The Olympic torch working its way through Lancashire, followed closely by the Metropolitan Police, 1 June 2012. Photo by Lesley Millie
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Editorial

Andrew Millie, Professor of Criminology, Edge Hill University

**Marking and exam boards are done and the summer is upon us** (although I write this looking out of my office onto a wet and windy university!) The weather aside, summer 2012 has the potential to be a very busy time for British criminology. First we have the annual BSC Conference 4-6 July, held at University of Portsmouth. The conference offers the usual diversity of talks, including plenary presentations from Roger Hood, Katja Franko Aas, David Garland and Sharon Shalev. The conference opens with the presentation of the BSC Outstanding Achievement Award, this year going to Jock Young. There would be little argument about Jock’s contribution to criminology! Also at the conference is a drinks reception to mark the publication of the Oxford Handbook of Criminology, now in its fifth edition. It is a sign of the growth of the discipline that the revised handbook enters a very busy marketplace for textbooks; however a quick look at the contents tells me that this will remain on many student reading lists.

As well as the conference, there is much for criminologists to be interested in this summer with the various sporting events taking place. By the start of the conference we will know who has won the Euro 2012 football tournament held in Poland and Ukraine. The security arrangements for this tournament, various racial incidents and clashes between fans and police will provide much material for criminological enquiry. Perhaps of greater significance for British criminology is the London Olympic and Paralympic Games, starting on 27 July. With this in mind this newsletter includes four contributions on the topic of sport and criminology. Nic Groombridge considers why criminologists should be interested in sport, giving examples including match fixing, ‘drug cheats’ and brawling boxers. Groombridge suggests there is scope for a ‘sports criminology’. The second contribution is from Jon Coaffee on the securitisation associated with London 2012. Coaffee quotes the Metropolitan Police Authority (2007) who claim that, “The 2012 Olympic and Paralympic Games will require the largest security operation ever conducted in the United Kingdom”. With the appearance of, as Coaffee notes, “anti-aircraft missiles on the top of East London tower blocks”, this security is very real for some Londoners. In his contribution Allan Brimicombe considers the economic implications of such security. The games will cost over £9 billion, including £1 billion on security. Brimicombe makes the important point that, “Total safety is very expensive yet unachievable”. The legacy for East London is also considered. There will be much to learn from the experiences of London 2012 and hopefully it will be remembered only for the sport. However, there will be little pause for breath as the planning the Commonwealth Games in Glasgow 2014 is well underway. In the final contribution to this newsletter, Suzanne Young, Simon Mackenzie, Michelle Burman, Nick Fyfe, Niall Hamilton-Smith, Chris Johnston and Jonny Pickering consider this planning, and the culture of high security that surrounds it.

The rest of the newsletter contains news from various BSC committees and regional branches. For those not interested in sport I appologise for this rather sports-dominated issue. However, as Groombridge concludes in his piece, you don’t have to like sport to have a criminological interest in the topic; in fact, “it might help not to be too keen”. Finally, for those presenting at this year’s conference can I encourage you to consider submitting your paper to the BSC Online Journal, “Papers from the British Criminology Conference” - see advert on p6. The deadline for submissions is Friday 7 September 2012 and the journal will be published in December. If you are interested please email me at: Andrew.millie@edgehill.ac.uk.

Andrew Millie, June 2012
A letter from our President

Lorraine Gelsthorpe, Professor in Criminology and Criminal Justice, Cambridge Institute of Criminology, University of Cambridge

Dear Colleagues, In the last Newsletter I mentioned that the BSC Executive have been thinking about ways in which we can increase the ‘voice and vision’ of the BSC in the context of public policy-making and criminal justice practice. As a first step, we organised a BSC/Ministry of Justice/Home Office/British Academy symposium in March - with about forty participants comprising academic criminologists, government researchers and policy makers, and British Academy representatives (the British Academy kindly hosted the symposium). The seminar was designed to consider both ‘what’s new’ and ‘what’s important’ - with Mike Hough explaining the ‘crime drop’ and reflecting on the future and whether we might expect things to get worse...or better, Rob Allen speaking about developments in youth justice and what these developments presage for the adult system, Justice Tankebe speaking about ‘Legitimacy and cooperation with legal authorities’, and Coretta Philips addressing concerns about minority ethnic groups and criminal justice and drawing out the implications of recent work on ‘identity, ethnicity, and social relations in prison’ for a future research agenda. Mike Hough also addressed a paper produced by Fergus McNeill on new findings and issues relating to desistance (though without a Scottish accent - Fergus was not able to be with us on the day). The symposium was considered to be a huge success and thus the first of a series we hope. The next symposium is likely to have a single theme and will be in the Autumn 2012. (Please do let me know if you have ideas which we can suggest to colleagues in government and if you would like to be involved; the main idea is simply to encourage knowledge exchange).

We have also been engaging in discussions organised by the Academy of Social Sciences about the future of social science, and about the moves to facilitate open access to scientific research. The report of the Working Group chaired by Dame Janet Finch was published on 18 June and recommends a programme of action to enable more people to read and use the publications arising from research. It is suggested that better, faster communication of research results will bring benefits for public services and for economic growth, and that it will also bring improved efficiency for researchers, and opportunities for more public engagement with research. See: www.researchinfonet.org/wp-content/uploads/2012/06/Finch-Group-report-FINAL-VERSION.pdf

But this will have some implications for learned societies like the British Society of Criminology because of the income earned from journal publishing which is then ploughed back into other activities. Thus it makes sense for us to continue involvement in the Academy - alongside similar organizations - and for us to reflect on these matters together. We have also been involved in ESRC discussions with learned societies, learning about its plans and priorities for the future.

