Olympic Rings of Steel: Constructing Security for 2012 and Beyond

Pete Fussey and Jon Coaffee.

Introduction

The relationship between security and mega-events has received much attention in recent years, particularly after 9/11 where fears of no-warning mass casualty attacks perpetrated by international terrorist actors have stimulated ever more detailed and pre-emptive security responses. These approaches to event security are now becoming relatively standardised as a 'model' or 'blueprint' for reducing vulnerabilities and maximising security at major conferences, cultural festivals and sporting events (*inter alia* Coaffee and Rogers, 2008). Within this context, this chapter examines the form, function and impact of London's 2012 security strategy. It identifies and critiques the role of surveillance as one of its central features and examines the security operation's relationship with prevailing trends evident in previous Olympic and other mega-sporting event security practices.

Despite their plural and locally grounded nature, Olympic-related threats are often exogenously defined (c.f. Said, 1993) and, in turn, inspire strong continuities and commonalities across Olympic security responses over both time and place. This paper argues that wider shifts towards 'total' security models comprising continually reproduced security motifs can be observed. These have occurred generally since the terrorist atrocities at Munich (1972) and, particularly, since the International Olympic Committee's (IOC's) more active role in security planning since the 1984 Winter Games in Sarajevo. In turn, these strategies institute Olympic 'spaces of exception' that have become standardised, mobile and globalised. These rebordered spaces ultimately become disassociated from the specific geographical contexts of host cities.

The first part of the chapter explores this dynamic in more detail. This is intended to serve three functions. First, it establishes the baseline trajectory of standardised Olympic security strategies onto which London's approach is then mapped. Secondly, contained within this discussion is the argument that these globalised security practices impact unevenly on the idiosyncratic geographies of different Olympic cities to which they are applied. This discord is perhaps most clearly articulated around the theme of terrorism (the central concern of London 2012 security planning). Here, strong commonalities across Olympic security operations contrast with vernacular locally-shaped threats. Finally, given the resonance of previous Olympic security orthodoxies, alongside the formal mechanisms of transferring learning between host cities (see Klauser, this volume), this discussion will locate London's Olympic planning within this much wider, and under-acknowledged, security cycle. In doing so, it is hoped that the scope of London's Olympic security strategy – across bid, preparation, development, application and legacy – is captured.

We argue that London's hosting of the 2012 Olympics both connects with *and* foments different and novel elements to this continuing process of Olympic securitisation. In many respects, the English capital *already* exhibits many of the characteristics comprising standardised Olympic security programmes. 2012 security begins at a different point than for other hosts. For example, in addition to the often-cited (and probably outdated) epithet of the world's most surveilled metropolis, London has considerable experience in creating technologically patrolled splintered spaces as a foil to terrorism. After establishing this context, the chapter explores the more specific anatomy of the 2012 project with particular attention to the role of surveillance. This discussion also considers the impact and legacy of the operation.

Particularly important here is the contested nature of risk and the legacy of post-event retention of security and surveillance structures. Against a historical backdrop of such measures repeatedly being pioneered on East Londoners, these mechanisms may invest new meaning to the 'community focused' discourse surrounding the 2012 Games.

Olympic (In)securities

Although Olympic-related threats are myriad and complex, after Munich and, particularly since 9/11, Olympic security planning has been dominated by the threat of terrorism. Taking a broad view, terrorist activity around the Olympics has involved myriad forms. Over the last 22 years, for example, these have included perceived threats from left-wing groups (Barcelona, 1992 and Athens, 2004), left-wing state proxies (Seoul, 1988), right-wing extremists (Atlanta, 1996), ethno-nationalist separatists (Calgary, 1988 and Barcelona, 1992), single-issue groups (Albertville, 1992 and Lillehammer, 1994), hostile states (Seoul, 1988) as well as violent Jihadi extremists (Sydney, 2000). Rather than providing an exhaustive and narrative list of events, what follows is a brief analysis of some of the broader processes at work and their implications for future security planning as they apply to selected Olympiads since the late 1980s.

Notwithstanding the prominent and much-discussed attacks at Munich and Atlanta, and despite (and possibly because of) the 'lockdown' of Olympic sites (Coaffee and Fussey 2010), since 1976 much terrorist activity surrounding the Olympics have occurred outside of the time and place of the event, most notably at the Seoul and

Barcelona Olympiads. More recently the 2004 Games in Athens also experienced significant localised terrorist activity in the build up to their Olympiad – the first post-9/11 Games.

In the case of Seoul, 1988, both the specific geo-political setting (of the two hostile nations divided by strained border arrangements) and the geographical features of the host nation (that South Korea's *de facto* island status meant visitors overwhelmingly relied on commercial aviation) combined to generate specific terrorist threats against the Games. These threats became manifest when North Korean agents and Japanese Red Army proxies targeted the international aviation industry (United Nations Security Council, 1988). This culminated in the successful bombing of Korean Airlines flight KAL 858 at the cost of 115 lives and a disrupted global campaign against Seoul-bound airlines. Although rooted in the geographical and political contexts of contemporary South Korea, this campaign drew a global response, both in the shape of an unprecedented international Olympic-related intelligence operation and the IOC adopting an enhanced diplomatic function. These have become staples of subsequent Olympic security projects and enabled the IOC to aggrandize its security function and attendant 'knowledge brokering' role (Ericson, 1994).

