

# **The Future of Events and Festivals**

**Edited by Ian Yeoman, Martin Robertson, Una McMahon-Beattie, Elisa Backer and Karen A. Smith**

Copyrighted material - provided by Taylor & Francis  
Vida Bajc. Methodist Univeristy. 30/09/2014

First published 2015  
by Routledge  
2 Park Square, Milton Park, Abingdon, Oxon OX14 4RN

and by Routledge  
711 Third Avenue, New York, NY 10017

*Routledge is an imprint of the Taylor & Francis Group, an informa  
business*

© 2015 Editorial matter and selection: Ian Yeoman, Martin Robertson, Una  
McMahon-Beattie, Elisa Backer and Karen A. Smith; individual chapters:  
the contributors.

The right of Ian Yeoman, Martin Robertson, Una McMahon-Beattie, Elisa  
Backer and Karen A. Smith to be identified as the authors of the editorial  
material, and of the contributors for their individual chapters, has been  
asserted in accordance with sections 77 and 78 of the Copyright, Designs  
and Patents Act 1988.

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reprinted or reproduced or  
utilised in any form or by any electronic, mechanical, or other means, now  
known or hereafter invented, including photocopying and recording, or in  
any information storage or retrieval system, without permission in writing  
from the publishers.

*Trademark notice:* Product or corporate names may be trademarks or  
registered trademarks, and are used only for identification and explanation  
without intent to infringe.

*British Library Cataloguing-in-Publication Data*

A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

*Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data*

The future of events & festivals / edited by Ian Yeoman, Martin Robertson,  
Una McMahon-Beattie, Elisa Backer and Karen A. Smith.

pages cm. — (Routledge advances in event research series)

1. Special events—Planning. 2. Special events—Management.
  3. Festivals—Planning. 4. Festivals—Management. I. Yeoman, Ian.
- GT3405.F88 2014  
394.2—dc23  
2014007930

ISBN: 978-0-415-82462-0 (hbk)

ISBN: 978-0-203-37039-1 (ebk)

Typeset in Times  
by Apex CoVantage, LLC

# 14 The future of surveillance and security in global events

*Vida Bajc*

## Future points

- Security and surveillance have taken center stage in global events as a synergetic strategy to minimize uncertainty through control of collective behavior.
- This synergy subjects every aspect of global events to the specifications of the surveillance and security apparatus.
- The apparatus imposes its own vision of secure social order on global events through the process called *security meta-ritual*, a transformation of social and physical spaces into a sterile zone of safety within which every person's movement and communication are monitored and managed.
- *Security meta-ritual* will likely shape the future of global events and their aftermath by fostering legitimacy in the apparatus and encouraging sacrifice of democratic principles in exchange of security.

## Introduction

Surveillance and security in global events comprise a synergetic strategy for imposing a vision of secure social order on collective public activity. In this strategy, surveillance is the means through which the vision of order is imposed, while security provides this ambition with a sense of urgency. The surveillance and security apparatus imagines the order it imposes through obtaining information about past human behaviour using data-mining techniques and then processing this information using computer modelling, statistical analysis, and computational mathematics. The goal is to minimize uncertainty by controlling social behavior that is yet to transpire. In this process, security becomes the dominant ordering principle, a *meta-frame* according to which every aspect of the event is planned and performed. *Security meta-framing* is applied to a wide variety of social situations. In the context of global events, the design and the performance of secure order have a specific form called *security meta-ritual*. The *security meta-ritual* will likely shape the future of global events through the following factors: the dynamics through which security comes to be elevated to the top of collective priorities in anticipation of the event; the role of the media in this process; the reference to collective and institutional memory; the urge to mobilize all possible resources;

the expectation that all event participants must cooperate; the creation of a sterile zone of safety; and the socialization into this vision of secure social order. Resistance and public protests are likely to be the single most important factors in countering the effects of *security meta-ritual*.

### **Surveillance, security, and global events: a conceptual clarification**

The increasing association of security and surveillance with global events has come to be known as ‘major event security.’ While popularized in the mass media and the professional jargon of many practitioners and more often than not also uncritically adopted by scholars, the expression obscures more than it reveals. To think about how metal detectors, personnel in uniforms featuring the sign ‘Security’, surveillance cameras, unmanned aerial vehicles equipped with high-resolution cameras, special forces, undercover agents, background checks, identity cards, surveillance data bases, anti-aircraft missiles on residential rooftops, hidden sharpshooters, a chain of fences, and metal barriers may shape the future of global events, it is necessary to first disentangle three closely related but distinct phenomena: global events, surveillance, and security.

