and tourist investment, to beautify the city for the fifth centenary, and to remove obstacles in the path of urban schemes (in temporary suspension) for which it was hoped that there would soon be more public funding.”<sup>115</sup> While Balaguer justified slum clearance and his costly public works program as means of creating a “dignified atmosphere” for the 500th Anniversary, critics claimed that he was more concerned with building monuments to himself than with improving the welfare of the country.<sup>116</sup>

Estimates of the number of *barrio* dwellers evicted during the period of heightened redevelopment prior to the 500th Anniversary vary in news reports and academic research.<sup>117</sup> It is difficult to determine the total impact of the mega-event on slum clearance due to a lack of official documentation and because evictions prior to the event occurred within the context of broader urban renewal. However, the consequences of the mega-event are easy to pinpoint in areas slated for redevelopment explicitly in preparation for the celebrations, such as the Barrio Maquiteria neighborhood adjacent to the Columbus Lighthouse.

At a cost of \$100 million, Balaguer saw the construction of a massive lighthouse, allegedly housing Columbus’ remains, as the centerpiece of the 500th Anniversary celebrations. Critics have described the lighthouse,

---

110. *See id.* at 98.

111. *See id.* at 84-85.

112. *See id.* at 85; United Nations Committee on Economic, Social, and Cultural Rights (UNCESCR), *Concluding Observations on Dominican Republic*, U.N. Doc. E/C.12/1994/15 (1994) available at <http://www1.umn.edu/humanrts/esc/DOMINICA.htm> [hereinafter UNCESCR].

113. Morel & Mejia, *supra* note 12, at 85.

114. *Id.* at 98.

115. *Id.* at 100.

116. Treaster, *supra* note 100.

117. *See, e.g.*, UNCESCR, *supra* note 112 (estimating that 30,000 households were displaced); JORGE HARDOY & DAVID SATTERTHWAITE, *SQUATTER CITIZEN: LIFE IN THE THIRD WORLD* 42 (1989) (100,000 individuals); Morel & Mejia, *supra* note 12, at 84 (30,000 households); UNCHS GLOBAL REPORT, *supra* note 8, at 246 (180,000 individuals); Eike Shutz, *Para Festejar el Dia Actualmente Son Desaslojadas Miles de Familias en Santo Domingo*, MEDIO AMBIENTE Y URBANIZACIÓN, Dec. 1998, at 79 (19,000 households).



which is half a mile long, ten stories high, and projects a beam that can be seen from 150 miles away in Puerto Rico, as "pharaonic."<sup>118</sup> The electricity required to power the lighthouse diverted energy from the surrounding city for up to four hours at a time.<sup>119</sup> Construction of the lighthouse involved the leveling of slums and the erection of a four-mile long wall, dubbed by locals "the wall of shame," to block adjacent poor districts from view.<sup>120</sup> It is estimated that the lighthouse project involved the eviction of over 10,000 people to make room for the massive structure and several surrounding acres of landscaped grounds.<sup>121</sup> Protests surrounding the gross excesses of the lighthouse prevented the Pope and other international dignitaries from attending its dedication ceremony.<sup>122</sup>

Several institutional problems in Santo Domingo contributed to the devastating effects of the 500th Anniversary celebrations on low-income communities: displaced tenant families were not compensated for improvements they had made on public land, there was no connection between the displaced families and newly constructed units, and no standards were adopted for relocation.<sup>123</sup> Tenants in slums were considered "second-class" citizens with fewer rights than homeowners.<sup>124</sup> Relocated homeowners received some compensation (albeit at an inadequate level), while evicted tenants received nothing.<sup>125</sup> Although there were legal provisions that protected tenants from unjustified and uncompensated evictions, the government repeatedly violated these provisions.<sup>126</sup>

## V. COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS

In both Seoul and Santo Domingo, the hosting of mega-events had a dramatically negative impact on low-income communities, particularly for populations living in informal settlements. These case studies call into question the efficacy of mega-events in reducing urban dualism and improving urban infrastructure in an equitable manner. In order to identify ways to improve mega-event implementation, it is first necessary to examine, in more detail, the similarities between these two cases.

