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Abstract

Since the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001, urban spaces have become increasingly subject to various methods of surveillance and control, especially by physical means. Yet, while 9/11 acted as a catalyst for rapid increases in security measures, the process of securitization has a much longer history. Accordingly, this research looks at how security has been planned and how this has changed over the last four decades in the context of Canada.

The dissertation focuses on three Canadian case studies to explore the evolution of security planning: the October Crisis with an emphasis on Montreal (1970), the Asia Pacific Economic Cooperation summit in Vancouver (1997), and the 2010 Vancouver Winter Olympic Games. Each case represents a significant moment in Canadian security planning and provides insight into the shifting structure of Canada’s security apparatus. Furthermore, these cases offer a lens into the historical transformations of the Canadian ‘security state’.

While the issues and actions associated with these cases cut across local, national, and international scales, the impacts of security measures in each were mostly local and
urban. To show how Canadian urban spaces have been transformed and controlled by an evolving security framework, I argue that security planning must be understood as a form of urban planning, although one that remains to be properly acknowledged by the profession or even the academic discipline of planning. Given the democratic claims of liberal planning and its professed concern for the good city, it is therefore significant that the security measures studied in these case studies were implemented without democratic scrutiny but with significant consequences for urban experience. This dissertation tells a story of security planning in Canada, demonstrating how its practices have changed over time in ways that are at odds with liberal political values cherished by mainstream planning.
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Introduction:

URBAN SECURITY AND INSECURITY IN CANADA

The universal consequence of the crusade to secure the city is the destruction of any truly democratic space.


The city has always represented both the triumphs and the failures – and certainly the challenges – of democratic life.


Security practices have long influenced the shape of cities, but only in more recent times, and especially since the terrorist attacks on September 11, 2001, have such measures become more consequential in shaping the form and everyday life of cities (Gray & Wyly, 2007). As a result of this event, security is more front and centre in a global context. Many scholars and public officials have come to believe that urban responses to the perceived threat of terrorism have been lamentable. Some authors have focused on the negative impact of increased security measures in cities (Coaffee, 2004; Graham, 2004a; Marcuse, 2006; Savitch, 2008; Sorkin, 2008) while others have demonstrated that security measures are being justified at the great expense of civil liberties (Gregory & Pred, 2007; Weizman, 2007). While this critical scholarship has been insightful, few scholars have considered the context of Canada and the response of the Canadian state to various security crises. This research project investigates the history, practice and effects of urban security planning in Canada, focusing on how Canadian cities have been managed as a problem of security.
While this dissertation very briefly traces the roots of urban security to the founding of Canada’s first cities, the primary goal is to tell a story of Canadian security planning focused on three urban cases from the last 40 years: (1) the enactment of the War Measures Act and mobilization of the military to address the ‘October Crisis’ in Montreal in 1970; (2) the use of controversial security actions to counter protests against the Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation (APEC) Summit in Vancouver in 1997; and (3) the implementation of security plans throughout Vancouver as part of the 2010 Winter Olympic Games. While these cases have been and continue to be subject to extensive political debate, they collectively provoke larger geographical questions concerning the urban manifestations of concepts such as freedom, democracy and spatial control.

Addressing crime through urban design has become a popular mechanism to order an urban environment according to security principles. While somewhat intertwined with such discussions, this research specifically examines how politicians, urban officials, police, militaries, and other arms of government intervene in distinct periods of urban crisis or insecurity. Therefore, this project purposely leaves aside crime and focuses on the state’s interpretation of urban crises or events and its actions against politically motivated antagonists.

At the heart of my research is the city. Max Weber (1958) popularized the German quote, “the city air makes you free” and since then, many authors have employed the saying. The maxim alludes to the emancipatory quality of cities (Debord, 1983, p. 176) and the unhindered connections and exchanges that exist in the public spaces of cities (Sorkin, 1999, p. 4). But what this dissertation shows is that these qualities have never fully materialized. In other words, cities are faltering in providing the spaces for
freedom. As David Harvey (2006, p. 103) metaphorically suggests, the city air is a little polluted at the moment.

Even though these authors frame urbanity by the idea of freedom, Debord (1983) suggests that freedom has never been realized. As Sorkin (1999) and Harvey (2006) argue, the idea of freedom is constantly under attack by privatization and securitization, among other processes. In this project, I focus on the methods of securitization in three disparate case studies to show how Canadian urban spaces have been transformed and controlled by a shifting security framework. In other words, my project provides a unique geographical analysis by uncovering the significance of such events in the history of urban security planning in Canada.

As security becomes more embedded in the everyday spaces of city life, it is possible that the emancipatory qualities of cities will be further hindered. Therefore, the goal of this research is to carefully examine how the mechanisms of urban security planning during periods of crisis management highlight the contradictions that exist between the city as both a liberating and disempowering space.

**Research Questions**

Within the 40-year span of these case studies, security planning has continually transformed to address different threats and events. This history points to a process whereby increased security measures and new forms of social control have become more normalized in the everyday operation of cities. To move towards a deeper understanding of these dynamics, this project investigates how security planning not only reconfigures urban space during significant crises or events, but also influences planning practices and cities more generally.
This project is organized around five questions. First, what constitutes a problem of insecurity in each moment and how is it defined? Understanding the way a problem is conceptualized is crucial, for it informs how particular solutions or responses are shaped. In all three cases, I ask, what is the perceived threat that is driving the security planning?

The second question interrogates how security initiatives were carried-out in each case. Who were the actors involved in planning the security measures and how were these actors defining the problem of security? Key here is to critically examine the forms of rationality used to legitimize the technocratic solutions employed. In other words, how does the state operate as a security actor and how do its various components work together to shape and make sense of the city?

While the second question focuses on the security operations staged during each event, it also solicits an examination of the urban, the focus of the third question. What were the spatial and social implications of the security measures and how were fundamental qualities and concerns of planning and/or urban space (such as freedom, democracy, civil liberties, and mobility) co-opted or compromised?

Fourth, what has the state ‘learned’ from each scenario in terms of security and to what extent has this knowledge influenced the securitization of future urban threats? In many instances, certain forms of thought developed to address one problem migrate to address very different problems.

The final question addresses the intersection between security and planning. What are the implications for cities and the profession of planning when security planners play an influential role in planning the city during moments of crisis? This question explores the short-term and long-term consequences for everyday life when an entirely different
type of planning—one that is structured around a set of people, logics and expertise distinct from that of traditional planning—is left in charge of the city.

To illuminate some of the wider implications of security planning for the management of cities, I use my research findings to make the following three central arguments throughout the dissertation. First, I argue that there has been a tactical shift in policing over the course of the study period. Police forces seem to be moving towards more pre-emptive security practices rather than their more traditional role as a reactive profession. Second, I claim that security planners have become more spatially aware and more concerned with controlling urban spaces. Finally, security logic has become so powerful that simply deeming any conceivable threat to human safety as a security problem, allows security interventions without public debate. As such, this logic has legitimized an undemocratic process of planning.

This dissertation does not prescribe a new best practice for planning nor does it directly offer solutions to the problems caused by security planning. Rather, this project can be understood as a call to planners, the planning profession, and citizens more generally to become more aware of the influence of security on cities. My research also attempts to demonstrate that despite the perceived “temporary” nature of each crisis or event, there are lasting implications for cities and subsequent security crises. As I will show, temporary events allow the police and municipal authorities to acquire new technologies, tools and techniques of security that often remain part of a city’s security apparatus after the event. In other words, these events do not just begin and end punctually, but there is an enduring legacy of security that remains after each crisis. In most cases, the legacy is both symbolic and material. This project offers important
insights for the world of planning in terms of understanding the myriad ways that security practices are shaping urban life.

The Connection to Planning

Planning, according to the Canadian Institute of Planners (CIP), “means the scientific, aesthetic, and orderly disposition of land, resources, facilities and services with a view to securing the physical, economic and social efficiency, health and well-being of urban and rural communities” (Canadian Institute of Planners, n.d.). This definition privileges land use planning, as it attempts to demarcate an exclusive terrain for professional planning practice. Contrary to this narrow definition from the CIP, most planning scholarship recognizes planning as a diverse discipline, comprising a variety of actors and procedural theories. For example, Leonie Sandercock’s book Towards Cosmopolis (1998) clearly outlines the evolution of planning theory and identifies different models of planning practice. Models such as equity planning and communicative action, gesture toward a more collaborative type of planning that incorporates the voices of larger communities. But even beyond this still institutionalized form of planning, Sandercock (1998, p. 97) discusses a more radical planning model, where members of civil society carry out actions to contest hegemonic power structures (see Beard, 2003; Friedmann, 1987; Miraftab, 2009). In other words, planning is broader than just what happens at City Hall, or in professional planning firms.

Therefore, we must ask who is a planner, and what do they do? The most obvious candidates for the designation are those with professional planning degrees and who work in municipal and provincial departments bound by a set of regulations imposed by a governing body. But what about radical planners, activist planners, and all those who are
not employed within that institutionally defined world but are nevertheless working
toward transforming our cities? Do we consider a group of ‘guerilla gardeners’ to be
planners, when they occupy a disused space and arbitrarily turn it into a garden? If our
answer is affirmative, or we are at least open to the possibility, then it is also not a stretch
to consider security actors such as the police as planners.

While the role of civil society in community-based or radical planning is now a
well-established trope in the world of planning, this project aims to expand our
understanding of planning in the opposite direction by focusing on the state’s role in
shaping cities. In CIP’s brief discussion of the essence of planning, there is no mention of
urban security as it manifests through the actions of state officials, the police, the military
or other security related professionals. As such, CIP remains oblivious to this ‘other
world’ of planning, unlike even a moderately holistic standpoint that would include in a
definition of planning the sheer diversity of actors and agendas involved in the
production of urban space. As I have just outlined, planning scholarship recognizes the
myriad of planning actors at the grassroots level, but what about those state actors who
perform their jobs outside the conventional boundaries of professional planning?

Security planning actors are not bound by planning legislation or by a set of
principles imposed by CIP. They work within their own professional frameworks, with
different kinds of professional expertise. While these actors may not be considered
professional planners, some are engaged in the making and remaking of cities through
security practices. Planning may not be the full-time work of most police employees, but
in moments when they have to decide on how to permanently or temporarily deploy
surveillance technology, erect security barriers around certain buildings, or reconfigure
traffic patterns for security considerations, they become planners charged with planning particular spaces of cities.

Despite CIP’s oversight, planning and security are clearly linked. At the core of both urban planning and security planning lies a normative logic: improving the physical, social and economic make-up of the city. Security planning is especially concerned with ensuring that vital urban spaces are physically safe and that key systems of infrastructure are likewise shielded from danger and threat. By doing this, security planners can reassure the public that they are free to go about their daily activities without the fear of threat of danger or violence. This is what keeps people attending sporting or cultural events and using public transit. Finally, economic stability is dependent on safeguarding capital assets and maintaining the flows and circulation of people and commodities. Overall, planning and security are concerned with maintaining those processes that ensure a stable and productive society or what could be referred to as the ‘good’ society.

The normative solutions to planning problems are not without criticism. In *Planning Theory for Practitioners*, Brooks (2002) identifies five broad critiques of planning that come out of different schools of thought. He identifies one of his critiques as “Planning is Malevolent,” otherwise known as the ‘dark side of planning’ and attributes the development of this critique to scholars such as Oren Yiftachel. The critique suggests that “planning’s theoretical and professional discourse tends to concentrate on its contribution to well-established societal goals such as residential amenity, economic efficiency, social equity, or environmental sustainability,” ignoring “planning’s advancement of regressive goals such as social oppression, economic inefficiency, male domination, or ethnic marginalization” (Yiftachel, 1998, p. 395). While some planners
have made some commendable achievements, Yiftachel (1998, p. 400) shows how “the very same tools ostensibly introduced to assist social reform and improve people’s quality of life can be used to control and repress peripheral groups.” As such, planning can be linked to “state mechanisms of social control and oppression” (Ibid., p. 395). While I agree with this critique I want to push the argument a step further and suggest that there is a ‘dark side’ to planning, propagated by non-traditional planners, which is nevertheless having an impact on the urban environment.

The actors in this securitization process—politicians, bureaucrats, police officers, security professionals, and even soldiers—are working together in ways that have yet to be explored and properly understood, especially by those who subscribe to a narrow professional definition of planning such as the one proposed by CIP. These agencies dealing with security operate in the urban realm, with perspectives on the good city that may or may not align with those of traditionally or professionally trained planners. Even so, they are instrumental in the manipulation and organization of cities during times of crisis as much as ‘peace’.

Given this context, it is imperative that the study of planning not be restricted to the institutionalized practice of the profession. Security planning is also planning, only it is out of the hands of the traditional professional planner. From this perspective, state-regulated planning that focuses on changes to urban environments, whether they come from the traditional planner or the security professional, should be the object of critical scrutiny in the domain of planning broadly understood. By focusing solely on the traditional planner as part of our disciplinary inquiry, the ability of planners to understand how other actors have shaped cities is lost.
A second major descriptor of planning is the process. As CIP explains, “Planners employ diverse and thorough consultations as part of their research to ensure that as many voices as possible are heard and considered during the planning process.” The idea that the planner has a certain communicative role between the public, the state and private sector has become the dominant liberal planning model. This theory of planning practice, put forward by John Forester (1989) and reworked by countless other authors (see Fainstein, 2000; Healey, 1996; Innes, 1995), has become integrated into the everyday practice of planning in Canada. However, this narrow description of planning practice ignores the myriad ways that planning is practised outside the institutionalized boundaries of the profession. Nevertheless, the communicative action paradigm presents two possible avenues for understanding security planning.

First, rational comprehensive planning was the dominant framework for planning before the 1960s. It was a method of organizing space premised on expertise and logical decision-making done in the bureaucratically defined ‘best interest’ of the public (Sandercock, 1998). Davidoff’s (1965) classic critique of the rational form of planning posited that planning is not a neutral discipline but politically charged. He argued that planners needed to recognize this fact and advocate for those with less political power. In the following years, other planning theories came to expand upon Davidoff’s arguments, including equity planning (Krumholz & Forester, 1990) and communicative action (Forester, 1989; Healey, 1996; Innes, 1995). All have addressed the need to democratize rational planning by giving the public a stronger voice. In the case of security planning the rational comprehensive approach, characterized by expert guidance and the lack of consultation, still functions as the guiding framework. After the progress made
democratizing planning, the normative logic that frames the communicative action model helps to provide a critique of the security planning process as it is deployed in each case.

In contrast, it is possible to argue that the dominance of the communicative action model in liberal mainstream planning theory may not be effective at addressing the challenges of securitization and the militarized thinking of security planning. While the paradigm may be useful for providing a critique of the security planning process, it does not provide a remedy for it. For example, it is unlikely that security planning will become democratized and it may be unrealistic for planners to hope to do so—unless oppositional public opinion becomes a political force to be reckoned with. Until such time, we must come to an understanding of how space is produced outside the particular formation of professional planning and look at the broader array of forces responsible for the production of urban space (Huxley & Yiftachel, 2000). By asking “why things are the way they are” (Ibid., p. 337) it is possible to understand planning in terms of social control and security practices.

In sum, planning and security have similar disciplinary goals, which are rooted in a normative logic. But by examining planning from a narrowly defined institutionalized understanding of the practice, CIP ignores all the non-‘planners’ who transform the city while working within a different professional framework from that of traditional planning. Consequently, it is important to look beyond the planner as an actor approach, and examine the apparatus of planning defined by Michel Foucault (1980, p. 194) as “the relationships among a set of distinct elements such as professional discourses, governmental institutions, administrative procedures, regulatory laws, legal concepts, architectural forms and plans, scientific statements and moral proclamations” (as cited by
By acknowledging this, it is possible to examine the three case studies as planning predicaments where, more often than not, the key players were security professionals and state officials rather than actual city planners.

While the communicative action paradigm can illuminate some of the problems with the process of security planning, it does little to help us comprehend the effects of such a form of planning on the everyday life of cities. In other words, there is a whole other world of planning that has emerged in the last few decades that operates beyond the municipal building and according to a set of principles which are different from the way they are institutionally defined in the world of conventional planning. These people are doing planning outside the traditional formation of the discipline, so planning scholars must figure out a way to understand this other world. As a result, this dissertation can be understood as a cautionary tale about planning being larger than the way it is considered within the profession and by extension also the discipline.

Methodology

For this research I adopted a mixed method approach involving sustained archival research and in-depth interviews. For the October Crisis and APEC chapters, I relied more on archival documents, while interviews played a more critical role in the Vancouver Olympics. In all three cases, I made extensive use of media reports to provide a more comprehensive analysis. Archival documents provided a technical overview of the security planning for the first two events and also gave me insight into the political and social climate of the period in question. Since the Olympics were taking place during the time of my research, there was no archive of material to study. As such, I conducted interviews with several high profile individuals to obtain information and anecdotal
evidence regarding security planning. I also spent a significant amount of time in
Vancouver before, during and after the Olympics. The following section describes and
justifies each method.

Ottawa, Montreal, Quebec City and Vancouver were the primary locations for
research. While Ottawa was not the focus of any one case study, the National Archives
located in the Capital held the largest amount of material related to the October Crisis. In
addition, the involvement of the federal government and its subsidiary agencies involved
in state security (such as the RCMP, Department of National Defence, and Canadian
Security and Intelligence Service), meant that Ottawa was the site for part of the field
research. In terms of historical analysis, Montreal and Vancouver were largely
emphasized because a majority of significant Canadian security crises in the last century
have occurred in Quebec or British Columbia (For a source that makes this argument pre-
APEC see Kellet, 1995).

Case study research is one of the most common research methods used in
planning scholarship (Yin, 2003) and it provides an opportunity to explore a specific
context from many angles, using many methods (Bradshaw & Wallace, 1991). However,
this approach has long been criticized for its inability to generalize results beyond the
single case. But, Bent Flyvbjerg (2004) argues that using generalizations as the basis for
scientific research is overrated especially as it pertains to the social world.1 Furthermore,
Bradshaw and Wallace (1991) argue that generalizing case studies can contribute to the
oversimplification of an otherwise complex situation. They go on to suggest that case
studies can often fill a gap in theoretical knowledge, since the uniqueness of a particular

---

1 For a more complete defence of the case study method, see Flyvbjerg (2004).
case does not easily yield a theoretical conclusion. As such, this method can be useful for bringing to light new ideas and potential routes for further research (Markovitch & Hendler, 2006, p. 416).

Case study research can offer contextual analysis and can accommodate mixed-method approach involving a variety of data (Yin, 2003). Given the questions and themes I decided to address, the case study approach seemed like the ideal method for exploration. Especially in the context of urban securitization, analysis, according to Bernazzoli and Flint (2009, p. 450), should be contingent upon the temporal and spatial context. They also point out that studies of securitization should not “be examined in isolation. Rather, such studies must have an eye toward connectivity, always accounting for the relationships between seemingly disparate actors, events, and processes. Such an approach allows for analyzing how different forms of violence performed by different agents in different arenas are related” (Ibid., p.450). With this in mind, my research examines the connections between each case to show the shifting yet persistent connections between security and planning. In this study, “experiences and meanings are assumed to be largely bound to the time, people and setting” (Baxter & Eyles, 1997, p. 515). Therefore, my analysis of each case reflects on a distinct event, characterized by different actors, contexts, and modes of thinking and produces a representation of security events within the Canadian context rather than a generalizable theory of security planning.

**Stage One: Archives**

Archival research represents a major part of the primary data collected for this project, especially for the October Crisis and APEC chapters. Archival data provide
multiple levels of evidence from varying sources, help to uncover details and descriptions about events from different viewpoints, and offer a way to create historically accurate timelines. While archives can provide an extremely rich understanding of a case, there are some key problems and constraints with archival research. Moore (2010) argues that partiality—the way decisions are made on how to classify and preserve documents—is a key weakness with archival research. This means that some documents may be purposely or unintentionally destroyed, classified under vague categories, or restricted from public scrutiny. In this sense, researchers are bound by bureaucratic oversights or institutional restrictions. Other scholars have argued that the classification or absence of archival material is often motivated by social and political values, reflected by the power of the state (Kurtz, 2001; Ogborn, 2003). But Withers (2002, p. 305) does not see the archives as “a straightforward expression of power.” Rather, he sees it as an accumulation of material that may or may not have undergone careful state scrutiny. In other words, archives are limited, forcing researchers to follow a certain path, and making it impossible to provide a complete historical account of particular events. Therefore, we must recognize that interpretations of archival documents are influenced not only by their institutional history, but by the researchers who attempt “to reconstruct, restore, recover the past, to present and re-present stories of the past within [their own] narratives” (Bradley, 1999, p. 109).

In 2000, the governmental cabinet minutes from the October Crisis, which included material detailing security plans and decision-making processes, were released to the public. With the exception of William Tetley’s limited use of these documents in his 2007 book on the October Crisis and Michael Gauvreau’s (2009) use of the
documents in an article discussing the federal government’s psychological fight against FLQ terror, they remain untouched by scholars. In this research, I wanted to not only to understand how decisions were made about security during that time period, but I also wanted to uncover the urban dimensions of the Crisis. Hence, I was looking for specific evidence in the archives about this issue as a way to add a new dimension to an already expansive story. Some of the primary archival documents I consulted were policy reports, parliamentary records, security assessments, and multi-media material. Documents pertaining to APEC were mostly available through the University of British Columbia Archives and the City of Vancouver Archives.

When consulting archival documents, I consistently looked for evidence related to my research questions. My interviews—which I discuss below—were also structured in line with these questions. To analyze the archival and interview data, I coded my material according to themes derived from the research questions. Table 1 is an outline of the five main themes along with seven loosely defined sub-themes. For example, all material related to the theme of “threat” was coded with the number 1. A file was created for this theme and divided into the three case studies. Evidence that showed how the threat environment was understood during each time period was placed in the appropriate file with the accurate reference. The same thing was done with the more loosely defined sub-themes. These themes represented findings that did not necessarily speak precisely to my research questions, but were nevertheless crucial to the narrative and the overall analysis.

To organize all my material, I used Scrivener, a word-processing program for managing large writing projects. This software facilitates the management of notes, research data, and thoughts, within a multi-layered interface. This program became a
useful tool for organizing my data and linking it with my analysis and interpretations. For example, for each case study I created a new Scrivener document. Each document was divided into four layers: draft, notes, secondary data, and primary data. The secondary and primary data sections were sub-divided according to the twelve analytical themes and I could display all of the themes on a ‘corkboard’ if I needed to look at the broader picture or make connections between different items. This program simplifies the organization of data by allowing sections of writing to be highlighted, coded and linked to other parts of the document. Overall, Scrivener was a beneficial tool not only for analyzing and organizing my data, but also for simplifying the draft writing process.

Table 1
Framework for the analysis of data.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Central Themes</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Threat</td>
<td>What are the threats and how are they defined as a problem of security/insecurity?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Security</td>
<td>How was the security apparatus expanded, and how were the security measures rationalized?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Impact</td>
<td>How was the urban environment transformed? Ie: silencing of politics; new forms of spatial and social control.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Legacy</td>
<td>What are some of the long-term legacies of the security planning?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Planning</td>
<td>What is security planning, how is this a planning predicament and is their an impact on the traditional planning profession?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-Themes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6 Scale of the urban environment and the event.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Public space and the tension between public and private.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Perceptions and senses of security and insecurity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Reactive to pro-active.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Civil liberties.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Knowledge transfer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Political dimensions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I also made extensive use of newspapers and other periodical sources held in the University of Toronto’s library system and at the various archives I visited. Media stories
helped shed light on popular perceptions of security crises in Canada as they unfolded on a day-to-day basis, and revealed key modes of discourse for defining these crises in spatial terms.

**Access to Information**

Obtaining governmental documents related to security operations is a difficult task. Throughout the course of my research, I submitted several “Access to Information and Privacy” (ATIP) requests. When the ATIP Act became law in 1983, it was considered to be revolutionary for security research (Hannant, 1993). Even though it established a more open process for acquiring public documents, it also created new roadblocks and strict criteria for accessing information.

Access to security and intelligence files “is the epitome of the conflict over freedom of information in a democracy: it reflects, on the one hand, the gravest fears about the capacity of the secret state to pry into the personal lives of its citizens and, on the other hand, officialdom’s most serious worries about the dangers of disclosure of sensitive information” (Leigh, 1997, p. 126). There are three major exemptions written into the law: 1) material that would prejudice law enforcement, or security, defence or international relations; 2) material received in confidence from other governments or states; and 3) personal details about individuals. Essentially, “information is exempted where its disclosure could reasonably be expected to be injurious to the conduct of international affairs, the defence of Canada or of any state allied or associated with Canada, or to the detections, prevention or suppression of subversive or hostile activities” (Ibid., p. 129). The government is required by law to provide a reason why a document
has not been disclosed, but it is not required by law to provide reasons why sections of a document have been redacted.

Another ambiguity in the act is that some sections are purposely written to be open for interpretation. McDonnell, (2000, p. 231) argues that the purpose of such sections is “to protect the government and create impenetrable obstacles for researchers who want to uncover information on security issues.” For example, any document that falls within the broad and vague spectrum of “national security” can be withheld from the public. Even though appeals can be made to the Privacy Commissioner and then to federal court, this can be a lengthy process.

The fact that so many documents are now classified as restricted in light of the threat of terrorism has led Onsrud (2003, p. 207) to argue that restricting access “to geographic and related data actually may jeopardize rather than increase homeland security.” Nevertheless, I do not believe that these restrictions significantly hindered my ability to perform my research. While many documents were redacted, making them difficult to follow, I often found the same document in another file, released by a different department, un-redacted. This suggests there is a discrepancy in the way ATIP standards are enforced across departments. The only roadblock I encountered involved my request for “Urban Domain” security planning documents for the Olympics. I requested these files after the Games, but my request was denied. Nevertheless, I was able to discuss urban domain planning with several officers during my interviews.

Stage Two: Interviews
I conducted ten interviews, roughly one hour in length, with the highest-ranking individuals in the security planning hierarchy within the major police forces, the
Canadian Security Intelligence Service (CSIS), and the City of Vancouver. These conversations were complemented by six interviews—also roughly one hour in length—I conducted with planners, activists and civil rights lawyers. Given the limited access to security planning documents, interviews were a critical means of exploring how and why security was planned from the perspective of those involved in the planning and those monitoring it. Furthermore, interviews are considered one of the most useful ways of uncovering decision making-processes (Miles & Huberman, 1994). As such, the interviews helped illuminate how the security planning process unravelled for the Olympics.

The interviews were semi-structured and were organized around specific topics and questions. The semi-structured interview format allowed for spontaneous questioning in the form of probing questions, indirect questions and interpretative questions. While I had to adapt my questions to the interview participant because some of my pre-formulated questions were not applicable to each participant, the script remained relatively consistent over the 16 interviews. Furthermore, this interview technique ensured that the most crucial questions were addressed and created some leeway for unforeseen information to emerge. The questions were formed in relation to my research questions set out at the beginning of this chapter. (For a list of sample questions, see appendix A).

To begin, I purposely sampled individuals I knew were involved in security planning for the Olympics. From media reports, I was able to determine the key players, and I searched for their contact information online. Purposive sampling is a strategic way of identifying people who are relevant to one’s research questions (Bryman, 2001, pp.
I sent out several requests for interviews and my response rate was more positive than negative. Declines came from one RCMP officer who was also involved in APEC, two members of the Department of National Defence involved in Olympic security activities, two members of the Vancouver Police—one who retired following the Olympics and the other who was simply too busy—and one civil servant at Transport Canada involved in transportation planning during the Olympics.

I conducted my first interviews in November 2009 before the Olympics and the remainder of my interviews in Spring 2010, after the Olympics. The purpose of these interviews was to access a certain type of knowledge from ‘experts’ that may not have been available elsewhere. These informants provided first-hand interpretations of events and provided insight into “the behaviour and policy of their organization in a particular context” (Lindsay, 1997, p. 35). I used snowball sampling to contact people I would not otherwise have identified and I used theoretical saturation to ensure that the number of interviews I conducted was both manageable and adequate. Since all my interviews were with key informants, a pattern quickly emerged where I noticed many of the same stories and issues being repeated by different individuals. All interviews were recorded and transcribed for further analysis.

Introduction to the Case Studies

The dissertation is organized around three case studies, each of which is presented in a single chapter. In the following section I summarize the context surrounding each case.
The October Crisis

On October 5th, 1970 a major crisis was initiated by the kidnapping of British Trade Commissioner James Richard Cross. He was taken hostage from his home by members of a clandestine organization known as the Front de libération du Québec (FLQ). James Richard Cross was somewhat of a random victim; few people knew who he was. Nevertheless, the FLQ used the hostage in attempt to blackmail the federal government into ceding to several demands. For days, the negotiations were stagnant. The government was not willing to compromise; meanwhile the Quebec population was becoming increasingly restless. Some started openly advocating for the government to negotiate, while others started to mobilize to support the FLQ, at least politically. The government finally gave into one of the FLQ’s demands and read the FLQ manifesto over radio and television. The manifesto served to galvanize the population and led many Quebecers to identify with the FLQ cause. On October 10th, a second kidnapping took place. This time, Pierre Laporte, the Minister of Labour and Immigration of Quebec, was abducted outside his suburban home. The crisis had suddenly escalated.

The Montreal Police and the Sûreté du Québec (Provincial Police) were over-extended in their quest to find the kidnappers and maintain overall security, which led Quebec’s political leaders to request the assistance of the military on October 15th. Members of the Canadian Armed Forces were deployed to protect government buildings, strategic spaces and political figures in Ottawa, Montreal and Quebec City, allowing the police to dedicate more resources to finding the kidnappers. After one day, these searches had gone nowhere, leading the government to declare a “state of apprehended insurrection” and invoke the War Measures Act on October 16th. The legislation effectively suspended the Bill of Rights, giving sweeping powers to the police to perform
searches and arrests without a warrant, and to detain persons for days without immediate charge. The following day Pierre Laporte was murdered. On November 6th, one of Laporte’s kidnappers was arrested and the rest were arrested on December 28th. The Cross kidnappers were discovered in their hideout in the North of Montreal on December 3 and given safe passage to Cuba in exchange for the release of Mr. Cross.

The presence of the military occupying the streets of Ottawa, Montreal and Quebec City remains one of the most potent images when recalling the October Crisis. The military aimed to protect the same spaces the FLQ targeted in bombing campaigns throughout the 1960s: the symbolic spaces of Anglophone (British, American and English Canadian) imperialism, culture and economic hegemony. During the crisis, this symbolic terrain became increasingly securitized, culminating in the enactment of the War Measures Act and the deployment of the military in the name of civilian. The security planning for this event manifested itself in the form of spatial and social control, and while the October Crisis had underlying nationalist tones, it was at the urban scale, and more particularly in Montreal, where the conflict was contested.

