Editorial | Surveillance and Sport

Ian Warren

Deakin University, Australia.
ian.warren@deakin.edu.au

Nils Zurawski

University of Hamburg, Germany.
nils.zurawski@uni-hamburg.de

At first glance sports and surveillance make an unlikely pair. The two phenomena are rarely thought of as sharing common features or warranting scholarly attention. Surveillance often holds negative connotations associated with discourses of control and domination. These seem out of place when a broad understanding of sports as a recreational or social pastime is concerned. However, when looking closer, elite sports in particular are inextricably tied to concepts associated with surveillance and control, which are closely associated with managing athlete's bodies and performances, often by athletes themselves. Indeed, various contentious forms of surveillance are intrinsically connected to the control and management of contemporary professional sports governance authorities, elite athletes and coaching staff.

Most literature identifying the relationship between sports and surveillance has examined the subject of security at sports mega events, such as the Olympic Games or the Fédération Internationale de Football Association (FIFA) World Cup. Other aspects of surveillance have been of lesser interest to scholars. Besides the quite visible aspects of surveillance to promote security at these large scale and global events, there are also several more nuanced forms of surveillance that impact on the day-to-day lives of athletes, coaches and administrative staff. These routines of surveillance associated with sports participation require further examination in terms of their impacts on both global and local elements of contemporary sports administration, and their filtration into everyday surveillance practices. Of central significance in this special edition of *Surveillance & Society* is how the bodies and performances of athletes are often the primary focus of these forms of surveillance.

An individual's identity as an athlete is inextricably tied to their history of performance. At the elite levels of professional or representative national sport, various forms of surveillance are part of the routines of training or sports performance, even though they are seldom framed as surveillance practices. Many forms of surveillance have been introduced to promote ideals of fairness and athlete purity. Perhaps the most notable of these 'surveillant assemblages' (Haggerty and Ericson 2000) involves the global reactions to illicit doping to artificially enhance an athlete's performance or recovery from injury. The blood and urine of elite athletes are routinely tested for abnormalities that suggest the use of illicit performance enhancing substances, including anabolic steroids, erythropoietin (EPO), a form of blood doping, or other banned yet legally obtained medications and health supplements. Complex global networks enforce this combined surveillance and control regime through periodic biological testing and the retention of the intimate bodily samples of elite athletes. More recently, monitoring an elite athlete's out-of-competition geographic location has been introduced to supplement the surveillance regime down to the one-hour-a-day-availability-ruling through the ADAMS whereabouts-system¹ introduced under the World Anti-Doping Authority (WADA) code (Hanstad and Loland 2009) and the contentious biological passport system

¹ Anti-Doping Administration and Management System of the World-Anti Doping Agency (WADA).

(Hardie 2013). These combined measures reinforce the applicability of Bentham's Panopticon to elite athletes, where the watched are never entirely sure when they are being watched and are always aware of the presence of formal surveillance to fulfil broader sports objectives of fair play and prevent cheating.

Such forms of surveillance permeate other social domains, yet would be regarded as invasions of privacy outside of elite sport. Hence, the surveillance of an athlete's financial records might provide evidence of expenditure to establish a connection to doping or illicit drug violations. Increasingly, notions of integrity stretch to an athlete's associations with criminal underworld figures and the quest to eliminate gambling or match fixing. In recent years, both European and Australian sports have reacted to such perceived crises that appear to threaten integrity in professional sports through tighter and more expansive forms of control and surveillance into the lives of elite and semi-professional athletes.

However, the panoptic analogy remains a rather crude metaphor for the extent to which surveillance pervades contemporary sport and the conduct of its practitioners. Prior to this volume, the only paper published in *Surveillance & Society* to examine sport (Manley, Palmer and Roderick 2012) identifies that athletes in an elite rugby training academy are subject to various forms of 'rhizomatic surveillance' that are closely tied to monitoring their health, medical welfare and athletic development. All of these motives for surveillance are considered essential and unquestioned elements of sports participation, especially in elite sports. Equally, these forms of surveillance generate various types of sous- or counter-surveillance aimed at exploiting opportunities to subvert the routines of being constantly watched, even if an athlete has no intention to undermine the broader objectives of fair play or compromise their self-disciplinary routines. Thus, the 'all seeing eye' that aims to micromanage an athlete's physical development is not quite total or ubiquitous. Rather, athletes also watch the watchers to exploit blind spots in the apparently constant surveillance apparatus to obtain some relief from a gaze designed to maximise fair performance, or detect the ever-present threat of cheating.