### A. Rapid Urbanization and Shifting Economic Priorities

In both Seoul and Santo Domingo, the mega-events were promoted

---

118. *What Price Columbus?*, WASH. POST, Sept. 28, 1992, at A16.

119. Rafferty, *supra* note 11, at XI.

120. Michael J. Rosenfeld, *Goodbye Columbus: Dominicans and the "Wall of Shame,"* NATION, Feb. 24, 1992, at 217.

121. John Mitchell, *In the Shadow of Columbus*, WORLD & I, Feb. 1997, available at <http://www.worldandi.com/archive/lfeb97.htm>.

122. See Douglas Farah, *Curse of Columbus? President Misses Dominican Celebration*, WASH. POST, Oct. 7, 1992, at A1; Jimenez, *supra* note 11, at 2; *What Price Columbus?*, *supra* note 118.

123. See UNCESCR, *supra* note 112.

124. See HARDOY & SATTERTHWAITTE, *supra* note 117, at 48.

125. *Id.*

126. See Morel & Mejia, *supra* note 12, at 105.

within the context of rapid urbanization and the growing primacy of the capital city in the nation's economy. As a result of these trends, the market pressures on urban land were already intense in the host cities. In both cities, the government initiated massive urban development projects prior to the hosting of the event, and these projects were largely focused on improving the attractiveness of the city for tourism and international investment. Urban growth and the ensuing investment in construction projects had already precipitated slum clearance programs to open up urban land in the city center for more profitable uses.

However, in both cities the mega-events accelerated and changed the nature of the eviction process. As numerous researchers have noted, mega-events tend to place tremendous pressures on housing markets by attracting an influx of visitors over a very short period of time.<sup>127</sup> Time pressure was often cited as the rationale for excessively violent or disruptive eviction programs and disregard for even minimal tenant protections.<sup>128</sup> And, although previous evictions occurred within the context of widespread construction programs, aimed (at least ostensibly) at improving the urban infrastructure, event-related evictions were often disconnected from any clear long-term goals. The removal of housing in Puchon along the Olympic torch in Seoul and the massive evictions to build a largely symbolic lighthouse in Santo Domingo most dramatically illustrate this point.

In the aftermath of these temporary mega-events, the lasting legacies in both cities include an escalation in land and housing prices, greater dependency of the local economies on tourism, and a more dispersed and economically marginal squatter population. Perhaps most importantly, the mega-events exacerbated, rather than alleviated, regional imbalances in the host countries. According to Kang Hong Bin, a government official in Seoul, "[i]mproved urban services, increased public amenities, [and] accelerated real estate developments in Seoul" contributed "to the widening disparity between Seoul and the regions, attracting even further capital and people to the city."<sup>129</sup> Since 1988, South Korea has attempted to alleviate the worsening problems of overpopulation in Seoul by discouraging downtown construction under a national decentralization policy.<sup>130</sup> In Santo Domingo, the 500th Anniversary significantly increased imbalances in the national economy and diverted attention away from long-term solutions to poverty. The emphasis on tourism projects in Santo Domingo has reinforced urban primacy and undermined the country's attempts to redistribute economic growth through export manufacturing zones outside the primary city.<sup>131</sup>

---

127. See, e.g., Mark Clifford, *Too Many People Looking for Too Few Houses*, FAR E. ECON. REV., Sept. 8, 1988, at 84, 84-85; Olds, *supra* note 42, at 51; Ritchie & Hall, *supra* note 44, at 107-09; Greene, *supra* note 42, at 39-40.

