Many nations like to host international sporting events, but people are against it.
Describe both views and give your own opinion.

Holding a multinational game for many reasons could be tempting for most of the governments while public backlashes against what people consider to be too costly an expense sometimes have been seen. Based on the communal benefits in short or long term, which could be different from enough individuals', the authorities make the crucial decision to become ~~on becoming~~ a candidate to hold a tournament or not.

Ardently awaiting the estimated outcome, pushed by sport lovers, and aligned by the to-be-benefited part of the population, men in charge impose the costs to the whole country believing that this oils the wheels of the economy, and, they hope, the industry as well. They trust they are paving the way for~~to~~ having a state in which tourism, and therefore, diversity is welcomed which is a cultural progress. Yet, if society benefits from this hospitality, why should the impoverished not? Why some are to be left deprived, empty-handed of the income of this would-be successful investment? To have the decision widely well-received which will definitely affect the quality of the hosting, allocation of a decent proportion of the expected benefit to the poor must be clearly announced. How would the respected council hold the competitions without being held by their own people?

People oppose hosting a world or continental sport ~~vying~~ because they think it is not timely, due to some religious or superstitious beliefs, economically rational or fairly profiting all. In my country, for instance, a majority of people believe that football matches, for example, should not be held on special days which religion forbids any happiness in.

Followed from the above, barely would Countries not having the support of their people to being the host be the favorite to become the host, hence the importance of achieving countrywide acceptance.