

# Introduction: Security and Surveillance at Sport Mega Events

Richard Giulianotti and Francisco Klauser

## Introduction

In recent times, sport mega events have grown into major global spectacles that possess huge economic, political and social significance. Cities and nations compete intensively for the right to host mega events such as the Olympic Games, the Superbowl in American football, the Champions League final in European football or the 'World Cup finals' of various sports. For the organisers, these events are seen as conferring high levels of national and international prestige on host cities, as well as a variety of other benefits such as urban regeneration, increased tourism and new partnerships with global corporations. For example, the 2006 World Cup finals in Germany were estimated to have attracted 5 million international visitors, combined global television audiences of 26 billion and a national economic boost of US\$12.5 billion (Giulianotti and Klauser, 2010).

One issue which has become central to the planning and implementation of sport mega events is security, particularly since

the 9/11 attacks on the United States. Granted, security concerns in sport do go further back, as most obviously demonstrated by the 1972 Munich Olympic attacks, at which 17 people were killed when Palestinian terrorists held Israeli athletes hostage, and also by the concerted attempts by various authorities to prevent spectator violence at major football tournaments since the mid 1970s onwards. Yet, in the post-9/11 environment, rising expenditures on security demonstrate the intensification of the issue of sport and security. For example, while security spending at the 1992 Barcelona Olympics came to US\$66 million, the budget for London 2012 stands at a projected US\$1.7 billion (*The Telegraph*, 9 September 2010; *Daily Telegraph*, 11 December 2007). Such expenditures are realised through the mobilisation of more security personnel, such as the 60 000 additional police officers to be drafted in for London 2012, and the implementation of high-tech security technologies. As security

**Richard Giulianotti** is in the School of Sport, Health and Exercise Sciences, Loughborough University, Ashby Road, Loughborough, LE11 3TU, UK. E-mail: r.giulianotti@lboro.ac.uk.

**Francisco Klauser** is in the Institute of Geography, Université de Neuchâtel, Espace Louis Agassiz 1, Neuchâtel, 2000, Switzerland. E-mail: francisco.klauser@unine.ch.

at sport mega events has grown exponentially in recent times, so the diverse effects of these processes on the host cities and nations become increasingly complex and problematic.

## Approach

The focus of this Special Issue of *Urban Studies* is on the interplay between security, sport mega events and cities. Sport mega events are typically moving from host city to host city. Their organisation and securitisation thus mainly constitute urban phenomena, even if their economic and social outputs are often expected and experienced on a broader scale. Emphasising the urban-centrism of sport mega events is of major importance to elucidate the conditions, needs and impacts of event security.

For the 2008 European Football Championships in Switzerland and Austria, for example, UEFA produced more than 15 km of tarpaulin to cover the most prominently positioned fences, demarcating a multitude of access-restricted and controlled spatial entities, from the stadia to the referee headquarters and from team hotels to fan zones (UEFA, 2008). Mega event host cities thus exemplify the splintering of the contemporary urban environment into a wide range of more or less hermetically enclosed and tightly controlled enclaves that are supported by advanced surveillance technologies and increased numbers of security personnel (Klauser, 2010). Such spatialised security measures are driven by the need to monitor and manage a context of increased diversity and density, that is the object of escalating security concern. Yet the aim of these spatial enclosures is not only to secure specifically arranged and hierarchically organised parts of the urban environment, but also to channel spectator flows throughout the

host cities, from railway stations to stadia, from event location to event location, from fan zone to fan zone. Small and larger portions of space are cut off and networked with the rest of the cities through a multitude of access- or passage-points, some controlled more highly than others. What is emerging is a temporally limited, security-related form of 'passage-point urbanism' (Graham, 2010).

Yet besides emphasising the urban logics, implications and legacies of mega event security, attention must also be paid more generally to the role of mega events in the current dynamics and global recalibrations of security governance. From a security perspective, the 'politics of the event' is one of the central political issues in the world today. This raises a series of important questions with regards to mega event security as both the product, and as the producer, of a broader set of developments in contemporary security governance, ranging from the militarisation and commercialisation of public safety to the increasing technologisation of urban-centred security and surveillance measures.

The Special Issue thus not only provides critical accounts of the effects and conditions of mega event security in specific urban settings. The papers which are contained here also aim to understand and to situate contemporary mega event security as a symptomatic expression of a broader cluster of developments in contemporary security governance, which are in turn giving rise to new and profound social questions. It is at this junction, of course, that the Special Issue draws heavily upon the realms of security and surveillance studies. Both fields have insisted strongly and at length upon the shifting modes of global security governance in general (Dillon and Reid, 2001) and on questions of how contemporary security practices and surveillance impact upon the urban environment

more specifically (Coleman, 2005; Graham, 2010). Yet the existing literatures on security and surveillance in the urban context widely overlook the question of how exceptional occasions such as sport mega events may function as catalysts in the formation of urban-centred security governance.