128. See, e.g., Morel & Mejia, *supra* note 12, at 98.

129. Maass, *supra* note 11 (quoting Kang Hong Bin).

130. Yoo, *supra* note 18, at 59.

131. See Portes et al., *supra* note 95, at 13.

## B. Increasing Disparities in Land and Housing Markets

In both Seoul and Santo Domingo, the removal of informal settlements from center city areas in preparation for mega-events resulted in an overall increase in high-cost, modern housing at the expense of low-cost, informal housing. In its 1996 Global Report on Human Settlements, the United Nations Centre for Human Settlements found that evictions often result in the conversion of high-value urban land from urban poor who inhabit settlements to middle- or upper-income groups.<sup>132</sup> The municipal governments in both Seoul and Santo Domingo failed to recognize or compensate the investments made by residents of informal settlements, whose labor and capital helped “urbanize” large areas of these cities with little or no government support. Instead, their efforts were sacrificed to enable a government-led shift to development-based tourism.

Seoul’s redevelopment strategy for the Olympics channeled substantial profits to construction firms and increased housing opportunities for middle- and upper-income populations but reduced housing opportunities for low-income communities.<sup>133</sup> Spurred by the Olympics, the price of apartments soared by 20.4% in the first eight months of 1988 and land prices rose by 27% in 1988, the steepest rise since 1978.<sup>134</sup> The effects of Olympic-related development and the displacement that accompanied it did not end with the completion of the Games. The Habitat International Coalition estimates that as many as 1.5 million people, or 15% of Seoul’s population, faced dislocation after the Olympics as a result of redevelopment.<sup>135</sup> Housing constructed for the Olympics, such as the Olympic Family Town, was rented to Olympic officials and tourists for \$275 a night and then sold to middle- and upper-income buyers after the Games.<sup>136</sup> Units in the Olympic Village, which housed athletes during the Games, were “exceedingly large by Korean standards...making the apartments affordable only to the upper middle class, and possibly attractive only to those customers with a distinctly Western outlook.”<sup>137</sup>

Formalization of housing markets in Santo Domingo also resulted in increased costs for tenants. Through the urban renewal programs in the 1980s, housing markets were “dollarized,” putting them out of reach of most wage earners.<sup>138</sup> The price of urban land rose, and the landholding structure tended to become more concentrated.<sup>139</sup> This situation was exacerbated by lack of eviction protections and irregularities in compensation for displaced families.<sup>140</sup> Despite the new units produced

---

132. See UNCHS GLOBAL REPORT, *supra* note 8, at 244.

133. See ACHR, *supra* note 12, at 90.

134. Yoo, *supra* note 18, at 59.

135. Bank, *supra* note 11.

136. *See id.*

137. Leslie Freudenheim, *Olympic Housing in Seoul*, PROGRESSIVE ARCHITECTURE, Oct. 1988, at 38, 38.

138. Morel & Mejia, *supra* note 12, at 86.

139. *Id.* at 92.

140. *See id.* at 86.

under Balaguer's construction program, the loss of informal, affordable units and the much higher rents in the rebuilt units made the program "completely ineffective in overcoming the country's serious housing shortage."<sup>141</sup>

### C. Autocracy and Elitism in the Planning Process

Several researchers have commented on the elitism that tends to pervade mega-event planning. Roche equated mega-event planning with elite and often autocratic political structures.<sup>142</sup> Similarly, Armstrong found that eighteen of the twenty-three publicly funded mega-event projects in his study "came about through the efforts and influence of individuals who were powerful politicians."<sup>143</sup> Relying on a logic of "trickle-down" economics, "city leaders and event organizers typically claim that mega-events help to address the economic and cultural needs and rights of local citizens, regardless of whether the citizens have actually been consulted about or involved in their production."<sup>144</sup>

In both Seoul and Santo Domingo, the events were organized and implemented almost entirely by urban elites, with very little public participation. The scale of redevelopment in preparation for the Seoul Olympics was driven to a great extent by large, powerful construction firms. During the 1960s and 1970s, the scale of work undertaken by South Korean construction companies working overseas grew rapidly, particularly in the Middle East.<sup>145</sup> By 1981, South Korean companies represented the world's second largest contractor for international construction projects.<sup>146</sup> With the collapse of the Middle East construction boom in 1979, these construction companies sought secure projects in South Korea.<sup>147</sup> The Olympics, and the massive redevelopment projects that accompanied the Games, provided such an opportunity. Construction companies lobbied the municipal government to implement the joint development model,<sup>148</sup> which privatized redevelopment and stimulated massive conversion of informal settlements into middle-class neighborhoods.<sup>149</sup> In fact, Chung Ju Yung, the president of the Seoul-based Hyundai Construction, co-chaired the South Korean Olympic bid team along with Seoul's Mayor Park Young Soo. Together, Chung and Park lobbied hard among Third World delegates to the IOC, arguing, "the time had arrived for a developing country to host the Olympics."<sup>150</sup>

141. *Id.* at 85.