Spanish authorities faced terrorist threats to the 1992 Barcelona Games from three fronts between 1986 (following the IOC's award of the Games) and 1992. These originated from the left-wing Grupo de Resistencia Antifascista Primo Octobre (GRAPO), Terra Lliure (Catalan separatists), and Euzkadi Ta Askatasuna (ETA). In the run-up to the Games, during 1992 GRAPO conducted five bombings, one small-arms attack and, demonstrating the symbolic value of Olympic targets, conducted a

double bombing of a Catalan oil pipeline the day before the opening ceremony (sourced from the Global Terrorism Database (GTD)). More localized still were the actions of Olympic-opposed Catalan nationalists Terra Lliure. Escalated activity comprised 53 attacks (almost exclusively bombings) (sourced from the GTD) including targeting banks sponsoring the Games. The most prominent Spanish group, ETA, simultaneously undertook a sustained bombing campaign culminating in an (media-suppressed) attack on the electricity supply to the opening ceremony (see Toohey and Veal, 2007). ETA's targeting of the Olympics also extended to Madrid's unsuccessful bid to host the 2012 Games. Most directly, this campaign culminated in bombing Madrid's intended Olympic stadium 11 days before the IOC's final decision – or, an attack on the 'symbol of Madrid's candidature' as the Spanish media reported it (*El Mundo*, 2005). Given that different terrorist ideologies influence a varied selection of targets (*inter alia* Drake, 1998; Fussey, 2010 in press), the Olympics provide a ready and consistent symbolic target for myriad groups regardless of their ideological, operational and tactical diversity.

In the 9/11 era of supposedly 'international terrorism' this more localised pattern continues. For Athens, 2004, although, Hinds and Vlachou (2007) argue that, in the main, the Athenian security project was geared towards external threats, domestic threats were most visible. These included the fallout from the conviction of 15 N17 activists during 2003 and the emergence of the anti-Olympic domestic radical group 'Revolutionary Struggle' (who executed 5 bombings in Athens in the run-up to the Games) (sourced from the GTD).

Olympic Threats Reconsidered

The above juxtaposition of globalised terrorist risks and the local manifestation of threat articulates a wider theme of Olympic insecurity. Despite the conspicuous internationalism of the Olympic Games, many of the groups that target them are grounded in specific local socio-political contexts (see Fussey *et al*., 2010 forthcoming for comprehensive discussion of Olympic threats 1972-2010). Borrowing from Said (1993), Olympic threats should perhaps be considered contrapuntally. The (potentially imperialistic) imposition of an international event harbouring specific values and visions of order stimulates myriad discourses of resistance. Such discourses are generated via complex politico-cultural processes and do not easily lend themselves to be simply cleaved into exogenous and internationalised categories of 'threat.' As Said (1993: 19) notes, 'the world is too small and interdependent' for confrontation to be polarized thus, hence account needs to be made of the confluence of global and local elements, as they constitute Olympic threats. It is in this respect that the 1972 attack at Munich may be seen as truly exceptional, both in terms of its complexity and the importation of activism to the host nation. The state-led murder of 260 protesters 10 days before the 1968 Mexico City Olympics further underlines the novelty of post-1972 emphases on externalised threats.

Olympic Security: Exceptionality and Standardisation

One of the key drivers behind Olympic security programmes, then, has been a 'protectionist reflex' (Beck, 1999: 153) in response to aforementioned generalised and externalised risks. In turn, these risks can be seen to further inform and shape more generalised paradigms of security that have been progressively standardised since Munich. This process has been further underpinned by a shift in the governance of Olympic security throughout the 1980s and the fact that the exceptional nature of such

projects entices recourse to previous precedents for which the IOC, as an 'institutional memory,' is uniquely positioned to broker appropriate knowledge. This is not to denote a static process, however, as variations of intensity and form (largely depending on the vernaculars of the host's security infrastructures) do exist as has the growing centrality of surveillance within these strategies. Nevertheless, a recurrence and reinforcement of key security motifs can be observed.

Such approaches culminate in Olympic 'spaces of exception' that seek to delineate the Games from their contextual geographies. Comprising these enclaves are myriad security strategies, which, although acknowledged, their exegesis lies beyond the scope of this paper. As such, the role of surveillance is seen as a particularly central feature of these approaches and constitutes the principle site of analysis. To illustrate this process, key components of previous security operations are first outlined to serve as a baseline to examine the relationship to Olympic security processes at subsequent events, including the forthcoming 2012 Games in London.

Responding to Munich: Montreal, 1984 and Seoul Policing

Sharply contrasting Munich's 'low-key' approach (reflecting contemporary German sensitivities over conspicuous public displays of social control), little expense was spared on securing the 1976 Olympiad in Montreal. Here, protection from terrorism became *the* key security concern for Montreal's organising committee (COJO). Despite official articulations of 'discreet efficiency' Montreal's strategy was unique in scale and placed enormous emphasis on specific strands of security. Central to these were preventative measures, a strong and visible presence of security forces, and particular emphasis on enhanced and integrated surveillance, communication and

decision-making measures (which had been a major failing at Munich and, later, at Atlanta). Specific measures included isolated transport security corridors, enhanced accreditation requirements for site workers and, crucially, probably the first widespread and systematic deployment of CCTV to feature at an Olympics (COJO, 1976). Electronic surveillance was duly given a central role, as articulated in the Official report of the Games,

> it was agreed that the best way to deter suspected trouble-makers was … [one] that would leave no doubt in their minds they were under continual close surveillance. (COJO, 1976: 559)

Costing US$100m (equivalent to around US$380m today) such techniques became staple features of subsequent Olympic security strategies and mark the increasing prominence of electronic surveillance.

The baton of technological innovation was transferred to the next Olympiad, the XIII Winter Games at Lake Placid (1980). Here, the most advanced technological measures ever used at an Olympics were deployed. Taking advantage of the particular geography that allowed many Winter Games to be physically separated from their surroundings, many of the innovations involved the surveillance and strengthening of perimeters. In doing so, 12ft high touch sensitive fencing, voice analysers, "bio-sensor" dogs, ground radar, night vision and CCTV were installed (LPOOC, 1980). Together, these represented innovations on surveillance and security practices used to secure military sites and airports and became strategies emulated at subsequent

Olympics. Such was the securitisation of this environment at Lake Placid, the legacy of the Olympic village was that it was converted into a correctional facility (*Ibid*.).