While surveillance carries a critical connotation of unequal power relations, domination, subjection or biopolitical population management, in sports these objectives may also become an aspect of protecting athletes involved in either junior or elite competition. For instance, the paper by Elaine Cook and Kim Dorsch in this edition highlights how sports organisations invoke quite sophisticated methods to monitor the activities of coaches in youth sport. Similarly, motives for introducing expansive anti-doping tests at the elite level are partly designed to protect the health of elite athletes. In each case, the ideal of protection extends and is normalised within the hierarchical disciplinary structure of sports administration, even if their implementation is selective, imperfect or promotes questionable competitive values. This ensures the focus on surveillance as an intrinsic aspect of sports participation, governance and popular consumption is extremely useful to interpret both the prevailing values and practices in contemporary sports culture, and new topics for debate on surveillance itself.

In fact, sports represent an ideal field to explore the importance of everyday surveillance practices. The routines of preparation associated with conducting or participating in a sports mega event at international level highlight unique facets of surveillance as everyday and normalised elements of elite international or professional sports performance. While these routines do have potential individual or social costs, or are open to various forms of subversion by athletes willing to challenge the broader objectives of fair play, other forces, such as the media or formal governance reactions to a detected rule violation, provide fuel for more rigorous forms of surveillance. This spiral of surveillance permeates downwards to impact on prospective elite athletes, and outwards to impact on other forms of behaviour considered to compromise integrity or fair play. How these values mirror and intersect with norms of surveillance in everyday life is a fruitful site for on-going research and theorisation.

The connection between surveillance at mega events and in everyday activities in public space is the most visible manifestation of surveillance in sports and everyday life. Here, the motive of protection or security

becomes a pertinent marker for determining how distinct forms of surveillance introduced to securitise a sports mega event seep into routine forms of population management. Elsewhere, sports mega events have been identified as contributing to a surge in surveillance that affects local populations in host cities (Palmer and Warren 2013; Giulianotti and Klauser 2010; Taylor and Toohey 2011). However, if surveillance requires an accompanying motive to promote order or self-discipline amongst those subject to an authoritative gaze, then that motive is often ambiguous in the realm of sport. As several papers in this special edition demonstrate, the physical safety of athletes, spectators or event infrastructure is simply one dimension of this equation.

In general we can identify two major areas in which the relation between sports and surveillance can be researched. The first involves examining the body of the athlete and their performances, which is entwined with a complex array of sports governance and political considerations. The fight against doping is arguably the most prominent marker of this surveillance focus. The second is the underlying surveillance complex associated with the preparation, management and conduct of sports mega events. Much of this focus is about security rather than sports. Sports, it seems, are mere vehicles for mass consumption and mass surveillance practices associated with the Olympic road show. Nevertheless, these spectacles need 'pure' athletes. This is why athletes representing the commodities of global mass consumption are the objects of so many forms of surveillance aimed at controlling their behaviour, both during and outside of competition, through an array of complex bureaucratic and sports management structures. As such, surveillance itself becomes an aspect of consumption. Indeed we would suggest that in sports, these forms of surveillance are in fact consumed (cf. Zurawski 2014).

This edition contains contributions that address surveillance in relation to both the athlete and the broader realm of sports governance and for the first time discusses these dual issues as mundane aspects of contemporary sports. Our objective is to generate new insights into sports and surveillance alike. For reasons of organisation, we have divided this issue in two halves, with contributions examining surveillance, securitisation and sports governance at mega events in the first half of this volume, and the surveillance of athletes in the second.