## Positioning

In substantive terms, the Special Issue brings together four main fields of research, each of which deserves some discussion here.

First, the Special Issue draws upon the sophisticated body of literature focusing on the economic impacts of sport mega events, notably in relation to urban regeneration and gentrification, and in terms of urban entrepreneurialism (Harvey, 1989) and 'place selling' (Kearns and Philo, 1993). Perhaps the most substantial debates in this regard have centred on the claimed 'legacies' of sport mega events for hosting cities and nations. These range from urban infrastructural improvements and regeneration (Burbank *et al.*, 2002) to increased employment and tourism revenues (Euchner, 1999). Thus there are extensive studies arguing that sport mega events enable host cities and nations to plug into different circuits and flows of global capital. Local and national business figures and political leaders seek to cement forms of bridging social capital which may be established with the visiting 'transnational capitalist class' (Sklair, 2000). Urban redevelopment opens new, neo-liberal, commercialised spaces to global retail chains as part of the broader 'brandscaping' of cities (Hall, 2006; Klingmann, 2007). Host cities and nations may also project themselves as 'festival' locations, to attract other events and 'expos', particularly where the competition for hosting rights is highly competitive and widely covered in international media (Roche, 2000).

In interrogating the economic logics and implications of mega events, different scholars have suggested a strong connection between the hosting of high-visibility sports tournaments and new kinds of political economy, as one powerful index of the ways in which post-industrial cities have come to utilise cultural fields in order to establish economic growth (Hall, 2006; Miller, 2000). Much of this mega event research into urban entrepreneurialism has been influenced by North American studies that explore the economics of sport team franchises, stadium-building and urban 'boosterism' in global cities which host elite professional (or 'major league') sports clubs (Coates and Humphreys, 2000; Lee and Taylor, 2005; Noll and Zimbalist, 1997; Siegfried and Zimbalist, 2006; Spilling, 1996; Whitson and Horne, 2006). In addition, a growing international body of work has addressed this problematic from a perspective centred on the global South, showing that sport may also serve to establish emerging nations such as Brazil, Russia, India, China and South Africa on the world stage (Alegi, 2008; Close *et al.*, 2006; Matheson and Baade, 2004; McRoskey, 2010). In these literatures, however, little is said about the link between urban entrepreneurialism and security issues and discourses associated with mega events. Many of the papers in this collection focus on precisely this fundamental point.

Secondly, sociologists and anthropologists have been most prominent in examining the socio-cultural politics and impacts of sport mega events. This work has addressed the ways in which dominant civic or national solidarities and identities are constructed through these mega events (DCMS, 2008) and how marginalised or resistant communities have challenged these processes (Hargreaves, 2000; Lenskyj, 2000; Marivoet, 2006; Morgan, 2003; Shaikin, 1988). While both of these approaches offer

important insights into the roles of mega events as catalysts to promote wider socio-economic, urban, political or cultural outputs, relatively little critical attention is paid to the implications of sport mega events in terms of security governance and surveillance. This Special Issue contributes towards filling that research gap.

Thirdly, substantial research into sport-related violence has centred on football hooliganism and the heightened security strategies that have been imposed in response both inside and outside stadia (Armstrong, 1998; Giulianotti and Armstrong, 1998; 2002; Murphy *et al.*, 1990; O'Neill, 2005; Spaaij, 2006; Stott and Reicher, 1998; Tsoukala, 2009). The more nuanced social research has explored how anti-hooliganism control measures may intensify (rather than eradicate) the phenomenon, undermine civil liberties and give rise to security technologies (such as CCTV) which have been transferred into wider public settings.

Fourthly, in the past decade, human geography, urban sociology and criminology have contributed most to research into issues of security and social control at individual sport mega events (Bennett and Haggerty, 2011; Boyle and Haggerty, 2009; Chang and Singh, 1990; Floridis, 2004; Klauser, 2008a, 2008b; Samatas, 2007). Although a lack of truly empirical and comparative work in this field of research persists, these investigations allow for an initial understanding of the importance of urban space as the locus, medium and tool of mega event security, and of its wider socio-spatial implications. Studied examples include the 2004 Athens Olympics (Samatas, 2007), the 2006 Turin (Fonio and Pisapia, 2011), the 2008 Beijing (Yu *et al.*, 2009) the 2010 Vancouver (Boyle and Haggerty, 2009) and the 2012 London Games (Fussey and Coaffee, 2011; Fussey *et al.*, 2011); as well as the 2006 FIFA World Cup in Germany (Klauser, 2008a,

2008b; Eick, 2011; Baasch, 2011) and the 2008 European Football Championships 2008 (Hagemann, 2010; Klauser, 2011). This fourth field of research into sport mega events provides the most obvious location for the papers presented here, although readers will recognise the significance of the other three domains for our contributors.

