Across fifteen case studies and four framing essays, Vida Bajc and contributors detail and analyze the socio-cultural conditions and historical-technological changes through which surveillance and security have come to constitute a critical—perhaps even the primary—concern in staging the spectacle of contemporary Olympic games. While not considering every Olympiad over the last half-century, the volume presents astonishing coverage of many of those Games through a wealth of international scholarship on the topic. As such, it is the most comprehensive scholarly analysis of Olympics-specific surveillance and security to date.

Surveilling and Securing the Olympics is framed by Bajc’s theorization of the Games as ‘complex event’ (30) whose intricacy, and therefore uncertainty, is mitigated through what she calls the ‘security meta-ritual of the Olympic Games’ (42). Bajc identifies seven stages of the security meta-ritual. Beginning with the awarding of an Olympiad to a host nation, and culminating with the Games themselves, these stages include a ‘shift of attention’ (44), the activation of ‘collective memory’ (49) and ‘institutional memory’ (52), the ‘mobilization of all resources’ (55), the ‘cooperation of all involved’ (60), and ‘purification’ (65), all of which results in the creation of ‘sterile zones of safety’ (67) within which the Games are expected to be staged in security. While the legacy of an Olympics is not formally included in the stages of the security meta-ritual, the residual effects of the ritualized transformation of the social order and legal system, technological advances and spatial reconfigurations within the host nation may carry long-lasting consequences.

The case studies are organized around three questions. First, how are security and threat conceptualized vis-à-vis the staging of the Olympics in each host nation/city? Second, how do techniques of surveillance and the development of surveillance/security apparatuses contribute to the elimination such threats, and the orderly staging of the Games? Third, what are the lasting aftereffects of such techniques and apparatuses on host societies following the Olympics? Informing each of these questions is the tension, most explicitly identified in the essays by Handelman (“Olympic Surveillance as a Prelude to Securitization”) and Bajc (“The Olympic Games as Complex Planned Event: Between Uncertainty and Order through Security Meta-ritual”), between the founding ideals of the modern Olympic movement on the one hand, and the techniques of bureaucratic control on the other. The former elevates goodwill, openness, democratic and egalitarian competition—all of which contribute the complexity—which is to say unpredictability, of staging the games. The latter trades in categorization, exclusion, and, increasingly, militarization (in both state-organized and corporate forms) to structure complexity in such a way as to control unpredictability. Furthermore, as each of the case studies demonstrates, the staging of the Olympic Games is both a reward to host nations within a larger set of geopolitical concerns, as well as an opportunity for the host to demonstrate to the world something significant about itself. In these terms, the orderly staging of Games, therefore is a high-stakes spectacle of national competence and future capacity. The awarding and staging of the Olympics may also be understood itself as a technique of discipline within the extant geopolitical hegemony.

The foregoing will likely not be news to scholars of surveillance or Olympic history. What is novel about Surveilling and Securing the Olympics, however, is the attempt to read these varied cases through the security meta-ritual lens and offer empirical evidence of the requisite social-spatial regime of control that must take place for the Games to be performed. Drawing upon the work of Mary Douglas (1966), Bajc argues the development and implementation of a specific ‘surveillance-security nexus’ (23) in preparation for the staging of the Olympics is a form of ritual purification. Through security meta-ritual, the incompatibility of the practice of everyday life and that of the mega-event is negotiated and articulated on social, spatial and technological grounds. In
actual practice, this means the relative chaos and uncertainty of the everyday is, at least partially, reorganized, that is, surveilled, categorized, vouchsafed (where appropriate/necessary), re-educated, and separated at a safe distance from the complex ordering of the Games themselves. To use Douglas’ (1966: 36) apt phrase, the everyday is ‘matter out of place’ in the staging of the Olympics. And yet, as these case studies indicate, the Games are always inextricably located within the (reorganized) social order whose uncertainties threaten its unhindered staging.

The case studies elaborate the stages of security meta-ritual in varying detail and explicitness. The shift of attention manifests almost from the moment of being awarded games, and generally expresses a host nation’s aspirations on the global stage. For example, in writing about the 1968 Mexico City Games, Witherspoon (“Repression of Protest and the Image of Progress”) demonstrates how the Mexican government’s desire to be seen as a modern leader amongst other Latin American nations conditioned its violent repression of student protests. In the case of the 1980 Moscow Games, Marmor-Drews (“‘To Guarantee Security and Protect Social Order’”) points out the importance to the Soviet government that it demonstrate itself equally as capable as western capitalist nations in the successful organization of the Games. Commercial concerns are also at play, as in the case of Athens in 2004, where Tsoukala (“Asymmetric Power Relations”) argues Greek officials viewed a successful hosting of the Games as an entry point into the global surveillance-security technology market. Shedding the weight of history may also be part of this shift, as in the case of the 1972 Munich Games, as detailed by Hansen (“‘The Most Beautiful Olympic Games That Were Ever Destroyed’”) which were meant to stand in open, welcoming contrast to the militarism and Nazism which characterized the 1936 Berlin Games. The shift of attention also entails the initial formulations of perceived threats to the Games, whether they are internal or external to the host nation. The activation of collective memory is articulated in myriad culturally-specific ways. Chong, de Kloet and Zeng (“People’s Olympics?”) argue that the Chinese government leveraged feelings of historical cultural humiliation and a legacy of Confucianism in the preparations for the 2008 Beijing Games, while memories of the 9/11 and 7/7 attacks informed the preparations for the 2002 Games in Salt Lake City (Varano, Burruss and Decker, “National Special Security Event”) and 2012 London Games (Bongiovi, “Public-Private Global Security Assemblages”) respectively. Indeed, in the case of London, the 7/7 attacks came the day following the award of the 2012 Games.