#### ***Global events as capacity to perform a planned collective activity under controlled conditions on a global scale***

Global events can be thought of as large-scale, mass-mediated collective happenings with limited duration and potentially significant transformative capacities that reach well beyond their physical location (see Bajc 2012). Such events may be planned or unexpected. Planned global events are spectacular demonstrations of the power to meticulously design and then perform in a controlled way the planned order of a collective human activity on a huge scale during a specified period of time in a designated place. In contrast, unexpected events tend to have a shocking effect by exposing vulnerability and unpredictability and making us aware of the limits of human capacity to control social life. The security imperative and technologies and practices of surveillance have become an intimate part of both types of global events. In this chapter, the focus is on planned global events.

In anthropological terms, planned events of this kind are rituals, versions of which are found in all cultures and historical periods. For scholars of ritual, such collective happenings are central for understanding of collective social life, particularly how group members relate to each other and to members of other groups. This is so for a number of reasons (see Handelman 1990), two of which are particularly relevant for the study of surveillance and security. Rituals foster group sentiments and in this way separate those who belong to the group from all others. This sense of belonging on the part of ritual participants is shared through meanings and communicated through symbols and shared experiences. Rituals also facilitate social change and transformation and communicate ideas about social

order and rules of social behavior. In this way, rituals are important means through which members of a group are socialized into a particular socio-cultural order.

Given the importance of rituals for collective social life, it is not surprising that in late-nineteenth-century Europe there were attempts to simply invent rituals that would have the capacity to unite large populations (Hobsbawm and Ranger 1983). Sports competitions, festivals, parades, expositions, and other such highly visible public rituals contributed to the articulation of the process of national identity formation and recognition by other emerging nation-states. Following Maurice Roche (2000), then as today, such events are used as opportunities to articulate ideologies and models of governance. Neo-liberal economic ideas are particularly salient, as cities and their state governments seek to capture the world's attention in a highly competitive global market for consumer attention, political power, and corporate investment. So, too are models of global order, as local power elites project and promote their status in the global network of governing power structures by demonstrating the ability to produce a highly controlled event of enormous complexity. With the emphasis on control, global events have become exemplifications of a vision of secure social order, confidence in the ability to design such social order, and the power to control its process at such a massive scale (Bajc 2012).

### ***Surveillance as bureaucratic means of imposing secure order on a complex collective public activity***

In most basic terms, surveillance is a bureaucratic means of population planning and control on a massive scale by using information collected about human behavior in the past to project, anticipate, and preempt human activity in the future (see Bajc 2007a, 2010). In the context of global events, surveillance is the ability of credentialed professionals to identify and classify individuals and groups for the purposes of monitoring, tracking, blocking, and otherwise controlling their movement into, out of, and within a designated geographical area for the duration of the event (Bajc 2007b, 2011b, 2014). This ability to control by planning, anticipating, projecting, and preempting depends on systematic and ongoing accumulation of information about individual and group behavior and then processing this information using computer modeling, computational mathematics, and statistical analysis. The goal is to develop technologies and devise procedures, policies, and rules that help reinforce the planned order of the event and preempt human activity that does not correspond to these plans.

The historical roots of surveillance are in the development of the modern state, particularly its exclusive claims to a territory with clearly delineated boundaries and sovereign authority to govern the population on that territory. This required a capacity to manage the population by separating people who belonged to the state from others through a passport regime (Torpey 2000) and subjecting aspects of lives of individuals within the territory to state regulation (Foucault 2008). For these purposes there developed ways of methodical and systematic accumulation of information about each person and modes of statistical analysis to process this

information (Desrosières 1998). Through this way of governing developed the modern bureaucracy, a cadre of professionals the work of which depends on the mastery of gathering and processing of information. Surveillance as a means of controlling participation at global events is an extension of these processes of population management. As Gilles Deleuze (1992) pointed out, it is also a manifestation of the shift toward control on a global scale for political and economic purposes.