This cross-pollination of security also transcended ideological barriers. For example, during 1980, a 'Moscow Doppler' can be observed whereby previous security themes – such as the deployment of US-made security apparatus including metal detectors and x-ray scanners (used at previous Games, including at Lake Placid during the same year) – were incorporated whilst newer approaches were refined - such as zero-tolerance style policing approaches and exclusion orders - that featured at subsequent Games, notably Sydney and Beijing (albeit with variations of scale). The militarisation of Olympic security has also continued, as evinced (particularly) during the Seoul, Barcelona, Athens and Beijing Games. A further component of these broader strategies has been private security, deployed at Tokyo (1964), refined at Lake Placid and established on a grand scale at Los Angeles (1984).

Olympic security following 9/11

Since 2001, Olympic and major sporting event security strategies have reproduced and built-upon these themes. Echoing Ball and Webster's (2004) argument that security antecedents have been intensified, rather than replaced by 9/11, what has shifted since 2001 has been the scale, technological innovation and centrality of surveillance strategies to overall Olympic security planning. Rather than constituting a simplistic expression of technophillia, this commitment to distanciated electronic surveillance is also seen by practitioners to harmonise with the IOC's (often abandoned) aim of projecting the Games as an athletic event and not an exercise in

security. This trend is particularly apparent in relation to the Athens and Beijing Olympic security programmes.

Despite being the smallest country to host Olympics since 1952, the Greek Olympics set out the most expensive, elaborate and extensive security programme ever deployed at the Games. Indeed, this first post-9/11 summer Olympiad provides an exemplar (and possibly the apotheosis) of the 'total security' paradigm. Quintupling Sydney's security costs, Greece spent $1.5Bn on the Athenian security project (*inter alia* Hinds and Vlachou, 2007). Although partly attributable to a limited extant security infrastructure prior to the Games (particularly when compared to London), much of this cost can be connected to post 9/11 perceptions of vulnerability and heavy commitments to technological surveillance (see Samatas, 2007; this volume for authoritative accounts of Athens' exorbitant yet flawed security model).

The IOC's decision to award the XXIX Olympiad to Beijing in July 2001 stimulated a monumental programme of Olympic-related security development. Particularly interesting is how it juxtaposes standardised security practices with the specific confluence of global and national processes at that distinct time. In one respect, Beijing's strategy was facilitated by the state's immense power to mobilise security (as experienced by the totalitarian Moscow and reforming Seoul Olympiads). At the same time, 'Dengist' notions of 'socialism with Chinese characters' (Cook, 2007) – or a state-oriented yet liberalised economy receptive to specific currents of globalisation – enabled the infrastructure and machinery of security to be imported whilst requiring that the global media market export specific brand images of the city.

Technological security measures included embedding Radio Frequency Identification (RFID) tags in some event tickets (such as the opening ceremonies) that allowed their holders' movements to be monitored. Despite these headline-catching technologies, principal emphasis rested on more prosaic surveillance camera networks. Initiatives include the 'Grand Beijing Safeguard Sphere,' the construction and integration of a city-wide surveillance camera system that some sources (Security Products, 2007) claim cost over $6Bn. This and related initiatives has led to estimates that Beijing now hosts over 300 000 public surveillance cameras (*inter alia* Los Angeles Times, 2007). China's recent trend towards hosting international mega-events has also driven surveillance camera deployment across other cities, including Shanghai (hosting 'Expo 2010') and Guangzhou (the 2010 Asian Games). These developments have further catalysed a nationwide 'Safe Cities' programme to establish surveillance cameras in 600 cities (*New York Times*, 2007). Overall, such developments have probably allowed China to claim Britain's dubious accolade of the planet's most intensely observed nation.

Reflecting on Olympic Security, 1976-2008

Since 1976, in responding to the risk of asymmetrical and potentially catastrophic terrorist attacks, Olympic security strategies have become increasingly standardised over temporal, national and ideological borders. The components of these strategies can be seen to comprise a heavy commitment to preventative measures, situational crime prevention (particularly in relation to environmental and architectural design), zero-tolerance style policing, private security, enhanced access controls to Olympic sites, and a central commitment to technological surveillance. Together these inaugurate Olympic imprints – what we might term 'spaces of exception' that are

delineated from their host agglomerations. As Agamben (2005: 1) noted in his seminal work on exceptionality, while such conditions are legitimated via their seemingly provisional nature, they operate within 'a no-mans land between public law and political fact.' Once established, such states become sedimented as they 'transform …exceptional measure into a technique of government' (*Ibid*.: 2). Although referring to conditions of governance, the same may be said for places. Indeed, as Boyle and Haggerty (2009) have noted, such rebordering practices now extend to non-event IOC activities as illustrated by the Committee's recent conference in Guatemala City which resulted in its host neighbourhood being cordoned off and its borders patrolled by armed and militarised police.

This standardisation of practice is also due to extend to future events (as evinced in the familiar components to Rio de Janeiro's 2016 security plan, see Rio2016). These consistencies also apply to London 2012 as the current Mayor of London, Boris Johnson recently made clear to a Parliamentary Culture, Media and Sport Committee hearing:

> broadly speaking, there will be quite substantial security and protection around the main Olympic venues of the kind that you would expect, and you will be seeing more detail about that nearer the time, but it will be not unlike what they did in China. (Department for Culture, Media and Sport, 2008)

London, however, introduces a slightly different dynamic to this Olympic security process as the city already boasts considerable experience in constructing sites of exorbitant security (*inter alia* Coaffee, 2009). In contrast to previous Games where

the Olympics were seen as a spur and justification for introducing and permanently retrofitting surveillance technologies, London is overtly building on its pre-existing expertise in crime prevention and counter-terrorism in securing the 2012 Games.

