**Beyond Legacy: Backstage Stigmatization and ‘trickle-up’ politics of urban regeneration**

Abstract: This paper explores how stigmatisation is intimately linked with neoliberal governance and capital accumulation in specific ways through processes around the Glasgow Commonwealth Games. It advances previous research where I explored the effects of stigma on the East End community hosting the Games (Paton, McCall, Mooney, 2016). Here I try to extend this analysis through shedding light on some of the processes of power and profit which motivate stigmatising processes by ‘gazing up’, rather than ‘gazing down’. That is, looking at the role of the stigmatisers in this project and not the stigmatised. It draws loosely from Goffman’s (1963) concept of ‘backstage’ to shed light on those who produce and profit from these stigmatisation processes, including government bodies and actors and private business interests. Looking at some of the processes through which stigmatisation is profited from reveals not only forms of power vital to this process but that it is a key form of exploitation integral to capital accumulation. Under austerity, the political economy of the Games constitutes state support of private finance and a simultaneous withdrawal of social welfare support, which transfers the burden of debt from the state to the individual and wealth from public funds to private funds.
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The story goes that in the summer of 2014, a terrified athlete ran into a newsagent shop in Dalmarnock, Glasgow. The Commonwealth Games had just begun in the city and this competitor had lost his way from the Athlete’s Village and, clutching a map, was seeking directions to safety. He was in the ‘red zone’ – Dalmarnock – which was a designated host neighbourhood site for the Games event. The map issued to visiting athletes competing in the Games event instructed them which neighbourhoods were unsafe and to be avoided - the ‘red zone’ was a no-go area. The bemused newsagent looked at the map to assist the lost athlete and saw that her shop – promised to experience the benefits of the Commonwealth Games ‘trickle-down’ of tourist consumerism – was in the ‘red zone’. Yet this discovery seemed to confirm some suspicions she had. A number of local business owners were disappointed that the promised influx of visitors and ‘trickle-down’ capital had not materialised, which was of no wonder, then, if the neighbourhood was marked as a dangerous hinterland. There was much talk of the map as the story spread amongst East End neighbourhoods. As researchers undertaking fieldwork (Paton et. al, 2017), we heard the story told countless times in various versions but largely the same message rang clear: that yet again Glasgow’s East End, with a long history of being stigmatised, had been marked-out, branded, excluded, deceived and designed out of the Games.

Except, they had not. The ‘red zone’ map did not exist. As researchers investigating the impacts of the Commonwealth Games, we drew on all the contacts we had in the field, even submitting a Freedom of Information request to find the map. Despite everyone talking about it, even claiming to have seen the map, we could not find a copy, because there was no such map. The only map that existed was a parking zone map. The idea of Dalmarnock being relegated as danger zone was a myth, a kind of local urban legend originating in the East End from its own residents and circulating around the neighbourhoods. Perhaps this myth of the red zoning of the neighbourhood is of no great surprise given the decades of negative political and media discourses heaped upon the East End: ‘Glasgow’s welfare capital’ ‘Glasgow’s Guantanamo’, home of the ‘Shettleston man’, who dies 14 years younger than other men in the UK at 63 (Mooney, 2009b; Gray and Mooney, 2011) all epitomising ‘bad’ individual lifestyle decisions and choices made by ‘the poor’.