The APEC Summit

In November of 1997, Canada hosted the APEC summit in Vancouver. This was to become Canada’s largest security operation to date and was an important precursor to the enormous security preparations made during subsequent global summits in many cities. The parts of Vancouver where delegates would be present became fortified enclaves, and routes in and out of the city were continually blocked for the safe passage of motorcades. The largest controversy during the event was the Prime Minister’s decision to host the APEC Economic Leader’s Summit (AELM) on the picturesque
University of British Columbia (UBC) campus. A scenic location for the AELM was a tradition at previous APEC Summits, but hosting the event on a university campus presented a major problem for security planners.

What resulted was one of Canada’s most significant clashes between police and protesters. Thousands of people congregated on the UBC campus to protest a number of issues, including human rights abuses in certain APEC member countries. The presence of then President Suharto of Indonesia was the most controversial, but the Canadian authorities ensured that he would be shielded from protesters. During the AELM, police erected a security perimeter to keep demonstrators at a distance and out of sight from the event. The first march of the day resulted in part of the fence coming down and the deployment of pepper spray to contain the crowds. Later in the day, police used excessive force to remove protesters from one of the exit points of the AELM. Looking at the case more carefully, however, it appears as though political authorities interfered in the security operations for questionable reasons and that police unlawfully tried to suppress the expression of dissent. Following APEC, there was a public inquiry into the actions of the RCMP during the summit, which resulted in several recommendations for the future of security planning in Canada. These will be discussed in greater detail in Chapter 3.

Following APEC, similar manifestations of this sort of conflict between security forces and protesters emerged in cities around the world where brute force was used against mostly peaceful anti-globalization protesters. In every case, urban spaces became symbolic sites of contestation and oppression.
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This was one of the findings from the public inquiry to be discussed in Chapter 3.
The Vancouver Winter Olympic Games
From February 12 to 28, 2010, Vancouver-Whistler was host to the 21st Olympic
Winter Games. Canada welcomed approximately 2600 athletes from 82 different
countries along with thousands of tourists, coaches, and Olympic officials. Hosting an
Olympic Games requires years of planning and billions of dollars. Besides infrastructure
improvements, security represents a large portion of Olympic spending. Large-scale
events such as the Olympics have become increasingly concerned with security issues
since the Munich games in 1972, when 11 members of the Israeli Olympic delegation
were murdered by a clandestine Palestinian organization known as Black September.
Following 9/11, security provisions have only intensified and the Olympic Games have
actually become showcases and testing grounds for security expertise (Bennett &
Haggerty, 2011). Security for the Vancouver Olympics exceeded the cost and alterations
to space of any previous security operation in Canada. Driving the security planning for
the games was the unlikely threat of terrorism and the more likely threat from disruptive
protests. Parking was restricted, venues were delimited with fencing, and police were
deployed throughout the city.

Terrorism never proved to be a significant threat to the Games but it was always
the overarching benchmark for security plans. The mounting opposition was actually
more of a concern for authorities, and security planners were well prepared to address
domestic protest. Several demonstrations took place over the course of the Games, most
occurring in the first few days. All protests were peaceful save for the “heart attack”
march on the first full day of Olympic competition, when several people littered the street
with newspaper boxes and smashed the windows of the Hudson Bay Company, one of
the Games official sponsors. This protest was met with a level of force and intimidation
unprecedented in Canadian history, suggesting that $1 billion in security resulted in an enormous build up of the security apparatus.

**Rationale for the Case Studies**

The cases chosen for this dissertation are not random events, but rather watershed moments in the world of security planning in Canada. The October Crisis was the first time the WMA was invoked during peacetime in Canada. Also, just prior to the Crisis, the Canadian military was significantly transformed, partly to address the rise of political and social turmoil in urban environments. The case of APEC was significant for two primary reasons. First, clashes between police and protesters received significant attention from the media. As a result, security for economic summits was increasingly enhanced at all subsequent events. Second, the re-organization of public space for security purposes was front and centre at the event. The territorialisation of security on such a large scale was uncommon at this point in time, but has since become a crucial aspect of security planning. Thus, APEC in Vancouver was a catalyst both for increased event security and for security practices that are more spatially defined. The final case study on the Vancouver Olympics uses a contemporary moment to show how the security apparatus has transformed over the course of the last four decades. It was the most expensive security operation ever undertaken in Canada and it set a precedent for the future of security planning for mega-events in Canada. All the ‘best practices’ learned over the years were implemented for the Olympics and were subsequently adapted to the security framework for the G20 in Toronto just four months later.

While the nature of each event is quite different—the October Crisis was a response to political turmoil; APEC was an economic summit; the Vancouver Olympics
was a sporting event—they all represent watershed moments in the evolution of security planning in Canada. Both the October Crisis and APEC were followed by public inquiries into the security actions, which had led to significant alterations to the security apparatus and recommendations for the future of security planning. Even though no public inquiry followed the Olympic security operation, the lessons learned from previous events were standardized and enhanced as part of the most comprehensive security plan ever conducted in Canada. Ultimately, this research traces the emergence and expansion of a complex set of security practices and ‘logics’ over the last forty years. Taken as a whole, the case studies show a move towards increased integration between security actors and a growing hegemony of pre-emptive expertise as a method of securitization. The cases also reveal the advent of a somewhat new form of planning, which sits not only outside the traditional planning bureaucracy, but shifts the responsibility of policing and security away from the democratic apparatus as well. In each moment, there was something significant happening and this dissertation highlights the continuities and discontinuities of the security apparatus over time.

Outline of the Dissertation
Before launching into the first case study, Chapter 1, “Planning a Securitized World,” considers some of the key themes and concepts driving this project. I begin this chapter by outlining a brief history of security planning in cities. This section demonstrates that cities have long been planned according to security principles and that planning has often been used as a tool to control populations or create defensible spaces. Following this discussion, I examine the dialectic of public space to show how the process of securitization conflicts with the emancipatory qualities of cities. I then explain
how the term security is understood throughout this dissertation. Michel Foucault’s emphasis on planning at the beginning of his lectures compiled in *Security, Territory, Population*, helps establish a clear and concise framework for understanding the various facets of a security apparatus. As Giulianotti and Klauser (2010, p. 58) point out, security planning comprises “a complex assemblage of social control mechanisms,” something the work of Foucault helps to analyze. As part of this exploration, I also present a critique of the concept of ‘balance’, which suggests that equilibrium must be found between freedom and security. The chapter concludes with a brief look at a history of security crises in Canada as a way to set up the subsequent case study chapters.

Chapter 2, “The Urban Contours of the October Crisis,” begins with an examination of the socio-economic context of Quebec prior to the October Crisis, focusing particularly on the contrast between the Quiet Revolution, which started around 1960, and the period preceding it. Through this discussion, the reasons for the political turbulence of the 1960s become apparent. In response to rising instability, the Canadian security state was reconfigured in preparation for an urban insurrection. However, when the October Crisis erupted, the state turned to some of the most extreme measures of repressive security to manage the crisis. While the spatial awareness of the police and the Canadian government lacked sophistication, this case serves to frame security planning as an urban problem.

By the time of APEC, security practices became more spatially focused. Chapter 3, “Setting a New Course: How Security Triumphed Over Freedom at APEC” examines the effects of a more spatially circumscribed security framework on practices of democratic dissent. To do this, I study the role of the actors (police, politicians,
dignitaries, protesters, and university administrators) involved in the event and I use the subsequent public inquiry into APEC police activities to suggest that the affair marks a turning point in the planning and management of security for major urban events in Canada.

Chapter 4, “Rationalizing Security Planning for the 2010 Vancouver Olympics” investigates how security operations were planned before the event, what their impact was during the event and what their lasting impact was after the event. This chapter demonstrates how several tools used in the previous case studies were reworked and deployed in new ways during the Olympics. I also show that the security measures were legitimized, not through a democratic process, but by relying on the exceptional nature of the Olympics to make secretive and hidden decisions about security plans.

In the conclusion, I briefly present a new case study, the 2010 G20 Summit in Toronto, as way to exhibit the transferability and continuation of security planning from one event to another and to demonstrate the ongoing transformation of the Canadian security apparatus. The use of this new case helps to reinforce some of the key arguments made throughout the dissertation, to which I return in the conclusion.

The value in this empirical research lies in the examination of three different case studies, each of which is defined by a unique political, geographical and temporal context. By focusing on the links between each case, it is possible to “identify and unmask ways in which it [the securitization of society] is continuously reworked, reconfigured, and reproduced” (Bernazzoli & Flint, 2009, p. 450). But while the structure of the security apparatus and the method of planning differs from case to case, the goal of security planning remains unwavering: to find a balance between freedom and the need to
protect other state concerns. Critiquing such attempts to achieve this balance, Mitchell (2003, p. 80) suggests that the right to say almost anything is protected but that this provision does not ensure the right to be heard. I will now turn to a more thorough discussion of these themes.
On 19 February 2009, Barack Obama came to Ottawa on his first official international visit as President of the United States. When an American President arrives in Canada’s Capital, the downtown core is transformed. Buses are re-routed, streets are closed off, and barriers proliferate throughout the public spaces of the city. Over the course of three days, Ottawa was transformed into a security fortress with thousands of makeshift barricades lining the streets, snipers in helicopters and on top of strategic buildings and bulletproof glass encasing the front entrance to the Parliament buildings. The seeming ease by which the city was securitized is perhaps a result of careful urban planning over the years.\footnote{While more research is needed on the issue, the plan for Ottawa’s ceremonial parade route was partially implemented in 2000 and completed in 2006. Since this is the route most foreign dignitaries take to enter the capital, the designs for this route likely adhere to strict security guidelines.}

Understanding cities in terms of security has become increasingly integral to urban management. This chapter begins with an overview of how security practices have a long history of shaping cities. The second part of this chapter will explore the intellectual principles, themes, and concepts that frame the overall project and drive the more empirical discussions found in the subsequent case study-based chapters. First, I will explain what I mean by the term 
\textit{security} and 
\textit{security apparatus}. Second, I will discuss the relationship between freedom and security and question whether a ‘balance’ can be found between the two forces. Freedom is both an enabler of and a hindrance for security. Similarly, security is used to ‘guarantee’ freedom while it can also severely
circumscribe or restrict it. Since the focus of this dissertation is on the security planning involved in ordering and regulating urban environments, this discussion is central to my analysis. The chapter concludes by situating the case studies within a more specific history of urban security in Canada.

The Historical Link Between Planning and Security

Long before planning emerged as an institutional and scientific practice in the late 19th century, security was a key component of the design of cities and settlements. Coaffee, Murakami Wood, and Rogers (2009) and Graham (2011) devote sections of their respective books to the history of security and securitization in cities. Their breadth of historical detail will not be matched in this chapter, but it is important to highlight the key historical conjunctures as they relate to planning.

While many authors have argued for planning as an emancipatory tool (Clavel, 1986; Davidoff, 1965; Friedmann, 1973), there is nevertheless a long history of spatial planning used as an instrument of social control (Sorkin, 2008). For example, fortified cities were planned with watchtowers and large walls as a way to monitor and control the space within the walls and to protect citizens from outside violence (Mumford, 1961).

One of the major concerns of many states in the nineteenth century was urban riots and insurrections. Hobsbawm (2005) argues that urban form can facilitate insurrections and that planning urban environments to address the potential of an uprising can play an important role in thwarting civil unrest. Baron Georges-Eugène Haussmann’s 19th-century redesign of Paris demonstrated how deliberate planning could facilitate easier military manoeuvrings in the urban landscape in response to insurrections in the more revolutionary neighbourhoods of a city (Harvey, 2003; Misselwitz & Weizman, 2003;
Scott, 1998). Haussmann ordered the destruction of many politically charged
neighbourhoods in Paris to make way for large boulevards. Not only were these roads
meant to improve circulation, they provided ample space for military processions and
provided authorities with better access to certain quarters of the city where civil unrest
was common.

The changing conditions that made urban life prosper or perish “had to be known
in precise detail in order to plan for the population of the city” (Rabinow, 2003, p. 360).
By the end of the 19th-century, spatial planning in countries like Germany and England
had become a tool for “political control based on a scientific understanding of society”
(Ibid., p. 361) and it was in colonial cities that planning and the force of the warring state
reached its apotheosis.

Many authors have examined the use of planning and urban design by France in
its colonial contexts in Morocco (Abu-Lughod, 1980; Rabinow, 1997; Wright, 1991),
Algeria (Çelik, 1997; Misselwitz & Weizman, 2003) and Vietnam (Wright, 1991). France
used its colonial cities to experiment with geographical ways of imposing urban order
and to determine the political effectiveness of certain plans (Rabinow, 2003, p. 353). In
particular, the city of Algiers was seen as a laboratory for French planners to test spatial
plans before applying them to other colonies or to cities in France (Çelik, 1997). Cities in
Morocco were also seen as laboratories. The first comprehensive urban planning
legislation in the French-speaking world was imposed on Morocco in 1914 (Rabinow,
1997, p. 290). The French also manipulated urban environments in their colonial outposts
to impose social and spatial segregation between natives and European settlers (Abu-
Lughod, 1980; Wright, 1991). Frantz Fanon (1963, p. 40), describes this imposed
segregation as a “violence which has ruled over the ordering of the colonial world” and served to erase and even destroy native customs and social forms. While primarily ‘experimental’, colonial planning was clearly used to pacify populations and control territory for the purpose of securing the economic interests of European settlers and companies.

In trying to establish a model for modern urban society in these colonial cities, planning became an instrument of state power. According to Boyer (1983, pp. 14–15), planning requires “constant supervision and disciplinary correction from the centralized political authority,” and therefore planning had “to become institutionalized at the state level” if it was going to become an effective control mechanism. Therefore, Harvey (1985, p. 176) argues, the role of the planner as a state actor is to

contribute to the process of social reproduction and that in so doing the planner is equipped with powers vis-à-vis the production, maintenance, and management of the built environment which permit him or her to intervene in order to stabilize, to create the conditions for “balanced growth,” to contain civil strife and factional struggles by repression, cooptation, or integration.

In other words, Harvey sees planning not only as a way to maintain the capitalist system, but also as a tool for preventing or at least limiting unrest.

Planning can also be understood as a device for creating the conditions for security. For example, the destructive forces of aerial bombing on cities during World War II led governments, planners and even architects to develop spatially defined defensive strategies into the future of city building (Hewitt, 1983). French Architect Le Corbusier believed that his urban planning vision, based primarily on building large towers set in parkland, would ensure cities were less vulnerable to aerial bombing (Graham, 2004b). With the onset of the Cold War prospect of nuclear warfare, physical
planning took precedence over social planning, as urban vulnerability became a priority in the face of a new threat (Light, 2002). In response to this looming threat, a strategy known as defensive dispersal was promoted across the United States. The goal was to decentralize the large and dense urban conglomerations, thereby reducing the risk of casualties in the event of an atomic or nuclear strike (Dudley, 2001; Galison, 2001). One way the US government enabled this was by passing the Federal-Aid Highway Act in 1956, more popularly known as the Interstate and Defense Highways Act, which created a system of highways across the country. While this story is more complicated than I have room to discuss, this example shows how the perception of insecurity advanced a form of spatial planning that sought to radically alter the shape of cities.

By the 1950s, years of segregation and systemic racism had created conditions for civil unrest in many American cities. Instead of addressing some of the structural constraints, the ‘urban crisis’ was framed by the US Government “as a national security crisis” (Light, 2002, p. 609). Such framing “transformed urban problems into strategic challenges to be met through techniques and technologies of command, control, communication, intelligence, surveillance and reconnaissance” (Ibid.). As a result, military professionals were recruited to work as advisors to urban management (Light, 2002). The break-out of violence in American cities created the justification for new “technically sophisticated” approaches to urban planning offered by the defence industry, such as techniques and technologies of control and surveillance (Light, 2002, 2003, 2004). After many failed urban renewal schemes in the United States, the profession of planning had come under much criticism, and by the 1960s, as Jennifer Light’s extensive research shows, integrating military technical expertise into professional planning seemed
like an ideal method since both professions dealt with the control of space. Defence institutions had essentially capitalized on a new market and have continued to influence urban development and city life ever since.

By the 1970s, there was a shift in attitude towards crime—particularly in the United Kingdom and the United States—that led governments to pursue a more hard-line ‘law and order’ approach to urban management (Hall et al., 1978). At this time, a technique of planning known as “Crime prevention through environmental design” (CPTED) became a popular tool for addressing ‘undesirable’ behaviour (S. Cohen, 1985; Jeffrey, 1971; O. Newman, 1972). Given the political and social turbulence in many European and North American cities in the 1960s, planners and governments sought new ways to order urban environments and stem the decline of central neighbourhoods. It was assumed that understanding principles of defence could lead to better planning and safer spaces. This method, developed mostly by criminologists and sociologists, emphasized the idea of a spatial fix to crime and ignored many larger social problems. Nevertheless, CPTED principles have since become an essential element in many planning or redevelopment projects.

Many of these methods of controlling and ordering the urban environment have been reworked and reconfigured to suit the contemporary city. For example, the urban fortress method, aptly labelled “citadelization” by Marcuse (2004), has become a common practice for isolating and protecting high-profile spaces and buildings from security threats. Coaffee’s (2004) detailed account of how the central city of London has been securitized in response to years of Irish Republican Army bombings presents one of the clearest and dramatic examples of this form of planning. Obstructions such as blast
walls, Jersey barriers, and bollards have become permanent fixtures around government buildings, and embassies, and other commercial establishments as part of a range of anti-terrorism security measures. These measures rework the urban environment in a way that restricts access to public spaces and hinders freedom of movement (Boddy, 2008; Coaffee, 2004; Graham, 2004a; Marcuse, 2004, 2006; Savitch, 2008).

Essentially, the use of spatially restrictive security measures can represent a form of exclusionary zoning whereby the nature and use of public space is altered. Security concerns have perpetuated the increasing privatization of public space (Németh & Hollander, 2010), while in other cases, such as gated communities, exclusionary planning is premised on security principles (Blakely & Snyder, 1997; Low, 2003). For the spaces of the city that remain nominally public, surveillance technology and other forms of public surveillance have become the dominant form of security (Lyon, 2004). The amplified prevalence of surveillance networks means that the public is being increasingly monitored by armed guards, security cameras and identification checks (Graham & Wood, 2003; Lyon, 2004; Sorkin, 2004). According to Whyte and MacDonald (1989, p. 37) surveillance is problematic because it is “the indirect application of power…where power becomes silent, where it ceases to reveal itself in an open and engaged fashion, the mantle is passed; the legal regime is supplanted by another.” In a liberal democracy, it is unlikely that the securitization of space would become so prolific if the state had not emphasized and possibly exaggerated a particular threat.

As I discuss further in Chapter 3, another type of fear to emerge in recent decades stems from the anti-globalization protests of the 1990s and 2000s (see D’Arcus, 2006; Epstein & Iveson, 2009; Ericson & Doyle, 1999; Herbert, 2007; Warren, 2004). As a
response, police in cities around the world have acquired increased tactical power and
developed new methods of crowd control to manage protests surrounding global
economic summits. Tackling protests by means of increased methods of securitization
undermines the democratic nature and use of public space (Warren, 2004). According to
Sorkin (2008) every new security intervention continues to test the boundaries of how far
this type of spatial control can progress.

As security increasingly permeates urban planning agendas, Gray and Wyly
(2007, p. 330) remark that:

In American cities, more and more aspects of everyday life and death now take
place in the shadow of horror and fear, sustained by the manufactured certainty of
uncertainty in an endless American war on terror. A culture of intensified (yet
routine and almost mundane) militarization now pervades daily life in America’s
roster of world cities. In turn, the militarization of urban life helps to reinforce the
widespread perception of a new urban vulnerability, providing popular support in
America for the expansion of old and new campaigns of horror and war elsewhere
in the global urban system.

The fears of atomic warfare that characterized the Cold War have been replaced by fear
of terrorism in the post-9/11 era. Given the information provided by politicians and
circulated through the media, it can be assumed that the threat of terrorism is only
‘temporary’. Yet, as Graham (2011, p. 60) points out, “new military ideologies of
permanent and boundless war are radically intensifying the militarization of urban life.”
While Graham uses the term militarization, I prefer the use of securitization. Bernazzoli
and Flint (2009, p. 449) argue that securitization is a more open term that allows for an
analysis of “different forms of violence without assuming an a priori separation of
military and society” (449). Civilian life has long been influenced by military
imperatives (Virilio, 1986) and there are plenty of studies that demonstrate this (See
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2 Bernazzoli and Flint are taking up an argument put forth by Deborah Cowen at the 2009 AAG conference.
Cowen, 2008; Light, 2003; Woodward, 2004). Therefore, cities were never non-militarized spaces; their social and cultural landscapes have always been influenced by military doctrine, technology, and knowledge. But to come back to Graham’s crucial point, the permanent state of war or uncertainty—the idea that there is a perpetual enemy always looking to attack—has led to and legitimized the securitization of cities based on militarized techniques and technologies of managing space. Current trends to securitize urban environments in the face of terrorism or protest are just the latest manifestation of this longer history.

Despite changing perceptions of threats to cities, security remains the governing logic and has, according to Giorgio Agamben (1997, p. 1) been “the basic principle of state politics” since “the birth of the modern state.” If this is indeed the case, then planning, understood by Yiftachel (1998, p. 395) as the practice of implementing spatial public policies, is controlled and influenced by the security framework of the modern state. As I have just described, security has often played an integral part in the development of cities. It is as much about protecting people as it is about ensuring a system or order and circulation continues to operate. But despite this dual aspect of security, Graham (2011, p. xxi–xxii) “wonders whether urban securitization might reach a level in the future which would effectively decouple the strategic economic role of cities as the key drivers of capital accumulation from their historic role as centres for the mobilization of democratic dissent.” In this project, I focus on the democratic aspects of cities and show how limits placed on the spaces for protest represent a systematic transformation in the securitization of cities. The next section will elaborate on this point and discuss the key themes and concepts driving this research.
The Dialectic of Public Space

While cities have long been defined in terms of security and insecurity, the emancipatory potential of urban spaces has persisted. In 2011, cities around the world became charged with political energy. Even in the most authoritarian regimes of the Middle East and North Africa, people took to the streets and public squares to demand regime change. As the success of this “Arab Spring” was televised across the world, another movement called Occupy Wall Street emerged in North America. People in cities across the US and eventually elsewhere in the world, physically occupied public spaces to challenge—among other issues—growing socio-economic inequalities. In both these cases, mobilizing a common voice was greatly facilitated by technological advancements and the proliferation of social media. But if 2011 showed us anything, it was the continued political importance of public space.

Michael Sorkin (1999, p. 4) claims that the multiple exchanges occurring every day in the public spaces of cities make them the privileged places for the politics of freedom. He goes on to assert that the city embodies the idea of freedom itself; the freedom to exchange contrary ideas and opinions is key for fostering a healthy democracy. But this dissertation is not really a story about the emancipatory and political potential of public space. Rather, this is a story about the way these spaces are defined, controlled and restricted by state authorities. Public space has not always been a bastion of democratic utopianism. As D’Arcus (2006, p. 17) explains, “Where the state intruded too heavily in regulating the conditions of public debate and interaction, or where private market interests had too much influence in the public sphere, democracy suffered.” While Mitchell (2003, p. 51) acknowledges the emancipatory potential of public spaces, he points out that, “public space has long been a place of exclusion, no matter how much
democratic ideology would like to argue otherwise.” Only those who conducted themselves in rational and orderly ways could debate and express opinions in the “democratic” public sphere. All others—especially women, children, racialized people, and the poor—have a history of exclusion and have ironically had to take to public spaces to argue for their inclusion (Mitchell, 2003).

Thus, the sustained need for public space as an enabler of social movements has meant that governments continually try to redefine how such spaces are planned and managed. Many new urban regeneration strategies throughout the world have taken a disciplinary approach to planning, where public space is either privatized, absent, or fortified and where democratic decision making is negligible (Campanella, 2008; Coaffee & Murakami Wood, 2006). These strategies are often coupled with new surveillance technologies and urban designs that try to prevent or deter crime, terrorism and anti-social behaviour (Fussey, 2007; Raco, 2003). In countries like the United States and the United Kingdom, there are a plethora of formerly public spaces, which have been privatized and are now strictly regulated (Németh & Hollander, 2010). During mega-events or economic summits, areas for protest have become severely circumscribed and located at a significant distance from venue sites. In other words, Graham’s speculation that the securitization of cities would diminish the role of urban space as a forum for democratic dissent is becoming more tangible in the everyday management and experience of cities.

Despite the expanding influence of security on cities, there is still the possibility for public debate and discourse. The world of security planning is not perfect, and as I will show in each case study, there are gaps in the plans, often leaving room for
resistance. The continual integration and coordination between security agencies and the growing power of the logics and expertise associated with this form of planning may not always pre-empt the threats or challenges being addressed. As such, it is crucial to acknowledge the limits of security at certain junctures and to clarify from the outset what security is, or can do, and what it is not, or cannot do.

Towards an Understanding of Security

In basic terms, security is conventionally understood as the “condition of being protected, free from danger, safety” (Der Derian, 1995, p. 28). More specifically, Waever (1995, p. 47) suggests that security denotes some kind of threat-defence relationship, one in which the state plays a central role. For my project, security planning is understood as the reactionary and precautionary measures taken by state authorities to address a crisis/emergency, or to prevent the possibility of a disruptive incident such as an insurrection or a terrorist act.

To begin, we must understand security as a social construction. Drawing on securitization theory, Neocleous (2007, p. 133) points out that security issues only become a problem “through an analysis of who or what is said to be being secured.” This point suggests that one way of achieving a critique of security is by examining the discourses which frame security threats and how they are then used to legitimize securitization. This discourse will be examined in each case study.

We must also recognize that the term security is highly contested and has a variety of meanings and interpretations. The following discussion does not explore the expansiveness of the term; to do so would limit the possibility for developing a more critical understanding of security. Accepting the ambiguity of the term or labelling
anything a security issue allows governments to restrict freedoms in a variety of social spheres (Neocleous, 2007, p. 146). I will, however, try to explain how the problem of security relates to the discipline of planning, and how planning has become part of the security apparatus, a term I will discuss later on. To understand how governments have tried to address fear and danger through mechanisms of security, Michel Foucault’s lectures, collected in *Security, Territory and Population* provide a useful point of entry.

In these lectures, Foucault begins by questioning how we understand security. He distinguishes security from what he has discussed in previous lectures: the juridical mechanism (law and punishment) and the disciplinary mechanism (surveillance and correction). The mechanism of security takes into account the cost and probability of an “event” and determines what level of disruption is acceptable (Foucault, 2007, p. 6). To make a preliminary distinction between the juridical-disciplinary mechanisms and that of security, Foucault uses the example of theft. Whereas there are laws against theft and ways to monitor a thief, the purpose of security is “to keep a type of criminality, theft for instance, within socially and economically acceptable limits and around an average that will be considered as optimal for a given social functioning” (Ibid., p.5). In other words, security is an intervention to manage an acceptable outcome while the legal code stipulates what is prohibited (prevention) and the disciplinary mechanism dictates what must be done (prescribed actions) (Ibid., p. 47). Therefore, the mechanism of security examines the probability of an event occurring, calculates the potential costs of the event, and evaluates the level of threat deemed acceptable.

Another way Foucault distinguishes between the juridical, disciplinary and security mechanisms is by considering how each one dealt with planned spatial
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3 This could be a crime such as theft but it could also be situations such as an epidemic or natural disaster.
distributions. To illustrate his point he uses the example of the town and makes the central argument that “the problem of the town was essentially and fundamentally a problem of circulation” (Ibid., p. 13). He suggests that control over a population and a territory was amassed in the ‘capital city’, the site of juridical power during the 17\textsuperscript{th}-century. Around the same time, new towns—Foucault refers to planned settlements such as Richilieu (France) and Kristiania (currently Oslo)—were constructed according to a disciplinary logic involving relations of hierarchy, power and function, whereas established towns had to question “what must be done to meet something that is not exactly known in advance” (Ibid., p. 19). Stuart Elden (2007, p. 565) provides a useful interpretation of this point: “While discipline operates through the enclosure and circumscription of space, security requires the opening up and release of spaces, to enable circulation and passage” (p.565). While the construction of new towns could rely on a disciplinary type of planning to perfect order, security has to deal with material givens: “It is simply a matter of maximizing the positive elements, for which one provides the best possible circulation, and of minimizing what is risky and inconvenient, like theft and disease, while knowing that they will never be completely suppressed” (Foucault, 2007, p. 19).

Despite Foucault’s attempt to make a clear distinction between the three mechanisms, he states that they are not successive but simply present changes in the characteristics of governance (Ibid., p.10). As ‘liberal’ states have moved away from certain coercive and violent methods of maintaining order, they have come to rely more on bio-power, a system of subtle techniques for maintaining knowledge of and control over populations (Ibid., p.1). But this is how the state functions when it is not faced with
a crisis. An invocation of crisis shows, more visibly the overlapping and interrelated nature of these mechanisms of power. The cases presented in this dissertation represent situations when the smooth operation of bio-power has been disrupted and the Canadian state has resorted to more visible displays of power in terms of spatial organization and social and physical force. Therefore, the function of security is to make “use of some instruments of prohibiting and prescribing” and “respond to a reality in such a way that this response cancels out the reality to which it responds—nullifies it, or limits, checks or regulates it” (Ibid., p.47). As I will demonstrate, “security is a way of making old armatures of law and discipline function in addition to the specific mechanisms of security” (Ibid., p. 10). Thus, Foucault’s juridical, disciplinary and security mechanisms can be understood as the foundation of the security apparatus. This apparatus, I argue, is a form of governing that is more visibly and spatially defined than bio-power and yet still exercises authority over society through both overt and covert mechanisms of control.

In the context of this dissertation, it is crucial to understand how planning fits within the framework I have just outlined. In Chapter 1 I discussed how planning is often defined in terms of social justice, but that it can also be considered as a method of social control and security. Furthermore, Oren Yiftachel (1998, p. 400), has outlined some of the ways that urban and regional planning is, like the city itself, immersed in a dialectical process, where plans for social reform can improve quality of life for some while being repressive for others. Despite planning’s noble ambitions, it has always been subject to
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4 One problem here is that “reality” is subjective, meaning a particular reality can be imagined to legitimize mechanisms of security. The threat of terrorism, for instance, may be a reality for some but fiction for others. As we will see in the three case studies, the threat levels driving the security arrangements are questionable.
the state’s desire for more social control. As Jennings and Lodge (2011, p. 221) point out in their study on mega-event security, “the aim of government, in its regulatory form, is to eradicate risk and maximize social control.” Therefore, planning acts as a regulatory arm of the state, where planners seek to control and manage urban space in preparation for uncertain but possible events. Security planning can easily be placed within this dialectical character of planning. Taken as a whole, planning can be understood as a tool of the security apparatus, which is used to produce order (disciplinary function) and to guide disorder (security function) (Agamben, 1997; Foucault, 2007).

