University of Alberta

Securing the Olympic Games: Exemplifications of Developments in Urban Security Governance

by

Philip John Boyle

A thesis submitted to the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

Department of Sociology

© Philip John Boyle
Spring 2011
Edmonton, Alberta

Permission is hereby granted to the University of Alberta Libraries to reproduce single copies of this thesis and to lend or sell such copies for private, scholarly or scientific research purposes only. Where the thesis is converted to, or otherwise made available in digital form, the University of Alberta will advise potential users of the thesis of these terms.

The author reserves all other publication and other rights in association with the copyright in the thesis and, except as herein before provided, neither the thesis nor any substantial portion thereof may be printed or otherwise reproduced in any material form whatsoever without the author's prior written permission.

EXAMINING COMMITTEE

Kevin Haggerty, Department of Sociology

Rob Aitken, Department of Political Science

Steven Penney, Faculty of Law

David Whitson, Department of Political Science

Dominique Clément, Department of Sociology

External Reader: Jon Coaffee, University of Birmingham

ABSTRACT

The Olympic Games are now characterized by overt displays of military personnel and hardware, the deployment of new surveillance technologies and policing techniques, and rapidly escalating budgets. Yet, most research on security at these urban events has been confined to the sociology of sport or the applied profession of sport management. This dissertation contextualizes the Olympic Games within current debates about security in the post-9/11 environment, and asks what the Games reveal about developments in security, surveillance, and urban governance. At the same time I also ask how the Olympics reinforce and extend these developments in socio-cultural ways. These questions are pursued through four analyses of different aspects of the Games: practices of socio-spatial regulation in Olympic host cities, ideas of resiliency and preparedness in urban governance, the performative dimensions of precautionary governance, and the production and globalization of security expertise. I conclude by suggesting that the Olympics provide a window into future directions in urban security governance.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to extend my gratitude to my supervisor, Kevin Haggerty, who encouraged this project from the beginning, been enthusiastic throughout, and is a model for those entering the profession. Thank you to Rob Aitken and Steven Penney for providing comments on my dissertation at an early stage, and to David Whitson, Dominique Clément, and Jon Coaffee for their constructive criticism and debate during the final examination.

I received generous financial support from Department of Sociology and Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research at the University of Alberta and from the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council. I have also benefited from the many dedicated and highly capable people that make the Department of Sociology run in the way it does. This research would not have been possible without this support.

My family in Calgary – David and Christine Boyle and Cathy and Russ Tait – has always been supportive of education and career choices, and my extended Oliver family has always been enthusiastic throughout multiple pronouncements of 'one more semester.' Tonya Davidson has been a good friend since our first day as 'buddies' in the department and subsequent intersections in Ontario and elsewhere. Finally, my most heartfelt thanks go to Marcia, who has been with me every day of this process.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Abstract

Acknowledgements

Introduction....................1

Chapter One

Introduction....................26
- Vancouver, a city 'beset by beggars and thieves'....................32
- Governing disorder from a distance....................40
- Tactics and authorities for governing disorder....................44
  - Carrall Street Greenway....................47
  - Downtown Ambassadors....................51
  - The Granville Entertainment District....................55
- Redefining success....................61

Conclusion....................63

Chapter Two

Introduction....................68
- Surveillance assemblages....................70
- Meeting uncertainty with resiliency....................74
- Resiliency in Vancouver....................78
  - Visualizing cities....................79
  - Planning for the worst....................83
  - Practical expertise....................86

Conclusion....................94

Chapter Three

Introduction....................99
- Imagining an uncertain future....................102
- Precaution, premediation, and the Olympic Games....................105
- Performing precaution....................108
  - Managers of unease....................112
  - Demonstration projects....................117
  - Fantasy documents....................120

Conclusion....................123

Chapter Four

Introduction 129
Olympic security networks 133
State institutional networks 133
Learning from others 136
'Body shops in the brain business' 141
The Olympic security field 145
Conclusion 154

Conclusion 161

References 173

Appendix A

SECURING THE OLYMPIC GAMES: EXEMPLIFICATIONS OF DEVELOPMENTS IN URBAN SECURITY GOVERNANCE

Introduction

The Olympic Games are political, national, and consumerist spectacles that have been critically examined from a wide variety of perspectives in relation to a wide variety of topics (recent and forthcoming overviews include Horne & Manzenreiter, 2006a; Lenskyj, 2010; Lenskyj & Waag, 2011). In the recent decade the Olympic Games have also become conspicuous *security* spectacles characterized by overt displays of military personnel and hardware, the deployment of sophisticated new surveillance technologies, and rapidly escalating budgets (Boyle & Haggerty, 2009a). Initiated by the siege and subsequent killing of 11 Israeli athletes at the 1972 Munich Games and accelerated by the detonation of a pipe bomb at Atlanta's Centennial Park during the 1996 Olympics, the security apparatus that now encircles these events reached a categorically different level of intensity after September 11th 2001 to the extent that authorities and critics alike routinely describe the Games as the world's largest peacetime security operations. September 11th (hereafter 9/11) did not cause this intensification so much as it acted as a tipping point for what was already being described as "the new terrorism" (Juergensmeyer, 2000) to describe the combination of religious and political extremism, unorthodox methods (including the potential for using chemical, biological, or nuclear weapons), and penchant for theatricality that was coalescing around the Olympics and other high profile events. Further

reinforced by high profile attacks such as the 2004 Madrid train bombings and the 2005 London subway bombings, concerns that the global profile of the Olympics provide an ideal platform for catastrophic terrorism now figure prominently in the bidding, staging, and wider official discourse surrounding the Games (Atkinson & Young, 2005).

The exponential growth of security budgets for the Games reflects these concerns. Notwithstanding the pitfalls of using a single case to establish a baseline, the estimated $180 million US spent on security for the 2000 Sydney Games is a suitable point of comparison as this figure was unprecedented at the time. Four years after the Sydney Games, and two years after 9/11, Greece spent a reported $1.5 billion US on security for the 2004 Athens Games, an increase of over 700%. China reports that $350 million US was spent on security for the 2008 Games, but this figure is widely regarded to be extremely conservative as it does not reflect expenditures authorized through other budgets (Thompson, 2008). The Security Industry Association (2007) for example estimates that China spent $6.5 billion US on security projects across Beijing that were not part of the budget for the Games but nonetheless timed to coincide with the event. While stark, this example highlights the intractable problem of disaggregating official expenses from those authorized through other channels that is not unique to China (or to security). Few hosts of either democratic or authoritative bent are expected to match the resources put forth by China for the Games in the near future but the UK is also expected to

exceed the initial high-water mark on security expenditures set by the Athens Games. Originally set at £600 million GBP, the security budget for the 2012 Game has been revised upwards twice, once in late 2007 to £838 million GBP and again a year later to £1.5 billion GBP ($1.2 billion and $2.2 billion USD, respectively).

Security budgets for the smaller Winter Olympics have seen comparable escalations in the last decade. Occurring only 5 months after 9/11, the US spent an estimated $350 million US on security for the Salt Lake Games, an amount substantially greater than what was spent for the much larger Sydney Games only two years prior. Even before 9/11 the US planned to spend more on security than Sydney – approximately $200 million USD – with the balance coming from the federal government in the aftermath of 9/11. Approximately $140 million USD was spent on security for the 2006 Turin Winter Games, though this estimate does not include substantial costs associated with the involvement of the Italian military. The budget for the 2010 Vancouver Games exemplifies the sharp disjuncture that exists between bid-book security estimates and final expenditures. The initial bid-book estimate of $175 million CAN was widely derided Canadian media and in confidential RCMP reports as far too low and later calculated to cost just under $1 billion CAN. This budget was topped off by at least $15 million CAN of federal funds for security upgrades on regional rail, ferry, and airport systems, which according to the federal transportation minister was seen as an “extra benefit that [...] will be in

place in time for the 2010 Olympic Games and Paralympic Games" (in The Canadian Press, 2009). Vancouver now holds the dubious distinction of having the largest security budget for the Winter Games, something that will likely be assumed by Russia when the Black Sea resort of Sochi hosts the 2014 Winter Olympics.

These financial figures and the massive security and surveillance infrastructures they enable suggest the significance of the Games for critical security scholarship. Yet, there has been comparatively little academic scrutiny of these security events or their consequences. This topic has been touched on in a critical way by sociologists of sport, most notably Lenskyj (2002, 2008), and less critically by those working in the fields of administrative criminology and the policy-oriented domain of sports management (Decker et al., 2005; Decker, Varano, & Greene, 2007; Palmer & Whelan, 2007), but on the whole issues relating to the policing and security at the Olympics have received far less attention than the volumes of analysis directed towards other aspects of the Games. This is changing, however, both from within mainstream academic studies of the Games and from elsewhere. Horne and Manzenreiter (2006b: 19) note that "security issues are likely to come more to the fore in production of sports mega-events [and] will form a substantial research theme in future studies of sports mega-events," and notable contributions in this direction include Atkinson and Young (2002, 2005) and Schimmel (2006). Coming from different origins, a range of scholars with interests in current theories on

governance, risk, and critical takes on the 'war on terror' after 9/11 are beginning to express interests in major sporting and political events as well (Coaffee & Wood, 2006; Bajc, 2007; Samatas, 2007; Boyle & Haggerty, 2009a; Yu, Klauser, & Chan, 2009; Giulianotti & Klauser, 2010; Bennett & Haggerty, forthcoming 2011; Fussey, Coaffee, Armstrong & Hobbs, forthcoming 2011). While diverse, this burgeoning literature indicates growing interest in the Games in light of theoretical discussions on the nature of surveillance, social control, and power in the contemporary period.

This dissertation has two substantive aims. First, this dissertation makes contributions to the aforementioned literatures concerning the sociology of major events with an investigation of the social, political, and cultural dimensions and impacts of security at the Olympic Games. Second, and more generally, this dissertation uses the Games as a window into developments in the field of urban security governance today. What follows is a brief excursion into this field that will foreshadow the issues this dissertation will take up in the chapters to come.

By urban security governance I am referring to more than the formal institution of municipal government and associated law enforcement agencies but the constellation of state and non-state entities involved in shaping the spaces, inhabitants, institutions and infrastructures of cities in support of the aim of preventing or minimizing harm. This obviously entails a great many things in

practice, but one inescapable element of urban security governance is surveillance. The fortifications that enclosed ancient cities are perhaps the most dramatic testament to how cities have always been shaped by the two-sided aim of protecting against external attack and internal subversion. Walls lost their utility to protect cities long ago, but the desire to facilitate surveillance over the flows of people, capital and goods that traverse cities remains a strong thread in the history of modern urbanism, one that extends from the *trace italienne* of the 16th century through to Haussmann's grand boulevards of 19th century Paris (Ashworth, 1991; Hirst, 2005).

Security and surveillance in cities today is still enabled by modifications to the built environment but the growth of electronically mediated surveillance in cities since WWII has been exponential. Part of this has to do with shifts in urban governance under advanced liberalism. Advanced liberalism is a term associated primarily with those working under the umbrella of governmentality studies and particularly the work of Nikolas Rose (1999). Advanced liberalism is closely related to, but extends beyond, neoliberalism. As variants of liberalism as a whole, both presume a sphere of freedom outside of politics and seek to place limits on the extent of political intervention in that sphere. Emerging against the backdrop of the welfare states of the post-WII years – what Rose calls social liberalism – neoliberalism is commonly understood as an economic doctrine wherein "the human condition can best be advanced by the maximization of entrepreneurial freedoms within an institutional

framework characterized by private property rights, individual liberty, free markets and free trade" (Harvey, 2006: 145) combined with a profound antipathy to the regulatory frameworks inherited from the preceding era. However, as Rose and others working with ideas pioneered by Foucault have argued, contemporary strategies of governance cannot be grasped solely in terms of the 'rolling back' of the welfare state and the 'rolling forward' of the market (Rose & Miller, 1992; Dean, 1999; Rose, 1999). Political rule today, these authors argue, involves the reorganization of all forms of social life along market values, not just economic relations. Furthermore, the idea that the state is reverting to the role of a 'night watchman' with a minimal role in organizing social life belies the extent to which deeply interventionist agendas have emerged around issues such as crime control and immigration (Wacquant, 2001). While the mobilization of state power around these issues has not been lost on those working from a political economy standpoint (eg., Brenner & Theodore, 2002; Peck & Tickell, 2002), the term advanced liberalism is nonetheless preferred in this dissertation in order to encompass these wider shifts in governance rather than the term neoliberalism, which I reserve to refer more narrowly to economic transformations (cf. Lippert, 2005: 5-6).

Advanced liberalism is typically discussed in relation to the exercise of higher forms of state power but has deep implications for urban governance as well, namely in encouraging what Harvey (1989a) calls urban entrepreneurialism. According to Harvey's account, the adoption of neoliberal policies by higher

levels of government in the 1980s and 1990s and the simultaneous deindustrialization of western economies compelled cities to compete with one another in order claim a greater share of the people and capital that comprise post-industrial capitalism. Harvey describes four conceptually distinct strategies that he sees emerging at the time: cities may fashion themselves as centers of production, particularly for emerging knowledge-intensive sectors; as centers of consumption; as command and control centers for regional and global corporations; or as locations for industries dominated by government spending such as advanced health care research or defence. Any combination of these options may be present in a single instance, and any attempt to reposition a city as a key location within these sectors will be met with varying degrees of success, but on the whole these strategies reflect how macro-level economic shifts during and since the 1970s left cities with few options but to maximize their role as speculative growth machines in order to reverse their declining fortunes (Molotch, 1976; Gibson, 2004).

For Harvey, the “leapfrogging innovations in life styles, cultural forms, [and] products and services mixes” (Harvey, 1989a: 12) that came to be theorized as postmodernism in the 1980s was merely the logical outcome of cities trying to mimic and outdo one another, not the breakdown of grand narratives as others were claiming at the time (Lyotard, 1984). Of more import to the analysis here is Harvey’s insight that the entrepreneurial turn in urban governance “opens up a range of mechanisms for social control” (Harvey, 1989a: 14) as localities

attempt to redevelop themselves as tourism or consumptions centers. A number of scholars since Harvey have fleshed out this initial insight to show how measures such as private security patrols, public video surveillance, or the selective use of trespass and property law are used to rehabilitate inner-city neighborhoods into high-end residential, shopping, and entertainment districts (e.g., Coleman, 2004; Gibson, 2004). The centrality of these functions in urban governance has been reinforced as social polarization in cities increases at precisely the time that urban redevelopment is pushing into new frontiers. Consequently, "cities have become strategically crucial geographical arenas in which a variety of neoliberal initiatives – along with closely intertwined strategies of crisis displacement and crisis management – have been articulated" (Brenner & Theodore, 2002: 351) as localities struggle to find ways to deal with the 'externalities' and contraditions of post-industrial growth. This is, of course, only a general sketch of what is a highly uneven and trial-and-error process, and more nuanced argumentation would have to examine specific instances in light of these general dynamics. Given the aggressive place-making activities that are rallied around the Games, Olympic host cities provide considerable opportunities to do so.

A more prominent factor in the intensification of security and surveillance in cities is the threat of terrorism that has grown since the 1970s and climaxed (for European and North American countries at least) with 9/11. The emergence of non-traditional, asymmetric threats such as nerve gas attacks in

public transit systems, massively destructive truck bombs, hijacked aircrafts, and the future prospect of swarm attacks executed by semi-professional militant cells (Arquilla, 2009) have lead to concerns that cities are profoundly vulnerable to all sorts of unpredictable and potentially catastrophic attacks that exploit the vulnerabilities that highly complex infrastructures and numerous soft targets afford (Luke, 2004). Such concerns have been powerful drivers in merging urban security governance within the wider idea and practice of national security after 9/11. As Graham has noted,

> In the wake of 9/11, and other catastrophic terrorist acts of the last few years, the design of buildings, the management of traffic the physical planning of cities, migration policy, or the design of social policies for ethnically diverse cities and neighbourhoods, are being brought within the widening umbrella of 'national security' (Graham, 2004b: 11).

The security of cities has thus become a key plank within the national security strategies of most western countries. One indication of this in the US context is that in 2009 the Department of Homeland Security's Urban Area Security Initiative (UASI) constitutes approximately 46% of the agency's $1.7 billion USD homeland security grant program. The exponential growth of video surveillance in cities in the last decade is one expression of this development that also includes the use of new biometric identification tools in law enforcement, widespread efforts to integrate disparate video surveillance and augment these networks with various recognition capabilities, satellite-based communications and visualization tools for law enforcement and emergency management agencies, and the adoption of lethal and less-than-lethal weapons by civilian agencies.

Some degree of caution is warranted in taking these developments as entirely new. As noted above, concerns about external attack and internal subversion have always shaped the built form of cities. Protecting cities from nuclear strike occupied the minds of civil defense strategists for much of the Cold War, and this remains a concern today. Organized political violence and militarized police response is hardly new in places such as Northern Ireland in the 1970s and 1980s and today in the rapidly developing cities of the global south. In North America issues such as race riots, organized crime, domestic terrorism, and major political summits like the 1999 World Trade Organization were already driving the widespread implementation of surveillance cameras and the adoption of military technologies in law enforcement, which was reinforced by the profit-seeking activities of the defense industry to diversify their core markets (Haggerty & Ericson, 1999; Nunn, 2001; Light, 2003).

Nevertheless, events of the preceding two decades have dramatically intensified the degree to which cities are perceived to be vulnerable to unpredictable, asymmetrical attacks, with 9/11 serving to “conflate and further legitimize dynamics that were already militarizing urban space” (Warren, 2002: 614). The result has been an unmistakable if highly uneven surveillance surge that is enveloping the populations, critical infrastructures, and political/economic institutions that constitute major metropolitan cities since 9/11. New York City for instance has been building an elaborate surveillance

network around the city's financial district dubbed the Lower Manhattan Security Initiative (LMSI). Modelled on the 'rings of steel' approach taken in London (Coaffee, 2003), the LMSI blends movable and static physical barriers with an estimated 3,000 public and private surveillance cameras equipped to scan licence plates and track vehicles as they move through the security zone (Buckely, 2007). Similarly, Chicago has embarked on what is called Operation Virtual Shield, an ambitious project to roll out a fibre optic network across the downtown core that will integrate public and private video surveillance cameras in a single system and provide a single high-capacity communications and data backbone for further homeland security initiatives.

These developments in urban governance connect with wider shifts in perceptions of risk that have occurred in the recent decade. Beck (2002) maintains that 9/11 signalled that we have entered an era of unmanageable and potentially catastrophic risk that threatens the very processes of modernization from which they emerge. This seemed abundantly clear when everyday objects were used to transform one of the most banal symbols of globalization – the commercial aircraft – into massively destructive weapons. The lesson many took from this was that high consequence risks no longer came from elsewhere but emanated unpredictably from within the very social and infrastructural milieu they threaten. This recognition has introduced a categorically different epistemology to the enterprise of risk management, one that, while undertaken in the name of risk, is analytically distinct. Risk management, as Rose has

noted, is a "family of ways of thinking and acting involving calculations about *probable* futures" (Rose, 2001, emphasis added). Today however, ruminations on risk now involve considerable guesswork on what could *potentially* transpire, not just what is statistically likely or reasonably foreseeable. As Mythen and Walklate (2008: 234) have put it, "The new calculus [of risk] does not assess the future by focusing on the past – 'What was?' – nor indeed the present – 'What is?' Instead, security assessments are directed by the question: 'What if?'"

Again, the necessarily speculative process of asking 'what if' is not necessarily new. A similar calculus dominated thinking about the prospect of nuclear warfare during the Cold War. This was exemplified by US military analyst Herman Kahn (1962), who advocated the notion of 'thinking the unthinkable' when contemplating the effects of nuclear war, even if it meant planning for the deaths of thousands of citizens. However, even the possibility of mutually assured destruction during the Cold War was structured within a commonly understood bipolar geopolitical system with identifiable adversaries, means, and objectives (Daase & Kessler, 2007). The threat of nuclear strike remains today, but the end of bipolarity, the rise of non-state terrorist groups, and the proliferation of traditional and non-traditional weapons today necessitates a much more expansive mode of asking 'what if' when imagining future threats. This epistemological shift is what drives a number of processes in security governance today. First, it encourages a default position of distrust, suspicion,

and perpetual vigilance for signs of threats ‘in our midst’ on the basis that the potential for catastrophic risk is everywhere and imminent. This perception – which is a product of the discourse on ‘the new terrorism’ rather than anything intrinsic to risk today – is what drives the aggressive pre-emption of security threats that is characteristic of security politics today, which involves the “strong urge to criminalize not only those who actually cause harm, but also those merely suspected of being harmful” (Ericson, 2008: 57).

Second, one of the consequences of asking ‘what if’ is the acceptance of the inevitability of high-impact events despite their improbability. This entails joining aggressive preemptive action with radical readiness so that high-impact events, if rare, do not spiral into unmitigated disasters by virtue of failing to manage their consequences. For example, a threat analysis by Canada’s then-named Office of Critical Infrastructure Protection and Emergency Preparedness (OCIEP) conducted shortly after 9/11 stresses the need for “robust and flexible mitigation, preparedness, response and recovery plans” for critical infrastructure protection after 9/11 because of the possibility, “*regardless of how remote*, that an event on an equally grand scale might occur again” (OCIEP, 2003, emphasis added). The key phrase here is ‘regardless of how remote’ as it emphasizes the reflexive willingness to accept the inevitability of high-impact events and plan extensively for their impacts in the present, no matter how improbable.

Third, and as the above suggests, the necessarily speculative process of asking 'what if' provides considerable leeway for perceptions and responses to risk to be driven not by objective assessments of threat, vulnerability, and consequence but by culturally held conceptions of disaster, dread, and worst-case scenarios. The use of low-probability, high-impact events, or "black swan" events as they have been called (Taleb, 2009), as imaginative scenarios for organizations can have constructive outcomes if used in measured ways, such as leading to greater awareness of technical or organizational limitations that might otherwise go unnoticed (Clarke, 2006, 2008). But the invigoration of conceptions of risk with imaginations of disaster can have less desired effects as well. Even if undertaken in earnest, predicating organizational responses on improbable but high-consequence scenarios can motivate decision-makers to take aggressive and expensive courses of action that exceed frameworks of proportionality and likelihood, particularly if undertaken to assuage public perception in relation to highly-charged situations (Stern & Weiner, 2006). Worst-case analyses can be used to 'show' that all risks are known and manageable, even if there is no plausible hope of anticipating all possible interactions within a complex system, or manipulated to justify the implementation of contentious or untested measures on the basis that they are commensurate to the risks at hand (Clarke, 2008: 157). Thus while imagining the worst can be a necessary and constructive process to addressing unknowable risks, the "de-bounding of risk perceptions and fantasies" as Beck

puts it (2002: 44), can have socially malign consequences, even if undertaken in good faith and with earnest intentions.

The Olympic Games are microcosms of these wider developments. Being global events that happen in intensely local places, analysis of the Olympics can provide a great deal of insight about the nature of urban security governance within these developments. At the same time, one of the overriding arguments of this dissertation is that the Games are more than windows from which insights into prevailing dynamics in security governance may be discerned. This dissertation argues that the Games are also *generative* sites that drive processes that stretch in time, space, and in socio-cultural ways, and that reinforce wider processes already contributing to the securitization of cities. Keeping in mind this duality of the Games as both product and producer of developments in security governance, the key aim of this dissertation is to examine how the Games both express, extend, and reinforce issues in security and surveillance today. Or, to put this as a question, what can an analysis of security at the Olympic Games tell us about urban security governance today? And how do the Olympics reinforce and extend these developments?

Each of the following four chapters is a different cut at these questions. The first two chapters focus on what are explicitly articulated long-term security 'legacies' pursued by authorities hosting the Games. In the first chapter I show how the 2010 Olympic Games was positioned by a complex of local actors as

an opportunity to highlight Vancouver's reputation as a livable city. Part of this involved the implementation of a municipal policy called Project Civil City, which sought to regulate a series of broadly defined disorders in the name of enhancing the city's livability. I interpret Project Civil City in light of the literature on the links between urban revitalization and security governance, and argue that this policy reflects the ongoing search for an institutional fix for the growing problem of social and spatial polarization in Vancouver.

In the second chapter I show how the Games have been used by authorities as opportunities to implement variety of security and surveillance measures that are intended to be lasting outcomes of the Games. This chapter takes a different tack than those who draw cautionary lessons from the Athens and Beijing Games by returning to Vancouver to highlight the idea and practice of resiliency in urban governance. As a general term resiliency refers to the capacity for complex systems to adapt to unexpected shocks without serious and lasting disruption. In this dissertation, resiliency refers more specifically to a rationality of governance that accepts the inevitability of large-scale disruption and seeks to mitigate the impact of surprise events, whether of intentional or accidental origin. While resiliency may not offend the same liberal sensibilities that the legacies of previous Games do, resiliency nonetheless represents a "softer and more subtle approach" to embedding security within urban life (Coaffee, Murakami Wood, & Rogers, 2009: 255). I conclude this chapter by suggesting that resiliency is based on an ontology that

prioritizes localized crises and worst-case scenarios, which has the effect of crowding out other issues facing human populations where the effects are only visible in the aggregate.

The following two chapters pertain to outcomes that are less explicit but no less important. Chapter Three examines the cultural dimensions of security provision under conditions of uncertainty. In this context, there is considerable pressure upon authorities to maintain the appearance that all risks, including catastrophic risks, are known and manageable. If security is not just about protecting but reassuring the public that it is safe from harm (Bigo, no date), then security *requires* this communicative dimension in order to convey control and foster trust in the symbolic order of things, particularly in the context of shared imaginations of disaster. I conclude by suggesting that the unintended consequence of this performative dimension of security is to reinforce the dynamics of fear and uncertainty that are prevalent in social life today. Finally, Chapter Four examines the epistemic networks that have emerged around the recurring problem of securing high profile major events. Three institutional networks are outlined, each of which have the explicit aim of transferring security-specific knowledge within their respective institutional boundaries. The role of private entities as knowledge brokers within these networks is also considered. This chapter concludes that these networks are not the apolitical or disinterested processes they are made out to be but strong channels through which the wider policy objectives pertaining to major event

security are consolidated and disseminated. In doing so, they function as key channels in the ongoing ‘making up’ and globalization of security expertise. Collectively, these arguments support the overall claim that security at the Olympic Games has technological, epistemological, and cultural legacies that extend well beyond each event. I conclude this dissertation by suggesting that the Olympics provide a glimpse at future directions in urban security governance.

These analytical aims are informed by a number of divergent literatures, many of which have been touched on above. This includes the work of a school of critical urban geographers who extend David Harvey’s (1989a, 1989b) insights into urban governance under advanced liberalism, the writings of a range of authors that extend and diverge from Ulrich Beck’s (1992, 2002) writings on risk, and Steven Graham’s (2004a, 2010) work on war, cities, and urban geopolitics. Threaded through these authors to provide a loose theoretical orientation is the language and concepts of governmentality studies. Much of the broad literature assembled under the sign of governmentality studies takes its cue from Foucault’s (1991) schematic lecture on the nature of modern governmental thought. For Foucault, ‘government’ does not refer only or even primarily to the formal apparatus of the state but to the generic process of “the right disposition of things, arranged so as to lead to a convenient end” (Foucault, 1991: 93). As he makes clear in his essay, governance understood in this way is not an activity monopolized by the state; states may learn to govern,

a process he refers to as the 'governmentalization of the state,' but it is not intrinsic to, or co-terminal with, the modern state. Rather than focusing on what he called the "mythicized abstraction of the state," Foucault directs our attention to the multiform institutions, tactics, procedures, technologies, and associated forms of knowledge that govern in a multitude of ways from a multitude of sites, only some of which may be tied to the formal state apparatus (Hunt & Wickam, 1994: 178; Rose, 1999: 15). Furthermore, Foucault's orientation is to focus on the 'how' of governing rather than determining who holds power over others, which encourages a focus on the pragmatics of particular programs of government rather than offering sweeping generalizations about the nature of government, society, or power (Haggerty, 2006: 40). As Rose has succinctly put it, the analysis of government in the wake of Foucault starts with asking "what authorities of various sorts wanted to happen, in relation to problems defined how, in pursuit of what objectives, through was strategies and techniques" (Rose, 1999: 20).

This aim involves the invocation of two concepts that are central to governmentality studies: rationalities and technologies. Rationalities are discursive fields characterized by patterns of thought, shared vocabularies, and relatively consistent forms of logic regarding the proper targets and exercise of power (Rose & Miller, 1992: 175; Rose, 1999: 28). Rationalities are distinct from philosophies of political power or ideologies insofar as rationalities are inherently problematizing and problem-solving activities (Lippert, 2005).

Technologies are the myriad of “mundane programs, calculations, techniques, apparatuses, documents, and procedures though which authorities seek to embody and given effect to governmental ambitions” (Rose, 1999: 175). This is, in principle, quite open; maps, architecture or audits can all be mobilized as technologies of governance. But not everything is always and already a technology of governance. Rather, objects or procedures become technologies of governance insofar as they are “traversed and transected by aspirations to achieve certain outcomes in terms of the conduct of the governed” (Rose, 1999: 52). Collectively, these concepts suggest an analytics of governance that focuses on the “the historically constituted matrix within which are articulated all those dreams, schemes, strategies and maneuvers of authorities that seek to shape the beliefs and conduct of others in desired directions by acting upon their will, their circumstances or their environment” (Rose & Miller, 1992: 175).

Following the spirit of this body of thought, this dissertation draws on aspects of this literature to frame each chapter. In Chapter One I am concerned with demonstrating how the *Polizeiwissenschaft*, or police science, the field of administrative governance concerned with defining and promoting municipal order typified by the city-states of 17th and 18th century Europe, remains a constitutive if under-theorized rationality of urban governance today. The following two chapters – Chapters Two and Three – are connected by the idea of precaution as a rationality of governance. As will be discussed, precaution is

related to, but exceeds, the language and practice of risk management in that it focuses on worst-cases rather than probabilities. Chapter Two ties this rationality of governance to a set of technologies for promoting urban resiliency, and Chapter Three examines the cultural dimensions of precautionary governance in which security is fashioned into cultural productions intended for circulation and consumption. Finally, Chapter Four considers the role of major events in the constitution of expert knowledge regarding urban security governance. Thus while this dissertation is selective in the uptake of concepts from the governmentality literature, and consequently will not fully represent the breadth of this literature (see Dean, 1999; Rose, 1999), it is fully in keeping with Foucault's own approach to think of theory as a "tool kit from which to draw selectively in light of the analytical task at hand" (Haggerty & Ericson, 2000: 608).

Methodologically, this dissertation incorporates a mix of original interviews and document analysis. Thirty interviews with 28 participants were conducted between November 2007 and July 2010. As most of this research was conducted in the two years before the 2010 Vancouver Winter Games, the majority of the interviews relate to the Vancouver experience. The population of interviewees includes a range of activist and advocacy groups in Vancouver, law enforcement and public safety officials at the municipal, provincial, and federal levels in Canada, UN officials, and representatives from various corporations involved in the Games (see Appendix A for a full list of

interviewees). All interviewees were identified through media reports, government documents, or whose name recurred on conference delegation lists and other open sources, and contacted by email to request an interview. This approach was generally successful with the exception of three prominent individuals with whom I could not interview after an extended period of effort. Multiple requests to interview members of the RCMP Integrated Security Unit between 2007 and 2010 were not responded to.