The Executive will shortly be holding a meeting to reflect on some practical possibilities for increasing voice and vision. If you have any suggestions…please do get in touch. We’re smaller than some societies; we’re regional; we’re a multi-perspective discipline which makes responding to some invitations to comment (on government consultation papers for instance) quite difficult because there is no one voice, but many. But we are keen to make a mark.

As one long exercise draws to a close for some of us (marking) the Olympics open. Articles within prompt serious reflection on sport and criminology. I look forward to seeing you at the Portsmouth BSC conference!

Lorraine Gelsthorpe, June 2012
Sports (criminology) illustrated

Nic Groombridge
Senior Lecturer, Media Arts and Sociology, St Mary’s University College

In many cases it may be a good thing for the proceedings of a domestic tribunal to be conducted informally without legal representation. Justice can be done in them better by a good layman than by a bad lawyer. This is especially so in activities like football and other sports, where no points of law are likely to arise, and it is all part of the proper regulation of the game. (Lord Denning [1971] Enderby Town FC v The Football Association)

No points of law are likely to rise? This separation of sport and law has largely fallen in the face of the sub-discipline of sports law and, as we shall see, international law. And does it remind us of the desire by some to keep politics out of sport? But sport still retains a considerable amount of power to decide its own business. Particularly its own rules on pitch, piste, table or court and even over competitors’ and spectators’ private behaviour. The lex olympica (Mestre, 2009) sees the International Olympic Committee demand State-like and quasi, extra-territorial powers in Olympic years. FIFA makes similar demands for World Cups which State Crime and politically acute criminologists need to follow up.

In this article I hope to show that sport offers rich opportunities for research and teaching materials in criminology: sport criminology, if you like. A few stories from the week of writing (ending 12 March 2012, the week randomly chosen, the stories not) illustrate some of the issues:

“Italian football clubs face trial in match-fixing scandal”

“Portuguese police to question Manchester United over Bébé transfer”

“Frank Warren is right to call British Boxing Board of Control's bluff over David Haye v Dereck Chisora”

“You cheat! Amir Khan slams Lamont Peterson over failed drugs test”

“F1 rejects zero-tolerance system penalties for going off the track”

It is a matter of chance that two boxing stories appear here but we should not be entirely surprised as it involves organised violence, yet neither story involves violence directly. Indeed, boxing typically features in sports law - and general law - texts as an example of the principle of volenti non fit injuria - you step into a ring you can expect to be hit. And this principle of informed consent as a defence - and what one can or should consent to - informs discussion of homosexual sado-masochism (‘the Spanner Trial’ R v Brown [1993] 2 All ER 75) and Female Genital Mutilation which rightly exercise human rights-oriented criminology. In some sports there is also an informal consent to roughness beyond the rules but within the spirit (both codes of Rugby, and eagerly anticipated by the crowd in Ice Hockey).

Some of the last paragraph and even the bald headlines above should tip criminologists off that crime and deviance are imbricated in much sport. Yet I have found very little evidence of any criminological engagement with sport despite many criminologists being fans of sport. Or, perhaps,
they have no wish to disturb their ‘guilty pleasures’ by examining them too closely. As indicated already, law has leapt on sport with alacrity and sport sociology has long embraced deviance and occasionally tutted over crime and crowd trouble (though see Atkinson and Young, 2008 and Blackshaw and Crabbe, 2004 for more critical approaches). In the absence of a specifically criminological engagement with sport I have tried to kick start a sport criminology that steers between sports law and sports sociology (Groombridge, 2012, based on my British Criminology Conference presentation 2010). Returning to our headlined stories illustrates some of the issues.

Given the time of year it is less surprising that football should feature in these stories. Starting with the match fixing story (for the Guardian this was an Italian story not a sport one). We might first observe that in recent years snooker, cricket and sumo have all hit the headlines with allegations and, occasionally, findings of match fixing. This Italian one features 52 players in three teams and allegations of a Balkan gang offering payments from €5-35,000. One of the few mentions in criminology of sport is Jupp’s (2001: 203) throwaway example of bribery to affect a sport result as ‘hidden crime’. Stories like this should interest transnational and organised crime criminologists. Sticking with football the Guardian also reports that a ‘judicial police national unit for combating corruption’ is investigating the transfer to Manchester United of Bébé for €9m. He changed agents just before the transfer, hardly played for United and the new agent received 40% of the fee. This raises again issues of transnational and organised crime but also FIFA’s own internal rules on the behaviour of agents.

International and regulatory issues are at stake in the case of the heavyweight match between David Haye and Dereck Chisora scheduled for Upton Park on July 14 2012. It is to take place under the aegis of the Luxembourg Boxing Federation as the British Board of Boxing Control (BBBC) has refused to sanction the fight. Some might remember that the two boxers were involved in a brawl at a Press Conference in Germany and were questioned by the police. We shall see whether the BBBC’s threat to ban for life all involved works or is found to be compliant with European law.

Still with boxing: Amir Khan lost to Lamont Peterson in December 2011 complaining of interference from the judges; and now the rematch scheduled for 19 May 2012 has been cancelled after Peterson failed a drugs test. It is not clear whether Khan could have offered to fight Peterson irrespective but is demanding the reversal of the previous result. But the use of drugs to enhance in-game performance or training is one of the most contentious issues in sport and much of the pre-Olympic build up focuses on the rigour of the testing regime. Note also that the British Olympic Association recently lost before the Court of Arbitration in Sport (CAS) its battle with the World Anti-Doping Agency over the length of bans for ‘drug cheats’.