**Freedom Versus Security**

In the first three lectures of *Security, Territory, Population*, Foucault expands upon his idea of the security apparatus by discussing three threats: insurrection, scarcity, and epidemic. Common to each threat, Foucault (2007, p. 64) argues, is its relation to the town. Essentially, each threat is situated within an urban context and can be understood as the following problem: “how should things circulate or not circulate?” (Ibid.). Furthermore, each threat is constantly in flux, meaning that the threat of scarcity, for instance, is dependent on a series of variables. Therefore, the apparatus of security is focused on ensuring and maintaining a positive circulation of people and merchandise. Foucault then argues that “freedom,” as opposed to a rigid disciplinary system of regulation, was the best method to prevent problems such as scarcity and guarantee circulation. As Foucault (2007, p. 49) states: “It is this freedom of circulation (of people and things), in the broad sense of the term, it is in terms of this option of circulation, that
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5 Here, I recognize that the state is not monolithic, but that there are different actors within the state that have an impact on development outcomes. There will always be people who are working towards different goals within the institutions that effect planning and even some planners who resist certain policies.

6 While he does mention insurrection as being a concern for planners, his focus in this section is more on the concept of the town.
we should understand the word freedom, and understand it as one of the facets, aspects, or dimensions of the deployment of apparatuses of security.” In other words, freedom has an intrinsic relationship with the security apparatus, where the ‘creation’ of freedom ensures a capitalist economy to function (human security) and the security apparatus allows for freedom of circulation to take place. Planning, it might be said, is the tool used to guarantee this order.

An underlying purpose of planning practice is to mitigate the tension between exploitation by private individuals and the rights of so many (Boyer, 1983, p. 67). In addition to managing complex systems of infrastructure, planning in the capitalist context addresses the inequalities and negative externalities that result from living within a free market economy. This means that part of planning’s theoretical purpose is to limit some freedoms for the overall benefit of society and for the maintenance of an acceptable order. As Brooks (2002, p. 37) explains, “freedom is always a matter of degree, of course, and a certain amount of individual freedom must be sacrificed in order for any society to govern itself. The critical question is: how much freedom can we afford to sacrifice to allow a governmental planning function to operate?”

Brooks’ suggestion that there is a trade-off between freedom (although he does not specify what kind of freedom) and security employs language that is common to liberal theories of security. When the circulating order is threatened, security planners often deploy this rhetoric of balance as a way to rationalize their actions. Neocleous (2007) is critical of the liberal premise that a balance must be found between freedom and security. He explains, by way of John Locke, that a fundamental tenet of liberalism is the preservation of liberty through security (liberal democratic governance) and that citizens
have the ability to dissolve government when it is seen as threatening liberty. In this sense, liberalism would seem to be rooted in a balance of power that favours liberty over security. But, another part of liberal democratic governance is the constitutional ability of state authorities to act in their own discretion during an emergency, granted it is in the “interest of the people” (Neocleous, 2006, 2007). This element—referred to as the prerogative (Neocleous, 2007, p. 135)—allows state authorities to declare an emergency, deploy unrestrained security measures and force the public to accept these measures as necessary. As a result, liberty, the supposed central doctrine of liberalism, is undermined.

The existence of the prerogative points to a contradiction at the root of the liberal order. This aspect of liberalism permits the sovereign to resort to violence and actions beyond the rule of law in situations where the state is threatened. According to liberal ideology, this dilemma is not seen as a contradiction, but rather a question of balance because the sovereign who suspends democracy does so in the name of liberty. So, when security planners invoke the language of balance, they are suggesting that freedom and security are part of a zero-sum game and that sometimes the balance has to be tipped temporarily towards security to ensure that freedoms are preserved. While liberalism may appeal to freedom, in practice, this contradiction sometimes results in distinctly illiberal actions or a negation of democratic values. As such, “liberty and security are either rolled together or security is something possessed for liberty — ontologically and politically prior to the commitment to liberty” (Neocleous, 2007, p. 140). From this perspective, it is necessary to question the concept of balance and to examine how this idea translates into certain planning measures.
When security planners or politicians invoke the language of balance, use of the prerogative is made to appear like the exception rather than the norm. Exceptional security measures tend to be legitimized by arguing that the emergency is only temporary and that freedom or ‘life’ will be restored to “normal” after the emergency. Contrary to this liberal theory, Neocleous (2006, p. 207) demonstrates using historical evidence that emergency powers “are an ongoing aspect of normal political rule.” For example, measures deployed during emergency situations are rarely temporary; they often stretch “beyond their original context, to the extent that they become part of the everyday functioning of the rule of law” (Ibid., p. 144). As new forms of security become increasingly accepted as part of everyday urbanism, it is crucial to critically engage with and interrogate the rhetoric of balance in order to show that it relies on false premises.

Nevertheless, Neocleous (2007, p. 145) argues that the liberal framework built around conceptions of security and freedom—freedom provides security as security ensures freedom—has allowed the state to “tighten its grip on civil society and ratchet-up its restriction on human freedom.” Deploying to the concept of balance “opens the (back-) door to an acceptance of all sorts of authoritarian measures; measures which are then justified on liberal grounds” (Ibid., p. 133). It allows security planners to operate beyond public scrutiny and to justify a form of planning that contributes to the mounting security apparatus. Since liberalism posits that security is needed for liberty to exist, then many actions, no matter how restrictive and invasive, are acceptable to preserve liberty.

What I show in the subsequent case studies is that these moments of security planning represent a way for the state to exercise its prerogative, where security planners are given money and tools to plan a security operation largely in secret and without
public scrutiny. These operations result in many socio-spatial restrictions and the securitization of daily life, but are legitimized as being in the best interest of society. Since this type of planning is part of the world of security and security “justifies the short-circuiting of even the most minimal liberal democratic procedures” (Ibid., p. 147), every other planning consideration is marginalized, “most notably the constructive conflicts, the debates and discussions that animate political life” (Ibid., p. 146). With the use of three different cases, this dissertation traces the growth of a set of experts and logics that have become difficult to question. In Canada, a country known for proclamations of liberal democratic principles such as accountability and public oversight, it is disconcerting that the field of security planning does not receive the same amount of democratic scrutiny that other forms of planning do. So rather than discuss security planning as a question of balance, we should understand the practice as part of the state’s exercise of the prerogative and as a normalization of the exception.

The Security Apparatus

The juridical, disciplinary and security mechanisms described in more detail above comprise what I have already referred to as the security apparatus. Two of the major actors in this apparatus are the police and the military (Cowen & Gilbert, 2007, p. 11). The liberal rationale for both institutions was based on the desire “to protect property and freedom locally and internationally” (Ibid.). The need for the police and the military to maintain this order again challenges the notion of a balance between freedom and security. As Moss (2009, p. 67) argues, “the need to have a police force with sufficient powers to enforce the law effectively and efficiently” represents “the coercive potential
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7 Cowen and Gilbert link the emergence of the police and military to the desire of the liberal state to defend individual rights which were organized through property.
of the state.” In other words, liberal conceptions of security emphasize, on the one hand, a non-interventionist state in the ‘market’, where certain individuals and products are free to circulate and, on the other hand, a system of policing and military protection to ensure and protect this circulating order. Thus, the powers given to these security actors reinforce liberalism’s commitment to security.

Challenges to the circulating order legitimize some of the most oppressive responses from security forces. In the dissertation’s three case studies, we either see abuses of police power or the law shifting to permit questionable police activities. Periods when the state has acted beyond the rule of law in the name of the public good has been referred to as the “state of exception” (Agamben, 2005). Like the prerogative, this concept refers to periods of emergency when it is acceptable and justifiable for state authorities to use extra-legal means to maintain security. However, I agree with Neocleous (2006, p. 206) when he argues, “it is through the law that violent actions conducted in ‘emergency conditions’ have been legitimated.” During the October Crisis of 1970, state actions were justified through the War Measures Act, a legal tool that did not necessarily suspend the rule of law, but rather reworked it. In the later cases examined here, the state avoided the use of such heavy-handed measures and sweeping laws, but this does not suggest a ‘democratization’ of security planning; rather it points to a shift in the way emergency situations have been framed. As my research shows, the state has moved away from merely declaring formal emergencies and has headed towards “the paradigm of security as the normal technique of government” (Agamben, 2005, p. 14).
Since the 1970s, many states have withdrawn from traditional welfare state practices and moved towards more neoliberal forms of governance (see Brenner & Theodore, 2002; Peck & Tickell, 2002; N. Smith, 1996). According to Agamben (1997, p. 1), the withdrawal of the state from interventions in daily life has meant that security is now the central premise of state activity. But this development is less concerned with human security and more concerned with protecting the economic lifelines of cities through spatial security (Hidek, 2011, p. 254).

The spatial dimensions of security planning represent a significant dilemma. On the one hand, security planners try to preserve the state’s authority by controlling the spaces where that authority is challenged. Conversely, such measures limit the public spaces where democratic discourse can materialize. This is the central contradiction of public space, where the need for free speech and an open society is constantly hindered (or as liberals like to suggest, balanced) by the need to maintain order and security in a city. So, the ‘right to the city’ is always a struggle between those wishing to control space and those wishing to transform it (Harvey, 2006; Mitchell, 2003).

Security planning is also inherently undemocratic. According to Neocleous, (2007, p. 146) security is a “concept that legitimizes any action by the state whatsoever, so long as the action is conducted in the name of security.” Security planning relies on the hegemony of security discourses to circumvent the more democratic and open methods of planning. But, a more democratic process that guides security planning may not result in more acceptable security actions. Much of contemporary planning theory is premised on the assumption that “the right-decision making process will enable planning (however defined) to further its progressive, even emancipatory, potential” (Huxley &
Yiftachel, 2000, p. 334). As a result, they argue that the field of procedural planning theory has contributed little to understanding how space is produced outside this particular formation (Ibid.). Consequently, Huxley and Yiftachel (2000, p. 337) call for new research “to demonstrate the specific effects of planning practices rather than starting from theoretical normative assumptions about the ends of those practices.” Therefore, I do not presume that a democratic framework would improve security planning. Rather, I examine the security planning process in each case and point to the effects of such processes on urban life and urban form.

A History of Security Interventions in Canada

Obviously, there is a much longer history of security crises in Canada and here I will briefly discuss some of the more significant politically charged security situations to have preceded the October Crisis. While I do not offer an exhaustive history, it is important to gain a sense of how Canadian authorities have handled internal security over time. I do this for two reasons. First, I believe attention should be given not just to specific cases themselves, but to the fundamental qualities of security actions that remain constant over time. The notion of Canada as a “Peaceable kingdom”—credited to the writing of Northrop Frye (P. C. Newman, 2006)—is displaced when we look at the history of conflict within the country. Second, I want to show that security planning in the more contemporary context of my case studies should not be juxtaposed against a utopian past, when cities were free and uninhibited by security measures. Rather, this section simply explores how security crises have been dealt with over time.

Canada, like many settler countries, was founded on violence against indigenous populations. The first colonial settlements often replaced strategic and sacred indigenous
spaces with symbols of the European world. A notable example of these symbols—one related to security—is the rampart wall surrounding Quebec City, one of Canada’s oldest cities. The fortification did little to fend off the British attack on the Plains of Abraham in 1759, allowing the British to conquer French Canada.

In the years that followed, there were numerous cases of political upheaval in Canada. The 1837-38 Rebellion in both Lower and Upper Canada represented a desire for responsible government (Historica Foundation of Canada, n.d.). Les Patriotes, as they were known in Lower Canada, now Quebec, were easily defeated by the more numerous British soldiers. Nevertheless, they live on as a symbol of French resistance to English domination. The Red River Rebellion in Manitoba in 1869-70 and the North-West Rebellion in Saskatchewan in 1885 are symbols of Métis resistance against what they viewed as English oppression (Beal & Macleod, 1984; Bumsted, 1996). The Federal government sent in the military to quell the rebellion and assert its authority over the territory. Louis Riel, the leader of the resistance, was convicted of treason and executed for his crime. The division between French and English Canada has always plagued Canadian unity and in 1917, many French Quebecers opposed conscription in World War I because they felt no allegiance to Britain, nor did they want to serve under Anglo-Protestant rule. On April 1, 1918, four men were killed when the army opened fire on a crowd protesting the conscription law in Quebec City (Corkery, 2001).

Labour issues have also been a major cause of political unrest in Canada. In one of Canada’s first labour crises, Winnipeg was crippled by a massive and dramatic general strike for six weeks in the summer of 1919. Frustrated by unemployment, inflation, poor working conditions and regional disparities after World War I, workers from both the
private and public sectors joined forces to shut down or drastically reduce most services (Bercuson, 1990). The workers were orderly and peaceful, but the reaction from the employers, city council and the federal government was aggressive. Striking police officers were replaced, weapons and arms were secretly shipped to the military, North West Mounted Police and the special police force, and legislation was changed to allow for the deportation of immigrants without trial (Corrado, Oliverio, & Lauderdale, 1992, p. 374). The strike ended in "Bloody Saturday" when the Royal North-West Mounted Police attacked a gathering of strike supporters. Two strikers were killed, 30 were wounded and many were arrested.

At the height of the Depression, a group of unemployed people decided to trek from Vancouver to Ottawa to protest the abysmal working conditions in federal relief camps scattered across rural Canada (C. Davis, 2011; Offman, 2001). When they reached Regina, they were stopped by the RCMP and had to endure gunfire, tear gas and arrests. Vancouver was a hotbed for political activity in the 1930s, including the Battle of Ballantyne Pier in 1935 and Bloody Sunday in 1938. In both cases, several thousand protestors were met with police brutality (C. Davis, 2011). Finally, a labour dispute in Montreal meant that the city was without a police force in the fall of 1969. This resulted in looting, robberies and riots. To deal with the lack of police, the military was called in to support the city and the municipal government passed legislation “prohibiting assemblies and demonstrations” for a period of 30 days (Canada’s Human Rights History, n.d.-a).

All of these events were identified as a threat to state authority, “requiring immediate police and military response” (Corrado et al., 1992, p. 373). While Canadian
historian Peter C. Newman (2006) may be correct in suggesting that these instances of insecurity “were merely police issues that had spun out of control,” they nevertheless challenge the popular trope of Canada as a Peaceable Kingdom. A more complete analysis of these earlier cases is beyond the scope of this dissertation. But they provide a useful sketch of how the Canadian state has continually responded to security crises using both legal tools and force to eliminate perceived threats. A year after the military was deployed to preserve peace in Montreal, soldiers were back, in what must have seemed to some like a case of déja-vu.
Chapter 2:
THE URBAN CONTOURS OF THE OCTOBER CRISIS

“Cities are the physical expression of societies who build them and the political, social and economic interactions of their inhabitants. They reflect currently prevailing inequalities and manifest themselves as segregated cities, which only serve the few, excluding the many from the benefits of citizenship” (de la Barra, 2000, p. 7).

In the early morning of October 16, 1970, Gaston Miron, an established Montreal poet and publisher, was awoken at gunpoint in his bed. At 4:00 am, the War Measures Act (WMA) had been invoked, giving police the authority to perform searches and arrests without a warrant and to detain people for a period of 21 days without charge. Initially, Miron thought that Canada had gone to war with the United States, but when he questioned the circumstances he was told by officers to “shut up” and that he no longer had rights (Cruickshank, 1980). While the scenario seems unfathomable, Pierre Trudeau, the Prime Minister who invoked the measures, had preconceived the situation fifteen years earlier. In a conversation with Miron while in Paris in 1955, Trudeau stated: “I’d know when separatism came because there would be police at my door in the middle of the night breaking into my house without a warrant; throwing me in jail without a charge” (Ibid.). Thinking of this as the police took him, Miron wondered whether Quebecers were finally free (Ibid.).

Quebec sovereignty had not been achieved, as Miron had hoped. Rather, the federal government had employed the most oppressive form of state legislation, the WMA, to thwart the possibility of an insurrection. Triggered by two kidnappings, the October Crisis went far beyond a hostage predicament to become a symbolic exercise of
state power over not only the Quebec separatist movement but over Quebec territory as well. Montreal was at the heart of the October Crisis and the actions of the Front de libération du Québec (FLQ) and the governmental responses left a scar on its face. Like many other cases of this sort, the city was more than just a backdrop to the crisis; it was integral to understanding why the crisis happened and how security actions were enacted.

The October Crisis is one of the most studied subjects in Canadian history. But for over 40 years, few people in Canada have discussed the urban dynamics of the Crisis. In this first vignette on the history of security planning in Canada, I examine how the Canadian state carried out security practices at the urban scale. Throughout the chapter, I argue that the October Crisis was not an isolated incident but rather a transformative moment in the re-configuration of the Canadian security apparatus. The security actions were not contained to the crisis itself but had long-term implications for both security planning and for the state of democratic dissent in Canada.

Given the revolutionary spirit of the 1960s, especially throughout cities in the US and France, the federal government feared that the rise of separatism in Quebec and FLQ violence in Montreal would result in an insurrection. Prior to the crisis and for some time after, ordering the urban environment and transforming the security apparatus to better address potential turmoil in cities was the object of state planning and as I will show, the state was ready to use heavy-handed measures if necessary. The impact the October Crisis had on the evolution of security planning in Canada represents an overlooked dimension of Canadian urban history.
The Urban Scale of the October Crisis

The October Crisis has been traditionally construed, especially in English Canada (LaPierre, 1971), as a national crisis with sovereigntist overtones. The struggle for national liberation has rarely been considered outside a nation-state framework and, in the case of the October Crisis, interpretations have tended to focus on the scale of Quebecois nationalism, ignoring urban spatial upheaval and the experience of everyday life in cities like Montreal. This is not to suggest that the national scale represented by the Canadian or Quebec state is an unimportant avenue for analysis. Rather, I am suggesting that an examination of the nexus between the urban and the national scales can provide a new understanding of the Crisis.

The bridge between the nation and cities is the production of space and scale. As with nationalism, space and scale are produced; they are social constructions which are continually transformed by political actions (Marston, 2000; N. Smith, 1992). Space is a social product of state and non-state processes (Lefebvre, 1968) and these processes have material consequences for a citizen’s daily existence. Many authors have argued that the local scale is the actual level at which the national and international processes that produce social life and which shape the urban environment can be observed (see for example Brenner, 2000; Holston & Appadurai, 1999; Isin, 2007; Lefebvre, 1968; N. Smith, 1992). Of course, this does not discredit the concept of the nation-state as a structural force; it simply suggests that the geographies of violence, for instance, are most visible and perhaps more easily understood at the scale of everyday life.

According to Isin (2007, p. 221), “the state emanates from the city, organized through it and assembled by it.” He argues that the concepts of the state and the nation are operationalized in the city, not simply in physical or material space, but through
various symbolic practices as well (Ibid., p. 221-222). As such, the city should be interpreted as a site of struggle, where local citizens and processes such as capitalism, globalization, modernization and nationalism are continually transforming urban space and producing new conceptions of the city. Looked at from this viewpoint, the October Crisis can be seen in part as a violent struggle between the state and the FLQ for control of the city and more specifically Montreal.

In the 1960s, the Quebec government re-engineered the state as a way to modernize the provincial institutions. At the same time, however, a new self-awareness emerged amongst Francophone Quebecers that triggered a renewed sense of nationalism and cultural identity. The specifics of this time period, known as the Quiet Revolution, will be discussed later in this chapter, but an essential aspect of this new solidarity was the defence of the French language and a reassertion of it as the lingua franca of Quebec. Most of the economic grievances, spatial inequalities and language injustices that typified this time period stemmed from the particular class and ethnic cleavages that existed between the wealthy minority Anglophone population and the working class Francophone majority in Montreal. French was not threatened elsewhere in Quebec; it was in Montreal where French unilingualism was a hindrance to economic opportunities and spatial mobility. It was also the place where symbols of colonialism and economic imperialism were most present and significant. Therefore, Montreal was not just the backdrop for the Crisis; it can be understood as a place through which people created their identities and enacted citizenship (Isin, 2007, p. 223). It was a space where French Canadians tried to exercise their right to the city by transforming it through collective struggle (Harvey, 2006).
The Historical Context

Prior to the Quiet Revolution of the 1960s, English-Canadian and American companies dominated commerce and industry in Quebec. The conservative Union Nationale party, the dominant political party of the time led by Premier Maurice Duplessis, believed that a laissez-faire economy was the best way to accommodate the economic power of the Anglophone population. The Francophone majority rarely contested this fait accompli of Anglophone control and preferred linguistic peace to any conflict. This meant that the economic power remained in the hands of the wealthy Anglophone elite and limited employment opportunities for Francophones who could not speak English.

The Catholic Church was also influential during this period. It controlled the social sphere of Francophones including education and health care. It also urged the population to reject the evils of a liberal economy so that they could maintain and protect their French-Canadian identity and avoid being assimilated into a North American English-speaking majority (Kaplan, 1992; Laur, 2002; Levine, 1990). Since the 1759 Conquest, the primary concern for the French-speaking nation had been “la survivance.” This form of nationalism was characterized by the preservation of the traditional French-Canadian culture and way of life based largely on language, religion and a rural agrarian lifestyle (Kaplan, 1992; Laur, 2002; Levine, 1990). The clergy promoted their ideologies in the Catholic education system to minimize the threat to cultural survival and advocate spatial separation between the French and the English.

The situation for Francophones in the province began to change with the onset of the Quiet Revolution. In 1960, the Liberal government of Jean Lesage replaced the Union Nationale, ending 16 consecutive years of conservative rule. The Liberals sought to
modernize the province and improve the socio-economic context of the Francophone majority. This period witnessed massive social investment and a transformation of the state. There were major increases in public service jobs and consequently, an expansion of the Francophone middle-class. Furthermore, school taxes were standardized, substantially improving the French school systems (Kaplan, 1992; Levine, 1990).

Even before the Quiet Revolution, there was a broad sense in Quebec that a major societal change was underway. Urbanization and secularization were rapidly increasing, values were becoming more liberal and a new sense of national and cultural identity was beginning to emerge. The French language became the major link uniting the nation, while influential literature such as La revue socialiste (1959-1965), a journal advocating full independence for Quebec and the liberation of the French Canadian proletariat, and Cité libre (1950-1966), a journal (founded by future Prime Minister Pierre Trudeau) challenging the conservatism of then Premier Duplessis and the influence of the Catholic Church, encouraged new ways of thinking about societal reforms. With the emergence of such publications, it was evident that Quebec society was ripe for change.

These journals both advocated for economic equality for French Canadians and for the secularization of society. However, each journal offered a different vision of how to best organize and modernize the Quebec state. As such, there were two competing views of modernity: one put forward by the Francophone proletariat calling for an independent Quebec based on a socialist state structure and another promoted by the Francophone bourgeoisie that proposed a liberal-capitalist state run by Francophones.¹ In

¹ Surely, there were other conceptions of modernity proposed by other groups at this time. However, for the purpose of this chapter, I focus on the two most dominant conceptions during the Quiet Revolution. They also happen to be the most relevant to the case study.
this instance, the FLQ’s vision conformed to *La revue socialiste* while the governing Liberal party was greatly influenced by the vision promoted through *Cité Libre*.

Nevertheless, emancipation was at the heart of both conceptions. According to Frantz Fanon (1963), all liberation movements seek to unify the nation by expelling a colonizer. But, Fanon also warned that the national consciousness which emerges within liberation movements is often corrupted by the native bourgeoisie and middle class who attempt simply to replace the colonists and take over their positions (Fanon, 1963, p. 152). As such, the Liberal Party’s position was not necessarily liberationist. Rather, the premise for their actions was to shift the subordinate majority into a position of power.

The modernization that took place during the Quiet Revolution did not fully meet the criteria of a modern society as understood by the FLQ because replacing the Anglophone elite in Quebec with a Francophone elite undermined the possibility for a socialist state purged of all class divisions. As a result, the FLQ’s modern vision was nearly always overshadowed by the liberal modernity proposed by the governing elite.

The Quiet Revolution was part cultural and part ideological (Cohen-Almagor, 2000). First, it reflected the interests of the Francophone majority, which had been economically subordinate to the English speaking population, by reaffirming the right to use French in all aspects of social and economic life. *Maître chez nous* was the slogan used during this period to convey the concept of taking economic and social matters out of the hands of the clergy and the Anglophone minority and placing them under the purview of the Francophone majority. Second, it involved social and economic development that entailed massive provincial government intervention in the
modernization of the state. The government expanded its role in health care, welfare and education and sponsored many enterprises and major industrial projects (Charters, 1997).

Despite the centralizing tendencies of the state, the modernization project had much in common with capitalist ideals. However, under capitalism, the benefits of modernization are rarely shared equitably. For example, forty percent of all unemployed people in Canada lived in Quebec in the 1960s (D. Cohen, 1970, p. 13), while the English-owned banks, most headquartered in Montreal at the time, continued to increase their profit year after year (Simard, 2000).

The Quiet Revolution transformed the ‘ethnic’ phase of French Canadian identity into a more modern, Québécois ‘national’ identity (Simard, 2000). The citizens of Quebec came to be defined as a people linked by the French language, a common history, and a delimited territory, all of which were entrenched in the public institutions of the emerging state apparatus. More generally, “the modernization of politics was thus as much a process of territorialization as it was a process of secularization and rationalization” (Neocleous, 2003, p. 411). In Quebec, this project involved “nationalizing the masses” by initiating a re-conceptualization of the nation as a vast territory united in a collective struggle to become “masters in their own house.”

The modernization processes associated with the Quiet Revolution contributed to a re-conceptualization of the nation and its territory, laying the foundation for the emergence of a competing vision of a modern Quebec based on territorial sovereignty. According to Laurendeau (1974, p. 73), “…[la] révolution tranquille, dont l’objectif était l’intégration fonctionnelle et rationelle du Québec au développement du Canada, a finalement dépassé son objectif en donnant une vigueur considerable aux aspirations
Therefore, the promotion of Francophone territorial control during the Quiet Revolution established what Neocleous (2003, p.411) would call the groundwork for sovereignty. Neocleous argues that historically, sovereignty has often been achieved through violence. The real potential for violence led the federal government, as this chapter will eventually show, to re-configure the security apparatus and to engage in many questionable and illegal practices against separatist groups, including legitimate political parties such as the Parti Québécois (see Fidler, 1978). In essence, the modernization project, as set out by the governing Liberal Party to bring stability, justice and prosperity to all, triggered a separatist movement within which some factions turned to violence as a means to obtain their political goals. This, in turn, forced the government to react with repressive measures. Many revolutions begin in urban spaces and it is within these spaces that the FLQ emerged with an alternative vision of the state.

Along with the concept of a Francophone controlled territory in Quebec, the FLQ also shared two major visions with the Liberal government of the time: both wanted the clergy stripped of its power and influence over social and political life and both sought to liberate Quebecers from economic oppression suffered at the hands of the mostly Anglophone upper class. The FLQ’s desire to eliminate class division, however, overstepped the boundaries of modern ideas associated with the Quiet Revolution. The FLQ blamed every social ill on colonialism, capitalism, and the church, and social reform was considered to be just as necessary as independence (Laurendeau, 1974). As the signs of modernization linked to the Quiet Revolution became apparent, they exposed many

2 “The Quiet Revolution finally surpassed its original objective, to become more functionally and rationally in line with development elsewhere in Canada, and ended up significantly energizing separatist aspirations” (my translation).
lingering inequalities (Simard, 2000). For the FLQ, this simply reinforced the need to establish an independent and socialist Quebec state. The FLQ’s competing vision for a modern Quebec was predominantly linked to left-wing ideology and revolutionary movements such as the Black Panthers in the US and liberationists in Algeria and Cuba.

The FLQ became an active revolutionary group in 1963 and adopted ‘paramilitary’ style tactics to emphasize their cause. Pierre Vallières joined the FLQ a few years after the first bomb was detonated and was considered the intellectual philosopher behind the group. He wrote the controversial book *Nègres blancs d’Amérique* (1968) (White Niggers of the Americas) while in a US jail for FLQ activities. In autobiographical style, Vallières depicted his impoverished life that was so common for Quebec’s working class during the Duplessis era and exposed the exploitation of French Canadians by the Anglophone upper class. He concludes by calling for an armed struggle in Quebec to overthrow the oppressors.

While the FLQ is mostly remembered as a separatist organization advocating independence for the territory (its initial *raison d’être*), it believed independence solely based on nationalism was too restrictive. Consequently, it dissociated itself from political jargon such as *maître chez nous* and built its vision on the idea of class struggle and the plight of the working class. Eliminating the struggle between the capitalists and the working class was paramount for their cause. Thus, the FLQ turned to Marxism as a framework for creating a more equitable Quebec society.

The FLQ also believed that using a conventional political framework, as a channel for pushing its agenda, was futile (Simard, 2000). For Paul Rose and Francis Simard, members of the FLQ involved in kidnapping Pierre Laporte, the avenues of
democracy were closed. For example, a surge of violent demonstrations throughout 1969 led Montreal City Council to prohibit “holding of any assembly, parade or gathering on the public domain of the City of Montreal for a time period of thirty days” (Canada’s Human Rights History, n.d.-b). In another more mysterious case, nine armoured Brinks trucks lined up outside the Royal Trust in Montreal to transfer valuables from Montreal to Toronto. This occurred only a few days before the April 1970 provincial election, where the separatist Parti Québécois was surging in the polls. Newspapers throughout North America reported this as capital assets fleeing the province, something federalists had encouraged the electorate to fear should a separatist party come to power in Quebec. The Parti Québécois ended up only electing seven members out of 108, leading many to believe that the “coup de la Brinks” was purposely orchestrated to deter voters from opting for the separatist party (Beaulieu & Gagnon, 2011; Cardin, 1990).

These are just two cases among many others that led the FLQ revolutionaries to believe that politics in a liberal democracy was a tool to guarantee the survival of bourgeois society. Taking cues from the writings of revolutionaries like Frantz Fanon, Che Guevara, Carlos Marighella, and the Black Panthers, many FLQ members were convinced that only violence could overthrow a class-stratified society rooted in colonialism and repression. From a Marxian viewpoint, Vallières (1968, p. 66) understood the crux of societal problems as neither moral nor metaphysical but material. Hence, for Vallières, any solution to Quebec’s problems had to be pragmatic and involve actions that clarified the FLQ’s ideas.

One of the FLQ’s goals was to challenge the legitimacy and the root cause of the socio-political situation rather than orchestrate a coup d’état (Laurendeau, 1974). It used
a variety of tactics, including graffiti, strategic bombings, and robberies, to expose repression and cripple the capitalist system. While not every FLQ member participated in the more violent actions, there was a common belief that only through the use of force could a new sense of nationhood be achieved, and that the FLQ had the duty to be in the vanguard of the struggle (Bédard, 2002). At the same time, violence was believed to be the final arbiter when every other means employed by the FLQ to realize its goals had failed (Laurendeau, 1974). The FLQ contended that the “system” was inherently violent: “Un système d’oppression économique (qu’il soit colonial ou racial) peut se perpétuer calmement, sans troubles apparents et être horriblement brutal” (Laurendeau, 1974, p. 21).3 In other words, political violence was simply a response to structural forms of economic and social violence. Nowhere was the social and economic disparity between Francophones and Anglophones more apparent than in Montreal, where the tensions were most intense (Cardin, 1990, p. 46).