I was struck by this urban myth and what it revealed about the impacts of territorial stigma and how stigma was reproduced and internalised to powerful effect (Paton et. al, 2017). While in this case the ‘red zone’ was fictional, it echoed Stavrides (2012) exploration of red zones as exceptional spatial formations erected as a ‘state of emergency’ in urban public spaces to manage transition in public urban spaces. These politically and spatially mediated areas are designed to be performed in ways which enact new forms of citizenship and governance (Stavrides, 2012). This resonates with how the Games were received locally. Despite the disruptions and problems caused by Games related demolition and displacement of residents and the lofty and unsupported claims around the local ‘legacy’ of such mega-sporting events, many residents we spoke to had expressed support and even gratitude towards hosting the Games. There were a few strong campaign groups resisting and the Games development such as Glasgow Games Monitor, Save The Accord Centre and the Jaconelli family (see below) but, broadly speaking, there was more acquiescence than opposition despite high levels of demolition, displacement and disruption. In embracing the Games, it seemed that residents were attempting to perform the ‘right’ identity, front stage. It echoed Goffman’s (1963) account of strategies adopted by the stigmatised in order to manage a ‘spoiled identity’ rather than contesting the structures that produce stigma. Given the long history of negative imagery and construction of blemish in the East End, this form of impression management is motivated by the experience and embodiment of entrenched processes of devaluation expressed through socio-spatial abjection. However a Goffmanesque reading of stigma as a relational classification, as Tyler's paper in this collection points out, can exclude, or at least make peripheral, questions of the power structures behind these social relations. The muted resistance from local residents suggested that the on-going stigmatisation of the area acted as an effective governing force. While Goffman’s (1983) later work offers recognition of the need to focus on those in a position to give ‘official imprint to reality’ in order to further our understanding the stigma project, it is through Tyler’s interpretation of stigma (as) power that we can begin to see just how social *and* spatial abjection operates as a ‘soft power’ which is integral to governing. That is, not just those who can imprint reality but their specific interests in doing so – which are classed and centred upon exploitation and accumulation.

In this context, I conceive of stigmatisation as being central to moral and economic class projects which are realised in distinctly spatial ways. The contemporary pressures to become places and people of value under austerity and financial capitalism demonstrate the advance of this project, articulated through government policies of urban regeneration which are intimately linked to capitalist accumulation (Smith, 1996). This reading of stigma is in line with the core message of this collection which offers a historical re-reading to situate stigma (as) power as integral to forms of governance. As Tyler (2017) rightly advocates, understanding stigma (as) power involves making the political economy of shaming practices clear. In this chapter, I want to extend this enquiry. Given how stigmatisation is intimately linked with neoliberal governance and capital accumulation, I shed light on some of the processes of power and profit which motivate stigmatising processes. I do this by ‘gazing up’, rather than ‘gazing down’, that is, looking at the role of the stigmatisers in this project and not the stigmatised. In this way I explore the notion of the ‘trickle up’ of capital – a form of accumulation which is more tangible than the fabled economic principle of ‘trickle-down’ capital (Sowell, 2012) on which many regeneration processes are justified. I look at some of the processes through which stigmatisation is profited from, which reveals not only forms of power vital to this process but that stigmatisation is a key form of exploitation integral to capital accumulation. The political economy of the Games reveals a support for private finance and a simultaneous withdrawal of social welfare support, which transfers the burden of debt from the state to the individual and wealth from public funds to private funds. I draw loosely from another of Goffman’s (1963) concept to do this, that of ‘backstage’, but used here to shed light on those who produce and profit from these stigmatisation processes which includes those in government and private business interests.

To do so I begin this paper by outlining the relationship between territorial stigmatisation and gentrification. This relationship has been outlined by others (Gray and Mooney, 2011; Slater and Anderson, 2012; Wacquant, 2007; 2008; Kallin and Slater, 2014) to show how each work in tandem within urban regeneration interventions, in differing ways, to define value. Regeneration of places coincides with discourses that devalue the people living there often via processes of territorial stigmatisation, which justifies further disinvestment. Stigmatisation helps make these sites ripe for future investment of capital, which is most often state-led gentrification (Smith, 1996). I take this argument further in this paper to explore how socio-spatial abjection is amplified under austerity. Austerity performs a vital role in facilitating the shift in debt and risk from private to public assets and from the state to the individual and households (Peck, 2012). When working-class residents cannot be successfully regenerated into neoliberal consumer citizens, austerity is used to justify and advance greater welfare retraction. I argue that stigmatisation operates within these urban restructuring processes as a profoundly classed project which, firstly, makes places and populations manageable, valuable and, if not possible, then ultimately disposable, and secondly, serves class-interests, including corporations and private capital, within a political economy of neoliberal capitalist accumulation.