Richard Gasquet’s own International Tennis Federation (ITF) employs a ‘zero tolerance’ policy so when minute traces of cocaine were found in his system he was in danger of a ban and fine. He was not in competition and it was accepted that he had enjoyed many kisses in a night club with a woman alleged to be a cocaine user. The CAS overturned the ban. Clearly these transnational, regulatory and drug use issues should interest criminologists. And as the last story about Formula 1 shows, some sports can decide to retain discretion for its officials and not go down the ‘zero tolerance’ line.

The Tour de France has, notoriously, been marked by drug and other ‘doping’ scandals and several athletics races are in contention for the ‘most corrupt’ according to Cooper (2012): the men’s 100m at Seoul Olympics 1988 (Ben Johnson, famously then, and a further five of eight found guilty of doping offences in their careers) and the women’s 1,500m at the 2005 World Championships in Helsinki (first five all had guilty findings in career). There are clear differences between drugs in sport and drugs in society but the trend in society towards decriminalising drugs, or at least recognising that the ‘war on drugs’ has been lost, appears to have had no traction in sport. We will test the athletes for performance enhancing drugs but not the performers at the Opening ceremony. Those tests are carried out in and out of competition and require the athletes to make their lives more transparent than a registered sex offender’s. Drugs are an innovation too far but athletes, coaches and commercial equipment suppliers will pursue any legal advantage. An athlete at the 1948 ‘Austerity’ Olympics
interviewed by Hampton (2012) remembers being given Horlicks, calling it ‘drugs’. Houlihan (2002) mentions ancient Egyptian athletes’ confidence in the effects of ground hooves (the rear hooves of an Abyssian ass specifically).

In the run up to the Olympics the Guardian has been selecting ‘stunning Olympic moments’ and number 28 (in the week of writing) was Dick Fosbury’s introduction to high jumping of his new method ‘the Flop’. I use such examples of ‘innovation’ to illustrate Merton’s work to students. His innovation has become mainstream but others have not been so lucky. The cyclist Graeme Obree had his bikes and even riding position banned twice by the UCI.

Some of the few mentions of sport in criminology are of crime prevention, community penalties or sport as rehabilitation; Nichols (2007) reviews the issues and Meek (2012) has produced a good example of an evaluation of sport in prison. Such schemes usually receive uncritical support from media and celebrities and it may be the task of criminologists to deliver the bad news - that such schemes may be good things in their own right but cannot provably cut crime.

Sports journalists are sometimes derided as ‘fans with typewriters’ and increasingly retired players secure positions as commentators. Both feel tied to their sport emotionally and there are examples of ‘difficult’ journalists being barred by teams and Sir Alex Ferguson refused to speak to the BBC for six years after a documentary investigated his son’s actions as a sports agent. In the United States, Dave Zirin (King, 2008), and UK Andrew Jennings are rare examples of journalists biting the media hand that feeds them. So who else might critically examine crime and deviance in sport?

From what we have seen sports law is largely involved with disputes between players and authorities or authorities and news media. Indeed, in the Gasquet case Adam Lewis QC represented the player and Jonathan Taylor the ITF, yet they edited a book together (Lewis and Taylor, 2008). Sport law follows the ‘black letter’ tradition sometimes tinged with equity and sports sociology largely backs the huge anti-doping edifice heaped on sportspeople.

Blackshaw and Crabbe (2004) are critical of the law and order inclinations of much criminology, but a critically informed sports criminology might borrow from cultural criminology (the massive socio-cultural role of sport), the harm perspective (drug use), green criminology (how many golf courses do we need) and gendered perspectives (nowhere is gender and sexuality more policed and judged than in sport).

You don’t even have to like sport - it might help not to be too keen.
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**Papers from the British Criminology Conference 2012**

An Online Journal Published by the British Society of Criminology
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The 2012 BSC Conference is held at the University of Portsmouth, 4-6 July.
If you are presenting a paper at this year’s BSC conference we would gladly welcome submissions to the 2012 edition of the online journal.

Details of the journal are available at: [www.britsoccgrim.org/publications.htm#002](http://www.britsoccgrim.org/publications.htm#002)

The final deadline for submissions is two months after the conference, on Friday 7 September 2012. The journal will be published in December 2012.
Resilience through lockdown: Reflections on ‘total security’ preparations for London 2012

Jon Coaffee
Professor of Spatial Planning and Urban Resilience, University of Birmingham

Is Olympic security provision disproportionate to the threats faced? In recent years international sporting spectacles such as Olympic Games have merged with dystopian images of cities under siege as terrorist risk has seen resilience and security professionals attempt to deliver events in maximum safety and with minimum schedule disruption. However, spectacular events are also spectacular targets, defended through highly militarised tactics and detailed and expensive contingency planning. In other words, lockdown military security has become an essential part of ensuring (temporary) resilience for sporting mega-events (Coaffee et al., 2011). Although such tactics and strategies are being rolled out for London 2012 in response to a range of perceived threats and disruptive challenges, they are by no means unprecedented.

The ‘superpanopticon’ advanced in preparation for Athens 2004 - the first post-9/11 Summer Olympics - exemplifies this trend (Samatas, 2007). In the midst of the ‘war on terror’, Athens spent well over five times the security budget of Sydney 2000, deploying over 70,000 specially trained police and soldiers at Olympic venues whilst another 35,000 military personnel patrolled the streets. The military hardware utilised included 13,000 surveillance cameras, mobile surveillance vans, chemical detectors, Patriot anti-aircraft missile sites, NATO troops specialising in weapons of mass destruction, AWACS early warning surveillance planes, police helicopters, fighter jets, minesweepers and monitoring airships (see also Coaffee and Fussey, 2010).