Central to the ability to collect and process information were two developments: *individuation* of each person as identifiably unique and *exclusionary classification* to sort out the information collected (see Bajc 2007a; 2010). *Individuation* refers to assigning to each person a unique set of identifiers, which make it possible to differentiate between individuals. Early on it was family and given name, date and place of birth, and some kind of a number. Technological and scientific innovations yield ever more perfected identification signs from mug shots to fingerprinting, retina scan, and, most recently, a DNA sequence. Only after a person has been so identified does it become possible for information about this individual to be systematically collected, mobility monitored in space and through time, and access denied.

*Exclusionary classification* is the sorting of this information into clear-cut, exclusive categories. This process works in two directions: from individual behavior to a category and from a category to an individual behavior. Every time a person scans her identification card, swipes her credit card, completes a business transaction, dials a number on her cell phone, sends an e-mail from her own account, accesses an Internet website from her own computer, or sends or receives a Tweet through her own account, that information is fed into centralized databases where it can be accessed on demand. So-called data analysts can classify this information about past behavior into various categories such as safe, dangerous, public protester, terrorist, or hooligan on the basis of which a given individual can be denied access to a global event at some future date. This is how individuals find themselves on a no-fly list, particular soccer fans are barred from attending a game, protesters against G8 meetings are denied entry into the country where the meeting is held. *Exclusionary classification* also allows the operatives to profile, which means to invent categories based on imaginary characteristics of a social group – for example mob, hooligan, or terrorist. Behavior of individuals in sports stadia or on streets and plazas surrounding the event, which resembles imagined characteristics of that category, is flagged out and individuals so identified removed from this space.

With technological developments in data storage capabilities, access to databases of various communications service providers, and sharing of data between surveillance and security apparatuses worldwide, as well as advancements in computational and complex systems analysis, data analysts are able to mine various centralized databases in search for patterns that are used to reconstruct the past and project into the future. Retrospectively, patterns of behavior of a particular individual or social group are reconstructed after the fact. Prospectively, future human behavior is envisioned by thinking out acts of human beings before the fact. Such

computer programs help simulate every conceivable scenario, design drills and exercises of disruption management and preemption, and calculate potential risks (Amoore 2011). The goal of these calculated imaginaries is to mitigate or preempt envisioned human activity that was not planned by the event organizers.

### ***Security as the meta-frame***

This ambition to control through the means of surveillance is given a sense of urgency thorough the notion of 'security'. Security is a socio-cultural construct that has the capacity to become the dominant ordering principle of social organization in such a way that it is able to push in the direction of collective understanding that all means necessary should be employed to ensure that global event will take place as planned and with no unintended disruption. In this process, security battles against other values associated with global events such as equal access, open participation, festivity, spontaneity, interpersonal bonding with other participants, the right to protest, or privacy. The author calls this struggle for security to dominate the organization of social life *security meta-framing* (Bajc 2011a). In a meta-framing dynamic, the prefix 'meta' signifies that there is a necessary hierarchy. In this hierarchy, security dominates as a logic to reduce social complexity in order to minimize uncertainty. This logic is based on *exclusionary classification* and exclusionary thinking in that it generates categories of human activity that are either acceptable or not acceptable. Through *security meta-framing*, the public is presented with mutually exclusive options of either security or danger, where security is interpreted as an obvious choice. But what is 'security'?

While surveillance can be articulated as technologically and expertly informed bureaucratic practice of ordering and controlling present and future social life, security has no such tangible manifestation. This is so because security is a perception of reality that is internalized as an emotion or a worldview and politically articulated as an ideology or an agenda (Bajc 2013). Security is a domain of experience in which there are embedded specific cultural assumptions about safety and danger and cultural sentiments about what is and is not orderly. As a meta-framing process, security becomes a logic according to which *exclusionary classifications*, such as hooligan, terrorist, alien, state enemy, or VIP, are invented as means to reduce social complexity in order to minimize uncertainty. In this way, whether internalized and politically articulated by individuals or institutions, lay people or national security advisers, security is a cultural construct that profoundly shapes the way people live their everyday lives (Bajc and de Lint 2011).