The empirical discussion in the second part of this paper takes a classic journalistic approach which ‘follows the money’ by presenting data on the various lands deals and profiteering which took place in relation to the Games. While Goffman’s notion of backstage referred to the space where we prepare for or cast off our performed identity, “typically out of bounds to members of the audience” (Goffman, 1959, p.124), I use it in this context to consider the ‘out of bounds’ structural processes which capitalise upon stigma. Looking ‘backstage’ is used here to focus on how profit is generated in relation to the management, curation and orchestration of the performance of value. This notion of backstage reveals the creation of stigma for the purpose of profit and capital accumulation and in doing so brings in the power structures and class interests missing from the classic approach to studies of stigma. In presenting the political economy of stigma in relation to the Commonwealth Games Event, I advocate a sociology of stigma which connects the macro to the micro, indeed makes the very interrogation of that connection its key point of interest. And a sociology of stigma which takes seriously the role of the stigmatisers and those who profit from these processes to make clear the structural processes involved. It is reminder that stigma serves class interests and capital accumulation processes.

**Gentrification and territorial stigmatisation**

Gentrification and territorial stigmatisation have been shown to have an intense symbiotic relationship (Gray and Mooney, 2011; Slater and Anderson, 2012; Wacquant, 2007; 2008). As different sides of the same coin (Kallin and Slater, 2014) they express the cycles of disinvestment in places which have been rendered surplus whether through deindustrialisation or policy neglect. We can see this operate in how the regeneration of areas coincides with discourses that devalue the people living there. Neighbourhoods are constructed as being ‘problem places’ particularly areas of concentrated social housing labelled as ‘sink estates’ (See Slater's paper in this collection) and used to invoke ‘underclass’ imagery of welfare dependency, crime and fecklessness. This territorial stigmatisation expresses a powerful **spatial dimension to stigma whereby neighbourhoods are marked as ‘places of blemish’** through ‘discourses of vilification’ that are perpetuated in popular and political discourse (Wacquant, 2007). The devaluation of place (land) and its occupants shifts responsibility for decline to the individuals living there. Gray and Mooney (2013, p.10) describe this political construction of place as a neo-liberal alibi for accumulation strategies by and for the owners and managers of private capital:

… the construction of place through territorial stigmatisation tends to obfuscate fundamental structural and functional differences underlying neighbourhood effects, and displaces questions of culpability and collective responsibility away from the state and business sectors.

This justifies further disinvestment as social and spatial abjection expedite the process of devaluation and this disinvestment effectively makes these sites ripe for future investment of capital - state-led gentrification. State-led gentrification is a neoliberal urban restructuring project (Smith, 1996) which operates at spatial *and* social levels. It is presented through regeneration policy as a process whereby ‘capital’ of social and economic varieties can be introduced into neighbourhoods via gentrification. Whether through mixed tenure developments, which invites middles-class residents to the area (Uitermark et. al, 2007) or large-scale events and developments such as mega-sporting events, this ‘capital’ is claimed to ‘trickle-down’ to benefit and valorise the wider neighbourhoods and its residents. Territorial stigmatisation and gentrification therefore help to define value: revalorising and devalorising places as a means of extracting value from land. In this context, we can see the power of stigma in action as it expedites the process of devaluation of people occupying that space: it is used strategically to devalue people and places in order to create a rent gap and forms of capital accumulation (Kallin and Slater, 2014).

The stigma-to-gentrification practice acts as part of a class project of restructuring which operates on social and spatial levels. The most obvious and grave outcome of these processes is displacement. This has proven to be the case with many large-scale regeneration initiatives, particularly mega sporting events, as the Centre on Housing Rights and Evictions (COHRE) concluded, which entail ‘massive displacements and reductions in low cost and social housing stock, all of which result in a significant decrease in housing affordability’ (COHRE, 2007, p.11). However the processes elicit more complex effects expressed through ‘soft power’. Gentrification and stigma work together to a specific form of socio-spatial governance involving social and economic regulation. This also includes the manufacturing of working-class residents’ aspiration towards private housing consumption to be more compatible with neoliberalism (Paton, 2014). This ‘politics of aspiration’ thinking underpinned much of New Labour urban and social policy (Mooney, 2009a): that poor levels of aspiration could be enhanced by social capital, including role models of middle class residents in mixed developments (Uitermark et. al, 2007). Indeed, the politics of aspiration underpinning urban regeneration is focused less on displacing residents are more on ‘civilising’ them (Uitermark et. al, 2007), making them more productive by becoming more affluent users of private rather than collective goods i.e. through becoming home-owners rather than social renters or benefit claimants (Paton, 2014). Stigma operates in this context as a form of ‘soft power’ to shame those who do not or cannot become more productive neoliberal consumer citizens. If they fail, this then compounds their pathologisation; as abjects who are holding back ‘progress’ and the ‘legacy’ that such projects are to bring (Paton et. al, 2017). In this sense, gentrification and stigmatisation entrap residents - the fallacy of ‘trickle down logic’ on which regeneration is premised obscures structural inequalities and instead pathologises places and their residents. This has explicit consequences in an era of fiscal discipline when it becomes more difficult for people or places to become productive in neoliberal terms, particularly in areas with high levels of poverty and underemployment and unemployment. In response, conditionality is as a government strategy to justify the retrenchment of welfare interventions (Dwyer & Wright, 2014). Welfare conditionality links welfare rights to notions of ‘responsible’ behaviour. That is, access to certain basic, publicly provided, welfare support becomes dependent upon on an individual agreeing to meet specific patterns of behaviour or obligations. Welfare conditionality also compounds stigma and enables greater extraction of value: the ‘unproductive’ resident in ‘problem’ neighbourhoods faces sanctions for failure to meet the required conditions despite the structuring forces – such as austerity and stigmatisation – which prohibit them from doing so. Thus under the conditions of austerity, the relationship between territorial stigmatisation and gentrification are intensified further involving a redistribution of wealth and debt.