Some contributions prove that the management of (bodily) performances is at the same time a cornerstone for security practices at sports mega events. Andrew Manley and Michael Silk aptly demonstrate that reputation management, which rests at the heart of both physical and ideological forms of surveillance associated with sports mega events, emerged from the interconnected facets of geography, culture and performance at the 2012 London Olympic Games. Through intricately managed urban development and performative displays at the Opening Ceremony, the notion of surveillance appeared to serve two purposes. The first was to provide a sanitised space designed to include ticketholders, many of whom were temporary visitors to London during the sixteen days of Olympic competition, which simultaneously helped to exclude displaced locals from attending events or being seen within the protected enclaves surrounding the event sites. Second, the performative dimensions of the Opening Ceremony constructed a particular vision of English colonial influence and contemporary urban demography that is considered by Manley and Silk to heighten social division and cultural invisibility from the preferred version of modern English history. This process has a more intricate effect on the broader legacies of contemporary surveillance in the UK. Notably, Manley and Silk point to how these cultural messages can legitimise contentious surveillance practices that affect displaced or 'othered' populations before, during and after the conclusion of the Games.

Similarly, Simone Eisenhauer, Daryl Adair and Tracy Taylor indicate a dominant form of surveillance that is more aligned to preserving the security of global sponsorship interests rather than physical or human security at the 2010 FIFA World Cup in Cape Town, South Africa. While physical security is intertwined with various surveillance measures invoked at the behest of FIFA, the world game's governing authority, the most visible legacies of surveillance are associated with mediated images of a safe and sanitised tourist

destination supported by exclusive commercial sponsorship arrangements. As with the 2012 London Olympic Games, the urban Cape Town environment was transformed to host this mega event, with numerous accompanying surveillance requirements designed to preserve the integrity of the FIFA brand and the exclusive rights of commercial sponsors. This moves away from conventional analyses of securitisation initiatives at mega events to reveal a more complex role for surveillance in preventing global commercial losses and protecting exclusive brand recognition arrangements at mega event sites.

Chad Whelan's discussion of surveillance and security networks has several possible applications to the issues of event securitisation and brand protection at sports mega events. According to Whelan, the conflation of surveillance with security tends to overlook the obvious necessity for various surveillance methods to enhance event safety and prevent terrorism or other forms of human tragedy. Within this milieu, the positive elements of surveillance in enhancing mega event security are often overlooked. However, the additional complexity of mega event security arrangements raises more nuanced forms of inter-agency or networked surveillance that are yet to be adequately understood either in the surveillance or mega event literature. Whelan's analysis highlights why these forms of surveillance are considered necessary to promote a greater understanding of the multifaceted political, social and situational dimensions of mega event securitisation, in a context where inadequate surveillance has numerous ramifications for cities wishing to host a sports mega event.

While these intricacies have obvious impacts on the future development of surveillance theory and practice in the realm of sport, Fred Mason's photo-essay highlights the interplay between the visible and not-so-visible elements of mega event surveillance and securitisation. As with Manley and Silk, Mason's photographic record at the London 2012 women's soccer events in Glasgow reveals a performative element that involves the conflation of the spectacle of the mega event with patron surveillance. The eerie realisation that two spots on a light tower are actually armed paramilitary spotters highlights the lengths organising bodies will go to secure a sports mega event through overtly visible 'saturation' policing contingents in and around sports stadia, and more covert forms of surveillance. These concessions appear to be accepted conditions associated with the global commercial, media and securitisation apparatus associated with contemporary sports mega events.

Kevin Dixon offers the first of two papers in this volume invoking the term 'lateral surveillance'. This concept has been identified by Mark Andrejevic (2004: 481) as a process that unravels 'the anonymity of urbanised modernity' through a variety of peer-to-peer forms of technological and social surveillance. Such is the nature of sports fandom that surveillance is by no means confined to those in positions of authority seeking to ensure good order amongst the masses. Rather, sports fans also conduct surveillance of each other to determine in- or out-group relations and levels of authenticity that characterise the viewing experience. Using a Bourdieusian approach that builds on Andrejevic's work, Dixon astutely recognises that fans engage in various forms of watching that have discernible capacities to shape notions of inclusion and exclusion 'from below' (Stenson 2005). Such nuances provide a crucial framework for investigating both the informal dynamics of routine fan behaviours, while offering numerous sites for the elaboration of 'top-down' surveillance, consumption and securitisation practices that characterise contemporary elite sport.