Eighteen interviews were conducted in person during four trips to Vancouver, B.C. (November 2007, July 2008, January 2009, November 2009), one trip to Ottawa, ON (February 2008), and one to London, UK (November 2008), which involved attending a security industry conference in conjunction with research being conducted for Office of the Privacy Commissioner of Canada (OPC) with Kevin Haggerty (Boyle & Haggerty, 2009b). The remaining 10 interviews were conducted by phone. The interviews were semi-structured and, with one exception, recorded with a digital recording device, and ranged in length from 10 to 120 minutes.

This research has also amassed a small archive of government and non-government documents dealing with major event security. This includes post-event analysis and recommendation reports from government and non-governmental observers (such as the US Government Accountability Office), various reports and testimonials to government from individuals involved in

previous events, law enforcement manuals and trade journals (such as *The Police Chief*, *Homeland Security Today*, and *Frontline Security*), reports from non-governmental authorities such as RAND and Jane's Intelligence Review, and official publications from the International Olympics Committee and Olympic organizing committees. Original documents regarding Canada's preparations for the 2010 Games were also obtained through Freedom of Information requests to the RCMP, Public Safety, and Canadian Forces. Media reports from select national and international newspapers such as *The Province* (Vancouver), the *Globe and Mail*, and *The New York Times*, as well as numerous websites were also collected. Thanks to Chris Shaw for sharing a large dossier of documents obtained from the RCMP by Freedom of Information request in 2007 and Peter Morgan for sharing numerous written reports on preparations for the 2010 Games in 2008.

Research for this dissertation was supported by funds granted through the Doctoral Dissertation Grant from the Department of Sociology at the University of Alberta. This research was reviewed and approved by the Research Ethic Board of the University of Alberta.

A note on style

This dissertation has been written with the intention of producing four article-length manuscripts that, with further revision, can be submitted for publication.

As such, I have foregone what may be the usual route of producing a dissertation that follows a singular narrative from introduction to conclusion. Instead, what follows are four relatively freestanding chapters that each speak to the overall question of examining the security legacies of the Games within the wider context of developments in urban security governance.

Parts of this dissertation are under revision or forthcoming in various publication venues. A revised version of Chapter One (co-authored with Kevin Haggerty) has been accepted for publication in *Urban Studies*. A previous version of Chapter Four is forthcoming in *Security Games: Surveillance and Control at Mega-Events*, edited by Kevin Haggerty and Colin Bennett (2011), and a condensed version of this entire dissertation is forthcoming in *A Handbook of Olympic Studies*, edited by Helen Lenskyj and Stephen Waag (2011).

CHAPTER ONE

‘We have become a city beset by beggars and thieves’: Vancouver and *Project Civil City*

Introduction

One of the primary reasons that hosting the Olympic Games is an attractive proposition for cities is that they are seen as unparalleled opportunities to accelerate inward investment while showcasing the city to a global audience. Infrastructural improvements long on the municipal wish list may be fast-tracked, hospitality and tourism facilities ranging from hotel upgrades to resort mega-projects may find new investors, and plans for the revitalization of lands slated for future development may be greatly accelerated by the Games. The intense media exposure that host cities receive means they are also seen as opportunities to overwrite dated perceptions with newer images of urbane cosmopolitanism cultivated for a global audience (Whitson & Macintosh, 1996; Degen, 2004; Hiller, 2006; Short, 2008). While tangible transformations of the former sort are more readily identifiable for residents and researchers alike, it is in the intangible transformations of the latter sort where success or failure for Olympic host cities is ultimately registered. Turin’s former mayor Sergio Chiampario summarizes this orientation when he remarked of the 2006 Winter Games, “it would be mistaken to confine the discussion of Turin’s transformation to construction projects. We are distancing ourselves from the old stereotype of a grey industrial city, and showing instead that we are a

European, multicultural, eclectic and dynamic place where tradition and innovation work together" (in CNN Traveller, 2006: 6). The fact that this statement appears in a travel magazine featuring the slogan "for people going places" distributed amongst major international airlines, hotel chains, and travel agent associations, and which boasts to potential advertisers readers with an average salary of $170,000 US underscores the sort of market the mayor wishes to bring to his revitalized, cosmopolitan city (Vanolo, 2008).

These place-making activities in Olympic host cities often invite parallel efforts to regulate the visible reminders of poverty and social polarization that manifests on city streets. These efforts usually involve strategies to regulate broadly defined 'disorders' or 'nuisance' behaviors that are deemed incompatible with the stylized representations of the city cultivated by local growth coalitions (Lenskyj, 2002; COHRE, 2007). The urge to clean up or civilize certain elements of city life is not unique to Olympic host cities, of course. Moral panics about the dangerous and criminal underclasses and subsequent efforts to reengineer the social and physical space of cities are recurring features in the history of urban development (Valverde, 1991). More recently, the regulation of 'quality of life' offences has also become an integral component to the remaking of city centers under advanced liberalism. These imperatives are especially acute in Olympic host cities because of the high stakes of revitalization associated with these events, making these cities

particularly good laboratories from which insights into the role of social regulation in contemporary urban governance may be gained.

This chapter aims to discern such developments. The empirical focus of this chapter is a major city initiative of the City of Vancouver, host city of the 2010 Winter Olympic Games, called *Project Civil City* (hereafter PCC). Adopted in November 2006, PCC sought to reduce homelessness, the open-air trade and use of drugs, and aggressive panhandling by 50% and non-specific reductions for street disorder in general, which was broadly defined as "any activity or circumstance that deters or prevents the public from the lawful use or enjoyment of the City" (COV, 2008: 10). While the 2010 Olympics provided a deadline and sense of urgency for this initiative, the Games were also seen as a "tremendous opportunity" and "catalyst" (COV, 2006c: 5) for PCC to usher in a long-term social order legacy after 2010 that would buttress the city's reputation for livability into the future.

On one level this chapter is concerned with analyzing PCC in light of the aforementioned links between urban revitalization and the regulation of disorder (Coleman, 2004; Gibson, 2004; Helms, Atkinson, & MacLeod, 2007; Lippert, 2007; Beckett & Herbert, 2008). This literature examines how the entrepreneurial turn in urban governance involving the revitalization of city centers is often accompanied by programs in which "security, policing, the regulation of conduct, and moral ordering have become essential ingredients"

(Helms et al., 2007: 267). This coupling is firmly entrenched in the repertoire of advanced liberalism, yet much of the existing literature focuses on the UK or US experience. Beyond filling this geographic gap with a Canadian instance (see also Huey, Ericson, & Haggerty, 2005; Lippert, 2007; Sleiman & Lippert, 2010), PCC is an instructive case in the study of urban social regulation in how it aspires to bring together a whole range of previously unconnected municipal services including engineering, sanitation and hygiene, parking authorities, zoning and building codes, and the police along with private sector actors and citizens themselves into a wide-ranging disorder governing network within which a diverse set of technologies for managing disorder are deployed. Many of these technologies will be familiar to analysts of urban social regulation, but the instructiveness of PCC is not because of the comparatively few entirely new measures it introduced. PCC is an instructive case because of how it attempted to reinforce, expand, and link up a number of existing technologies for regulating disorder so that civility would emerge as naturally as possible from the urban milieu. As such, PCC is close to what Osborne and Rose theorizes as an urban diagram that seeks to "capture the forces immanent in the city, to identify them, order them, intensify some and weaken others, to retain the viability of the socializing forces immanent to urban agglomeration whilst civilizing their antagonisms" (Osborne & Rose, 1999: 738). Though this experiment in urban governance was cut short during the course of this research due to a wholesale shift in the composition of Vancouver city council in early 2009, the 28 months that PCC was official policy in Vancouver is

nevertheless significant as it exemplifies how the ongoing revitalization and gentrification of city centers is now accompanied by organized efforts to manage the inherited geographies of poverty and exclusion generated by previous rounds of development (Brenner & Theodore, 2002, 2005).

On another level this chapter is also interested in substantiating theoretical claims relevant to what Foucault and others have discussed as *Polizeiwissenschaft*, or the police science (Knemeyer, 1980; Foucault, 1991; Gordon, 1991; Pasquino, 1991; Valverde, 2003). Initially associated with the administrative city-states of 17th and 18th century Europe, the early modern idea of the police science refers to the proliferation of detailed and practical regulations by which authorities of the time sought to produce the 'well regulated city' rather than the craft of forensic investigation that emerged in the latter half of 19th century Britain. Early liberal philosophers problematized this rationality of governance when contemplating the proper limits of state power as it appeared to epitomize the dangers of state overreach (Knemeyer, 1980: 188-189). In doing so, the idea of the police science was soon minimized to the notion of secret policing spying on freeborn citizens, something that was wholly and inherently illiberal in nature and which had no place in the emerging liberal democracies of the age. In the process the entire edifice of the police science gained its current connotation with what are now regarded as authoritarian police states.

But this minimization reflects more the ideology of liberalism than its governmental practice. Even when the discourse of *laissez faire* has been at its greatest, political authorities in liberal states have retained a keen interest in maintaining order by regulating a host of mundane activities (Valverde, 2003: 236). This is most apparent today in the domain of urban governance, which is characterized primarily by practical concerns such as monitoring drinking establishments, providing waste management services, formulating and enforcing fire, zoning and building codes, and regulating mobilities in the name of public order. Project Civil City exemplifies these activities, and in doing so demonstrate how the governmental ambitions of the police science remains a fundamental if under acknowledged form of governance today.

Characterizing these detailed activities of governing as indicative of the persistence of the police science does not mean they are inherently illiberal, however, and therein lays the theoretical significance of this chapter. One of the important sub-themes of the governmentality literature is to analyze how different modalities of governance co-exist with one another. A common touchstone for this literature is Foucault's early discussion of governmentality in which he takes care to avoid the impression that his genealogy of political thought can be interpreted as the linear succession of one rationality to the next; for example, from sovereignty to discipline to government. "In reality," Foucault writes, "one has a triangle, sovereignty-discipline-government" (Foucault, 1991: 102). From this starting point various scholars have examined

how different rationalities of governance co-exist with one another as well as their relationship to sovereign and disciplinary power. Pratt (2001) for example examines immigration law in Canada, and contrary to those who point to the increasing actuarial nature of immigration law argues that this field remains "expansively and unapologetically sovereign" (Pratt, 2001: 49). Similarly, Lippert (2005) argues that the interpenetration of pastoral power and liberal governance can be found in the practice of sanctuary. The critical point in these analyses is avoiding reifying advanced liberalism – or any other form of liberalism – as the same sort of internally coherent and totalizing structure that envelopes all other governing logics of the kind that Foucault was perpetually suspicious of (Lippert, 2005: 6). Following the spirit of this approach, the key theoretical contribution of this paper is in demonstrating how the supposedly illiberal ideals of the *Polizeiwissenschaft* can be put into practice in ways that are broadly consistent with advanced liberal governance in order to realize the vision of the well regulated city.

Vancouver, a city 'beset by beggars and thieves'

Vancouver is regarded by urban geographers as "both distinctive and instructive" for developments in contemporary urbanism (Hutton, 2004: 1954). The city has evolved from its inception in 1886 as the terminal point of Canada's trans-national railroad and command center of British Columbia's hinterland economy into a key transportation, finance, and cultural center

within the network of cities that comprise the Pacific Rim. A crucial moment in Vancouver's turn towards the Pacific Rim was the 1986 World Exhibition, a provincially subsidized event intended to "advertise the amenities and economic opportunities of Vancouver and British Columbia to an international audience" (Ley, Hiebert, & Pratt, 1992: 255). By this measure the event was a resounding success as foreign direct investment in Vancouver, particularly from pre-transition Hong Kong, quickly increased and fueled a decades-long building boom that has reshaped the city's landscape (Olds, 1995; Hutton, 1998; Olds, 1998).

The 2010 Olympic Games were expected to continue this pattern of growth by accelerating inward investment and strengthening the city's international profile. At least three major infrastructural projects were timed to coincide with the 2010 Olympics as well countless smaller projects around the city.[1] The Games also provided the impetus for the development of Southeast False Creek, the final parcel of undeveloped land around False Creek, which was to be developed as a flagship community for sustainable urbanism for use during the Games as the athlete's village (Kear, 2007). But it was in the intangible domain of place branding where the most concerted activities were directed. In particular, the Olympics were envisioned as a vehicle for consolidating the city's global cache as a 'livable city.' Vancouver's economic plan for the

[1] These include a rail link to the airport, a new convention center in downtown Vancouver, and a multi-billion dollar upgrade to the Vancouver-Whistler highway, co-host of the 2010 Games.

Olympics states that the Games are an opportunity to “further our long-term objectives,” including to “foster civic pride and a greater sense of community in our residents, to create positive experiences and fond memories for our visitors, and to captivate the media though a festive environment, positive images and broad exposure to one of the most livable cities in the world” (COV, 2006a: 4-5).

Livability is, of course, a highly politicized term that means different things to different people at different times. In the 1960s the livable city movement in Vancouver (and other cities at the time) called for moderate, human-center growth where personal expression and spiritual fulfillment would be prioritized over naked capital accumulation. “Growth boosterism, the hallmark of Vancouver’s politics since the town’s inception in 1886, was to be replaced by the liberal notion of the ‘livable city,’ a landscape in harmony with human sensibility” (Ley, 1980: 239).

Livability remains central to Vancouver’s collective identity today, and city officials pride themselves on the fact that the city consistently ranks amongst the world’s most livable cities. However, the enthusiasm for livability now espoused in Vancouver is less an extension of the 1960s philosophy as it is a reflection of the civic wisdom expounded by publications such as *City Journal* and Richard Florida (2005) that cities only flourish in the post-industrial age if they are able to attract the young, highly educated, and mobile ‘creative class’

of workers needed to drive today's knowledge economy. Livability in this context is articulated not as a philosophical commitment to spiritual fulfillment but an instrumentalized discourse to attract and retain this critical mass. Doing so may be a boon for certain industries and their supporting networks, but others have pointed out that the rush to cater to the creative class by carving out signature districts (theater districts, gay districts, high technology districts, entertainment districts) and gentrify older neighborhoods often has detrimental displacement effects for low income individuals and families in these areas (Zukin, 1991; Peck, 2005).

This instrumentalized understanding of livability has been a key concept in Vancouver's growth over the recent three decades. In 1991 Vancouver adopted the *Central Area Plan*, which by virtue of consolidating the central business district and zoning some of Vancouver's key retail, tourism and recreational clusters (namely Gastown, Granville Island, and Yaletown) is recognized to have set the template for Vancouver's post-industrial geography that persists today (Hutton, 2004). It is telling that in the year Vancouver adopted the *Central Area Plan* the city had a larger proportion of its total experienced labor force – 78.1% – working in quaternary occupational sectors[2] than either of

---

[2] The quaternary occupational sector includes jobs in the professional, technical, managerial, and administrative fields that require significant education and training. They are characterized by decision-making powers and high levels of autonomy, and usually come with higher than average salaries and job security. Quaternary occupations are regarded as expressions of advanced economies (i.e., knowledge-based rather than manufacturing or industrial) (Ley, 1996: 83).

Canada's two largest cities, Toronto (74.3%) and Montreal (74.0%), and exceeded only by Ottawa (86.0%), the national capital (Hutton, 1998: 45). The 1991 Plan appealed to this occupational stratum with generous allocations of land for densified housing (condominiums and in-fills of older, smaller homes in established neighborhoods) and provisions for substantial civic investments in recreational, cultural and leisure facilities (Hutton, 2004). This version of livability remains central to Vancouver's economic development policies today. For example, the Vancouver Economic Development Commission's guiding principles state, "talent is increasingly mobile, drawn to cities that balance economic opportunity and quality of life. Quality of life is Vancouver's signature – the city consistency ranks in the top 3 cities in the world for quality of life. To attract and retain skilled workers and quality jobs, Vancouver will continue to make the city's quality of life a top priority" (VEDC, 2006: 3).

The 2010 Games were seen as an opportunity to showcase this livability to the world. But almost as soon as Vancouver won the 2010 Games concerns were raised that Vancouver would become known for quite a different set of characteristics. While featuring sweeping mountain vistas, waterfront cafés, Stanley Park, uber-hip shopping and residential districts, and easy access to world-class outdoor pursuits, Vancouver is also home to the Downtown Eastside (DTES). Historically the core of the city, the neighborhood is now an area of deeply impacted poverty where homelessness, drug and alcohol

addition, street prostitution, and the highest rate of HIV/AIDS infection of any North American city are part of daily life (Huey et al., 2005; Mopas, 2005). Outside of the DTES concerns that the aggressive panhandling, open drug use, and Vancouver's visible homeless population – the most recent estimate of which is approximately 2,600 homeless people in the greater Vancouver region (GVRSC, 2008: 9) – would dominate visitors' perceptions of the city over more carefully stylized characteristics (McCallum, Spencer, & Wyly, 2005).

This was of particular concern for Vancouver's business elite. The Vancouver Board of Trade has long been vocal in drawing attention to the city's 'disorder problem' as part of its wider campaign to maximize the economic opportunities of the city, and it stepped up this campaign once the Games were awarded to the city (Suborg, Van Wynsberghe, & Wyly, 2008). In 2006 the Board of Trade sent a letter to federal, provincial, and municipal leaders stating that Vancouver was "in the grip of an urban malignancy manifested by an open drug market, rising property crime, aggressive panhandling and a visible, growing population of the homeless" culminating in "a street environment that is slowly but surely deteriorating." "These concerns," the letter warns, "are shared not only among the business community, but also by residents and even by many foreign tourists, so much so that families are increasingly avoiding our downtown area and international travel planners are beginning to recommend that Vancouver be avoided as a travel and convention destination"

(Vancouver Board of Trade, 2006).[3] A second letter from the Board of Trade on behalf of the same complex of signatories cautions that Vancouver was a city "beset by beggars and thieves" that were "certain to be noted by the international media [during the 2010 Olympics] and will be one of the lasting legacies reflecting on Vancouver, British Columbia and Canada's reputation" (Vancouver Board of Trade, 2007). Events soon to follow reinforced the Board's concerns. In 2008 former US network news anchor Dan Rather released a documentary about Vancouver in which he marvels at the contrast between an "urban landscape studded with snow-capped mountains [and] multimillion-dollar condos cradling a downtown that is home to one of the worst urban blights in North America." And soon after this *The Economist* (2008) ranked Vancouver as the most livable city in the world with full marks on all indices but one: the prevalence of petty street crime and visible homelessness.

Addressing the street-level manifestations of social inequality in Vancouver thus became a critical issue in the years leading up to the 2010 Olympics, particularly amongst the city's economic elite who regarded this inequality as a drag on the showcasing potential of the 2010 Games. The Non-Partisan

[3] Signatories to this letter include Tourism Vancouver, the Downtown Vancouver Business Improvement Association, the Vancouver Hotel Association, the Vancouver Taxi Association, Retail BC, the Downtown Vancouver Association, the Vancouver Hotel General Managers' Association, the Building Owners and Managers Association of BC, the Council of Tourism Associations, the BC Restaurant and Foodservices Association, and the BC and Yukon Hotel Association.

Association (NPA), Vancouver's historically pro-growth and pro-business municipal party (Ley, 1980), was instrumental in politicizing these concerns. In 2006 the NPA, which enjoyed a Council majority at the time, held the Mayoral Roundtable Discussions on Public Disorder and Homelessness, a series of consultations with community groups and businesses. Spearheaded by Mayor Sam Sullivan and NPA Councilor Kim Capri, at least 75 different organizations took part in these meetings including the Vancouver Board of Trade, various commerce associations, business improvement districts, housing, poverty, and social justice advocacy groups, churches, community policing offices, community associations, labor groups, a handful of individual banks and insurance companies, and academics from the Simon Fraser University School of Criminology. These consultations were supplemented with the results of a self-described "unscientific" (COV, 2006c: 3) survey of Vancouver residents, which indexed perceptions of disorder and collected suggestions for action.[4]

It was through these consultations the four main targets of PCC and a number of its recommendations put forth for the first time. With popular legitimacy apparently established through this processes, Project Civil City was announced at a splashy news conference in November 2006. With the Mayor proclaiming that the city has let "unacceptable behavior become acceptable", PCC was unveiled as a way to "clean up" the city and ensure that "Vancouver

[4] The survey was voluntary and accessible only online.

remains one of the best cities in the world to live, work, visit, play and invest" (COV, 2006c: 7; Sullivan, 2006b; Ward, 2006a).[5] The Vancouver Board of Trade and a collective of Vancouver's eighteen business improvement associations immediately applauded the initiative, and despite opposition from some councilors and local poverty advocacy groups the NPA-dominated council majority adopted PCC on November 27th 2006.

Governing disorder from a distance

Contrary to popular perception in Vancouver, Project Civil City did not create any distinctly new legal powers to be enforced by local authorities. Canadian cities exist as entities created by provincial law rather than constitutionally mandated tiers of government, and consequently have a comparatively narrow repertoire of powers available to them (Levi & Valverde, 2006). Canadian cities cannot, for example, enact criminal law. As mentioned above, the core of PCC is in setting the 50% reduction targets for homelessness, aggressive panhandling, and the open-air use and trade of drugs. How it seeks to achieve these reductions is by arranging the activities of others – notably existing city services, business improvement districts, and citizens themselves – to regulate

---

[5] The phrase "live, work, play, and invest" is a marketing slogan that appears in numerous promotional materials associated with the 2010 Games. It is also included in short, pre-recorded pitches spoken by celebrities and prominent Canadians extolling the virtues of Vancouver played to crowds waiting in security lines and staging points while entering venues during the 2010 Games. It is a revealing phrase that brings together the main themes of Vancouver's postindustrial development.

disorder on their own account. Higher levels of government are to be lobbied when solutions do not already exist in areas such as drug policy, criminal law, low-income housing, and public health, or imported from afar via the transfer of best practices from cities such as Seattle or New York, but the bulk of the work done by PCC is in the unification, coordination, and realignment of existing potential.

As such, PCC governs in the quintessentially liberal way. Rather than acting directly upon disorderly conduct with civilizing agents that might resonate with dystopic visions of authoritarian regimes, PCC governs from a distance "by arranging the activities and calculations of a proliferation of independent agents [and the] forging of alliances" (Rose & Miller, 1992: 180). This aim creates a need for specialists in inter-agency relationships characterized by their "interstitial role and its interdisciplinary skills" (Garland, 1996: 455). In the context of PCC this "strange new specialism" (Garland, 1996: 455) was fulfilled by the PCC Implementation Office (PCC-IO) and PCC Commissioner, Vancouver's version of what Coleman describes in the UK context as "highly-paid anti-social behavior 'czars'" (Coleman, 2005: 136). The institutional role of the PCC Commissioner is to steer this disorder governing apparatus by facilitating working relationships between city departments, other levels of government, and private sector partners, identify problems and solutions, encourage others to undertake concrete action, and monitor outputs (Crawford, 2006). In May 2007 the former provincial

Attorney General Geoff Plant was appointed to this role, a choice that was undoubtedly influenced by the stock of interpersonal political capital and familiarity with government intricacies he could bring to this 'strange new specialism.' Reflecting the emphasis on joined-up action inherent to governing at a distance, Plant describes his official role in various city reports as that of a convener, catalyst, collaborator, and facilitator, acting to "help those who have direct responsibility for services and programs to do their job more effectively" by "bridging jurisdictional boundaries, engaging directly and collaboratively with community stakeholders, advocating for new approaches where appropriate, and monitoring progress (COV, 2007d: 2). Elsewhere, Plant simply describes his role as "hard-wiring quality of life into the city's mission and work" (Plant, 2009: 1).

At the public unveiling of Project Civil City Mayor Sullivan proclaimed that "what gets measured gets done" (Sullivan, 2006b), and much of what the PCC does reflects this evidence-based orientation. The first action planned to occur under PCC was a benchmark analysis of the levels of aggressive panhandling, open drug sales and use, and homelessness in the city. In addition to rendering these issues knowable and actionable, statistics are also crucial in monitoring the progress of others (Crawford, 2006: 453). Towards this end the PCC-IO was plugged into a whole range of statistical circuits including DTES monitoring reports, information collected under existing governmental agreements (such as the Vancouver Agreement and Four Pillars drug strategy),

municipal housing and building inspection reports, engineering and planning services databases, criminal justice statistics, health services, and EMS data. "All of this information will be utilized to monitor and evaluate progress towards achieving the PCC goals," states one PCC report (COV, 2007d: 11-12). The PCC-IO was thus envisioned as a center of calculation where statistical knowledge of the disorder problem is "transported from far and wide and accumulated in a central locale, where they can be aggregated, compared, compiled and the subject of calculation" (Rose, 1999: 211).

Yet at the same time that PCC emphasizes the role of evidence-based policy it also slips into an intuitive and qualitative confirmation of 'what works' in reducing disorder. For example, a street cleaning project in immediate vicinity of Main and Hastings in the DTES concludes that while it was impossible to determine a statistical relationship between increased street cleaning and feelings of public safety, "qualitatively it was confirmed that there is a direct relationship" (COV, 2006b: 8). This orientation was also expressed in an interview with the Downtown Vancouver Business Association's Director of Security, a former city police officer and vocal supporter of PCC, who said,

> After 30 years of policing I can tell you that if there's a dirty mess in the lane that there will be drug-related behavior. That's just the way it is. But if you clean it up and remove that stuff and open up sight lines you can design out crime.

This exemplifies how PCC relies on both 'high' knowledge derived from statistical knowledge and the craft-like expertise of those on the streets that is gained and validated through intuition (Valverde, 2003).

Tactics and authorities for governing disorder

PCC eschews abstract or systematic thought about Vancouver's social problems in favor of enumerating problematic areas, activities, and potential solutions. This epistemological orientation is characteristic of the police science, which relies on "long lists of heterogeneous, unprioritized problems and situations (Valverde, 2003: 246). Beyond the mainstay issues of homelessness, aggressive panhandling, and the open-air trade and use of drugs, a raft of issues such as bedbugs in the DTES, garbage in alleyways from 'dumpster divers,' litter, graffiti, bike theft, theft from vehicles, stolen vehicles, off-leash dogs, late-night noise, fights, and public urination around the Granville Entertainment District, and the drug trade at particular downtown intersections are listed as problematic. The recommendations for action are an equally diverse set of tactics for promoting civility and governing disorder: over 54 recommendations are put forth in the inaugural PCC report and elaborated into 75 recommendations in the first progress report. Approximately one-third of these involve lobbying the provincial and federal governments for policy changes in areas such as federal drug policy, mental health services, criminal law, and housing. Specific recommendations of this sort include the continuation of a supervised safe injection site in the DTES, advocating for

national return warrants,[6] changes to provincial law allowing police to approve criminal charges without review by the Crown, greater provincial funding for low-income housing, emergency shelters, and addiction services, more money for police and social workers, and affirming the commitments of all levels of government to the existing Four Pillars Drug Strategy and the Vancouver Agreement.[7]

The balance of the recommendations put forth in PCC consists of much more immediate and pragmatic actions akin to “the best method of carrying dirt out of the streets” (Valverde, 2003: 246). These tactics include encouraging business owners to lock or remove dumpsters to prevent problems associated with binning, improving the enforceability of municipal tickets by linking them to municipal and provincial databases (such as vehicle licensing), adopting ‘no sit/no lie’ municipal bylaws to complement those already dealing with

---

[6] The Vancouver Police Department and City Hall have for many years been lobbying higher levels of government for the use of national return warrants. These warrants enable persons found in one jurisdiction and under warrant in another to be transferred at the expense of the jurisdiction of warrant. Current practice is that the arresting jurisdiction must pay for the escorted return. The Vancouver Police Department estimates that Vancouver has over 2,500 individuals wanted on warrants issued elsewhere in the country. As of the time of this writing the federal government has not made any changes, but the Vancouver Board of Trade collects Air Miles from members and donates them to the VPD so they may be used to return such individuals (Fong, 2008).

[7] The Four Pillars Drug Strategy is a strategy to address the drug problem in Vancouver and the DTES. The ‘four pillars’ refers to equal emphasis on prevention, treatment, harm reduction, and enforcement. The Vancouver Agreement is a strategy to address homelessness and poverty in the DTES. Both agreements are partnerships between all three levels of government, health authorities, police, and local organizations.

camping and sidewalk vending, encouraging the police department to enforce the province's existing *Safe Streets Act* and *Trespass Act* pertaining to aggressive panhandling and private property, encouraging the speedy removal of graffiti, improving lighting in problem areas, redesigning problem corners and laneways, providing more public toilets downtown, reducing the risk of vehicle theft in downtown parking lots, expanding 'bait' cars and bikes, exploring the possibility to CCTV use "to deter public disorder and support our police in the capturing of individuals breaking the law" (COV, 2007c: 25-26), or rezoning back lanes to allow for patios and rear-facing storefronts "in a more European way" (COV, 2006c: 11).

Though rarely stated as explicitly, the majority of these tactics for 'carrying dirt out of the streets' operationalize two closely related criminological theories: broken windows and situational crime prevention. The broken windows argument asserts that the proliferation of small transgressions signifies a lack of social control and that further, more serious acts will be of little consequence (Wilson & Kelling, 1982). Given this up-tending cycle, the attention of police should thus be directed at checking small-scale transgressions – the first broken window – before they lead to more serious crimes and eventually fear, apathy, and the atomization of neighborhoods. Situational crime prevention focuses on how changes to the built environment

reduce opportunities for crime.[8] The common denominator amongst these 'common sense' approaches to crime is the implicit understanding that the urban environment emits signals regarding safety and vulnerability to potential offenders and authorized users alike, and that manipulating these signals can produce desired effects; namely, reducing disorder and crime (Beckett & Herbert, 2008). The remainder of this chapter shows how these criminological theories are put into practice through three different projects initiated or expanded under *Project Civil City*: the Carrall Street Greenway Project, the Downtown Ambassadors, and the Granville Street Entertainment District.

Carrall Street Greenway

The origins of the Carrall Street Greenway project predate PCC, but it is precisely the type of initiative that PCC sought to reinforce. Carrall Street runs north to south in the transition zone between the growing affluence of Gastown and Victory Square to the west and the dire poverty of the DTES. The Greenway project is beautification scheme involving narrowing the 6-block length of Carrall in favor of wider sidewalks and bicycle lanes, restoring the street's historic cobblestone paving, introducing more trees and shrubs, improving lighting, and zoning changes allowing street-facing patios, cafes,

[8] Situational crime prevention is also known by the more popular phrase 'crime prevention through environmental design' (CPTED), though the difference between the two is negligible (Herbert and Brown 2006: 762). The two could be used interchangeably, but for the sake of consistency I use situational crime prevention.

and small-scale performance spaces. These design changes are intended to reduce opportunities for crime while the zoning changes are intended to "enhance pedestrian presence and street vibrancy" by attracting strollers and patrons to the revitalized area, which is presumed to increase interpersonal surveillance and "make the street safer" (COV, 2007c: 4).

The project also involves the redesign of two existing city parks: Maple Leaf Square and Pigeon Park. Modifications to Maple Leaf Square are minimal but changes to Pigeon Park are substantial and described as "pivotal" to the entire project (Vancouver Parks and Recreation, 2009: 2). Occupying a triangular slice of land at the northwest corner of Hastings and Carrall, Pigeon Park is a popular location for neighborhood residents to sell small goods displayed on the sidewalk, local hangout for residents, and overnight bedroom for some. The park itself, which is mostly concrete but shaded by at least 6 large trees, is often lamented in the media for being strewn with refuse, trash, needles, carts full of scavenged goods, and populated mainly by neighborhood denizens that chase away other users. The northwest border of the park is the wall of an adjacent building covered with graffiti, memorials, a large mural, and other artwork by local residents. The park is, by certain standards, a criminogenic space, though it is a crucial mixing ground for the neighborhood.