**Austerity: the ‘trickle-up’ urban policy**

While the implementation of austerity following the global financial crisis in 2008 has been uneven, in the UK it became the leading policy ‘wisdom’ for tackling the imagined ‘problem of public debt’ (including the debt accrued from bailing out banks) (Clarke & Newman, 2012). It has been used to justify public spending cuts and welfare conditionality.

 According to the neoliberal script, *public* austerity is a necessary response to market conditions, and the state has responded by inaugurating new rounds of fiscal retrenchment, often targeted on city governments and on the most vulnerable, both socially and spatially (Peck, 2012, p.626).

This has resulted in what Peck (2012, p.630) calls ‘neoliberal buck-passing’– a redistribution of fiscal responsibilities. This type of buck-passing involves a further downsizing of government to local government as ‘small-state’ settlements (Peck, 2012) as a means of rolling out more privatization. Fiscally constrained local governments are then forced to capitulate to market logic, rationalized by austerity wisdom. This sees local government increase their borrowing and entering into new contractual forms of public/private partnership, particularly in relation to urban policies (Aalbers, 2008; Rolnik, 2013). This buck-passing is clear in the UK government’s historical set of welfare reforms in 2012, fragmenting state-level welfare provision to local delivery hubs, outsourcing the delivery of key services to private contractors and encouraging those citizens with the means to do so to take responsibility for their own welfare in the private sector.

This neoliberal austerity logic has been established as the norm, supported by political and media discourses which have fuelled moral panics about welfare recipient as ‘benefits scroungers’, increasing the abjection of the most vulnerable in the most deprived areas (Tyler, 2013). The hegemony of neoliberal austerity on one hand, increases inequalities and poverty (O’Hara, 2015; Cooper & Whyte, 2017) whilst on the other, extolling the value of self-responsibilization, it individualises the causes of poverty (Dwyer & Wright, 2014). The withdrawal of public funding for fundamental social support and the individualisation of ‘risk’, also generates greater levels of debt (O’Hara, 2015; Ellis, 2017: Soederberg, 2013). Yet, the logic of austerity politics means that welfare recipients should feel gratitude for any state support that they receive or, indeed, guilt for receiving financial support in an austerity era which we are told (albeit falsely) that we are all in together. So when aspiration towards private consumption fails as it inevitably does under austerity, dispossession can be achieved with ease when the subject is indebted (Desmond, 2016; Paton & Cooper, 2016).