This capacity of security to become a meta-frame is related to a number of developments. On the part of the public there is a general expectation that something must be done to tame uncertainty and to ensure safety in participation at global events. This public sentiment about uncertainty, characteristic perhaps of late modernity (see Beck 1992), is merging with other historical shifts. On the part of the state, institutions responsible for matters of state sovereignty, such as

the military and intelligence services, work under the assumption that threats to security of the state are existential and therefore require the use of all possible means to preempt such threats from materializing (Buzan, Waever and de Wilde 1998). Internally, a different set of state institutions was put in place, such as the police, which was to be primarily concerned with involvement with local communities to ensure safety and retrospectively respond when the law is not followed (see Zedner 2009). Today there is a tendency to treat all sorts of social situations, including global events, as security problems rather than issues of safety and legality (Waever 1995). As well, there is a push to integrate institutions previously ascribed to different spheres of responsibility into one network of security authorities and experts (Bigo 2012). In this process of articulation of what is and is not a matter of security, economic interests also tend to play a prominent role (Neocleous 2006).

Crucial for the study of *security meta-framing* is an understanding of its capacity to dominate collective life in a huge variety of social settings, from military occupation, colonial ambitions, ethnic conflict, class disparities, or racial tension, to global events (see Bajc 2013). The challenge in the study of *security meta-framing* is to understand the dynamics of how security comes to dominate as a particular kind of logic to minimize uncertainty by controlling human behavior through surveillance, what kind of social order this generates in particular social settings, and what the consequences of this social order may be for the life of communities and individuals. In the case of global events, *security meta-framing* enables a specific kind of transformation that has a ritual form. This form is called *security meta-ritual* (Bajc 2007b, 2011b).

### ***Security meta-ritual and the future of global events***

*Security meta-ritual* is a process in which the surveillance and security apparatus performs its vision of secure social order in the context of global events. This is a process of change from routine everyday life, which the apparatus deems dangerous, into a different kind of social order, which the apparatus envisions as secure. This transformation involves changes of physical as well as social spaces. As others have observed, this change can be intensely visual to the point of resembling a spectacle (Boyle and Haggerty 2009). Looking at the nature of this transformation more closely, however, it becomes evident that these dynamics themselves have a ritual form. Approaching these dynamics from the standpoint of ritual theory has important empirical and theoretical implications for understanding the past, the present, and the future of surveillance and security in global events. What follows is an outline of the *security meta-ritual* model derived from empirical and theoretical research on global events so far (Bajc 2007b, 2011b, 2012b, 2014, forthcoming). *Security meta-ritual* is likely to shape the future of global events particularly in terms of changing the aesthetics of our living environment, the notions of privacy of event participants, the ways in which people relate to each other in public spaces, and not the least, the very nature of global events.



### ***Shift of attention***

When the public is made aware that preparations are underway to organize a global event in a given metropolitan area, there is a shift of attention from routine daily life toward the event. With this cognitive shift there emerges a dynamic of *security meta-ritual* as an attempt to set the parameters and the conditions for the organization and performance of the event. For institutions, this is a shift from routine responsibility toward how human and other resources are to be diverted toward preparations for the event. In some cases, particularly when the event is noncyclical, the period of time between the breaking of the news that an event is forthcoming and the dates of its actual performance can be extremely short. Such a shock notice leaves the public with limited means to question the imperative of security and its exclusionary logic. It may also shorten internal debates within various security-related agencies and institutions of political leadership. Cyclical events, in contrast, particularly those of huge complexity, tend to be scheduled years in advance, opening a prolonged international and local spotlight on the organizing elites and the host country through investigative journalism and public scrutiny (Bajc forthcoming). Given the symbolic power of events, this shift of attention will continue to bring to the fore struggles over issues related to marginality and disadvantage that would otherwise remain in the background and to create spaces for social protests against the organizing elites. These dynamics will vary according to different political, social, and cultural circumstances of the location of the event.

### ***The role of the media***

In this process, the media play a crucial role. Investigative reporting draws attention to public protests, grievances by minority groups, treatment of the poor and the homeless, and various forms of corruption. Closer to the time of the event, mass media become the means through which the apparatus communicates to the public the parameters of how the new social order will be implemented, including what is permitted and what is not allowed, changes in road traffic patterns, restrictions of airspace, information about operatives and agencies involved in pursuit of the planned order, and other detailed instructions and descriptions of the workings of the apparatus. Journalists also pay close attention to how the surveillance and security apparatus is implementing its vision of secure social order for the event by scrutinizing its failures and uncovering corruption. For those who will take part in the event via live broadcasts into their homes, sports bars, clubs, or individual mobile devices, these reports may be the only awareness of the workings of the *security meta-ritual*, while others attending in situ or living near the event's physical location are likely to have a very different experience of this process. Which details are conveyed through these broadcasts varies widely around the world (Moragas, Larson and Rivenburgh 1995), and viewings are often organized as occasions of their own (Dayan and Katz 1992). In addition to investigative reporting of failure of the apparatus,

social media will continue to offer new possibilities for transmission of images, texts, and other expressions of the experience of *security meta-ritual* to the publics worldwide. This is so despite the fact that social media are often prohibited inside the sterile zone of safety.