## Structure of the Special Issue

The papers contained in this Special Issue capture both the contemporary international complexity of sport mega events and the interdisciplinarity of scholarly inquiry into this subject. We feature contributors with expertise in the fields of urban studies, anthropology, criminology, history, human geography, political science, sociology and sport studies, and who are based in the UK, mainland Europe, North America, Africa, east Asia and Australasia. The papers examine a diversity of sport mega events, notably five Olympic Games, three World Cup finals in football, one European football championship and various national events in Europe, North America and Australasia.

We locate these papers within three main sections. Part 1 focuses on sport mega event security issues and debates with respect to their urban, national and global contexts. It features papers by Armstrong, Hobbs and Lindsay; Boyle and Haggerty; Klauser; Cornelissen; and, Murakami Wood and Abe. Part 2 examines the complex interplay between security techniques and strategies inside and beyond the urban stadium, along with their various impacts on the development of sports. It includes papers by Taylor and Toohey; Schimmel; and, Giulianotti. Part 3 explores the interrelations of sport-focused security technologies and the cities that are hosting these mega events. This section features papers by Coaffee, Fussey and

Moore; Eick; and, Samatas. In the remainder of this introduction, we explore each section in more detail, while briefly setting out the contents of each paper.

### **Part 1: Local, National and International Contexts and Driving Forces in Mega Event Security**

Part 1 of the Special Issue positions event security issues and debates within their complex local, national and global policy dynamics and contexts. In recent years, the various forms, effects and driving-forces of contemporary security governance have been acknowledged both from a general perspective (for example, Power, 2007; Amoore and de Goede, 2005) and from the viewpoint of mega event securitisation more specifically (Samatas, 2007; Klauser, 2008a). These studies have positioned mega event security within a complex field of agencies, driving-forces and motivations, including a range of international processes and stipulations, as well as diverse national and local predispositions and impulses in security matters. There are a number of important issues to be found here, but two of these are especially important.

First, and stemming from a concern with neo-liberal urban governance more generally, debates have focused on the capacity of mega event security to trigger and to facilitate public policies and developments, driven by various interests and agencies both internationally, nationally and locally. For many analysts, urban revanchism (Smith, 1996) is strongly at play here. Revanchist stadium developments may involve the 'reclaiming' of urban spaces for bourgeois audiences and the clearing of unwanted or marginal populations from newly sanitised commercial zones. In the US, for example, Super Bowl host cities have hired private security agencies to squeeze the homeless from event locales. In

Delhi, urban redevelopment for the 2010 Commonwealth Games included the demolition of slum housing for over 250 000 people to enable construction of stadia and the Athletes Village (*Michigan Daily*, 1 February 2006; *Guardian*, 22 February 2010). Conflicts arise as marginalised groups and their supporters contest these processes, although most substantial resistance invariably emerges from the best-resourced social groups. More broadly, new social movements often spring up in protest at the bidding for, or the staging of, sport mega events. In Toronto, the 'Bread Not Circuses' movement organised high-profile protests to oppose the city's bid to host the 2008 Summer Olympics, while the 2010 Winter Olympics in Vancouver also drew public protests (Lenskyj, 2000). In Sydney, the Anti-Olympic Alliance organised various public and virtual (website) demonstrations against the hosting of the 2000 Olympics.

Secondly, and complementing the first point, a series of studies have highlighted the normative weight of best practices provided by security experts moving from country to country and from event to event. These investigations have shown local stakeholders to be increasingly exposed to globalised networks of expertise that are pushing towards the reproduction of previously tested collaborations and templates in security matters (Samatas, 2007; Yu *et al.*, 2009; Boyle, 2011). Indeed, there are many good reasons for understanding sport mega events as highly visible and prestigious projects, whose securitisation is firmly embedded in more or less coercive transnational circuits of imitation and standardisation. Yet, the role of local motivations and specificities in event security should not be underplayed, or forgotten completely.

Focusing on both the role of local agency, motivation and expertise and on the weight of international stipulations in mega event

security, this Special Issue underlines the need to apprehend mega event securitisation as a combination of processes and projects which bring together various public–private, local, national and transnational actors whose own positions are defined by interwoven interests and concerns.

This section features five papers from Europe, North America, Africa and east Asia. The paper by Gary Armstrong, Dick Hobbs and Iain Lindsay provides a strongly ethnographic account of the specific local political and social issues and conflicts surrounding the hosting of the 2012 Olympics in the London borough of Newham. The site of the Olympic stadium and athlete village, Newham is one of England's poorest, youngest and most ethnically diverse boroughs. The authors focus particularly on the work of one local social movement—The East London Communities Organisation (TELCO)—in seeking to influence the planning for, and proposed legacy of, London 2012, often in marked contrast to the interests and goals of the powerful Olympic 'hegemon'.