But where does the wealth go? Austerity has also ushered money into the Treasury ‘to make the sums add up’ (Chakrabortty, 2014) through large-scale privatisation sell-offs and the intentional withering of public service providers to open up new markets for private business, whether in the criminal justice and probation service (Mansfield & Cooper, 2017) or labour through workfare placements (Ellis, 2017). By stark contrast, austerity policies which affect working-class households do not touch the elites, rather austerity policies protect concentrations of elite wealth and power. There has been a consolidation of wealth amongst the top income earners the UK’s 1000 richest saw their wealth increase by £138 billion between 2009-2013 (Cooper & Whyte, 2017). The 2016 budget announced the threshold for the higher rate of income tax to be raised from £42,386 to £45,000. For those with valuable assets, capital gains tax will be cut from 28 per cent to 20 per cent (Fenton, 2016). Corporation tax has been cut from 30% to 20% since 2008 (and falling) (Cooper & Whyte, 2017). In all, ‘a direct policy translation of trickle-down economics that cannot merely be attributed to austerity politics, but is part of the wider package of measures that are supposed to encourage economic recovery’ (Cooper & Whyte, 2017: 17). This consolidation of wealth amongst elites also rests upon the consolidation of debt amongst low-income groups – which is exploited for capital gain by extractive markets: an additional market which profiteers from expropriation (Desmond, 2016). Debt-related poverty is particularly lucrative as demonstrated by the growth in debt and expropriation businesses which profit from debt related poverty or, as some have called it, a ‘poverty industry’ (Soederberg, 2013). This poverty industry which thrives under austerity, includes media and production companies which profit from televisual dramatization of poverty which compounds stigmatisation of the most vulnerable whether as benefits claimants (Tyler, 2015; Jenson, 2014) and debt and enforcement agencies who evict tenants in debt-driven rent arrears such as bailiff companies (Paton and Cooper, 2016).

In this collection Tyler argues for ‘reconceptualising stigma as a political economy of (de)valuation’. I suggest the practices around mega-sporting events offer an insightful political economy case study of social and spatial abjection in action, demonstrating how these government structures are embroiled with private partners and finance capital. And this approach, Tyler also suggests, requires critical methods rooted in the struggles against the structures that produce people as ‘markedly inferior’. With this in mind, for the remainder of this paper I will revisit the 2014 Glasgow Commonwealth Games but with a different gaze to that of my previous research study, subverting the traditional gaze upon the stigmatised to look up at those who profit from stigmatisation though Games related development. That is, those business and government bodies and officials who profited from processes which devalued the neighbourhoods and residents in order to support and justify the Games. Much of the data is drawn from research by activist researchers and members of The Glasgow Games Monitor who carefully documented these deals and I am very grateful to them for collating and publishing this information[[1]](#footnote-1).

**The Glasgow Commonwealth Games in the context of stigma production**

The 2014 Glasgow Commonwealth Games had the explicit aim of being a mechanism for economy investment and regeneration in the city, specifically the East End which had suffered from deep economic and social problems stemming from the collapse in industry there in 1970s. Despite numerous regeneration interventions since the 1980s, the East End still suffered from high levels of poverty. The Games was touted as being potential saviour the East End of the city. The 2014 Glasgow Commonwealth Games policy discourse epitomised this trickle-down assumption that private sector economic investment would filter in and down and help improve the life chances, health and well-being of residents. This was expressed by the Scottish Government’s baseline evaluation for the CWG:

[…] there are also plans to affect social outcomes for the city, using the Glasgow 2014 Games as an impetus for raising aspirations, driving achievement and contributing to a positive future for Glasgow. Notably, there has been substantial new investment for the Games in Glasgow’s east end, in some of the most deprived communities in Scotland. (Scottish Government Social Research, 2012, p.7)