### ***Collective and institutional memory***

*Security meta-ritual* draws on collective and institutional memories related to failures of the apparatus to preempt a disruption. Collective memory here refers to a mode of experience through which people are able to share memories of events past by creating awareness in each person that there are others who identify themselves in relation to particular narratives about past events (see Bajc 2006). Referring to such collective memories has the goal of reassuring the workings of the apparatus and to strengthen the validity of *security meta-ritual*. Institutional memory refers to what has come to be called ‘best practices’ and ‘lessons learned’, the tendency on the part of the apparatus to accumulate knowledge about how its vision of secure social order was planned and carried out in the past and passing that knowledge to others. Disruption to the performance of the 1972 Munich Olympics is often said to have created a historical shift in *security meta-framing* of global events and seems to be one of the catalysts for the emergence of *security meta-ritual*. There are wide variations in what is remembered and by whom about specificities of interruptions of particular global events. The huge casualties that resulted from the apparatus attempting to crush student demonstrations in Mexico City days before the 1968 Olympics and the bomb that exploded during the Atlanta 1996 Games, with incomparably fewer casualties, are two examples of such differences in remembering.

### ***Mobilization of all resources***

Disruption to the planned event is considered a failure of the performance of the apparatus in that it undermines its claims to the ability to control the future. In the marketplace of security enterprise, such failure can also have real financial consequence. Thus there is a push for constant vigilance in identifying and envisioning threats to security, the urge that all preventive measures necessary must be taken to preempt such scenarios, the pressure that no resources be spared to this end, and the tendency to entrust these matters to private enterprise. To this end, there will continue to be a pressure to perfect surveillance techniques, implement the latest technologies available on the market, and mobilize all institutions. In some states, this process has been legally sanctioned through classifications such as ‘national special security event’, which help to streamline allocation of resources. Such classifications also create a legal space for anti-democratic legislation that is aimed at restricting or prohibiting unplanned collective public expressions. The host country itself can be put under pressure by global institutions, raising important questions about how host states

maintain their sovereignty in the face of such global power. These dynamics will be playing out differently in different states and host cities, as they will experience financial crises, their institutions forced to deal with budget cuts, and the population expected to cover the losses.

### ***Cooperation of all involved***

A smooth and efficient performance of the planned order on the part of the apparatus depends on the willingness of all involved to cooperate toward the common goal. On the part of the public, this means getting people to agree to adjust their behavior in accordance with the parameters of the *security meta-ritual*. Similarly, various institutions are made to work together, including the military, the police, undercover agents, special forces and national intelligence agencies from multiple states, and various security services corporations and enterprise. This subordination of public behavior as well as the workings of a wide variety of institutions toward the common goal is a multilayered process that varies widely depending on the host city and state as well as the type and the complexity of the planned event. Those who are able to obtain permission to attend any part of the event must comply with the specifications of the apparatus or else risk being excluded. Others who live in the area where the event is taking place may find these specifications disruptive to their daily routine life, prompting a variety of public responses. Institutions, in turn, each have their own organizational culture so that to be able to work together effectively there needs to develop some form of a shared way of doing things. There are wide variations in terms of which among these organizational cultures comes to dominate for the duration of the project, how others are made to adjust, and what kind of consequences there may be for dissent. In all of this, host countries will continue to aspire to prove themselves capable of such organizational cooperation at this scale in the eyes of the global elites. In this push for cooperation at the global scale another phenomenon is emerging that will likely continue to expand, namely, a set of global 'security experts'. These are surveillance and security operatives with access to information, policy makers, and political elites, which enable them to compile institutional memories to be able to emerge as a 'go to' service in the organization of the next event (see Richards, Fussey and Silke 2011).