Laminating Security Infrastructures: Building on London's track record

As Jennings and Lodge (2009) highlight, for Olympic-type events, security arrangements tend to layer over existing infrastructures (or at least those components that fit the standardized security framework). In the course of over a century of experiencing modern urban terrorism, London has a long history of piloting and subsequently bequeathing advanced surveillance strategies, particularly among its eastern, Olympic-focused territories (Fussey 2007). The city therefore has a mature security infrastructure onto which the 2012 programme will be grafted. Indeed, as the Olympics Minister, Tessa Jowell, has recently articulated, 2012-related security measures are rooted in the UK having "years of experience in both tackling terrorism and hosting major sporting and cultural events" (*The Observer*, 2009).

Contrasting the experiences of many host cities (except possibly Atlanta) what is notable about the 2012 site is its development in the heart of an existing urban milieu; one that is densely populated, continually stereotyped through the discourse of 'dangerous spaces' and the host to an overwhelming majority of UK counter-terrorism related investigations. Whilst this segregation of Olympic and non-Olympic venues has been achieved at other Games (with the possible exception of Albertville's sprawling terrain in 1992), this extant urban setting generates additional security challenges. Yet it is perhaps in this respect that London has a particular track record

in creating urban enclaves that whilst not physically gated, are symbolically and technologically demarcated from their surrounding environments. Two such examples are particularly prominent in the capital.

High profile 'spaces of exception'

Following the bombing of London's financial heart in both 1992 and 1993 by the Provisional Irish Republican Army (PIRA), officials created a so-called 'Ring of Steel' which fomented a technologically delineated securitised zone predicated on monitoring and restricting access (Coaffee, 2004). Whilst target-hardening measures (such as security bollards and barriers) altered the urban landscape, it was camera surveillance that was viewed by Police as being the most important feature. An additional phase of expansion, intensification and 'hardening' subsequently occurred during the late 1990s with the introduction of Automatic Number Plate Recognition (ANPR cameras) and a substantial upgrading of existing camera provisions, rendering the 'Square Mile' area the most intensely monitored space in the UK (Coaffee, 2009), and, in likelihood, Europe. Yet, much of this expansion occurred during a time of reduced threat following the PIRA ceasefire prior to the Docklands bombing in February 1996. Here, the principle drivers were related to a desire to provide abstract (such as 'reassurance') as well as concrete indicators of security to abruptly hesitant investors, tenants and underwriters and avoid an exodus that could threaten London's privileged position within global finance markets (Coaffee 2004).

Similar principles were engaged and reproduced in the development of the capital's second business and finance metropolis at Canary Wharf in London's Docklands (situated geographically, if not socially or culturally, in the Olympic Borough of

Tower Hamlets). Following an averted PIRA bombing in 1992, and a realised attack in February1996, commercial tenants lobbied for a security cordon similar to the Ring of Steel initiated four miles to the west. This fortified landscape or 'Iron Collar' (Coaffee, 2004) was designed along similar security principles and for analogous reasons of reassurance and resilience. As highlighted below, such 'rings of security' bounded by ANPR cameras provide a template for Olympic security planning.

Since the new Millennium these cameras have since crept across space and function across the city. ANPR now provides automated sentries around the city-centre perimeter to police London's Congestion Charge. Further afield (and demonstrating the perennial 'Janus face' of surveillance – see Lyon, 1994) these cameras encircle the wider circumference of Greater London's Low Emission Zone to force owners of high-polluting vehicles to be (substantially) charged for using the capital's roads. Despite this diffusion, ANPR has noticeably converged eastwards with the Olympic Boroughs of Hackney (Wells, 2007) and Tower Hamlets (Coaffee *et al*., 2008) hosting particular concentrations. In the latter case, this technology is notably clustered around Canary Wharf's islands of affluence (coincidentally hosting the headquarters of London's Olympic planners) and its protective 'Iron Collar.'

Surveillance 2.0

Another strong commonality between these splintered spaces has been the use of advanced forms of technological surveillance to patrol their borders and interiors in addition to their broader deployment across the capital. Because these asocial and automated varieties have been previously comprehensively discussed generally (*inter alia* Lyon, 2003) and with reference to London (*inter alia* Coaffee, 2009; Fussey,

2007), the most notable aspects are only briefly revisited here to enable two distinct points of analysis. First, we highlight the propensity for these measures to be deployed into what are generally the poorest areas of London, particularly the three 'Olympic Boroughs' of Tower Hamlets, Newham and Hackney. Secondly, these measures constitute surveillance infrastructures that will be co-opted into the wider 2012 security ensemble, particularly in relation to the more populated areas encircling, and external to, the Olympic Park in Newham.

Most notable of these is Newham council's deployment of Face Recognition CCTV (FRCCTV) throughout the 1990s. Widespread conventional surveillance camera coverage was introduced comparatively late into the area and is more prominently associated with one of the earlier attempts to regenerate Stratford (the heart of 2012-related construction) during 1995's Stratford City Challenge scheme. In an area that had been unable to escape the label of 'dangerousness' that has historically afflicted much of East London, this regeneration stimulated a large deployment of surveillance cameras. FRCCTV followed soon after with the introduction of 300 cameras into the area (*The Guardian*, 2002), arguably one of the first public space deployments of the technology. Officially installed to counter crime and terrorism, in actuality the cameras became operational during 1998, the same year as the 'Good Friday Agreement,' which effectively led to the demilitarisation of PIRA. Critics have also emphasised the lack of evidence supporting their effectiveness in tackling crime (see *The Guardian*, 2002).

Other forms of second-generation surveillance strategies – particularly those designed to overcome fallible human attention spans by automatically 'identifying' phenomena

deemed suspicious – have also been tested on East Londoners prior to their wider diffusion. One notable example includes the *Intelligent Passenger Surveillance* (IPS) programme that automatically overlays live surveillance camera feeds onto 'ideal' images (such as an empty platform after a train has departed) and alerts of any 'suspicious discrepancies' (such as discarded luggage) first piloted at Mile End Underground station (Tower Hamlets) during 2003. Another less-publicised example was the 2006 experimentation with private sector microphone-equipped cameras in Shoreditch (Hackney) to monitor activity surrounding its thriving night-time economy. Here, manufacturers claimed that they had developed algorithms to distinguish between human screams of pleasure and distress and could automatically alert camera operators to the latter (Wells, 2007) – a claim that convinced municipal 'CCTV Managers' to allow it to be deployed into public spaces.