142. See Roche, *supra* note 17, at 6.

143. J. Armstrong, *International Events and Popular Myths*, in INTERNATIONAL EVENTS: THE REAL TOURISM IMPACT, PROCEEDINGS OF THE 1985 CANADA CHAPTER CONFERENCE 7 (Travel and Tourism Research Ass. ed., 1986), cited in Roche, *supra* note 17, at 6.

144. Roche, *supra* note 17, at 2.

145. ACHR, *supra* note 12, at 92-93.

146. *Id.*

147. *Id.*; see also Kim, *supra* note 46, at 242.

148. Kim, *supra* note 46, at 242.

149. See *supra* text accompanying notes 71-78.

150. John McBeth, *The Off-and-On, Up and Down Sports Success*, FAR E. ECON. REV., Sept. 8,

While the Seoul municipal government took a rather active role in promoting the Olympics, investing almost \$3 billion in improvements, it attempted to distance itself entirely from the slum clearance process. Through the joint development program, the City shifted responsibility for clearing land and relocating tenants to private construction companies. The government was able to remove itself from blame for the evictions by describing them as a private issue between tenants and construction companies.<sup>151</sup> The joint development program essentially privatized housing markets in Seoul, and the municipal government largely stepped back from the role of public planner.<sup>152</sup> The government relied on market ventures to “foster the perception of a modern city in a hurry.”<sup>153</sup> However, as ACHR points out, the government, by not demanding that construction companies make provisions for displaced tenants, created additional public costs associated with the increased demand for welfare and services by displaced populations.<sup>154</sup>

In Santo Domingo, urban development projects associated with the 500th Anniversary were carried out under the direct supervision of President Balaguer’s office. It is estimated that 92.1% of the public works projects were funded through the President’s office in the period of the most intense evictions, 1987 to 1989.<sup>155</sup> The state subcontracted to private construction firms, which made summary valuations of properties, decided which areas were to be demolished, assigned and distributed housing, and were able to call in police and military force to remove residents illegally occupying the land.<sup>156</sup> This system allowed developers to ignore formal channels, and corruption was rampant.<sup>157</sup>

Business elites in Santo Domingo were extremely optimistic about the effect of the Columbus Day celebrations on the city. The tourist industry, in particular, anticipated a dramatic increase in the volume of visitors as a result of the event.<sup>158</sup> The lighthouse project was conceived by Balaguer and driven by a national elite attempting to demonstrate its European Catholic culture.<sup>159</sup> Balaguer himself has been described as the “very embodiment of the cultural pretensions and prejudices of the Dominican elite,” having published a book deploring the country’s “ethnic decline”

---

1988, at 59, 59.

151. See ACHR, *supra* note 12, at 93.

152. See Kim, *supra* note 46, at 249.

153. *Id.*

154. See ACHR, *supra* note 12, at 93.

155. Morel & Mejia, *supra* note 12, at 106.

156. See *id.* at 99, 107, 109.

157. See *id.* at 109.

158. Canute James, *Columbus Fever Runs High*, FIN. TIMES, Feb. 27, 1992, at 35; see also MARIA ELENA PORTORREAL DE ALONSO, U.S. DEP’T OF COMMERCE, INT’L TRADE ADMINISTRATION, FOREIGN COMMERCIAL SERVICE, TOURISM IN THE DOMINICAN REPUBLIC, August 1992, LEXIS Country Reports, Dominican Republic (“Tourism growth predictions for [1992] are very favorable, the expectations are that the celebration of the 500th Anniversary of the Discovery of America will benefit an industry of great importance to the economy.”).