Montreal at the Centre of Turbulence

The report from the Laurendeau-Dunton Commission of 1968 clearly laid bare the ethno-economic divide in Quebec.4 Despite years of social and economic reforms, Francophones were still economically inferior to the Anglophone population in Quebec (Cardin, 1990). In Montreal, Saint-Laurent Boulevard continued to act as the traditional boundary between the two social spheres. The west part of downtown experienced enormous investment in the 1960s with the construction of modernist office towers

---

3 “Whether colonial or racial, an oppressive economic system can calmly perpetuate without any apparent problems and yet be horribly brutal” (my translation).
4 The Federal Government established the Laurendeau-Dunton Commission, also known as the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism, in 1963. Its central mandate was to make recommendations on preserving and enhancing the bilingual and bicultural nature of Canada’s two founding European nations.
representing the major financial institutions run by the Anglophone elite. The eastern part of downtown Montreal also witnessed some modernization with the construction of office complexes for Francophone run institutions such as the head offices for both Hydro-Québec and Caisses-Desjardins, but this did not compare to the more prosperous western part of the city. The spatial inequality of investment, which had existed for centuries, was about to be contested. When the symbolic letters FLQ began appearing in 1963 on buildings and newspaper boxes throughout English neighbourhoods, few people understood the full magnitude of the revolutionary violence to come (Rivest, 1970). These three letters became pervasive throughout Montreal, territorializing politics by contesting the spatial inequalities of a divided city.

The FLQ turned to violence against symbolic institutions and businesses in its opposition to the socioeconomic hierarchy. The government understood the FLQ as a clandestine group, trying to publicize its intentions “through acts of terrorism directed at the symbols of colonialism, federalism and oppressive ‘big business’.”5 It believed that the FLQ was using violence “to create an atmosphere, wherein mass uprisings would lead to a break down of authority, culminating in the overthrow of the Quebec government by force and establishment of a revolutionary, separate and sovereign state of Quebec.”6 The government’s analysis of the FLQ refused to acknowledge the reasons for the FLQ’s actions beyond the issue of sovereignty and it ignored the urban symbols of contestation.

The economic, social and linguistic grievances violently expressed by the FLQ and shared by a majority of Francophones were explicitly rooted in urban life. The impoverished living conditions of many of Montreal’s Francophone neighbourhoods

---


6 Ibid.
added to these grievances. The city was where the disenfranchised were aware of their subordination to the Anglophone “other” and where the Francophone intelligentsia and proletariat realized their collective oppression as a nation. According to Taylor (1970, p. 27), “the image of a society dominated by the Anglo-capitalist elite fits with the sense of powerlessness which is part of the feeling of alienation.” The violent actions committed by the FLQ were a way of shocking people out of their alienation (Simard, 2000). In fact, the FLQ’s actions during the October Crisis garnered a great deal of sympathy and support, even if most people refused to condone the kidnappings.

Not only were the grievances rooted in urban conditions, the upheaval that ensued took place exclusively in Montreal. This is not unusual as terrorism is almost always an urban phenomenon (Savitch, 2008). Cities are attractive terrorist targets for several reasons: they have symbolic value, there is the potential for massive destruction and disruption, they are sites of media attention, and they are loci of anonymity (Savitch & Ardashev, 2001).

From 1963 until the October Crisis in 1970, the FLQ carried out a series of bombings, targeting symbols of monarchy, colonialism, and private American enterprises (Laurendeau, 1974). Bombs are effective in achieving publicity and coercion but they are also symbolic. The FLQ attacked military, police, and government buildings, as well as specific parts of the city such as the wealthy Anglophone neighbourhood of Westmount. However, according to Charters (1986, p. 60) the FLQ was unable to devise an appropriate strategy for a revolution. Consequently, it spent most of its time spreading fear by attacking symbolic targets such as the Montreal Stock Exchange, and, until the
October Crisis, it did not represent a significant threat to the stability of the state (Figure 2.1).

This violence was an urban phenomenon, perpetrated more specifically in Montreal (David & Maheu, 1971). According to Charters (1997, p. 141), “most of the incidents (at least 125) occurred in or near Montreal – a clear reflection of the city’s political and economic significance in a modernizing Quebec.” At this time, Montreal was Canada’s largest city and the hub of its economy. In a city severely divided along economic and linguistic lines and burdened with economic and political symbols of Anglophone hegemony, spatial contestation and intimidation became a method of expressing political dissent.

Terrorists often try to attract media attention to their cause. The perpetration of violent acts in Montreal, the heart of the French-Canadian media, was therefore ideal for promoting the FLQ’s cause. Many newspapers offered a sympathetic view of the FLQ while others, such as the intellectual newspaper Le Devoir, played a particularly antagonistic role during the October Crisis by constantly questioning and challenging the federal and provincial governments’ response to the crisis (Lachapelle, 2005). Moreover, the media served to further the FLQ’s cause and give prominence to the October Crisis. When the FLQ manifesto was broadcast on Radio-Canada, only a few days into the crisis, the first major link between the FLQ and the people of Quebec had been established. This broadcast reached every household and attracted popular support (Crelinsten, 1987, p. 70). Furthermore, it forced the government to negotiate in the public arena and endowed the FLQ with political legitimacy.
Figure 2.1: Photos of FLQ bombings. Montreal Stock Exchange, 1969 (top) and a mailbox explosion in Westmount, 1963 (bottom). Source: Library and Archives Canada
Finally, by virtue of being based in a city, the FLQ was able to maintain a certain level of anonymity. The complexity of Montreal ensured that many terrorist acts could be carried out with relative ease, and that the FLQ members could circumvent the authorities more easily. Furthermore, the diversity of large cities allows terrorists to find support for their cause (Savitch, 2008). As the FLQ obtained wider coverage from a sympathetic French media, support for the FLQ’s ideas continued to gain ground. But the FLQ did not have a monopoly on violent contestation of social and economic order (Cardin, 1990, p. 47). As FLQ violence increased throughout the 1960s, turbulent demonstrations increased in parallel (Rivest, 1970) and many unions became more radicalized during this time, leading to more strikes and confrontations with the police.7

Throughout the 1960s, social and political agitations from unions, separatist groups, and especially the FLQ, continued to escalate (Ryan, 1970b) and Montreal was usually the theatre for this unrest (Le Devoir, 1970a). With the city in turmoil, security inevitably became a major concern for the government. With the appearance of revolutionary violence targeting the English economic hegemony that had dominated the city since the conquest of 1759, it was clear that Montreal’s days as the economic engine of Canada were coming to a close. Acknowledging that revolutionary violence was a possibility in Quebec and even elsewhere in the country, the government embarked upon a major reconfiguration of the Canadian security state to plan for an eventual urban crisis.

---

7 The bylaw originally passed by the City of Montreal in 1969 to prohibit demonstrations for a period of 30 days was eventually re-enacted in 1971 to address the outbreak of violence from striking workers on the picket line at La Presse newspaper (Canada’s Human Rights History, n.d.-b)
Planning for an urban insurrection

By the 1960s, the Federal government viewed Quebec separatism as a threat equivalent to communism (Cardin, 1990). As a result, security policy began to focus more on domestic insecurities related to separatism and leftist activism. A month before the October Crisis, addressing political violence from domestic sources was the dominant theme of a conference held at the Canadian Emergency Measures College in Arnprior, Ontario (Canadian Press, 1970). This caused emergency preparedness policy makers to place more emphasis on preparations for civil emergencies such as insurrections rather than nuclear attack. The following is an account of the security planning which took place prior to the October Crisis.

The gathering of security intelligence was spread across several government departments prior to the October Crisis. Those analysing the information gathered saw the unrest in 1960s Quebec as a product of the time. In particular, threat assessments by the Security Service branch of the RCMP, the precursor to the Canadian Security Intelligence Service (CSIS), suggested that separatist or revolutionary forces in Canada had to be understood within a more continental and even international framework. The Security Service believed that this form of protest had been imported into Canada and was dependant on what happened primarily in the United States and to a lesser extent elsewhere. So, as a result of civil unrest in countries around the world, internal security in Canada was seen to be more at risk because of outside influences. A revolutionary spirit was present around the world and was characterized by a violent rejection of traditional forms of authority, political systems, education, family, and sexuality (Cardin, 1990, pp.

---

8 LAC, PET, MG 26 O 11, vol.50 file 5, John Starnes, RCMP Director General Security and Intelligence, to D.S. Maxwell, Deputy Attorney General, 23 July 1970.
In France there were general strikes and major student uprisings. US cities were in turmoil over civil rights and anti-Vietnam war sentiment. In Latin and South America, kidnappings and terrorist attacks, similar to those that eventually occurred in Quebec, were part of an increase in urban guerrilla actions. Preparing for the possibility of a civil emergency, the Canadian government was aware of the international threats to internal security: a worldwide trend toward contempt for the established order, communist infiltration into unions and government, and unrest and violence in US cities that could have spill-over effects.9

The unrest in American cities and the emergence of guerrilla warfare, an unconventional form of warfare that uses military tactics, became major concerns for the federal government. The adoption of guerrilla warfare as a technique to challenge the political system provided the means to disturb everyday life and the complexity of urban life offered an unlimited territory for subversive activity (Ryan, 1970b). Some members of the FLQ attended training camps with revolutionary groups in Algeria and Cuba to learn about methods of guerrilla warfare.10 With these realizations, the government decided to re-evaluate the structure of Canadian security apparatus, resulting in the Defence Policy Review and a Royal Commission on Security, both published in 1969.

In 1963, Prime Minister Lester B. Pearson ordered a reform of the Canadian military, emphasizing the need to integrate the various sections of the armed forces and prepare for low-intensity military operations for internal crises (Loomis, 1984). In Quebec more specifically, security forces had already begun to establish contingency plans to deal with potential subversion and violence from political radicals in the
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10 Ibid., P. 63
province. By 1964, the RCMP, the Montreal Police and the Sûreté du Québec combined their efforts into an Anti-terrorist squad (Cardin, 1990; Robinson, 1988).

Despite many attempts by Pearson to rectify the social and economic disparities in Quebec, he foresaw civil unrest in Quebec and wanted well-trained military professionals to tackle a potential domestic crisis without bloodshed. Given the circumstances, Jean Victor Allard, the Chief of Operational Readiness, also believed that the military had to be radically restructured to counter unconventional revolutionary warfare (Loomis, 1984, p. 14). At this point, the federal government seemed to be anticipating the relocation of “war” from the open plains to the spaces of cities where traditional military techniques of warfare would no longer apply. By 1969 all ranks of military personnel were involved in counter-insurgency field training (Loomis, 1984, p. 25).

In February of 1969, the Defence Policy Review was published and identified specific threats to internal security. It showed that prior to 1969 risks to Canada’s internal security were minor, but that there were indications that social stability was changing. While the document was not specific to Quebec, the rise of Quebec nationalism was identified as one of the greatest threats to national security.\textsuperscript{11}

Stemming from Pearson’s earlier request, one of the major priorities of this review was to re-evaluate the Canadian Forces’ position in terms of internal security. In the document, internal security was defined as “the protection against threats of insurrection, riot, sabotage, or other large scale acts of violence by dissident elements within the population, seeking either to overthrow or enforce their will upon legitimate Governmental authority or to obtain redress of grievance by extra-constitutional or illegal

\textsuperscript{11} Ibid., P.64
means.”  

The paper goes a step further and discusses the capability of the armed forces to respond at the request of any level of government to a disaster or civil emergency. According to the National Defence Act, cited in the review, the Canadian Forces “are liable to be called out for service in aid of the civil power in any case in which a riot or disturbance of peace occurs or is considered by a provincial Attorney General likely to occur, and that is beyond the powers of the civil authorities to suppress, prevent or deal with.”  

By reiterating this aspect of the National Defence Act, which still holds true today, preparations were being made to deploy the military to address future threats to internal security.

One of Canada’s first thorough examinations of defence policy, the report also examined international circumstances and suggested that if civil unrest could not be contained, it would spread rapidly and move beyond the capabilities of police control. Given the international context and the potential for public agitation in Quebec, it was recommended that the armed forces plan for and prepare to respond to riots or other outbreaks of violence such as sabotage, insurrection, or national disaster. Therefore, it was believed that ground forces needed to be trained to deal with civilian control in urban settings because the deployment of troops was considered the only way to ensure and restore public safety and law and order. Looking at the US case, the Defence Policy Review pointed out that a troop to ‘rioter’ ratio of roughly .85 to 1 was needed to contain an uprising, which at the time meant that any riot in Montreal of over 1000 people would
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require the assistance of the armed forces.\textsuperscript{16} The report finally recommended that troops needed to be stationed near large urban centres where unrest could materialize.\textsuperscript{17}

One of the most important elements of the Defence Review process was the 1968 integration of the Navy, Army, and Air Force, into a single unit to become known as the Canadian Forces. The Army—or Mobile Command as it was known at the time—was in charge of military operations on land and its mandate was to fight agitation, terrorism or guerrilla warfare (Loomis, 1984). Jean Victor Allard was appointed chief:

He grasped the gravity of the situation as few in the military did, and he prepared for the forthcoming struggle by various means: reorganizing the command structure, redeploying available forces, re-equipping the operational units, and training the field forces. At all costs, what has come to be called a “normative plan” had to be devised to prepare the army and the tactical air forces for deterring protracted revolutionary war waged by the FLQ and, if deterring failed, to fight on as long as was necessary to win (Loomis, 1984, p. 111).

Since the threat was urban, soldiers had to be prepared for battle in the city. As such, the field manual for military operations on land was changed to include encounters with protestors, ‘delinquents’, ‘flower children’, and families (Ibid.).

The military finally had the opportunity to carry out security operations in the urban milieu during a Montreal Police Strike in October 1969, one year prior to the October Crisis. Faced with difficult working conditions caused by numerous FLQ bombings and a rise in labour disputes and protests, the Montreal Police Service decided to take strike action. During the strike, a group of protesting taxi-drivers precipitated a night of rioting at which point the military was called in to support the Sûreté du Québec

\textsuperscript{16} Ibid., P.67
\textsuperscript{17} Ibid., P.67
(Provincial Police). Operation Pegasus, as it was known in military circles, was a testing ground for the military to act in “aid of the civil power”.\(^\text{18}\)

Given the social and political climate of the time and Pearson’s desire to reform the role of the military, issues of security had become a top priority for the federal government. In June 1969, the Report of the Royal Commission on Security was released to the public after originally being submitted to the Governor General in October 1968. The purpose of this study was to look at ways to modernize security at the federal level (Security Intelligence Review Committee, 2005). From the outset, the commission defined the duty of the state as the responsibility to “protect its secrets from espionage, its information from unauthorized disclosure, its institutions from subversion and its policies from clandestine influence.”\(^\text{19}\)

Among the threats to national security, a section of the document focused specifically on the security threat posed by Quebec separatism. While the report acknowledged that separatism was a political movement that should be dealt with by political means, it also concluded that the movement had to be monitored for subversive or seditious elements such as communists and Trotskyists who were believed to be gaining influence. This led the commission to recommend that adequate steps be taken to gather information on such threats. The RCMP became engaged in closely monitoring separatist groups, making no distinction between those operating legally and those using illegal methods to promote the cause (Cardin, 1990, p. 79).

The Royal Commission also explored security issues pertaining to citizenship, immigration, and information. In particular, concern for the security of governmental buildings became crucial to safeguarding important and confidential government


documents. The Commission was alarmed by the unimpeded access to these buildings during working hours. Fear of an FLQ attack on federal offices led to increased security measures, especially during the October Crisis when the military was stationed around government buildings. It was not until this point that the federal government began to explore security measures for its infrastructure. This has only increased in subsequent years.

Overall, the Commission found that security planning and analysis was spread across “a number of disparate elements including the Cabinet Committee on Security and Intelligence, the Security Panel, the Privy Council Office, the Solicitor General and his Departments, the Minister of Justice and the Department of Justice, and the R.C.M.P.” To remedy the situation, the Commission recommended the creation of a Security Secretariat in the Privy Council Office, amalgamating all departments or agencies gathering security and intelligence data—notably the RCMP security service and the Department of National Defence security organization—into one civilian non-police security service.

This proposal caused a stir between the federal government and the RCMP. Prime Minister Trudeau and the cabinet supported the proposal, while the RCMP opposed it. In the end, the RCMP retained its role in gathering security intelligence, but the federal government appointed, for the first time, a civilian director, John Starnes, to oversee the operation (Security Intelligence Review Committee, 2005). This was considered a compromise at the time and it was not until over a decade later that the proposal was given more serious consideration. The other recommendations received little backing

\[20\] Ibid., P.13
\[21\] Ibid., P.105
from Prime Minister Trudeau, the Solicitor General and many other ministers.\textsuperscript{22} Despite the lack of support, addressing security issues remained urgent for the government. In late 1969, the Cabinet Committee on “Priorities and Planning” decided that ‘law and order’ would become a priority item.\textsuperscript{23} The Cabinet believed that the forces demanding social change through violent means had to be thwarted for the democratic, social and economic stability of the country.

Following this decision, the cabinet struck an interdepartmental committee in May 1970 to study several issues related to the preservation of law and order and to report back to the government. The committee examined six priority areas, two of which foreshadowed the October Crisis. The first priority area was procedures for requesting the assistance of the Canadian Forces in aid of the civil power (the police). The Canadian Forces submitted reports detailing how to request the participation of the military in a civilian context and how military intelligence and ground forces could assist in the preservation of law and order.\textsuperscript{24}

The second part of the priority items on ‘Law and Order’ explored the steps needed to enact the War Measures Act (WMA) in the event of an insurrection. After the Parti Québécois garnered 23 percent of the popular vote in the May 1970 provincial election, the Federal Cabinet immediately formed a special committee to consider how to manage the possible proclamation of the WMA and how to strengthen the role of the army and the RCMP in ‘maintaining public order’ (Fidler, 1978, pp. 23–24). In the face

\textsuperscript{22} LAC, PET, MG26 O 11 vol. 2, Hon. George McIlraith, Solicitor General, to Pierre E. Trudeau, Prime Minister, 21 May 1970.
\textsuperscript{24} Ibid., Procedures for invoking the aid of Canadian Forces in aid of civil power, 29 June 1970 ; Military intelligence – Assistance in the preservation of law and order, 23 June 1970.
of rising support for a legitimate separatist political party, representing a potential threat
to Canadian Unity, the federal government was looking for security solutions to a
political problem.

The RCMP Security Service, the section gathering security intelligence, was also
asked to submit a report detailing what it perceived to be its role in addressing the
Cabinet priority item on law and order.\(^{25}\) To neutralize, isolate and destroy forces that
threaten the preservation of law and order, the Security Service recommended an
expansion of its powers to act in areas from which it was excluded.\(^{26}\) It also emphasised a
desire to take full advantage of the provisions of existing laws in case of a security crisis.
While it is not clear what legislation the RCMP was pointing toward, surely the WMA
was among those laws.

On November 2, 1970, right in the middle of the October Crisis, the
Interdepartmental Committee on Law and Order rendered its response to the
government.\(^{27}\) After months of research it was unable to reach any final conclusions
respecting the overall problem of law and order in Canada. Furthermore, it was incapable
of offering an appraisal of the FLQ movement. However, the Committee did identify a
few problem areas that were worthy of government attention.\(^{28}\) It believed that the
ineffective police investigations into terrorist activity in Quebec were attributable to the
decentralized police organization that prevailed in Quebec and to the subordinate or

\(^{25}\) LAC, PET, MG 26 O 11, vol.50 file 4, Report by the Royal Canadian Mounted Police to the Inter-
Departmental Committee on Law and Order.

\(^{26}\) LAC, PET, MG 26 O 11 vol. 50, file 5, John Starnes, RCMP Director General Security and
Intelligence, to D.S. Maxwell, Deputy Attorney General, 23 July 1970.

\(^{27}\) Ibid., Response from the Interdepartmental Committee on Law and Order 02 November, 1970.

\(^{28}\) One of the six priority areas was to examine the procedures for the RCMP acting in aid of Provincial
authorities. This is only specific to the Ontario, Quebec, and Newfoundland and Labrador contexts where
there is a law enforcement agency at the provincial level. In this instance, it was crucial for the committee
to examine how the RCMP could work with the Sûreté du Québec in the event of a crisis.
secondary role the RCMP had been forced to play in the crisis. There were also problems with the sharing of information between the police forces, allowing the kidnappers to remain at large (Ross, 1995, p. 287). In other words, there was a realization—in the middle of the crisis—that the lack of cooperation and coordination between the various police agencies—municipal, provincial, and federal—was one of the largest hindrances to a smooth operation and that the recommendation for better integration was too late.

In sum, these transformations marked a pivotal moment for the emergence of a modernized Canadian security state. While the federal government wanted its armed forces trained and prepared for a potential internal crisis, it knew that the turmoil brewing in Quebec could not be addressed with a military response alone. Some politicians and bureaucrats did recognize the need to rectify many of the inequalities that existed in Montreal. In a letter (23 July 1970) to D.S. Maxwell, the Deputy Attorney General, John Starnes, the Director General of the RCMP Security and Intelligence, writes: “The trick, of course, will be to strike the appropriate balance between introducing necessary social and other reforms and preserving law and order in the community since, unfortunately, these aims, at times, may not be compatible.”29

However, the emphasis on security during the October Crisis meant that the concept of balance was still only a fiction and that the best way to avoid violence, according to Jean Victor Allard, was by exerting more power over the agitators (Loomis, 1984).

The October Crisis

With threat assessments stating that Quebec and more specifically Montreal was the most volatile place for domestic unrest, the three police forces—the Montreal Police

29 LAC, PET, MG 26 O 11, vol.50 file 5, John Starnes, RCMP Director General Security and Intelligence, to D.S. Maxwell, Deputy Attorney General, 23 July 1970.
Service, the Sûreté du Québec, and the RCMP—began in the spring of 1970 to develop a contingency plan to address the potential threat of kidnapping. Attempts by the FLQ to kidnap the Consul General of Israel and the United States were foiled, but on October 5 of that year, the FLQ was finally successful in kidnapping British Trade Commissioner James Richard Cross, initiating a major terrorist crisis.

As I described in the Introduction, the October Crisis was initiated by the Cross kidnapping and escalated when another FLQ cell abducted Pierre Laporte, the Minister of Labour and Immigration of Quebec. Even though the federal government and the police forces had been planning for a potential showdown in Quebec throughout the 1960s, they still seemed ill-prepared to respond to the crisis in an effective manner. With sympathy for the FLQ cause continuing to grow during the crisis, both federal and provincial government credibility started to wane. Within a matter of days, the federal government resorted to extreme actions to address the crisis and thwart what it viewed as a potential insurrection coordinated by the FLQ. Just as the violent methods of the FLQ actions targeted symbolic sites, there were essentially two major controversial security interventions that were symbolic acts during the October Crisis: the deployment of the military and the invocation of the WMA.

During the first two weeks of the crisis, the police believed that some FLQ members were advocating a revolutionary uprising by taking to the streets in uncontrollable mobs. Police capabilities were distended and—up until that point—investigations were not leading to the kidnappers. On October 11th roughly 1000 troops were positioned in and around federal government buildings in Ottawa-Hull under
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Operation ‘Ginger’. A few days later, at the request of the Sûreté de Québec, the Montreal Police Service, the City of Montreal and the Provincial Government, troops were sent into Montreal and Quebec City under Operation ‘Essay’. The many hundreds of troops made available to the Government of Quebec for protective duties enabled the police to pursue their investigative duties. The first troops in Montreal stood guard in front of City Hall, the armouries, and the central police station, while others were deployed along St-Jacques Street, the business district at that time (Le Devoir, 1970b). Soldiers were also stationed at the houses of parliamentarians and notable personalities, radio towers, explosive factories and depots, hydro transmission lines, bridges, the Provincial legislature, and the Ontario border crossings (Guise & Zolty, 1970). Especially in important neighbourhoods like Westmount, surveillance was pervasive (La Presse, 1970). While the military relieved the police of some of its duties, the soldiers remained under the control of civil authorities (Le Devoir, 1970b). Figure 2.2 presents some of the spaces where the soldiers stood guard.

At the peak of the crisis, roughly 137 persons were being protected by the military and over 6000 troops were deployed, adding “an eerie aura of war to the already tense atmosphere” (Radwanski & Windeyer, 1971, p. 61). This was the largest and most expensive military intervention during peace time in Canada’s history (Lord, 1980; Parizeau, 1980; Ryan, 1970a). It was also the 50th time that the military had been deployed in Quebec since confederation, making it the province with the highest number of military interventions (Lord, 1980). According to archival records, the Montreal police
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had between 3000 to 4000 officers persistently investigating the situation. The Sûreté du Québec had roughly 3000 officers. There were also around 500 police officers from other forces around the province and around 600 members of the RCMP in Quebec assisting in the operation. RCMP resources in Ottawa were also fully at the disposal of the joint effort.

There is a long history of the army assisting police activities in Canada, but dealing with a ‘police’ situation was one of the major problems facing the military during the October Crisis. Gellner (1974) suggested that despite the re-organization of the military in the 1960s, the soldiers were ill-equipped and not properly trained to deal with this type of urban guerrilla warfare. In addition, he was critical of the use of military weapons, which are used to kill. In a civilian context, he believed that only weapons that could induce shock or incapacitate should have been used.

The inability of the police to quickly put an end to the crisis—even with the deployment of the military—led the authorities to believe that the ‘urban jungle’ was the

Figure 2.2: The military presence during the October Crisis. Armed soldier (left); Soldiers guarding Montreal City Hall (middle); Vehicle checkpoint at the Ontario-Quebec border (right). Source: Library and Archives Canada.
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ideal environment for the kidnappers. Reference here to the ‘urban jungle’ suggests that police and military viewed the city as an untamed and disorderly space that allowed the FLQ to carry out its actions and evade capture. Members of the FLQ studied Carlos Marighella’s *Minimanual of the urban guerrilla*, suggesting that some of its tactics were actually modelled off this manual (Charters, 1997). For the police and especially the military, urban guerrilla warfare was something novel. The complexity of the urban environment was a major reason why the WMA became a crucial measure for combating these unconventional tactics. Essentially, the WMA turned Canada—and Montreal in particular—into a space of exception, where civil liberties were suspended, giving authorities full legal recourse to restrict all behaviour that could be interpreted as subversive.

A week into the crisis, the police were at their extreme limit. As a result, letters on behalf of the Montreal Police Service, the Mayor of Montreal and the Premier of Quebec were sent to Prime Minister Trudeau, requesting extra power to tackle the situation. Interestingly, the largest advocates for the WMA came from those involved in urban governance: the Mayor of Montreal, Jean Drapeau, and the Chair of the Executive Council for Montreal, Lucien Saulnier (Jamieson, 1988). These requests were rooted in the belief that the methods and laws available were too restricting to deal with the situation in a satisfactory manner and that the police required the ability “to move without fear of transgressing the law” (Haggart & Golden, 1971, p. 101). Given the number of searches that led nowhere, the police and the political leaders alleged that
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extraordinary measures were needed, not only to find the kidnappers but to prevent the destruction of the social order by revolutionary forces as well (Le Devoir, 1970d). They called for emergency powers that would allow the police to detain anyone suspected of trying to overthrow the government by illegal means. An apprehended state of insurrection was declared and the WMA was invoked at 4:00 a.m. on October 16, suspending the Canadian Bill of Rights, and making Canada the first western democracy to use emergency powers during peacetime. Under the Act, any action that was seen as supporting an insurrection or the FLQ was subject to five year’s imprisonment and anyone—supporter or not—could be detained and jailed for up to three weeks without charge (Haggart & Golden, 1971; Sauriol, 1970).

The WMA was a form of Martial Law adopted by parliament in 1914 at the onset of World War I. It was never revoked following the war, meaning it was left as a tool for future governments to use during emergency situations. It allowed the Governor in Council (the Governor General acting on the advice of the Federal Cabinet) to unilaterally confer exceptional powers to the state if there was evidence (real or apprehended) of war, invasion, or insurrection. The measure was used again during World War II and more controversially during the October Crisis. The kidnappings were believed to be the first step in an insurrection, so the federal government legitimized the use of the WMA by declaring a state of ‘apprehended insurrection’ (Beaton, 1971).

According to Haggart and Golden (1971, p. 101) the WMA “was designed and intended to support a military action, not a police action. It was never intended as a tool to root out criminals, whether they be self-styled terrorists or just thugs.” The ability to suspend civil

37 The WMA was was replaced by the Emergencies Act in 1988.
liberties unilaterally without requiring parliamentary approval meant the WMA received substantial criticism.

Resorting to such an extreme measure led many to question whether the level of so-called violence and terror necessitated the violence and terror brought on by the WMA. To begin, the federal government provided little detail as to why the WMA was absolutely necessary. Claude Ryan, the editor of *Le Devoir*, along with the Canadian Civil Liberties Association and the federal New Democratic Party, were some of the most vocal critics. They argued that the Government of Canada did not provide clear reasoning to justify the WMA (Canadian Civil Liberties Association, 1970; Ryan, 1970d). Ryan (1970b) went so far as to suggest that Canada was contributing to an alarming renaissance of McCarthyism, wherein accusations of insurrection were being made without proper evidence. The leader of the New Democratic Party, Tommy Douglas, believed that by using the WMA, the government was using a “sledgehammer to open a peanut” (as quoted in, *Le Devoir*, 1970d). The other opposition parties in Parliament were also sceptical about an apprehended insurrection but the use of the WMA was still approved by Parliament on October 19th by a vote of 190 to 17.\(^{38}\) This was not surprising, because it reflected the state of terror and panic that had seized the Canadian public following the murder of Pierre Laporte on October 17th (Ryan, 1970c). Only members of the NDP voted against the legislation because of the absence of the right to habeas corpus (Beaton, 1971, p. 150).

The federal government was convinced that within the first few days of extraordinary powers of search, seizure and arbitrary arrest without a warrant, a seditious
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plot by the FLQ to overthrow the government would be uncovered, thereby justifying the WMA and silencing its critics. But after hundreds of arrests and thousands of searches, the authorities never found a revolutionary plan for the liberation of Quebec (LaPierre, 1971, p. 26). The RCMP commissioner told Cabinet that no evidence could be found to prove that an insurrection was occurring (Jamieson, 1988, p. 28).