Overall, this discussion has sought to illustrate the trend of deploying novel forms of technological surveillance into East London, particularly in those areas adjacent to the Olympic Park, and high profile areas of London more generally. These are the contexts and themes of London's security practice onto which the global leitmotifs Olympic security standards must overlay. At the same time, the (current) £600m 2012 security budget will generate further opportunities to intensify and embed these practices. As the following sections highlight, these trends may forge strong harmonies with the plans to protect the 2012 Games yet, simultaneously, may also create dissonance with some of the idiosyncrasies of policing London.

Securing the 2012 London Olympics

> The 2012 Olympic and Paralympic Games will require the largest security operation ever conducted in the United Kingdom. The success of the Games will be ultimately dependant on the provision of a safe and secure environment free from a major incident resulting in loss of life. The challenge is demanding; the global security situation continues to be characterised by instability with international terrorism and organised crime being a key component. (Metropolitan Police Authority, 2007)

For host cities, policing the Games is seen as an exercise in exceptionality. The above statement, quoted from a Metropolitan Police (the constabulary covering most of London, including the city's Olympic venues) report on 2012 security planning demonstrates that this view is shared in London. Here, the scale and form of the project constitutes an unprecedented peace-time undertaking for the hosts. Of further interest is the primacy given to securing the Games from a cataclysmic terrorist attack. Indeed, the execution of the July 7th bombings a mere 20 hours after the IOC's decision to award the thirtieth summer Olympiad to London has provided a lasting and symbolic connection between the 2012 Games and terrorist violence. Coupled with unprecedented expenditure following the relaunch of the UK Government's counter-terrorist (CONTEST) strategy and its dominance in local security budgets, the threat of terrorism has become *the* prominent feature of 2012 security planning (Coaffee 2009). Such prioritisation is not only evident from the above planning document, it is unequivocally articulated in the consolidated *London 2012 Olympic and Paralympic Safety and Security Strategy*: 'the greatest threat to the security of the 2012 Olympic and Paralympic Games is international terrorism' (Home Office,

2009). Moreover, it is important to recognise how the primacy attributed to such concerns shapes the total security infrastructures deployed to secure the Olympics.

Building on the aforementioned foundations, private contractors were invited to construct the substantive and detailed aspects of the strategy via a series of tenders from London's Olympic Delivery Authority (ODA) during 2007. The first round of these tenders enabled private sector projects to be collated into the consolidated 2012 security plan developed and finalized during 2009 (Home Office, 2009) and thus makes it possible to identify the direction of resources within the wider strategy. More specifically, establishing contracts as early as 2007-2008 allowed them to be integrated into the projected Olympic construction programme.

A central theme of this overall security plan was the continuation of London's praxis of fragmenting urban spaces. This is perhaps most clearly articulated by the then Metropolitan Police security coordinator for the 2012 Games,' proposed framework for 2012 resilience arrangements. Here, Assistant Commissioner Tarique Ghaffur articulated the need for the Games' counter-terrorism plan to operate over a defined security 'footprint' (territory). In doing so, he evoked the City of London's 'Ring of Steel' as an exemplar of such a security regime (Ghaffur, 2007), one that continues the 'secure by design' mantle informing many prior London developments including Heathrow Terminal Five, the Millennium Dome, Wembley and Lords Cricket Ground. The ODA tenders, designed to enable private security contractors to situate specific strategies within these policy frameworks, reinforce this point. Explicitly characterising the Olympic Park as a splintered 'Island Site' (ODA, 2007), and thus semantically confirming its geographical isolation, these tenders reveal ambitions for

technological apparatus to police its borders. In doing so, the ODA placed particular emphasis on procuring technological solutions for these 'problem areas' including 'ACS [access control systems] comprising RFID token and biometric[s]', a 'combination of technology and physical searching' and 'CCTV, security lighting systems and intruder detection systems to be [established,] integrated with, and form a part of, the perimeter security' (*Ibid*.).

These measures also compliment more traditional forms of intra-city bordering. The Olympic park itself was 'sealed' in July 2007 and nearby public footpaths and waterways closed for public access. The encircling 11-mile blue fence - 'cordon blue,' which was put in place for 'health and safety' reasons, has been likened by some to the Belfast peace walls (*The Guardian* 2007). In 2009 this was replaced by electric fencing. Around the main venues and on the borders of the Olympic Park there has also been talk of setting up advanced screening access points – the so-called 'tunnel of truth' which can check large numbers of people simultaneously for explosives, weapons and biohazards. Those creating this elaborate security ensemble are also not spared from its controlling features as biometric checks via advanced hand-scanners are routinely carried out on the construction workforce within the sealed site (*inter alia* The Observer, 2009).

To manage this burgeoning assemblage, many disparate technological strategies are pulled together in the Metropolitan Police's newly constructed Special Operations Room, a surveillance camera command centre in Lambeth, South London, inaugurated in 2007. This facility, the largest of its kind in the capital, was ostensibly designed to oversee the security of major events such as the Notting Hill Carnival and

large sporting events including the London Marathon and, ultimately, the Olympics. Building on notions of 'nodal governance,' this development potentially could be seen in terms of 'nodal security.' Drawing on Castells (2000) characterisation of nodes as the points of confluence for overlapping networks, 'nodal governance' has been developed as a conceptual tool to understand how these nodes then exert their influence (*inter alia* Burris *et al*., 2005). These sites have been characterized as comprising four features: mentalities (mechanisms for thinking about the governed subject/network); technologies (methods for exercising influence); resources (the means to enable its operation); and institutions (to marshal the mentalities, technologies and resources). The Lambeth control room serves as a conduit, arguably comprising these four elements, where surveillance footage from the control centres of 32 other London boroughs is filtered through. As the network expands, new nodes arise via the forthcoming development of two similar facilities, one in Hendon, North-West London, and another in Bow, in the heart of the East End, close to the Olympic Park. Underlining the prominence of terrorism within this definition of 'security' is the integration of the Metropolitan Police's 'Gold Command' (the largely terrorism-focussed policing body with overall control of strategy and resources) into the strategic and operational management of this facility, their presence also enabling an ability to immediately seize control of the centre during any major incidents.