159. See Harding, *supra* note 11, at 12.

due to excessive immigration from Haiti.<sup>160</sup> The lighthouse project was the centerpiece of his attempts to sell the country to U.S. and European tourists and investors as a “a politically stable, economically promising paradise, ‘the land Columbus loved best.’”<sup>161</sup>

Balaguer’s excessive spending on massive public works, despite widespread poverty, undermined his administration’s legitimacy.<sup>162</sup> Balaguer returned to the presidency in 1986 after several years of exile and failed re-election campaigns. By 1989, he had already spent \$600 million on public works.<sup>163</sup> However, as Balaguer pushed an agenda of monumental public works, basic services collapsed throughout the country.<sup>164</sup> His leadership has been associated with a “cult of monumentality,”<sup>165</sup> and many Dominicans believe that Balaguer, at 81 years old, only ran for president again in 1990 so that he could oversee the lighthouse celebrations.<sup>166</sup>

According to Morel and Mejia, slum clearance projects in Santo Domingo were “highly conditioned by the authoritarian style with which they were conducted, the centralization of decision-making, and the weakness of the country’s social institutions.”<sup>167</sup> The state acted as an external, disruptive force, failing to pay attention to neighborhoods slated for renewal except to intervene as an agent of repression.<sup>168</sup>

#### D. Disruption of Social Networks and Informal Economies

The massive evictions that occurred both in Seoul and Santo Domingo prior to mega-events disrupted informal housing markets that had developed in response to the decades of in-migration and population growth in each city that outpaced housing production in the formal sector. Studies of both cities have described the displaced settlements as largely functional and stable communities prior to the evictions. For example, Kim notes the strong social ties that had developed in displaced communities in Seoul<sup>169</sup> and Morel and Mejia found that the conditions in the original settlements in Santo Domingo were largely satisfactory, with a prevailing sense of “belonging” and “community” that was lost after relocation.<sup>170</sup>

In Seoul, the redevelopment of SHR districts in the 1980s radically transformed the physical structure of the city. Fine-grained low-income communities were razed and replaced with high-rise developments, largely disconnected from each other and the surrounding community.<sup>171</sup>

---

160. *Id.*

161. *Id.*

162. See White, *supra* note 11.

163. Treaster, *supra* note 11.

164. See *id.*

165. Morel & Mejia, *supra* note 12, at 87.

166. Harding, *supra* note 11, at 12.

167. Morel & Mejia, *supra* note 12, at 140.

168. *Id.* at 86-87.

169. See Kim, *supra* note 46, at 246.

170. Morel & Mejia, *supra* note 12, at 86.

171. See Kim, *supra* note 46, at 243.

Evictions destroyed not only the physical environment, but also the social ties and support networks which had developed among residents. Despite its euphemistic title, the “joint development program” actually eroded relationships within communities, pitting property owners, tenants, and construction firms against each other for pecuniary advantages.<sup>172</sup>

Similarly, slum clearance projects in Santo Domingo fractured community identity by dismantling mechanisms for mutual support among displaced populations.<sup>173</sup> Low-income groups were forced to live farther and farther away from their places of work, and there was a loss of connection to sources of income, particularly in informal or “underground” economies.<sup>174</sup> In its relocation decisions, the government also failed to recognize the critical role of street vending in the barrio economy in Santo Domingo. Once removed to sparsely populated zones or areas where most people had very low incomes, street vendors lost their source of livelihood.<sup>175</sup> Similarly, those residents who were lucky enough to be relocated into high-rise housing constructed by the government were unable to operate the small, home-based businesses they had previously relied upon in single-level housing. The environment in these large housing complexes was not conducive to the creation of informal support networks.<sup>176</sup>