The paper by Philip Boyle and Kevin Haggerty advances a critical political sociological analysis of the hosting of the 2010 Winter Olympics by the city of Vancouver. Focusing particularly on the city's Project Civil City initiative, Boyle and Haggerty reveal how the staging of this sport mega event has served to promote new and exemplary forms of neo-liberal urban governance in concert with intensified levels of policing and securitisation. These processes have led to greater scales of social fragmentation and exclusion, despite statements from city authorities that the opposite effects are intended.

The next paper, by Francisco Klauser, engages with the policy transfer of specific 'security exemplars' between different events. The paper addresses this issue through the discussion of fan zones at the

European Football Championships 2008 in Switzerland and Austria. Fan zones, such is the basic assumption, must be understood as a previously tested and 'exemplified' solution to the problem of how to deal with security and branding in the context of increased density and diversity of the event city. The paper thus examines the mediating mechanisms through which the 'fan zones exemplar' was transferred from the 2006 FIFA World Cup in Germany to Euro 2008 in Austria/Switzerland. On this basis, the paper also brings to the fore a number of more fundamental insights into the public–private coalitions of authority and into the interactions of scale in contemporary security governance at mega events.

The paper by Scarlett Cornelissen examines the hosting of the 2010 World Cup Finals by South Africa. Drawing *inter alia* on theories of urban revanchism, Cornelissen explores the extent to which the host cities intensified social controls on urban spaces through new methods of policing and surveillance. In this way, rather than reinvent cities for the post-*apartheid* era, the tournament's main urban legacy appears to lie in sharpening socio-spatial divisions while providing market-friendly images to outside audiences.

The final paper in this section, by David Murakami Wood and Kiyoshi Abe, explores the historical relationships between sport and other mega events, and the making of particular urban aesthetics and forms of socio-spatial order, in Japanese society. Wood and Abe argue that sport mega events have been key contributors to the proliferation and normalisation of 'technocratic surveillance' in Japanese urban societies. At the same time, Japanese urban spaces are becoming increasingly abstracted, soulless, homogenised and corporatised, meaning that 'other' architectural forms and marginal social groups (such as the

homeless) are increasingly being eradicated or disappeared.

## **Part 2: Stadium Security, Sport Transformation and the City**

Part 2 examines the complex interplay between security techniques and strategies from the stadium to the event city, along with their various impacts on the development of sports. To begin here, control strategies within stadia have distinctive effects on spectator experiences, enjoyment of the spectacle and external social relations. In some sports, notably football, the physical separation or ‘segregation’ of opposing fans inside and outside stadia has served unintentionally to promote distinctive intragroup and intergroup social dynamics, by intensifying, for example, the forms of solidarity within supporter groups, the social expressions of rivalry and hostility between rival groups, and the potential for negative or confrontational exchanges between spectators and police officers (Giulianotti and Armstrong, 2002; Stott and Reicher, 1998). The mixture of security and commercial concerns can also serve to undermine enjoyment at sports events—for example, some sports fans complain that crowd atmosphere can be dampened when informal standing areas inside stadia are replaced by individuating and more expensive all-seated zones. In the post-9/11 context, the effect of intensified security upon the enjoyment of sports events by spectators has been difficult to gauge (see Taylor and Toohey, 2006).

In the past two decades, the commercial expansion (and, indeed, neo-liberalisation) of elite-level sports has been closely tied to the demonstration of effective and efficient securitisation in and around stadia. Pacified sports venues provide a more stable social environment for commercial activities and are intended to appeal to the more ‘civilised’

habitus of wealthier prospective spectators (Murphy *et al.*, 1990).

In this context, we need also to consider the many ways in which the urban geographies of social control that are centred on sport mega events have become increasingly stretched. As sports mega events have expanded in scale since the 1970s, so security focuses have extended more and more to the hundreds of thousands of visiting fans, as they travel to and from host nations, and spend days or weeks in the main cities. The virtual sport mega event has mushroomed since the early 1990s—for example, as giant television screens in major urban centres enable hundreds of thousands of ticketless fans to watch the major events ‘live’ (Bale, 1998; Klauser, 2008a; Hagemann, 2010). These ‘fan zones’ germinate new kinds of security concerns and, if poorly managed, can contribute to major breakdowns in public order, as witnessed in 2008, when tens of thousands of fans of the Scottish side, Rangers, rioted in Manchester after the UEFA Cup Final (Millward, 2009). Further security concerns may centre on the possible outbreak of terrorism, violence or disorder in locations that are far from the mega event’s host city.<sup>1</sup> Finally here, we would argue that, as their spatial effects and impacts have become stretched, so too we may rethink sport mega events in regard to their temporal dimensions. In other words, we may extend our definition of mega events to encompass tournaments that occur beyond specified time-periods (such as a fortnight or month). Thus, tournaments like the NFL in American football, English Premier League (EPL) in football, or NRL in Australian rugby league, which take place over several months, may be viewed as extended mega events that generate recurring security issues for cities that host competing clubs or ‘franchises’.