In the UK, the securitising of sporting spectacles has become increasingly prominent as London gears up to hosting the Olympic Games. Not only did security concerns and responses play a critical part in the bidding process; they also dominated media discussion immediately after the host city was announced. On 7/7/2005, the day after the announcement, a series of co-ordinated terrorist bomb attacks took place on the London transport network, prompting even more detailed security plans which could see the initial security bill quadruple from £225 million to over £1 billion, and the adoption of advanced biometric security systems to monitor crowds and athletes and to track suspects across the city (Fussey et al., 2011). Uniquely, in London’s case, Olympic security concerns have been grafted over a pre-existing security infrastructure, one which has evolved over many years due to the threat of Irish Republican and other forms of terrorism. As noted by the Metropolitan Police Authority in 2007:

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

In March 2011 an updated Olympic and Paralympic Safety and Security Strategy (Home Office, 2011) set out the key aims and objectives for the police and government in delivering a safe and secure Olympic Games. The strategy’s overarching aim was ‘to deliver a safe and secure Games, in keeping with the Olympic culture and spirit’ (p.7). This strategy was in line with the latest revised UK National Security Strategy; A Strong Britain in an Age of Uncertainty: The National Security
Strategy (October 2010) and was operationalised in line with the third iteration of the UK’s overarching counter-terrorism strategy, CONTEST (HM Government, 2011). The CONTEST strategy itself specifically focused on the 2012 Games, noting that the UK has guaranteed to the International Olympic Committee that it will ‘take all financial, planning and operational measures necessary to guarantee the safety and the peaceful celebration of the Games’ (p.105). Specifically, it highlighted a set of issues related to the threat and response to possible terrorist attack:

Terrorism poses the greatest security threat to the Games. Experience from previous Games and elsewhere indicates that global sporting events provide an attractive and high-profile target for terrorist groups, particularly given the potential for malicious activity to receive enormous international publicity. London 2012 will take place in an unprecedentedly high threat environment. Threat levels can change rapidly but by planning against a threat level of Severe we have maximised our flexibility to respond to a range of threats (HM Government, 2011: 106).

The final preparations for Olympic security planning are now underway, managed by the UK Security Services, the Olympic Security Directorate and multi stakeholder London Resilience Forum who have developed detailed pre-emptive security plans to sit alongside pre-existing resilience plans, to plan out vulnerabilities in advance. Most recently, in May 2012 ‘Operation Olympic Guardian’ began - a pre-emptive scenario-planning exercise intended to test security and resilience preparedness ahead of the Games. This has involved the testing of air missile defence systems, the responsiveness of Typhoon jet forces and the establishment of ‘No-fly’ Zones over London. As one BBC correspondent noted, such an exercise has the potential both to alarm and reassure in equal measure:

Exercise Olympic Guardian is an opportunity to fine-tune military plans. But it is also aimed at reassuring the public. The Olympics is the biggest global sporting event and the world will be watching. The sound of fighter jets and military helicopters, along with the sight of the Royal Navy’s largest warship, HMS Ocean, in the Thames may reassure many. But for some, just talk of this military hardware is causing alarm - most notably the plans to station ground-based air defence systems at six sites around the capital (BBC News, 2012a).

Campaign groups such as the ‘Stop the War’ coalition have accused the government of causing unnecessary alarm and a ‘climate of fear’ in the capital (BBC News 2012b). Such claims are exacerbated by related plans to site anti-aircraft missiles on the top of East London tower blocks whose residents learned, through leaflets, that a high velocity missile system would likely be placed on a nearby water tower offering a perfect view of the nearby Olympic Park (BBC News 2012c).

Such militarisation of the immediate environs of this high profile sporting event should however come as no surprise given the standardisation of security that has become an accepted part of the Olympics over the last thirty years. As the Games draw near and interest in all aspects of 2012 preparation rises, security-related stories are increasingly common in the print media both in the UK and worldwide. For example, a selection of those which emerged in May 2012 highlights a wide-ranging set of issues that both LOCOG (the London Organising Committee of the Olympic and Paralympic Games) and Londoners will be forced to confront this summer.

Other reports highlight a set of issues regarding policing the Games in what will be an unprecedented UK peacetime operation, seeing up to 12,000 officers from 52 forces deployed at ‘peak time’, alongside private security staff, and the utilisation of novel security technologies: ‘Metropolitan police plastic bullets stockpile up to 10,000 after UK riots - Scotland Yard confirms August unrest has led to increase in stock of baton rounds as security measures upped before Olympics’ (The Guardian, 2012a); ‘Metropolitan Police double officers around torch as crowds bigger than predicted’ (Daily Telegraph, 2012); ‘Metropolitan Police given 350 mobile fingerprint scanners in Olympics policing boost’ (V3 News, 2012); ‘Former Royal Marines to ferry around super-rich Games spectators’ (London Evening Standard, 2012); and ‘Flaws in vetting security staff being trained for the Olympics’ (ITV News, 2012).

As the Games approach, the everyday impact both on Londoners and visitors to the capital, and the possibility of protest, are also being highlighted in the media: ‘Fish photographer caught in Olympics terror alert: A man taking photos of a fish tank was stopped by a security guard who was supposed to be alert for hostile reconnaissance amid pre-Olympics terrorism fears’ (Amateur Photographer, 2012); ‘Olympics welcome does not extend to all in London as police flex muscles; Dispersal zone at Olympic Park will target anti-social behaviour, and there are claims sex workers are being cleansed’, (The Guardian, 2012b); and, Olympic crackdown: UK govt targets protests (Russia Today, 2012).