### ***Purification of participants and physical and social spaces***

The purification process involves physical and social spaces as well as individuals and objects. This process has different stages. In a designated urban area, a physical space is carved out from the routine life and sectioned off for the process of transformation in preparation for the event. In this space, existing architecture and landscape are altered through construction of event infrastructure, aestheticization of residential and commercial neighborhoods, removal of structures that are at odds with the envisioned order, and implementation of

surveillance-friendly public spaces and landscaping. Purification of physical space is accompanied by purification of social life. This is a process of removal of disadvantaged individuals and dislocation of entire social groups, the activities of which do not conform to the order as envisioned by the apparatus. As the time of the event nears, this space is sectioned off by an impermeable boundary and within this enclosure no stone remains unturned to ensure a purified, sterile zone of safety. This enclosure has specifically designated entrances through which the chosen participants are made to enter and be positioned in a particular location to which they are assigned. To enter, each preselected individual undergoes a process of purification by being subjected to varying degrees of identity checks, metal detectors, body searches, inspection of personal belongings, and surveillance cameras. The zone is itself divided into a hierarchy of subspaces, each with its own designated entrance through which only those may pass to whom this subzone has been assigned. In this way, within this sterile zone of safety, participants are ordered hierarchically in terms of privilege of access. Ways in which participants and institutions will resist this purification will vary, as will their results and consequences.

### ***Socialization effects***

Consequences of the *security meta-ritual* vary according to the scope and complexity of the event. A number of trends can be observed (see also Barnard-Wills, Moore and McKim 2012). Surveillance-friendly architectural and landscape design and fortified infrastructure reflect a particular security aesthetics, which will continue to shape the way people inhabit urban environments. Intervention into the community life of populations deemed dangerous or otherwise not fitting the vision of security-sanctioned social order will continue to create new forms of social exclusion and redefine the way people relate to each other in public spaces. The surveillance systems and policing strategies left in place after the event will continue to shape people's conceptions of privacy and their notions of the self. *Security meta-ritual* promotes a vision of secure social order in which every individual is controlled in space and through time where spontaneity is discouraged and unstructured festiveness deemed dangerous. This order fosters legitimacy and trust in the surveillance and security apparatus, nurtures fear of strangers and open public spaces, and discourages cosmopolitanism.

### **Concluding remarks**

Today, planned global events have become above all spectacular demonstrations of the capacity to meticulously design and then perform under highly controlled conditions the planned order of a collective public activity at a global scale (Bajc 2012). This chapter advanced the following argument: given that uncertainty is seen by the organizers as a threat to such staging of global events, security and surveillance have taken center stage as a synergetic strategy to

control collective behavior to be able to minimize uncertainty. In controlling social behavior, the surveillance and security apparatus imposes its own vision of social order using security as the sentiment that has the effect of creating a sense of urgency and surveillance as the means through which security is to be achieved. The process through which the apparatus imposes this order on a global event is referred to as *security meta-ritual*. This is a process of transformation of social and physical spaces into a sterile zone of safety within which every aspect of a global event is subjected to the specifications of the surveillance and security apparatus.

This security-sanctioned order in planned global events observed to date suggests a particular future trajectory: People will likely continue to be divided into insiders and outsiders, those who will be allowed to participate at the event and all others who will be barred from attending. Inside the sterile zone of safety and around its perimeter, every person's movement and communication will continue to be managed and controlled with the hopes to be able to prevent unplanned activity from happening. Breaches of this social order tend to lead to policy recommendations that more should have been done to prevent such disruptions from occurring. Such policies support the urge to mobilize all conceivable resources to enforce this vision of secure social order and are likely continue to encourage allocation of ever larger amounts of public resources and collective good to implement ever more perfected surveillance technologies and techniques for controlling human behavior in public events. So, too, locally specific as well as globally initiated forms of resistance and protest against these practices will likely continue.

Given its ritual nature, the *security meta-ritual* will likely shape social life in at least two ways: first, by fostering legitimacy in the ways of the surveillance and security apparatus; and second, by socializing participants and observers alike not only in what it takes to have safety but also that democratic decision making, freedom of movement and assembly, and the right to privacy should be worth sacrificing in exchange for a secure social order. Despite the tendency to shroud surveillance procedures and security considerations into secrecy, resistance and public protest will likely be the single most important factors in countering the effects of *security meta-ritual*. In light of all this, event practitioners, scholars, participants, and observers alike will be faced with important ethical concerns about their own role in the implementation of this vision of secure social order.