The section features three papers that are drawn from Europe, North America and

Australasia. Tracy Taylor and Kristine Toohey examine how event organisers in Australia have extended their security focus at sport stadia to the surrounding streets and precincts. The authors argue that many security measures have come at the expense of spectator enjoyment, through the banning of informal and pleasurable practices typically associated with sports fans, such as banging drums or waving flags. These constraining and alienating forms of security practice are remarkably incongruous within the context of an increasingly multicultural, socially diverse and leisure-orientated society.

The paper by Kim Schimmel explores the post-9/11 security context for sports in North America through a case study analysis of the annual Super Bowl in American football, which is staged by the National Football League (NFL). Schimmel examines how cities bidding to host this mega event must demonstrate to the NFL their anti-terrorist resilience across many urban settings. At the same time, the hegemonic forces in US society promote discourses that try to reconcile two conflicting aspects of sport mega events: on the one hand, the requirement to establish extensive, expensive and socially invasive anti-terrorist measures in urban settings; on the other hand, the retention of older, pro-growth arguments on the economic, political and social benefits of hosting such events.

The paper by Richard Giulianotti uses the case of football's English Premier League (EPL) to examine how intensified security measures in sports are deeply connected with the commodification of leisure spheres and the expansion of wider social control agendas. Drawing particularly on theories of urban revanchism and governmentality, Giulianotti argues that the informal and 'carnavalesque' sociability of supporters has been systematically marginalised by the promotion of more sanitised and commercially orientated forms of fan

activity within the football 'funhouse'. He explores how, despite constraining market and security environments, some instances of resistance and opposition to these processes have occurred among particular spectator groups.

### **Part 3: Security Technologies and Event Cities**

Part 3 explores the interrelations of sport-focused security technologies and the event cities that are hosting these mega events. Sport mega events often provide a crucial setting, or laboratory, for the testing of new security technologies and strategies that are diffused among wider populations. One strong illustration comes from the UK, where CCTV was effectively piloted in sport stadia in the late 1980s before being widely installed across public settings throughout the 1990s (Giulianotti and Armstrong, 1998, 2002).

It is evident too that, as sport mega events have grown in size and budget, so security expertise and technologies for these occasions have become both increasingly specialised and evermore marketable. Thus, the transfer of knowledge, security personnel and technological hardware now occurs on a routine basis between the host cities of sport mega events. This trend is channelled through specific policy handbooks and guidelines (such as the *2004 EU handbook on securing against terrorist acts at major sporting events*), standardised norms and procedures from the bidding process to the staging of the event, progress monitoring by the organising bodies, but also a range of more informal mechanisms which facilitate 'institutional learning' and 'fast policy transfer' (Peck and Theodore, 2001) from event to event (technology fairs, expert conferences, exercises, etc.). Besides such mechanisms, an important part is played simply by the global circulation of public and private stakeholders in security matters, travelling

from place to place and from event to event. As Siemens announces on its website

Siemens delivers complete infrastructure solutions for major sport events all over the world. Examples are the Olympic Games 2004 in Athens, the Asian Games 2006, the European Soccer Cup 2004 in Portugal or the Soccer World Cup 2006 in Germany, where Siemens equipped all twelve stadia with latest technology. In Portugal various Siemens Groups bundled application knowledge and synergies in the field of sport infrastructures and contributed most advanced technologies to nine of the ten stadia (Siemens, 2007).

Moreover, the various forms of policy transfer in security matters extend beyond the sporting sphere, to mega events in other domains, such as Expos, rock concerts and major political gatherings (Warren, 2004). For example, since NATO began to give air surveillance support in 2001, as part of the Alliance's contribution to the defence against global terrorism, Awac planes have been deployed for the Summer Olympic Games in Athens 2004, the 2005 Winter Games in Turin, the Pope's visit to Poland in 2006, the Spanish royal wedding in Madrid, the 2005 G8 Economic Summit in the UK, the 2007 European Defence Ministerial meeting, etc. (NATO, 2006).

It is also important to consider the interaction between the specific security strategies and technologies at sports events and the wider society. On one side, sport mega events leave distinctive security legacies for host cities and nations, notably in regard to the implementation of more advanced surveillance and data-gathering technologies, the testing of strategies for the urban 'clearing' of marginal populations and the introduction of social order legislation that may constrain civil liberties such as the right to free association and public gathering. On the other hand, we may consider how security planning for

sport mega events is influenced by emergent and contemporary strategies and technologies in the management and control of urban spaces. For example, Graham (2010) has examined in detail the rise of 'military urbanism', wherein the logics and techniques of military planners come to influence or shape urban architectures and public geographies. Inevitably, the design of sport stadia and the management of their crowds will show at least some traces of these processes.