However, the lockdown security that London will increasingly experience - both as the Olympics approach and during the event itself - raises questions over the proportionality of the security effort and the extent to which local people have been consulted, over security and resilience plans that will affect their neighbourhoods both now and into the future, once the well-protected Olympic flame goes out.
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The Olympics and (hopefully very little) criminology: Some economic viewpoints

Allan Brimicombe
Professor of Geo-Information, University of East London and Chair of the BSC Crime & Justice Statistics Network

The genesis of this piece lies in an email from Loraine Gelsthorpe (BSC President) about a supervision with her students:

Sport and criminology ... this came up in an undergraduate supervision group yesterday ... someone was reflecting on whether the money spent on the Olympics could have been better used to address social problems ... but then we wondered if the push for ‘hard work’ in and out of prisons could mean offenders/ex offenders being given jobs at the Olympics ... or coached by Olympic athletes, or entered for races against prison officers ...

Although this was light hearted, I was having an exasperating day to do with the impending Olympics, half read the email and dashed off a reply to the effect that there were serious considerations... Loraine politely explained her own exasperation with the students …as well as suggesting that I lighten up. Nevertheless, having pressed the ‘Reply to all’ button, the editor of this Newsletter suggested there were viewpoints worth discussing.

I have been working on a number of projects related to mega-events (including the London 2012 Olympics), some focusing on crime, some only tangentially so. Over the last few years I have heard many times: “couldn’t the money on the Olympics be better spent on...?” Notice this questioning is not a suggestion that the money is not be spent at all, but better spent on something else. This is crucial to my take on the debate that follows. First I’ll look at some macro-economic considerations on whether the Olympics are good for UK PLC, and then I’ll look at some issues concerning policing and crime.

The Olympics have evolved from the business-centred approach of the 1984 Los Angeles Games in which public spending was only 10%, to the environmental, economic and social transformation approaches of recent Games in which public spending predominates. Just as democratically accountable Governments have increasingly sought to justify their policies, actions, and public sector spending by evidencing their merit, quality and efficacy, so too has the International Olympics Committee (IOC) become acutely aware that they must stave off criticism that the Games are costing host cities too much (and the 2004 Athens Games are widely viewed as directly contributing to Greece’s current economic woes).

The Public Sector Funding Package (PSFP) for the preparation of the London 2012 Games is £9.3bn, up from an initial estimate at bid time in 2005 of £2.4bn. Two thirds of this is coming from Central Government with much of the rest from the National Lottery and the Greater London Authority (GLA). The operating budget of the local organising committee - LOCOG (London Organising Committee of the Olympic and Paralympic Games), a limited liability company - for the staging of the Games is £2bn, much of which will come from sponsorship and ticket sales. Nevertheless, the UK Government is the ultimate guarantor for the funding as required by the IOC (Berman, 2010). There is further public spending in the region of £800m targeted at other programmes to underscore the legacy benefits (National Audit Office, 2011).
The ordinary person in the street would have to think a while if asked how many zeros there are in a billion. The £9,300,000,000 of the PSFP when written out in full seems colossal ... for getting ready a sporting event! To put it in proportion, the average annual spend from the PSFP is 0.25% of total UK Government spending. Put that way, the Olympics are a mere trifle when compared to the annual spend on benefits, health, education and defence. The first question to be asked then is a macro-economic one: is there a net benefit to the UK economy over and above spending the money elsewhere, say, on better pay and conditions for the police? Where Government spending is concerned, what contributes most to GDP is spending on infrastructure that results in inward investment and the creation of permanent jobs in the economy, more so than if the money were spent on consumption (e.g. salaries, goods and services). The PSFP includes not just the building of a stadium and other building assets, but the land agglomeration and its decontamination, flood prevention and the undergrounding of overhead powerlines that has enhanced the development potential of nearly 500 acres of what was before largely derelict land. The money has also paid for improved transport infrastructure. I would estimate that about 70% of the PSFP was spent on infrastructure and therefore would have a net benefit to the economy. Most of the benefits will flow after the Games when the site is no longer needed for the Olympics and sections of land no longer required for the event (such as training areas and car parks) can be used for housing and commercial use. Of course, there is always the potential for some of the facilities to become a white elephant as happened in Sydney and Athens, and all hopes are pinned on the London Legacy Development Corporation.

What of the other 30% of the PSFP that is spent on consumption? The largest item by far is policing and security which comes to £1bn (Home Office budget on policing plus LOCOG budget on venue security). The IOC demands a safe Games. Total safety is very expensive yet unachievable. Stephen Graham (2012) sees this as an excuse to put in place permanent security arrangements that will lockdown London. The spend works out at £68,000 an athlete (Olympic and Paralympic) or £111 for every ticket. Attacks on crowded places by terrorists is part of the National Risk Register of Civil Emergencies (Cabinet Office, 2012) where they are rated as having a medium to high relative plausibility and a medium relative impact score. Based on figures in Dubourg and Hamed (2005) updated to 2012 values, an attack in the style of Norwegian Anders Breivik (77 dead, 242 wounded/injured) would be monetarised at £147m, a fraction of what is being spent on avoidance during London 2012. A study of the effect of the July 7\textsuperscript{th} bombings in London on business (London Chamber of Commerce & Industry, 2005) shows that businesses were operating as normal again within a couple of days. Similarly the adverse stock market reactions to 9/11 and 7/7 were short-lived. So does the £1bn represent value for money? We will probably never know. Some ten thousand security guards will have been trained, given short-term jobs and with their enhanced CV may be able to get further, longer-term employment - a possible positive legacy of the Games. Of course, any death due to violence or terrorism at the London 2012 Games will be tragedy indeed, especially given the price tag on avoidance.

One of the key ‘Olympic Promises’ is to transform the heart of East London. This won’t happen directly from the PSFP but is expected to arise from a number of catalytic effects that locating of the Olympic Park in East London is supposed to produce. The Host Boroughs, through the Single Regeneration Framework (Host Boroughs Unit, 2009) aim to achieve convergence with the rest of London by 2030:

... to create the most enduring legacy of 2012 in the communities of the Host Boroughs and to do that by ensuring that over the next 20 years the residents of the Host Boroughs will come to enjoy the same life chances as other Londoners.