Partly stimulated by fears of a spatially displaced terrorist attack, these technological security measures will also soak through the 'island site's' borders and permeate the broader locality. As such, during Games time, London authorities will be using advanced surveillance to track suspects across the city including London's ever expanding system of ANPR cameras. A RFID ticket trafficking system, which would

allow spectators to be tracked from their home (facilitated by the proposed combined entrance and transport ticket), has also been suggested. Towards the security epicentre in Stratford, a securitised traffic-free 'buffer zone' covering the areas to the south of the Olympic park, from West Ham and Plaistow, has already been approved – a development which may conflict with official declarations that the Games will foster community aggrandizement. Here, such controlled zones may conflict with the area's deep-rooted traditions of (extreme *laissez-faire*) street trading. Additionally, restrictions on protest and assembly around Olympic sites enshrined in the *London Olympic and Paralympic Games Act, 2006* (and likely to be policed by the aforementioned technologies) may potentially stifle another East End ritual: rebellion.

In sum, the confluence of recent security trends in the capital alongside the particular aims of 2012 Olympic security programme creates a climate that elevates the prominence of technological surveillance strategies. Indeed, the ODA's (2007) call for suppliers to offer strategies that 'create an integrated security environment that is effective, discrete and proportionate' echoes the IOC's longstanding aim of projecting the Games as an athletic event and not an exercise in security. What is significant in the context of Olympic security is that 'discretion' and 'proportionality' have often translated into distanciated forms of technological control. This policy direction was further confirmed by the then head of the 2012 security strategy, Tarique Ghaffur, as follows:

> One of the main issues will be technology vs. people … An event of this scale means technology plays a bigger part in the look and feel of the games and

> means surveillance will be a major issue that will likely cause debate. (Games Monitor, 2007)

Cumulatively, these approaches both harmonise with the standard approaches to Olympic security outlined above and, also, reassert London's tradition of applying technological strategies to 'separated spaces' to tackle crime, terrorism and other risks.

Fanning the flame: security legacies

One of the most frequently articulated concepts in relation to 2012 and a key determinant in London's award of the Games is the issue of 'legacy,' particularly in terms of the post-event use of the Olympic site and attendant community regeneration schemes. This post-Games utility also extends to the machinery of security. Indeed, the aforementioned tenders for Olympic Park security providers are encouraging companies to supply 'security legacy,' thus bequeathing substantial mechanisms and technologies of control to the post-event site. Here, questions remain over the security priorities of a high profile international sporting event attended by millions of people and the degree of infrastructure that will remain to police a large urban parkland (the future incarnation of the Olympic site). Although for other mega-events, such as the 2006 FIFA World Cup, the security legacy consisted of sustained networks of professionals rather than physical control measures (largely due to the deployment of mobile surveillance cameras) (Baasch, 2008), this post-event inheritance of security infrastructures is a common Olympic legacy. Indeed, the legacy of retained private policing following the Tokyo (1964) and Seoul (1988) Olympiads and the continuation of zero-tolerance style exclusion laws after the Sydney (2000) games are

a case in point. Private security providers have further expressed the view to the authors that the potential to engage in new markets and develop opportunities with the public sector after the Games is an additional, and perhaps more compelling, reason to engage in the Olympics project. Key here are the critical themes of legitimacy and control 'creep.' Furthermore, issues of citizenship and community (continually cited by the ODA as the main benefactors of the games) may also be called into question.

The social configuration of post-Olympic spaces and their attendant demands for security are also important. A repeated corollary of large-scale redevelopment/regeneration projects generally (*inter alia* Sassen, 2001) and in London specifically (Hall, 2002; Imrie *et al*., 2009) has been to reinforce micro-community level socio-economic segregation. In turn, the rebordered Olympic neighbourhood is likely to bring a host of new security demands, particularly for surveillance cameras, from the new inhabitants of its gentrified and splintered enclaves, as has traditionally been the case (*inter alia* Sennet, 1996; Bauman, 2000).

Conclusion - Olympic Rings of Steel

This chapter has argued that despite pluralities of threat and the diverse local topographies that shape them, strong commonalities can be observed across Olympic security operations over both time and place. These catalyse the institution of 'total' security 'spaces of exception' that are simultaneously standardised, transferable and mobile and potentially dislocated from their host environments. Although some localized security vernaculars inevitably penetrate their deployment (particularly given the importance of occupational cultures in delivering security, see *inter alia*

Reiner, 2000; Klauser, this volume), the overarching homogeneity of Olympic security arrangements necessarily impact unevenly on diverse host settings. Such asymmetries may relate to issues of efficacy, liberality and applicability.

For London 2012 two additional processes are at play. First, future candidates have noted the currency given by the IOC to London's emphasis on regenerative 'legacies' (see Rio 2016, 2007). Consequently, subsequent Olympics Parks are unlikely to become the suburban appendages of the past and, instead, become hosted within existing urban settings ripe for regeneration. The isolation and bordering of such spaces is likely to become more pronounced. At the same time, the flow of affluent migrants to the wider redeveloped areas may exacerbate demands to retain Olympic security infrastructures. Secondly, prior its Olympic bid, London already boasted a mature security infrastructure comprising key elements of standardised Olympic security. These include the symbolic and technological delineation of urban spaces and piloting advanced surveillance technologies. The £600m (and rising) London 2012 security programme is therefore commencing from a different position than for many preceding Olympic cities and, as the current planning and tendering arrangements demonstrate, is therefore likely to comprehensively intensify and embed the capital's security infrastructure.