In this section, we feature three papers that draw on research related to three Olympic Games—Athens 2004, Beijing 2008 and London 2012—as well as focusing on the FIFA World Cup 2006 in Germany. The paper by Jon Coaffee, Pete Fussey and Cerwyn Moore draws on research around London 2012, as well as work at other sport events, to explore the impact of security strategies (particularly anti-terrorist measures) upon urban settings. The authors compare and contrast the London 2012 security model with standard security strategies at other Olympic events, while also examining the way in which these event-focused anti-terrorist measures overlie existing and broader initiatives to secure 'crowded places'.

The paper by Volker Eick focuses on the 2006 FIFA World Cup in Germany. Starting from a critical assessment of FIFA's neo-liberalist event agenda, it studies how commercial considerations have become increasingly intertwined with (FIFA-imposed) security measures and strategies at the event. To address this issue, emphasis is placed on two examples: the RFID-based access control system for the World Cup stadia and the deployment of video surveillance systems in and around the stadia and at other official sites. On this basis, the paper also studies and questions the (uneven) security legacies of the event.

The final paper in this Special Issue, by Minas Samatas, advances a highly critical, comparative analysis of the 'security and surveillance industrial complexes'

enveloping the Summer Olympics in Athens (2004) and Beijing (2008). Highlighting the negative effects on civil liberties, Samatas argues that panoptic 'Olympic authoritarianism' (OA) can have long-lasting consequences for populations living under both democratic and authoritarian regimes, while contributing to the crystallisation of a 'global authoritarian surveillance society'.

## Note

1. For example, in June/July 2010, 74 people were killed in Uganda in a terrorist attack on World Cup television viewers, while in Somalia, Islamic militias banned the viewing of televised football, leading to at least two people being killed and scores being arrested (*Guardian*, 12 July 2010; *Telegraph*, 14 June 2010).

## Funding Statement

This research received no specific grant from any funding agency in the public, commercial or not-for-profit sectors.

## Acknowledgements

This Special Issue emerges from the Guest Editors' collaborative work within the Institute of Hazard and Risk Research at Durham University (2007–10). Many papers included here were first presented at an international conference organised by Klauser at Durham in April 2008. The Guest Editors would like to thank Stuart Lane, Gerald Chan and Steve Graham for the support provided at different stages of this endeavour.

## References

- Alegi, P. (2008) 'A nation to be reckoned with': The politics of World Cup Stadium construction in Cape Town and Durban, South Africa, *African Studies*, 67(3), pp. 397–422.
- Amoore, L. and Goede, M. de (2005) Governance, risk and dataveillance in the war on terror, *Crime, Law & Social Change*, 43, pp. 149–173.
- Armstrong, G. (1998) *Football Hooligans: Knowing the Score*. Oxford: Berg.
- Baasch, S. (2011) Event-driven security policies and spatial control: the 2006 FIFA World Cup, in: C. J. Bennett and K. D. Haggerty (Eds) *Security Games: Surveillance and Control at Mega-events*, pp. 103–119. London: Routledge.
- Bale, J. (1998) Virtual fandom: futurescapes of football, in: A. Brown (Ed.) *Fanatics!*, pp. 265–278. London: Routledge.
- Bennett, C. J. and Haggerty, K. D. (Eds) (2011) *Security Games: Surveillance and Control at Mega-events*. London: Routledge.
- Boyle, P. (2011) Knowledge networks: mega-events and security expertise, in: C. J. Bennett and K. D. Haggerty (Eds) *Security Games: Surveillance and Control at Mega-events*, pp. 169–184. London: Routledge.
- Boyle, P. and Haggerty, K. D. (2009) Spectacular security: mega-events and the security complex, *Political Sociology*, 3(3), pp. 257–274.
- Burbank, M. J., Andranovich, G. and Heying, C. H. (2002) Mega-events, urban development, and public policy, *Review of Policy Research*, 19(3), pp. 179–202.
- Chang, P. C. and Singh, K. K. (1990) Risk management for mega-events: the 1988 Olympic Winter Games, *Tourism Management*, 11(1), pp. 45–52.
- Close, P., Askew, D. and Xin, X. (2006) *The Beijing Olympiad: The Political Economy of a Sporting Mega-event*. London: Routledge.
- Coates, D. and Humphreys, B. R. (2000) The stadium gambit and local economic development, *Regulation*, 23(2), pp. 15–20.
- Coleman, R. (2005) Surveillance in the city: primary definition and urban spatial order, *Crime, Media and Culture*, 1(2), pp. 131–148.
- DCMS (Department for Culture, Media and Sport) (2008) *Before, during and after: making the most of the London 2012 Games*. DCMS, London.
- Dillon, M. and Reid, J. (2001) Global governance, liberal peace and complex emergency, *Alter-natives*, 25(1), pp. 117–143.
- Eick, V. (2011) 'Secure our profits!' the FIFA™ in Germany 2006, in: C. J. Bennett and K. D. Haggerty (Eds) *Security Games: Surveillance and Control at Mega-events*, pp. 87–102. London: Routledge.