The Olympic Park straddles four London Boroughs (Hackney, Newham, Tower Hamlets and Waltham Forest). Recorded crime in 2010/11 (Chaplin et al., 2011) shows much higher rates of crime in these Boroughs compared to the average rates in the rest of London. Robbery per 1,000 population is 56%
higher, violence against the person is 29% higher and burglary 26% higher. If the aspiration is that crime rates in these Boroughs will converge with the rest of London over time, then figures in Dubourg and Hamed (2005) updated to 2012 values can be used to calculate some indicative monetary benefits. Using the recorded crime in 2010/11 for key offences and applying the rest of London aggregate rates (per thousand population) to these four Boroughs, there would be a 23.8% overall drop in the key offences categories with a monetary benefit of £98.5m per annum. Nearly two-thirds of this can be attributed to the cost of violence against the person. To model the gradual convergence towards 2030 with nationally declining crime rates that may get reflected in a falling London average (or it may bottom out) with these four Boroughs chasing a declining target, is something I’m not going to attempt here. But it does show that reducing crime rates through an Olympic legacy has considerable monetary benefits to the local communities, to say nothing of the social benefits that would arise.

My apologies to the reader if this piece has been statistically stuffy, but you are at the end of it now. Whether the money spent on the London 2012 Games might have been better spent on other things is to some extent a moot point. Like the Diamond Jubilee, it’s here and now and it’s been a while coming. Best to enjoy it and hope that it works out to be best value for money (which is a different debate).
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In 2014, twenty-four months after London 2012, Glasgow will be hosting the Commonwealth Games, the largest event ever to have been hosted by Scotland. The 2014 Games are anticipated to attract 1.5 million spectators and 4,500 athletes over the 11 days of competition and 13 of the 15 venues will be located in the Glasgow area. The overall Games budget for G2014 is £524 million¹ with the security budget of £27 million making up 5% of the total budget (Audit Scotland, 2012). In comparison, the security budget for the 2010 Commonwealth Games held in Melbourne was 8% of the total Games budget and the 2012 Olympic security costs are estimated to be 5% of the overall Games budget (Graham, 2012), so the proportion being spent on security aligns with other mega-events. The security structure for G2014 consists of several governing bodies made up of the Scottish Government, Strathclyde Police, the Games Organising Committee, and Glasgow City Council. In addition the sub-level working groups consist of partnerships with several additional security and safety organisations including Strathclyde Fire and Rescue, the Scottish Ambulance Service, Her Majesty’s Inspectorate of Constabulary for Scotland (HMICS), British Transport Police, The Scottish Crime and Drug Enforcement Agency (SCDEA) and private security contractors. The private security contractors will play a crucial role in G2014, in that they will be involved in securing all the venues and access points, and it is estimated there will be nearly three times the number of private security personnel (3000) than police officers (1,100) on competition days (‘Glasgow 2014’, 2007). The security planning for G2014, including risk assessment and securitisation, is already well under way and the security vision for a safe, secure and peaceful Games has been developed with the purported aim of ensuring that G2014 is fundamentally a mega-sporting, rather than a mega-security event.

Mega-sporting events have attracted academic research from a wide range of disciplines. For criminology, such events offer a unique opportunity to gain an insight into crime control, police management and securitisation at the national and international level. A team of researchers from the Scottish Centre for Crime and Justice Research and the Scottish Institute for Policing Research have been funded by the European Commission to study the security planning process, through a grant under the Prevention of and Fight against Crime programme, within the general funding programme on Security and Safeguarding Liberties, in the Freedom, Justice and Security work area.

The G2014 research project is concerned with the governance of security in relation to this specific mega-event: in particular the negotiation of the multi-level (central and local) government relationships and public-private partnerships required for the delivery of ‘security’ through policing. While mega-events are, due to their scale and infrequency, sometimes portrayed as exceptions to everyday security processes and discourses, our approach is to analyse the heightened tensions and responses around security during large spectacular events as reflective of broader and more mundane

¹ This was the new budget set in 2010 and is an increase of £151 million from the budget set in 2007
public and official sensibilities around security. Mega-events like G2014 are potential case studies for analytical work about the ‘culture of security’ more widely conceived in contemporary society, as opposed to merely time and place bound ‘moments’ of high security. By looking beyond the often turbo-charged (and sometimes rather extreme) concerns with security, spectacular events can sometimes render visible wider trends in policing, regulation and social control which may be more difficult to recognise in the routine activities of our day-to-day lives.

The culture of security is clearly a topic which can be examined from multiple perspectives, but our analytical framework seeks to focus on the culture of ‘high’ security. The securitisation processes we are concerned with are ‘high’ in the same sense that Sheptycki (2007) has identified a layer of ‘high policing’ which operates as an international-facing model of police thinking and practice, and which is largely occupied with risk and threat assessments of perceived global or inter-regional crime and security issues. The discursive norms of this layer of high security have produced a distinctive cultural orientation towards the concept of security which is manifest in the risk assessment and precautionary approaches adopted and promulgated by mega-event security staff.