The final paper to examine fan surveillance offers a partial bridge between the otherwise discrete issues of surveillance associated with the management of patrons, athletes and others involved in sports administration. The contribution from Ian Warren, Darren Palmer and Chad Whelan argues that sports organisations have the legal right to develop rules and procedures to selectively include or exclude individuals from participating as fans, athletes, coaches or officials. However, these internal governance processes also have the capacity to influence, or are shaped by, equivalent external surveillance processes adopted by public authorities to enforce the criminal law, preserve national security or promote greater integrity in sports administration. Of the three discrete examples presented in this paper, perhaps the most

contentious involves the potential use of existing identity authentication processes for online ticket sales to assist police and venue authorities to enforce bans imposed against disorderly patrons. As with other surveillance mechanisms designed to promote integrity and fair play in professional sports, the perceived benefits of efficient ban enforcement in and around elite sports venues raises the potential for increased data sharing between private companies and police to offset limits associated with the manual surveillance of sports patrons. Although each example presented in this paper should be viewed in its specific context, it is equally clear that various internal and external surveillance practices directed at sports fans, athletes, coaches and other officials are directly linked to, and build from, the capacity of sports organisations to develop identity authentication mechanisms to govern their own affairs. Arguably, the normalisation of these surveillance practices within sport confers a degree of legitimacy on related external criminal law enforcement and security measures, despite constraints under the laws of due process, information privacy and natural justice.

The second series of papers focuses primarily on surveillance as it impacts on athletes. Here, there are discussions of intrusive and ambiguous forms of surveillance that affect sports participants, which are frequently excused as being ‘part of the game’ or considered the inevitable concessions one has to accept in order to become an elite or aspiring athlete or official. Honorata Jakubowska’s research highlights how sex verification testing legitimises certain hetero-normative assumptions that reinforce gender divisions in contemporary sports. While many in the athletic community consider these assumptions to be acceptable and warrant expansion in exceptional cases, those with a critical feminist knowledge demonstrate how such surveillance practices can produce highly damaging personal and cultural legacies that reflect problematic sex divisions in contemporary sport. These processes in turn reinforce the imperfect science that deems women to be physically inferior to men.

Anthony Rees, Tom Gibbons and Kevin Dixon also adopt the Bourdieusian concept of lateral surveillance to demonstrate how competitive cyclists develop a hierarchical pecking order during their collective training regimes. In this sense, a person’s image as a cyclist is simultaneously linked to perceptions of their physical ability within the sport’s culture. Their research highlights how informal social sorting processes determine insiders from outsiders, the latter of whom are considered not to reflect appropriate team values in terms of their athletic performance or appearance. As with Kevin Dixon’s paper on authentic forms of football fandom, these informal modes of lateral surveillance have important ramifications for determining who is considered appropriate to be part of the competitive cycling community, based on image, skill and conformity to a hierarchically developed notion of ‘team’.

The types of lateral surveillance identified by Rees, Gibbons and Dixon have several potentially negative effects when read alongside Sarah Teetzel and Charlene Weaving’s paper examining the legacies of a college football doping scandal at a Canadian University. In identifying the response by anti-doping authorities to expand both locational and biological surveillance of suspect college footballers, this paper highlights how the anxieties promoted by doping scandals at the elite professional level have seeped into the processes of integrity management in semi- or non-professional contexts. This has significant potential to tighten the levels of surveillance deployed by sports governing authorities and university management, as well as lateral surveillance amongst college athletes. This paper also has numerous parallels with the surveillance surge identified by Manley and Silk in this volume, which becomes normalised to govern suspect populations considered to be outside prevailing conceptualisations of the good athletic citizen.