With little indication that Canada was in a state of apprehended insurrection or that a revolution was brewing in the streets of Montreal, critics of the WMA became more vocal about civil rights abuses. In response, the government told the public that the reasons for declaring the WMA were extensive but that these reasons were confidential and might never be disclosed to the Canadian people (Le Devoir, 1970e). The public was expected to have faith in the government regardless of its dubious reasoning for declaring the WMA (Levitt, 1970). But suspending people’s rights in order to uncover criminal activity is a menacing way to govern. Charters’ (1986, p. 69) reflection on the October Crisis clearly explains the dilemma of increasing security:

Open societies may be more vulnerable to violent destabilization than closed ones, but they also have flexibility and reserves of strength that allow them to absorb a great deal of disorder without either collapsing or becoming police states. It is worth bearing that in mind each time a series of terrorist incidents at home or abroad makes us feel vulnerable and leads to calls by the public, the media, and the politicians to ‘tighten up’ security. If the October Crisis has taught us anything, it is that over-reaction to terrorism can place democracy at as much risk as an inadequate reaction.

Whether or not the public trusted the government to act appropriately, an overwhelming majority of Canadians supported the WMA.39

Despite the strong support, Prime Minister Trudeau recognized some of the civil libertarian critiques of the WMA and acknowledged that some of the powers afforded

under the WMA were perhaps too extensive. Therefore, he wanted to work with the opposition to conceive of a new law that could better deal with the situation (Le Devoir, 1970d). The regulations under the WMA were eventually substituted with the Public Order Temporary Measures Act, which was introduced to Parliament on 3 November 1970 and adopted one month later. It encompassed many of the same provisions as the WMA, only in this case, the legislation was specific to the FLQ and had an expiration date of 30 April 1971 unless authorities could claim the necessity for the law’s continuation. But by this point, the WMA had already served its purpose. By mid-November close to 500 people had been arrested (Beaton, 1971), 238 of them during the first morning the Act was invoked (Charters, 1986), and thousands of searches had been performed (LaPierre, 1971). Few people were ever charged, suggesting that the arrests represented an abuse of a newly obtained power (Cohen-Almagor, 2000).

The Prime Minister stated that in order to revoke the Public Order Act he needed the assurance from the police forces that there was absolutely no more danger of a further crisis. The Canadian Civil Liberties Association was critical of this point, exposing the faulty logic of security planning: “In a free society, the onus of making the case must be on those who seek to invade our freedoms not on those who seek to preserve them. Clearly, as long as the onus is on those who seek their preservation, the existence of repressive measures can always be justified.”40 In other words, governmental authorities and certainly the police will always desire more power to make their job easier. But the police do not need exceptional powers to make them more competent (LaPierre, 1971, p. 29). Law enforcement is part of a larger system of justice of which policing is only one
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aspect. In the face of a seemingly restrictive and slow legal process, Haggart and Golden (1971, p. 59) argue that the police appealed for “the Valhalla of which all policemen dream; … to be let loose like little kids in a candy store, to enforce laws they had asked for as they saw fit. They would not be hampered by ‘legal machinery’—meaning lawyers, judges, bail, courts, presumptions of innocence or public scrutiny of their actions or their prisoners.” But in the end, it was careful police work and not the use of repressive emergency powers that eventually solved the kidnapping cases (Canadian Civil Liberties Association, 1970; Crelinsten, 1987; Levitt, 1970; Ryan, 1970d).

The Impact of the Security Measures

The prospect of any popular revolution or street uprising dimmed once the WMA was declared and, a day later, when Pierre Laporte was murdered, the city literally went silent. Radwanski and Windeyer (1971) described the scene in Montreal as exceptionally quiet: the usually exuberant public life of the city faded when reports of the assassination came in. When Laporte’s body was recovered, it dispelled the spontaneous revolutionary fantasy (Bédard, 2002), while support for the government peaked and sympathy for the FLQ fell dramatically (Auf der Maur, 1995).

According to one federal assessment of the events of October, “Appreciation of Recent Events in Québec”, the WMA and the military served many purposes.41 First, the government believed that the measures dislocated the FLQ command structures by arresting some of its most notable members. Second, the measures forced the FLQ terrorists underground in the sense that all areas of the city and region were under constant surveillance and anyone advocating for the FLQ was immediately deemed a
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criminal. Third, the measures at least temporarily cooled students and other mass movements because the FLQ and support for the group had become illegal. Fourth, authorities were able to seize some firearms used, it was believed, to assist the FLQ. Finally, the measures meant there was a great possibility of uncovering evidence of sedition and terrorism and of obtaining intelligence on terrorist activities.

Governments often respond to terrorism by increasing spatial control in terms of heightened security rather than addressing root causes of political violence. According to Torrance (1995, p. 313), “the tendency for democracies to transform themselves into authoritarian regimes when confronted by violent challenges” poses a great danger. Deploying the military and invoking the WMA served to intimidate the FLQ and antagonize its sympathizers, but did little to prevent the murder of Pierre Laporte or to find his kidnappers. This led many to believe that these measures were simply a symbolic show of force designed to quell the sovereignty movement and intimidate left-wing radicals (Brodeur, 1980; Vallières quoted in Charters, 1997; Fidler, 1978; Levitt, 1970; Whitaker, 2002).

Evidence of this argument lies in the number of people arrested but never charged during the October Crisis. Essentially, the Act gave police the power to interpret any form of left wing or separatist politics, or any action that could be related to FLQ ideology, as a terrorist threat. According to Robert Bureau, a former professor of Social Law at Université de Montréal, the arrests and searches conducted while the WMA was invoked turned many people into so-called ‘terrorists’: unionists, activists, journalists, intellectuals, students, and members of the Parti Québécois (Bureau, 1970). In other
words, the WMA was used to target those involved in legitimate political dissent, placing limits on other collective struggles in Quebec.

In late 1970, a group of writers came together and published a collection of essays in a book called, *Strong and Free: A Response to the War Measures Act* (1970). In this volume, various authors claimed that the WMA represented a use of excessive force for a minor crisis and, as such, was unnecessary. The majority were particularly critical of the government’s emphasis on security rather than on the underlying social and economic grievances that may have caused the uprising. More crucially, the authors also assert that the WMA was used to crush separatists and to equate the movement with violence and terror.

Many of these concerns were confirmed ten years later in the Duchaîne Report. Commissioned by the Parti Québécois Government in 1976, this inquiry looked into the events of the October Crisis. The document confirmed what many had suspected: the WMA and the military were used as tactics to intimidate separatists and leftists and to repress overall dissent (Falardeau, 1980; Laurendeau, 1974; The Gazette, 1980). LaPierre (1971, p.30) argues that it was an “arrogant and arbitrary use of power to curb public will” that encouraged the acceptance of the WMA. Even senior governmental officials admitted that governmental approval at the height of the crisis was probably more a result of shock and fear rather than reasoned thought. Ultimately, the Duchaîne Report also discredited the FLQ as a major revolutionary force. It stated that besides about 35 determined members, the group was fairly disorganized (The Gazette, 1980).
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The true role of the military during the October Crisis was also questioned. Jacques Parizeau (1980), one of the Parti Québécois’ first elected members of the Provincial Legislature (Assemblée Nationale), argued that the military’s role went beyond the mundane task of protecting buildings and prominent individuals and served to dissuade political dissidence through intimidation. While it is possible that the federal government tried to instil calm through the deployment of the military, Gellner (1974, pp. 157–158) suggests that the deterrent effect of the military is actually negligible and often gives revolutionary forces a more important status. In the context of Northern Ireland, for example, Charters (1986, p. 67), explains that the presence of the British army in the 1960s and 70s actually caused sectarian violence to increase in that country. Despite the military presence in Ottawa, Montreal and Quebec City, the crisis continued to escalate as the FLQ received even wider support.

In attempting to preserve democratic rule during a “state of apprehended insurrection”, the federal government attacked democratic rights and privileges with the use of the WMA. The Federal Minister of Communications at the time, Eric Kierans, stated during the October Crisis that if the government lost sight of the country’s democratic traditions, there was the chance “that dissension could become sedition” and that “intellectual curiosity could become evidence of a conspiracy” (Kierans, 1970). Nevertheless, public dissent in the form of demonstrations or marches was declared illegal, which effectively gagged support for the FLQ cause and eliminated a crucial form of democratic participation. According to Lefebvre (2003, p. 20) “wherever threatened, the first thing power restricts is the ability to linger or assemble in the street.” The WMA

---

43 Original French version: «…que dissension devienne sédition, que curiosité intellectuelle devienne évidence de conspiration…»
essentially denied the democratic right to dissent in public space, making way for the wave of repression that ensued.

Dissent and the Space of Exception

After the WMA was declared, basic rights and civil liberties were suspended, a situation which could be described as a ‘state of exception’ (Agamben, 1998). According to Hannah (2007, p. 59), “the state of exception is not the chaos that precedes order but the situation that results from its suspension.” In the week leading up to the declaration of the WMA, pandemonium broke out in Montreal, leading Prime Minister Trudeau to institute a state of exception by suspending civil liberties pursuant to the declaration of the WMA.

The effects of the WMA went much further than simply thwarting the crisis and “restoring the calm”; it allowed for a massive police operation with unyielding powers. In addition to the hundreds of arbitrary and unnecessary arrests, there were numerous instances where civil liberties were repressed. For instance, on October 18, nine people were arrested at a demonstration for distributing leftist posters and material relating to the FRAP, a municipal political party running in the Montreal municipal election on October 25. Employees of the National Film Board were arrested for taking photos of Camp Bouchard, a military base in the suburbs of Montreal. They were producing a film concerning the effects of revolutionary influences on young people. The film was confiscated and turned over to base security for processing.44 There were many other instances, even outside Quebec, where authorities attempted to use the regulations set out in the WMA to crack down on undesirable activities. For example, the Mayor of

44 Ibid., Operation Essay daily reports.
Vancouver tried to use the exceptional powers granted to authorities in October 1970 to rid the city’s beaches of ‘hippies’ (Valpy, 2010).  

Enactment of legislation like the WMA not only suspends the law and the juridical order by stripping the population of its rights, but it also affects public space (Hannah, 2007). The WMA can be understood as a tactic of sovereignty by which the state geographically exerts control over a territory (Butler, 2004). To be able to detain or arrest people, the state must exert some form of geographical control over a particular population by suspending rights within the framework of emergency powers or tightening security measures in the form of military intervention (Hannah, 2007, p. 63). In the case of the October Crisis, both the juridical (WMA) and the disciplinary (military) mechanisms of the security apparatus were deployed.

The unlawful incarcerations and the military presence during the October Crisis were a form of intimidation typical of a society subject to a state of exception. Most of the arrested were never charged, a fact suggesting that the arrests were never carefully planned but rather an abuse of newly granted powers (Cohen-Almagor, 2000). Michel Brault’s film, Les Ordres (1974), clearly depicts the repercussions of the WMA on the everyday lives of civilians. In some cases, those who were unlawfully detained lost their jobs and had their public image harmed. The actions of the police, operating under the WMA, affected not only individuals and their families, but also entire neighbourhoods known to harbour a significant number of separatists and left-wing radicals. As such, Montreal became the space of exception, where the military intervention and the WMA simultaneously restricted freedom and dictated the activities of everyday life. To
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45 Despite the geographic isolation of the crisis, the WMA (federal legislation) applied to the entire country.
demonstrate its power, the government chose to perform a “coup de théâtre” (Whitaker, 2002, p. 50), rather than address the social and economic ills facing the most marginalized and alienated groups.

In the years that followed the crisis, many attempts were made to provide a deeper analysis of the WMA and the crisis in general. One of the most vocal critics of the government was Pierre Vallières, who argued throughout the 1970s that the reorganization of the Canadian Forces in the 1960s was designed specifically to quell insurrections in Quebec. He also believed that the security operation for the October Crisis was premeditated and designed to perfect the repressive apparatus, to centralize data on subversion, and to disrupt Quebec nationalism (as referenced in Charters, 1986, p. 62). Writing prior to any public inquiries into the October Crisis, Fidler (1978) speculated that if police and government files were opened to the public, one would find that the WMA was indeed a method of provocation “designed to intimidate the Quebecois with a massive display of federal force, to show them what would happen if they chose to exercise their right to self-determination. The kidnappings were simply a pretext” (Fidler, 1978, p. 44). Evidence provided by Loomis (1984) and the various security studies referenced earlier in this chapter tends to reaffirm both Vallières’ and Fidler’s arguments.

Despite the federal government’s prominent role in the crisis, it was actually the provincial and municipal governments that requested the assistance of the military and the use of the WMA. In addition, the soldiers were controlled by the Sûreté du Québec and played only a support role to the Quebec civil authorities. Disgruntled with the provincial government’s handling of the situation, a group of prominent figures in
Quebec came together to draft a letter formally demanding that Premier Robert Bourassa and his government negotiate with the FLQ kidnappers. In a similar vein as *Strong and Free*, the group argued that the rigid ‘law and order’ approach to the crisis was simply creating an escalation in the violence while hindering the democratic path towards social change, a necessary step to solving the crisis (Le Devoir, 1970c). Years later, in *Dissent and the State* (1989), C.E.S. Franks (1989, p. 19) put forward a similar argument:

> The challenge is not for the state to suppress dissent, but for the state to ameliorate the problems and conditions that cause it. Only then can a regime prove that it is attempting to accommodate the basic human needs and rights that justify its existence. Regimes that do this are...much more secure and legitimate than those dependent on powerful security services that control and prevent dissent.

Many government officials recognized the need for social reform. For example, Jérôme Choquette, Quebec’s Minister of Justice during the Crisis, stated in a television interview near the beginning of the Crisis that the government was ready to address societal problems and that one reform they would introduce was more active listening to social groups such as citizen coalitions (Choquette, 1970). Many community groups in Quebec supported this recommendation for more direct democracy (Gagnon, 1970; Hétu, 1970). Solutions to criminal activity do not have to take the road of oppressive security. Political violence in particular can be addressed through social and democratic reform. Citizens groups are a key element of the democratic framework for planning, yet they are rarely acknowledged as a legitimate route for a more democratic method of security planning. This will be discussed in more detail in the subsequent case studies.

The federal government also developed a new strategy for dealing with the crisis, which relied on political manoeuvring as a way to maintain long-term security. As the
next section will show, security goes far beyond the material ways of controlling spaces and bodies and becomes a method of governing.

The Government’s New Security Strategy

While troops in the streets and the suspension of civil liberties through the WMA defined the crisis, there was an entire other world of political manoeuvring that was less visible but just as powerful. With heavy criticism from notable public figures such as Claude Ryan and René Lévesque, Prime Minister Trudeau realized that the crisis had to be addressed on a different level. He shifted his government’s focus away from security and more into psychological warfare as part of a plan to win over intellectuals and deflect attention away from the reasoning for the WMA (Gauvreau, 2009). This strategy began on 19 October 1970, when the federal government proposed an operations centre that would “advise, assist and coordinate the action of each department in fulfilment of its part in the strategic plan” to lead the country out of the crisis and thwart the FLQ. This centre became the focal point for co-ordinating the strategic plan, identifying gaps in it, analyzing the operations and providing daily situational reports. The team comprised a representative from the Prime Minister’s Office, an information officer, a security officer, appropriate representatives from the provincial and municipal governments and a chief of operations who would act in accordance with directions from the PM and the cabinet.

The lack of success up until this point was believed to be a result of jurisdictional issues and communication problems (Ross, 1995). For example, relations between the three forces, the Montreal Police, the Sûreté du Québec, and the RCMP started to

47 Ibid.
deteriorate soon after the crisis began. The Montreal Police began taking unilateral action without consulting the other forces.\textsuperscript{48} Information was not being made readily available to the other forces and communication and coordination was not smooth.\textsuperscript{49} As a result, the purpose of the Operations Centre was to “establish reliable and recognized lines of communication with provincial and municipal governments and every effort should be made to prevent it from co-opting unto itself direct operational responsibilities for conducting activities at the program or local level.”\textsuperscript{50} Up to that point, the various levels of government relied on the security apparatus, notably the military, the police, and the WMA, to deal with the crisis rather than using political leaders, communication, legislation, political parties and government departments to assist in every aspect of eliminating the crisis.\textsuperscript{51} This led to a major political and psychological strategy to thwart the rise of popular support for the FLQ.

In a memorandum to Cabinet, the operations centre listed its most immediate objective: to contain the FLQ through explicit action that engendered mass confidence in government and non-confidence in the FLQ.\textsuperscript{52} To do this, the operation centre needed to limit demonstrations, show that the Federal and Provincial governments were in control, and keep public attention on ministers and premiers, not the police and military. In the short term, the government had to make the reasons for their actions understood by the public. It also believed that a strong presence of French Canadians in government in Ottawa and a withdrawal of troops as soon as possible to prevent the Crisis from turning

\textsuperscript{48} LAC, PET, MG 26 O 11, vol.21, W.L. Higgitt, RCMP Commissioner to George J. McIlraith, Solicitor General, 18 November 1970.
\textsuperscript{49} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{50} LAC, PET, MG 26 O 11, vol.13 file 12, “Memorandum to the Prime Minister,” Government Operations Centre, 19 October 1970.
\textsuperscript{51} Ibid., “Memorandum to the Cabinet: A Strategy for Dealing with the FLQ,” 19 October 1970.
\textsuperscript{52} Ibid.
into a symbol of French defiance.\textsuperscript{53} In the medium and long term the government wanted to use the events to reinforce the principles of a democratic system and demonstrate its willingness to continue working towards a better society. Two of the first reforms they proposed to do were to introduce new special situation legislation to replace the WMA and redistribute parliamentary seats in Quebec to better represent the population.\textsuperscript{54}

Another component of the Operations Centre was the conduct of psychological warfare. About a month into the Crisis, the issue of national security was recast as a question of psychology (Gauvreau, 2009, p. 173). In a document entitled “Offensive Psywar guidelines” the Operations Centre aimed “to assist government and law enforcement agencies by isolating the FLQ from the society in which it operates.”\textsuperscript{55} The document outlined four non-mutually exclusive objectives to achieve this overall goal: destroy the credibility of the FLQ as a progressive force; isolate the movement from Canadian society; attack the structure of the FLQ by causing dissension within its ranks; and isolate the most hard core members.

A major part of security operations is psychological war against a population. The combination of both overt and covert security methods signifies the multi-dimensional structure of a security apparatus. It also suggests that the October Crisis was not just a moment of security but marked an important reorganization of the security apparatus in Canada.

\textsuperscript{53} Ibid.  
\textsuperscript{54} LAC, PET, MG 26 O 11, vol.13 file 12 and vol.47 file 16, “Strategy Development: Current Crisis”, 19 October 1970. As mentioned earlier, the federal government substituted the WMA with the Public Order Temporary Measures Act, but it was not until the mid-1980s that the WMA was replaced by a more updated legislation. In 1974, the federal government reformed the distribution of seats in the House of Commons guaranteeing that Quebec could never have less than 75 seats.  
\textsuperscript{55} LAC, PET, MG 26 O 11, vol. 47 file 16, “Offensive Psywar Guidelines”.
The Trajectory of the Security Apparatus

In Michael Freeman’s 2003 book, Freedom of Security: The Consequences for Democracies Using Emergency Powers to Fight Terror, he evaluates the effectiveness of emergency measures during several crises from countries around the world. He argues that in most cases, there has been a trade-off between security and democracy but that in the case of the October Crisis, this did not occur (Freeman, 2003). Without advocating the use of emergency powers, he posits that the October Crisis represents the best-case scenario because “the army, police, and political leaders all held a strong normative commitment to democracy and liberty” (Ibid., p. 132). He also claims that because the WMA was temporary and ended on 30 April 1970, it had no lasting impact (Ibid., p. 131). Freeman’s reasoning relies on liberal ideology to argue that liberties were only suspended in the short-term, so that they could be preserved in the long-term. Contrary to this assertion, the security measures deployed during the October Crisis served to criminalize dissent and intimidate those with leftist political leanings or nationalist tendencies. Furthermore, some people arrested during this time lost their jobs or became ostracized from their community (Brault, 1974; Simard, 2000). These certainly constitute a legacy and to claim that there was no lasting impact is false.

The FLQ’s actions throughout the 1960s and during the October Crisis of 1970 meant that terrorism was seen as a plausible threat to Canadian democracy. In the years following the October Crisis, the federal security apparatus was continually transformed to address this new circumstance. Writing a few days before the invocation of the WMA, Jean-Paul Desbiens (1970), a notable Quebec journalist, hinted that “Le risque, à courte terme, de comportements aussi erratique que ceux du FLQ, c’est d’amener le gouvernement, appuyé par la population, à couper largement dans les libertés dont nous
jouissons tous.” In other words, the experience of terrorism gave the government grounds on which to restrict some fundamental freedoms. Another notable figure, Jean Gérin-Lajoie, the Quebec Director of the Steelworkers Union, also believed that because of terrorism, people would be willing to accept even the most outlandish security measures (Gérin-Lajoie, 1970). As I have already shown, the various levels of government employed language that amplified the FLQ threat in order to legitimize the use of exceptional powers and mobilize ample support for their security tactics.

The federal government relied on a security logic—premised on the normative idea that a measure like the WMA preserved the common good over individual rights (Sauriol, 1970) and on the assumption that the FLQ was a credible state adversary—to legitimate its actions. Lucien Saulnier, Chair of the Executive Council for the City of Montreal, believed the WMA was an essential and necessary way to preserve freedom: “Après la vie, le bien le plus précieux de l’homme, c’est sa liberté et, dans les grandes centres urbains, lorsque l’homme craint pour sa vie quand il descend dans la rue, il a perdu sa liberté” (Masson, 1970). This line of reasoning is typical of the language and logic used to justify security practices. According to Saulnier, it was the FLQ that made everyone’s lives insecure. For most people, however, especially Montreal’s Francophone population, the feelings of fear and anxiety present in many aspects of urban life prior to and throughout the October Crisis were not provoked by the FLQ but rather by the state, the media and the police (LaPierre, 1971). The threat of terrorism allowed the

56 “The short-term risk of erratic actions like those perpetrated by FLQ, is to lead the government, supported by the public, to place limits on the liberties that we all enjoy” (my translation).
57 “After life, the most precious human right is liberty and, in large urban centres, when a person goes out on the street and fears for their life, they have lost their liberty” (my translation).
government—in this case and the cases to follow—the discretion to use exceptional measures to address a questionable danger.

The WMA marked a turning point in the legality of police activity. Fidler (1978) argues that after the October Crisis, some illegal police activities became legal and public commissions were prevented from accessing information related to national security. Examining various pieces of legislation presented after the October Crisis, “the Quebec-based Human Rights League was led to conclude that the federal government was introducing ‘war measures’ piece by piece, by providing each of its principal pieces of legislation with exceptional or extraordinary powers” (Fidler, 1978, pp. 16–17). By doing this, the government made resorting to the WMA unnecessary during times of crisis.58

Furthermore, the inclusion of the Charter of Rights and Freedoms into the Constitution in 1982 was accompanied by a notwithstanding clause allowing Parliament or any provincial legislature to suspend certain provisions of the Charter for a maximum of five years if deemed necessary.59 Once again, this type of measure renders the WMA moot, but ensures the state of exception is never too distant.

In a public inquiry commissioned by the Quebec Government in 1977, Jean Keable was asked to look into police activities in Quebec in the early 1970s. The report, published in 1981, pointed to the continuation of oppressive and sometimes illegal police tactics under the pretext of rooting out terrorism. In a news conference following the publication of his report, Keable proclaimed that “terrorism had the effect of increasing police control over day-to-day life of citizens” (The Gazette, 1981). He also stated that:

“Terrorism in 1970 permitted an increase in the powers of the police...and permitted an

58 LAC, PET, MG 26 O 11, vol.21 file 12, Ron Basford, Minister of Justice to Pierre Trudeau, Prime Minister, 22 October 1975
unprecedented amplification of the presence of security services in the life of citizens”.

The police controlled the FLQ through undercover work so tightly in the years after the October Crisis that it led one police officer to state “the police were the FLQ” (Ibid.).

The military received little criticism for its actions during the Crisis. Charters (1986) suggested that this was a result of the professionalization of the military rather than the preparation made to deal with an insurrection in Quebec. Regardless, this was a major step towards bringing the police forces and the military closer together. Since the October Crisis, the police and the military have continually worked together in securitizing mega-events. GAMESCAN was the operation to counter terrorist actions during the 1976 Montreal Olympics, which became the largest Canadian military operation in Canada with 16,000 soldiers deployed (Lord, 1980). In the spring of 1976, in anticipation of the Olympics, various police services launched a ‘clean-up’ operation targeted at domestic ‘radicals’ and separatist militants (Fidler, 1978, p. 33). Later, the 1978-79 federal budget set out provisions for the purchase of new military equipment such as “new tanks and armoured cars designed for ‘civil insurrections’” (Ibid., p. 17).

While the police and the military worked closely together to provide security for events following the October Crisis, it has been rare to see the military called upon to provide security in urban settings, except in cases of disasters such as floods and winter storms. Perhaps the militarized atmosphere of the October Crisis led to a distaste for military interventions in urban spaces during moments of political upheaval. This is not to suggest that the military has played less of a role during moments of civilian security. Rather, as we will see in the subsequent case studies, the military remains a key actor, but
its presence has become more hidden from public view and subordinate to a more militarized police force.

The End of the Crisis and the Future of Security

By mid-November of 1970, troops were being withdrawn from sites such as the Montreal airport and the St. Lawrence Seaway for fear that their continued deployment would be used by Quebec moderates such as René Lévesque as a sign of occupation by Canada’s military. Soldiers assigned to protect non-cabinet ministers (Canada and Quebec) were also withdrawn. By the end of November, the police had located the hideout of the Liberation Cell, the group holding James Cross captive (Crelinsten, 1987). On December 3, after negotiations with the authorities, Cross was liberated and the kidnappers were given safe passage to Cuba. Almost a month later, on December 29, the police arrested the last three kidnappers of Pierre Laporte in a farmhouse in Saint-Luc, a town on the outskirts of Montreal (Lesage, 1970). For a story with so many urban overtones, the rural setting was a strange dénouement to the crisis.

The political and economic inequalities between the French and English populations in Quebec were most apparent in Montreal. Anglophones controlled the economy and possessed strong influence over the political sphere. They were also able to maintain their economic hegemony through spatial exclusion. By the 1960s, this traditional configuration was being challenged, not least by the FLQ, whose members used political violence to challenge the established order. Throughout the decade, the streets of Montreal became the battleground for the FLQ’s struggles, culminating in the October Crisis.
The ineffectiveness of the police to bring a quick end to the crisis meant that the government looked to other measures to solve the crisis. The deployment of the military (now better trained and prepared for domestic crises) and the enactment of the WMA were used not only to address what was perceived as an insurrection but also to symbolically intimidate the public. In so doing, aspects of normal life such as political dissent were rendered vulnerable to state power (Hannah, 2007) and people holding left wing or separatist views were broadly targeted. The civil liberties of millions were suspended, while the few kidnappers remained elusive, hiding in anonymity within the urban environment. Rather than addressing the social and economic ills that may have triggered such dissent in the first place, the WMA only extended the spaces of government control.

The first thing state power attempts to do when faced with a crisis or the potential of a threat is to increase security measures in cities. During the October Crisis, the military served the purpose of securitizing spaces and buildings while the WMA rendered all individuals vulnerable to the security actions of the state. In his reflections on the October Crisis, former Minister of State Gérard Pelletier said: “The October Crisis brought certain concepts into concrete collective experience which in normal times often remain very abstract: democracy, fundamental rights, civil liberties, protest and so on” (Pelletier, 1971, p. 151). The security blanket thrown over Montreal drove much of the democratic ‘voice’ underground and out of the spaces of the city, the traditional loci of civic engagement.

Upon the arrests of the final three kidnappers, some journalists stated that the security situation went back to normal in the city (Lépine, 1970). But the army remained
in Quebec until 4 January 1971, and the temporary emergency regulations remained in
place until the end of April 1971. Now that terrorism was considered a tangible threat, the
various levels of government, the police forces and the military reflected on and
evaluated the actions they took and the measures necessary to prevent a similar crisis in
the future. When a CBC reporter asked Quebec Premier Robert Bourassa in December
1970 what lessons the government would take from this experience, he responded
tellingly:

> It is obvious that Police Forces should be equipped to face such a situation, as I
said in the past, it is a new form of terrorist activities and we have to be prepared
to face that. This is an experience which will help the Quebec Government to face
a situation in the future. It is evident for everybody that terrorist activities are
existing in most country and we have to live with that but we have to be better
prepared to face that and in Quebec, it will be the case.60

In the two years following the October Crisis, surveillance of the FLQ became
ubiquitous, leading to many arrests (Ross, 1995, p. 292).

Four decades after the October Crisis of 1970, images of the Canadian military
occupying the streets of Ottawa, Montreal and Quebec City remain potent. Jean-Victor
Allard, speaking on behalf of the Mobile Command Unit during the military’s
restructuring period in the 1960s, makes the following statement regarding integration:

> In all our planning, we assumed that the military and civil elements would be kept
separate but that over-all civil control such as planning execution and supervision
of activities would be coordinated and carried out by integrating organizations in
which there were military, police and civilian components (quoted in Loomis,

Integration of the different police forces and even the military may have been poorly
organized during the October Crisis, but it has become, as I will show in the remaining
case studies, a crucial component in major security planning operations.

60 LAC, PET, MG 26 O 11, vol.38 file 4, Statement by Robert Bourassa, Premier of Quebec to the CBC, 3 December 1970. N.B.: The grammatical errors in this quote are a reflection of Bourassa’s spoken English.
The October Crisis was perceived as an example of a ‘new’ form of security threat emerging out of the rapid changes taking place in Western societies.\(^{61}\) A new era of insecurity characterized by urban unrest in many liberal democracies had finally erupted in Canada. For the federal government at the time, the proclamation of the WMA revealed some of the inadequacies of existing criminal law.\(^{62}\) Therefore, as Ministers of Justice, both Pierre Trudeau (1967-68) and John Turner (1968-72) advocated “law reform in an age of confrontation, an age characterized by conflict between freedom and authority” (Loomis, 1984, p. 90). Both Trudeau and Turner suggested that the 1960s ushered in a new era, where suddenly the “conflict between freedom and authority” had to be ‘re’-balanced. But this narrow legal perspective ignores the many ways that insecurity can be addressed without the use of the security apparatus.

Highly restrictive and controversial security measures are often the first and primary ways of dealing with an urban crisis. Control over the spaces of the city is consistently the object of security planning when the state is placed in a position of insecurity. The next two chapters will continue to show the shifting nature of security planning and how the state addresses different forms of urban insecurity.
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\(^{61}\) LAC, PET, MG 26 O 11, vol.47 file 24, D.F. Wall, Secretary to the Cabinet for Security Matters to J. Davey, Program Director of the Emergency Operations Centre, 10 March 1971.

Chapter 3:

SETTING A NEW COURSE: HOW SECURITY TRIUMPHED OVER FREEDOM AT APEC

On a typical rainy Vancouver day in November 1997, thousands gathered on the campus of the University of British Columbia (UBC) to protest the Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation (APEC) meetings. On this particular day, leaders of the member economies were gathering at the Museum of Anthropology, one of UBC’s most picturesque locations. In anticipation of this event, a large area surrounding the museum was cordoned off. As a result, protests were kept out of sight from the meeting location.