Despite the breakdown of community networks as a result of displacement in Seoul and Santo Domingo, low-income communities became more politically organized prior to the mega-events as tenants mobilized to resist displacement. In Seoul, the Olympics helped consolidate an international housing rights movement in Asia, and added legitimacy and exposure to the newly formed Asian Coalition for Housing Rights.<sup>177</sup> In Santo Domingo, barrio dwellers organized powerful coalitions with churches, city planners, and international human rights groups to demand changes in Balaguer’s slum clearance programs. Almost immediately after the plans for redeveloping the capital for the 500th Anniversary were drawn up, barrio residents organized to fight displacement. As early as 1986, the Comité Para la Defensa de los Derechos Bariales (COPADEBA, or the Committee for the Defense of Barrio Rights) was organizing residents of impacted neighborhoods.<sup>178</sup> In 1987 they launched a campaign to bring international attention to the problem of barrio rights in Santo Domingo.<sup>179</sup> Under the auspices of COPADEBA, protestors in Santo Domingo offered a more humane plan, called the

---

172. *See id.* at 246-47.

173. Morel & Mejia, *supra* note 12, at 88.

174. *See id.* at 86.

175. *See id.* at 138.

176. *See id.* at 139.

177. *See* ACHR, *NGO Profile*, *supra* note 63, at 155; *see also* Kim, *supra* note 12, at 223-231 (describing the role that the Olympics played in mobilizing communities in Seoul to demand official recognition of housing rights).

178. *See* Morel & Mejia, *supra* note 12, at 96.

179. *See id.* at 96-97.

"Alternative City," to address the problems of urban slums.<sup>180</sup> Elements of their proposal were eventually incorporated, although in very limited ways, into official policy.<sup>181</sup> COPADEBA, with the support of international NGO's, succeeded in establishing assessment standards, basic tenant rights, and guarantees that residents would be informed prior to eviction.<sup>182</sup> However, as Morel and Mejia note, "to the extent that victims won compensation...this was more a result of their capacity to offer resistance and opposition, negotiate, and propose alternatives...than of any state planning or intent."<sup>183</sup>

#### E. Undermining Rule of Law Claims

In both Seoul and Santo Domingo, mega-events were initiated with an eye to promoting the country's participation in the global economy through legal reform and the strengthening of rule of law institutions. Soon after its successful bid, the Korean government launched the Civilian Olympic Preparation Committee, a nation-wide civilian organization, to promote awareness and respect for law and order.<sup>184</sup> The goal of the civilian campaign was to "to show the world that Korea had developed economically, as well as socially and culturally" and to demonstrate that Korea could "live up to the social norms of the developed nations."<sup>185</sup> However, according to Chan Jin Kim, a former member of the Korean National Assembly, the mission of the civilian campaign was soon undermined by the government's emphasis on "superficial things that would make Korea look good to the rest of the world."<sup>186</sup>

In the years preceding the 500th Anniversary, the Dominican Republic became the subject of international criticism for human rights violations. In 1991, the U.S. State Department published a report condemning human rights abuses in the Dominican Republic, particularly the treatment of Haitians working in the sugarcane industry.<sup>187</sup> The U.S. Congress considered withholding \$200 million in aid to the Dominican Republic to protest the abuses.<sup>188</sup> In addition, Balaguer's presidency had been riddled

---

180. See *id.* at 97-98, 117; U.N. High Commissioner for Human Rights, *Fact Sheet No. 25, Forced Evictions and Human Rights*, May 1996, at <http://www.unhchr.ch/html/menu6/2/fs25.htm>.

181. See UNCESCR, *supra* note 111; Morel & Mejia, *supra* note 12, at 102.

182. See Morel & Mejia, *supra* note 12, at 142.

183. *Id.* at 140.

184. Kim, *supra* note 37, at 34.

185. *Id.*

186. *Id.*

187. HOUSE COMM. ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS & SENATE COMM. ON FOREIGN RELATIONS, 102D CONG., COUNTRY REPORTS ON HUMAN RIGHTS PRACTICES FOR 1991, at 572-81 (Joint Comm. Print 1992); see also Stephen Fidler, *Dominican Republic; Apres Moi, Le Deluge*, FIN. TIMES, Feb. 27, 1992, at 33.