Changes slated for completion in the summer of 2009 as part of the Greenway project include the installation of additional lighting, a self-cleaning toilet, a

new water fountain, new benches and tree planters, repainting all surfaces, and re-installing the streetcar tracks that first cut the triangular park from the surrounding street grid (Vancouver Parks and Recreation, 2009). Sitting surfaces, both formal (benches) and informal (tree planters with rounded edges) are to be maintained but long, flat surfaces (suitable for sleeping) are to be minimized. High-powered night lighting was initially considered but dropped from the final plan in favor of regular lighting. Certain bushes are to be removed that were deemed to provide shelter for drug transactions or used as toilets. Having been determined undesirable, the wall of graffiti art backing Pigeon Park was painted over. Reflecting the working assumption that the built environment emits signals regarding appropriate usage, a police spokesperson reports that doing so "has had a positive effect of not providing an environment that reflects lawlessness and discourages the criminal element from congregating" (quoted in Sifton, 2009).

An aggressive campaign to enforce municipal bylaws in the neighborhood accompanied these design modifications. This resulted in a dramatic increase in the number of tickets issued for infractions such as jaywalking, loitering, camping, trespassing, and even spitting: in 2008 439 tickets for bylaw infractions were issued in the DTES, a sharp increase from the 247 tickets issued in 2007 in the DTES (Bellett, 2007; Howell, 2009a). The VPD acknowledges that most individuals ticketed in the DTES cannot afford to pay these tickets and have publicly stated that collecting these fines is not

important. The reason for issuing these tickets, according to the officer who wrote a report on the 'New York model' of policing for Vancouver (Lemcke, 2007), is to "change behavior – to get people to stop doing certain things" (quoted in Howell, 2009b) by using the issuance of a ticket as a teachable moment to communicate what is tolerated in the area. It is also an opportunity to check identification and search for illegal items or outstanding warrants. The same officer quoted above cites a case where an individual wanted on warrants in Montreal for sex crimes was identified after being ticketed for not wearing a bicycle helmet in support of the department's ticketing practices.

The brick-by-brick rebuilding of Vancouver along the lines of the Carrall Street Greenway is beyond of the scope of any governmental effort. Nonetheless, this project exemplifies how PCC envisions different city services including sanitation, zoning, policing, parks and recreation, and planning can be complementarily arranged so as to effect maximum reductions in disorder writ small to a number of city blocks. Project Civil City also recommends that city officials work towards building a "new public order enforcement continuum" (COV, 2006c: 8) where all city residents are mobilized as extended 'eyes and ears' of the police. An integral part of this continuum is the Downtown Ambassadors, which will be turned to next.

Downtown Ambassadors

Vancouver has 18 business improvement associations (BIAs). Like most BIAs across North America, they provide supplementary services within a defined territory that are funded by levies paid by each member. These services can include street beautification, garbage removal, place promotion, and, for the larger ones, security patrols. The role of PCC in relation to the city's BIAs is to strengthen the services they already provide by facilitating cooperation amongst the BIAs, advocate on their behalf for additional funding, or assist in developing new programs modeled on the successes of BIAs in other cities. Some of the programs that the PCC Commissioner has championed include *Keep Vancouver Spectacular*, a combined effort between BIAs, community associations, volunteers, school groups, and the city to engage in monthly neighborhood clean-up campaigns, and *Adopt-a-Block*, a neighborhood crime prevention program. Both initiatives are based on comparable projects developed in Seattle, regarded by some as a "pioneer in the development of new techniques of urban social control" (Beckett & Herbert, 2008: 10).

The most prominent and contentious public-private partnership championed by PCC is the Downtown Ambassadors, the supplemental hospitality and security initiative of the Downtown Vancouver Business Improvement Association

(DVBIA).[9] The program consists of uniformed security guards – the Ambassadors – who patrol the streets of the DVBIA, often in pairs, with the twin mandate of providing 'street concierge' services to visitors and acting as extended 'eyes and ears' for the police.[10] The program consists of sixteen Ambassadors, four shift supervisors, and one Program Director providing patrols between 7:00am to 10:30pm daily year round within the DVBIA. The program is funded entirely by the DVBIA with an annual budget of approximately $700,000 CAN, and up to 10 Ambassadors can be found on the streets of the DVBIA during peak hours. According to the DVBIA Security Director, a former VPD officer and major contributor to the program's current structure, the Ambassadors maintain a 50-40-10 split between security, hospitality, and administrative functions respectively, but informal discussions with individual Ambassadors reveal security functions to make up two-thirds or more of their daily routines in the form of moving along panhandlers, tracking known offenders, monitoring problem areas (i.e., high-theft car lots), notifying business owners of graffiti, garbage, or other site-specific concerns, and liaising with police (Huey et al., 2005; Sleiman & Lippert, 2010).

---

[9] The DVBIA is Vancouver's largest BIA. Its territory extends, roughly, from the stadium complex and Gastown in the east to the residential West End and from the waterfront south to the Granville Bridge. This territory includes most of the city's central business district, many of the city's top tourist attractions, theater venues, major shopping centers, the cruise ship terminal, and the Granville Entertainment District.

[10] Individual Ambassadors are employed directly by the private firm Genesis Security, which is contracted by the DVBIA to provide the service.

In other words, much of the day-to-day routine of the Ambassadors consists of monitoring and indexing different forms of disorder so that it can be acted upon. In recent years this security function has been deliberately made more visible through changes to the uniform worn by the Ambassadors so as to signal effective guardianship, deter offenders, and reassure the public. The uniform initially consisted of red golf shirts, black slacks, and porter-style caps with the 'Downtown Ambassadors' trademark emblazoned on the caps and shirts. These uniforms were visible, but not in a way that reinforced an image of authority. The DVBIA Security Director remarked in an interview (with notable sarcasm) that these uniforms were "too soft, walking around with colorful umbrellas and stuff like that. And the hats... that works for most people, but there's a small group of people that that doesn't work for." Arguably, it is this small group of people that the Ambassadors wish to impress most with an image of authority. Towards that end the new uniform takes on a noticeably more para-police image with heavy boots, flashlights and radios attached to thick belts, utility vests, cargo pants, and a large 'Genesis Security' patch on the shoulder. This uniform clearly tries to tip the image of the Ambassadors away from the friendlier image of the street concierge towards a tougher image of security. "We like the edge that it gives," says the Security Director. As part of the publicly funded expansion of the Ambassadors (discussed below) the Ambassadors also patrol the Granville Entertainment District at night. With this deployment all signs of hospitality are done away with entirely in favor of noticeable larger security guards, black

jackets, gloves, and cargo pants, and orange safety vests. In addition to the new uniforms the program also leases a black Hummer with the Genesis logo displayed across the side as a supervisory vehicle, the choice of which undoubtedly contributes to the program's new visual edge.

In early 2007, just months after PCC was adopted, the West End, Yaletown, and South Granville BIAs entered into service agreements with the DVBIA to have the Ambassadors operate in their territories as well,[11] thus extending the program's coverage to most of the downtown peninsula with the exception of the Robson Street and Gastown BIAs.[12] Project Civil City directly contributed to the further expansion of the program by recommending that it be eligible to receive public funding on that basis that it "has proven to be a successful model of providing uniformed staff on Vancouver's downtown streets during the busy tourist season" (COV, 2006c). In mid-2007 the DVBIA presented a cost-sharing proposal to City Council asking for close to $750,000 to expand

---

[11] The name and likeness of the Downtown Ambassadors are trademarked to the DVBIA, thus preventing these surrounding BIAs or any other from launching their own freestanding Ambassador program without paying fees to the DVBIA. The DVBIA has threatened to sue other Vancouver BIAs if they start up an Ambassador-like program, leading to acrimonious relationships between the DVBIA and some smaller BIAs.

[12] The Yaletown BIA has two Ambassadors seven days a week year round. They are on the street for 8 hours a day, 9:00am to 5:50pm. The South Granville BIA has one Ambassador on the street for 12 hours a day year round, from 8:30am to 8:30pm. The West End BIA has two Ambassadors seven days a week year round. They are on the street for 8 hours a day, 9:00am to 5:30pm. The Gastown and Robson BIA contract security services from other companies.

the program to 24-hour coverage within the DVBIA (~$240,000) and to bring the program to smaller BIAs that cannot afford the trademark fees and administrative overhead of hiring the Ambassadors on their own (~$500,000). Though significant opposition was voiced by legal observers (Pivot Legal Society, 2008), the VPD, and some city councilors, the funding proposed was approved following the logic that "an investment in visible security, including in the business areas frequented by visitors to the city, is not just an investment in security, it is an investment in the economy of the city" (COV, 2007b: 9), reflecting how the fostering security-related initiatives is an integral part of the entrepreneurial turn in urban governance.

The Granville Entertainment District

One of the problematic spaces singled out by PCC is the Granville Entertainment District, a three-block stretch of Granville Street south of Robson. Once a thriving commercial corridor, the area experienced significant decline in the 1970s and 1980s and became populated by gritty hotels, pawnshops, homeless people, and the center of a swift drug market to the point that one journalist referred to it as Vancouver's "heart of darkness" (Cox, 1987). The area was rezoned as a pedestrian mall in the early 1980s as a way to compete with a newly constructed indoor mall nearby. Revitalization remained slow and difficult, so in 1997 the stretch was designated in city planning documents as the 'Theater Row Entertainment District' and zoned for higher

densities of liquor-licensed seats (Lees, 1998; Garr, 2007). The number of drinking establishments swiftly increased: prior to the 1997 designation the strip had 1,175 licensed seats, which grew to over 6,700 in 2007 (COV, 2007a: 3). This revitalization effort has predictably generated its own problems. As the Entertainment District has become a popular nighttime destination for young people throughout the lower mainland it has also become a chief problem area for the VPD where assaults, gang-related activity, high levels of noise, drinking, vandalism, and alcohol-fueled mayhem are weekly routines. Young women regularly expressed concern that tightly packed, anonymous, and intoxicated crowds were conducive to unwanted groping by male patrons. A key aim of PCC is thus to manage this "ticking time bomb" as some have described it (Eustace, 2007).

The regulation of the Granville Entertainment District relies less on regulating individuals directly as it does on arranging time and space so that opportunities for disorder are minimized (cf. Berkley & Thayer, 2000). This is most apparent in a number of modifications to the built environment along the strip in recent years. For example, flat, closely grouped benches that once offered an easy place to congregate or lie down have been reduced in number, spaced further apart, and refurbished with protruding armrests comfortable only for sitting ("prickly space," Flusty would call it [in Coaffee, 2003: 41]). Permanent metal bollards now line the lower blocks of the strip to prevent vehicles from incurring upon the sidewalk. A dedicated and well-publicized taxi stand has

been established near one of the major cross-streets to assist in clearing out patrons after closing, and the taxi authority reminds drivers of their legal obligation to accept all fares, not just the more lucrative short hops. Changes to public transit serving the area were also proposed, which combined with the taxi stand are intended to make it easier to clear the area after closing.

These tactics for managing the ebb and flow of people have been accompanied by the creation of a new police squad to deal specifically with the Entertainment District. Before 2007 the area was not operationally distinct from the rest of downtown; police responded to calls on Granville as they would elsewhere in the district, which meant that officers became occupied with making arrests, locating witnesses, and filing paperwork for incidents that had already occurred. This consumed an inordinate amount of resources and left other areas of the core under-serviced. Over two long weekends in the summer of 2007 the VPD experimented with an alternative approach by closing the three-block strip to vehicle traffic and deploying 16 regular officers and 7 traffic enforcement officers at the closed ends of the strip. Known officially as the LIMA squad ('lima' being the phonetic pronunciation of the letter 'L,' in turn standing for 'liquor' in this context) and referred to colloquially by police as the 'party zone,' this experiment represents an attempt to shift the regulation of the Entertainment District from reactive law enforcement to proactive public safety. Ticketing and powers of arrest remain options for officers when needed, but on the whole the emphasis is on

preempting problems before they occur by maintaining a highly visible and interactive presence. The officer in charge of the VPD's Emergency and Operational Planning Unit that oversees the LIMA squad explained this approach in an interview:

> We encourage our members to engage the crowds as well, to do what we call the meet-and-greet, so say hi, how are you tonight, that sort of thing, because that verbalization increases the visibility. Sometime the fluorescent vests will wash over but if they engage in even a short one-sentence conversation then it imprints it in them that ya, the police are here and things should be ok. Deterrence is a portion of it but the majority of it is public reassurance.

These road closures and increase police presence have been credited with reducing late-night disorder and increasing feelings of safety amongst female patrons by reducing sidewalk congestion, increasing positive police and patron interaction, and opening up sight lines. In a statement blending Foucault's arguments regarding the individualizing and normalizing power of surveillance with Le Bon's social psychology of crowds, a police report on the street closures stresses the importance of these tactics in disaggregating the potentially unruly crowds in Granville:

> Behavioral issues associated with contagion, invincibility, and anonymity are reduced when people know they can be seen by, and cannot readily hide or escape from, police. The open street allowed this to occur. This deterred and reduced violent and crowd mentality behavior (COV, 2007a: 10).

Based on these successful test weekends and the potential for this model to contribute to the goals of PCC, the LIMA squad has become permanent for all weekends between May and September and non-routine weekends during the

rest of the year (i.e., during a high profile NHL game or New Year's Eve) funded by a business tax proportional to an establishment's liquor license.

The Granville Entertainment District is also the latest candidate for open-street CCTV in Vancouver. The first attempt to introduce CCTV cameras to public space in Vancouver was in 1999 when the VPD proposed installing 16 cameras in the DTES to monitor the drug and sex trade, but this proposal was dropped after encountering significant and unexpected community opposition (Haggerty, Huey, & Ericson, 2008). In 2006 a second proposal came before the police board to introduce CCTV, this time in the Entertainment District. Instead of playing up metaphors of urban decay and victimization as in the first attempt, this attempt cites extensive nighttime foot traffic, large numbers of liquor seats, high call loads, officer safety, times of high civil unrest (the 1994 Stanley Cup Riot and the 2002 Guns & Roses riot are specifically cited), their utility during the heightened security environment of the 2010 Olympic Games, and their potential counter-terrorism applications as justification for the cameras (VPB, 2006: 3). This proposal also distanced itself from the earlier CCTV plan by making clear that "the cameras would not be focused on the DTES" (VPB, 2006: 3). The second research report on the issue also included the endorsement of a senior UK police constable who states that the Entertainment District is "exactly the kind of area where we would install CCTV in England" (Sullivan, 2006a).

The proposal initially planned to have ‘Phase One’ operational sometime in 2008. However, no further discussion of the matter came before the police board after the initial proposal, leaving privacy advocates unsure of what occurred (Huey, 2009). In hindsight, however, it appears that the VPD may have been aware of developments occurring elsewhere. In October 2008 the provincial government announced $1 million CAN to fund video surveillance pilot projects in Kelowna, Surrey, and Vancouver, of which Vancouver received approximately half (BC, 2008). Over $2 million CAN was made available to the city by the Integrated Security Unit for cameras to monitor locations in the urban domain during the Games. This came before city council in early 2009 in which Vancouver’s Office of Emergency Management (OEM) asked council to accept this funding in order to ensure “effective emergency management in key areas” during the Games (COV, 2009). Though these monitoring capabilities were described as temporary, critics were quick to note that funds from the province were marked for a permanent control room in the city’s emergency management center, which confirmed for many that at least some cameras would be retained. This was confirmed in conversation with the Director of the OEM, who stated that the city would indeed be keeping the 70-odd cameras after the Games. Though plans for these cameras include mobile monitoring capabilities for the city’s annual Festival of Lights, other large-scale gatherings, and public emergencies, official interest having cameras in the Entertainment District remains high. Indeed, the VPD expressed their interest in being consulted on the future use of the cameras almost as soon as

the Paralympic Games concluded in March 2010 (Lupick, 2010). Given this long-standing official interest and the lack of coordinated community opposition to the idea, the implementation of cameras in the Entertainment District may be a matter of time (Huey, 2009).

Redefining Success

Project Civil City came to an effective end in December 2008 after Gregor Robertson and a slate of center-left candidates swept 11 of 12 incumbent NPA councilors from office. Robertson, whose campaign platform included promises to dismantle PCC, announced soon after taking office that he would not renew the city's contract with Geoff Plant in February 2009, thus ending PCC at that time. While many factors contributed to this outcome, this local landslide was precipitated in large part by seismic shifts in the global credit market in late 2008. One consequence of these developments was the bankruptcy of the New York investment bank funding construction of the 2010 athlete's village. Having made contractual commitments to VANOC to ensure the project's completion by November 1st 2009, the city requested that the province amend the *Vancouver Charter* so that it could borrow and lend beyond existing statutory powers (Mason, 2009). The request was approved, and in what was initially a secret transaction the NPA-dominated council extended $100 million CAD in cash and guarantees to the project developers. When news of the loan was made public through leaked council documents

just weeks prior to the election date, widespread outrage was registered at the voting booth with the removal of almost all of the NPA representatives that had dominated city council. This sweep from power is the latest instance in a pattern spanning at least two decades in which the political fortunes of the NPA are tied to the ebb and flow of market cycles that are increasingly trans-national in reach (Ley, 1980).

Before concluding it is worthwhile to reflect on the comments offered by Geoff Plant upon the termination of Project Civil City as they resonate with Garland's (1996) discussion of the contemporary politics of crime control. In Garland's assessment, the acceptance of high crime rates as a 'normal social fact' encourages criminal justice organizations to "seek to be evaluated by reference to internal goals, over which they have near total control, rather than by reference to social goals such as reducing crime rates, catching criminals or reforming inmates, all of which involve too many contingencies and uncertainties" (Garland, 1996: 458). This is precisely the argument that Plant extended upon the termination of PCC in February 2009. In his estimation, the 50% reduction targets initially put forth in PCC were unattainable because the targeted behaviors are "complex and somewhat intractable social phenomena, and therefore are affected by many variables and inputs." This is further compounded by the quantitative difficulties in determining "the relationship of PCC activities to any changes in the incidence of the activities" (Plant, 2008: 15). In light of these challenges Plant recommends that the success of his

tenure as PCC Commissioner be "evaluated as to how the project positioned itself and pursued its work," including his role as a "high profile champion of particular issues that require an increased in attention, collaboration, understanding, and unity across government and organizations" (2008: 15). Such comments reflect a significant retreat from the ambitious 50% reduction targets in favor of defining success in a process-oriented way. This shift can be tracked across the progress reports produced by the PCC Commissioner as they move away from quantitative indicators of progress towards emphasizing "what the organization *does*, rather than what, if anything, it *achieves*" (Garland, 1996: 458). Plant's comments might be interpreted as an effort to have his work as the PCC Commissioner evaluated in a way that shines a more favorable light on him, yet they should also be regarded as an instance of a wider shift in governmental attitudes warning against the futility of overreach and suggesting a more modest remit consistent with maximizing bureaucratic efficiency and cost effectiveness over substantive change.

CONCLUSION

The wider significance of Project Civil City is two-fold. First, PCC exemplifies how the task of disorder management is being pursued through much more comprehensive and far-reaching programs of governance. Scholars of urban regulation have typically focused on the adoption of singular tactics of disorder management such as CCTV or legal tools for regulating street

activities. PCC includes these elements and many more, some of which existed but were underdeveloped and some that were "borrowed from distant urban experiences" (Lippert, 2007: 29), and attempted to weave these tactics into a disorder-governing network in order to stave off a disorderly decline into economic ruin. These efforts were ultimately cut short due to local politics, which reminds us that governance is a perpetually failing endeavour and, more practically, precluded the possibility of assessing the impact of PCC on street disorder in the immediate run-up to the Games in February 2010. Nevertheless, this blueprint for governing disorder is a suggestive instance of the "trial-and-error searching process" in which a variety of institutional strategies are being "mobilized in place-specific forms and combinations in order to confront some of the many regulatory problems that have afflicted advanced capitalist cities during the post-1970s period" (Brenner & Theodore, 2002: 375). Project Civil City is an instance of this process, an experiment in urban regulation that employed the discourse of livability and the technologies of situational crime prevention and broken windows in support of bolstering Vancouver's image "as an area both for market-oriented economic growth and for elite consumption practices" (Brenner & Theodore, 2002: 368).

It should be emphasized that PCC did not 'criminalize poverty' as was often claimed by activist groups in Vancouver. To the contrary, recommendations to increase federal and provincial funding for housing and mental health services or to extend the exemption of the city's safe injection site from criminal law

could have had constructive outcomes had PCC not been prematurely abandoned. Nevertheless, the reliance of PCC on the 'common sense' criminologies of situational crime prevention and broken windows suggests that PCC would have done little about the wider origins of inequality in Vancouver. The thesis that smaller disorders precipitate more serious crimes contained in the broken windows approach in particular has been criticized at length for being theoretically and empirically unsound while providing a veneer of empirical support for officers to get back to 'kick ass' police work, the brunt of which is often borne by those already marginalized (Erzen, 2001; Harcourt, 2001). Similarly, situational crime prevention may control the spatial distribution of disorder but cannot alleviate the conditions under which it is produced (Beckett & Herbert, 2008).

Nevertheless, municipal governments easily instrumentalize these approaches as they suggest a range of tactics that are commensurate with the narrow repertoire of powers available to cities. The discretionary margin afforded by the broken windows thesis, for example, to regulate a wide range of behaviors that are not illegal *per se* but presumed to invite more serious crime dovetails with the broad definition of disorder contained in PCC. Likewise, situational crime prevention invites modifications to the built environment of the sort exemplified by the Carrall Street Greenway that now demarcates the affluence of downtown Vancouver from the dire poverty of the DTES. Given that these families of tactics may only control the geography of disorder in Vancouver

rather than its causes, PCC is close to what Brenner and Theodore describe as a flanking mechanism "through which to insulate powerful economic actors from the manifold failures of the market, the state, and governance that are persistently generated within a neoliberal political framework" (Brenner & Theodore, 2002: 374).

Project Civil City also underscores how the ideals of the *Polizeiwissenschaft* persist and are reinforced by the ambitions of municipalities to regulate broad categories of social behavior. To reiterate the point raised at the outset of this chapter, the police science was problematized by early liberal thinkers as typifying the dangers of state power to seek to regulate all aspects of society. According to conventional political analyses this mode of governing was merely a stepping-stone in the emergence of liberalism. However, others argue that the contradiction between liberalism and the police science can only be maintained if the police science is regarded in the ideological way that early liberal thinkers projected (Novak, 1996; Valverde, 2003). In contrast, these authors suggest that the police science should not be regarded as a political philosophy that is irreconcilable with liberalism but a problematizing rationality that can be carried out in liberal or non-liberal ways. The monitoring of drinking establishments, for example, can be conducted illiberally with state spies or liberally as with the issuance of liquor licenses that promote self-regulation on the part of business owners (Valverde, 2003). Similarly, the indexing of urban disorder can be done by 'civilizing agents' of

the state or by Ambassadors that mediate between the state and society. Taking a broader view, the aim of creating the 'well regulated city' was advanced by PCC not by direct imposition on the part of authorities but in attempting to arrange the activities of others so that opportunities for disorder were minimized and interpersonal and reciprocal surveillance could emanate naturally from the density of social interactions. All of this was overseen by the PCC Commissioner, Vancouver's civil *deputaten* whose administrative role in the well regulated city "is to inspect and manage the population" by compiling "statistical table[s] bearing on all the capacities and resources of population and territory (Pasquino, 1991: 113). The case of Project Civil City thus exemplifies how the police science is not a curious leftover of late feudalism but a problematizing activity that has intensified rather than disappeared under advanced liberalism as cities across the global north seek to realize their vision of the well regulated city.

CHAPTER TWO

Risk, uncertainty and resiliency in urban governance

Introduction

The previous chapter examined efforts at the municipal level to regulate poverty and homelessness in Vancouver as one front of a wider campaign to showcase the city to the world in the context of entrepreneurial development and inter-urban competition. This chapter shows how the Olympics have become occasions for authorities to accelerate improvements in security and public safety capabilities in the context of unpredictable but potentially catastrophic risk and concerns regarding urban vulnerability. These legacies can now be explicitly articulated components of the Olympic business plan designed to capitalize on an opportune moment alongside transportation infrastructures, sporting facilities, and hospitality amenities. Peter Ryan, one of the IOC's foremost security consultants and former top law enforcement official during the 2000 Games, clearly articulates this kind of opportunism when he states, "The preparations for the Games and the investment in security infrastructure will be an enormous legacy for the country and its national security capability after the Games are over. This opportunity should not be wasted" (Ryan, 2002: 26).

This chapter is split into two broad sections. The first section discusses the security legacies of the Athens 2004 and Beijing 2008 Olympics. Popular and academic discussion of these events has tended to use these cases as cautionary tales for the fate of future host cities (e.g., Giulianotti & Klauser, 2010). These arguments are a subset of wider concerns that the intensification of surveillance and counter-terrorism efforts after 9/11 means we are faced with an ever-advancing security state characterized by preemptive "counter law" (Ericson, 2008) that suspends democratic principles and institutionalizes a quasi-legal state of exception. I don't seek to directly refute these claims. However, my view is that the ongoing extension of these warnings – whether in the context of the Olympics or more generally – directs attention away from a whole domain of governmental practice pertaining to urban resiliency and preparedness that has been developing with little critical attention. In other words, in the post-9/11 world we are faced not only with the growth of preemptive governance but with governance in the name of resiliency, but analysis of the latter has been overshadowed by concerns of the former.

The second major section of this chapter returns to Vancouver in order to focus on a series of technologies for building resiliency accelerated by the needs of the Games. My argument is that preparations for the Games provides a glimpse at three different facets of urban resiliency: new technologies for visualizing cities and their vulnerabilities, the practice of planning for the worst, and the development and extension of organizational expertise pertaining to crisis

management. The logic of resiliency poses a different set of concerns from those associated with preemptive law insofar as it involves practices of localized crisis management that focuses on the continuity of systems, which becomes problematic when it eclipses more systematic sources of uncertainty facing human populations on a daily basis.

Surveillance assemblages

Explicitly articulated security legacies have become a key part of hosting the Games. In Greece security preparations for the 2004 Games were nested within the modernization of the country's national security capabilities that had been ongoing for a least a decade in advance of the Games (Samatas, 2004). It was in this context that Greece spent an estimated $1.5 billion US on security for the Olympics, which was timed to coincide with the Games but was also tied to the long-term policy objectives of the state. Greece's Minister of Public Safety said this of the Games unprecedented security budget:

> This great expenditure is not concerned only with the duration of the Olympics. It is an investment for the future. The special training, technical know-how, and ultramodern equipment will turn the Hellenic Police into one of the best and most professional in the world, for the benefit of the Greek people (Floridis, 2004: 4).

The centerpiece of this 'ultramodern equipment' was a large-scale communications system provided by an international consortium of technology firms headed by Science Applications International Corporation (SAIC), a U.S. defense contractor known more for its relationship with the Pentagon than the

IOC. The communication system, known as a C4I system (an alpha-numerical acronym for command, control, communications, computers, and intelligence) was designed to centralize all data and communications channels for public authorities across Athens during the Games. The system itself was composed of

> 29 subsystems integrated into a unified command and control system linking the Greek police, firefighters, the Greek Coast Guard, and the Greek Armed Forces through 130 fixed and 5 mobile command centers. It was also to include a surveillance blimp above Athens, underwater sensors guarding the Piraeus harbor, hundreds of closed-circuit television cameras (CCTV), vehicle tracking devices, and motion detectors. Information data were provided to a 7000-strong Greek security force guarding 35 Olympic venues in Athens and four other cities and critical infrastructure facilities, such as power stations, water works, and fuel depots (Samatas, 2007: 221).

Though this system ultimately did not work as intended during the Games, leaving officials to fall back on existing military radio channels or mobile phones, the system was envisioned as part of the modernization of Athens and the country as a whole (Samatas, 2007).

Likewise, security for the 2008 Beijing Games took place within the broader modernization of Beijing's policing and surveillance capabilities. Here these efforts were advanced under the banner of the 'Grand Beijing Safeguard Sphere,' one of nearly 300 'Safe Cities' programs being rolled out across the country. Person-to-person surveillance played a large role in the security efforts for the Games; in addition to the estimated 100,000 police officers deployed for the games (a figure not including military personnel), a 400,000-strong contingent of neighborhood committee representatives reported

anything of suspicion to local authorities, which reflects China's traditional strength of bringing overwhelming human labor to any problem. Beyond this, China also enthusiastically exploited advances in technology for securing the Games. This included an estimated 300,000 fully networked CCTV cameras, mandatory residential ID cards for all inhabitants, and a host of rumored monitoring capabilities such as long-range RFID detection capabilities (to scan ID cards from a distance) and wiretaps in taxies and hotels frequented by foreigners. Security for the Games thus mixed the old with the best of the new, the legacy of which prompted cultural critic Naomi Klein to refer to post-Games Beijing as 'Police State 2.0' (Dickinson, 2008).

These examples underscore how the Games can be utilized to introduce planned surveillance 'surges' involving the "rapid and overt introduction of new technologies with less public debate that usual, because they are perceived as necessary responses to a changed situation" (Ball & Webster, 2003: 141). They also reflect how the integration of various surveillance technologies into cohesive networks is a key aim in security governance today. This has been discussed in more general terms as the 'surveillant assemblage,' which describes the "desire to bring systems together, to combine practices and technologies and integrate them into a larger whole [...] with such combinations providing for exponential increases in the degree of surveillance capacity" (Haggerty & Ericson, 2000: 610). If assemblages are "all about linking, cross-referencing, [and] pulling threads together that previously were

separate" (Lyon, 2003: 647), then the Olympics provided authorities in Athens and Beijing with the opportunity and justification to pull together assemblages with the power of scrutiny that is significantly greater than the sum of its parts.

These assemblages, delivered for the Games but designed for post-Games use, are certainly worthy of critical study for the dangers they may pose to personal privacy, political dissent, and democratic expression (e.g., China Rights Forum, 2006; Boyle & Haggerty, 2009b). However, fixating *only* on these legacies misses the wider panoply of changes accelerated by the Games that are of equal significance. In Vancouver public debate about security for the Games focused almost solely on the prospect of a 'big brother' legacy in the form of CCTV cameras retained after the Games (Bader, 2009; Shaw & Lee, 2009; Vonn, 2010). Such concerns are valid but often overstated. The retention of some cameras after the Games was guaranteed when Vancouver became the recipient of $2.5 million CAN for video surveillance for the Games in 2009, and though current plans include using the 70-odd cameras purchased directly by the municipality for traffic monitoring and emergency management purposes, the long-standing desire to have cameras in the Entertainment District (see Chapter One) suggest that the cameras will eventually be used in this area. These municipally-owned cameras are joined by those installed as part of provincially and federally funded upgrades to the region's transportation networks as well as any that accompany major projects such as the city's new convention center and airport rail link. A full and accurate

inventory of all these cameras is impossible, but at the same time they probably do not substantiate concerns that Vancouver would be left with thousands of CCTV cameras on every corner after the Games. Again, I would not suggest that the retention of even 70-odd cameras is insignificant. Rather, my point is that fervent and occasionally wild speculation (e.g., Marshall, 2008) of the sinister legacies of the Games serves to direct attention away from other outcomes, which is symptomatic of a wider eclipse wherein concerns of a creeping and oppressive surveillance state keeps other developments below the analytical radar – in particular, the ideas and practices of managing unpredictable risks by building resiliency.

Meeting uncertainty with resiliency

Resiliency is commonly defined as the ability of a complex system to adapt and respond to unexpected shocks without serious or lasting disruption (Smith & Mischerbacker, 2009). Public Safety and Emergency Management Canada defines resiliency as

> the capacity of a system, community or society to adapt to disturbances resulting from hazards by preserving, recuperating or changing to reach and maintain an acceptable level of functioning (PSEPC, 2008: 9).