## References

- Amoore, L. (2011) 'Data derivatives: on the emergence of a security risk calculus for our times', *Theory Culture and Society*, 28(6): 24–43.
- Bajc, V. (ed.) (forthcoming) *Surveilling and Securing the Olympics: from Tokyo 1964 to London 2012 and beyond*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

- Bajc, V. (2013) 'Sociological reflections on security through surveillance', *Sociological Forum*, 28(3): 615–23.
- Bajc, V. (2012) 'Events, global', in M. Juergensmeyer and H. Anheier (eds.) *Encyclopaedia of Global Studies*. London: Sage.
- Bajc, V. (2011a) 'Introduction: security meta-framing: a cultural logic of an ordering practice', in V. Bajc and W. de Lint (eds.) *Security and Everyday Life*. New York: Routledge, pp. 1–30.
- Bajc, V. (2011b) 'Collective activity in public spaces: the Pope John Paul II in the Holy City', in V. Bajc and W. de Lint (eds.) *Security and Everyday Life*. New York: Routledge, pp. 49–76.
- Bajc, V. (2010) 'On surveillance as solution to security issues', in G. Cassano and R. Dello Buono (eds.) *Crisis, Politics, and Critical Sociology: essays on resistance and social practices*. Leiden and Boston: Brill, pp. 183–96.
- Bajc, V. (2007a) 'Introduction: debating surveillance in the age of security', Special issue Watching Out: Surveillance, Mobility, and Security. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 50(12): 1567–91.
- Bajc, V. (2007b) 'Surveillance in public rituals: security meta-ritual and the 2005 U.S. Presidential Inauguration', Special issue Watching Out: Surveillance, Mobility, and Security. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 50(12): 1648–73.
- Bajc, V. (2006) 'Collective memory and tourism: globalizing transmission through localized experience', Special issue Collective Memory and Tourism. *Journeys: The International Journal of Travel and Travel Writing*, 7(1): 1–14.
- Bajc, V. and de Lint, W. (eds.) (2011) *Security and Everyday Life*. New York: Routledge.
- Barnard-Wills, D., Moore, C. and McKim, J. (eds.) (2012) 'Introduction: spaces of terror and risk', Special issue. *Space and Culture*, 15(2): 92–7.
- Beck, U. (1992) *Risk Society: towards a new modernity*. London: Sage.
- Bigo, D. (2012) 'International political sociology', in P.D. Williams (ed.) *Security Studies: an introduction*. 2nd ed. London: Routledge.
- Boyle, P. and Haggerty, K. (2009) 'Spectacular security: mega-events and the security complex', *International Political Sociology*, 3: 257–74.
- Buzan, B., Waeber, O. and de Wilde, J. (eds.) (1998) *Security: a new framework for analysis*. Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner.
- Dayan, D. and Katz, E. (1992) *Media Events: the live broadcasting of history*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Deleuze, G. (1992, Winter) 'Postscript on the societies of control', *October*, 59: 3–7.
- Desrosières, A. (1998) *The Politics of Large Numbers: a history of statistical reasoning*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Foucault, M. (2008[2004]) *The Birth of Biopolitics: lectures at the Collège de France, 1978–1979*. G. Burchell (trans.). New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Handelman, D. (1990) *Models and Mirrors: towards an anthropology of public events*. 2nd ed. New York: Berghahn Books.
- Hobsbawm, E. and Ranger, T. (eds.) (1983) *The Invention of Tradition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Moragas, M., Larson, J. and Rivenburgh, N. (1995) *Television and the Olympics*. London: John Libbey.
- Neocleous, M. (2006) 'From social to national security; on the fabrication of economic order', *Security Dialog*, 37(3): 363–84.
- Richards, A., Fussey, P., and Silke, A. (2011) *Terrorism and the Olympics: major event security and lessons for the future*. London: Routledge.

- Roche, M. (2000) *Mega-events and Modernity: Olympics and expos in the growth of global culture*. London: Routledge.
- Torpey, J. (2000) *The Invention of the Passport: surveillance, citizenship and the state*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Waever, O. (1995) 'Securitization and desecuritization', in R.D. Lipschutz (ed.) *On Security*. New York: Columbia University Press, pp. 46–86.
- Zedner, L. (2009) *Security*. New York: Routledge.

Copyrighted material - provided by Taylor & Francis  
Vida Bajc. Methodist Univeristy. 30/09/2014