The academic study of a security culture involves looking behind the surface presentation of objectified risks in order to uncover the ideological drivers of risk-based approaches. By analysing risk as a culturally constructed ‘reality’ (Douglas, 1992), risk assessments can be understood as socio-political processes of decision making. In Scotland, there is much by way of social and political circumstance which needs to be taken into account when considering the official constructions of risk and security for the Games. Despite Scottish police services having considerable experience preparing for and policing significant events such as the G8 summit in 2005 and the Papal visit in 2010 (see Gorringe and Rosie, 2008a; 2008b) this will be the largest ever security operation organised in Scotland. G2014 is taking place in a highly sensitive political context, with the Scottish Police and Fire and Rescue reforms underway which, in 2013, will amalgamate Scotland’s eight regional police forces into one national organisation, the Police Service of Scotland. And of course the Scottish Referendum is due to take place in autumn 2014, so that very shortly after the Games the country will be asked to vote on the question of independence from the UK. The successful ‘delivery’ of the Games is therefore part of a much wider story of the political aspirations of the Scottish National Party.

In addition to this political context, a bureaucratic context supports the current landscape of multi-level public-private partnerships which make key decisions in the governance of the security ‘blanket’ that envelops the Games. The initial observations of the G2014 planning process have shown very complex security governance structures with varying levels of working groups and committees developed to ensure comprehensive security preparations are in place. The G2014 structure is an example of nodal governance (Button, 2008) in which networks of security and safety organisations (both public and private) have a particular role and responsibility in securing G2014. For instance, the Games Organising Committee have responsibility for securing the Games venues, including the athletes’ village, while Strathclyde Police are in control of securing people and places outside the vicinities of the venues. It is estimated that 80% of the security at venues, including access points, will be carried out by private security contractors recruited by the Organising Committee. These roles and responsibilities are closely defined such that risks not only become things that are culturally constructed, as Douglas (1992) has said, but also a type of property, whereby each identified risk is ‘owned’ by a particular organisation in the security network. This functions not only as a division of labour, but in practice for the police as a means of farming out responsibility for the management of many risks, through defensible processes which will insulate blame if one of those risks comes to fruition through improper management. This kind of implied blame that lies within the apparently more neutral concept of risk has been observed by writers including Douglas (1992) and Giddens (1999). This is a form of responsibilisation; but whereas the term has commonly been used with reference to the State shifting the burden of protection against crime onto citizens, here the police are ‘responsibilising’ partner agencies.
This is, however, an overly neat analysis, and actually responsibilisation or risk-shifting in the G2014 security planning process is far more complex. Multi-level governance blurs accountability boundaries and despite the best efforts of the police and security partners to define the limits of responsibility, an obscuring of responsibility can still occur where the co-working structures become highly complex (Stoker, 1998). The Audit Scotland (2012) G2014 progress report has already highlighted this concern, particularly at the operational level, where the working partners have yet to be clear on defining the responsibilities and accountabilities for each of the security organisations. So governing large scale sporting events involves such multi-layered hierarchies that it can be unclear who is ultimately responsible for what; but this is made even more complex when trying to balance security with the idea of family-orientated Games. Whilst the police and private security companies look through a lens of security, the Games organisers insist that the Games are a sporting, not a security, event. This causes tension between security partnerships and Games organisers and can increase the fuzziness of the responsibilisation processes mentioned.

We are currently around half-way through the G2014 project and as the above discussion suggests, perhaps the most notable interim observation in our exploration of the culture of high security is related to the subjective experiences and interpretations of the risk assessment procedures which form the basic architecture of the security processes ultimately developed. A top-down view of these risk assessments presents an official and fairly logical picture of the identification of risks, their allocation to the most suitable ‘managers’ or ‘owners’ in the security governance network, and the development and implementation of security responses which aim to reduce any given risk to an acceptable level. The bottom-up view of risk offers a very different insight. The interim findings reveal that the risks identified for G2014 have reputational implications for their ‘owners’ in the case of mismanagement as well as consequences for Games delivery. This ever-present blame culture invites overkill in securitisation and a pre-emptive approach to security (Boyle and Haggerty, 2009; Fussey et al., 2011) in which the ideal is ‘total security’. The reputational risk for a risk-owner of catastrophic but highly unlikely events such as serious terror strikes substantially outweighs the risk of more likely but less severe crimes and incivilities. The result can be a huge expense on securing against such high-level risks, as we have seen with the semi-militarized approach at the London Olympics.
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**BSC Postgraduate Committee News**

The BSC Postgraduate conference is shaping up to be an interesting and varied conference once again, with poster presentations in addition to papers on a range of research topics. After a visit on possibly the coldest day of the year, I am looking forward to returning to the city of Portsmouth in sunny and warm July (we can but hope). I was struck by the accessibility of the accommodation, conference venue and sights of Portsmouth, and it is always nice for someone living in the West Midlands to be by the sea!

The programme offers sessions for paper-led presentations with topics as varied as global security, homelessness, policing, experiences of prison, stalking and other sexual offences and the use of animals in the CJS. We also have a valuable session on ‘Getting through the Viva’ - perhaps not an immediate concern for some, but the more advice any PhD student can get on this the better.

The organisers have excelled themselves in providing a range of different experiences and the conference dinner looks to be a grand affair on HMS Warrior - I hope many of the post-graduate delegates can also attend the main conference.

This is my first year as Chair of the BSC Postgraduate Committee and it is worth noting we have high numbers on this committee, many of whom are regulars at the PG conference and are working hard to keep this going. Tammy Ayres is now appointed Secretary of the committee - thanks to her sterling efforts stepping in last year.

The BSC Postgraduate Community Facebook group now has 115 members and is proving a very useful site for sharing news reports, interesting articles and offering support as a network of post-graduates studying MSc/MA level and above.

Susie Atherton, De Montfort University
The chair of the BSC Learning & Teaching Network, Helen Jones, is now also Discipline Lead for Sociology at the Higher Education Academy (HEA). The HEA supports a large network of learning and teaching practitioners involved in sociology and criminology throughout the UK. It was the HEA that provided the funding for this network and for some funded projects (more on this soon). The BSC Learning & Teaching Network will be providing funding, events, resources and a large number of opportunities to network with learning and teaching practitioners from a variety of institutions and roles. It will be the task of the BSC Learning & Teaching Network to promote learning and teaching developments and to establish and build on relationships between the BSC, institutional departments and HEA.