It is not possible to present a full account of how stigmatisating discourses produced helped construct the image of the East End. And in one respect, discussing the East End in these terms contributes to the simplistic narrative of the place when it is, in reality, a highly diverse area of complex local geographies, various histories and contrasting life chances. However there are few pivotal moments which compounded the reputation of the area. In one infamous episode, then-leader of the Conservative Party and future (now ex) Work and Pensions Secretary, Iain Duncan Smith was famously reported as having his ‘Easterhouse epiphany’ - his so-called conversion to ‘compassionate conservatism’ after visiting the neighbourhood and being so shocked about the levels of deprivation and poverty (Collins, 2002). This Damascene publicity performance was aimed at promoting himself and his party and certainly not to promote the East End, in fact, it condemned it (Toyenbee, 2013; Hancock and Mooney, 2013). This visit informed the thinking behind Duncan Smith’s later report *Breakthrough Glasgow* (Duncan Smith, 2008)in which he coined the term "Shettleston”, a by-line bogeyman: "His life expectancy is 63, he lives in social housing, and is terminally out of work. His white blood cell count is killing him due to the stress of living in deprivation." He seasoned this by adding that Glasgow had the highest rate of crime in Scotland and more gangs than anywhere outside London. These sensationalistic ‘accolades’ and titles associated with the East End branded it as sick, criminal and welfare dependant. Headlines in the run up to the Games raged that the East End was the UK’s “benefits capital”, with the Daily Mail (Garland, 2012) reporting ‘almost nine out of 10 working age adults on social welfare’. Billionaire Sir Tom Hunter the retail entrepreneur owner of *Sports Division* in response claimed that East End residents were ‘addicted to social welfare’, asserting that those relying on benefits had become “pampered” and “expect what others strive and graft hard for” (The Daily Record, 2012). A quick ‘fact check’ shows that there was no basis for this reported ‘nine out of 10’ claim (FullFact, 2012). The DWP had not at that time released any information on the topic. Instead, according to data on NOMIS statistics portal - figures held by the DWP at August 2011 show that just under 45 per cent of working age adults were claiming the DWP-administered benefits - almost half the figure quoted (Fullfact, 2012). Such hyperbole was commonplace in relation to the East End and the moral panic and scapegoating around welfare claimants which have been ramped up further under austerity which promotes conditionality. The point is that the derogatory by-lines imprint on places and people and provided justification for wholesale landscapes change and private development in this neighbourhood. The Games were promoted as an event for the ‘public good’ and for the ‘public interest’ (Porter and Gray, 2015). But the question of public good and public interest is a moot one.

**Behind the scenes of the Games**

It is vital then to scrutinize what goes on behind the scenes – turning the gaze onto those who profit from this stigma production. First we know that the Games, like all mega-sporting events, are big business. Yet just how big and whose business is very revealing. The Scottish Government was one of three partners in the Games, contributing 80 per cent to the net public cost of the Games. The other partners were Glasgow City Council, which contributed 20 per cent to the net public cost of the Games, and Commonwealth Games Scotland. The Games have since been lauded as not only being a financial success but significantly under budget (BBC, 2015). A report by the Accounts Commission said £461.7m in public funding had been anticipated, but only £424.5m was spent. However the original budget for Games budget was £373 million which increased to £454 million in 2007 prices and was since restated to £524 million at cash prices (Audit Scotland, 2012). In terms of local economic benefit, the returns of mega-sporting events are entirely underwhelming (Deans, 2016). A report which emerged commissioned by the Welsh Government (2016) on the economic viability of bidding to host the next CWG, concluded that hosting the Games was not beneficial. The report revealed that short term economic impacts from hosting the events are likely to be of a broadly similar scale as would be derived from any government investment of equivalent size such as road, rail and specific land regeneration projects. Yet these are the types of investments which could have actual material local benefits for residents – a legacy which *is* for the public good. And in the longer-term, little evidence was found that the Games would have a positive impact on the wider economy (Welsh Government, 2016). There are no real surprises in these findings as they support an international body of research which challenges not only the purported legacy (Minnaert, 2012; Rojek, 2013) but which also outline the punitive impacts and displacement that occur (Porter et. al 2009; Minnaert, 2012, COHRE, 2007; Du Plessis, 2007). But who *did* profit from the Games?

The kind of ‘trickle down’ of capital thought to ‘save’ the East End went straight into crony pockets. One of the main regeneration initiatives which had focused on the East End was Glasgow East Regeneration Agency (GERA). Founded in 2007, GERA was a charity, and one of five regeneration agencies in the city, which aimed to help fight poverty in the East End. Its aim was to help people find jobs and support that dubious ‘trickle down’ of capital which would to save the East End, with the goal "to relieve and/or prevent poverty particularly among residents of East Glasgow". In 2012, the five agencies were merged into a single body, Glasgow's Regeneration Agency, resulting in some staff being made redundant. The flow of capital here was straight into crony pockets as Labour MSP Ronnie Saez, the former Chief Executive Officer (CEO) of GERA walked off with £500,000 pay out (Glasgow Games Monitor, 2012a). The deal involved a ‘severance payment’ of £42,000 and a £470,000 increase to Saez’s pension, including a £208,000 discretionary payment (Glasgow Games Monitor, 2012a). Following a report leaked to The Sunday Herald (2012), it emerged that this money had been reserved for investment in a school in Dalmarnock and thus Saez was dubbed the poverty campaigner who stole the ‘poor kids’ cash’ (The Herald, 2012). While an investigation by the Office of the Scottish Charity Regulator (OSCR) ruled the incident as misconduct, no action was taken.