Martha Piper, the university President, warned Prime Minister Jean Chrétien that reducing the size of the protest zone and restricting sight lines would “increase the risk of serious incident arising out of over-crowding and frustration in a very confined space.”

The events that transpired suggest that there was some truth in Dr. Piper’s statements. A lingering question is whether or not the security of the dignitaries would have been compromised if the protestors had been afforded more opportunity to be seen and heard. This is highly doubtful. So, when space is severely regulated around such events, what is the actual intent? An analysis of the APEC case shows that security concerns were exaggerated in order to limit the spaces for protest. While this case is not as significant as the Olympics in terms of urban securitization, it marks the beginning of a form of
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1 In APEC language, all members are referred to as ‘member economies’ rather than countries or nations. This is meant to remove the political dimension to these meetings. In other words, the Prime Minister of Canada is representing Canada’s economy, not any other aspect of Canada as a country.

2 University of British Columbia Archives, APEC Inquiry Collection, Jonathan Oppenheim Sub-Collection (Hereafter referred to as JOC), Box 5 File 5.17, Dr. Martha Piper to Prime Minister Jean Chrétien. 19 November 1997.
planning that is placed mostly in the hands of security ‘experts’. The case also reveals the refinement and increased dedication to an integrated security structure and a growing reliance on security expertise. Thus, this chapter demonstrates how ‘security’ has come to legitimize various actions that make security planning more difficult to hold accountable and scrutinize. While I focus on APEC to highlight this conclusion, this chapter is concerned with the broader implications of control and regulation that emerged alongside the larger anti-globalization protests that took place in the late 1990s and early 2000s. Understanding APEC within these larger global developments that followed the event helps to unpack the ways in which the Canadian security apparatus has adjusted to a changed climate of political dissidence.

During this 1990s, a newly energized civil society emerged intent on expressing its opposition to a variety of policies in the name of social justice. Confronted with such antagonism, the state looked for security solutions to maintain a balance between the democratic right to dissent and the need for civic order. APEC can be considered a watershed moment for Canadian security planning. As this second vignette will show, the actions taken to secure the city for APEC and limit the signs of protest came under tremendous scrutiny after the event. As a result, security planners were able to learn from their mistakes and refine the security apparatus to meet similar situations in the future. This chapter begins by explaining how the security apparatus in Canada evolved after the October Crisis. It will then discuss the anti-globalization movement and how police tactics for addressing such protests have changed over time. I then explain how security was planned and managed during APEC, particularly with respect to the controversial events that transpired on UBC campus. The chapter concludes with an examination of a
Changes to the Canadian Security Apparatus

Between the October Crisis in 1970 and the APEC Summit in 1997 there were several significant moments in the transformation of security planning. Just six years after the October Crisis, and four years after the fateful events of the Munich Games, Canada hosted the 1976 Summer Olympics in Montreal. The Montreal Olympics became Canada’s largest security operation, with thousands of security forces deployed and roughly $100 million spent on protecting the Games. This seems like a small sum compared to current Olympic security budgets, but at the time, it was a significant amount to be spent on a temporary security operation.

After years of surveillance and infiltration of the FLQ and other separatist groups, the federal government decided to set up the Royal Commission of Inquiry into Certain Activities of the RCMP, better known as the McDonald Commission. As the title suggests, it was established to examine allegations that the RCMP had engaged in illegal activities throughout the 1970s. The final report, published in 1981, recommended that the Security Service division of the RCMP, which was responsible for issues of national security, be assigned to a new civilian agency.3 The Royal Commission on Security from 1969 had also made the same recommendation, but as I mentioned in the previous chapter, the federal government decided to install a civilian director general to oversee
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the operations of the RCMP security intelligence unit rather than overhaul the entire system. In 1984, the Canadian Security Intelligence Service (CSIS), a civilian agency, was established and the RCMP was no longer responsible for intelligence operations in matters that concerned national security.

Another more symbolic shift in the security apparatus in Canada was the replacement of the War Measures Act (WMA) with the Emergencies Act in 1988. While the two Acts are similar, all temporary measures authorized under the Emergencies Act are subject to the Charter of Rights and Freedoms. But, as I mentioned in the previous chapter, the “notwithstanding clause” in the Charter allows Parliament or any provincial legislature to suspend certain provisions of the Charter for a maximum of five years if deemed necessary.4

Despite new experiences hosting mega-events and changes to Canada’s security apparatus, the controversy surrounding the RCMP’s security practices during the APEC Summit meant that the historical and geographical differences between and the October Crisis were not so disparate. Joel Bakan and Andrew Irvine, both professors at UBC, made comparisons between the two events. Bakan (2000, p. 78) suggested that police actions during APEC were “the most important civil rights travesty since Prime Minister Trudeau invoked the War Measures Act in 1970”, while Irvine (2000, p. 39) argued that the two events showed “how fragile some of our most fundamental rights and freedoms can be” where their suspension is sanctioned by government whenever deemed appropriate. Although the circumstances that propelled Montreal into a crisis in 1970 were much different from the issues surrounding Vancouver’s APEC summit, fears of
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terrorism and leftist political dissent were high priorities for security planners in both cases.

**Anti-Globalization and the Policing of Protest**

Economic integration and trade liberalization are the primary goals of the APEC meetings. It is part of a larger neoliberal agenda to remove barriers to the free movement of capital. According to Bakan (2000, p. 83), the discourse of neoliberalism has been construed as a “technical and apolitical” part of sound economic policy. As such, deliberations at these summits rarely make connections between economic policy and other issues such as human rights and environmental destruction. Thus, when protesters contested APEC policies at the 1997 summit, they were viewed as “ill-informed and irrational” ideologues (Bakan, 2000, p. 83) because their concern with human rights and the environment had nothing to do with economics. In this sense, Herbert (2007, pp. 615–16) argues that the state acts as “handmaiden to global capital,” while the police are forced to defend—violently if necessary—the state’s support for neoliberal policies.

Under the guise of neutrality and universality, these global economic summits have proliferated over the last two decades. In response, social movements were galvanized to challenge and politicize these meetings and the economic “science” behind them (Epstein & Iveson, 2009). In the late 1990s, a new form of social activism emerged which became known as the “anti-globalization” movement. Not all groups that made up this movement were necessarily anti-globalization; the movement comprised a variety of groups and organizations fighting for a plethora of emancipatory causes (Köhler & Wissen, 2003). The movement only became infamous after it disrupted the World Trade Organization (WTO) Ministerial Conference in Seattle in 1999. Various groups
collaborated to contest the policies of the WTO, but when protestor actions effectively shut down the first day of talks, the demonstrators had to contend with a deluge of police force and legislation limiting the spaces for protest (Herbert, 2007; King & Waddington, 2005; Noakes, Klocke, & Gillham, 2005).

Even though the WTO in Seattle came two years after APEC, the former was considered the watershed event in terms of security planning and the policing of protest on a global scale (Noakes et al., 2005, p. 241). Briefly, this event propelled other police forces to learn from the Seattle experience and update their arsenals and procedures for managing protests (Ibid.). In the Canadian context, however, APEC (along with the WTO) had a significant impact on the future of security operations in Canada. These events triggered new styles of policing protest, which I will now review in more detail.

Research on policing strategies for addressing public order has proliferated since the release of Della Porta and Reiter’s (1998) book *Policing Protest: The Control of Mass Demonstrations in Western Democracies*. This edited volume explains protest policing styles through various comparative case studies. The contributors point out how methods of policing dissent have changed over the last few decades and how these strategies differ in various countries. Most importantly, this book shows that there is a general trend towards a seemingly more tolerant style of regulating protest.

Noakes, Klocke and Gillham (2005) discuss this tolerant style of policing in their study of the struggles between protesters and police over space at anti-war/anti-capitalism protests in Washington D.C. in 2001. They make reference to two methods: negotiated management and strategic incapacitation. Negotiated management is a more passive technique of policing that replaced the forceful tactics used to police protest prior to the
1970s (Della Porta & Reiter, 1998). Characterized by greater cooperation between police and protest groups, this has proved to be a more effective way for police to control disorder and to increase the predictability of protest actions (Noakes et al., 2005). For example, police allow certain tactics such as blocking a street, while protest groups provide information on desired demonstration routes. But this only works for groups that are willing to co-operate with the police. Some groups will not allow their right to protest be restricted, while others, especially those involved in the anti-globalization movement, do not necessarily have leaders for the police to engage with (King & Waddington, 2005; Noakes et al., 2005). For these protests, police have moved increasingly towards the ‘strategic incapacitation’ model, where security planners create no-protest zones, make pre-emptive arrests, use methods of surveillance and infiltration, and employ non-lethal force to ensure that protest tactics do not escalate to a level deemed illegitimate and unacceptable to authorities (Noakes et al., 2005). This model has allowed the police greater control over the spaces of protest, without seeming as oppressive.

These methods of policing protest suggest that the police have full agency when dealing with demonstrations. However, Ericson and Doyle (1999) argue that policing during international events like APEC must be understood as something different from traditional policing cultures. One of the major differences between normal day-to-day policing and policing for international events, is that the government often takes a more active role (Ericson & Doyle, 1999, p. 591), resulting in additional politicization of the police force (Martin, 2011). As this case will demonstrate, the federal government was influential over where and how protest could take place during APEC.
In more recent years, research on policing protest has tried to incorporate a more spatial perspective. In one retrospective study of the WTO protests in Seattle, Herbert (2007) examines what it means for the state to zone the expression of dissent by restricting access to certain areas of the city. He proposes seven different ways of viewing the state, which collectively provide “a more complete account of what the state does when it spatially regulates protest” (Herbert, 2007, p. 604). From a Canadian perspective, Zajko and Béland (2008) have examined the spatial context in which protesters and state actors clashed during APEC 1997 in Vancouver and the 2002 G8 summit in Kananaskis, Alberta. Their research highlights “the enduring tension between the logic of territorial control stemming from state sovereignty and the recognition of the right to protest that is a key component of modern democratic citizenship” (Zajko & Béland, 2008, p. 732). The idea of citizenship is also a key element in Epstein and Iveson’s (2009) study of APEC 2007 in Sydney, Australia. They argue that the increasingly stringent spatial restrictions associated with global summits such as APEC, can actually contribute to a new form of insurgent citizenship.

One of the most important pieces of work to deal with the controversies around APEC 1997 is Pepper in Our Eyes: The APEC Affair, a volume edited by UBC law professor Wesley Pue. While the use of pepper spray on peaceful demonstrators dominated the news, this book goes much deeper and asks “questions relating to constitutional principle, the role of police in democratic society, and the effects of ‘globalization’ on rights and politics in Canada” (Pue, 2000a, p. x). While the book illuminates some of the larger issues surrounding security and civil liberties, this chapter takes the analysis a step further by incorporating a spatial perspective. Because planning
is such a localized discipline and issues of democracy are often approached at the national scale, Friedmann (2008) argues that planners have made few contributions to democratic theory. While this chapter does not explicitly contribute to such theories, it examines how security planning and political manoeuvring can restrict the spaces where democratic practices are enacted.

Security Planning for the APEC Summit

The APEC meeting brought together thousands of delegates from 18 member economies. Of these delegates, 75 were considered Internationally Protected Persons (IPPs), the “greatest number of internationally protected persons ever gathered in one place in Canada” (Johnson, 1997). In 1997 this was not only the largest such meeting ever held in Canada, but it was also the largest and most complex police operation ever undertaken by the Vancouver Police Department (VPD) and the RCMP. According to William Hooper, a CSIS employee involved in the preparations, APEC was actually deemed the largest security operation in Canadian history. Over 3000 police officers were involved in providing security and hundreds more from CSIS, Canada Customs, and the Department of National Defence (DND) assisted the operation.

Vancouver became a highly securitized landscape, where APEC venues and hotels were made off-limits to the public or placed under stringent security protocol. The most contentious of these venues were the Museum of Anthropology (MoA) and Norman Mackenzie House (the residence of the university’s President) on UBC campus. These
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6 JOC, Box 5 File 5.7, “Public Complaints Commission Statement by William Hooper (CSIS)".
adjacent sites were used for the APEC Economic Leaders’ Meeting (AELM) on the last day of the summit. UBC was chosen to symbolically demonstrate Canada’s commitment to education and youth and to showcase the beauty of the country. Hosting the AELM in a retreat-like setting had become a tradition for APEC summits, and the UBC site was seen as an easy space to secure. But the use of a university translated into a major security concern as opposition to APEC started to mount. Over the first six days of the summit, there were no significant security issues. Several days before the AELM, however, tension started to brew between the police and protesters on UBC campus. On November 25, roughly 3000 people marched through campus, protesting the economic policies of APEC and the human rights abuses by certain leaders attending the AELM. The UBC campus became the site of conflict between police and protesters in one of the largest demonstrations in Vancouver’s history (The Province, 1997).

The federal government chose the UBC campus for the AELM, but members of the university community were not invited to participate in any aspect of the APEC summit. The exclusive business orientation of APEC frustrated a large portion of the university community who were also concerned with human rights issues, especially given the questionable records of member economies like China and Indonesia. The issue of human rights became a rallying point for demonstrators opposed to APEC policies and especially to the use of UBC campus for the AELM. The main priority for security planners was to ensure the safety of venues and the delegates but the mounting opposition to APEC, especially on UBC campus, added another dimension to the already complex task of securitizing the city.
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7 JOC, Box 2 File 2.21, “APEC Executive Tour: UBC Site.” 12 November 1997.
8 JOC, Box 6 File 6.11, “Site selection.” A major advantage noted for every APEC venue was the ability to secure the site.
Learning from the Past

Prior to the previous APEC event in Manila in 1996, 400,000 ‘shanty town’ residents were relocated and their homes destroyed in a state-sponsored ‘city-beautification project’. In response, 10,000 anti-APEC protesters marched from Manila to the site of the former shanty town, only to be repeatedly stopped by the military and police who had set up barricades along the route.\(^9\) Large-scale events such as APEC are often wielded as a reason to clean up a section of a city or to displace the most marginalized communities. Likewise, in every Summer Olympics from Seoul (1988) to Beijing (2008) there have been examples of displacement and gentrification resulting from Olympic related development (Bulman, 2007). Over 2000 families will be displaced from a favela in Rio De Janeiro to make room for the security perimeter surrounding a venue for the 2016 Summer Olympics (Coffey, 2010).

To develop the security and transportation plan for APEC, Canadian organizers relied on the experiences from Manila and other cities that had hosted mega events.\(^{10}\) In addition, the organizers looked at local events, national summits and conferences, and international meetings such as previous APEC and G7/G8 summits as a way to take lessons learned and best practices and adapt them to the particular Vancouver environment.\(^{11}\) Teams comprised of government and police officials travelled to Seattle (APEC 1993), and Manila to complete fact-finding missions on the impact and protocols for accommodating so many IPPs for the event. The security planning group also

\(^9\) JOC, Box 4 File 4.6, Jago, C. David (12 May 1997) “APEC at UBC and the project of Globalization”.
\(^{10}\) City of Vancouver Archives (CVA), City Corporate Service Fonds (CCS), Vol. 941-D-2 File 5, Administrative report from Deputy City Manager to Vancouver City Council, “APEC 1997: Police and Engineering Costs” (30 October, 1997).
\(^{11}\) JOC, Box 2 File 2.6, “Second Advance Visit Briefing”. September 1997.
travelled to Denver to observe the G8 Summit in June 1997. These trips were crucial to ensure effective planning and to establish the credibility of the planning group.12

But the security planners also believed that adapting and adjusting the security arrangements to blend with local customs and tolerance should only be done to the extent that it did not compromise the total security package. Despite the major social, cultural and physical differences found in each of these cities, security tends to take a similar shape and form wherever such events take place. The fact that concrete barriers were positioned around Vancouver to stop ‘Beirut-Style’ car bombings suggests that context has little impact on the security preparations (Jiwa, 1997).

A Novel Idea: The Integration of Security

Security planning for APEC began in 1996, and from the outset, the RCMP and the VPD acknowledged their complimentary roles in providing security.13 This was the first time that joint operations of such magnitude had taken place in Canada, so to avoid duplication of security services, the police forces worked closely together. They had to establish an integrated command structure and a comprehensive security plan in order to be prepared for any issues that could arise during the summit. Despite this integration, the two forces had clearly defined and separate tasks. As the federal police force, the RCMP is legislated to protect IPPs and is also the lead security agency for international events hosted in Canada. This meant that the RCMP was primarily tasked with implementing and managing the security measures at APEC venues and hotels, but the VPD still provided whatever assistance was necessary. The VPD was responsible for everything outside the venues, including crowd and traffic management and other more everyday
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12 JOC, Box 4 File 4.4, “A retrospective view of VPD’s APEC ‘97 planning and deployment”.
concerns such as criminal activity. Given the VPD’s daily engagement with urban issues, there has long been an agreement between the two police forces that the VPD would be responsible for motorcades and crowd control during protests.\textsuperscript{14} Notwithstanding these specific areas of responsibility, the RCMP and VPD were more integrated than ever before.\textsuperscript{15}

The engineering department of the city was also heavily involved in security planning before the event and emergency preparedness during the event. It was tasked with planning, developing, and implementing the traffic management plan and it was required to seal manhole covers and remove newspaper, mail, and waste containers from APEC event sites and along motorcade routes.\textsuperscript{16} Leo Knight, a former VPD and RCMP officer, called this the “sanitization process,” a way to ensure a zone is completely securitized in the most exhaustive way possible to ensure that no threat is posed to arriving dignitaries (quoted in Johnson, 1997). The engineers also assisted security agencies with planning the motorcade routes; they identified the main routes and over 350 alternative routes in case of disturbances.\textsuperscript{17} There were roughly 674 motorcade movements throughout the APEC summit and alternate routes were used only twice to avoid protest groups.\textsuperscript{18} In anticipation of the numerous motorcade movements, security officials advised Engineering to close several streets for the duration of the APEC summit. Burrard Street, one of the main North-South arteries through downtown.

\textsuperscript{14} JOC, Box 4 File 4.1, “Memorandum of agreement between the VPD and the RCMP, “E” Division, in respect to VIP security duties within the city of Vancouver.” 15 December 1983.
\textsuperscript{15} JOC, Box 8 File 8.11, Memorandum from Errin A. Pyner to the RCMP Public Complaints Commission. Transcript of the RCMP video “Policing APEC – Training Version”. 11 June 1998.
\textsuperscript{16} City of Vancouver Archives, City Engineering Services Fonds, Volume 986-F-5 File 8, “VPD Briefing Notes”.
\textsuperscript{17} JOC, Box 2 File 2.6, “Second Advance Visit Briefing”. September 1997.
\textsuperscript{18} JOC, Box 4 File 4.4, “A retrospective view of VPD’s APEC ’97 planning and deployment”.

123
Vancouver, was one of the most controversial closures, and many other streets were closed prior to and during motorcade movements. Parking was also restricted throughout the downtown core during APEC, and residents along the motorcade routes were restricted from leaving or accessing their homes between certain times.¹⁹

Security planning was not only a RCMP-VPD project with assistance from city engineers; it was an integrated project involving people from a variety of government departments, with the RCMP as the lead agency. The RCMP created seven working committees comprised of various agencies to look into communications, information systems, tactical response, logistics, motorcades, investigation, sites, and finance.²⁰ Each committee had an essential role to play in the overall security plan. For instance, the communications committee provided media analysis and also developed strategies to inform the public of security disruptions. The sites committee had to acquire information on each of the 14 sites, including the airport, the MoA, Norman Mackenzie House, BC Place, the Vancouver Trade and Convention Centre (VTCC) and nine hotels, to determine what the best methods and tools would be to ensure that each site became a secure and “sanitized” location.²¹ The committees relayed information and made recommendations back to the integrated command structure.

The Physical Security for the Event

Security planning has come to rely heavily on technology such as surveillance equipment. During APEC, each site was equipped with closed-circuit television cameras
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²⁰ JOC, Box 4 File 4.2, “APEC City Departments Overview”.
(CCTV) and two aircraft were used to provide CCTV coverage of motorcade movements.\textsuperscript{22} The RCMP also used 24 U.S. defence satellites linked to a new advanced emergency management computer system known as EM2000, which provided officers with better situational awareness of issues arising anywhere in the city (Jiwa, 1997).

Securing venues for an event is the most complex operation for security planners. Buildings do not exist as islands unto themselves. Rather, they represent locations with a myriad of connections to the surrounding urban environment. Each site also tends to have several functions. The VTCC, for example, where the main conference took place, is not only a site for large gatherings but it is a tourist attraction, a transportation hub, a hotel, and a place of commerce, making it an already highly congested area.\textsuperscript{23} The building is flanked by a stunning waterfront and hosts a number of businesses and offices, food courts, a Skytrain station, and parking. Shutting down the site can have enormous repercussions for all those who frequent the space on a daily basis. Given the importance of the VTCC and adjacent buildings such as the Pan Pacific Hotel as a site for APEC events, security planners deemed the area a ‘red zone’, meaning the air, ground, and marine zones around the red zone became a ‘no-go’ area (Jiwa, 1997). The other hotels where the leaders were staying also became mini-fortresses, even as they were mapped in one of Vancouver’s newspapers. Figure 3.1 was part of an article published in The Province, explaining the red zone security details.

\textsuperscript{22} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{23} JOC, Box 7 File 7.2, Briefing note from the RCMP Federal Security Coordinator to the Solicitor General, “Update APEC Security Planning.” 16 October 1997. A new VTCC has been built since the APEC summit. The one I refer to here used to be located inside Canada Place, an iconic building on Vancouver’s harbour, built to house the Canada pavilion during Expo 1986.
Figure 3.1: Explaining the Red Zone security. Source: Jiwa, Salim. (19 November 1997). Vancouver does the full Mountie. *The Province*. P. D6-7.
Every access point from air, sea, and land was sealed using the latest instruments in security technology and by ensuring that all sites were protected using barriers, surveillance cameras, snipers, divers, and a heavy police presence. The Canadian Forces also played a role in the security arrangements. It was responsible for mundane tasks such as airport baggage security and more high-risk scenarios such as a hostage rescue, or a nuclear, biological or chemical attack. In addition, DND had a navy vessel docked in Vancouver to assist RCMP with marine and underwater security and response.24

The UBC campus site also represented a unique challenge for security planners. Comprising both natural and developed areas, spatial control became one of the key tools for securitizing the campus.25 Despite these challenges, the campus was chosen partly because of its picturesque location and partly because it was considered an area that could be easily sealed off (Sallot, 1997). According to the contract between the Federal Government and UBC, however, a line-of-site for protesters to the MoA had to be maintained, meaning that sealing off the site required careful attention to the issue of demonstrations.26 UBC’s security concerns were much broader than simply the protection of IPPs. It was more concerned about accommodating the “legitimate rights of these interest groups to demonstrate against APEC…in a manner which does not endanger the APEC Leaders during their meeting on November 25, nor disrupt campus activities in the period leading up to the AELM.”27
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26 JOC, Box 5 File 5.17, Elise Courtney (UBC) to Trevor Thompsett (RCMP), “Re: APEC Secure Zone.” 17 October 1997.
27 JOC, Box 8 File 8.15, “UBC APEC Security Issues.”
Given that the location of this security operation was a university campus, officers were asked to be considerate of the fact that a University is a site where difference of opinions and dissent is encouraged. But, as the remainder of this chapter will show, political officials interfered with the security planning process and police actions were far from considerate.

**Collecting Security Intelligence**

Security planning is usually a reflection of ‘threat assessments’. These played a major role for security preparations during the APEC summit. In January 1997, a multi-dimensional and jurisdictional Threat Assessment Group (TAG) was established and included the RCMP, VPD, CSIS, DND, Citizenship and Immigration Canada, Canada Customs and other departments with intelligence interests. The intelligence gathered by TAG was also reinforced by additional threat assessments issued by CSIS as the meeting approached. TAG performed a political and security assessment of each member economy, identifying 58 terrorist groups targeting member economies. In the end, none of these groups posed a significant threat in relation to APEC in Vancouver. CSIS conducted an additional threat assessment for the event and it was also unable to identify any specific terrorist threat to the meeting. No APEC conference had ever been subject
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31 JOC, Box 5 File 5.6, CSIS Presentation, “The terrorist threat to APEC.” 14 October 1997.
to a terrorist attack, but it had always been regarded as an attractive target because of so many heads of state gathered in one place.\textsuperscript{32}

The intelligence amassed could not identify any major threat to the meetings but according to CSIS, “forums of this magnitude become the focus of protest activity and represent an attractive target for terrorists.”\textsuperscript{33} It was this \textit{assumption} and not intelligence that formed the basis for security planning. Such a statement also links protest with terrorism. Even though the nature and the likelihood of each scenario were entirely different (Terrorism: unlikely but large impact; Protests: likely but low impact) the two scenarios were treated as symbiotic, lumping protesters into the same category as terrorists.

The threat posed by terrorism is often the benchmark for security planning. Not only can a terrorist attack cause a great deal of damage and harm many people, its ultimate goal is to spread fear within society. As such, planning for a terrorist attack receives significant attention even though it is uncommon in Canada. The National Counter-Terrorism Plan (NCTP) approved by cabinet in 1989 was subsequently reviewed one year prior to the APEC summit due to changes in the ‘threat environment’.\textsuperscript{34} The NCTP was tested for the first time during Exercise Shield, held in Vancouver from 9-11 September 1997, just two months prior to the APEC summit.\textsuperscript{35} The scenario involved a hijacked plane with an IPP, synchronized with the explosion of a chemical device on a

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\item\textsuperscript{32} Ibid.; JOC., Box 2 File 2.16, Note from Cal Corley to Patricia Hassard, “Summary of CSIS threat assessment (PIL0822) – APEC.” 17 October 1997.
\item\textsuperscript{33} JOC, Box 2 File 2.16, Note from Cal Corley to Patricia Hassard, “Summary of CSIS threat assessment (PIL0822) – APEC.” 17 October 1997
\item\textsuperscript{34} JOC, Box 7 File 7.1, “National Counter-Terrorism Plan.” 29 October 1997. The threat environment in 1989 was more concerned with threats from communism. With the fall of communism in the Eastern Bloc countries of Europe starting in 1989, this was no longer seen as a threat.
\item\textsuperscript{35} JOC, Box 7 File 7.2, Briefing note from the RCMP Federal Security Coordinator to the Solicitor General, “Update APEC Security Planning.” 16 October 1997.
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
bus, along with a murder and a chemical bomb in one of the hotels. The mock situation involved over 400 participants and it allowed security agencies to identify problems in their command level and communication structure. This ultimately resulted in improved integration and coordination of the various agencies. However, these enhancements to the security structure were irrelevant when the police had to deal with protesters during the demonstrations on UBC campus.

Besides information related to potential terrorist threats, TAG was set up to provide the necessary information on individuals and groups who planned protests. In an exhaustive list, a situation report for APEC identified every group or prominent individual holding an anti-APEC position as a possible threat to the Summit. Over 100 anti-APEC groups and adversaries from member economies were described as potential agitators, including organizations such as the Anglican Church and the British Columbia Teacher’s Federation. The situation report also recommended that monitoring of activist groups needed to begin as soon as possible to collect intelligence. It was even deemed necessary to monitor ‘legitimate’ groups for radical factions.

As the event approached, the largest concern of the security agencies became indigenous and environmental activists and protests targeted towards human rights. Even though TAG and CSIS had no specific information about these groups, they still warned that protest activities involving passive resistance and civil disobedience could occur.
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37 Ibid.
40 JOC, Box 2 File 2.16, Note from Cal Corley to Patricia Hassard, “Summary of CSIS threat assessment (PIL0822) – APEC.” 17 October 1997; Box 4 File 4.8, APEC Threat Assessment Group, “Final situation report for APEC member economies.” 14 November, 1997; Box 7 File 7.2, Briefing note from the RCMP
a presentation outlining the “terrorist threat to APEC,” CSIS alleged that “the potential for violence associated with environmental and native issues, along with groups opposed to APEC itself, pose a potential threat of confrontations with security authorities.” 41 Once again, the conflation of terrorism with protest implied that similar security tactics could be employed against groups even if violence was not part of their protest strategies. The conflation of terrorism with protest allows police forces to use tactics such as undercover investigative work, normally reserved for tracking terrorists or drug trafficking cells, to follow protesters and gather information on their activities.

With dissent and protest deemed a legitimate threat to the APEC summit, the joint security force immediately initiated extensive surveillance of activists. It created a Crowd Infiltration Unit comprised of RCMP and VPD members with experience in covert surveillance, intelligence gathering and familiarity of the Vancouver area. 42 These officers collected information and took detailed notes during surveillance activities at various anti-APEC events and meetings, and they were disbursed in the crowd during large demonstrations to relay information. 43 Even though the mandate for collecting intelligence had been given over to CSIS since 1984, this “explicitly excluded the covert surveillance of groups involved in ‘lawful advocacy, protest or dissent’ unless it could be proved on independent grounds that they posed a significant security threat” (Irvine, 2000, p. 36). Thus, protesters were not seen as a ‘significant’ threat to APEC, but still required covert police monitoring.

41 JOC, Box 5 File 5.6, CSIS Presentation, “The terrorist threat to APEC.” 14 October 1997.
43 Ibid.; In JOC, Box 4 File 4.8, there are various police notes from covert operations.
While the surveillance of activists and the use of intelligence to control protest groups is nothing new in Canada, the availability of more advanced methods of collecting information “has allowed for an increasing level of control” (Della Porta & Reiter, 1998, p. 7). Zajko and Béland (2008) point out that surveillance and infiltration is also a way of producing a controlled space. Attempting to control the spaces of protest, police use this tactic to maintain situational awareness over unpredictable crowds of people.

Another way the police maintained awareness is by requiring groups wishing to hold a demonstration to obtain a permit from the Festival Expediting Staff Team (FEST) run by the Engineering Department at the City of Vancouver. According to Vancouver law, groups must obtain a permit to hold a march, protest or demonstration; otherwise, any obstruction of traffic can result in police action. As mentioned earlier, this method of policing protest is known as ‘negotiated management’. Through this system, the VPD is able to negotiate demonstration routes and spaces with groups and voice its disapproval to the City over particular FEST pass requests. The permit system is a simple way for the state to acquire knowledge of political demonstrations and for the police to become more pro-active in how it deals with local protest groups. Knowing where protesters intend to gather and march allows the police to pre-emptively cordon off certain areas of the city using various types of security barriers and surveillance technology.

The surveillance of activists and the bureaucratic controls placed on dissent is an alarming development in the world of policing protest. Police scrutiny alone can have a chilling effect on those who wish to publically express their opinion through protest or
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activism. In a series on the criminalization of dissent, the Ottawa Citizen newspaper explained that,

The tactic of police or spies arriving unannounced on the doorsteps of demonstration organizers or people just contemplating a public rally represents a hardening of the security establishment's dealings with those who openly voice their opinions. The people receiving the CSIS and RCMP phone calls or visits are not extremists. They're ordinary Canadians -- union members, students, professors and social activists -- who disagree with government policy and want to exercise their rights to free speech and assembly (Ottawa Citizen, 2001b, p. A1).