Having roots in the study of ecological systems and later economic systems, resiliency has become a master concept linking the discourse and practice of national security, public safety, and law enforcement across countries of the North Atlantic (Coaffee et al., 2009). The enthusiasm for resiliency can be tied

to changing conceptions of risk in the last two decades, particularly after 9/11. For many, 9/11 confirmed what was already being described as "the new terrorism," characteristic of which is radical uncertainty, catastrophic destructiveness, and inevitability (Laqueur, 1996; Juergensmeyer, 2000). Dillon paraphrases this refrain when he writes, "we do not know when terrorists may strike, we do not know how they will strike, and we do not know with what terrifying effect they will strike. We only know for sure that they will strike" (Dillon, 2007: 9). Closely related to this are concerns that accidental and natural disasters could, in the context deregulated industry and tightly coupled infrastructures (Perrow, 1999; Graham & Marvin, 2001), cascade across multiple systems and result in unmitigated catastrophes. Hurricane Katrina in particular is commonly held as the paradigmatic case demonstrating the "vulnerabilities of living with big systems" (Luke, 2004: 120) compounded by deep racial divisions and decades of infrastructural neglect.

These forms of unpredictable, high consequence risk, whether of intentional or accidental origin, are said by some to be beyond the beyond the limits of established risk management strategies (Beck, 1992, 2002). The limits of insurability in particular are said to be revealed by such low probability, high consequence events. This argument does not appear to be borne out empirically (Bougen, 2003; Ericson & Doyle, 2004), but nevertheless such events do reveal the limits of "archival-statistical knowledge" (Collier, 2008).

Archival-statistical knowledge attends to the probability of future events based on their historical regularity. This epistemology is suitable for happenings of regular occurrence as they can be quantified and brought within the realm of estimation. But archival-statistical knowledge is inherently deficient for irregular events as by definition they lack the regularity that makes them amenable to statistical forecast. This would be of little consequence for one-off happenings of low consequence, but in the context of potentially catastrophic risk a fundamentally different epistemology is called for.

A number of authors have begun to explore precaution as a rationality of governance in relation to low probability, high consequence risk. Precaution is associated primarily with environmental protection in the form of the 'precautionary principle,' but it has parallels in a range of security domains including personal crime prevention, dangerous offenders, international security, and terrorism (Haggerty, 2003; Stern & Weiner, 2006; Aradau & van Munster, 2007; de Goede & Sandalls, 2009; Hebenton & Seddon, 2009). Precaution involves two distinct logics that, I would contend, have so far been discussed separately. On one hand exercising precaution involves the aggressive pre-emption of potential threats without waiting for indications of likelihood. A strong version of this means accepting an unending number of false positives (i.e., innocent but convicted) rather than allowing the potential for a single false negative (i.e., guilty but free) to result in catastrophic destruction and irreversible loss (Stern & Weiner, 2006). On the other hand

exercising precaution encourages extensive preparations in crisis management so that when irregular but catastrophic events *do* occur – and 'being resilient' assumes such events to be inevitable despite their improbability – they do not spiral into unmitigated catastrophes because of a lack of preparedness. This emphases the multiplication of contingency plans to deal with a wide variety of potential occurrences, encourages coordinated response of state, private sector, and individuals themselves to surprise events, prioritizes the ongoing training for first responders and emergency managers, and advocates for the continual staging of vulnerability assessments and planned exercises in crisis management, particularly relating to the protection of critical infrastructure (Lakoff, 2007). In other words, resiliency is an approach to risk management that foregrounds the prevalence of risks that cannot be predicted but whose effects must be extensively planned for through a permanent, open-ended state of cultural and material readiness where the capability to respond, adapt and recover from surprise events is distributed across government agencies, private sector actors, and citizens themselves (Coaffee et al., 2009: 133-139)

Precaution thus involves two broad sets of strategies that are somewhat contradictory: aggressive preemption on one hand so that future catastrophes do not come to pass, and radically readiness for when they do. Both rely on an imaginative foresight of the future that is decoupled from archival-statistical knowledge. Unlike O'Malley's (2000) discussion of reasonable foresight, which is a non-actuarial rendering of the future that remains concerned with

likelihoods, precaution is form of foresight that emphasizes speculation on worst-case scenarios. As Ewald (2002: 288) puts it in his touchstone discussion of the topic, precaution “invites one to anticipate what one does not yet know, to take into account doubtful hypotheses and simple suspicions. It invites one to take the most far-fetched forecasts seriously, predictions by prophets, whether true or false.” In the next chapter I will argue that precautionary governance involves a performative imperative wherein this form of worst-case thinking must be communicated to a variety of audiences in order to build trust and confidence in a context of uncertainty and doubt. The remainder of this chapter demonstrates how authorities in Vancouver have taken the 2010 Games as an opportunity to accelerate or develop initiatives that contribute to the region’s resiliency.

Resiliency in Vancouver

The Vancouver Games were not met with the same sweeping enthusiasm for long-term security legacies as in Athens or Beijing. Rather, officials in Vancouver expressed a more modest willingness to exploit opportunities that arose during preparations. A coordinator in Vancouver’s Office of Emergency Management (OEM) put it this way in an interview:

> We did leverage opportunities for sure. The whole Olympics from our perspective was about leveraging opportunities and getting stuff done by a deadline that would have dragged on further if we didn’t have that deadline.

The Direct of B.C.'s Integrated Public Safety Unit (BC-IPSU) offered a similar comment, saying, "The Olympics was a catalyst to get some of this done, but the systems will remain in place after the Olympics." The following sections will focus on three aspects of these preparations as they pertain to building resilience, which the OEM coordinator quoted above defines as "the ability to tackle, problem solve, and recover from a variety of shocks that are bigger than the day-to-day noise": visualizing cities, planning for the worst, and the development of organizational expertise pertaining to crisis management.

Visualizing Cities

One of the key security concerns today is that the sheer material complexity of cities makes them extremely vulnerable to accidental or intentional disruption (Luke, 2004; Coward, 2009). One response to this problem is what Collier and Lakoff (2008a; 2008b) describe as vulnerability mapping. Vulnerability mapping refers to a set of techniques for visualizing cities as sites of interlocking vulnerabilities and hazards used in the development of consequence management techniques. One classical form of this that developed during the Cold War are city maps superimposed with blast rings and evacuation routes used to estimate the impact of a direct nuclear strike (Farish, 2004). Today, vulnerability mapping is aided by advances in geographic information systems (GIS) that enable the visualization and

analysis of multiple forms of geographic data and facilitate simulating a wide variety of future possibilities.

Vulnerability mapping in Vancouver ahead of the Games proceeded first by taking high-resolution aerial images of the lower mainland region. Taken by B.C.'s Integrated Land Management Bureau (ILMB) on behalf of the Air Photo Consortium (a group of law enforcement, public safety and first responder agencies in the region), these images were procured to provide a "common operating picture for all agencies involved in emergency management and public safety related to 2010 Olympics and all future emergency and public safety events," according to the contract tender (Inwood, 2008a). The resolution of these images was specified by the ILMB to be 10cm per pixel for urban areas, which is technically sufficient to render anything 20 centimeters or greater distinguishable. These digital images formed the basis for the subsequent cataloging of urban vulnerabilities and response capabilities across the lower mainland by municipal and provincial authorities. Critical infrastructures in particular were mapped out, which included major industrial factories, transit corridors, and power distribution networks, schools, and government buildings. Loaded into a GIS system this data allows emergency coordinators to assess vulnerabilities, simulate potential hazards, and communicate with other agencies in the event of an emergency.

The GIS system of choice for the OEM in Vancouver is EmerGeo, which the Director of the OEM described in an interview as a "geospatial awareness and consequence management tool." In its customized configuration for the OEM the system accepts data meeting a certain threshold from a parallel GIS system run by the city's 911 call center (in that context, the Emergency Event Map Viewer, or E2MV). This data is cross-referenced by EmerGeo with the map layers compiled by the OEM and displayed on individual monitoring stations or large screens in the OEM command center. In addition to the basic spatial awareness that this presentation gives for emergency coordinators, cross-referencing 911 data with the OEM's databases provides a visual indication of potentially interlocking hazards within the radius of a given event, such as if a major industrial fire were in the vicinity of a power transformer. Planners are alerted to such interactions by visual and auditory cues, and the system provides the option of pushing out mass emergency notification messages to affected subscribers. The Emergo system also accepts data feeds from the OEM's mobile CCTV system, approved in 2009 on the basis it would provide "rapidly deployable temporary monitoring capabilities at large public events or in response to hazards, emergencies and other unforeseen eventualities" (COV, 2009: 2), thus contributing to the real-time visualization of events at street-level when deployed.

At the time of the Olympics EmerGeo connected only to the 911 call center's GIS system but further connections with comparable systems run by the

regional transit or provincial authorities are possible in the future. These connections are enabled by a system architecture built to a common technical standard in order to enable system interoperability. The Director of the OEM touched on this in an interview:

> In the system design and work that we are doing in terms of the network infrastructure and technology infrastructure we have kept future interoperability in mind. We wanted to make sure that the technical piece was capable of doing that, but those linkages haven't been made yet.

Preparations for the London 2012 Games include comparable GIS systems built to the Open Geospatial Consortium (OGS) standard by the UK company ERDAS, which is intended to integrate London's patchwork of video surveillance networks and allow public safety authorities to share data across multiple platforms in mutually useable forms.

The integration and expansion of CCTV networks enabled by this interoperability is of significance for those whose primary interest in the growth of CCTV, but for the purposes of this analysis what is significant is that CCTV is just one element of a system of visualization practices with the purpose of promoting urban resiliency by mapping and assessing potential vulnerabilities, providing real-time situational awareness, and facilitating communication between diverse entities regardless of the specific type of incident encountered. This 'all hazards' preparedness is brought to the fore in an article in *The Province*, which describes the OEM using EmerGeo to run through simulations involving a simultaneous plane crash, chlorine spill, and

bomb threat (Inwood, 2009a). These simulations can be augmented by any number of ‘off-the-shelf’ software plug-ins that simulate in great detail the fallout of different sorts of catastrophes, such as modeling plume dispersion from explosions. Under these conditions, the development of GIS systems in consequence management, exemplified here by the Emergo system, “contributes to resiliency by providing that situational awareness information quicker than might otherwise be provided,” said an OEM coordinator in an interview. Though used in only a limited capacity during the 2010 Olympics – specifically, to monitor incidents along the Olympic transportation corridors – the development of this instrument was aided in large part by the planning, mapping, and data gathering activities accelerated by the Games, all of which is usable after the Games. As the Director of the BC-IPSU said: “All the mapping that we’ve done for the Olympics – and we’ve had many enhancements – will carry on. We can use that data whether it is for a flood, forest fire, and hazardous material. All that will live on.”

Planning for the worst

The 2010 Games provided the impetus for the staging of a number of major security and public safety exercises between 2007 and 2010. According to the 2010 Integrated Security Unit, these exercises were to “establish a common baseline of understanding inter-agency plans, their procedures, and their linkages” amongst the constellation of agencies involved in the 2010 Games

(V2010-ISU, 2008). Three of these exercises were specific to the Olympics – Exercise Bronze (Nov. 2008), Silver (Mar. 2009), and Gold (Nov. 2009) – but a number of regional exercises scheduled by Public Safety Canada's National Exercise Program were accelerated to coincide with the Games. The Olympics also provided the occasion for a major cross-border critical infrastructure and emergency preparedness exercise between Canada and the US, agreed to in principle in the *Security and Prosperity Partnership* "to focus on terrorist events that could affect [the] 2010 Olympics."

Whether performed as tabletop exercises or live simulations, the staging of exercises such as those held in advance of the 2010 Olympics are key tools in planning for an unpredictable future (Anderson, 2010). Planning for hypothetical worst-cases becomes a practical reality in this context. Their utility in doing so stems not from actually predicting worst-cases as it does from facilitating organizational learning by "forcing managers to imagine possibilities that might not otherwise have occurred to them" (Clarke, 2008: 157). For Herman Kahn, RAND analyst and intellectual pioneer of scenario testing, the development of improbable scenarios were methods to 'think the unthinkable,' as the title of his best-known book suggests (Kahn, 1962). A former RCMP official involved in the 2010 Games as a safety officer with a public corporation made a very similar point in an interview, saying,

> The key is to imagine the unimaginable, because that's where your planning has to start. You've got to plan for the worst, and you have to be prepared for the worst. You may not roll out that part of the plan but you've got to have those plans for the good, the bad, and the ugly.

Some of the ‘ugly’ scenarios considered in preparations for the 2010 Games included the bombing of a major public transit center, hostage situations reminiscent of Munich, the detonation of a radiological weapon, and the dispersal of radioactive agents through artificial snow making equipment, which included role-playing victims and media coverage (Inwood, 2008b, 2009b; Matas, 2009). “With these scenarios, we are not planning for everyday events,” said the Director of B.C.’s Integrated Public Safety Unit in an interview. “The probably of anything like that occurring is very small, but we still need to have plans in place for it and exercise those capabilities.”

These exercises in planning for the worst are not themselves new, having been a part of military planning for decades. But the range of catastrophic scenarios involved in these exercises underscore the emphasis on planning for a much more expansive and destructive imagination of future threats. Outside of the Olympics this catastrophic imagination can be seen in the proliferation of consultancy reports (e.g., RAND, 2006) or the staging of exercises that involved worst-case possibilities (de Goede, 2008). The DHS *National Planning Scenarios* (2005) for example outlines 15 catastrophic scenarios that might befall US cities including the detonation of an improvised nuclear device in the heart of Washington D.C., the dispersal of weaponized anthrax, bubonic plague, and chemical nerve agents in shopping malls, airports, and sports stadiums, and exploding chlorine tanks that send toxic clouds across major metropolitan areas. Again, the point with these is not to predict with certainty

the risk of such events happening but to use them in the development contingency plans for a whole spectrum of potential futures – 'the good, the bad, and the ugly' – by identifying gaps or misconnections between agencies that can be the target of intervention. Failure is useful and even desirable in this context as it serves to diagnose areas that require attention (Clarke, 2006), though it can also undermine the performative value of these exercises (see Chapter Three).

The utility of planning for the worst needs to be balanced against practical considerations. "While Olympic security planners and line-level personnel must prepare for the worst, the reality is that they will deal almost exclusively with mundane issues" (Decker et al., 2005: 66). The Director of the OEM also made this point, saying, "You need to consider the worst-case, but you can't spend 90% of your time planning for it because that only leaves you 10% of your time for things that are certain to happen." These exercises that preceded the Olympics – as well as the Olympics themselves – also build resiliency in much more prosaic ways; namely, by providing a setting for the development of practical expertise in the organizational dimensions of crisis management.

Practical expertise

In an interview published in the trade magazine *Frontline Security*, former CSIS director and federal security coordinator for the 2010 Games Ward

Elcock compares preparations for the Olympics to a school of higher learning, saying, “instead of acquiring knowledge at the grade school [level] you are doing so at the university level,” which “takes you through to a bigger level of experience and expertise” (in Frontline, 2008: 38). In doing so Elcock underscores how the preparations for the Vancouver Games were an important pedagogical site in the development of practical expertise. This expertise can have to do with a wide range of operational areas such as public order policing, protective services, or training for first responders. This section focuses on how preparations for the Games were also an important site for the training of public safety officials in the organizational intricacies involved in crisis management.

Bellavita (2007: 11-12) provides a telling account of the inter-agency animosities that plagued preparations for the 1996 Atlanta Games:

> For example, on a bad day getting ready for the 2002 Games, cops were perceived by other disciplines as prima donnas. Firefighters were seen as lazy. Public works was fragmented. Emergency management agencies suffered from an organizational inferiority complex. Private and corporate security personnel were viewed as rent-a-cops. Emergency medical groups were looking for someone to tell them what to do. Public health agencies only seemed able to hold meetings. Infrastructure owners did not want to tell anyone about their vulnerabilities. Everyone was afraid the cops would get more than any other group. All the disciplines were overly sensitive and picked up quickly on any possible slight. [...] Many federal law enforcement agents brought in to help plan the Games looked at Utah public safety as – with some exceptions – a collection of well-meaning, but naive hicks. In turn, federal agents were seen as arrogant and inept. Rural agencies didn’t trust their urban counterparts. Sheriffs didn’t trust police. Neither trusted the state. No one trusted Washington. And Washington returned the favor.

As Buntin's exhaustive analyses have shown (2000a, 2000c, 2000b), these difficulties were compounded during the Games by uncertain and/or unpracticed command structures. These issues crested when a byzantine labyrinth of communication protocols prevented authorities from warning officers in Centennial Square that a bomb threat had been received before the bomb detonated nearly 20 minutes later. Bellavita (2007: 16) is worth quoting again at length on this (citations removed):

> The problems associated with efforts to get the information about the bomb threat to the right people are legend in the special event security community. Even if communication had worked perfectly, here is what would have had to happen within the communication protocols created for the Games: (1) The Atlanta dispatcher who received the 911 call would notify (2) the Atlanta Agency Command Center (ACC). The person who took the call at the ACC would notify (3) the state representative in the ACC (because Centennial Park was a state controlled venue). The state representative would notify (4) the State Olympic Command Center. The person who took the call in the state center would notify (5) the Centennial Park venue commander who would then notify (6) his officers.
>
> If, in a hypothetically "perfect" world, each communication took only three minutes, the message about the bomb threat would take almost twenty minutes to get to the officers who needed to act on the information. Nine of those police officers – unaware of the call – were moving people away from the unattended backpack. All were hit by shrapnel when the bomb exploded, twenty minutes after the bomb threat.
>
> The Atlanta Olympic communication protocol was the result of political, organizational, and technological factors of that particular event. While there is much to critique about that incident, the focus here is on communication. The 911 call was made from a payphone outside Centennial Park. Yet the call had to be routed all over the city to transmit a message to someone less than 100 yards away.
>
> A lesson from almost every training exercise is "communication was a problem." The same lesson emerges from major event experience. Even with efficient protocols, communication difficulties are certain to occur

> during a special event. And the more agencies involved, the greater the likelihood of problems.

'The Atlanta experience' has since become a shorthand way to express these communication difficulties experienced in multi-jurisdictional environments. It is also the main reason why the 2002 Salt Lake Games were declared a National Special Security Event (NSSE), a designation that involves the implementation of the standardized organizational structure used by the US Secret Service for diplomatic security (Decker et al., 2005; Reese, 2008). This structure is based on the Incident Command System (ICS), an organizational tool that emerged out of wildfire management in California in the late 1970s. While various permutations of the ICS exist, in its generic form it sets out a common task-based organizational structure (as opposed to agency-based) and defines roles and responsibilities in order to facilitate coordination and communication between different agencies. The utility of this template depends on it being widely adopted and understood so that cooperating agencies are working with the same basic tools, framework, and language. The diffusion of the ICS proceeded slowly throughout the 1980s and 1990s in the US, but in 2004 the ICS was adopted as the core organizational instrument of the National Incident Management System (NIMS). Since that time, every NSSE, whether it is a diplomatic summit, political inauguration, or Super Bowl, is approached as an opportunity to develop working expertise in the ICS/NIMS framework at the local level (Reese, 2009).

Variations of the ICS have been adopted by a number of federal and provincial agencies in Canada over the past two decades. It is now the basis for the RCMP's major events template (see Chapter Four) and the Emergency Response Management System (BCERMS) in B.C. But the adoption of the ICS at the level of policy does not instantly translate into practical knowledge among those responsible for putting this tool into practice. The Olympics were significant in this regard as it became a "gigantic exercise" (Ward Elcock, in Frontline, 2008: 38) for on-the-job training for a wide range of law enforcement and public safety officials in the roles and responsibilities of the ICS. The Director of the Major Events and Protective Services Division for example explained in an interview how the RCMP had been "leveraging the planning process in order to support the development of the template and our planning processes internally," which includes applying the generic ICS template to major events as well as how different agencies fit into this structure.

Officials at the municipal level also emphasized this point. The Director of the Vancouver Police Department's Emergency and Operations Planning Section relayed in an interview that "when we built our command and control model we stayed within the ICS framework, [and] we now have a number of people that have been trained to a reasonably high level and now have some significant experience in working in that environment." The Director of Vancouver's OEM conveyed how the Games were an opportunity to get local

officials trained in the BCERMS structure, saying, “It exists in BC but we haven’t really had the chance to use it, so it’s given us a chance to truly operationalize it and build capacity in the city by giving people an understanding of it.” This is reflected in changes to the physical layout of the OEM main operations center itself. Prior to major renovations in the latter half of 2008 the operations ‘pit’ of the OEM resembled what the Director described as a “mission control type of scenario where you have podium-style workstations facing front and all of the information up front and everyone doing their own thing without a lot of interaction.” Upon a second visit in late 2009, this disciplinary arrangement has been abandoned in favor of a floor plan that “aligns more with functional structures than agencies,” which takes the form of clustered workgroups assigned to the four main functional aspects of the ICS: operations, logistics, planning, finance.

A post-2002 Games security report expresses how even the most well defined organizational structures depend on the “sociology of human relationships” (Oquirrh Institute, 2002: 20) to make them work. Some officials interviewed for this research expressed how preparations for the Games improved the ‘sociology of human relationships’ by providing an opportunity for people from various agencies that do not regularly work together to concentrate on specific problems, which turns formal, abstract trust into informal, situational trust (Lee et al., 2009). The Director of Vancouver’s OEM touched on this in an interview, saying:

> Emergency management is 80-90% trust-based relationships. That's what makes this job work. I think the planning and exercising that has gone into this, and some of the planning that may not be specifically related to the Olympics, has done nothing but to improve and strengthen relationships.

Another coordinator in the OEM reiterated this point, saying, "When things happen you really need to know who to call, and knowing who is on the other end of the phone really helps. In fact, knowing the person might be the only reason for making that call." From a networking perspective such informal capital can be as important, if not more, than structural connections (Dupont, 2004).

The 2010 Olympics thus served as a key pedagogical site for the development of a specific form of expertise pertaining to major events. The practical, 'on the job' nature of this expertise is important because tacit knowledge, unlike the formalized knowledge contained in reports or templates, tends to decay without utilization (Tully, 2007). "One has to renew these types of big events from time to time to maintain the currency of this valuable expertise," says Ward Elcock (in Frontline, 2008: 38). This Director of the BC-IPSU also made this point in an interview, saying, "It's like anything else, certain skills you need to exercise on a regular basis. Certain skills degrade. If you aren't using it over time, you lose that edge."

This wider significance of the development of this expertise is that it is of direct utility outside of the Olympics. It extends to the management of other

major sporting or political events in Canada through the formalized artifact of the RCMP's major events template, which the Director of the Major Events and Protective Services Division describes as "the blueprint that we follow when we coordinate major events across Canada." It is also of utility for any major event or crises requiring multi-agency coordination. "We are not creating and using a model just for the Olympics here," said the Director of B.C.'s Integrated Public Safety Unit in reference to the development of BCERMS. The Director of the VPD's EOPS division made a similar comment about their ICS-based model for the Games, saying, "It is completely transferable into any 'all hazards' type of emergency setting." Furthermore, as of December 2009 the ICS has been made the core of the new *Federal Emergency Response Plan* (Government of Canada, 2009). In light of this the 2010 Olympics can be seen, as the 2002 Games were in the US, as an early large-scale exercise for the structures, practices, and lessons of inter-governmental cooperation and domestic crisis management that are now institutionalized at the federal level. Something of this sort is expressed by the head of the 2010 Integrated Security Unit when he says that the "whole of government" approach developed and tested through the real-world laboratory of the Olympics but applicable to any major crisis requiring coordinated large-scale response will be the "greatest legacy" of the 2010 Games for Canada (RCMP, 2010).

Resiliency emphasizes organizational integration and communication so that incidents do not spiral into unmitigated disasters because of a lack of information sharing or coordination amongst agencies sharing responsibility. In Vancouver, the Olympics provided a context for the development of a pool of practical expertise in the tools of multi-agency crises management that can be used in any sort of emergency management context.

CONCLUSION

Upon visiting Vancouver approximately one year ahead of the 2010 Winter Games IOC President Jacques Rogge extolled the long-term security and public safety benefits of the Games, saying, "Security investment always leaves a good legacy of security for the country. Whenever the Games are finished, everything that has been built, the expertise that has been acquired, the hardware that has been put in place, is serving the country and the region for decades to follow" (in Simpson, 2009). Coming as it did during a spate of drug-related violence in Vancouver this statement was likely intended to reassure those affected by the violence, and perhaps some were. And put in the way Rogge did these legacies seem to be yet another upshot amongst many of being one of the select cities to host the Olympics. However, some of these outcomes may not be as wholly beneficial as Rogge suggests. Citizens of China, for example, may not have found much reassurance in the promise of a newly refurbished state surveillance apparatus after the 2008 Games. There,

the threat of domestic extremism was used to justify the implementation of a wide range of surveillance measures intended to outlast the Games and become permanent features of Beijing's landscape. Some might say that the Beijing Games is an extreme case and thereby claim that this experience offers no warning for citizens of democratic countries. The Beijing Games *is* an extreme case but the danger presented when the Games are used to justify surveillance measures only marginally connected to the Games is not restricted to authoritarian regimes. A glimpse of this in the UK context is gained from a leaked Whitehall memo from the "'No. 10 Policy Working Group on Security, Crime and Justice, Technological Advances," which deals with the implementation of a number of surveillance measures in the UK including the expansion of a DNA database for suspected terrorists and their families. In anticipating the public disapproval that such measures might encounter, the memo concludes, "Increasing [public] support could be possible through the piloting of certain approaches in high profile ways such as the London Olympics' (in Hennessy & Leapman, 2007, insertion in original).

Such developments deserve critical attention. In this chapter, however, I have sought to accentuate a series of developments related to urban resiliency accelerated by preparations for the 2010 Winter Games. These developments include new technologies for visualizing vulnerabilities and providing situational awareness, the broadening of contingency plans for dealing with potential catastrophes, and the development of practical expertise pertaining to

‘joined up’ governance. These technologies of resiliency, while seemingly routine and mundane, or associated primarily with the domain of emergency management, exemplify a whole stratum of governmental activity that has flourished rather quietly alongside the preemptory state of post-9/11.

As noted at the beginning of this chapter, these resiliency-building activities have been prompted by the interrelated issues of the prevalence of unpredictable risks, an issue that is brought to the fore by the Games but not unique to Olympic host cities. So what are the wider critical implications of resiliency? Resiliency does not at first glance appear to offend the same liberal sensibilities that the explosive growth of indiscriminant surveillance after 9/11 does; there is little to suggest some sort of all-seeing ‘big brother’ legacy in Vancouver after the 2010 Olympics. Resiliency does, however, pose a different set of normative issues to which the work of Lakoff and Collier is instructive (Lakoff, 2007; Collier & Lakoff, 2008a; Collier & Lakoff, 2008b).

At the most general level resiliency can be said to be about protecting *systems* rather than protecting *populations*. This distinction is bound to be messy in practice but it is accentuated by the epistemological grounding and points of intervention that characterize each form of security. Population security seeks to map out the regularities exhibited by human populations such as birth and death rates, sicknesses and accidents, or taxation and labor, the development of which “revealed the population as a domain with its own specificity and

irreducibility" (Rose, 1999: 113). As Foucault and those working in his wake have theorized, the 'discovery of the social' in this way gave birth to an array of different social experts who were called upon to diagnose social pathologies and determine social truths.

Resiliency on the other hand does not index populations and their regularities but critical infrastructures and their vulnerabilities. This too is giving rise to new forms of expertise under the umbrella of resilience, the objectives of which are much different than social experts. Whereas social experts were called upon to engineer society itself, the practical expertise of resiliency and preparedness aims to ensure that continuity of systems. "If population security builds infrastructure, preparedness catalogues it and monitors its vulnerabilities" (Lakoff, 2007: 271). The mandate for the new degree in Infrastructure Protection and Security at Carleton University for example is designed to "equip high profile security managers, engineering advisors and policy-makers with the knowledge and skills to assess and respond effectively and efficiently to threats that may jeopardize the security and safety of important infrastructure systems." Moreover, resiliency is inherently oriented towards managing the effects of worst-cases scenarios, the effect of which is to draw attention away from risks that, while perhaps not resonating with cultural or individual perceptions of what constitute a 'catastrophic' event due to their distribution in space and time, are nonetheless devastating in their consequence. The classic example here is the difference between deaths from

airline crashes and death due to drinking and driving (Clarke, 2006). Far fewer people die annually in plane crashes than deaths associated with drinking and driving, yet when plane crashes *do* occur they are often spectacular, fiery wrecks that kill all on board in an instant and attract considerable amounts of attention. Drinking and driving-related deaths on the other hand happen with saddening frequency that, while no doubt devastating for the circle of people touched, are revealed to be catastrophes in the aggregate rather than each individual instance, and as such do not seem to ‘qualify’ as disastrous.

The consequence of the focus of resiliency on the continuity of systems and worst-cases is that questions regarding the social basis of everyday vulnerability of human populations is marginalized or not posed at all (Lakoff, 2007: 270). In Vancouver for example the almost monumental efforts of poverty and health activists to draw attention to the plight of the city’s deeply impacted destitute population found little traction amongst the overwhelming crush of concerns that terrorists or anarchists would run wild over the Games and use any number of unpredictable means to ensure chaos. Ultimately, then, the legacy of this for Vancouver may be one of improved urban resiliency but exacerbated social inequality, particularly when seen in light of the potential implications of the socio-spatial ordering project outlined in the previous chapter.

CHAPTER THREE

The performative dimensions of precaution

Introduction

In June and July 2008 Chinese authorities staged a series of high profile security exercises dubbed ‘Great Wall 5’ in preparation for the 2008 Olympics. What was notable about these exercises is how they were photographed and distributed to news agencies around the world. These photographs showed Chinese commandos storming buildings and buses where ‘terrorists’ held their ‘hostages,’ fully suited hazmat teams attending to scores of casualties, and a counter-terrorism team storming across an open square on Segways with weapons drawn. The pinnacle of these exercises was a set of choreographed drills that took place inside a Beijing sports stadium. Unlike other exercises where venues were props to the drill (such as when decontaminating bleachers), these drills were performed ‘on stage’ not unlike the sports events that were soon to follow. Photos of these drills show dozens of paramilitary officers in grid formation displaying their martial arts skills, emergency responders cutting steel barriers in unison, a simulated riot scene complete with smoke and fire, and various other action shots worthy of Hollywood film.[13]

[13] Images of Great Wall 5 were collected from various English-language Chinese government websites that have since been removed as well as a

The overt theatricality of these exercises can be attributed in part to China's use of the Games as a platform to promote the country's expanding economic, political, and military power as well as the state's tradition of using military exhibitions to impress political leaders (Thompson, 2008). However, these exercises can also be seen in continuity with comparable undertakings in other countries that, while not expressing the same exuberance as in Beijing, nonetheless exhibit a theatricality suited to the local context. The RCMP's Exercise Bronze is one such undertaking. The previous chapter considered the role of this exercise in building organizational integration and planning for the worst, but what is noteworthy about Exercise Bronze for the purposes of this chapter is how it was publicized. Soon after Exercise Bronze wrapped up the RCMP posted a two-minute video clip of the exercise to the ISU's website. This video showed officials gathered around computer screens, banks of monitors displaying data, men and women in combat fatigues and communications headgear punching away at workstations, zoom-ins on various law enforcement insignia and badges, wall-sized maps of the lower mainland, and sweeping pans of officials huddled around conference tables. These images are overdubbed with a narrator explaining the activity, which concludes, "The safety and security of Canadians, athletes, and international visitors is our highest priority. These exercises are part of the efforts to make

---

collection of images posted at www.boston.com/thebigpicture (The Big Picture, 2008).

sure that the 2010 Olympic and Paralympic Games are secure" (V2010-ISU, 2008).

