

**Abstract**

The ambition to host mega sports events is (or can be) perfectly justifiable with various arguments. The most persistently used argument is the supposed financial or direct economic gain for the host economy, of which the compelling body of evidence is discouraging. This implies that the justification for hosting should come from a different, broader economic angle. This paper provides a critical discussion of the myriad of economic and frequently intangible effects that could be put forward in the public debate preceding the submission of a bid. Paradoxically, most of these effects are not, or infrequently employed in public debates.