In other words, police scrutiny can be viewed as intimidation by some and can serve to deter people from working with groups monitored by the police (Hannant, 1993). While the War Measures Act shut down dissent and allowed the arrest of hundreds of innocent people during the October Crisis (1970), police have found a way to exert similar control without having to resort to such controversial legislation.

In the case of APEC, surveillance of activists and the permit system allowed the RCMP and the VPD to gain knowledge about the key protests and their leaders. In addition, the police were able to identify potentially disruptive individuals and perform pre-emptive arrests before the summit and before demonstrations even occurred. For example, notable activist Jaggi Singh, a lead organizer for APEC-Alert, was arrested several days before the summit by four plain-clothed officers and was only released after the event.\textsuperscript{45} The police used such procedures to prevent those individuals and groups suspected of violent ambitions (Ottawa Citizen, 2001a).

Despite extensive intelligence and surveillance of protest groups, the demonstrations on UBC campus were mishandled. What occurred could be termed “insurgent citizenship” (Epstein & Iveson, 2009), where a massive security intervention

\textsuperscript{45} JOC, Box 2 File 2.7, File on the Jaggi Singh arrest. He was arrested for allegedly speaking into a megaphone too loudly, harming the eardrums of a UBC security guard.
did little to prevent protesters from finding innovative ways to express their dissent. At the same time, the restrictions placed on the freedom of expression ensured that protesters were neither seen nor heard by APEC dignitaries.

The Restriction of Dissent on UBC Campus

Policing protest involves extensive proactive planning. Leo Knight, a former RCMP and VPD officer, echoes this point: “The police force will definitely act proactively, not reactively. If an individual poses a definite risk, police will act. We don’t want to be draconian, but we don’t want to look like fools in front of the world either” (quoted in Johnson, 1997). The double-sided nature of this statement has become prevalent in security discourses. Security rhetoric is characterized by statements such as “We don’t want to be Draconian but we don’t want to look like fools”; “We must respect the right to protest while recognizing the need for security”; and “We must try to limit the impact on inhabitants, while ensuring the highest standards of security.”

This type of language is clearly present in a video produced by the RCMP for APEC member economies. Discussing issues of security, several officers express the desire to strike a balance between the right to freedom of speech and the need for security. Lieutenant Ken Higgins, Deputy Chief Constable of the VPD, acknowledged in the video that the police strategy had to ensure the safety of the dignitaries from the time they arrived in Canada until the time they left, all while accommodating the needs of citizens and those who wished to exercise their right to demonstrate. This dichotomy was also present in the sound bites provided by other officers in the video. Al Niedtner, a Sergeant with the VPD
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46 These are not real quotes but rather a combination of statements I have read or heard over the course of this research.
focused on site planning, said: “These plans will balance the need to provide protection with the desire to minimize any inconvenience to other guests and the public at large.” Murray Day, Inspector with the VPD APEC planning group, believed there was a necessity to gather intelligence on protest groups but that the goal of the police would be to remain objective while preserving public peace.

While the right to protest is guaranteed in a democratic country like Canada, John Buis, the media relations officer for APEC ’97, suggested that it “has to be balanced with the security interests of internationally protected people” (quoted in Johnson, 1997). In the Second Advance Briefing on Security Planning (September 1997), the RCMP described its approach as “designed to provide security and prevent any embarrassments during APEC, while respecting the rights of our citizens to gather lawfully in public places.” Using security measures to prevent embarrassments suggests the police went beyond their role in maintaining safety of IPPs.

The intention to maintain a ‘balance’ is prominent in most security planning rhetoric, but what transpired during APEC suggests the balance had already been tipped in favour of security. As Bakan (2000, p. 83) suggests, “before something can be balanced…it must be assigned a weight.” In the case of APEC, evidence shows that an enormous ‘weight’ was placed on security for President Suharto, the Indonesian head of state at the time. In fact, the presence of Suharto at the APEC meetings was one of the most galvanizing reasons for widespread protest. His record of human rights abuses in places like East Timor led some protest groups to argue that he was a war criminal and that his presence in Canada and on UBC campus was not acceptable.
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After a recent visit to Germany, where protesters jeered Suharto, Indonesian officials feared that a similar situation might arise in Canada. To avoid any comparable embarrassment, Suharto wanted a guarantee from the Canadian Government that he would not see or be subjected to any demonstrations, otherwise he would not attend the event. This threat sent the Prime Minister’s Office (PMO) into a diplomatic offensive. The PMO told the APEC Canada Coordination Office (ACCO) “to do anything to ensure the president of Indonesia attends APEC.” Accordingly, tremendous energy was spent by ACCO to appease the Indonesian concern. On two separate occasions, the federal government sent a senior level diplomat and then the Minister of Foreign Affairs with a letter from the Prime Minister, to convince the Indonesian President to attend the APEC event in Canada. His fears were quelled when he was told that protesters would not be permitted in close proximity to the president (Sallot, 1997).

ACCO was always firm with the Indonesians, stating that demonstrations would occur, but that Suharto would be safe and secure. Despite having serious reservations about curbing public dissent, security officials gave in to certain demands from the Indonesians that would not typically be considered security issues. The Indonesian delegation was particularly concerned with the area around their hotel, where President Suharto could potentially run into protesters. Canadian officials said that marches might occur within the view of the hotel but that there would be plenty of police to control the
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crowds and prevent trespassing onto hotel property. This was not a sufficient answer for Suharto, who changed to a hotel at a greater distance from the public square in front of the Vancouver Art Gallery. This square is the traditional locus for political mobilization in Vancouver.\(^5^3\) Hence, Suharto switched hotels to avoid potential protesters rather than for a plausible security threat.

In moving Suharto to a new hotel, the RCMP was simply adhering to their approach to APEC, which was not only to provide security but “to prevent embarrassments.” But according to Okafor (2000, p. 189), “it is important to recognize that because the RCMP is a crime prevention and law enforcement organization, its duty to afford special protection to IPPs does not extend to protecting IPPs from non-criminal attacks on their dignity.” Therefore, some actions taken by the police during APEC can be seen as part of the expanding scope and definition of security. As more issues become defined in terms of ‘security’, certain police actions will be legitimized despite having little to do with traditional notions of policing such as public safety and crime prevention. The desire to ensure President Suharto’s attendance at APEC made the security planning more complicated and even controversial. But while Suharto’s presence had a significant influence in terms of curtailing signs of protest on UBC campus, as I discuss later in the chapter, it cannot be attributed as the sole reason. I make this claim because similar tactics of limiting the spaces for dissent and cracking down on protesters have only increased since the time of APEC even as figures such as Suharto have become less prominent. So rather than sheltering Suharto from protesters, it seems like curbing

\(^5^3\) Ironically, the square, acted as a showcase for General Motors’ products throughout the APEC events. Thus, the corporate take-over of this politically charged space muted the politics of contestation.
dissent more generally, and providing a more secluded setting for elite deliberations, are simply trends that started around the time of APEC.

The Politics of Security Planning

Despite all official guarantees that APEC security was the exclusive responsibility of the police, political officials influenced security planning in many significant ways. The first sign occurred several days before the AELM, when a group of students set camp in front of the MoA prior to the implementation of the security fence surrounding the venue. In a transcript of a recorded police telephone call, security officials responsible for the site discussed the PMO’s displeasure with the tent city situation on UBC campus. While the tent city was not immediately considered a security issue, the PMO wanted the protesters and their tents removed. The police and others explored ways to remove the tent village and even sought legal advice to help inform their actions. First, the RCMP erected a perimeter fence with police tape around the site of the meetings and initially used a soft approach to entice the protesters to leave. Second, the officers contacted the Department of Justice (DOJ) for consultation. The DOJ pointed out that the contract between the federal government and the University stipulated that on November 24, the federal government was to take possession of the MoA, meaning the protesters could be removed on that day in accordance with trespassing laws. But the contract only included the MoA and Norman Mackenzie house, so to remove the ‘tenters’, a letter of understanding was signed between the University president and the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, replacing Museum of Anthropology with Museum of Anthropology and grounds.

54 JOC, Box 1 File 1.15, “Transcript of recorded telephone calls between police and ACCO.”
The date was also moved from the 24\textsuperscript{th} to the 22\textsuperscript{nd}.\textsuperscript{56} The result “allowed the geographical and temporal definition of the security zone to be expanded, apparently for no other reason than to expedite the arrest of the students who were peacefully camped on the grounds as the letter of understanding was signed.”\textsuperscript{57} This was not public knowledge until almost a month after the event.

Like the arrests during the October Crisis under the WMA, the police researched legal reasons to perform arrests when no obvious security threat was identifiable. With this new agreement in place, the tenters were asked to leave the area because it had to be secured for the AELM. Four people refused and were arrested. They were released later that night after signing an undertaking declaring that they would not participate in any anti-APEC related events or come within 100 metres of an APEC venue or hotel as a condition for their release.\textsuperscript{58} Such spatial and temporal agreements create a space of exception, where normally acceptable rights are suspended. Rather than invoke a regulation like the WMA, which would have suspended the Bill of Rights throughout all of Canada, these little forms of regulation act in much the same way but are more subject—and site—specific.

Less than a month after the APEC summit, the undertakings performed by the RCMP were deemed unconstitutional in reference to a Quebec Court case where a judge ruled that arrested demonstrators during an anti-poverty march could not be denied the right to protest in future demonstrations (Thanh Ha, 1997). The RCMP placed illegal restrictions on the right to express free speech. It also placed spatial restrictions on free
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speech. Furthermore, for such an undertaking to occur, the prisoners would have to swear an oath to a justice of the peace and not a police officer as the detainees had done. Even though the undertaking was deemed illegal following the event, the RCMP stated that “the wording was developed in good faith, having regard for the public interest and the desire to prevent the continuation of further alleged criminal offence.” In the case of APEC, the RCMP tried to regulate what could be said and where it could be said in terms of dissent, but it used the fear of further criminal activity as an excuse to keep demonstrators away.

The spaces of exception did not end with the tent city. In accordance with the UBC-federal government contract, the RCMP negotiated with the university a suitable spatial arrangement that would “ensure that any protest or demonstration associated with the APEC leaders’ meeting be reasonably conspicuous and effective.” But by August, the PMO “expressed concerns about the security perimeter at UBC, not so much from a security point of view but to avoid embarrassment to APEC leaders.” According to the notes of RCMP Supt. Wayne May, the Prime Minister wanted the security perimeter adjusted to guarantee the meetings would take place in a retreat-like setting, with no distractions from demonstrations. Again, the concept of balance is present in the language of Robert Vanderloo, the Executive Director of ACCO, when he suggests that the security planners must find a balance between the concerns of the PMO and the right
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to protest: “we do not wish student demonstrations and efforts by the government to suppress the freedom of expression to become a major media story.”

On November 10, university officials negotiated a significantly enlarged demonstration area in front of the Law School building. The RCMP initially complied until a high-level site visit from Jean Carle, Senior Assistant to the Prime Minister, who ordered the RCMP to push back the demonstration area in front of the law building. His largest fear was the sloping lawn in front of the Law School, which was the only part of the designated protest zone that provided a public viewing area to the AELM and the passing motorcades. Carle argued that the fence needed to be pushed back because the Prime Minister was “under the obligation to protect the safety and integrity of his guests” (Jimenez, 1997, p. A9). Once again, this type of commentary stretches the definition of security to include elements such as ‘integrity’.

In a vigorous exchange with Carle, Chris Brown, the university’s APEC coordinator, argued that the university had an obligation to provide “line-of-site” access to at least some part of the AELM and that the area in front of the law school was the only space for this. In the end the RCMP officers in charge were forced to move the fencing to create a larger red zone area. Martha Piper, the President of UBC, sent a letter accusing the Prime Minister of violating the agreement by not providing a clear line-of-site so the

---
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demonstrators could be seen and heard. Jean Carle, on behalf of the Prime Minister, responded with a quick and ambiguous letter stating that “security considerations were of paramount concern and restrict the availability of suitable sites.” The new fence line made the protesters hidden from passing vehicles and from the MoA.

According to Dennis Pavlich, associate vice-president for academic and legal affairs, “UBC was forced to restrict the size and visibility of the protest area at the insistence of the PMO” (Jimenez, 1997, p. A9). Interference by the executive branch of government into security affairs is an alarming breach of constitutional democracy. The supposed neutrality of the police force is upended when there is political interference. As Pue (2000b, p. 17) argues, “…Canada has well-developed mechanisms that are supposed to protect the police from political interference and to protect citizens from political policing. The reason is simple: blurring this boundary renders the rest of the constitution irrelevant.” When politicians impose their own demands on security operations, a government starts to approach a dictatorship (Pue, 2000b).

After APEC, the lengths to which the PMO tried to convince President Suharto to attend the Summit became public knowledge. As a result, the public started to question whether spatial limitations on dissent were actually part of a legitimate security concern or merely a way to preserve President Suharto’s “dignity.” In the operational plan for UBC campus, the authors state: “It is specifically NOT part of our (RCMP) function to ‘insulate’ attendees from hearing or seeing protesters, via any attempts to stifle protesters

---
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or demonstrators.” The police were committed to this principle but were stifled by political interference, an aspect of the event which was never put to a public inquiry (Pue, 2000a). As Della Porta and Reiter (1998, p. 29) show using historical examples, “police forces will fulfill demands by the government, even without regard for their correspondence with democratic rights.”

The idea that the UBC site was a sort of special space where dignitaries should be isolated from protesters or any sign of dissent started to pervade the thinking of the security planners. Their job suddenly went from ensuring the safety of IPPs to addressing all visual signs of oppositional politics regardless of the security threat. For example, the Graduate Student Union asked the RCMP what its position was on hanging banners outside the Graduate Student Centre since it would be within the secure zone during the AELM. Officers Trevor Thompsett and Bill Dingwall from the RCMP discussed the ‘non-security’ issue at length in an e-mail:

Thompsett: Common sense tells us we do not want banners nor would the PMO’s office. Having said that, banners are not a security issue. They are a political issue. If they are not going to be permitted, what is the authority for removing them and who is going to do it? Shooting from the hip here but taking them down is touching with someone else’s property that is not a security concern.

Dingwall: If they hang the banners towards the MOA, are they going to be visible through the trees? Could we erect some sort of draping to cut off the view? Secondly, they are only leasing the building and I suppose that we could make the argument that the exterior of the building is not being rented and the University, as landlord, could remove them. If they are threatening, this may also give us some leeway.  

For two high-level police officers to be devoting so much attention to this issue exemplifies the influence of political officials on the security arrangements. In another

---
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incident, the Graduate Student Centre raised the Tibetan Flag prior to the RCMP takeover of the building. The RCMP removed the flag, saying that it caused too much hostility within the Chinese student community.

The security forces went beyond their duty to maintain security during the AELM and ensured that delegates were shielded from protest. Clearly, creating a dignified space for delegates goes beyond security duties (Zajko & Bélanger, 2008, p. 726). The desire to hold the AELM in relative isolation backfired when the university campus became the site of one of Vancouver’s largest demonstrations. The decision to host such an event at UBC clearly suggests that security planners only thought about the physical rather than the social geography of the space. Inviting dictators to a university campus will obviously galvanize the student body. In other words, the security planners understood the beauty of the site and how to securitize it, but they did not recognize the potentially contentious politics of hosting such an event within a politically charged university setting. As a result, security was as much about preserving the safety of dignitaries as it was about shielding them from the sites/sights and sounds of dissent.

Restricting the ‘Signs’ of Protest

Despite UBC’s displeasure with the limited size of the protest zones and warnings of amplified security measures, the transformation of the campus ensued. Primary intelligence stated that protesters were the most likely threat to the AELM, so a plan was designed and put in place to deal with the possibility of confrontational demonstrators. First, the police presence was enormous. Riot police in full gear were prepared and waiting in the coordination area, while police on bicycles and unmarked vehicles circled the campus. In addition, marksmen and observer teams were strategically placed in
discreet observation posts on the roofs of several buildings on campus.\textsuperscript{71} The west zone of the MoA site, flanked by forested bluffs, with trails down to the oceanfront, was also highly secured to prevent any demonstrators or others to breach security through the ‘backdoor’.\textsuperscript{72} Site security aircraft and patrol vessels monitored the area day and night.

The second crucial form of securitization on campus was the extensive fencing set-up around the site, monitored by uniformed police officers and 12 roving VPD officers on bicycles.\textsuperscript{73} Figure 3.2 shows the extent of the fence-line. At the time, this was a relatively novel form of securitizing the physical environment, and as D’Arcus (2006, p. 146) notes more generally, it symbolically “reflected the more general tension within liberal democracy between the right to freely dissent and the need for order.” According to Puder (2000, p. 133), APEC was a perfect example of how a physical space is transformed for security reasons:

Since police observe behaviour in the real world, not in the abstract, officers must also consider their physical environment. The APEC summit required officers to weigh a number of factors: protected dignitaries, potential weapons, buildings and barriers, vehicle routes, crowds, and confined areas, plus many other environmental variables. Whenever possible, prudent police planning modifies the environment to improve security. An example from APEC was the construction of fences to restrict crowd movements.

After all the fencing was in place, the police realized a major deficiency. The fencing was held together using plastic tags, which could be broken-off using one’s fingers.\textsuperscript{74} The fencing was leased from the ‘Indy’ car race in Vancouver, and was only “designed to keep vehicles and pieces of vehicles out of a crowd. It (was) not designed to keep people
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During the main demonstration on November 25, part of the fence came down, leading to the initial torrent of pepper spray on the demonstrators (Figure 3.3).

The use of pepper spray became the highlight of the APEC summit. It was sensationalized in the media, detracting from the actual issues the protesters were trying to emphasize. Before pepper spray was ever deployed, however, the crackdown of protest on UBC campus was initiated when Craig Jones, a law student and resident of Green College, was arrested for refusing to relinquish his protest signs. A few months after the event, Jones wrote a detailed narrative outlining what happened that day in precise detail. It was called “Chronology of APEC Events: Realpolitik and APEC Preparations” and was posted to a website called “The Rule of Law.” His story is worth retelling since it clearly depicts the way space and dissent were controlled and restricted during the event.

Jones was acting as an observer for the British Columbia Civil Liberties Association (BCCLA), but when he saw what he believed to be arbitrary arrests, he decided to test the RCMP’s response to protest. He believed that the “RCMP was using the criminal law and its security powers to control the nature and location of protest in a dangerous and unconstitutional manner.” He made three 8x11 signs stating ‘Free Speech’, ‘Democracy’ and ‘Human Rights’ and made reference to the Charter of Rights and Freedoms in a footnote on each sign stating that he is the sole owner and that removal of his signs would be against the law. The signs were posted on the security fencing along the motorcade route in front of his student residence at Green College.

---
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Figure 3.2: Security perimeter during the AELM and key sites on UBC campus. (Source: UBC Archives)
1 – Green College
2 – Law School Building
3 – Museum of Anthropology
4 – Norman Mackenzie House
5 – Gate 6
6 – Graduate Student Centre

Figure 3.3: A clash between protesters and police during the AELM on UBC campus. Protesters pull down the security fence (left), followed by the deployment of pepper spray (right). Source: UBC Archives.
Jones was soon informed that the signs could not remain on the fence and that police would take them down and return them to him. Once the signs were returned, he went back into his student residence and brought out two coat racks and wheeled them to the side of the fence with two of the signs taped to them and one sign placed on the sidewalk. Jones and his fellow protesters were told to move off the sidewalk because they were obstructing it. But there were no pedestrians and if there were any, they would be trapped behind the fence at least until the motorcades passed and the checkpoint reopened. Nevertheless, the demonstrators agreed to leave the sidewalk and moved up onto the grass. Then, RCMP officer Insp. Dingwall told Jones the signs had to be removed within 10 minutes or they would be taken. The police did not anticipate that protesters might use this area, so its officers were ill prepared to deal with the situation. Insp. Dingwall explained that there was an agreement in place by which all protesting would be restricted to the ‘protest area’ about 200 metres away, but out of view of the motorcade. This particular demonstration, however, was peaceful and the police never mentioned that the signs or the demonstrators were a concern for security.

When Craig Jones refused to give up his signs, he was taken to the ground and arrested for obstruction. The police went on to confiscate two cardboard signs, one placard and the human rights sign that was on the sidewalk. Minutes later a student from the residence came out with bed sheets on which he wrote a political statement. These were also immediately confiscated. In another incident, one woman was told that she had to remove her sign on orders of the PMO or she would be arrested. When she asked the officers what she would be arrested for the officers said they would make something up.

---
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What happened to Craig Jones and his colleagues outside Green College raises the following question: Was the RCMP actually concerned about security or was the potential for these protesters to be merely *seen and heard* by passing motorcades more worrisome? This particular incident shows how security planners can reach for the language of security—a term which has been increasingly expanded—to legitimize innumerable actions even if they were not planned. The ad-hoc nature of these actions also uncovers the limits to security planning.

Later that day the campus was turned into one of the largest demonstration sites in Vancouver history. When part of the fence line came down on the Main Mall near the rose garden, the RCMP unleashed pepper-spray on the crowd, effectively dispersing the demonstrators. Some of these demonstrators formed smaller groups and headed towards the various motorcade exits on campus. Six gates had been setup, which operated as checkpoints around campus. In an act of civil disobedience, demonstrators conducted a sit-in where all willing participants sat on the road to block the motorcades from leaving UBC campus. At Gate 6, some 50 protesters gathered peacefully for about an hour and asked the RCMP at the location to give due warning if the road was to be cleared because some protesters did not wish to be arrested.79 One protester spoke over a megaphone to his associates, telling them that unless they were prepared to be arrested, they should clear the road if asked to do so by the RCMP. He expected that the protesters would be given the opportunity to get up and leave if asked to do so and he asked the RCMP to give them fair warning to clear the road if that was the police intention. This happened

79 JOC, Box 1 File 1.19, “Mark Brooks complaint to the Commission.”
before S/Sgt. Hugh Stewart, the RCMP commander in charge of the quick response teams, arrived with two of his teams.80

As the police presence started to increase, S/Sgt. Stewart told the protesters that the road was going to be cleared and that they only had a limited time to disperse. Even though Gate 6 was the least desirable route for leaders leaving the campus, it was the easiest to secure and had the least number of protesters.81 Before the demonstrators had a chance to leave, the RCMP, including Bud Mercer, the future head of the Integrated Security Unit for the Vancouver Olympics, started to use pepper spray at point blank range, causing a disorderly and chaotic exit from the road (Mackin & Dembiki, 2009). It seems this was inappropriate since according to Cpl. Gulayets, head of the Quick Response Team, most of the protesters were passive: “they were sitting – about half were sitting on the ground, the other half were standing. There was one with a bullhorn. Some of the protesters were chanting chants, I guess, whatever, you know, whatever they do. And basically it was actually quite peaceful at that point.”82 The protester with the megaphone was arrested and charged with inciting a riot and obstruction. Within minutes he was told these charges had been dropped and that he was charged with breach of the peace like most of the other protesters arrested that day.

The problems surrounding the Gate 6 incident became clear during the Commission of Inquiry. An officer from the Toronto Police Service said that “when plans
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are made for major events involving visiting world leaders, the police expect that
demonstrators will make an effort at some point to block exits from functions. Planning
documents should address such eventualities.”\(^{83}\) No plans were in place to deal with such
a situation. Instead, the police resorted to the use of pepper spray to disperse the peaceful
crowd, an action the Commission found was contrary to standard RCMP procedure
regarding political protests.

In both the Jones case and the Gate 6 incident, there was a power struggle
between the right to be heard and seen and the perceived necessity for security. The
police actually turned both incidents from non-threatening situations involving a lawful
public into a security issue. As questions started to arise regarding RCMP conduct after
the summit, the RCMP said the signs near the motorcade were considered a security risk
because they could have been used as projectiles onto the motorcade route.\(^{84}\) But there
were a number of objects nearby that could have also been used, including a bicycle
helmet, knapsack, metal coffee cups, coolers and other similar items. With the projectile
issue being foremost in Insp. Dingwall's mind, he was asked why those items were not
seized. He said he had not seen them.\(^{85}\)

The RCMP denied that the content of signs was an issue. The student who had
his ‘bed sheet’ banners confiscated was told at the time that he was in obstruction of
justice, not because his banners could have been used as a projectile. He believed the

\(^{83}\) APEC – Commission Interim Report, 2001 (Online). Ottawa: Commission for Public Complaints
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RCMP was covering its tracks after the fact. Passive sitting protesters were also considered a security threat because they were essentially imprisoning IPPs from leaving the campus and “impeding legitimate IPP security measures.” By labelling both situations security threats, the police were able to exert their control over placid yet politically charged situations.

Of the 66 people arrested during APEC, most were detained under a provision known as “breach of the peace.” When the police have reason to believe that someone will cause harm to another person or property, the police can detain that person to prevent a “breach of the peace.” Whether or not the intention is to actually charge people with a crime, the police have the full authority to arrest indiscriminately using this piece of criminal law. The freedom to arrest exerts a level of control over space and also spreads fear in a crowd of demonstrators who do not wish to be arrested. This law facilitates the control of space through its pre-emptive force.

A legislated prerogative like the WMA may no longer seem like the most appropriate action to deal with dissent, but there are many other pieces of legislation that can be used to control protest. In some anti-globalization protests that followed APEC, different levels of government have enacted special legislation that applied to small areas of cities for the duration of a particular summit, which gave police extra powers within those areas (Epstein & Iveson, 2009; Herbert, 2007; Yang, 2010). These more temporal and spatially specific legislations can act as mini-Martial Laws where police are granted
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exceptional powers for a limited time, in a delimited space. Occasionally, however, police extend even these newly granted powers beyond their jurisdiction.

In the case of the WTO in Seattle in 1999, the city passed special legislation as a response to the first day of conflict. Order No.3 established a restricted access zone around 25 blocks of the downtown core, which became known as the no-protest zone (Herbert, 2007, p. 602). According to Herbert (2007) the police misunderstood the emergency orders restricting access to downtown and extended their powers, restricting people from other areas beyond that zone. Interpreting the emergency orders as a type of “martial law”, the police took extraordinary actions to reassert its authority and territorial control over Seattle (Herbert, 2007, p. 612). The lack of control over a situation often acts as a legitimizing factor and as a catalyst towards more oppressive police tactics.

Order No.3 was challenged in what Herbert (2007) refers to as the Menotti case (Menotti vs. Seattle, 2005). The first sentence in the ruling read: “In this case we search for the proper balance between, on the one hand, the vibrant rights of free speech and assembly in an open society and, on the other hand, the needs of a city to maintain order and security” (Herbert, 2007, p. 603). The language in this ruling is clearly rooted in a liberal understanding that freedoms must be balanced against the need for security. The plaintiffs lost the case, suggesting once again that the scale is tipped towards security rather than freedom.

For APEC 2007 in Sydney, Australia, special legislation was passed for a two-week period establishing two zones where the police acquired extra powers such as the ability to stop and search people and vehicles, erect barricades and arrest without option for bail anyone who committed an offence against a police officer (Epstein & Iveson,
For Epstein and Iveson (2009, p. 278), the spatial and temporal restrictions during the APEC summit were explicitly designed to limit dissent: “By establishing and enforcing restricted zones, as well as controlling the spaces of protest, the parliament sought simultaneously to allow and to marginalize dissent, thereby privileging the rights of APEC leaders to speak over the rights of citizens to oppose that speech.” By providing a space for protest—albeit severely circumscribed—security planners can claim they are just trying to achieve a balance between free speech and security (Ibid., p.277). In fact, liberal democracies actually encourage dissent at such events just not anywhere near the events themselves (Ericson & Doyle, 1999).

Looking at cities as spaces to be controlled and disciplined during economic summits and other mega-events allows for the re-interpretation of political protest as a security threat. If only designated locations are safe for protest, how can cities continue to be spaces of freedom and democracy? As Herbert (2007, p. 616) asserts, “if protest is marginalized spatially, it is also marginalized politically.” The discipline imposed on cities during events such as APEC limits the spaces for protest and serves to legitimize future restrictions. Furthermore, security measures for these events “are in fact typical of advanced liberal approaches to urban citizenship and governance, which seek to establish good order in the city through a combination of facilitation and authoritarianism” (Epstein & Iveson, 2009, p. 278). Framing security issues spatially allows security planners to disguise their actions as security-related rather than as a restriction of civil liberties.

Major events tend to be catalysts for security enhancements. It has now become acceptable, at least in the eyes of government and security planners, that fences, barriers,
temporary police powers, and surveillance cameras be used as tools to control urban space. This is part of the trends in the policing of protest. A more overt and novel method of controlling space during APEC 1997 was the use of bike patrol officers to monitor demonstrations (Figure 3.4). In the context of APEC, “the degree of force used to balance an individual’s right to protest and the security of IPPs is difficult to achieve. Bike patrol officers can be used to obtain that balance.” Bike patrol officers present a less aggressive face to demonstrators and respond quickly to problems arising from crowds that have become unmanageable. Not only could the bikes act as transportation but when the officers were stationary, they could overlap their bikes and act as a barrier by facing crowds. This was a pioneering technique at the APEC summit and has been used at subsequent major events.

After APEC, the Canadian Commission of Public Complaints against the RCMP conducted an inquiry, responding to several complaints submitted by those involved in the APEC protests. While the Inquiry did confirm the federal government’s influence over security planning and the use of excessive force by the RCMP, it actually legitimized certain actions undertaken during APEC. Thus, the findings and recommendations from this inquiry were significant in transforming the future of security planning in Canada.
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Figure 3.4: Two photos of VPD bike patrol reinforced by RCMP officers during the AELM on UBC campus. Source: UBC Archives.
As the largest security planning event ever undertaken by either the VPD or the RCMP, the APEC Summit required accreditation for roughly 23,000 people. This included 8,600 delegates, over 3,000 police officers, employees of the Department of National Defence, 1,000 volunteers, suppliers and hotel staff.\footnote{APEC – Commission Interim Report, 2001 (Online). Ottawa: Commission for Public Complaints Against the RCMP. Section 5: Planning for APEC. \url{http://www.cpc-cpp.gc.ca/prr/rep/phr/apec/apec-intR-index-eng.aspx} (03 December 2009).} Such a major undertaking required extensive planning. Until the AELM, there were no important security incidents. The AELM on UBC campus, which was supposed to be a retreat-like setting, became the focus of some of the most controversial security actions in Canadian history. The APEC Commission was established after the event, and addressed 52 complaints lodged against the RCMP mostly relating to actions on UBC campus during the AELM. From March 23, 1999 to June 30, 2000, 153 witnesses were heard and 710 exhibits received in evidence.