This chapter argues that Great Wall 5 and Exercise Bronze are comparable expressions of a broader dynamic wherein security provision is now accompanied by communications projects intended to show that authorities can deliver on the promise of security under conditions of uncertainty. These efforts are prompted by the concerns outlined in the previous chapter regarding the normalization of low probability, high consequence risk and precautionary governance. What matters for authorities under these conditions is not only exercising precaution over high-risk situations but also sustaining the *appearance* of maximum security in order to maintain symbolic control over what are perceived to be uncontrollable situations. Beck touches on this when he says, "the hidden central issue in world risk society is *how to feign control over the uncontrollable* – in politics, law, science, technology, economy and everyday life (Beck, 2002: 41, emphasis in original). While much of what follows in this chapter is inspired by Beck's insight on this, my argument departs from Beck's overall approach and is more in line with Campbell's (1992) non-essentialist take on the constitution of authority. In Campbell's argument, which is heavily indebted to Butler's (1990) theory of performativity, the communicative acts of the state are more than expressions of pre-existing authority but the very means through which authority is constituted and reproduced. My argument takes a similar approach. If

confidence and trust in the capability of authorities to deliver on the promise of security is neither given nor stable, then the provision of security *requires* the "stylized repetition of acts" (Campbell, 1992: 9) in order to convey control and foster trust in the symbolic order of things, particularly in a context of heightened uncertainty. Such acts are more than "epiphenomenal to an ontological or epistemological core" (de Lint, 2008: 167) but one of the ways that order, security, and state legitimacy is produced. Three different sets of speech acts, as Butler would call them, through which security authorities 'show' that the Games are safe are outlined in the latter portions of this chapter: the discursive work of managers of unease, demonstration projects, and fantasy documents. These have in common the theme that authorities have contemplated all possible future scenarios, including worst-case and catastrophic risks. Actually doing so is impossible, but *saying* and *showing* that authorities have considered such possibilities are rhetorical ways that unmanageable dangers are transformed into manageable risks. As such, what is at stake in this analysis is broadening our understanding of the performative dimensions of precautionary governance.

Imagining an uncertain future

As discussed in the previous chapter, a number of authors have advanced the claim that 9/11 marked the tipping point bringing the logic of precaution into the heart of security governance today (Stern & Weiner, 2006; Aradau & van

Munster, 2007; de Goede, 2008; Ericson, 2008; de Goede & Sandalls, 2009). One important element amongst the diversity of changes involved in this shift is the deliberate contemplation of a much wider scope of potentially catastrophic futures regardless of likelihood. A watershed moment in fostering this imaginative rendering of the future was the finding of the 9/11 Commission that 9/11 was enabled in part by a "failure of imagination" (2004: 339) amongst U.S. security and intelligence agencies to recognize that such an attack was possible. The Commission therefore recommended that it was "crucial to find a way of routinizing, even bureaucratizing, the exercise of imagination" to prevent future terrorist attacks (9/11 Commission, 2004: 334).

While the idea of bureaucratizing the imagination may seem difficult if not impossible, this recommendation touches upon a tradition that goes back to a circle of civilian defense analysts and military theorists working in US think tanks during the 1950s and 1960s. The most prominent of these was Herman Kahn, the futurist and RAND analyst mentioned in the previous chapter whose work includes *Thinking about the Unthinkable* (1962). The subject of Kahn's work during this time was the prospect of thermonuclear destruction, an 'unthinkable' possibility that Kahn subjected to rigorous thought. Prominent in Kahn's methodology for doing so was "the exhaustive enumeration of hypotheses" (Aron, 1968: 15) in order to guide civil defense planning in the event of a nuclear strike. For Kahn these fictional futures were useful not as "predictive devices" but as "aids to thought" in service of "stimulating and

disciplining the imagination" (Kahn, 1968: 152). Drawing on Grusin (2004), de Goede (2008) theorizes this wider contemplation of catastrophic futures as premediation. Following Kahn's intellectual arc, premediation is "not necessarily about *getting the future right* as much as it is about trying to imagine or map out as many possible futures as could plausibly be imagined" (de Goede, 2008: 159, emphasis in original). At the same time, premediation is "not about the future *at all*, but about enabling action in the present by visualizing and drawing on multiple imagined futures" (de Goede, 2008: 159, emphasis in original).

Premediation is intimately connected with the exercise of precaution. If precaution is a logic concerned with managing catastrophic possibilities that cannot be predicted based on their historical regularity, then the exercise of precaution *requires* the "resonating fiction of a disastrous future about to unfold" (de Goede, 2008: 162) in order to enable action in the present. As Ewald has written in his touchstone discussion of precaution, "I must, out of precaution, imagine the worst possible, the consequence that an infinitely deceptive malicious demon could have slipped into the folds of an apparently innocent enterprise" (Ewald, 2002: 286).

Precaution, premediation, and the Olympic Games

The intensive and wide-ranging surveillance of potential threats, the unmistakable militarization of the Games, and the routine staging of security exercises that "self-consciously deploy imagination in their scenarios, worst-case narratives and disaster rehearsals" (de Goede, 2008: 156) suggests that the Olympics are one institutional, discursive, and spatial-temporal domain where precautionary thinking and the contemplation of catastrophic futures has burgeoned. This is, at least, the conclusion of *Jane's Intelligence Review*, which declares that the Olympics are characterized by the precautionary notion of "high consequence aversion" wherein undo attention to "nightmare scenarios" and other "potential worst cases" drive host countries to "exert a disproportionate amount of resources in mitigation of a risk relative to the probably of the risk occurring" (Jane's Intelligence Review, 2007: 1). Toohey and Taylor arrive at a similar conclusion, arguing, "The use of such an extensive range of risk management initiatives, taken together with the press releases and public information issued by the event organizers, suggest that the precautionary principle and risk aversion pervaded the event planning process" (2008: 465).

These conclusions appear to have some support. As Buntin's analysis recounts, the 1993 bombing of the World Trade Center, the 1995 Oklahoma City bombing, and 1995 Tokyo subway sarin gas attack introduced "the fear of

catastrophic terrorism" to the inner circle of security planners responsible for the 1996 Atlanta Games (Buntin, 2000a: 24). Similar concerns took root ahead of the 2000 Sydney Games where Australia's counter-terrorism policies and expertise were deemed "next to irrelevant" in dealing with new threats such as "anthrax pumped through the air conditioning system at a venues" (Thompson, 1999: 119). This acknowledgement introduced an intense uncertainty to the planning process, one that revolved around the question of how to manage a spectrum of threats that was "so amorphous that it is almost impossible to conceive of a policy framework to deal with it" (Thompson, 1999: 119-120). For Peter Ryan, Chief of the New South Wales Police Force at the time, the answer to dealing with this uncertainty was the same as Kahn's exhaustive enumeration of hypotheses. Ryan recalls how Australian officials "tried to factor in as many scenarios as possible for Sydney. Even those that would sound bizarre and outlandish to non-security professionals were given a response capability" (in Host City, 2008). One such scenario involved a fully loaded passenger jet crashing into the opening ceremonies, even if the probability of such an attack was "unthinkably low" (Ryan, in Vecsey, 2003). Ryan would express similar thoughts about his involvement in the 2004 Athens Games, saying that authorities there had to "plan for every contingency," a process that Ryan described, again in plain continuity with Kahn, as "thinking the unthinkable" (in Host City, 2008).

The approach taken in Australia and Athens contrasts starkly with preparations for the 1972 Munich Games. There, planning for the Games included preparation of 26 potential public emergencies for consideration by Munich's security planners. As in Australia, one of these scenarios involved a jetliner crashing into the main Olympic venue at peak capacity. However, all 26 scenarios were rejected outright by Munich police on the basis that taking them seriously would require a heavy security presence that would contrast with the image of Germany that organizers sought to promote. The official slogan of the 1972 Games was 'the Carefree Games,' and Georg Sieber, the police psychologist charged with this task, was sent away to come up with scenarios better suited for the occasion. Of the rejected scenarios Sieber's 'Scenario 21' was startlingly prescient of what would happen during the Games. In Scenario 21 Palestinian militants would invade the building housing the Israeli delegation at 5:00am, kill one or more Israeli athletes, hold more as hostages pending the release of Arab prisoners held in Israeli jails, and demand passage by aircraft from Munich to an Arab capital. The actual events of September 5th 1972 would prove Sieber only partly correct. Palestinian attackers entered the village at 4:40am, not 5:00am as envisioned by Sieber, and they did so not by blasting through walls but by scaling a chain link fence and picking a feebly locked door (Wolff, Cazeneuve, & Yaeger, 2002).

All this seems to confirm that planning for the Olympics is now permeated by a precautionary logic that includes the contemplation of a broad spectrum of

possible future events, even ‘bizarre and outlandish’ ones. My view is that such conclusions are misplaced, primarily because they are based on what authorities say and are seen to do. This methodological orientation is particularly evident when Toohey and Taylor base their conclusions on the “press releases and public information issued by the event organizers” (2008: 465). Such evidence is highly suggestive but is not conclusive of the approach taken by those in charge, particularly when detailed information about these activities is filtered through the press relations sections of organizations deeply vested in the optics of the event. At the same time I would not suggest that what officials say and are seen to do is wholly unimportant. These activities *are* important, but they are important for different reasons altogether, reasons that have to do with the performative dimensions of precautionary governance.

Performing precaution

A suitable place to begin is with the extensive literature from social psychology, which makes the point that individuals perceive risk through highly situated lenses shaped by personal history, cognitive biases, and social proximity to sources of risk (Kahneman, Slovic, & Tversky, 1982). Consequently, people’s assessment of their vulnerability to potentials harm rarely lines up with the statistical likelihood of those harms actually occurring. Personal crime prevention is a case in point in this insofar as fear of crime prompts some to exercise extreme caution over statistically improbably events

(Jenkins [2000] unquantifiable “dread factor”) while more likely occurrences receive scant attention because they do not tap into the same reservoir of concern. Such efforts appear ‘irrational’ when assessed according to objective standards, but viewed from within an individual’s situated logic may be perfectly rational. Thus rather than asking why people exercise caution over the ‘wrong’ things – a question that presumes the working of a calculative, actuarial logic – it is more fruitful to recognize that risks are perceived and managed by individuals within a fundamentally different epistemology, one that is socially and culturally situated (Haggerty, 2003).

A comparable argument pertaining to the exercise of precaution in security governance can be made at the societal rather than individual level. According to Ewald’s discussion on the topic, precaution is exercised over risks characterized by “scientific uncertainty on the one hand and the possibility of serious and irreversible damage on the other” (Ewald, 2002: 282). I would argue that these factors are not intrinsic to some dangers over others but emerge from the processes by which the idea of catastrophes are constituted. That is, what is regarded as ‘catastrophic’ risks are not determined only by scientific uncertainty and irreversible damage but also by collectively held valuations of worth, danger, and vulnerability (Douglas & Wildavsky, 1982; Quarantelli, 1998). In other words, catastrophes and disasters are not simply material events but also *ideas* that depend upon shared valuations of meaning, emotional attachment, and cultural unease that come to be associated with

particular intersections of low probability, high consequence risk, and these associations are strong factors in determining which risks are 'selected' for precautionary treatment (Kittelsen, 2009).

Major sporting events are one such culturally conditioned site. Catastrophes befalling packed stadiums feature prominently in the cultural industry's fictional depiction of disaster since before 9/11 as illustrated by films such as *Black Sunday* or *The Sum of All Fears*.[14] After 9/11 this cultural figuration of disaster moved outside Hollywood and into the heart of the security establishment. One indication of this is that three of the DHS National Planning Scenarios (2005) involve attacks on major sporting venues.[15] Like the detonation of a nuclear weapon above a capital city or multiple hijacked airlines, attacks on high profile sports venues are part of our collective imagination of what catastrophes are. The Olympic Games, as one of the world's premier media and consumer spectacles, figure in at the peak of these concerns, particularly after 9/11. Whether or not the Olympics are at risk is not

---

[14] *Black Sunday* (1977) involves a disgruntled US war veteran attempting to detonate a bomb over the 1976 Super Bowl at which the President is in attendance by hijacking the famed Goodyear blimp. The subheader of the original promotional posters for the film cries, "It could be tomorrow!" *The Sum of All Fears* (2002) features an extension of a similar plot where a nuclear bomb is actually detonated while the President narrowly escapes.

[15] Scenario 4 is a biological attack where terrorists release pneumonic plague into an airport bathroom, a sports arena and a train station in a major city. In scenario 5 terrorists in a small aircraft spray a chemical blister agent over an at-capacity college football stadium. Scenario 12 involves terrorists delivering handmade bombs using a large car or truck bomb and suicide belts to attack a sports stadium and a hospital emergency room.

the most pressing factor determining whether a precautionary approach is warranted. What matters is that the Olympics are widely *thought* to be vulnerable to a range of unpredictable threats, and in this cultural imaginary there is considerable pressure for authorities to ‘show’ that all risks have been contemplated and are manageable, especially catastrophic risks (Salter, 2008: 242). Under these conditions the “promise and apparatus of rational planning itself becomes mainly rhetorical, a means by which plans – independent of their functional relevance to the task – can be justified as reasonable promises that exigencies can be controlled” (Clarke, 1990: 4). From this vantage point we can interpret what officials say and are seen to do not as straightforward indications of operational plans (cf. Toohey & Taylor, 2008) but as speech acts concerned with ensuring that the “*appearance* of securability and manageability is maintained” (Amoore & De Goede, 2008: 9, emphasis in original). The Olympics offer an empirical site to identify these dynamics, and in doing so broadening our understanding of the performative dimensions of precaution.

The remainder of this chapter outlines three ways that the exercise of precaution communicated to a variety of audiences in the context of the Olympics: the rhetorical work of managers of unease, demonstration projects, and fantasy documents.

Managers of unease

Bigo (2002) theorizes managers of unease as those who are "invested with the institutional knowledge about threat and with a wide range of technologies suitable for responding to those threats" (Bigo, 2002: 74). They promote a vision of a predictable, ordered future by publicizing the security efforts of the agencies they represent by drawing on specialized, exotic knowledge regarding risk and available risk minimization strategies. As security experts in public positions and key institutional locations, managers of unease "benefit from the belief that they know what 'we' (unprofessionals, amateurs) do not know and that they have specific modes of action of a technical nature that we are not supposed to know about" (Bigo, 2002: 74).

The role of managers of unease typically comes to the fore during times of crisis in order to proclaim confidence in the ways in which certain risks are being managed. One recent example of this came when questions were raised regarding Brazil's capabilities to guarantee security during the 2016 Games after gunfights between rival gangs in Rio de Janerio killed 12 just two weeks after the city won the 2016 Games, including two police officers who died when their helicopter was shot down by machine gun fire. Shortly after this Brazil announced it had hired Rudy Giuliani's security consultancy firm to

advise on security planning for the Games, and Giuliani quickly expressed his confidence that the Games would be safe despite the city's recent violence.

Managers of unease were critical in persuading the world that the 2002 Salt Lake Winter Games were safe in the wake of 9/11. Shortly after 9/11 concerns were voiced in major US media outlets that professional sports events were profoundly vulnerable to high-consequence asymmetrical attacks (Wong, 2001). Industry executives wondered how they would protect their lucrative product, with one saying, "the once ridiculous 'what-ifs' now have to be taken seriously" (in Gegax, 2004; cf, Mythen & Walklate, 2008). The 2002 Games became a lightning rod for these concerns, which only intensified after anthrax began arriving in the mail of several prominent news outlets and two US senators later in 2001. According to Robert Flowers, head of the Utah Olympic Public Safety Command, these happenings "changed people's psyche. We weren't talking about anthrax in Olympic venues before. Now we are. It caused us to take some things more seriously" (quoted in Dahlberg, 2001).

According to government officials the security plan for the 2002 Games would be "completely reevaluated" after of 9/11 (in Vosepka, 2001). Overall, however, few major changes were made to the security plan save for reinforcing existing measures with the influx of federal funds that came soon after 9/11 (Decker et al., 2005). But after an initial period of questioning whether the Games would go on the tone of prominent government officials

was soon “brimming with confidence with respect to US military resources” to manage any unforeseen events that may occur (Atkinson & Young, 2005: 278). The Director of the newly created Department of Homeland Security expressed the view that Salt Lake City would be “one of the safest places on the globe,” and President Bush reiterated this by saying “I can’t think of any place safer to be” (in Knight, 2001). Similarly, Mitt Romney, head of the Olympic organizing committee, assured the public that security planners had embarked upon a “thorough process of contingency planning” that included “considering all the things the world might throw at us, and making sure that under any circumstances we can envision the Games can go on” (in Saunders & Christie, 2001). It was also in this context that IOC spokesperson Francois Carrard sought to reassure the American public that a plane crashing into the opening ceremonies live on TV has always been considered by the IOC “regardless of the tragedy of Sept. 11” (in Bose, 2001).

Managers of unease were even more prominent in the lead up to the 2004 Athens Games. Salt Lake City had the benefit of being held in a homogeneous state with little internal dissent deep within the continental territory of the world’s preeminent military superpower. The situation for the 2004 Games could hardly be more different. Greece became the smallest country to hold the Olympics since Finland in 1952. The country’s thousands of kilometers of rugged, unguarded coastline and uninhabited islands greatly complicated security arrangements. Domestic security concerns revolved around the

apparent renewal of the militant November 17 and the Revolutionary People's Struggle groups, and the country's geographic situation between Europe and the Middle East raised similar concerns at the international level. These anxieties increased exponentially after 9/11 and the 2004 Madrid bombings, which were compounded by reports that the Games were deeply mired in delays and that the IOC took out a $170 million US insurance policy in the event that the Games had to be cancelled.

Greek officials were continually called upon to reassure the world that their security plans were up to task in this context of heightened uncertainty. Notable in this was a short essay published in the policy studies journal *Mediterranean Quarterly* where the Greek Minister of Public Order offers the "unique guarantee that all who come as guests to our country will be – and will feel to be – completely secure" (Floridis, 2004: 5). Part of this exercise in persuasion draws on the unprecedented level of international assistance assembled around the 2004 Games in the form of the Olympic Security Advisory Group (OSAG),[16] convened according to Floridis to give Greece the "totality of knowledge and experience gained from recent Olympics" (2004: 5). A substantial theme in this also emphasized the existence of "some two hundred special operational plans" devised to "ensure security against any threat" (2004: 3-4). "For us, there is no distinction between large and small dangers," says Floridis. "We operate on the assumption that we must have the

[16] The OSAG consisted of the US, the UK, Spain, Australia, Spain, Israel, and Germany.

ability to counter all kinds of threats successfully" (2004: 3). Other officials extended this message as the Games drew closer. In the month prior to the 2004 Games one Greek official reassured the world that "whatever is humanly possible to predict has been predicted" and, like Floridis, said, "we have examined and considered more than 200 extreme-case scenarios" (in Hawaleshki, 2004). Similarly, the new Minister of Public Order sworn in weeks before the Games assured the *New York Times* that Greece had "practiced all possible scenarios, even the worst ones" (in Janofsky, 2004).

As these statements make evident, one commonality amongst these various proclamations is that security authorities had planned for all possibilities, 'even the worst ones.' Actually doing so is a practical and epistemological impossibility. But whether contingency plans for a jet crashing into the opening ceremonies or any of the '200 extreme-case scenarios' actually exist is not of primary concern from the vantage point of this chapter. Indeed, some of these reassurances offered border on the surreal, such as the Governor of Utah's statements that the 2002 Olympics would be safe from anything short of a direct nuclear strike (in Saunders & Christie, 2001). But *saying* that authorities have considered and planned for the worst brings these contingency plans into being as social facts that do the rhetorical work of transforming uncertainty into manageable risks (Clarke, 1990). However, these performative utterances carry greater discursive force if "there is some parallel material

force that can reinforce the intention of the speaker" (Price, 2008: 4). Demonstration projects are central in this regard.

Demonstration projects

Demonstration projects are stylized occasions "staged in the knowledge that they will achieve mass media circulation" (Price, 2008: 13) and designed to convey the impression that risks are under control (de Lint, Virta, & Deukmedjian, 2007; de Lint, 2008). Demonstration project often coincide with the statements of managers of unease or are part of their narratives, such as when President Obama not only declared the Louisiana coast to be clean and safe after the May 2010 Gulf oil spill but also swam in the Gulf's waters and ate seafood with his family at local restaurants.

Major security and emergency management exercises are important demonstration projects in the context of the Olympic Games. In addition to the functional purposes these exercises serve for organizations dealing with complex and unforeseeable situations, these exercises are also opportunities for authorities to demonstrate security and preparedness capabilities to a wide audience. Greek authorities for example routinely cited the details of a range of counter-terrorism exercises held in preparation for the Games in conjunction with the OSAG. The exercises included simulated suicide bombings, chemical and biological attacks, plane and yacht hijackings, and attacks on critical

infrastructure through exercises such as Trojan Horse, Gordian Knot, Hercules Shield, and Flaming Glaive. The largest of these exercises – Olympic Guardian II – was held over two weeks in May of 2004. The specifics of this exercise were never disclosed but it involved 1,500 Greek security forces, 400 U.S. special operations forces, and a collective contribution of 100 special operations forces from the UK, Canada, Germany and Israel acting in coordinated response to a wide range of full-scale terrorist attack scenarios including multiple and simultaneous incidents at Olympic venues (Migdalovitz, 2004).

As this chapter suggested at the outset, these exercises can take on varying levels of theatricality where security and preparedness capabilities are performed in ways that are "timed to take advantage of the publicity that news media can provide" (Price, 2008: 3). In Vancouver Exercise Silver and Gold each involved drills with military air and sea vehicles, the visibility of which was hard to conceal. But they also included drills where members of the press were expressly invited to attend, such as the drill mentioned in the previous chapter where 'radioactive snow' was dispersed over hundreds of spectators and included roll-playing victims and member of the press, all of which was performed in front of a live audience of reporters. While such rehearsals have the first order function of providing a setting for advanced training they also have the second order function of making visible the level of preparedness of authorities to respond to non-routine situations. "People will be happy we are

prepared to respond to any sort of emergency," says Ted Townsend, an official with the city of Richmond where the exercise was taking place. The Director of the BC-IPSU reiterates this, saying the exercise was "intended to give the public confidence that security forces are prepared" (in Matas, 2009).

These preparedness exercises featuring various catastrophic possibilities have become pre-Games rituals that serve, as rituals anthropologically do, to mark the progression from one stage to the next (cf. Bajc, 2007). In this context, these security rituals mark the progressive tooling up of security agencies, culminating in grand spectacles – such as Great Wall 5 or Exercise Gold – that signal that the security apparatus is at full operational readiness, or is 'stood up' as Vancouver officials liked to say, thereby demonstrating to all that the Games may proceed in safety. These major rituals are accompanied by a host of minor rituals and demonstration projects that are no less significant in the communication of security readiness. Some are staged in response to specific uncertainties, such as when Chinese authorities stationed an armored personnel carrier at the main entrance to the media village for the remainder of the 2008 Games after a family member of a US coach was stabbed to death Beijing. Others are opportunistic representations conducive to easy import into media templates. Athens and Beijing both placed anti-aircraft missile launchers within sight of the main venues that provided a dramatic backdrop for televised reports from the field. These expressions of security are joined by the unmistakable presence of surveillance cameras and armed guards that, as one

journalist in Athens remarked, are in “in plain sight, for every villain to see,” leading the same journalist to comment on the Hollywood-like atmosphere of it all by asking, “what’s real and what’s for show? What’s a barrier? What’s an empty milk jug?” (Roberts, 2004). There are also the innumerable rituals of passage such as pat downs, mag-and-bag sweeps, and security announcements typified by airport security writ large that need to be negotiated whenever entering venues. To paraphrase Foucault (1977), all this amounts to ‘hundred of little theaters’ of security where precaution is *seen* and in some cases *felt* to be exercised.

Fantasy documents

Fantasy documents are another way that the exercise of precaution is communicated. Fantasy documents the plans, statements, or reports put forth by government and/or private organizations that grow out of “the managerial need to *do something* about potentially grave danger” (Clarke, 1990: 19, emphasis in original). Fantasy documents are tangible artifacts that articulate ways of managing high-consequence risks that, if realized, cannot be reasonably envisioned ahead of time, such as when BP’s plans for dealing with an undersea blowout proved next to useless when it actually happened. As such, fantasy documents are curious mixes that are neither fully real nor unreal but virtualities (Shields, 2006) that are “functional in the sense of asserting to others that the uncontrollable can be controlled” (Clarke, 1990: 16).

Some fantasy documents are generated to meet the requirements of external organizations. The candidacy files put forth by prospective host cities to the IOC are a case in point on this. The security sections of Olympic bid books are full of fantasy projections detailing how many officers and volunteers can be mobilized for duty, what sorts of technological innovations can be deployed, the country's level expertise with major events, guarantees from various levels of governments that the Games will be safe, organizational charts, and the financial cost of it all. While these reports are not outright fabrications, they are put forth by private organization seeking to meet the perceived requirements of what will further the candidate along the path to being the next Olympic host city. And when successful, these projections almost invariably bear little resemblance to what is actually needed for the event. This disjuncture is particularly stark when it comes to the financial estimates for security for the Games, which are almost always extremely conservative at the bidding stage. Exemplifying this is the $175 million CAN bid book estimate for security at the 2010 Games, which the RCMP regarded as "conceptual" and "arrived at with limited RCMP input" (RCMP, 2005) and later ballooned to $1 billion CAN.

Some fantasy documents are formulated specifically to address public anxieties. The organizing committee of the 2012 London Games for example has published two stylized pamphlets to assure British residents that the

government is up to task of securing the Games (Home Office, 2009a, 2009b). These include sketching out key tasks such as how security is being designed in to Olympic venues, how the risk of terrorism is being met, who is responsible for what, and how costs will be controlled, all of which is accompanied by various stills showing UK law enforcement and emergency management performing their duties. Still others are imaginative technologies (de Goede, 2008: 192) for documenting the process behind which authorities will plan for all possible security scenarios. An example of this is a consultancy report by RAND (2007), the institutional incubator of worst-case thinking since Kahn, that is "intended to be of interest to anyone who is involved in the planning, delivery or legacy" of the London 2012 Games (RAND, 2007: ii). The final chapter of this report develops a model to "think logically and systematically about the potential future security environment that could exist in 2012" (2007: 61). Echoing the imaginative methodology of 'thinking the unthinkable' pioneered by Kahn, this report seeks "to *foresee* in a structured and systematic way a range of different security environments that could potentially exist in 2012" (2007: 50, emphasis in original). The report offers a model for doing so that is composed of three variables that can assume low, middle, or high values: adversary hostile intent, adversary operational capability, and potential domestic/international influences on UK security. Cross-tabulation of these three factors (i.e., visualized as 3x3x3 cube) produces 27 possible future security environments (FSEs) ranging from, in the best case scenario, threats using legal, non-violent means in an improved global

geopolitical environment to, in the worst case scenario, deliberate acts of mass violence using technological sophisticated means within a degraded global environment. Within this imaginative environment planners are encouraged to devise "as many potential scenarios as necessary" within the parameters of the 27 FSEs, "each one having varying implications for current security planning and preparations for future operational response" (2007: 61). This imaginative orientation starkly contrasts to that taken in Munich where security official deliberately downplayed the premediation of future possibilities in order to accommodate the desired image of the Games. While planners are still attentive to ensuring that the optics of security does not supersede the spectacle it encircles, today security officials would not be so confident as to reject any possibilities outright. Indeed, the RAND model warns against such complacency by encouraging planners to treat "all futures as equally valid" (2007: 50).

CONCLUSION

To pay attention to how security authorities say they are planning for the worst is not to dismiss these activities out-of-hand as irrational or ill conceived. Worst cases *do* happen, and when they do it is clearly better to have considered the possibility before hand than not. What is of interest in this chapter is how authorities *say* and *show* they are planning for the worst. Rather than accepting these speech acts as factual representations of an inner logic, the overriding

interest in this chapter is how the rhetorical work of managers of unease, staged demonstration projects, and fantasy documents are intended for consumption as proof of the capability of authorities to manage risks under heightened conditions of uncertainty (de Lint, 2008: 178). This is not to lapse into blanket cynicism where all things said and done by security officials are interpreted as calculated public relations exercises empty of functional substance. Many of these performances are tied to instrumental objectives that have the second-order function of making security preparations visible that security officials are willing to play up to greater or lesser degrees. Examples of this include some of the drills associated with Exercise Silver in Vancouver wherein members of the press were invited to attend. In some instances, however, the desire for good optics appears to outstrip functional utility, such as a Great Wall 5 drill involving a back-mounted flamethrower. While the visual impact of a flamethrower is difficult to miss, the operational utility of a weapon designed to flush out enemy trenches in WWII in the context of the Olympic Games is less than obvious.

Whether tied to instrumental objectives or not, these performances are central to the imperative of impression management under conditions of uncertainty that pervades security governance today. Security, much like punishment, must be *seen* to be done if confidence in the capabilities of authorities to deliver on the promise of maximum security are to be maintained (Garland, 2000). "Highly visible equals highly secure," says a press briefing from the White

House in reference to the 2002 Games (in Toohey & Taylor, 2008: 462). Part of this communicative dimension undoubtedly targets a specific audience with a message of deterrence, but the wider audience for these performances is also the general public that is provided with a message of reassurance. In doing so these performances constitute a range of meanings for the public, including the nature of threats today, the appropriate methods of response, and the capacity of authorities to maintain a secure order in the face of unpredictable risks. Ultimately, it is through these performances that trust between authorities and the public, and thus the legitimacy of state power, is constituted and anchored (Campbell, 1992; Garland, 2000; de Lint, 2008).

The emphasis on raising the visibility of security also has some unintended outcomes to be considered, primary amongst which is that the performative dimensions of security may function to amplify rather than dampen insecurity about risk. One potential source of this is if demonstration projects reveal operational shortcomings that undermine confidence in the capabilities of authorities. A pointed example of this comes from Vancouver during an Exercise Silver drill when a military helicopter carrying an RCMP Emergency Response Team (ERT) was unable to land as planned in front of the assembled press because of construction debris from earlier in the day. Instead, the helicopter landed 200 yards away and the ERT quickly disappeared into the athlete's village to complete the drill. "Talk about anticlimactic," writes a

reporter from the trade publication *Homeland Security Today*, who is worth quoting further on this:

> The bungled beginning to this exercise left many critics questioning only if it was a preview of more serious problems to come. Given the lack of urgency on display during the simulation, one had to wonder if the security officials responsible for guaranteeing the safety of athletes, visitors, and residents during the Games were up to the task (Wiebe, 2010: 21).