This so-called ‘golden handshake’ was signed off by three councillors, one of whom, James Coleman, who had promised the users and carers of the Accord Centre a new purpose-built facility as a CWG legacy (Glasgow Games Monitor, 2012a). The Accord Resource Centre, a community centre for adults with learning disabilities served the East End community of Glasgow for 20 years. But it was also occupying a site earmarked for development as a car park. Despite protest from local families city planners decided it had to be bulldozed to make way for a car park for buses for the 11-day event. Helen McCourt of the Save the Accord Campaign said, “Over 120 people were put out. Glasgow City Council told us we’d be getting a new building but there has been nothing. They said there was £250,000 for it but now it’s gone—what’s happened to it?” (Ahmed and Kiernan, 2012). After promising this new replacement centre, Coleman then later claimed that money to do so was no longer available (Glasgow Games Monitor, 2012a).

The other was councillor was George Redmond, who told Margaret Jaconelli and her family to ‘take it [their eviction] on the chin’ (Glasgow Games Monitor, 2012) home-owning resident Margaret Jaconelli’s was fighting a compulsory purchase order on her house as it faced demolition to make way for Games development. Her neighbours in social housing had been gradually evicted and re-housed since initial demolition announcement in 2000 but as a homeowner, Margaret wasn’t eligible for such resettlement. She was offered £30,000 – said to be the market value of her property, which was, in fact, independently valued at £90,000 (Gray, 2014). Yet clearly it was of much higher land value to the developers due to the rent gap on the site with the proposed development opportunity. £30,000 would not buy Margaret an equivalent property elsewhere in the city. Margaret requested a fair payment for her property with which she could purchase a similar property. Despite a lengthy campaign, Margaret and her family were forcibly evicted from their home of 35 years at 4am with around 100 police officers in attendance to ‘support’ the eviction.

A report by Glasgow Games Monitor (2012a) points out that across the street from where Margaret Jaconelli lived and was evicted, Labour party donors and property developers Allan Stewart and Steve McKenna, bought property in 2006 for £1.6 million. When the Athlete’s Village was announced for the site, Glasgow City Council paid them £1 for the land, plus a £1.7m amount and then ‘gifted’ them another valuable parcel of land around the corner (Glasgow Games Monitor, 2012a). In another deal, the Games Village site was obtained by City Legacy Consortium at no cost, arriving at an undisclosed profit-sharing agreement with Glasgow City Council, the terms of which are not publicly available (Gray, 2014). Added to this, London Mayfair developer, Charles Price, bought up property on the earmarked Games Village site for around £8 million in 2005-06, then sold the land to the City Council for £17 million in 2008 (Gray, 2014). Through these shady land purchases and sales the Games have involved capital and public funds, actively funnelled away from the local community into private business. Around £30 million of public subsidy from government budget was spent on remediating land, demolishing existing housing, and compensating landowners (Gray, 2014). This programme of demolition began as soon as Glasgow announced it’s bid to host the 2014 Commonwealth Games in 2000. The disposability and devaluation of neighbourhoods and residents was clear from the outset. There were high levels of demolition particularly in Dalmarnock where, The Games Monitor estimates, around 3,000 people were removed from the area through disinvestment and demolition. Tenants of socially rented accommodation were easily dispersed to other social housing neighbourhoods across the city. Initially 1,400 homes were promised on the Games village site, but this figure was reduced to 700 homes. Only 300 of these homes have been allocated for ‘social rent’ (Games Monitor, 2014).