188. Greg Chamberlain, *Haiti Protests as Workers Expelled*, GUARDIAN (LONDON), June 26, 1991; see also LAWYER'S COMMITTEE FOR HUMAN RIGHTS, A CHILDHOOD ABDUCTED: CHILDREN CUTTING SUGAR CANE IN THE DOMINICAN REPUBLIC 77-80 (1991) (describing how the United States Trade Representative nearly revoked the Dominican Republic's trade preference status under the General System of Preferences and the Caribbean Basin Initiative because it was



with allegations of fraud and corruption, hampering the country's ability to attract foreign investment.<sup>189</sup>

Although the 500th Anniversary celebration was primarily geared towards monumental public works and tourism promotion, observers have noted that the Balaguer administration also hoped to use the event to neutralize the Dominican Republic's reputation of past human rights abuses and impress upon foreign investors that the national economy was "in good health."<sup>190</sup> In the two years prior to 500th Anniversary, the Dominican Republic caught up on payments to the World Bank and Inter-American Development Bank and entered into new loan agreements with the IMF, clearing the way for negotiations with creditor governments over debt restructuring.<sup>191</sup> At the inauguration ceremony for the Columbus lighthouse, Balaguer had hoped to host an impressive array of foreign dignitaries, including Pope John Paul II, the king and queen of Spain, and numerous heads of state who would be willing to endorse the Dominican Republic's progress. However, as a result of the bad publicity generated by the slum clearance efforts and international criticism of the excesses of the monumental lighthouse, most invited speakers canceled or rescheduled their appearances.<sup>192</sup> Joao Baena Soares, then Secretary General of the Organization of American States, was the sole visiting dignitary to attend the inauguration, and he used to opportunity to denounce human rights abuses in the Americas.<sup>193</sup>

As these examples illustrate, urban and national policymakers eager to ensure foreign investor confidence do not necessarily see slum clearance and rule of law ambitions in opposition to each other.<sup>194</sup> However, the efficacy of mega-events in promoting investor confidence is highly questionable when coupled with slum clearance due to the negative publicity mass evictions generate and the social instability caused by population displacement.<sup>195</sup> In both Seoul and Santo Domingo, attempts to remove slums from the view of international visitors and the media

---

alleged that the country was not adhering to basic international standards of worker rights); AMERICAS WATCH, NATIONAL COALITION FOR HAITIAN REFUGEES, A TROUBLED YEAR: HAITIANS IN THE DOMINICAN REPUBLIC 5 (1992) (criticizing the failure of the United States to use its influence as the Dominican Republic's largest trading partner to protect the human rights of Haitian workers).

189. See PRS Group, *Climate for Business*, POLITICAL RISK SERVICES, Nov. 1, 1996, LEXIS Country Reports, Dominican Republic.

190. See, e.g., Fidler, *supra* note 187, at 33; Susan Hayward, *Can Celebration Rescue the Dominican Economy?*, TORONTO STAR, Dec. 27, 1988, at A30; Wilenz, *supra* note 11, at 704

191. *Id.*

192. See Farah, *supra* note 122.

193. Jimenez, *supra* note 122, at 2.

194. As a more recent example outside the context of mega-events, the South African government recently conducted widespread evictions of squatters from publicly owned land. In the wake of land seizures by landless peasants in Zimbabwe, the African National Congress cited the need to "show the world that it respects the rule of law and property rights—and to convince foreign companies that it is safe to invest in South Africa," as justification for the evictions. Jon Jeter, *South Africa Flattens Squatters Homes*, WASH. POST, July 13, 2001, at A1.

195. For a general discussion of the human and economic costs of forced evictions, see LECKIE, *supra* note 7, at 29-30.

backfired, undermining the host countries' human rights reputations. International agencies, such as the United Nations Centre for Human Settlements (UNCHS) and the United Nations Committee on Economic, Social, and Cultural Rights (UNCESCR) condemned both countries for evicting slum dwellers in preparation for the events as violations of international covenants and domestic law.<sup>196</sup> International press coverage of both events was highly critical of the evictions. For example, articles with headlines like "What Price Columbus?,"<sup>197</sup> "Rocky Course for Lighthouse in Eye of Storm,"<sup>198</sup> and "A Gloomy Monument to Columbus"<sup>199</sup> far outnumbered positive coverage of Santo Domingo's 500th Anniversary celebration.<sup>200</sup> In such an environment, investor confidence and acceptance among the international legal community was likely diminished, rather than improved.