Furthermore, all performances are polysemic and open to interpretations not intended by their senders. In this context, one of the unintended consequences of the repetitious extension of assurances that authorities are planning for the worst may be to reinforce the rhetoric of the new terrorism "that we are living in a changed, uncertain, and dangerous world (Coaffee & Wood, 2006: 515). It is unclear, for example, how many people are comforted by the assurances of authorities that the Games are safe from planes crashing into the opening ceremonies on live television, crop dusters spreading sarin gas over venues, radioactive snow being dispersed over spectators, or any of the nightmare scenarios that authorities proclaim to be prepared for. It may be reasonable for them to plan for such events, but the publicization of these plans in the name of reassurance risks raising more concerns than are put to rest. Substantiating this point empirically requires the type of risk perception research undertaken by social psychology, which is beyond the scope of the research done for this dissertation. However, Tulloch's ethnographic research on perceptions of vulnerability in the run-up to the 2000 Sydney Games is suggestive as he demonstrates how residents "weave [the Olympics] into whole world of other

anxieties" (2000: 226) that stretch far beyond the Games themselves. These insecurities may also be reinforced by a strand of media coverage that draw on the opinions of a variety of experts that accentuate the difficulties inherent to securing public and highly complex events in urban environments, detail the range of security measures being undertaken for the Games, and reiterate the importance of planning for the worst (e.g., Liu, Vladu, & Roberts, 2004; Inwood, 2008b; Lee, 2008). The cumulative outcome of this discourse may serve to foster an insecure public that welcomes, or even demands, the uptake of enhanced security measures as they are deemed necessary, acceptable, and rational responses commensurate to heightened risk, and marginalizes claims to the contrary with the view that these measures are a small price to pay for dealing with potentially catastrophic risk. This environment of heightened insecurity provides opportunities for authorities to push through measures that might otherwise come up against significant resistance, such as the DNA database in the UK touched on in the previous chapter. It also provides fertile ground for the security industry, which since 9/11 has been "wooing willing governments with their security and surveillance products designed to detect 'terrorists' and also other miscreants who may be found in cities or in airports and at borders" (Lyon, 2004: 136), a suitable environment to market their products as a fix for security anxieties.

To conclude, it is worth considering what is left out of the performances this chapter has focused on. In Butler's (1990) theory of performativity the

performance produces the effect it names. Following this line of argumentation it can be suggested that the performative dimensions of security call into being the risks they purpose to address. Again, this is not to suggest that risks do not exist outside of the way authorities talk about them. Rather, it is to suggest that if risks, and catastrophic risks in particular, are *ideas* conditioned by prevailing if contested measures of worth and fear, then the continual iteration of *particular* ideas of catastrophe constitute some risks as more pressing than others. The inverse of this is to marginalize other issues that, for one reasons or another, are not constructed as risks in the same way but which nonetheless can have devastating effects on human populations. The classic example of this is the US administration's continual reminder of the catastrophic danger that Iraq's fictional weapons of mass destruction held for the American way of life while the flooding of New Orleans, an entirely foreseeable catastrophe decades in the making, received only passing attention until it was too late. This suggests we should pay attention not only to the performative dimensions of precaution but that gaps in these performances as well.

CHAPTER FOUR

The global Olympic security field

INTRODUCTION

In responding to a series of questions from the media about security preparations for the 2010 Vancouver Winter Olympics, a spokesperson for the RCMP's Integrated Security Unit said, "We look a lot to other countries as well, where events have happened. That teaches us a little bit about what security was put in place [and] what kind of problems they had" (Thompson, 2009: 9). This seemingly innocuous post-script, offered almost as an afterthought, is a singular expression of a broader set of activities wherein authorities involved in major event security learn – or at least publicly profess to learn – from the experience of comparable major events held elsewhere. This learning takes place through a variety of ways, from the production and circulation of after-action reports, briefing documents, and other "immutable mobiles" as Latour (1986) would call them, to the movement of people from event to event or amongst the nexus of state, non-state, and private institutions involved in these events.

These processes of teaching, learning, and emulation are not new policing or the specific domain of major event security. Adapting to the failures of the

past, either in an organization's own history or that of others, is one way that policing organizations change over time, even if that change is slow, uneven, or externally driven (Waddington, 2008), and informal observation programs arranged between policing agencies involved in similar events is a "well-honored tradition in the event security community" (Bellavita, 2007: 20). However, these processes of inter-event scrutiny have dramatically intensified amongst state policing agencies and expanded to include non-state actors to the point that this tradition and community is rapidly becoming a formally differentiated and functionally specialized field of expertise that approximates what others might call a transnational epistemic community (Haas, 1992). Emerging from the interrelated issues of the fragmentation of the state monopoly on security provision, the increasing prominence of non-state and private sector actors in security governance, and the recurring practical problem of securing large, complex, and temporary public events from an assortment of risks, this field is composed of formal and informal networks within and amongst national law enforcement, public safety, and intelligence agencies, international sporting federations, international governance organizations, and security consultancy and technology firms. As the quote at the beginning of this chapter suggests, the interconnections amongst these actors facilitate the transfer of 'best practices' in major event security from event to event. More generally, and insofar as this security field also serves to define the Olympics as an opportunity for developing lasting security legacies,

they also serve as key channels in the ongoing 'making up' and globalization of security expertise in the post-9/11 world.

Analysis of this emerging security field speaks to several interconnected issues in literatures on security governance today, including the idea that policing and security is better grasped with the model of networks rather than dichotomies (Johnston & Shearing, 2003; Dupont, 2004), that it is transnational in scope (Sheptycki, 2000; Bowling, 2009), and the growing fragmentation of authority in security governance amongst state and non-state actors (Klauser, 2009). More broadly, this chapter will also suggest that this field provides a window into what Bigo conceptualizes as the transnational management of uncertainty insofar as this field continually constructs the Olympics as inherently vulnerable moments that are in need of the specialized expertise it provides (Bigo, 2002). As such, this chapter is concerned less with the much narrower policy-oriented and evaluative question of the efficacy of these networks in capturing and transferring best practices, something that is difficult to ascertain even under the most transparent of circumstances, as it is with situating the empirical case of the Games within the broader issue of how the provision of security is shaped by a coalition of state and non-state actors that transcends the (increasingly blurry) boundaries between public/private authority and local/global relations.

Conceptual inspiration for this analysis derives in part from the criminological literature on security networks (Johnston & Shearing, 2003; Dupont, 2004), which has yet to fully consider international networks. This chapter also draws upon the strand of comparative public policy studies concerned with knowledge diffusion and transfer (Haas, 1992; Dolowitz & Marsh, 1996), which is useful for concepts such as lesson drawing, emulation, elite networking, and epistemic communities. However, this literature has been critiqued for the tendency to connote that policy makers engage in rationalistic and voluntaristic processes of evaluation and adoption (Stone, 2004). In contrast, a newer literature has sought to reconceptualize these processes as inherently socially constructed and situated within fields of power and politics (Stone, 2004; Ilcan & Phillips, 2008; McCann, 2008; Peck & Theodore, 2010). Rather than using terms such as policy transfer and/or convergence, which suggest that policy knowledge circulates in flat, apolitical space in accordance with the rational intentions of policy makers, this literature uses terms such as mobility, mutation, and nonlinearity in recognition that power and politics structure the market for ideas and best practices, "which is rarely, if ever, just about transferring policy knowledge and technology from A to B" (Peck & Theodore, 2010: 169-170).

Olympic security networks

Dupont (2004: 79) notes that "security networks are porous and tracing boundaries can be a perilous exercise." This is particularly true in the context of the Olympic Games where multiple networks intersect, overlap, and are continually shifting in step with the global march of the Olympic industry. This plurality and fluidity renders any attempt to map these networks unavoidably partial. Nonetheless, three key institutional networks can be identified, each of which functions to facilitate the "transfer and diffusion of innovative practices" (Dupont, 2004: 80) within their respective institutional boundaries: state networks, inter-state networks, and non-state networks. Private security firms, while not constituting networks per se, are also significant transfer agents within this field.

State institutional networks

The approach taken by the US and Canada towards major events is illustrative of what Dupont (2004) characterizes as state institutional networks. Both countries have major event designations that, when invoked by relevant authorities, signal that the event has been deemed to require exceptional security measures and triggers the involvement of a predefined network of state agencies. In the US this designation is called a National Special Security Event (NSSE). Once this designation is invoked by the President or the

Director of Homeland Security, the US Secret Service (USSS) is appointed as the lead federal agency for developing and implementing security plans in conjunction with state and local authorities, the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI), and the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) (Reese, 2008). Canada takes a comparable approach. Canada's Minister of Public Safety has the authority to declare any event a "major event" if it is deemed to be of national or international significance where the overall responsibility for security rests with the federal government of Canada. Once designated as such, the RCMP is appointed the lead security planning and coordination agency in conjunction with other federal agencies, provincial public safety and emergency management authorities, and local law enforcement bodies.

The USSS and RCMP each have internal units responsible for major event security policy within their respective countries: within the USSS, the Major Events Division, and within the RCMP the Major Events and Protective Services Division. These specialized institutional units fulfill a multitude of roles including serving as central points of liaison between different organizational and operational divisions within the agency and developing unified command models for each event. Key to the latter function is the utilization of organizational templates that further specify how law enforcement, public safety, and intelligence agencies should (ideally) interact, define command authority and lines of communication, specify roles and

responsibilities for middle- and upper-level planners, and set out timetables for operational planning. As mentioned in the previous chapter, these templates are based on the Incident Command System (ICS). In Canada this template is no more than a large binder complete with organizational charts, checklists, timelines, job descriptions, examples of useful forms, and numerous technical appendices. As the Director of the RCMP's Major Events and Protective Services explained in an interview, this template "standardizes our system so that someone who is just starting to plan can look at this and get a sense of where to start and who to talk to," yet is "always evolving because with every event the lessons learned and the best practices are reintegrated so that it helps us evolve our practices and processes."

It should be noted that these templates are primarily organizational tools pertaining to command structures, communications, and inter-agency working relationships, with detailed operational planning falling to temporary units dedicated to that particular event (such as the RCMP's Integrated Security Unit for the 2010 Games). Nonetheless, these institutional unit play a crucial role in maintaining continuity at the policy level between past and future events by acting as institutional memory banks for best practices and lessons learned that will shape how future events are managed in the country. As such, these units function as core nodes of state institutional networks insofar as they are "repositories for resources and information that each member of the network can access" (Dupont, 2004: 80) that facilitate the mobilization and transfer of

knowledge within each respective agency. As the Director of the RCMP Major Events and Protective Services Division explained in an interview, "knowledge is reported through appropriate channels within the force and maintained, and that's what the Major Events Division is doing and has done in the past. We manage information on a needs basis."

Learning from others

As the quote at the beginning of this chapter suggests, preparing to host the Olympic Games includes the observation of comparable events in other countries. Interactions with other countries are necessarily more complicated than facilitating knowledge mobility within a single institution. In Canada's case, these international activities were coordinated through the Office of the Coordinator for 2010 Olympics and G8/G20 Security, which acted as a "hub or switch that centralizes all outgoing flows from national sub-units and despatches [sic] back all incoming flows" (Dupont, 2004: 81).

Canadian officials have been invited observers at all Olympics since the 2002 Games in preparation for the 2010 Games as arranged through the federal security coordinator. Such observation programs are, as one security planner involved with the 2006 Turin Games put it in an interview, "a regular occurrence for large scale events." This can involve small groups of planners sitting in on a few meetings and debriefing sessions to fully embedded

planners shadowing counterparts in task-specific domains for weeks at a time. Longer, more in-depth observations allow the exchange of “plans and lessons learned and documents and things like that” but also in “building that informal relationship,” according to another planner involved in the 2002 Games, that is important to effective learning in general.

These densest international connections are between countries that share preexisting relationships; in Canada’s case, this means interaction with the US. Canadian officials have directly observed security operations for the 2002 Winter Games, a number of Super Bowls, and a series of other NSSEs in the years preceding the 2010 Games. These activities are complemented by a range of professional conferences and working seminars hosted by US authorities at which RCMP personnel have “attended, reviewed, and shared best practices at” (RCMP, 2005: 3), including a post-Games review of the USSS plans and after-action reports related to the 2002 Winter Games, an FBI major event planning conference, a USSS threat assessment and assassination seminar, and multiple cross-border critical incident and emergency response exercises. Though evidence of comparable policies across jurisdictions is not itself evidence of deliberate policy transfer (Bennett, 1991: 223), the fact that the RCMP has adopted the ICS as the basis of the agency’s major events template suggests that the emulation of policy instruments is part of this cross-border institutional learning as well.

Until recently these transnational networking activities were composed almost exclusively of state actors interacting directly with one another, but a growing range of non-state actors are becoming prominent in the field. The IOC coordinates its own institutional knowledge network called the Olympic Games Knowledge Management (OGKM) program that is comparable to the state institutional networks outlined above, though it is both non-state and transnational. Inaugurated in 1998 as a way to reduce the growing cost and complexity of the Games, the OGKM program is geared towards "capitalizing and transferring 'know-how' from Games to Games," according to OGKM literature, by "offering a platform of learning through a variety of ways of knowledge transfer – from written reports and documents, to a global network of experienced advisors, to opportunities to learn in a live environment." This evolving 'platform of learning' as it pertains to security covers a range of issues that individual organizing committees are responsible for such as controlling access and egress, hiring security guards and contracting police officers, acquiring security equipment for venues and accommodations, ensuring compliance with pertinent laws and regulations, and integrating these plans with the overall plans of the host law enforcement and public safety agencies.

Every Olympic organizing committee since Sydney has contributed after-action reports and other planning documents to the OGKM, resulting in a significant body of formal knowledge that is made available to future

organizing committees by the IOC. These reports include detailed description of security arrangements and critical incidents as well as “a whole set of recommendations and lessons drawn from the event for how to make it smoother for future Games,” according to an individual who drafted some of these reports after the 2006 Turin Games. IOC’s own ‘in-house’ experts are also made available to organizing committees, particularly at the early stages of planning. This trade in embodied experience is supplemented by the informal practice of recruiting members of previous organizing committees – sometime known colloquially as ‘Olympic gypsies’ – into key positions for upcoming events. VANOC’s Director of Security Integration, for example, is a former Italian military official who fulfilled a comparable position in the organizing committee for the 2006 Turin Games.

International governance organizations are also becoming prominent in this field. In 2006 the European Union (EU) and the United Nations Interregional Crime and Justice Research Institute (UNICRI), which describes itself as a “laboratory for testing ideas,” embarked on a collaborative research program on major event security called EU-SEC. The EU-SEC program has the aim of harmonizing national policies around major events, encouraging practical cooperation and information sharing, and identifying and promoting major event best practices across the EU. In 2006 the original EU-SEC program and its successor, EU-SEC II, were integrated as a regional platform within the UN International Permanent Observatory on Security during Major Events (IPO)

along with newly created platforms in South America and Southeast Asia. Similar to EU-SEC, the IPO functions with the aims of “strengthening international cooperation and facilitating the exchange of information among national agencies in charge of security during major events; promoting the identification of best practices within the field; improving the capability of relevant national agencies and departments to maintain security during major events” (UNICRI, 2007: 1). A range of services can be requested by member nations that support these aims, chief amongst which is the *Security Planning Model*. Similar to the major event templates created by the state networks touched on above, this instrument is essentially a ‘to-do list’ for how national authorities can begin security planning for a major event. This planning model has since involved into the *Major Event Toolkit for Policymakers and Security Planners*, which according to an IPO official includes specific information and examples from previous events. Again paralleling the state and non-state networks outlined above, the IPO has a rotating cast of ‘in house’ experts – currently lead by the Scottish police commander responsible for the 2006 Glen Eagles G8 summit – and a roster of public officials who occupied prominent positions in previous major events that can be requested by member states to act as consultants.

'Body shops in the brain business'

Private firms are also becoming prominent actors within these networks. Multinational technology and consultancy firms stand out in this regard, but in theory any private entity claiming technical expertise can seek to position itself as knowledge brokers within these networks (Stone, 2004). Insurance companies, for example, are potentially important transfer agents insofar as they may influence governments and organizing committees to adopt certain security measures as part of insurability requirements.

Private sectors actors do not, on the whole, constitute closed networks such as those outlined above. Instead, they seek to insinuate themselves as nodes within other networks by monopolizing capital, or "context-specific resources" (Dupont, 2004: 84), to increase their value relative to other nodes (Castells, 2000: 15-16). In this context, knowledge is capital. More specifically, practical knowledge gained through experience is capital, and promoting this capital is a vital activity within this niche of the security industry. Part of this promotional work involves highlighting the practical experience gained through involvement in past events. The slogan for the UK event management firm *Rushmans* for example is, "Knowledge is not enough – experience is essential," and promotional copy from *Rushmans* and other comparable companies often enumerate previous events in which they were involved as evidence of their expertise.

Private knowledge brokers also acquire capital by acquiring people. The long-standing trend in security of the ‘revolving door’ between state security agencies and private corporations is reflected in the current context by how private firms recruit experts into their fold in order to increase their value within state and non-state institutional networks. ‘Expertise’ in this context is defined by previous experience or institutional affiliation, not formal credentials (McCann, 2008). As such, the individuals valued by private firms are often retired state officials that held prominent roles with previous major events, particularly at the high end of the market where multi-million dollar ‘tier one’ supply chain management and integration contracts can be at stake. Contemporary Services Corporation for example, which fashions itself as the industry leader in sport event security management in the US, counts Mark Camillo amongst its management board, a former member of the US Secret Service and Olympic Security Coordinator for the 2002 Salt Lake Games. In 2009 a Canadian subsidiary of CSC won a $97 million CAN contract from the RCMP to provide private security officers and conduct security screenings at venues for the 2010 Vancouver Winter Olympics. Similarly, the US defense contractor SAIC won a $350 million US contract from Greece over competing bids in part because the company retained David Tubbs, the former executive director of the Utah Olympic Public Safety Command (UOPSC), who was already being enticed by Greek officials to consult on the 2004 Games.

These instances are consistent with the broader methods of the transnational security industry to stock its ranks with former government officials valuable for their practical experience and professional contacts, “their name implying both high-quality service as well as access to powerful policy networks” (O'Reilly, 2010: 190). This highlights how the stock-in-trade of these companies is not necessarily in the domain of technical capabilities per se (though assembling these capabilities by tapping into industry networks is necessary) but in the capability to make itself valuable to others by recruiting those with specialized knowledge. A SAIC vice president explained this in an interview, saying “one of the things that we pride ourselves in is having people with excellent experience that can bring to the table help to shorten the learning curve, save time and of course save money.” He continued:

> For every major event, regardless if it’s the Olympics or not, one of the things that’s hard is having enough specific people and you only need them for a year, six months, or two years. Well, if I want to go out and hire, for instance, five aviation experts that are going to help me plan the Olympic Games for instance, do I really have that insight of the ex-police agency or ex-DoD agency that are ready and available for the next two years to dedicate their life? No. But where do you get that? You go to a company that has retired resources who have done this for other agencies and now are available and not only that they will lend them to you for two years versus you should have started ten years ago training and building this capacity and sending this person around the world to get the experience so that they could do this eight years from now. That’s not very practical.

SAIC can, of course, provide precisely that experience, a point sharpened by the fact that this VP was formerly a Utah law enforcement officer involved in the 2002 Games before joining SAIC to work on other major events. This is why Bartlett and Steele (2007) refers to these security consultancy firms as

"body shops in the brain business," a phrase originally coined in reference to SAIC but applicable to many other corporate actors in this field as well.

Transnational security consultancies thus provide numerous opportunities for former officials to convert their experience into consulting expertise and move into the private sector. This career trajectory is typified by Peter Ryan, who after overseeing security for the 2000 Sydney Games as the Chief of the New South Wales police department joined the organizing committee for the Athens Games as a security consultant and later fashion a career as one of the world's foremost major event security experts. According to Ryan, "the experience gained with Sydney particularly was a very good starting point, which enabled me to move into the broader international strategic security realm. People were aware of my background, and as a result, sought my assistance and advice for major political and sporting events" (in Major Events International, 2009). The overlapping career trajectories of these individuals can be powerful conduits for facilitate the mobility of knowledge between "far-flung and, in many cases, incommensurate cities" (McCann, 2008: 11) by moving from event to event and amongst the complex of public and private institutions involved in major events. This movement of embodied expertise also facilitates the transfer of knowledge in a non-spatial way. As security for the Games continues to move towards large scale and highly sophisticated integration projects that merge with what companies such as SAIC, Raytheon, Lockheed Martin or Siemens already do as contractors for the defense industry, these corporate transfer

agents also serve as interfaces between advances in military surveillance and communications technology and their domestic applications in the homeland security market. This three-way interface of expertise is illustrated by the contingent of SAIC representatives at a 2008 major events security conference in London that consisted of the former Utah official/SAIC VP quoted above, a newly retired US military official recruited to SAIC, and a British biometrics expert recruited to pursue contracts for SAIC for the 2012 London Games.

The Olympic security field

These institutional networks and private sector actors appear at first glance to constitute what Ward (2006b: 70) calls "strong diffusion channels and distribution networks that exist to facilitate the transfer of policies of a particular type from one place to another." These distribution networks are composed of flows of physical artifacts – templates, models, after-action reports, and the like – that "travel in briefcases, are passed around at conferences and meetings […] and repeatedly the topic of discussion" (McCann, 2008: 6), and transnational flows of people themselves who move physically between events and professionally between state, non-state, and corporate institutions.

However, there are numerous risks in taking evidence of these networking activities at face value as evidence of knowledge transfer. Critical takes on

knowledge transfer warn against taking evidence of interaction as evidence of learning without detailed empirical investigation, which is often precluded in this context by government secrecy. The sociology of organizational failure also tells us that mistakes are prone to be repeated, particularly when lessons are drawn from experience that is distant in space and time (Bennett, 1991; Donahue & Tuohy, 2006). Numerous other logistical factors making knowledge "sticky" (Szulanski, 2000) or difficult to transfer can be enumerated. After action reports may be drafted, circulated, revised, and passed up the chain in order to satisfy various institutional requirements, but there is no guarantee that these reports will be taken seriously in the future. Bellavita is worth quoting on this point given his experience with the 1996 and 2002 Olympics:

> At least one – and often several – after-action reports followed every Olympic or equivalently unique event in the United States since 1980. Almost without exception public safety planners responsible for the next major event ignored those reports (Bellavita, 2007: 2).

He continues,

> Typically, the people who are aware of these reports and who read them are either not around when it comes time to plan for the event, forget what they read, or are not in an organizational position to implement the recommendations of these reports (Bellavita, 2007: 4).

Furthermore, the production of these reports cannot be separated from the desire of authorities to use these occasions as vehicles to hide failure and burnish success (Birkland, 2009). This came up in an interview with a Vancouver police officer closely involved in the 2010 Games a few months after the events concluded:

> There are a couple of reports that are being compiled. One is already finished and the other is being compiled in relation to the overall Vancouver response. And I know the ISU is doing this as well.
>
> Q: Will these be publicly available?
>
> I don't know. I know one is, for sure, but you don't want to... from what I've seen of it, it's basically... I don't want to call it a propaganda piece but it is very self-aggrandizing. There is a lot of patting on the back going on in it. I don't think there's much critical thinking or much critical assessment of what went right and what went wrong.

It is also debatable whether the globetrotting junkets of high-level officials genuinely influence the activities of mid- and lower-level workers who do the bulk of the detailed planning for an event. "It depends if these people are really involved in the detailed planning," said a security planner with the organizing committee for the 2006 Games in an interview. More often than not, however, these processes occur above the heads of most. "People were just requested to work and be efficient," the same individual reported. Public authorities and organizing committees may hold divergent views on the look or feel of security, or in extreme cases harbor institutional animosities that hinder working relationships. A glimpse of this is gained from a confidential RCMP planning document that states, "The RCMP will provide security in spite of VANOC." Private companies may overstate their role in previous events or the value of their consultants in order to procure contracts when such involvement may have been minimal. "The world appears to be bursting with many who claim to have security experience from this Games or that," said one prominent IOC security consultant in a personal email communication.

Thus while the scrutiny of major events *does* occur, and while some of the insights gained through this scrutiny may undoubtedly be of use to those hosting future events, on the whole these networks do not amount to the disinterested bazaar of best practices they are often presented to be by authorities. “People give lip service to the desire not to reinvent the wheel, but when one looks empirically at how security planning begins, there is little evidence that planners or leaders incorporate lessons learned from one jurisdiction into their own” (Bellavita, 2007: 4).

However, the influence of these networks extends beyond the narrow function of identifying and transferring best practices from event to event. These networks are also powerful channels through which the practical expertise and technologies of security governance are produced and globalized in the post-9/11 world, a function that is more expansive than the transference of disinterested knowledge from A to B (Stone, 2004). There is a range of institutional motivations involved in this, the first of which are associated with the desire of nation-states to use these networks as opportunities to consolidate or expand their own economic and geopolitical interests. This can span from what Bennett (1991) calls “transfer by penetration” where powerful actors impose their expertise on other to where involvement in an ostensibly free market of ideas is used to advance ideological gains or bolster support for courses of action that would have been taken anyways. In Athens, for example,

security planning for the 2004 Games was influenced to a high degree, and in some cases contrary to the wishes of Greek officials, by the ‘advice’ of the Olympic Security Advisory Group (OSAG) and particularly the US and UK, which perceived their athletes and citizens to be at greatest risk. For the US this involvement was seen as an opportunity shore up its presence in the region by assisting Greece to develop its security capabilities, part of which included the condition that Greece source much of its security equipment from US companies, including the multi-million dollar integration contract obtained by SAIC for the Games (Tsoukala, 2006; Samatas, 2007). Diplomatic cables recently made available by WikiLeaks provide an unvarnished look at how the US views the upcoming 2014 FIFA World Cup and 2016 Olympics in Brazil as an opportunity to develop its interests in this region as well. Concerned by a lack of detailed progress in planning for these events, a 2009 cable states, “the delays we expect from the GOB [Government of Brazil] in planning and executing the preparatory works for a successful World Cup and Olympic Games will almost certainly place greater onus on the USG [United States Government] to ensure that necessary standards are met.” Given the high degree of interest from Brazilian authorities to stage a successful event and the presumed involvement of the US in doing so, the cable recommends that the US government “leverage cooperation with Brazilian authorities to further broader USG objectives in Brazil,” including developing the country’s cyber-security capabilities and “preparing for the commercial opportunities the games will afford U.S. businesses” (WikiLeaks, 2010).

The Beijing Games provides an illustration of how involvement in these networks can be used to advance pre-formulated political aims. Chinese officials participated in many of the same observation programs and high-level (and highly publicized) conferences in preparation for the 2008 Games that other Olympic hosts have, including debriefing sessions with Greece, high-level exchanges with the US, Interpol, and the IPO (Yu et al., 2009: 394-397). However, these exchanges were of "specific, though limited, value," and overall security efforts were "unmistakably domestic, reflecting a desire on the part of organizers to preserve sovereignty and maintain complete control" (Thompson, 2008: 47-48), thus suggesting that these overtures were calculated efforts to foster the perception of joining the international community rather than a genuine effort to learn from others. Furthermore, taking part in these exchanges provided Beijing with the defense that it's security measures for the Games were the natural evolution of what had come before and not the sinister police state that human rights organizations condemned, thus also demonstrating the ideological purposes to which involvement in international collaboration may be put.

The developmental goals of non-governmental institutions also play a role in the globalization of security expertise through the Games. The EU-SEC and IPO networks disseminate strong discourses about the desirability of using the Olympics or other major events as opportunities for the development of

security capabilities in the host country. The EU-SEC series of projects is explicit about this. One EU-SEC report states:

> Planners should be knowledgeable on how to ensure that countries that host major international events can gain long-term benefits from planned security. In particular, a legacy knowledge and a planning culture could ensure that the resources and know-how made available for major events such as infrastructure, training and technology solutions would enhance overall national capabilities and improve daily routine activities after the event (UNICRI, 2007: 7).

The EU-SEC projects were initially focused on the EU, but the IPO, of which EU-SEC is now a regional platform, promotes this message beyond the EU. The IPO is particularly oriented towards developing countries where major events are being held with increasing regularity yet where security capabilities are less developed, which is reflected in the creation of the IPOs two newest regional platforms in Central/South America and the Southeast Pacific. On paper these new regional platforms are conceptually equivalent to the EU-SEC, but in practice the movement of knowledge is decidedly unidirectional and moves from the European core to the developing periphery. This structured movement of knowledge is visually represented in one Power Point slide from an IPO webinar that shows a map of the world in which arrows extend from the EU-SEC logo in the center to the new IPO platforms on the periphery. "We want nations to be able to do major event security in a way that will be useful after the event is done so that all this money invested in security is not wasted," said the IPO official interviewed for this research. Doing so is "the only reason why there is a United Nation's program on major event security," the same individual continued, which is in keeping with the wider embrace of

knowledge management in support of the capacity-building objectives of the UN in developing countries (Ilcan & Phillips, 2008).

The IOC has an implicit stake in promoting (or at least not discouraging) the approach of the IPO as it provides potential hosts with a rationale for justifying the costs that come with hosting the Games. Unsurprisingly, the IPO's approach is tremendously appealing to the security industry as it offers the prospect of transforming an otherwise one-off event into a long-term engagement. As such, security companies have a vested interest in reinforcing the discourse around major events about the desirability of long-term security legacies as part of the wider policy objectives of hosting a major event. An IPO official put it this way in an interview:

> To sell their products they need to convince the organizers and host governments of the major event that there are long-lasting benefits to invest in their technology and that this technology is not only for major events but can be used in other situations too.

A clear example of such persuasion is found in a security conference held in 2007 for top UK officials devoted to "creating the legacy of 2012" that featured speakers from a variety of industry representatives and convened through the sponsorship of SAIC and Northrop Grumman, both military-industrial contractors seeking large video surveillance and communications integration projects being advanced by the UK government around the 2012 Games.

The convergence of interests between the IPO's developmental goals and the profit-driven interests of the security industry is coalescing in particularly powerful ways in relation to the rapidly developing cities of the global south where expenditures on national infrastructure are growing and where major events are being hosted with greater frequency. For the IPO these events are seen a "teachable moments" to develop the security capabilities of the host government as models for the development of other rapid growth cities, and for the security industry these events represent unparalleled opportunities to gain entry into practically untapped markets. American technologies firms such as IBM and Honeywell for example enthusiastically exploited the confluence of China's virtually limitless budget and policy objectives of the Grand Beijing Safeguard Sphere to sell a range of technologies to the authoritative government in preparation for the 2008 Games, possibly in breech of US trade law pertaining to selling crime control equipment to the authoritarian state after Tiananmen Square (China Rights Forum, 2006; Bradsher, 2007). The attention of the industry has now shifted to Brazil, which is set to host the FIFA World Cup in 2014 and the Olympics in 2016, an unprecedented back-to-back hosting of the world's two largest mega-events by one of the most rapidly developing countries in the world. Unsurprisingly again, the security industry is clamoring to be a part of the action, with firms such as *Major Events International* and the *Security Industry Association* arranging trade missions or compiling market forecasts for industry clients in the US as these events draw closer. This profit-driven search for new and expanding markets merges neatly with the IPO's

newest initiative inaugurated in early 2009 – IPO-TECH – which aims to develop partnerships with "prominent technology suppliers" to provide "proven" security technologies to major event organizers and train practitioners in their use during and after the event. Given that this initiative would provide a direct pathway into coveted markets it is unsurprising that numerous multinational security companies are seeking to establish themselves as partners of this is IPO initiative.

CONCLUSION

This chapter has outlined some of the actors and processes involved in the production and circulation of best practices for major event security. While the scrutiny of major events *does* occur, and while this scrutiny may be useful for future events (particularly within domestic institutional networks), these activities do not amount to the ideal types of epistemic communities envisioned by Haas (1992) characterized by disinterested professionals sharing a consensus about a common problem operating free of external constraints. To the contrary, the production and movement of best practices within these networks is highly structured within, and serve to reinforce, prevailing relations of politics and power and used to consolidate ideological gains or present the appearance of international collaboration. This agrees neatly with Peck and Theodore's argument that "policy models that affirm and extend dominant paradigms, and which consolidate powerful interests, are more likely

to travel with the following wind of hegemonic compatibility or imprimatur status" (Peck & Theodore, 2010: 170).