- Euchner, C. C. (1999) Tourism and sports: the serious competition for play, in: D. R. Judd and S. S. Fainstein (Eds) *The Tourist City*, pp. 215–232. London: Yale University Press.
- Floridis, G. (2004) Security for the 2004 Athens Olympic Games, *Mediterranean Quarterly*, 15(2), pp. 1–5.
- Fonio, C. and Pisapia, G. (2011) Gran Torino: social and security implications of the XX Winter Olympic Games, in: C. J. Bennett and K. D. Haggerty (Eds) *Security Games: Surveillance and Control at Mega-events*, pp. 137–149. London: Routledge.
- Fussey, P. and Coaffee, J. (2011) Olympic rings of steel: constructing security for 2012 and beyond, in: C. J. Bennett and K. D. Haggerty (Eds) *Security Games: Surveillance and Control at Mega-events*, pp. 36–54. London: Routledge.
- Fussey, P., Coaffee, J., Armstrong, G. and Hobbs, D. (2011) *Securing and Sustaining the Olympic City: Reconfiguring London for 2012 and beyond*. Aldershot: Ashgate.
- Giulianotti, R. and Armstrong, G. (1998) From another angle: police surveillance and football supporters, in: C. Norris, G. Armstrong and J. Moran (Eds) *Surveillance, CCTV and Social Control*, pp. 113–135. Aldershot: Gower/Ashgate.
- Giulianotti, R. and Armstrong, G. (2002) Avenues of contestation: football hooligans running and ruling urban spaces, *Social Anthropology*, 10(2), pp. 211–238.
- Giulianotti, R. and Klausner, F. R. (2010) Security governance and sport mega-events: towards an interdisciplinary research agenda, *Journal of Sport and Social Issues*, 34(1), pp. 49–61.
- Graham, S. (2010) *Cities under Siege: New Military Urbanism*. London: Verso.
- Hagemann, A. (2010) From the stadium to the fan zone: host cities in a state of emergency, *Soccer & Society*, 11(6), pp. 723–736.
- Hall, C. M. (2006) Urban entrepreneurship, corporate interests and sports mega-events: the thin policies of competitiveness within the hard outcomes of neoliberalism, *Sociological Review*, 54(2), pp. 59–70.
- Hargreaves, J. (2000) *Freedom for Catalonia? Catalan Nationalism, Spanish Identity and the Barcelona Olympic Games*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Harvey, D. (1989) From managerialism to entrepreneurialism: the transformation in urban governance in late capitalism, *Geografiska Annaler*, 71B, pp. 3–17.
- Kearns, G. and Philo, C. (Eds) (1993) *Selling Places: The City as Cultural Capital, Past and Present*. Oxford: Pergamon Press.
- Klausner, F. (2008a) FIFA land 2006TM: alliances between security politics and business interests for Germany's city network, in: *Architectures of Fear*, pp. 173–188. Centre of Contemporary Culture of Barcelona, Barcelona.
- Klausner, F. (2008b) Spatial articulations of surveillance at the FIFA World Cup 2006TM in Germany, in: K. Franko Aas, H. Oppen Gundhus and H. Mork Lomell (Eds) *Technologies of Insecurity*, pp. 61–80. London: Routledge.
- Klausner, F. (2010) Splintering spheres of security: Peter Sloterdijk and the contemporary fortress city, *Environment and Planning D*, 28(2), pp. 326–340.
- Klausner, F. (2011) Interpretative flexibility of the event-city: security, branding and urban entrepreneurialism at the European Football Championships 2008, *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*. doi: 10.1111/j.1468-2427.2011.01064.x.
- Klingmann, A. (2007) *Brandscapes: Architecture in the Experience Economy*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Lee, C.-K. and Taylor, T. (2005) Critical reflections on the economic impact assessment of a mega-event: the case of 2002 FIFA World Cup, *Tourism Management*, 26(4), pp. 595–603.
- Lenskyj, H. (2000) *Inside the Olympic Industry*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Marivoet, S. (2006) UEFA Euro 2004™ Portugal: the social construction of a sports mega-event and spectacle, *Sociological Review*, 54(2), pp. 127–143.
- Matheson, V. A. and Baade, R. A. (2004) Mega-sporting events in developing nations: playing the way to prosperity?, *South African Journal of Economics*, 72(5), pp. 1084–1095.
- McRoskey, S. (2010) Security and the Olympic Games: making Rio an example, *Yale Journal of International Affairs*, 5(2) (<http://yalejournal.org/2010/07/security-and-the-olympic-games-making-rio-an-example/>; accessed November 2010).
- Miller, H. H. (2000) Mega-events, urban boosterism and growth strategies: an analysis of the objectives and legitimations of the Cape