This Chapter has also argued that Olympic security programmes are largely predicated on externalised terrorist threats. The role of post-millennium tensions informed by partially knowable yet potentially catastrophic risks in shaping 'total security' paradigms also holds for London. Thus, Olympic risks are selectively and socially constructed. The extraction of this notion of threat from the wider canon of

(largely human-constructed) contemporary risks (see Beck, 1999) raises a number of final areas of reflection.

Initially, there is potential that standardised security responses may fail to map onto the uneven local topographies of terrorist threats to London. To take the example of one prominent Olympic security component, surveillance cameras, in London they have been more potent in tackling right wing terrorism than, say, violent Jihadi extremism (Fussey, 2007). An additional consideration is the continual mutability *within* types of terrorist threat. Al Qaeda-inspired activity, for example, has continually shifted from its pre 9/11 (more networked) form and 'post-Taliban' arrangements and is likely to be different in 2012 from what it is at the time of writing.

Accounting for broader social harms generated by the hosting of mega-events further complicates this dynamic. A key issue here is how these (perhaps more routine) harms risk being downplayed by the emphasis on terrorism. Empirical work has demonstrated that hosting mega-events can routinely generate low and mid-level offences (Decker *et al*., 2007) as well as organised criminal activity, particularly those of high exploitation (Fussey and Rawlinson, 2009). Indeed, Fussey and Rawlinson's (2009) ongoing ethnographic research into organised crime in East London ahead of the Games, has yielded data revealing the increased mobility (and reduced detectability) of the area's sex industry; transferability of skills as established organised criminal elements enter and consolidate positions in this market; and the establishment of new trans-ethnic coalitions as nodal points to facilitate the industry. Other data from this research reveals the exploitation and theft from vulnerable

migrant workers operating below sub-contractor level on construction projects in East London (as part of the wider Olympic-related regeneration programme, although not connected to the actual Olympic Park). In turn, this has generated pathways into the second economy as a strategy of economic survival alongside recourse to violent groups to address fiscal disputes.

As such, numerous criminogenic dynamics may be observed in relation to hosting the Olympics. Here, long-standing recognition that global processes impact on local criminal practices – such as the creation of new entrepreneurially-oriented territories of criminality (*inter alia* Hobbs, 2001) – are germane. Hosting mega-events such as the Olympics accelerate these global processes – including the reweighting of local economies towards (legal and illegal) consumer, leisure and service-oriented markets and their myriad environmental, social and cultural impacts – that, in turn, agitate and impel the development of new criminogenic contexts. Moreover, borrowing from Bauman (1998), such partially-visible movements can be seen to impact hidden, vulnerable and transitory populations most acutely and, for those it relocates, mobilises their delineation into protected tourists or policed vagabonds.

At present surveillance-related security dominates security planning for London 2012 given concerns about the threat of international terrorism. Yet the current and long term impact of non-terrorist criminality, already a significant feature of the Olympic host communities, is likely to grow significantly. Come 2012, the Olympic security operation put in place to protect the Olympic family during the Games – so called customer sensitive security – will be intricately blended with strategies which seek to regenerate local communities by upgrading housing, public places and community

infrastructures and legacy security from the Games. Whereas some elements of the Olympic 'rings of steel' may dissipate in the post-Games era, what remains of the security infrastructure is likely to have significant impact upon everyday life in East London.

References

Agamben, G. 2005. *State of Exception*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Baash, S. 2008. "FIFA Soccer World Cup 2006 - Event driven security policies." paper presented at *Security and Surveillance at Mega Sport Events: from Beijing 2008 to London 2012* conference, 25th April.

Ball, K. and F. Webster, eds. 2004. *The Intensification of Surveillance: Crime Terrorism and Warfare in the Information Era*. London: Pluto.

Bauman, Z. 1998. *Globalization: The Human Consequences*. Cambridge: Polity.

---------- 2000. *Liquid Modernity*, Cambridge: Polity.

Beck, U. 1999. *World Risk Society*. London: Polity Press.

Boyle, P., and K. Haggerty. 2009. "Spectacular Security: Mega-Events and the Security Complex." *International Political Sociology* 3 (2):257-274.

Burris, S., P. Drahos, and C. Shearing. 2005. "Nodal Governance." *Australian Journal of Legal Philosophy* 30 (1):30-58.

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

Coaffee, J. 2004. "Recasting the 'Ring of Steel': Designing out terrorism in the City of London," in *Cities, War and Terrorism: Towards an urban geopolitics*, edited by S. Graham, pp. 276-96. Oxford: Blackwell.

--------- 2009. *Terrorism, Risk and the Global City – Towards Urban Resilience*. Ashgate: Aldershot.

Coaffee, J., and P. Rogers. 2008. "Rebordering the city for new security challenges: From counter terrorism to community resilience." *Space and Polity* 12 (2): 101-118.

Coaffee, J., D. Murakami Wood, and P. Rogers. 2008. *The Everyday Resilience of the City: How Cities Respond to Terrorism and Disaster*. Basingstoke: Palgrave-MacMillan.

Coaffee, J., and P. Fussey. 2010 in press. "Security and the threat of terrorism." In *Olympic Cities: City Agendas, Planning, and the World's Games, 1896 to 2012* (Second Edition), edited by J. Gold and M. Gold, London: Routledge.

COJO 1976. *Official Report of the XXI Olympiad, Montreal 1976*, COJO: Ottawa.

Cook, I. 2007. "Beijing, 2008." in *Olympic Cities: City Agendas, Planning, and the World's Games, 1896 to 2012*, edited by J. Gold and M. Gold, pp. 286-97. London: Routledge.

Davies, S. 1996. *Big Brother*. London: Pan.