The activation of institutional memory occurs at both national and transnational levels. At the national level, established surveillance and security organizations including the police, military, intelligence agencies, and, increasingly, private security firms are called upon to contribute their expertise. In this sense, this stage also overlaps with the mobilization of all resources. At the transnational level, institutional knowledge transfer of best practices, and necessary improvements occurs between host nations, in part facilitated by the IOC. Hansen (“‘The Most Beautiful”) analyzes the failings of the 1972 Munich Games, which lead to the heavy, overt surveillance-security presence at the 1976 Montreal Games (Kidd, “The Army’s Presence Will Be Obvious”). In less dramatic examples, security technologies developed for Seoul in 1988 (Ok and Park, “Cross-National Intelligence Cooperation and Centralized Security Control System”) were adapted and deployed in the 1992 Barcelona Games (Essex, “Platform for Local Political Expression and Resolution”), in a pattern generally representative of knowledge transfer between hosts until the present.

The mobilization of resources covers a wide range of agencies and contractors. As both Tsoukala (“Asymmetric Power”) and Bongiovi (“Public-Private”) discuss, the provenance of these resources, particularly in the post-9/11 era has become increasingly multinational and privatized. But these resources also come in the form of the citizenry, whose cooperation, is crucial. Tagsold on Tokyo 1964 (“Modernity and the Carnivalesque”), Chong, de Kloet and Zeng on Beijing 2008 (“People’s Olympics?”) and Kennelly on Vancouver 2010 (“Promoting ‘Civility,’ Excluding the Poor”) all demonstrate how behavioral “education” initiatives operate as modalities of governmentality.
The final stages of security meta-ritual, purification and the creation of sterile zones, are directly linked to one another. Purification entails the evacuation of unwanted elements from what will become sterile zones, and as such, are the stages in which the surveillance-security nexus is most evident to the casual observer. The violence of purification ranges from the largely coercive, as in the cases of the Moscow (Marmor-Drews, “To Guarantee Security”) and Vancouver Games (Kennelly, “Promoting ‘Civility’”) to the murderous, as in the student massacre leading up to the 1968 Games in Mexico City (Witherspoon, “Repression of Protest”). The resultant creation of sterile zones depends heavily on spatial reorganization and the concentration of the surveillance-security apparatus, as Vanolo (“Spatialities of Control”) demonstrates with respect to the 2006 Turin Games. In other cases, such as the 1980 Moscow Games, authorities may attempt to claim and transform an entire city as a sterile zone.

Bajc asserts that the volume is a work of “historical and comparative team ethnography” (viii). However, it is not entirely clear how this group of ethnographers coordinated their respective case studies, particularly in comparison to the ethnographic team working at the Lillehammer Games in 1994, described by Rudie (“Rupturing Performer-Spectator Interaction”), from which Bajc draws methodological inspiration. While Bajc’s theorization of security meta-ritual provides a suggestive framework within which each of the case studies may be read, relatively few of the studies explicitly deploy or actively engage with the concept itself. Consequently, the reader should be prepared to do much of the analytical work of connecting case studies to one another, and weighing their trueness to Bajc’s claims about security meta-ritual.

Overall, *Surveilling and Securing the Olympics* is an outstanding collection on a subject that is both specific, and yet entails a wide range of socio-cultural, historical, and technological variation. The changes in the world since 1964 hardly need recounting here; suffice it to say the security concerns and surveillance techniques of the early 21st century would be unrecognizable—if not unintelligible—to the organizers of the 1968 Mexico City or 1972 Sapporo Games.

The 1972 Munich Games are widely, and correctly, understood as a critical point of inflection in the arc of Olympic organizing. And yet, globalization, the revolution in ICTs and the long shadow of neoliberal ideology have equally conditioned the development of the contemporary surveillance-security nexus. The critical question Bajc identifies for future research is not simply how the security-meta ritual plays out in different contexts, but rather, What are the lasting effects of the surveillance-security ritual on the social order of host nations?
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In *Transforming Capitalism Through Cooperative Practices*, Catherine Mulder employs what she calls New Marxian Class Analysis (NMCA) to six case studies that represent different aspects of