April Henning’s research into the use of supplements by non-elite runners highlights a different form of self-surveillance that has considerable potential to undermine the protective surveillance practices associated with formalised anti-doping controls. Drawing on a series of interviews with club runners in New York, Henning demonstrates a problematic contradiction that involves widespread resistance to ingesting any substance that is formally banned by anti-doping authorities, yet the commensurate willingness to ingest poorly tested supplements that are yet to be regulated under the United States

banning regime. This contradiction is particularly worrying, given athletes readily attested to the safety of these supplements based on second-hand testimonies published in running magazines or by others who endorse their use. This produces a surveillance blind spot that may place an athlete at serious physical risk despite potentially enhancing their performance.

Finally, Elaine Cook and Kim Dorsch document their research into a different form of surveillance focusing on the conduct of athletes and coaches during competitive Canadian youth team sports events. Using the Typology of Coaching Transgressions, the Justplay Behaviour Management Program helps to assess unhealthy levels of aggressive and abusive competition through an intricate form of surveillance by sports officials. This model is important for its ability to help shape a more inclusive and less abusive forum for youth sports participation, based on constructive encouragement rather than aggressive verbal or physical discipline. As a form of surveillance in its own right, Justplay promises to promote values of inclusion in the conduct and management of youth sport. In addition, this form of surveillance can also have numerous positive effects in achieving the broader objectives of fair play that underpin contemporary elite, non-elite, youth and recreational sports competition.

The papers in this volume reveal the multifaceted nature of surveillance practices in contemporary sport from the diverse fields of Surveillance Studies, kinesiology, sports philosophy, cultural studies, criminology, regulatory studies and security studies. This diversity is testimony to the sophistication and wide-reaching nature of various forms of biological, social and mass-population surveillance practices associated with both elite and low-level sports participation. The papers in this special edition of *Surveillance & Society* examine why, whether and when these practices are invoked to promote specific objectives associated with fair play or protection in sport, and provide a useful starting point for further theoretical and empirical development both within and outside this domain.

Acknowledgements

We would like to acknowledge the ongoing assistance of David Murakami Wood and Sarah Cheung in the preparation of this special edition, as well as the work of all the people who reviewed papers that are included in this volume. Special thanks are also extended to Victoria Millious at the School of Kinesiology and Health Studies at Queen's University, who provided invaluable assistance in promoting the call for papers for this special edition.

References

- Andrejevic, M. 2004. The Work of Watching One Another: Lateral Surveillance, Risk, and Governance. *Surveillance & Society* 2(4): 479-497.
- Giulianotti, R. and F. Klauser. 2010. Security Governance and Sporting Mega-events: Toward an Interdisciplinary Research Agenda. *Journal of Sport and Social Issues* 34(1): 1-13.
- Haggerty, K.D. and R.V. Ericson. 2000. The Surveillant Assemblage. *British Journal of Sociology* 51(4): 605-622.
- Hardie, M. 2013. Making Visible the Invisible Act of Doping. *International Journal of the Semiotics of Law* Feb 2013. DOI: 10.1007/s11196-013-9311-3.
- Hanstad, D.V. and S. Loland. 2009. Elite Athletes' Duty to Provide Information on their Whereabouts: Justifiable Anti-Doping Work or an Indefensible Surveillance Regime? *European Journal of Sport Science* 9(1): 3-10.
- Manley, A., C. Palmer and M. Roderick. 2012. Disciplinary Power, the Oligopticon and Rhizomatic Surveillance in Elite Sports Academies. *Surveillance & Society* 10(3/4): 303-319.
- Palmer, D. and I. Warren. 2013. Zonal Banning and Public Order in Urban Australia. In: *Policing Cities: Urban Securitisation and Regulation in a 21st Century World*, eds R. Lippert and K. Walby, 79-86. Abingdon: Routledge.
- Stenson, K. 2005. Sovereignty, Biopolitics and the Local Governance of Crime in Britain. *Theoretical Criminology* 9(3): 265-287.
- Taylor, T. and K. Toohey. 2011. Ensuring Safety at Australian Sport Event Precincts: Creating Securitised, Sanitised and Stifling Spaces? *Urban Studies* 48(15): 3259-3275.
- Zurawski, N. 2014. Consuming Surveillance: Mediating Control Practices Through Consumer Culture and Everyday Life. In: *Media, Surveillance and Identity*, eds A. Jansson and M. Christensen. New York: Peter Lang.