#### VI. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

In both Seoul and Santo Domingo, local governments were willing to invest several million dollars of public money in mega-events in order to demonstrate their city's ability to compete in an increasingly global marketplace. According to the logic of mega-events, by successfully hosting a world-class event and showcasing the city's modern infrastructure and amenities to a global audience, the host city would recoup its expenses in renewed tourism and international investment. Much of the research on mega-events reinforces this view by focusing on the economic costs and benefits of mega-events for the host city or the event sponsors while largely ignoring the social and spatial consequences of the events for low-income communities. As the case studies described in this Note indicate, poor neighborhoods and squatter communities did not enjoy the benefits of the international celebrations in Seoul and Santo Domingo. Rather, the urban poor were systematically removed or concealed from high-profile areas in order to construct the appearance of development.

Slum clearance in preparation for mega-events is shortsighted and ultimately regressive urban policy. Not only do slum clearance programs destroy the tremendous amount of human labor and household investments in "urbanizing" land through informal settlements, but they also undermine the host city's ability to project a positive image. Host cities and international organizations participating in mega-events should look at these events as opportunities to improve the physical conditions of informal and low-income settlements by adopting more equitable urban policies.

---

196. See UNCESCR, *supra* note 111. For an overview of international human rights law governing evictions, see LECKIE, *supra* note 7, at 33-60.

197. *What Price Columbus?*, *supra* note 118.

198. Harding, *supra* note 11.

199. Rafferty, *supra* note 11.

200. For examples of negative media coverage of Seoul's slum clearance efforts prior to the Games, see Bank, *supra* note 11; Leyden, *supra* note 11; Maass, *supra* note 11.

At an international level, organizations sponsoring or participating in mega-events – such as the International Olympic Committee, Asian Games, World Bank, and World Tourism Council – should establish human rights standards to govern venue selection.<sup>201</sup> Sponsors should develop a host city “score card” to evaluate the sufficiency of domestic legal protections, such as fair labor laws and basic tenant rights and take an inventory of existing urban infrastructure to ensure that preparations will not abruptly alter housing markets or force rapid physical changes that are not amenable to community participation. Host cities should not only be monitored to ensure protection of basic human rights, but resources should also be provided to municipal governments, as well as community-based organizations, to adopt long-term solutions to problems facing the host city. Any redevelopment in preparation for the event should guarantee adequate relocation compensation for all residents, not just homeowners, displaced in the process. Venues constructed for mega-events should be distributed throughout the host country or region to distribute investment and encourage more balanced regional growth.

At the host city level, linkage programs should be implemented so that profits generated by the events are brought back into low-income communities. For instance, a portion of attendance fees or sponsorships could be dedicated to local community development projects. Creative mechanisms to integrate event-related development into the urban social fabric should be adopted, such as enabling street vendors and family-run businesses to play a role in tourist enterprises.

Finally, the process of bidding for, planning for, and implementing mega-events must be democratized. Perhaps the most significant factor in determining the extent of displacement caused by mega-events is the presence or lack of community participation in event planning. In both the cases discussed here, autocratic decision-making and shortsightedness defined the event planning process. Host cities should capitalize on the civic-mindedness inspired by mega-events to institute new mechanisms for neighborhood-based planning. The mega-event should not dictate physical planning but rather respond to the clearly articulated needs of the host city and comply with a broader strategic plan. Without these measures in place, the short-term mega-event will inevitably compromise the long-term urban development strategy.

---

201. Although the IOC screens prospective host cities through an elaborate, multi-stage evaluation process, it does not formally inquire into the human rights record of bidding nations. See Mastrocola, *supra* note 36, at 145-46. As a former American representative of the IOC explained, “the truth is, if we begin to exclude cities solely because of complaints about human rights violations, there would be few countries where the Games could be held – including the United States.” *Id.* (quoting Anita DeFrantz).