The money generated from the Games not only lined the pockets of local elites and private funds, but leaked out of the city through corporate business sponsors. Many of the Games sponsors were corporations with ethically controversial histories and practices such BP, drones manufacturer Selex Es, and security company G4S (Glasgow Games Monitor, 2012b). One of the most notorious of the Games sponsors was ATOS. The French IT company was the outsourcing conglomeration employed by the Department of Work and Pensions (DWP) to carry out assessments on sick and disabled people. These assessments carried out by this private company on behalf of the government saw tens of thousands of sick and disabled people have their Social Security Benefit removed, reducing them to extreme poverty (Malik and Butler, 2014). It is estimated that more than 2,200 people have died before the assessment, known as the work capability assessment (WCS), has been completed. This policy aimed to cut the benefits bill by saving around £1bn over five years by fundamentally redefining the nature of disability (Gentleman, 2015). This process involved retesting claimants receiving the old incapacity benefit. Working-age people who are unable to work due to illness or disability were retested to see if they were eligible for the new employment and support allowance ESA (Employment and Support Allowance). Ironically, ATOS, a company which has direct adverse effects on people’s health and wellbeing, was a central sponsor for a Games which local government promised would bring health and well-being to the deprived East End. What is more, they sponsored the Games in a city which has consistently had a higher percentage of the working age population claiming incapacity benefits and ESA and higher level of reported disability among working age people in Glasgow (24%) than in Scotland as a whole (Glasgow Centre for Population Health, 2016). ATOS lost its contract after a series of controversial blunders but not beforeThe DWP paid Atos and Capita £507m for conducting the tests between 2013 and 2016, despite being criticised for its carrying out of these services (Malik and Butler, 2014). Since the work assessments were introduced, more than 600,000 appeals have been lodged against ATOS judgments, which have cost the taxpayer £60m a year. In four out of 10 cases the original decisions are overturned (Malik and Butler, 2014) - all at the cost of public money.These are practices which have directly effected East End residents - a large proportion of whom have a reported disability. Residents face the double injustice of being injured by these processes but censured for failing to be ‘regenerated’ or become successful, productive neoliberal consumer citizens. Given the economic conditions of austerity, their failure is certain but residents Glasgow’s most deprived are blame for this failure personally – in punitive and violent ways.

**Conclusion**

In this paper I have presented the Glasgow Games mega-sporting event as a form of gentrification underpinned by stigmatisation. These processes of value and devaluation which facilitated Games are central to moral and economic class project which is realised in a distinctly spatial way. The management of working-class places and people is of material importance to neoliberal practices of elite capital accumulation and stigmatisation helps realise this value. The increased pressure to become places and people of value under austerity demonstrates the advance of this project, articulated through government policies of urban regeneration which are intimately linked with capitalist accumulation. But, as I have outlined in this paper, this requires deeper understanding of the political economy of stigma. Incorporating the gaze up, as well as down, makes the state and capital present in our understanding. Looking ‘backstage’ shows how profit is generated in relation to the management, curation and orchestration of the performance of value. It reveals how the creation of stigma facilitates capital accumulation in specific ways and in doing so brings in the power structures missing from classic approach to studies of stigma. While Goffman, arguably, made some inroads, what has largely hitherto been elided is a consideration of structural and structuring relations of capital, power and class.

While the East End itself has been subject to all sorts of derogatory media by-lines and metaphors, the practices of elites and corporations involved in profiteering from the Games receive far less scrutiny. The political economy of the Games reveals a support for private finance and a simultaneous withdrawal of social support, which transfers wealth from public to private and the burden of debt from the state to the individual. This political economy also involves profiteering from land and displacement while residents were expected to be grateful for this regeneration intervention and find redemption. Yet the capital trickles up rather than down. Processes of accumulation in relation to the Games point out the hypocrisy of notions of legacy, particularly those claims pertaining to well-being and health. The deep swingeing arm of austerity has caused harm to many populations (Cooper & Whyte, 2017) and welfare cuts have had a particularly damaging effect to residents in the East End, making such claims profoundly cruel. This injurious hypocrisy leaves its mark in material and physical ways, compounding, yet going far deeper than, the effects of stigmatisation and pathologisation of the neighbourhood. This shows how imperative it is to make clear the material reality around stigmatisation: how the individualisation of structural problems of poverty, itself harmful, is used to justify austerity measures which enact greater levels of harm and even violence on people. This is realised through policy processes, whether under the guides of urban regeneration or welfare reform which many powerful groups then profit from in various ways. Exposure of the political economy of stigma is not only the critical reading that has been lacking in the sociology of stigma, it brings the hidden backstage, centre stage and under the spotlight. It makes government practices, public private-partnerships and private finance interests in stigmatisation processes clear and shows their role in legitimating and profiting from the harmful and violent project of austerity.
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