Decker, S., S. Varano, and J. Greene. 2007. "Routine crime in exceptional times: The impact of the 2002 Winter Olympics on citizen demand for police services." *Journal of Criminal Justice* 35 (1):89-103.

Department for Culture, Media and Sport. 2008. *London 2012: Lessons from Beijing*, committee hearing minutes available from http://www.publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm200809/cmselect/cmcumeds/25/8100703.htm.

Drake, C. 1998. *Terrorists' Target Selection*. Basingstoke: Palgrave-MacMillan.

El Mundo. 2005. *ETA pone un coche bomba contra el símbolo de la candidatura de Madrid 2012,* 27th June, available from http://www.elmundo.es/elmundo/2005/06/25/espana/1119719063.html (accessed, September 28th, 2009).

Ericson, R. 1994. "The Division of Expert Knowledge in Policing and Security." *British Journal of Sociology* 45 (2):149-175.

Fussey, P. 2007. "Observing potentiality in the global city: Surveillance and counterterrorism in London." *International Criminal Justice Review* 17 (3):171-192.

---------- 2010 in press. "An economy of choice? Terrorist decision-making and criminological rational choice theories reconsidered." *Security Journal* 23.

Fussey, P., and P. Rawlinson. 2009. "Winners and losers: Post communist populations and organised crime in East London's Olympic regeneration game" presented at the *2nd Annual European Organised Crime Conference*, Liverpool, UK, 9th March.

Fussey, P., J. Coaffee, G. Armstrong, and D. Hobbs. 2010. *Sustaining and Securing the Olympic City: Reconfiguring London for 2012 and Beyond*. Aldershot: Ashgate.

Games Monitor 2007. "The Multinational Security Games." Available from http://www.gamesmonitor.org.uk/node/348 (accessed September 23rd, 2009).

GCIM, Global Commission on International Migration. 2005. *Migration in an Interconnected World: New directions for action,* Geneva: Global Commission on International Migration

Ghaffur, T. 2007. *Letter to the House of Lords*, 8 June (London: Metropolitan Police Service).

The Guardian. 2002. "Robo Cop." June 13th 2002, available from http://www.guardian.co.uk/g2/story/0,3604,736312,00.html (accessed June 30, 2009).

The Guardian. 2007. "Cordon Blue." Friday 21 September, available from http://www.guardian.co.uk/society/2007/sep/21/communities (accessed September 21, 2007).

Hall, P. 2002. *Cities of Tomorrow*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Hinds, A., and E. Vlachou. 2007. "Fortress Olympics: Counting the cost of major event security." *Jane's Intelligence Review* 19 (5):20-26.

Hobbs, D. 2001. "The firm: Organizational logic and criminal culture on a shifting terrain." *British Journal of Criminology* 41: 549-60.

Home Office. 2009. *London 2012 Olympic and Paralympic Safety and Security Strategy*. London: HMSO.

Imrie, R., L. Lees, and M. Raco, eds. *Regenerating London: Governance, Sustainability and Community in a Global City*. London: Routledge.

Jennings, W., and M. Lodge. 2009. "Governing mega-events: Tools of security management for the London 2012 Olympic Games and FIFA 2006 World Cup in Germany." ESRC Centre for Analysis of Risk and Regulation Discussion Paper, London School of Economics and Political Science No. 55: 1-25.

Jiminez, F. 1992. "Spain: The terrorist challenge and the government's response." *Terrorism and Political Violence* 4 (4):113-114.

Klauser, F. 2011. "Commonalities and specificities in mega-event securitization: The example of Euro 2008 in Austria and Switzerland." In C. Bennett and K. Haggerty eds. *Security Games*. London: Routledge.

Lake Placid Olympic Organising Committee. 1980. *Final Report of the XIII Winter Olympic Games Lake Placid, 1980*, LPOOC: New York.

Los Angeles Times. 2007. "Beijing Olympics visitors to come under widespread surveillance." August 07.

Lyon, D. 2003. *Surveillance After September 11th*. London: Blackwell.

Metropolitan Police Authority. 2007. Metropolitan Police Service Olympic Programme. Update available from http://www.mpa.gov.uk/committees/x-cop/2007/070201/06/ (accessed October 1, 2009).

New York Times. 2007. "China finds American allies for security." December 28th.

The Observer 2009. Biometric tests for Olympic site workers." Sunday 11th, available from http://www.guardian.co.uk/uk/2009/oct/11/biometric-tests-for-olympic-site.

Olympic Delivery Authority. 2007. ODA Security Industry Day, Call For Security Tenders, available from:

http://www.london2012.com/documents/oda-industry-days/oda-security-industry-day-presentation.pdf (accessed December 3rd, 2008).

Rio2016. 2007. *Rio de Janeiro Applicant File – Theme 13: Security*. Rio de Janeiro: Brazil.

Said, E. 1993. *Culture and Imperialism*. New York: Vintage.

Sassen, S. 2001. *The Global City: New York, London, Tokyo*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

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

Security Products. 2007. *Beijing To Invest More Than $720 Million For 2008 Summer Olympic Games Security*, available from http://secprodonline.com/articles/2007/08/14/beijing-to-invest.aspx (accessed March 10th, 2010).

Sennet, R. 1996. *The Uses of Disorder: Personal Identity and City Life*. London: Faber & Faber.

Toohey, K., and A. Veal. 2007. *The Olympic Games: A Social Science Perspective*. Wallingford: Cabi.

United Nations Security Council. 1988. *Provisional Verbatim Record of the Two Thousand Seven Hundred And Ninety-First Meeting*, New York: UN, transcribed notes available from http://www.undemocracy.com/S-PV.2791.pdf.

Wells, A. 2007. "The July 2005 Bombings." paper given at the *Local; Government Agency 2007 CCTV Conference: The Development of a National Strategy, Innovative Systems, Effectiveness and Standards*, Local Government House, London, 4th July.