Furthermore, these networks facilitate the circulation of discourses that are considerably greater than the functional and ostensibly apolitical purpose of identifying and transferring knowledge from A to B. Specifically, by constituting and promoting the idea of the Games as an opportunity for developing long-term legacies, and then delivering the 'know how' and technologies to capitalize on this opportunity, these networks also serve as "informational infrastructures" (McCann, 2008: 12) through which security expertise is produced and disseminated globally. These networks are animated by a range of interests including the efforts of powerful nations to influence the security agenda of other nations, the attempts of host countries to recast their experience with the Games as an export commodity, the activities of international governing organizations to achieve developmental goals, and the profit-seeking interests of the security industry to promote their products and gain toeholds in emerging markets. These varied interests are welded together by the career trajectories of experienced officials – such as Peter Ryan but including many others – who "knowingly create careers for themselves through and against broader political-economic processes" (Larner & Larner, 2010: 219) by moving from event to event and through the nexus of state, non-state, and corporate institutions involved in major event security. This 'kinetic expertise' also travels through the growing circuit of conferences dedicated to

major events wherein a remarkably small and recurring cast of experts is brought together to discuss upcoming events or delivered to paying audiences. Recent and upcoming gatherings of this sort include the inaugural IPO-TECH symposium in May 2009 in Abu Dhabi, two “Olympic Safety and Security” conferences hosted by RUSI in November 2009 and 2010, and the “International Sports Security Summit” hosted by the event management firm *Rushmans* in November 2007. Collectively, these processes help produce a “dominant – albeit complex and fluctuating – coalescence of interests” (O'Reilly, 2010: 196) that seeks to ensure that the Olympics will result in a step change in the security infrastructure and capabilities of the host city and country.

This is, admittedly, perhaps an overly pessimistic reading of the situation, as if these networks constituted cohesive, deterministic, and perhaps parasitic forces seeking to foist the yoke of control upon unsuspecting local populations. No doubt the actors and aims of this field are more fragmented and less potent in practice than portrayed here, and these processes do not service the singular aim of establishing straightforward control. However, what fundamentally unites the diversity of actors in this field is a reliance on fostering *in*security as part of demonstrating the indispensability of their knowledge (Ericson, 1994). While the message from those directly responsible for the Games is a carefully guarded optimism that the Games will be safe, the overwhelming message promulgated within this field accentuates how the Games are inherently

vulnerable to a wide range of unforeseeable risks, including ‘lone wolf’ attacks, organized crime, paramilitary ‘swarm’ attacks, rampaging anarchists, natural and man-made accidents, and, of course, catastrophic terrorism (e.g., Zekulin, 2009). Much of this comes from retired state officials, often with intelligence backgrounds, who reinforce the “presumed apocalyptic potential of contemporary threats” (de Goede & Sandalls, 2009: 859). “We are involved in a technological war with actual adversaries and we have seen ample evidence of medieval minds that are consumed with finding the means of intimidating and destroying civilization,” says a former CSIS official about the threats facing the Vancouver Olympics (in Lee, 2008). Some of these messages come from the very same people who also deliver assurances that the Games will be safe. Peter Ryan for example has expressed the view that it’s “probably just a matter of time” before the Games are struck by a major terrorist attack (in the Houston Chronicle, 2007). Such statements demonstrate how managers of unease thrive on fostering an optimum level of insecurity as part of their discourse. The intelligence briefs – or “missives of insecurity” O’Reilly (2010: 192) might call them – produced by security agencies responsible for the Games also play a role in this insofar as these documents routinely find their way into public circulation and become fodder for journalistic speculation.

This is not to take the radical constructivist position that “threats do not exist prior to practices of articulation” as de Goede and Randalls do (2009: 861), or to interpret the statements of all officials as calculated fabrications motivated

by straightforward personal or corporate gain. The aims of the IPO for example could be hugely beneficial for developing countries, but even here the discourse of radical insecurity is plainly evident in the reports, speeches, and websites of UNICRI and the IPO. It is, however, to recognize the shared value of constructing the Olympics as fundamentally insecure that traverses this field and which creates a captive market for the increasingly specialized, institutionalized, and commodified expertise this field offers (O'Reilly, 2010). The security industry is particularly astute in framing the Games in this way by constantly unearthing new threats to be mitigated with their products. Consider for example the account by a local Vancouver journalist of a trade show hosted by an international industrial supply company that targeted the organizers and public safety officials for the Vancouver Olympics:

> Attendees were given an outline of the major threats facing the Games, including mustard and sarin gas, viruses and ricin, and radiological and nuclear weapons. The day wrapped up with a demonstration of the latest in 'multi-threat detection systems,' which allow security planners to remotely monitor wide areas for everything from noxious gases to radiation (Lee, 2008).

Even if a minor degree of journalistic license is allowed, Lee's account provides a condensed illustration of a much broader set of activities wherein "opportunists predictably will find ways to expand the definition of threat in order to assert how their expertise and innovations provide ideal solutions to the urban security challenges ahead" (Light, 2002: 612).

The security field that has emerged around the Olympics thus an issue-specific thread of O'Reilly's (2010) wider argument that a "fluctuating security

amalgamation" composed of interpenetrating state, non-state, and corporate interests "has impressed itself upon the agendas, discourse, methods, and ideologies of the global policing environment" (O'Reilly, 2010: 202). More broadly, this field is also a reflection of what Bigo theorizes as the transnational professionalization of unease that governs through *in*security "by using and indeed intensifying subjective states of doubt, anxiety, apprehension and the like" (Lentzos & Rose, 2009: 235). These forces pose acute challenges for the prospect of critical social movements in resisting the potentially detrimental security legacies of the Games. Social movements tend to be firmly rooted in local contexts, but given the wider cast of global actors at work in shaping the provision of security at the Games purely local action is likely to be ineffectual in challenging these processes unless they also reterritorialize their activities along the same plane, something that the history of social movements suggests is difficult to accomplish. Such movements would also have to address those in positions of authority who "define the sources of our insecurity and to produce techniques to manage them" (Bigo, in O'Reilly, 2010: 192). This too poses difficulties insofar as this authority is increasingly insulated from state-based channels of accountability and redress, something exemplified by the IOC in the context of the Olympic Games. There is, then, a pressing and ongoing scholarly need to examine how insecurity is instrumentalized – whether in the context of major events or the security field more generally – in order to understand the creeping securitization of ever more domains of life. I will close with a quote from Lentsoz and Rose, who are

particularly apposite on this point: “Only then would we be able to identify with any precision the new forms of freedom and unfreedom that are being presupposed and constructed by these new rationalization for governing insecurity” (Lentzos & Rose, 2009: 247).

CONCLUSION

This dissertation has advanced the overall claim that security for the Olympic Games generates outcomes that extend far beyond each individual event. In making this claim I have accentuated four different areas where the Games both express and extend wider dynamics pertaining to security governance today. Chapter One examined a municipal initiative of Vancouver to regulate disorder in the city in advance of the 2010 Olympics. This initiative was contextualized within the literature on advanced liberalism on one hand the specific contours of Vancouver's "actually existing" (Brenner & Theodore, 2002) history on the other. Legitimated in relation to the Olympic Games but intrinsically connected to the long-term reconstitution of Vancouver as a livable city, *Project Civil City* exemplifies how the remaking of cities is now accompanied by the 'rolling out' of socio-spatial ordering programs in which "security, policing, the regulation of conduct, and moral ordering have become essential ingredients" (Helms et al., 2007: 267).

Chapter Two examined the security and public safety legacies being pursued around the Olympics at other levels of government. In this chapter I departed from discussions of the legacies of the Athens and Beijing Games to accentuate a series of ways in which authorities in Vancouver sought to promote urban resiliency. I tied the logic of resiliency to the rationality of precautionary governance, which itself is tied to the normalization of low-

probability, high consequence risk. It was argued that precautionary governance is primarily thought of as a rationality of governance authorizing aggressive prevention motivated by the possibility of catastrophic risk but also holds that we must also plan for the inevitable realization of these risks regardless of whether they are intentional or accidental in nature. Three specific technologies of resiliency were underscored in this chapter: new technologies and procedures for visualizing cities and mapping their vulnerabilities, the testing and development of response capabilities with worst-case exercises, and the development of specialized expertise pertaining to the organizational dimensions of crisis management. I concluded this chapter by suggesting that the logic of resiliency focuses on systems and prioritizes worst-cases, the effect of which is to crowd out more ordinary but no less pressing issues facing human populations.

Chapter Three developed an analysis of the performative dimensions of precautionary governance. This chapter takes as its starting point the insight of Beck (and many others) that "the hidden central issue in world risk society is *how to feign control over the uncontrollable* – in politics, law, science, technology, economy and everyday life" (2002: 41, emphasis in original). However, *contra* Beck, I argued (again, with many others) that this imperative is not attached to all risks but emerges from the cultural processes by which certain risks – and high-consequence risks in particular – are constituted as more pressing than others. The social imagination of dread and disaster is

important in this process, and I argued that major sporting events and the Olympic Games in particular have figured prominently in this imagination for some time. Within the context of this collective imagination of disaster there is considerable pressure for authorities to ‘show’ that all risks, including catastrophic risks, are manageable and have been planned for, which I argued is extended through the rhetorical work of managers of unease, the staging of public demonstrations and rituals, and the production of fantasy documents. This chapter concluded by suggesting that the performative dimensions of precaution reinforce the politics of fear that dominates security discourse today.

Finally, Chapter Four maps out the networks and actors involved developing and transferring major event security expertise from event to event. Three institutional networks were identified, which function to facilitate the “transfer and diffusion of innovative practices” (Dupont, 2004: 80) within their respective institutional boundaries: specialized major event units within state policing agencies, the IOC’s knowledge management program, and the UN’s growing network of IPO platforms. The work of private entities, notably multinational security companies, in commodifying and selling security expertise was also outlined. These meaning of ‘legacy’ in relation to these networks is two-fold. On one hand, these networks are legacies themselves that have emerged in response to the recurring problem (and commercial opportunity) of hosting high profile events in different locations around the

world, particularly as they move to cities beyond the European and North American core. On the other hand, these networks constitute powerful discourses about the nature and desirability of implementing or accelerating long-term security programs around the Games, and in doing so are strong channels through which the expertise and technologies of security governance are disseminated around the world.

Some overall synthesis of these arguments is needed. As one of the premier platforms for global media exposure the Olympics are highly sought after by local growth coalitions seeking to remake urban identities and garner a greater share of the people and capital that constitute the global economy. This, in turn, demands a host of transformations to the urban environment, part of which includes efforts to regulate aspects of the city that are contrary to the polished image the city wishes to promote. The Olympics also serve to accentuate concerns about catastrophic terrorism, crime, and normal accidents that, in the context of large crowds concentrated in small areas, pose numerous logistical challenges. While the latter issues are far more likely to occur, the concern of catastrophic terrorism is what receives the most attention and which drives the implementation of a wide range of security measures for the Games. Integrated and centralized video surveillance networks spanning venues and transportation corridors, the pre-emptive surveillance of athletes, attendees and local inhabitants, the intensive policing of dissent, and nested security perimeters that encircle entire metropolitan regions (and further) are now

standard elements of what some have called “stage-set security” (Coaffee et al., 2009: 226). They also drive, as Chapter Two outlined, measures associated with building the resiliency of cities, which emphasizes the capacity of authorities to respond to surprise events through enhanced situational awareness and planning for worst cases.

These measures are driven only in part by objective security concerns. Being matters of national pride, competence, and international political standing, security at the Games is also influenced by the desire of authorities to protect their institutional reputation under the global spotlight should an even minor security breech occur. The RCMP’s description of the 2010 Vancouver Winter Games as a ‘no fail’ mission reflects this orientation. It is also driven by the implicit and explicit expectations of increasingly powerful sport federations to protect their signature product and commercial platform, the expectations of other nations to protect their athletes, citizens, and delegates, the market-seeking activities of private industry to promote standardized solutions to similar security threats, and excessive preoccupation with improbable but high-impact events. The confluence of these factors drive, as *Jane’s Intelligence Review* has noted, the adoption of “costly and inappropriate security measures” (Hinds & Vlachou, 2007) that exceed what proportionality might suggest.

Importantly, these measures can endure long after the events are over. This can be attributed to a range of political and institutional motivations including the

interests of local “primary definers” (Coleman, 2005) to catalyze urban redevelopment around the Games and the desire on the part of host governments to obtain a return on what is now a substantial investment or accelerate pre-existing improvement projects. These aims are also reinforced by a number of non-local influences including the advice of other host nations and the IOC as communicated through formal and informal channels, the profit-seeking interests of the security industry to use major events security in order to gain toeholds in new markets, and the long-term developmental objectives of international governing organizations. While not deterministic, these forces can be powerful influences in seeing that the Games do result in long-term security legacies for the host country.

These developments suggest a number of avenues for future research into the Olympic Games, the most pressing of which have to do with the potential of hosting major events to exacerbate social polarization in the name of putting on a good show and undercutting democratic principles in the name of keeping the Games safe. As has been shown, the security measures put in for the Games can outlast, and are often intended to outlast, the short period of the Games as authorities capitalize on these events as opportunities to meet a variety of governmental ambitions. The motivations behind this opportunism will be very in each case, as will the specific outcomes, but there is a general need to assess these outcomes as they are implemented and retained after the Games. Furthermore, it is important to remember that these legacies are not

just the product of local decision makers but also the outcome of interactions between local authorities and a complex of global actors that have interests in shaping the long-term outcomes of the Games. As such, there is a critical need to not only investigate the security legacies of the Games on a case-by-case basis but to examine how the interactions between the global and the local as they relate to the wider security objectives of these events, particularly if these objectives lead to inflated budgets that crowd out other areas of spending or contribute to the development and dissemination of models and technologies for facilitating state control over domestic populations. There is a need to critically assess the role of the IOC in this process, which has heretofore remained wedded to the refrain that is has no role to play in the domestic politics of host nations. Given that the Games can and have been used to justify cracking down on legitimate dissent and strengthening control over domestic populations, maintaining a position of political neutrality is ethically unsustainable. There is a related need to examine the role of the security industry in this as well, which has been shown to be ready to exploit the commercial opportunities that come with the Games but quick to disavow their involvement when normative questions are raised.

Thus to reiterate the point already made by others (Coaffee & Wood, 2006: 516; Giulianotti & Klauser, 2010: 52), perhaps the most pressing question for future studies of the Olympic Games and other major events is to examine how the security agenda of host nations is driven by the demands and interests of a

complex of transnational actors at the expense of local populations. This issue was highlighted at the recent 2010 Commonwealth Games in Delhi when access to the outdoor seating – the only seats with any hope of affordability for the vast majority of Delhi residents – for a number of long-distance running and cycling events were closed due to security concerns. Televised shots from inside the main venue for the start/finish line of these events showed a full and decidedly non-local crowd, but the bleacher-style seating along course routes were devoid of spectators save for those who caught glimpses of the action through security fencing. The juxtaposition between these images raises the question of how security concerns disproportionately impact local disadvantaged populations while enabling benefits to accrue elsewhere. As this anecdote suggests, the need for this analysis is particularly pressing given that major events are increasingly being held in the highly polarized cities of the global south or nations with dubious human rights records, so it is of pressing importance to examine the role of these security networks in shaping major event security in specific contexts in the future. Such questions are directly applicable to the study of other major events such as the FIFA World Cup or Commonwealth Games, as well as to major political summits, particularly with respect to how the lessons from previous events are culminating in a standardized template of temporary urban fortification that includes increasingly repressive modes of policing of dissent (Warren, 2002, 2004).

The wider significance of the Games is that they provide glimpses at future directions in urban governance. Technologically, these events are showcases for developments in surveillance and security products before being promoted as 'proven' security solutions to a range of security anxieties within the global homeland security market. Epistemologically, the Olympics are key locations in the production and globalization of security expertise pertaining to 'joined-up' governance and crisis management, the lessons from which are communicated to other events and drawn upon as models for safe, secure, and resilient cities in general, which has as much to do with creating an environment suitable for investment and relocation than it does with managing threats. And culturally, major events are fertile ground for the production of discourse that reinforces the refrain that we are living in a world of unpredictable, high-consequence risk in which ever-greater levels of security are necessary, desirable, and of unquestionable legitimacy. This has the effect of normalizing otherwise exceptional security measures, recalibrating public assessments of proportionality and privacy, and buttressing prevailing conceptions of high-consequence risk while crowding out other that lack the same emotive or political impacts.

These wider legacies gain their traction because of recalibrations in the idea and practice of national security within the last decade(s). As touched on in the introduction to this dissertation, one of the consequences of the globalization of non-state enemies and simple yet highly destructive weapons is that national

security is no longer fixed to the territorial container of the nation state but increasingly 'turned in' to the populations, critical infrastructures, political/economic institutions of cities. These concerns are not wholly new but a reactivation of older concerns that can be traced back to the vulnerability of cities to nuclear strike, yet even this possibility was structured within a commonly understood political system with identifiable adversaries, means, and objectives (Daase & Kessler, 2007). The dissolution of this system has blurred traditional distinctions between national security, public safety, and law enforcement, and positioned cities as the domestic front on the 'war on terror' (Graham, 2006). This includes the everyday lives of urban inhabitants, who are encouraged to make national security part of their daily routines through neighborhood watch schemes or micro-scale emergency planning. National security, as Coaffee and Wood write, "is becoming "more focused on the civic, urban, domestic and personal realms; in essence, security is coming home" (2006: 504).

The Olympics are significant in this context not simply because the Games have become bigger and more complex, or because governments appear willing to approve ever-escalating security budgets for the Games. They are significant because these events are laboratories for addressing the key issue facing urban security governance today, which is how to remake cities as safe and secure sites within which the flows of people and capital that constitute global commerce come together unencumbered by the dangers and

externalities of late modernism. Their utility in addressing the challenge between embedding security in the routines, habits, and infrastructures of cities while at the same time not immobilizing the flows of people and capital that cities depend can be contrasted against the securing of major political summits. These events are now heavily militarized island sites that resemble modern-day siege craft more than anything else, which if writ large to the problems of urban vulnerability today would “destroy the very texture of what makes cities function as urbanistic centers in the first place” (Molotch & McClain, 2003: 686). It is in seeking this balance between apparatuses of closure on one hand and facilitating desirable mobilities on the other that makes the Olympics laboratories in urban governance. “The lessons from this for any nation must be preserved and absorbed and developed further,” says Peter Ryan, the IOC’s top security consultant. “National security now begins on the streets of our cities, the ports and airports, and vulnerable borders which all nations have” (Ryan, 2002: 25).

It is tempting at this point to conclude by engaging in the sort of dystopic urban futurism popularized by Mike Davis (1998) and suggest that urban security governance will inevitably trend toward the sort of totalizing security apparatus typified by the Beijing Olympics. Such speculation requires a deterministic cynicism that I do not subscribe to. The outcomes of the Olympics will be different in each case; what happens in Beijing or Vancouver will be different than London or Sochi. Furthermore, there is no reason to think

that some of these outcomes will not be constructive or beneficial in nature. In practice, however, the Olympics do appear to exacerbate trends in urban governance that prompt the most concern. This includes the interpenetration of interests in security governance across a range of state and non-state actors, which prompts questions about whose interests are being served by the progressive extension of security into ever-more domains of life and makes the question of accountability much more difficult to answer given the wider cast of actors involved in security provision (Klauser, 2009). It also includes highlighting and exacerbating the role of uncertainty in driving forward security measures. Heightened levels of uncertainty can motivate policy makers to implement aggressive security measures that go beyond what would otherwise be consider appropriate or exploited to push through measures that would otherwise encounter significant resistance. Cumulatively, such an environment may by incompatible with the ideals of democratic society if it debases the capabilities of civil society to critique and resist the ever-greater means of monitoring society in the name of providing security. Perhaps the most disconcerting element of future directions in urban governance that the Games are beginning to highlight is in widening the chasm between global connection and local dislocation in cities where elites travel through dedicated and highly secured corridors and bubbles while the local dispossessed are contained behind security cordons, a partitioning buttressed by developments in urban governance in which Olympic host cities are often pioneers.

References

9/11 Commission. (2004). *Final Report of the National Commission on Terrorist Attacks upon the United States*. Washington D.C.: National Commission on Terrorist Attacks.

Amoore, L., & De Goede, M. (2008). Governing risk in the war on terror. In L. Amoore & M. de Goede (Eds.), *Risk and the War on Terror* (pp. 5-19). New York: Routledge.

Anderson, B. (2010). Security and the future: anticipating the event of terror. *Geoforum*, 41, 227-235.

Aradau, C., & van Munster, R. (2007). Governing terrorism through risk: taking precautions, (un)knowing the future. *European Journal of International Relations*, 13(1), 89-115.

Aron, R. (1968). *Introduction to Kahn's Thinking about the Unthinkable*. New York: Discus Books.

Arquilla, J. (2009, Feb. 15). The coming swarm. *The New York Times,* pp. WK.11.

Ashworth, G. (1991). *War and the City*. London: Routledge.

Atkinson, M., & Young, K. (2002). Terror Games: media treatment of security issues at the 2002 Winter Olympic Games. *Olympika: The International Journal of Olympic Studies*, 11, 53-78.

---. (2005). Political violence, terrorism, and security at the Olympic Games. In K. Young & K. Wamsley (Eds.), *Global Olympics: Historical and Sociological Studies of the Modern Games* (pp. 269-294). Oxford: Elsevier.

Bader, M. (2009). *Olympic security budget will create a big brother legacy*. Retrieved Mar. 3 2009 from www.straight.com.

Bajc, V. (2007). Surveillance in public rituals: security meta-ritual and the 2005 U.S. Presidential Inauguration. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 50(12), 1648-1673.

Ball, K., & Webster, F. (2003). The intensification of surveillance. In K. Ball & F. Webster (Eds.), *The Intensification of Surveillance: Crime, Terrorism and Warfare in the Information Age* (pp. 1-15). London: Pluto Press.

Bartlett, D., & Steele, J. (2007). *Washington's $8 Billion Shadow*. Retrieved Sept. 24th 2008 from http://www.vanityfair.com.

BC. (2008). *Province announces pilot to monitor high-crime areas*. Victoria: Ministry of Public Safety and Solicitor General and Ministry of the Attorney General.

Beck, U. (1992). *Risk Society: Towards a New Modernity*. Thousand Oaks, California: Sage Publications.

---. (2002). The terrorist threat: world risk society revisited. *Theory, Culture and Society*, 19(4), 39-55.

Beckett, K., & Herbert, S. (2008). Dealing with disorder: social control in the post-industrial city. *Theoretical Criminology*, 12(1), 5-30.

Bellavita, C. (2007). Changing homeland security: a strategic logic of special event security. *Homeland Security Affairs*, 3(3), 1-23.

Bellett, G. (2007, Mar. 16). Police target traffickers in drug sweep. *The Vancouver Sun,* pp. B.7.

Bennett, C. (1991). What is policy convergence and what causes it? *British Journal of Political Science*, 21(2), 215-233.

Bennett, C., & Haggerty, K. D. (Eds.). (forthcoming, 2011). *Security Games: Surveillance and Control and Mega-Events*. London: Palgrave.

Berkley, B., & Thayer, J. (2000). Policing entertainment districts. *Policing: An International Journal of Police Strategies & Management*, 23(4), 466-491.

Bigo, D. (2002). Security and immigration: towards a critique of the governmentality of unease. *Alternatives*, 27(1), 63-92.

---. (no date). *To reassure and protect after September 11*. Retrieved April 15 2007 from www.ssrc.org.

Birkland, T. (2009). Disasters, lessons learned, and fantasy documents. *Journal of Contingencies and Crisis Management*, 17(3), 146-156.

Bose, M. (2001, Sept. 18). *Olympic Games: IOC reveiw security plan*. Retrieved Apr. 3 2002 from www.telegraph.co.uk.

Bougen, P. (2003). Catastrophe risk. *Economy and Society*, 32(2), 253-274.

Bowling, B. (2009). Transnational policing: the globalization thesis, a typology and a research agenda. *Policing*, 3(2), 149-160.

Boyle, P., & Haggerty, K. (2009a). Spectacular security: mega-events and the security complex. *International Political Socioogy*, 3(3), 257-274.

Boyle, P., & Haggerty, K. D. (2009b). *Privacy Games: The Vancouver Olympics, Privacy, and Surveillance*. Ottawa: Privacy Commissioner of Canada.

Bradsher, K. (2007, Sept. 11). An opportunity for Wall Street in China's surveillance boom. *The New York Times,* pp. A.1.

Brenner, N., & Theodore, N. (2002). Cities and the geographies of "actually existing neoliberalism." *Antipode*, 34(3), 349-379.

---. (2005). Neoliberalism and the urban condition. *City*, 9(1), 101-107.

Buckely, C. (2007, Jul. 9). *New York plans surveillance veil for downtown*. Retrieved Feb. 10 2009 from http://www.nytimes.com.

Buntin, J. (2000a). *Security Preparations for the 1996 Centennial Olympic Games (A)*. Cambridge, MA: John. F. Kennedy School of Government, Harvard University.

---. (2000b). *Security Preparations for the 1996 Centennial Olympic Games (B): Seeking a Structural Fix*. Cambridge, MA: John F. Kennedy School of Government.

---. (2000c). *Security Preparations for the 1996 Centennial Olympic Games (C): The Games Begin*. Cambridge: John F. Kennedy School of Government, Harvard University.

Butler, J. (1990). *Genter Trouble*. New York: Routledge.

Campbell, D. (1992). *Writing Security: United States Foreign Policy and the Politics of Identity*. Minneapolis: Universitiy of Minnesota Press.

Castells, M. (2000). Materials for an exploratory theory of the network society. *British Journal of Sociology*, 51(1), 5-24.

China Rights Forum. (2006). IR 2008 update: security in Beijing 2008 and beyond. *China Rights Forum*, 2, 1-6.

Clarke, L. (1990). *Mission Impossible: Using Fantasy Documents in the Popular Imagination*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

---. (2006). *Worst Case: Terror and Catastrophe in the Popular Imagination*. Chicago: University of Chicago.

---. (2008). Thinking about worst-case thinking. *Sociological Inquiry*, 78(2), 154-161.

CNN Traveller. (2006). Old flame, new fame. *CNN Traveller, Jan/Feb,* pp. 5-6.

Coaffee, J. (2003). *Terrorism, Risk and the City*. Aldershot: Ashgate.

Coaffee, J., Murakami Wood, D., & Rogers, P. (2009). *The Everyday Resilience of the City: How Cities Respond to Terrorism and Disaster*. London and New York: Palgrave MacMillan.

Coaffee, J., & Wood, D. M. (2006). Security is coming home: rethinking scale and constructing resilience in the global urban response to terrorist risk. *International Relations*, 20(4), 503-517.

COHRE. (2007). *Fair Play for Housing Rights: Mega-Events, Olympic Games and Housing Rights*. Geneva, Switzerland: The Center on Housing Rights and Evictions.

Coleman, R. (2004). *Reclaiming the Streets: Surveillance, Social Control and the City*. London: Willan Publishing.

---. (2005). Surveillance in the city: primary definitions and urban spatial order. *Crime, Media, Culture*, 1(2), 131-148.

Collier, S. (2008). Enacting catastrophe: preparedness, insurance, budgetary rationalization. *Economy and Society*, 37(2), 224-240.

Collier, S., & Lakoff, A. (2008a). Distributed preparedness: the spatial logic of domestic security in the United States. *Environment and Planning D*, 26, 7-28.

---. (2008b). The Vulnerability of vital systems: how 'critical infrastructure' became a security problem. In M. Dunn & K. Kristensen (Eds.), *The Politics of Securing the Homeland: Critical Infrastructure, Risk and Securitisation* (pp. 1-32). London: Routledge.

COV. (2006a). *2010 Olympic and Paralympic Winter Games Draft Strategic Plan, Version 1*. Vancouver: City of Vancouver Office of Olympic Operations.

---. (2006b). *General Manager of Engineering Services re: street cleaning initatives*. Vancouver: City of Vancouver.

---. (2006c). *Project Civil City*. Vancouver: Office of the Mayor.

---. (2007a). *Administrative Report from the VPD Chief Constable, VPD and Chief Licence Official and General Manager of Engineering Services Re: Granville Entertainment District*. Vancouver: Vancouver City Hall.

---. (2007b). *DVBIA Ambassador Program Funding Proposal for Expansion*. Vancouver: Standing Committee on City Services and Budgets Committee Agenda.

---. (2007c). *Project Civil City March '07 Progress Update*. Vancouver: Vancouver City Council.

---. (2007d). *Project Civil City Oct. '07 Progress Update*. Vancouver: Vancouver City Council.

---. (2008). *Project Civil City Jun. '08 Progress Update*. Vancouver: Vancouver City Council.

---. (2009). *Minutes of the Mar. 29 standing committee on city services and budgets report re: acceptance of funding for temporary CCTV*. Vancouver: City Hall.

Coward, M. (2009). Network-centric violence, critical infrastrucutre and the urbanization of security. *Security Dialogue*, 40(4-5), 399-418.

Cox, S. (1987). Heart of darkness; groups seek solution for maligned mall. *The Vancouver Sun,* pp. B.1.

Crawford, A. (2006). Networked governance and the post-regulatory state?: Steering, rowing and anchoring the provision of policing and security. *Theoretical Criminology*, 10(4), 449-479.

Daase, C., & Kessler, O. (2007). Knowns and unknowns int he 'war on terror': uncertainty and the political construction of danger. *Security Dialogue*, 38, 411-434.

Dahlberg, T. (2001, Oct. 30). Salt Lake City braced for possible terrorist attack. *The Brantford Expositor,* p. B.3.

Davis, M. (1998). *Ecology of Fear: Los Angeles and the Imagination of Disaster*. New York: Vintage Books.

de Goede, M. (2008). Beyond risk: premediation and the post-9/11 security imagination. *Security Dialogue*, 39(2-3), 155-176.

de Goede, M., & Sandalls, S. (2009). Precaution, preemption: arts and technologies of the actionable future. *Environment and Planning D*, 27, 859-878.

de Lint, W. (2008). The Security double-take: the political, simulation, and the border. *Surveillance and Society*, 5(2), 166-187.

de Lint, W., Virta, S., & Deukmedjian, J. E. (2007). The simulation of crime control: a shift in policing? *American Behavioral Scientist*, 50(12), 1631-1647.

Dean, M. (1999). *Governmentality: Power and Rule in Modern Society*. London: Sage.

Decker, S. H., Greene, J. R., Webb, V., Rojek, J., McDevitt, J., Bynum, T., Varano, S., & Manning, P. K. (2005). Safety and security at special events: the case of the Salt Lake City Olympic Games. *Security Journal*, 18(4), 65-74.

Decker, S. H., Varano, S., & Greene, J. R. (2007). Routine crime in exceptional times: the impact of the 2002 Winter Olympics on citizen demand for police services. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 35, 89-101.

Degen, M. (2004). Barcelona's Games: the Olympics, urban design, and global tourism. In M. Sheller & J. Urry (Eds.), *Tourism Mobilities: Places to Play, Places in Play* (pp. 131-142). London: Routledge.

Dickinson, T. (2008, May 29). *Under survellance: Q + A with Naomi Klein*. Retrieved Aug. 27 2008 from www.rollingstone.com.

Dillon, M. (2007). Governing terror: the state of emergency of biopolitical emergence. *International Political Socioogy*, 1(1), 7-28.