A number of opportunities are currently on offer from the HEA:

1. Development Grants: For the academic year 2012-2013 there will be another round of grants for individual projects and collaborative projects.
2. Workshops and Seminars: Departments can claim up to £1000 to host an event.
3. Travel funding is available to enable staff to attend learning and teaching events in the UK, as well as an international scholarship fund to enable academics to experience teaching practice overseas.

For further information and application forms for the above three opportunities, please visit [www.heacademy.ac.uk/funding](http://www.heacademy.ac.uk/funding)

The HEA is providing sponsorship to this year’s BSC annual conference and the winners of the 2012 National Award for Teaching Excellence will be made at the SAGE reception. The call for the 2013 Award will be made shortly after the conference.

For more news on what is going on in learning and teaching within our discipline please take a look at the website for the Learning & Teaching Network of the BSC: [http://bscltn.wordpress.com/](http://bscltn.wordpress.com/)

Helen Jones, Manchester Metropolitan University
BSC Regional News

BSC Northern Ireland Branch News

The BSC Northern Ireland Branch co-sponsored a day-long symposium on “Risk, Crime and Security” that brought a variety of leading risk scholars to Belfast in May. The free event, hosted and co-sponsored by the Institute of Criminology and Criminal Justice at Queen’s University Belfast, attracted over 50 attendees from around Ireland and beyond. Professor Pat O’Malley, the 2012 Visiting Fellow in the School of Law at Queen’s University, acted as respondent to three panels featuring papers from Professor Adam Crawford (Leeds), Jane Donoghue (Oxford), Deena Haydon (Belfast), Kevin Haines (Swansea), Claire Hamilton (Dublin), and Toby Seddon (Manchester).

Shadd Maruna, the Regional Chair of the Northern Ireland Branch, said the Symposium was a fantastic showcase of the diversity of work across the British Society of Criminology drawing on the concept of “risk”, and especially the rich research that has been inspired by Pat O’Malley’s ground-breaking theoretical contributions in that area.

BSC Wales Branch News

The Wales Branch of the BSC ended the academic year with two successful seminars.

On 17 May Alice Mills of the University of Auckland spoke at Cardiff University on partnerships in the UK and New Zealand, with the title: “A Critical Partnership? The Relationship between the Third Sector and the State in Criminal Justice in the UK and New Zealand”.

On 6 June our annual joint seminar was held at Bangor University, held jointly with Bangor WISERD and Bangor School of Social Sciences. For the seminar Lawrence Burke of Liverpool John Moores University spoke on “Opening up the market: Implications for the Probation Service”.

BSC South East Branch News

Recent events organised by the South East Branch of the BSC include the following. On 16 May James Sheptycki (York University Toronto) and Ben Bowling (King’s College London) discussed their new book ‘Global Policing’, published by Sage. Afterwards there was wine and nibbles provided by Sage. On 20 June Dave Scott from the University of Central Lancashire presented a paper on the topic: ‘From Penal Hell and Back Again’. Both events were held at the LSE.
BSC South West Branch News

The BSC SW started 2012 with the third of their 2011/2012 seminar series on the 1st February. Michael Shiner (LSE) and Rebekah Delsol from Stopwatch were kind enough to do two presentations in one day, speaking to students at Plymouth University during the day and then onto the BSC SW seminar in the late afternoon – entitled: “Policing the Crisis: ‘Race’, ‘Riots’ and the Regulation of Stop and Search”. The final seminar of the 2011/12 year saw Adam Edwards and Gordon Hughes from Cardiff University visit Plymouth on the 15th March. BSC SW also supported Crimifilm, a film club held at Plymouth University which presents ‘crime’ film classics. Each film is recommended as a ‘classic’ film by a film-making professional, who also supplies a review of each film. So far the films shown have been, ‘Angels with Dirty Faces’, ‘Dirty Harry’ and ‘Brick’.

In May BSC SW supported a national conference on equality issues, “Making an Impact on Equality: Challenging Prejudice and Changing Behaviour”. Keynote speakers included Jonathan Rees (Director of the Government Equality Office), Duncan Lewis (Plymouth University), Kevin Coleman (Kick it Out) and Angela Donkin (Institute of Health Inequality).

All these events were publicised on the SW branch’s website, also launched this year - www.bscsouthwest.org. So far most events have taken place at Plymouth University where new SW chair Zoë James is based. Zoë said: “We are very keen for as many people to attend our seminar events as possible and would encourage those interested to get in touch. We have recently contacted colleagues in universities across the South West with the aim of disseminating event information throughout the region and welcome contact from BSC members in the South West who may be interested in running a local event with BSC SW support”. Contact Zoë at: Z.James@plymouth.ac.uk

BSC Scotland Branch News

In March Dr Susan Batchelor (University of Glasgow) became Chair of the Scottish branch of the BSC, and Professor Michele J Burman (University of Glasgow) secretary. The SCCJR 6th Annual Lecture was co-badged as a BSC event and was held at the University of Stirling on 31 May. Professor Elena Larrauri of Universitat Pompeu Fabra de Barcelona presented a lecture on “Is there a right to expunge criminal convictions?” There are plans for a further joint seminar early next academic year.

BSC Yorkshire and Humber Branch News

The Yorkshire and Humber Branch of the BSC held a very successful event on 22 March at which 7 papers were presented and around 40 people attended from across the region and beyond (Nottingham, Birmingham, Northumbria). It was encouraging to see PhD students actively taking part and also practitioners attending (local prisons plus probation and the police).