- Town 2004 Olympic bid, *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 24(2), pp. 439–458.
- Millward, P. (2009) Glasgow Rangers supporters in the city of Manchester: the degeneration of a ‘fan party’ into a ‘hooligan riot’, *International Review for the Sociology of Sport*, 44(4), pp. 381–399.
- Morgan, G. (2003) Aboriginal protest and the Sydney Olympic Games, *Olympika*, 12, pp. 23–38.
- Murphy, P., Williams, J. and Dunning, E. (1990) *Football on Trial*. London: Routledge.
- NATO (2006) NATO support for FIFA World Cup in Germany, *Shape News*, 6 June (<http://www.nato.int/shape/news/2006/06/060606a.htm>; accessed June 2011).
- Noll, R. G. and Zimbalist, A. S. (1997) *Sports, Jobs and Taxes: Economic Impact of Sports Teams and Facilities*. Washington, DC: Brookings Institution Press.
- O’Neill, M. (2005) *Policing Football: Social Interaction and Negotiated Disorder*. Basingstoke: Palgrave.
- Peck, J. and Theodore, N. (2001) Exporting workfare/importing welfare-to-work: exploring the politics of Third Way policy transfer, *Political Geography*, 20(4), pp. 427–460.
- Power, M. (2007) *Organized Uncertainty: Organizing a World of Risk Management*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Roche, M. (2000) *Mega-events and Modernity: Olympics and Expos in the Growth of Global Culture*. London: Routledge.
- Samatas, M. (2007) Security and surveillance in the Athens 2004 Olympics: some lessons from a troubled story, *International Criminal Justice Review*, 17(3), pp. 220–238.
- Shaikin, B. (1988) *Sport and Politics: The Olympics and the Los Angeles Games*. New York: Praeger.
- Siegfried, J. and Zimbalist, A. (2006) The economic impact of sports facilities, teams and mega-events, *Australian Economic Review*, 39(4), pp. 420–427.
- Siemens (2007) Integrated solutions at Alvalade stadium, Lisbon, Press release, 16 October ([http://www.buildingtechnologies.siemens.com/BT/GLOBAL/EN/PRESS/PRESS\\_RELEASE/SUBCHANNEL\\_PRESS\\_RELEASE\\_2007/Pages/integrated\\_solutions\\_at\\_alvalade\\_stadium.aspx](http://www.buildingtechnologies.siemens.com/BT/GLOBAL/EN/PRESS/PRESS_RELEASE/SUBCHANNEL_PRESS_RELEASE_2007/Pages/integrated_solutions_at_alvalade_stadium.aspx); accessed March 2010).
- Sklair, L. (2000) *The Transnational Capitalist Class*. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Slater, T. (2006) The eviction of critical perspectives from gentrification research, *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 30(4), pp. 737–757.
- Smith, N. (1996) *The New Urban Frontier: Gentrification and the Revanchist City*. London: Routledge.
- Spaaij, R. (2006) *Understanding Football Hooliganism*. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press.
- Spilling, O. R. (1996) Mega-event as strategy for regional development: the case of the 1994 Lillehammer Winter Olympics, *Entrepreneurship and Regional Development*, 8(4), pp. 321–343.
- Stott, C. J. and Reicher, S. D. (1998) How conflict escalates: the inter-group dynamics of collective football crowd ‘violence’, *Sociology*, 32, pp. 353–377.
- Taylor, T. and Toohey, K. (2006) Security, perceived safety, and event attendee enjoyment at the 2003 Rugby World Cup, *Tourism Review International*, 10(4), pp. 257–267.
- Tsoukala, A. (2009) *Football Hooliganism in Europe: Security and Civil Liberties in the Balance*. Basingstoke: Palgrave.
- UEFA (Union of European Football Associations) (2008) *Medienmitteilung Nr. 74*. ([http://de.uefa.com/MultimediaFiles/Download/MediaRelease/Competitions/MediaService/s/70/28/52/702852\\_DOWNLOAD.pdf](http://de.uefa.com/MultimediaFiles/Download/MediaRelease/Competitions/MediaService/s/70/28/52/702852_DOWNLOAD.pdf); accessed June 2011).
- Warren, R. (2004) City streets: the war zones of globalization: democracy and military operations on urban terrain in the early twenty-first century, in: S. Graham (Ed.) *Cities, War and Terrorism*, pp. 214–230. Blackwell: Oxford.
- Whitson, D. and Horne, J. (2006) Underestimated costs and overestimated benefits? Comparing the outcomes of sports mega-events in Canada and Japan, *Sociological Review*, 54(2), pp. 73–89.
- Yu, Y., Klausner, F. and Chan, G. (2009) Governing security at the 2008 Beijing Olympics, *International Journal of the History of Sport*, 26(3), pp. 390–405.