Dolowitz, D., & Marsh, D. (1996). Who learns what from whom: a review of the policy transfer literature. *Political Studies*, 44, 343-357.

Donahue, A., & Tuohy, R. (2006). Lessons we don't learn: a study of the lessons of disasters, why we repeat them, and how we can learn from them. *Homeland Security Affairs*, 2(2), 1-28.

Douglas, M., & Wildavsky, A. (1982). *Risk and Culture: An Essay on the Selection of Technological and Environmental Dangers*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Dupont, B. (2004). Security in the age of networks. *Policing and Society*, 14(1), 76-91.

Ericson, R. (1994). The division of expert knowledge in policing and security. *British Journal of Sociology*, 45(2), 149-175.

---. (2008). The state of preemption: managing terrorism risk through counter-law. In L. Amoore & M. de Goede (Eds.), *Risk and the War on Terror* (pp. 57-76). New York: Routledge.

Ericson, R., & Doyle, A. (2004). Catastrophe risk, insurance and terrorism. *Economy and Society*, 33(2), 135-173.

Erzen, T. (2001). Turnstile jumpers and broken windows: policing disorder in New York City. In A. McArdle & T. Erzen (Eds.), *Zero Tolerance: Quality of Life and the New Police Brutality in New York City* (pp. 19-49). New York: New York City University Press.

Eustace, C. (2007, Mar. 26). Granville Street is like a 'ticking time bomb'. *The Vancouver Sun,* pp. A.1.

Ewald, R. (2002). The return of Descartes' malicious demon: and outline of a philosophy of precaution. In T. Baker & J. Simon (Eds.), *Embracing Risk: The Changing Culture of Insurance and Responsibility*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Farish, M. (2004). Another anxious urbanism: simulating defense and disaster in Cold War America. In S. Graham (Ed.), *Cities, War and Terrorism: Towards and Urban Geopolitics* (pp. 93-109). London: Blackwell.

Florida, R. (2005). *Cities and the Creative Class*. New York: Routledge.

Floridis, G. (2004). Security for the 2004 Athens Olympic Games. *Medeterranean Quarterly*, 15(2), 1-5.

Fong, P. (2008, Jan. 19). B.C irked about out-of-province suspects; 'That's justice by good riddance,' official says. *Toronto Star,* p. A20.

Foucault, M. (1977). *Discipline and Punish*. New York: Vintage.

---. (1991). Governmentality. In G. Burchell, C. Gordon & P. Miller (Eds.), *The Foucault Effect: Studies in Governmentality* (pp. 87-104). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Frontline. (2008). Federal security support to the 2010 Olympics: an interview with Ward Elcock. *Frontline Security*, Spring, 36-38.

Fussey, P., Coaffee, J., Armstrong, G., & Hobbs, R. (Eds.). (forthcoming, 2011). *Securing and Sustaining the Olympic City: Reconfiguring London for 2012 and Beyond*. Aldershot: Ashgate.

GAO. (2005). *Olympic Security: U.S. Support to Athens Games Provides Lessons for Future Olympics (GAO-05-547)*. Washington D.C.: United States Government Accountability Office.

---. (2006). *Olympic Security: Better Planning Can Enhance U.S. Support to Future Olympic Games (GAO-06-753)*. Washington D.C.: United States Government Accountability Office.

Garland, D. (1996). The limits of the sovereign state: strategies of crime control in contemporary society. *The British Journal of Criminology*, 36(4), 445-471.

---. (2000). *Punishment and Modern Society: A Study in Social Theory*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Garr, A. (2007, Mar. 21). How Granville strip went bad. *The Vancouver Courier,* pp. 10.

Gegax, T. (2004). 'Anything is a target.' *Newsweek*, 143(48), pp.48.

Gibson, T. (2004). *Securing the Spectacular City: The Politics of Revitalization and Homelessness in Downtown Seattle*. Lanham, MD: Lexington Books.

Giulianotti, R., & Klauser, F. (2010). Security governance and sports mega-events: towards an interdisciplinary research agenda. *Journal of Sport and Social Issues*, 34(1), 49-61.

Gordon, C. (1991). Governmental rationalites: an introduction. In G. Burchell, C. Gordon & P. Miller (Eds.), *The Foucault Effect: Studies in Governmentality* (pp. 1-51). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Government of Canada. (2009). *Federal Emergency Response Plan*. Ottawa: Government of Canada.

Graham, S. (Ed.). (2004a). *Cities, War and Terrorism*. London: Blackwell.

---. (2004b). Introduction: cities, warfare, and states of emergency. In S. Graham (Ed.), *Cities, War, and Terrorism* (pp. 1-25). London: Blackwell.

---. (2006). Cities and the 'war on terror.' *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 30(2), 255-276.

---. (2010). *Cities Under Siege: The New Military Urbanism*. London and New York: Verso.

Graham, S., & Marvin, S. (2001). *Splintering Urbanism: Networked Infrastructures, Technological Mobilities and the Urban Condition*. London and New York: Routledge.

Grusin, R. (2004). Premediation. *Criticism*, 46(1), 17-39.

GVRSC. (2008). *Still on our Streets: Results of the 2008 metro Vancouver Homelessness Count*. Vancouver: Greater Vancouver Regional Steering Committee on Homelessness.

Haas, P. (1992). Epistemic communities and international policy coordination *International Organization*, 46(1), 1-35.

Haggerty, K. (2003). From risk to precaution: the rationalities of personal crime prevention. In R. Ericson & A. Doyle (Eds.), *Risk and Morality* (pp. 28-51). Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

---. (2006). Tear eown the walls: on demoloshign the panopticon. In D. Lyon (Ed.), *Theorizing Surveillance: The Panopticon and Beyond* (pp. 23-45). Portland, Oregon: Willan Publishing.

Haggerty, K., & Ericson, R. (1999). The militarization of policing in the information Age. *Journal of Political and Military Sociology*, 27(Winter), 233-255.

---. (2000). The surveillant assemblage. *British Journal of Sociology*, 51(4), 605-622.

Haggerty, K., Huey, L., & Ericson, R. (2008). The politics of sight/site: locating camears in Vancouver's public space. *Sociology of Crime, Law and Governance*, 10, 35-55.

Halchin, L. (2004). *Athens Olympics 2004: U.S. Government Involvement in Security Preparations*. Washington D.C.: Library of Congress, US Congressional Research Service.

Harcourt, B. (2001). *Illusion of Order: The False Promise of Broken Windows Policing*. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press.

Harvey, D. (1989a). From managerialism to entrepreneuralism: the transformation of urban governance in late capitalism. *Geografiska Annaler*, 71(1), 3-17.

---. (1989b). *The Condition of Postmodernity*. Oxford: Blackwell.

---. (2006). Neoliberalism as creative destruction. *Geografiska Annaler Series B*, 88(2), 145-158.

Hawaleshki, D. (2004). Athens under the gun. *Maclean's*, 117(30), pp.36.

Hebenton, B., & Seddon, T. (2009). From dangerousness to precaution: managing sexual and violent offenders in an insecure and uncertain age. *British Journal of Criminology*, 49, 343-362.

Helms, G., Atkinson, R., & MacLeod, G. (2007). Securing the city: urban renaisssance, policing and social regulation. *European Urban and Regional Studies*, 14(4), 267-276.

Hennessy, P., & Leapman, B. (2007, Apr. 2). *Ministers plan 'Big Brother' police powers*. Retrieved Feb. 12 2007 from www.telegraph.co.uk.

Hiller, H. (2006). Post-event outcomes and the post-modern turn: the Olympics and urban transformation. *European Sport Manaagement Quarterly*, 6(4), 317-332.

Hinds, A., & Vlachou, E. (2007). *Fortress Olympics: Counting the Cost of Major Event Security*. Retrieved April 15 2007 from www.janes.com.

Hirst, P. (2005). *Space and Power: Politics, War and Architecture*. Malden, MA: Polity Press.

Home Office. (2009a). *London 2012: A Safe and Secure Games for All*. London: The Home Office.

---. (2009b). *London 2012: Olympic and Paralympic Security Strategy*. London: The Home Office.

Horne, J., & Manzenreiter, W. (Eds.). (2006a). *Sports Mega-Events: Social Scientific Analyses of a Global Phenomonon*. London: Blackwell.

---. (2006b). An introduction to the sociology of sports mega-events. *The Sociological Review*, 54(2), 1-24.

Host City. (2008, Feb. 21). *How technology secured the Games: an interview with Peter Ryan*. Retrieved Oct. 25 2008 from www.hostcity.co.uk.

Houston Chronicle. (2007, Jan, 25). *Olympic security expert: terrorist attack on sports event 'just a matter of time'*. Retrieved May 13 2008 from www.chron.com.

Howell, M. (2009a, Jan. 20). Cops crack down on infamous Pigeon Park. *The Vancouver Courier,* pp. 9.

---. (2009b, Jan. 28). Cops defend ticketing in the Downtown Eastside. *The Vancouver Courier,* pp. 15.

Huey, L. (2009). The surveillance legacy: what happens to Vancouver's camera surveillance system after the 2010 Olympics? In *A Report on Camera Surveillance in Canada*. Kingston, Ontario: The Surveillance Project.

Huey, L., Ericson, R., & Haggerty, K. (2005). Policing fantasy city. In D. Cooley (Ed.), *Re-Imagining Policing in Canada* (pp. 140-208). Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Hunt, A., & Wickam, G. (1994). *Foucault and Law: Towards a Sociology of Law as Governance*. London: Pluto Press.

Hutton, T. (1998). *The Transformation of Canada's Pacific Metropolis: A Study of Vancouver*. Montreal: The Institute for Research on Public Policy.

---. (2004). Post-industrialism, post-modernism and the reproduction of Vancouver's central area: retheorizing the 21st century city. *Urban Studies*, 41(10), 1953-1982.

Ilcan, S., & Phillips, L. (2008). Governing though global networks: knoweldge obilities and participatory development. *Current Sociology*, 56, 711-734.

Inwood, D. (2008a, Dec. 14). HD aerial pics aim to bolster 2010 security. *The Vancouver Sun,* pp. A.23.

---. (2008b, Jun. 5). Hostage rescue, WMDs key to security: organizers must plan for the worst, says FBI Salt Lake co-ordinator. *The Vancouver Province,* pp. A5.

---. (2009a, Oct. 11). Mapping out the trouble spots. *The Province,* pp. A.39.

---. (2009b, Oct. 14). Security officials brace for trouble. *The Province,* pp. A.6.

Jane's Intelligence Review. (2007). *Fortress Olympics: Counting the Cost of Major Event Security*. Retrieved April 15 2007 from www.janes.com.

Janofsky, M. (2004, May 8). On US visit, Greeks pledge safe Games. *The New York Times,* pp. D.6.

Jenkins, L. (2000). Selecting scenarios for environmental disaster planning. *European Journal of Operational Research*, 121, 275-286.

Johnston, L., & Shearing, C. (2003). *Governing Security: Explorations in Policing and Justice*. Routledge: New York.

Juergensmeyer, M. (2000). Understanding the new terrorism. *Current History*, 99, 158-163.

Kahn, H. (1962). *Thinking About the Unthinkable*. New York: Horizon Press.

---. (1968). *Thinking About the Unthinkable*. New York: Discus Books.

Kahneman, D., Slovic, P., & Tversky, A. (Eds.). (1982). *Judgement under Uncertainty: Heuristics and Biases*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Kear, M. (2007). Spaces of transition spaces of tomorrow: making a sustainable future in Southeast False Creek, Vancouver. *Cities*, 24(4), 324-334.

Kittelsen, S. (2009). Conceptualizing biorisk: dread risk and the threat of bioterrorism in Europe. *Security Dialogue*, 40(1), 51-71.

Klauser, F. (2009). Interacting forms of expertise in security governance: the example of CCTV surveillnace at Geneva's international airport. *The British Journal of Sociology*, 60(2), 279-297.

Knemeyer, F.-L. (1980). Polizei. *Economy and Society*, 9(2), 172-196.

Knight, T. (2001, Dec. 17). *Winter Olympics: rings of steel to surround Games in response to terrorist attacks*. Retrieved Aug. 18 2007 from www.telegraph.co.uk.

Lakoff, A. (2007). Preparing for the next emergency. *Public Culture*, 19(2), 247-271.

Laqueur, W. (1996). Postmodern terrorism. *Foreign Affairs*, 75(5), 24-36.

Larner, W., & Larner, L. (2010). Travelling technocrats, embodies knowldges: globalizing privatization in telecoms and water. *Geoforum*, 41, 218-226.

Latour, B. (1986). Visualization and cognition: thinking with eyes and hands. In H. Kuklick & E. Long (Eds.), *Knowledge and Society: Studies in the Sociology of the Past and Present* (pp. 1-40). Creenwich, CT: JAI Press.

Lee, J. (2008, Oct. 30). Security experts forced to expect the worst. *The Vancouver Sun,* pp. A.4.

Lee, Y., Trim, P., Upton, J., & Upton, D. (2009). Large emergency response exercises: qualitative characteristics. *Simulation and Gaming*, 40(6), 726-751.

Lees, L. (1998). Urban renaissance and the street: spaces of control and contestation. In N. Fyfe (Ed.), *Images of the Street: Planning, Identity, and Control in Public Space*. London: Routledge.

Lemcke, W. (2007). *Major City Policing Report: Comparing Apples to the Big Apple*. Vancouver: Vancouver Police Board.

Lenskyj, H. (2002). *The Best Olympics Ever? Social Impacts of Sydney 2000*. Albany: State University of New York Press.

---. (2008). *Olympic Industry Resistance: Challenging Olympic Power and Propaganda*. New York: State University of New York Press.

---. (2010). Olympic power, Olympic politics: behind the scenes. In A. Bairner & G. Molnar (Eds.), *The Politics of the Olympics*. New York: Routledge.

Lenskyj, H., & Waag, S. (Eds.). (forthcoming, 2011). *A Handbook of Olympic Studies*. London: Palgrave.

Lentzos, F., & Rose, N. (2009). Governing insecurity: contingency planning, protection, resilience. *Economy and Society*, 38(2), 230-254.

Levi, R., & Valverde, M. (2006). Freedom of the city: canadian cities and the quest for governmental status. *Osgood Hall Law Journal*, 44, 409-459.

Ley, D. (1980). Liberal ideology and the postindustrial city. *Annals of the Association of Amercian Geographers*, 70(2), 238-258.

---. (1996). *The New Middle Class and the Remaking of the Central City*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Ley, D., Hiebert, D., & Pratt, G. (1992). Time to grow up? From urban village to world city, 1966-91. In G. Wynn (Ed.), *Vancouver and its Region* (pp. 234-266). Vancouver: UBC Press.

Light, J. (2002). Urban security from warfare to welfare. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 26(3), 607-613.

---. (2003). *From Warfare to Welfare: Defense Intellectuals and Urban Problems in Cold War America*. Baltimore: The John Hopkins University Press.

Lippert, R. (2005). *Sanctuary, Sovereignty, Sacrifice: Canadian Sanctuary Incidences, Power, and Law*. Vancouver and Toronto: UBC Press.

---. (2007). Urban revitalization, security, and knowledge transfer: the case of broken windows and 'kiddie bars.' *Canadian Journal of Law and Society*, 22(2), 29-53.

Liu, M., Vladu, T., & Roberts, M. (2004, Mar. 8). Olympic insecurity: the Athens Games will be the biggest - and most expensive - peacetime security operation ever. It's not on schedule. *Newsweek,* pp. 22.

Luke, T. (2004). Everyday technics as extraordinary threats: urban technostructures and non-places in terrorist actions. In S. Graham (Ed.), *Cities, War and Terrorism* (pp. 120-136). London: Blackwell.

Lyon, D. (2003). Technology vs. 'terrorism': circuits of city surveillance since September 11th. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 27(3), 666-678.

---. (2004). Globalizing surveillance: comparative and sociological perspectives. *International Sociology*, 19(2), 135-149.

Lyotard, J. (1984). *The Postmodern Condition: A Report on Knowledge*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Major Events International. (2009, Mar. 16). *Q&A: An interview with Dr. Peter Ryan*. Retrieved Sept. 9 2009 from www.mei.com.

Marshall, A. (2008). *Future of North America: Vancouver 2010, coronation of the North American "community."* Retrieved Aug. 3 2009 from www.globalresearch.ca.

Mason, G. (2009). Financing woes continue to dog Olympic Village *The Globe and Mail,* pp. A.6.

Matas, R. (2009, Nov. 4). When radioactive snow falls without warning. *The Globe and Mail,* pp. S.1.

McCallum, K., Spencer, A., & Wyly, E. (2005). The city as an image-creation machine: a critical analysis of Vancouver's Olympic bid. *Yearbook of the Association of Pacific Coast Geographers*, 67, 24-46.

McCann, E. (2008). Expertise, truth, and urban policy mobilities: global circuits of knowledge in the development of Vancouver, Canada's 'four pillars' drug strategy. *Environment and Planning A*, 40(885-904).

Migdalovitz, C. (2004). *Greece: Threat of Terrorism and Security at the Olympics*. Washington DC: Library of Congress Congressional Research Service.

Molotch, H. (1976). The city as a growth machine: toward a political economy of place. *American Journal of Sociology*, 82(2), 309-332.

Molotch, H., & McClain, N. (2003). Dealing with urban terror: heritages of control, varieties of intervention, strategies of research. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 27(3), 679-698.

Mopas, M. (2005). Policing in Vancouver's Downtown Eastside: a case study. In D. Cooley (Ed.), *Re-Imagining Policing in Canada* (pp. 92-139). Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Mythen, G., & Walklate, S. (2008). Terrorism, risk and international security: the perils of asking 'what if?' *Security Dialogue*, 39, 221-242.

National Planning Scenarios. (2005). *National Planning Scenarios*. Washington D.C.: The U.S. Homeland Security Council and the Department of Homeland Security.

Novak, W. (1996). *The People's Welfare: Law and Regulation in Nineteenth Century America*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.

Nunn, S. (2001). Cities, space, and the new world of urban law enforcement technologies. *Journal of Urban Affairs*, 23(3/4), 259-278.

O'Malley, P. (2000). Uncertain subjects: risks, liberalism and contract. *Economy and Society*, 29(4), 460-484.

O'Reilly, C. (2010). The transnational secruity consultancy industry: a case of state-corporate symiosis. *Theoretical Criminology*, 14, 183-210.

OCIEP. (2003). *Threats to Canada's Critical Infrastructure*. Ottawa: Office of Critical Infrastructure and Emergency Preparedness.

Olds, K. (1995). Globalization and the production of new urban spaces: Pacific Rim megaprojects in the late 20th century. *Environment and Planning A*, 27, 1713-1743.

---. (1998). Hallmark events, evictions, and housing rights. In A. Azuela, E. Duhau & E. Oritz (Eds.), *Evictions and the Right to Housing: Experience from Canada, Chile, the Domican Republic, and South Korea* (pp. 1-48). Ottawa: International Develpment Research Center.

Oquirrh Institute. (2002). *The 2002 Olympic Winter Games Security Lessons Applied to Homeland Security*. Salt Lake City: The Oquirrh Institute.

Osborne, T., & Rose, N. (1999). Governing cities: notes on the spatialisation of virtue. *Environment and Planning D*, 17(737-760).

Palmer, D., & Whelan, C. (2007). Policing in the 'communal spaces' of major event venues. *Police Practice and Research*, 8(5), 401-414.

Pasquino, P. (1991). Theatrum politicum: the genealogy of capital - police and the state of prosperity. In G. Burchell, C. Gordon & P. Miller (Eds.), *The Foucault Effect: Studies in Governmentality* (pp. 105-118). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Peck, J. (2005). Struggling with the creative class. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 29(4), 740-770.

Peck, J., & Theodore, N. (2010). Mobilizing policy: models, methods, and mutations. *Geoforum*, 41, 169-174.

Peck, J., & Tickell, A. (2002). Neoliberalising space. *Antipode*, 34(3), 380-404.

Perrow, C. (1999). *Normal Accidents: Living with High-Risk Technologies*. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press.

Pivot Legal Society. (2008). *Security Before Justice: A Study of the Impacts of Private Security on Homeless and Under-Housed Vancouver Residents*. Vancouver: Pivot Legal Society.

Plant, G. (2008). *Project Civil City Dec. '08 Progress Report*. Vancouver: Project Civil City Commissioner's Office.

---. (2009). *Vancouver: where livability is at the heart of the matter*. Adelaide: Address to the 2009 Local Government Managers Austrailia Future Leaders Forum.

Pratt, A. (2001). Sovereign power, carceral conditions and penal practices: detention and deportation in Canada. *Studies in Law, Politics and Society*, 23, 45-78.

Price, S. (2008). Missles in Athens and tanks at Heathrow: urban security and the materialiation of 'global' threat. *Social Semiots*, 18(1), 1-16.

PSEPC. (2008). *An Emergency Management Framework for Canada*. Ottawa: Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness Canada.

Quarantelli, E. L. (Ed.). (1998). *What is a Disaster? Perspectives on the Question*. London and New York: Routledge.

RAND. (2006). *Considering the effects of a catstrophic terrorist attack*. Santa Monica, CA: RAND Corporation.

---. (2007). *Setting the Agenda for an Evidence-Based Olympics*: RAND Europe.

RCMP. (2005). *Planning Update*. Vancouver: Vancouver 2010 Integrated Security Unit.

---. (2010). *A/Commr Bud Mercer on the challenges of securing the Olympic Games (video)*. Retrieved Mar. 12 2010 from www.v2010isu.ca.

Reese, S. (2008). *National Special Security Events*. Washington D.C.: Congressional Research Service.

Roberts, S. (2004, Aug. 13). Athens security: seeing isn't believing. *The New York Times,* pp. D.1.

Rose, N. (1999). *Powers of Freedom: Reframing Political Thought*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

---. (2001). The politics of life itself. *Theory, Culture & Society*, 18(6), 1-30.

Rose, N., & Miller, P. (1992). Political power beyond the state: problematics of government. *British Journal of Sociology*, 43(2), 173-205.

Ryan, P. (2002). *Olympic Security: The Relevance to Homeland Security.* Salt Lake City: The Oquirrh Institute.

Salter, M. (2008). Risk and imagination in the war on terror. In L. Amoore & M. de Goede (Eds.), *Governing risk in the war on terror* (pp. 232-256). New York: Routledge.

Samatas, M. (2004). *Surveillance in Greece: From Anticommunist to Consumer Surveillance*. New York: Athens Printing Company.

---. (2007). Security and surveillance in the Athens 2004 Olympics: some lessons from a troubled story. *International Criminal Justice Review*, 17(3), 220-238.

Saunders, D., & Christie, J. (2001, Oct. 25). All systems go for Salt Lake Games, official says. *The Globe and Mail,* pp. S.1.

Schimmel, K. S. (2006). Deep play: sports mega-events and urban social conditions in the USA. *The Sociological Review*, 54(2), 160-174.

Shaw, R., & Lee, J. (2009, Feb 3). Cameras mush vanish after 2010. *The Vancouver Sun,* pp. A.4.

Sheptycki, J. (2000). *Transnational Policing*. London: Routledge.

Shields, R. (2006). Virtualities. *Theory, Culture and Society*, 23(2/3), 284-286.

Short, J. (2008). Globlization, cities and the summer Olympics. *City*, 12(3), 321-340.

SIA. (2007). *China Security Market Report Special Supplement: Olympic Update*. Alexandria, Virginia: Security Industry Association.

Sifton, B. (2009, Jan. 26 2009). *Crackdown pushes DTES residents out of Pigeon Park*. Retrieved June 30 2009 from www.megaphonemagazine.com.

Simpson, S. (2009, Oct. 13). Greater industrial security expected at 2010 Games. *The Vancouver Sun,* pp. C.4.

Sleiman, M., & Lippert, R. (2010). Downtown ambassadors, police relations and 'clean and safe' security. *Policing and Society*, 20(3), 316-335.

Smith, D., & Mischerbacker, M. (2009). The chaning nature of risk and risk mangement: the challenge of borders, uncertainty and resilience. *Risk Management*, 11, 1-12.

Stern, J., & Weiner, J. (2006). Precaution against terrorism. *Journal of Risk Research*, 9(4), 393-447.

Stone, D. (2004). Transfer agents and global networks in the ‘transnationalization’ of policy. *Journal of European Public Policy*, 11(3), 545-566.

Suborg, B., Van Wynsberghe, R., & Wyly, E. (2008). Mapping the Olympic growth machine: transnational urbansim and the growth machine diaspora. *City*, 12(3), 341-355.

Sullivan, D. (2006a). *Closed Circuit Television Project*. Vancouver: Vancouver Police Board.

Sullivan, S. (2006b, Nov. 29). We have let unacceptable behaviour become acceptable in Vancouver. *The Province,* pp. A.18.

Szulanski, G. (2000). The process of knowledge transfer: a diachronic analysis of stickiness. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 82(1), 9-27.

Taleb, N. (2009). *The Black Swan: The Impact of Highly Improbable Events*. New York: Random House.

The Big Picture. (2008, Jul. 9). *Anti-terrorism exercises in China*. Retrieved Aug. 9 2008 from www.boston.com/bigpicture.

Thompson, A. (1999). Security. In R. Cashman & A. Hughes (Eds.), *Staging the Olympics: The Event and its Impacts* (pp. 106-120). Sydney: University of New South Wales Press.

Thompson, D. (2008). Olympic security collaboration. *China Security Review*, 4(2), 46-58.

Thompson, L. (2009). Major event marathon: preparing for the main event, or in this case main events. *The Frontline Perspective*, 3(3), 1-3.

Toohey, K., & Taylor, T. (2008). Mega-events, fear, and risk: terrorism at the Olympic Games. *Journal of Sport Management*, 22(4), 451-469.

Tsoukala, A. (2006). Security issues at the 2004 Olympics. *European Journal for Sports and Society*, 3(1), 43-54.

Tulloch, J. (2000). Terrorism, 'killing events,' and their audience: fear of crime at the 2000 Olympics. In K. Schaffer & S. Sidonie (Eds.), *The Olympics at the Millennium: Power, Politics and the Games* (pp. 224-242). New Brunswick, N.J.: Rutgers University Press.

Tully, J. (2007). Public policy, proximity and old industrial regions. *International Journal of Technology, Knowledge and Society*, 2(7), 117-127.

UNICRI. (2007). *Towards a European House of Security at Major Events*. Turin: United Nations Interregional Crime and Justice Research Institute.

V2010-ISU. (2008). *Olympic Security Exercise Underway*. Retrieved Feb. 12 2009 from www.bc.rcmp.ca.

Valverde, M. (1991). *The Age of Light, Soap, and Water*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

---. (2003). Police science, british style: pub licensing and knowledges of urban disorder. *Economy and Society*, 32(2), 234-252.

Vancouver Board of Trade. (2006). *Crisis in Vancouver: An Open Letter to The Right Honourable Stephen Harper, The Honourable Gordon Campbell, and Mayor Sam Sullivan*. Vancouver: Vancouver Board of Trade.

---. (2007). *Crime, Public Disorder and the 2010 Olympics: An Open Letter to The Right Honourable Stephen Harper, The Honourable Gordon Campbell, and Mayor Sam Sullivan*. Vancouver: Vancouver Board of Trade.

Vancouver Parks and Recreation. (2009). *Pigeon Park Improvements - Concept Plan and Funding*. Vancouver: Vancouver Parks and Recreation.

Vanolo, A. (2008). The image of the creative city: some reflections on urban branding in Turin. *Cities*, 25, 370-382.

Vecsey, G. (2003, Jun. 17). Athens Puts it's game face on. *The New York Times,* pp. D.1.

VEDC. (2006). *Guiding Principles: Economic Development in the City of Vancouver*. Vancouver: Vancouver Economic Development Commission.

Vonn, M. (2010). CCTV and the 2010 Vancouver Games: spatial tactics and political strategies. *Case Western Reserve Journal of International Law*, 42, 505-605.

Vosepka, R. (2001, Sept. 12). Security concerns for 2002 Games. *The Hamilton Spectator,* pp. E.01.

VPB. (2006). *Minutes of the May 17 Vancouver Police Board regular meeting*. Vancouver: Vancouver Police Board.

Wacquant, L. (2001). The penalisation of poverty and the rise of neo-liberalism. *European Journal on Criminal Policy and Research*, 9, 401-412.

Waddington, D. (2008). *Public Order Policing: Theory and Practice*. Portland, OR: Willan Publishing.

Ward, D. (2006a, Nov. 28). Mayor Sullivan pledges to 'clean up' the city. *The Vancouver Sun,* pp. B.1.

Ward, K. (2006b). 'Policies in motion', urban management and state restructuring: the trans-local expansion of busines improvement districts. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 30(1), 54-75.

Warren, R. (2002). Situating the city and September 11th: military urban doctrine, 'pop-up' armies and spatial chess. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 26(3), 614-619.

---. (2004). City Streets – the war zones of globalization: democracy and military operations on urban terrain in the early 21st century. In S. Graham (Ed.), *Cities, War and Terrorism* (pp. 214-230). London: Blackwell.

Whitson, D., & Macintosh, D. (1996). The global circus: international sport, tourism, and the marketing of Cities. *Journal of Sport and Social Issues*, 20(3), 278-295.

WikiLeaks. (2010). 2016 Rio Olympics – The Future is Now. Cable ID# 09BRASILIA1493. Accessed February 03 2011 from www.wikileaks.ch.

Wiebe, J. (2010). Preparing for Vancouver. *Homeland Security Today*, 7(1), 21-25.

Wilson, J. Q., & Kelling, G. (1982). Broken Windows. *The Atlantic Monthly*, March(31), 29-38.

Wolff, A., Cazeneuve, B., & Yaeger, D. (2002). When the terror began. *Sports Illustrated*, 97(8), 58-73.

Wong, E. (2001, Sept. 28). Guard is up for stadium security officials across the country. *The New York Times,* pp. D.8.

Yu, Y., Klauser, F., & Chan, G. (2009). Governing security at the 2008 Beijing Olympics. *International Journal of the History of Sport*, 26(3), 390-405.

Zekulin, M. (2009). Olympic security: Assessing the risk of terrorism at the 2010 Vancovuer Winter Games. *Journal of Military and Strategic Studies*, 12(1), 1-25.

Zukin, S. (1991). *Landscapes of Power: From Detroit to DisneyWorld*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

APPENDIX A

Interviewees
(Organizations only; positions where applicable.)

2010 Games Watch

Anti-Poverty Coalition

Bell Canada
    Director of Public Safety

British Columbia Civil Liberties Association
    Executive Director

British Columbia Integrated Public Safety Unit
    Director

British Security Industry Association
    Project Director 2012

City of Vancouver
    Councilor
    Director, Vancouver Office of Emergency Management (2 interviews)
    Manager, Vancouver Office of Emergency Management
    OIC, Emergency and Operational Planning Section (2 interviews)

Control Risks
    Associate Director

Downtown Vancouver Business Improvement Association
    Security Director

Johannesburg Metropolitan Police/TOROC

MEDEX Group
    Chief Risk Consultant

Pivot Legal Society

Royal Canadian Mounted Police
    OIC, Protective Operations Branch
    Director, Major Events and Protective Services Division
    Operations Planner, Major Events and Protective Services Division
    Director, Marine and Ports Branch, Border Integrity Branch

Science Applications International Corporation (SAIC)
Assistant VP
Identity Management and Event Security

Setracon
Chief Executive

UNICRI

UN International Permanent Observatory on Major Events

US Congressional Research Services
Research Analyst

Vancouver 2010 Bid Corporation
Director of Public Safety

VANOC
Director of Security Integration

Vancouver Public Space Network