The public inquiry was meant to shed light on the behaviour of the RCMP. It was alleged that the RCMP made excessive use of pepper-spray, took instruction from a political authority, arrested people on tenuous grounds, and imposed unlawful release conditions (the undertaking). Pue (2000b) argues that the story line typical of a student demonstration—protesters provoked police, police responded, and now the protesters are complaining—does not fit the traditional mold because, in this case, the police were actually overzealous against non-confrontational protesters. The complaints were grouped into categories and the commission made rulings and recommendations based on the complaints. For the purpose of this study, only seven are of crucial importance. Table 3.1 is a summary of the complaints, rulings and recommendations.
Table 3.1
Summary of seven complaints, including rulings and recommendations from the APEC Commission.  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Complaint</th>
<th>Ruling</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Demonstration site was too small, security zones were larger</td>
<td>The RCMP’s conduct was consistent with the Charter.</td>
<td>Peaceful protest should be afforded the opportunity to see and be seen by the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>than necessary, so as to protect delegates from the sites and</td>
<td></td>
<td>guests of an event.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sounds of protesters.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Undertakings were unlawful</td>
<td>Restrictive conditions were inconsistent with the Charter and inappropriate for the circumstances.</td>
<td>Legal advice should be made readily available to police during such events.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Removal of the Tibetan Flag</td>
<td>Inconsistent with the Charter</td>
<td>Consult with senior officers with full background knowledge.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Removal of Green College Signs &amp; Jones Arrest</td>
<td>No fault of the officers who were just following orders. But the indiscriminate removal of all signs ordered by Bill Dingwall was inconsistent with the Charter. Arrest of Jones was appropriate.</td>
<td>If the calibre of planning had been higher, the major gaffe of failing to recognize the obvious protest site outside Green College would not have occurred. Also a contingency plan should have been in place.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Police used excessive force, including pepper spray at the noon rally.</td>
<td>The RCMP response was appropriate to the circumstances.</td>
<td>More comprehensive planning is necessary and site commanders should be better trained and prepared.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Removal of protesters at Gate 6 with pepper spray and without adequate warning</td>
<td>Protesters were not given enough time to comply with the order and the use of force was not appropriate.</td>
<td>Reasonable efforts should be made to warn protesters of what police are going to do and provide them with enough time to comply with the warning.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The complaints can be categorized as challenges to three different types of restrictions: space, movement, and speech. The first and seventh categories of complaints are clearly restrictions on space. By creating a “red-zone” and by limiting the spaces for legitimate dissent, security planners effectively restricted the spaces for protesters to be seen and heard by APEC delegates. This has become common at subsequent economic summits, leading Bruce D’Arcus (2006) to label this tactic as ‘quarantining dissent’.

While the APEC Commission did recommend that in future, protesters should be given a space to be seen and heard, the Commission ruled that the RCMP conduct in establishing the security perimeter and the demonstration area did not infringe on the Charter of Rights and Freedoms. This set the grounds for prospective security practices to cordon off any size of space without fear of repercussions. Spatial discipline had suddenly become the most effective tool for actually criminalizing otherwise legitimate political actions and speech.

Taking lessons from the problems with the fencing during APEC—notably the flimsy plastic ties used to attach the fencing together—stronger and more impenetrable custom built fencing was used around large areas of Windsor, Ontario during an
Organization of American States Summit in June of 2000 and a six-block radius around the World Petroleum Congress in Calgary the same month (King & Waddington, 2005). By far the largest use of this type of barricading occurred during the Summit of the Americas held in Quebec City in April 2001. The fence for this event was subject to a court challenge where the judge actually ruled that the fence infringed on freedoms but allowed the controversial restriction to stand because of the plausible threat of violence (Dougherty, 2001). As such, fencing is now commonly used to demarcate high security zones during mega-events.

In Herbert’s (2007) study of the protests in Seattle during the WTO meeting in 1999, he borrows language from planning to examine what it means for the state to “zone” the expression of dissent by restricting access to certain areas of the city. In other words, different areas of the city were defined and understood not in terms of their urban purpose but in relation to ‘security’. By prioritizing security over other activities, the spaces for protest were limited to allow for the function of the economic summit to ensue. Emphasis on security also evacuates almost all other purposes from a particular area of the city. In Seattle, the central district of the city was not longer understood as the commercial core, but as a securitized zone. Security measures adjust and moderate the way a city functions well beyond the security boundaries of the designated security spaces. Waddington’s (1994) research on the control of demonstrations in London showed that the Metropolitan Police used a method of zoning to securitize the city according to necessary levels of protection and potential threats. Creating security zones is “legitimated in the name of preserving order” but as Herbert (2007, p. 616) argues “this political geography of speech compels concern about vibrancy in the public sphere.”
Therefore, limiting the most visible and effective spaces for dissent results in the marginalization of protest as a form of democratic political engagement.

The gamut of security measures available to police during mega-events can be understood as an indirect approach to restricting free speech. While complaint number three from the APEC Commission, the removal of the Tibetan Flag, clearly reflects a politically motivated restriction on visible signs of dissent, complaint number four illuminates the restriction and criminalization of speech in a more explicit manner. The physical space in front of Green College was never anticipated as a protest area but students appropriated the site and transformed it into a symbolic space. The failure on behalf of the police to recognize this location as a potential forum for protest meant the space remained truly public, at least until the police crackdown. Conversely, the designated protest zone in front of the Law School building was a controlled and ordered public space, where protest was severely circumscribed. While the uses of both spaces were the same—to protest APEC—the uncontrolled space in front of Green College gave protesters a higher potential of being seen and heard by delegates. By preventing signs of protest at this location, the space was no longer truly public. The removal of signs from demonstrators was more of a reaction to the lack of foresight in police planning than an issue of security.

Complaints two, five and six represent the tripartite restrictions in the most explicit manner. For instance, those arrested and forced to sign an undertaking as a condition for their release were restricted from expressing free speech within close proximity of any APEC related venue or event. A breach of this restriction could result in another arrest. In addition to the undertaking, the use of excessive police force was found
to be a coercive tool to impose illegitimate restrictions on rights and freedoms. Such tools threaten “the fundamental freedom of citizens to make legitimate political choices without fear of intimidation or retaliation” (Corrado et al., 1992, p. 367). Even though the undertakings and the use of force during the Gate 6 incident were deemed unlawful, there were few repercussions for the RCMP.

The recommendations from the Commission and police tactics used during the APEC event have been influential in security planning for all subsequent mega-events in Canada (Ottawa Citizen, 2001a). One of the most crucial recommendations from the Commission was that ample space be allocated at such events for demonstrators to be seen and heard. Despite the positive intentions of this proposal, it has been interpreted by police forces as a way to create what has become known as ‘protest pens’: specially designated and demarcated areas where protesters are allowed to demonstrate. For example, in trying to adhere to the APEC Commission suggestion, police decided to create designated protest areas near each Olympic venue during the Vancouver Games in 2010. However, when the police referred to these spaces as ‘free speech zones’, there was outrage from the public: all of Canada is a free speech zone (Hainsworth, 2009; Hui, 2011). Subsequently, the police changed the language and referred to the spaces as ‘safe assembly areas’, leading one to question what risks people would be taking if they decided to protest the Olympics outside these zones. Before turning to more detail on the Olympics, the final section of this chapter examines the legacy of security planning from APEC and how it set a precedent for future security operations.
The Legacy of APEC Security Planning

The most significant element of security planning during APEC was the collaborative relationship between the RCMP and the VPD. The lack of integration and coordination between police forces during the October Crisis was actually considered one of the impediments to finding the kidnappers. The Montreal Police were accused by the other forces of being uncooperative, while the RCMP was accused of withholding information that could have led to better coordination in the search effort. Since there are various scales of policing in Canada, jurisdictional issues are quite common. While these issues are often a problem at major events or during crises, APEC represents one of the first times where integration of the police forces was pursued. The integrated structure received positive appraisals from both the RCMP and the VPD, and the APEC Commission recommended that “the RCMP should adopt an integrated or similar command structure of planning and operations for public order events.”

One of the major challenges with this operational structure was integrating RCMP and VPD communications, which meant the two forces operated on the same radio channels. Placing all operations in a command centre located at RCMP headquarters facilitated the integration: “this again was a first for such operations and a radical departure from the past where both agencies would operate out of a separate centre.” The operations also included the civilian side of security planning with ACCO and City of Vancouver officials located at the same hub.
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Another example of integration and cooperation was the Threat Assessment Group (TAG). According to Al Niedtner, a retired VPD member who was the APEC VIP Security Coordinator,

The co-location with the federal/civilian planners was a stroke of genius. Unlike past events where the security simply attended the occasional meeting, this time we were an integral part of the planning. In fact the police ended up being the driving force on many issues and were ultimately viewed as the professionals that could be relied upon for clarity of process, excellent problem-solving and good decision making.\(^97\)

This integration set a precedent for collaboration among those agencies involved in security and, as I will show in the Olympic case study, it has become a defining characteristic of the security apparatus during mega-events.

When ACCO made critical decisions, the VPD and RCMP were unified in making sure these decisions did not have hinder their ability to provide security for the Summit. Niedtner argued that the police “were the ‘experts’ who were being consulted prior to any changes being made.”\(^98\) The notion of expertise provided the police with the authority to manage and securitize space in a technical and rational manner, without input from other sectors of civil society. In an interview with *The Ottawa Citizen*, Wesley Pue criticized the tendency to allow police to plan security without public input:

Mr. Pue believes the security for major gatherings should be decided through public debate and parliamentary scrutiny, instead of letting police to make up rules as they go along. For instance, there are no Canadian laws to allow for the installation of a perimeter fence limiting the movement of protesters at international meetings, Mr. Pue notes. Yet a large fence was built for Quebec City and such barriers will likely be fixtures at coming events. “That's not the kind of discretion that should be left to police officers in secret” (Ottawa Citizen, 2001a).

---
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Eight community meetings were held by the security agencies prior to the APEC Summit to inform the public about security arrangements for the event. But there was never a ‘consultation’ with the University community, including staff, faculty, students or the surrounding neighbourhoods about the appropriateness of using UBC campus as a venue for the summit. Chris Brown, the University’s APEC co-ordinator, believed that consultations with the broader community should have occurred before the decision was made to use UBC as the venue for any major international gathering or visit.

Given the tendency for university students to enthusiastically exercise their right to free speech, consultation could have provided the federal government with a better understanding of the challenges of securitizing a university campus. For the Canadian government, security issues were not a factor in the decision to host the AELM at UBC. The site had been used in 1993 as the picturesque setting for the Clinton-Yeltsin Summit. Hence, the government thought it would be the ideal location for the AELM. According to Trevor W. Thompsett, the site commander for the UBC site during APEC,

The fact the event was held at a university was a very significant factor for us. We had to contend with the ongoing politics and the fact we had a built in demonstration/protester factor. As you know, the federal government and UBC contracted to allow demonstrations/protests. Bottom line, from a security perspective, a University is not the best venue for politically charged functions such as APEC events.

Comments such as these make it seem as if university campuses should be avoided as locations for future summits. At the same time, however, campuses are ideal places for such summits because in many societies, universities are the loci of freethinking and
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debate. It is precisely in such environments where ideas and policies associated with events like APEC should be analyzed and scrutinized. Instead, the campus was belatedly viewed as a security nightmare, where police were required to suppress dissent to allow governments—some led by brutal dictators—to discuss economic policy without any democratic mechanisms to influence the debate. So, the fact that protest was unlawfully controlled “in the public areas of a Canadian university campus makes [crackdown on protest] all the worse” (Irvine, 2000, p. 29).

After what transpired at APEC and subsequently at the Summit of the Americas in Quebec City in 2001, the Canadian Government decided that a rural location would be more suitable for such summits. This was part of trend in security planning that looked to locate these summits in areas where few people would be able to participate in proximate protest (Boski, 2002). As a result, Kananaskis, a resort area of Alberta, was chosen to replace Ottawa as the host of the G8 summit in 2002. Whether urban or rural, a university campus or the central business district, isolating these events from protest has become integral to the geography of security planning. The securitization of these events is a way of limiting protest, critique and scrutiny of the politics of the event. But what is perhaps more alarming is the lack of oversight for the security planning operations, which operate unencumbered by public debate, to carry out actions as the planners see fit.

Despite an integrated command structure, collaborative work, and inventive methods of crowd control, the APEC Commission found that, as a result of poor planning, the APEC security team mishandled the events that transpired on UBC campus. Thus, APEC 1997 can be understood as a testing ground for future security planning surrounding major events in Canada. While the methods used to control the spaces of
dissent and provide security for IPPs were considered controversial at the time, they have been refined to meet the needs for similar events in the future.

From APEC, Canadian security forces were able to build upon perceived successes and address some of the failures during subsequent events. Officers involved in the event, such as Bud Mercer and Al Niedtner, subsequently took on leadership roles, most notably for the Vancouver 2010 Winter Olympics. What has not been carried forward is public scrutiny into security actions during similar events in the future. Since the APEC Commission, it is as though security measures have become more advanced and regularized as part of the ‘circus train’ of economic summits or global sporting events. APEC 1997 was a watershed event in terms of policing protest in Canada. Like the economic policies adopted at these global summits, security planning has become globalized, meaning that similar methods of securitizing space are deployed in similar ways all over the world. The most troubling fact about these moments of ‘exceptional’ security is how they can quickly become normalized as part of the everyday urban environment.

Given this context, it is important to recognize how different actors regulate space and how speech is ‘zoned out’ of spaces for dissent (Epstein & Iveson, 2009; Herbert, 2007). The controversy that arose from this event forced security professionals to not only re-evaluate how security planning should be done in the future, but it also legitimized some of the most controversial tactics for future security operations. Similar to the October Crisis, restrictions on speech, space, and mobility became the primary tools used by the authorities to maintain control over the city. In the case of APEC,

\[104\] Bud Mercer was involved in the deploying pepper spray at Gate 6 during APEC and would subsequently become the head of the Vancouver 2010 Integrated Security Unit. Al Niedtner, the VIP coordinator for APEC would later become the Urban Domain Security Coordinator during the 2010 Winter Olympics)
however, restrictions on space and mobility became inconspicuous methods of restricting free speech without violating, in most cases, the right to peaceful dissent.

The restrictions placed on protest are not unusual given the undemocratic nature of economic summits and related security planning. When Wesley Pue argued that public consultation should be integrated into security planning, he was showing how the world of security planning is undemocratic. The belief that the police act as neutral and rational planners is dismantled when we scrutinize the APEC affair. The political influence on security planning and the amount of time dedicated to non-security duties demonstrates the lack of neutrality of the police. The police made an attempt to rationalize its actions through security rhetoric, but in the case of APEC, their actions did not stand up to scrutiny. Although APEC was a special event and the security measures seemingly temporary, this form of planning is increasingly naturalized as an acceptable practice. While the exceptionality of the event gives police legitimacy to reshape the urban environment, what happens when the exception becomes the norm? The final case study explores this question in more detail and demonstrates conclusively why we need to understand security planning as a form of urban planning.
Chapter 4:
RATIONALIZING SECURITY PLANNING FOR THE 2010 VANCOUVER OLYMPICS

On 12 February 2010, the Olympic torch arrived in the City of Vancouver and set off several days of boisterous protests against the Olympics. These demonstrations highlighted issues related to indigenous sovereignty, corporate accountability, public financing, security operations, environmental destruction, and homelessness. They culminated in a demonstration entitled the “heart attack” march on February 13, the first full day of Olympic competition. Between 300 and 500 people gathered in Thornton Park at the Main Street Skytrain station east of Downtown. They were accompanied by several dozen police officers, many undercover or circulating on bikes. The purpose of the protest was to carry out direct actions that would disrupt the Olympics.

The march started around 9am and sprawled out onto Main Street. Traffic was immediately snarled. The crowd headed north and was followed calmly by police. Among the chants was “Whose streets? Our streets!” explicitly making a claim to the public spaces of the city and certainly a critique of those spaces no longer public as a result of security considerations. As part of the direct action tactics, some demonstrators turned over construction pylons and dragged street items such as newspaper boxes and dumpsters onto the road, creating an obstacle course for automobiles. The march weaved its way through the streets of the Downtown East Side and up towards Georgia Street and the central business district. As the march continued, the ultimate goal of the procession became apparent: to block the Lion’s Gate Bridge, the principal causeway out of
downtown Vancouver and the primary route to Olympic venues located in Whistler and Cypress Mountain.

When the march reached the Hudson’s Bay Company, one of the major sponsors of the Olympics and a company with a long history of colonial practices in Canada (Foster & Grove, 2008, pp. 53 as cited in Boycoff, 2011; Zig Zag, 2011), some protestors smashed its windows. Within an instant, the police who had been quietly following the crowd disappeared and were quickly replaced by a brigade of riot police dressed in full gear. They approached the march from behind, forcing the demonstrators to hasten their pace. With relative ease, the march was pushed out of the core of the city and further down Georgia Street, where the roadway is wider (seven lanes) and has less pedestrian activity. As such, the protest spectacle lost some of its influence and intensity.

Two blocks away from Denman Street, the last street before the Lion’s Gate Bridge, the protestors were met by hundreds of police officers blocking the intersection. When the marchers tried to take a new direction, a new brigade of riot police emerged from unknown locations to prevent any deviations. At this point, police outnumbered protesters and the march started to lose its energy. No matter what direction the protesters turned there was another wall of police. The police strategically moved in, split apart the herd of protestors, and with relatively little force, quelled the protest in an instant.

While the photos presented in figure 4.1 provide an indication of what happened on that day, they do little to explain how the police planned for such a disruption. Extensive knowledge of the city’s infrastructure and its vulnerable spaces is crucial in planning security for a major event such as the Olympics. In this carefully orchestrated police action, we see how an understanding of urban form and even urban social
dynamics became paramount for disbanding the protesters and eliminating what was considered riotous activity. The core of the city represented the corporate and festive face of the Vancouver Olympics; any disturbance that challenged that carefully crafted image had to be driven out of the area as quickly as possible. Hence, upholding a positive appearance of Vancouver was as important for security planners as maintaining the safety of the athletes and Olympic officials.

Figure 4.1: Disruption and police action during the "Heart Attack" march on February 12, 2010. Clockwise from top-left: Pylons and newspaper boxes left in the street by demonstrators; the smashed windows at the Bay; Police vehicles trailing the demonstrators; and the wall of riot police that eventually quelled the protest. (All photos by the author).

In this final vignette on Canadian security planning, I look specifically at how security was planned and managed for the Vancouver Olympics. From this case, it
becomes clear that security rhetoric has emerged as a powerful tool in legitimizing a more expert driven type of planning that excludes the voices of non-security professionals and has allowed some methods of securitization to become more common in everyday life.

Urban Security and Mega-Events

Research on security for sport mega-events has proliferated in recent years. It differs slightly from the literature on security for global economic forums and policing protest because it is a sporting spectacle. For example, the focus of an Olympics or a World cup is on Athletes and their game, so extremely restrictive security operations could hinder the enjoyment of the occasion and tarnish the reputation of a city. Economic summits, on the other hand, are usually private functions featuring diplomatic officials and political leaders, who meet away from public view. Nevertheless, both literatures provide a deeper understanding of state security practices and the effects of such practices on the spaces of the city.

Much of the research on sport mega-event security tends to adopt a case study methodology. As a result, there is a lack of a more theoretical approach to examining security for these events. In order to set out a research agenda for examining security practices during sport mega-events, Giulianotti and Klauser (2010, p. 57) attempt to root their study within three large bodies of scholarship. First, they suggest that securitization during mega-events must be understood “as a socially contested domain,” where a variety of stakeholders possess different levels of power and influence over the security agenda. Second, they point to the usefulness of critical urban geographical research as a way to examine how security during mega-events transforms public space and serves as a tool
for socio-spatial control. Finally, the authors believe the use of ‘risk theory’ can help contextualize the security planning process and illuminate the evolving responses to shifting perceptions of risk. These three fields help frame this case study with the more general examination of security planning for mega-events elsewhere.

In 1998, Vancouver submitted its bid to host the 2010 Winter Olympic Games. From the beginning, a resistance movement mobilized in opposition to the Games. Given the significance of the Olympics, it tends to be an ideal forum for protest and advocacy groups to gain exposure for a cause or to contest the Games. This, along with the threat posed by terrorism, has resulted in the display of high security measures beyond what the city would normally need (Coaffee & Johnston, 2007, p. 145). Sporting mega-events largely face three primary threats: terrorism, spectator and political violence, and crime (Giulianotti & Klauser, 2010, p. 52). However, the International Olympic Committee (IOC) is typically more concerned with terrorism and political violence because of the symbolic ramifications of such disturbances.

With these perceived risks, security planners must devise ways to protect sporting events without creating a “siege-like” situation in host-cities (Coaffee, Fussey, & Moore, 2011, p. 3319). In the case of the Olympics more particularly, Coaffee and Fussey (2010) show how in the last three decades, security measures have become increasingly standardized with the integration of security personnel into a single structure and the use of advanced technologies to securitize the city. But especially since the 2004 Athens games, Coaffee et al. (2011, p. 3316) explain that security is now characterized by the following elements: Intense pre-planning (thinking about all the possibilities and addressing vulnerabilities in the system); Island-security (venues in lockdown);
Advanced surveillance (Deployment of surveillance technologies and police); Buffer Zones (Control of the peripheral spaces); and Retention of security infrastructure after the event for other purposes besides anti-terrorism. This has become, as we will see in the case of Vancouver, of consistent model, albeit somewhat tailored to the local context of the host-city.

Despite this uniformed approach to Olympic security, Jennings and Lodge’s (2011, p. 219) research shows there is no evidence of “an overarching sporting mega-event consultocracy that applies its recipes across events.” They argue that there tends to be more similarities and connections with security tools used between cities hosting the same mega-event rather than between cities hosting different sporting events (Ibid., p. 220). For instance, addressing ‘hooliganism’ is more of a priority for World Cup organizers but less of an issue for the IOC. While the potential threats may differ, the authors agree that some of the basic security ‘best-practices’ are transferred from event to event. Vancouver is no different. It looked at previous Olympics and even economic summits to learn how to securitize the city and, as I will show, it deployed the typical standardized security model of intense pre-planning, island-security, surveillance technology, buffer zones, and retention of security infrastructure.

**Securing a Region; Protecting the Games**

Security planning usually relies on lessons learned from previous experience. In addition to the APEC Summit in 1997, the First Stanley Cup Riot in 1994 had a significant impact on the way the city was policed in the years that followed. On 14 June 1994, the Vancouver Canucks lost the seventh and deciding game of the National Hockey League’s Stanley Cup finals. At the conclusion of the game, a disappointed yet boisterous
crowd of around 50,000 poured into the streets of Vancouver, triggering what is now known as the First Stanley Cup Riot. The riot was characterized by vandalism, fistfights, and civil disobedience. Trying to contain the situation, the police were overwhelmed by the sheer number of people. Following the riot, the city refrained from hosting many events, leading to its reputation as the ‘no fun city’. Hosting the Olympics became an opportunity for the city to rid itself of this reputation and prove that it could manage a large-scale event.

For Peter Judd, General Manager of Engineering Services and General Manager of Olympic Operations for the City of Vancouver, the Stanley Cup Riot generated “a real nervousness about any kind of event where large crowds would gather” (personal communication, May 25, 2010). As such, the Vancouver Olympics represented an opportunity for the city to erase its unfortunate label and prove that its citizens could have fun while behaving appropriately. Ironically, this was made possible through an enormous security deployment.

The 2010 Vancouver Winter Olympic Games was the largest domestic security operation during peacetime in Canadian history (Government of Canada, 2010). Over 15,000 security personnel, including the Vancouver Police Department (VPD), Royal Canadian Mounted Police (RCMP), Canadian Forces, private security and officers from 118 law enforcement units from around the country were united in the Vancouver 2010 Integrated Security Unit (ISU) headed by the RCMP.

Security planning accounted for “venue security; marine & aviation security; transportation & traffic incident management; physical security; accreditation screening

1 All interviews are referred to as “personal communication” in accordance with APA standards. Note that in this document, all instances of “personal communication” are indeed interviews and not other forms of communication.
and verification and protective policing” (Government of Canada, 2009). The Canadian Border Services Agency and the Canadian Security Intelligence Service (CSIS) were also an integral part of the security planning. Both agencies responded to requests from the ISU and provided intelligence and other information and services to the ISU. The RCMP and private security were responsible for operations inside Olympic venues while the VPD was in charge of security outside the venues, an area referred to as the ‘urban domain’ (ISU, 2010). Even the military and military related agencies were involved with securitizing the spaces for the Games. The North American Aerospace Defense Command monitored the airspace above Vancouver and Whistler (Ottawa Citizen, 2008) and the Canadian Forces watched-over the harbour around Vancouver and forests around Whistler (CNN, 2010; Ferreras, 2010). Two cruise ships were also leased for the duration of the games to house the enormous influx of police officers (Cernetig, 2008). Over half of the security workforce was living on these vessels and they were treated as ‘venues’ requiring security “from the land, from the sea, and from the air” (Bud Mercer, Assistant Commissioner of the RCMP and Chief Operation Officer for the ISU, personal communication, June 1, 2010).

Taken together, the command and control structure, the panoptic security measures and the intelligence gathering comprised the overall security apparatus. The ISU worked closely with various government agencies and deployed a myriad of physical and technological tools to monitor and control activities with the goal of preventing any threat to the event. With submarines defending the harbour, fighter jets in the sky, and snowmobiles in the mountains it is not surprising that the initial security budget of $175 million was grossly underestimated.
The Security Budget

The estimated security budget from Vancouver’s Olympic bid was actually followed until about a year before the first day of the Olympics. In 2009, the Minister of Public Safety finally told Parliament that the actual security expense for the Olympics was closer to $1 billion (Government of Canada, 2009). The Olympics was suddenly the most expensive security operation ever to take place within Canada’s borders.

This realization simply added to the frustrations of an already vocal opposition claiming that the money could be better spent on social services than on the militarization of the city for a two-week party. According to retired Deputy Chief Constable Steve Sweeney of the VPD, who was tasked with the deployment of VPD members during the Olympics, “the budget from the bid phase was a ‘rabbit out of the hat’ budget. That was somebody’s guess because they didn’t have any way to gauge what it was going to cost” (personal communication, November 25, 2009). Despite the honesty of this statement, it is somewhat misleading. Chris Shaw, a professor at the University of British Columbia and a vocal opponent of the Vancouver Olympics, made a critical point regarding the budget: “Anyone who had studied security in past events as recently as 2002 and the Kananaskis G8 meeting realized that that number was ridiculously small” (personal communication, November 20, 2009). Simply by looking at previous events, a more reasonable and truthful estimate of the security budget could have been made. Over $1 billion was spent on security during the previous Winter Games in Torino, Italy in 2006, so there were in fact ways of estimating the cost of security. According to Shaw, “Bid core and later VANOC and different levels of government insisted, insisted that that was

---

2 I obtained evidence of this by submitting a letter through Access to Information sent to the RCMP, requesting the disclosure of the ISU’s financial statements.
a correct number and that anyone who said otherwise was simply trying to…diminish the possibility of the bid” (Chris Shaw, personal communication, November 20, 2009). Like Sweeney, Shaw suggested that the budget was made-up but he went further and stated that the $175 million budget “was something they could sell to the public” (Ibid.).

When the issue is security, it seems that no budget is too high. ‘Security’ will receive enormous funding, with few questions asked. Dale Bracewell, a transportation engineer for the City of Vancouver and director of Olympic transportation, stated that the budget was not a constraint on his security and planning preparations (personal communication, May 26, 2010). Knowing what needed to be done, he pursued his work even prior to budget approval. The inflated budget also increased the purchasing power of the various security units. Funds were used to acquire new equipment and to update the arsenal of police tactical gear. For example, roughly one thousand cameras were purchased or leased as part of an expanded surveillance network, giving Vancouver the highest concentration of surveillance cameras in all of Canada (Mertle, 2010). Manoeuvrable cameras were mounted on traffic signals and were connected to a new surveillance room located in the City of Vancouver’s emergency management operation centre. The cameras were removed after the Olympics, but the infrastructure remains in place, meaning that the cameras, which are now in storage, can be deployed at any time.

TransLink, the public transit authority for Greater Vancouver, spent $23 million on counter-terrorism measures and ensured there was ample security at most Skytrain stations throughout the system (Keast, 2008). The 25 venues were cordoned off using extensive fencing and were monitored 24 hours a day by security personnel and

---

3 Bid Core (Vancouver Olympic Bid Corporation) is the name for the team of people that put together Vancouver’s Olympic bid. When the city was awarded the Games, Bid Core became VANOC, the Vancouver Organizing Committee for the 2010 Olympic and Paralympic Winter Games.
electronic surveillance systems. One of the more unconventional tools of security was the use of surveillance balloons, previously used by the Canadian Forces in Afghanistan, to overlook the Athlete’s Village (Lee, 2010).

Besides acquiring new equipment, money was spent on extensive travelling. Many police officers were sent to Games in Torino and Beijing to experience how the events were planned and managed in these countries. Some were also sent to Calgary, Sydney and Salt Lake City, all previous hosts, and London, the location of the 2012 Olympics, to speak with security planners and to learn from their expertise. People from Salt Lake City to London were also hired to consult on the security for the Vancouver Games. Finally, money was used to actually implement the security measures such as fencing and security barriers around the entire city and wages for the enormous contingent of security personnel.

Security Logic and the Threat Assessment

The actions taken to securitize Vancouver for the Olympics were understood in relation to the threat environment. According to Inspector Joanne McCormick (personal communication, June 3, 2010) and Deputy Chief Constable Steve Sweeney (personal communication, November 25, 2009), both Olympic security planners for the VPD, the possible threat of terrorism was always the overarching threat that guided security planning for the games. According to Sweeney,

The Olympics is like nothing else we've ever done in Canada. Let's start right up. It's a post-September 11th Olympics. Now, we're not faced with the challenges of Salt Lake City, where it was literally four months after September 11th in the country that was attacked. But the world has changed since September 11th. That has radically changed how we look at large congregations of people and how we police it and I think the anxiety for police for those kind of large events (personal communication, November 25, 2009).
Given the events of Munich 1972 and the 9/11 attacks, and the global publicity of the Olympics, the Games are viewed as an attractive target for a terrorist attack. While the Montreal Olympics of 1976 witnessed a significant increase in security measures which included a strong military presence, it was not until after 9/11 that security budgets for subsequent Olympics ballooned (Giulianotti & Klauser, 2010; Shaw & Westergard-Thorpe, 2009). However, 9/11 did not significantly alter security strategies; it simply made access to funds and resources more available for the further intensification of security practices (Coaffee et al., 2011).

A link is commonly made between the events of September 11, 2001 and the everyday policing and securitization of the city and of sport mega-events (Coaffee et al., 2011; Giulianotti & Klauser, 2010; Jennings & Lodge, 2011; T. Taylor & Toohey, 2011; Yu, Klauser, & Chan, 2009; Zekulin, 2009). Despite the large scale and exceptional nature of the 9/11 attacks, increased security has become more pervasive in the common spaces of cities. While Coaffee et. al. (2011, p. 3312) claim that threats to the Olympics are “increasingly externally defined in terms of terrorism,” the case of Vancouver presents a more shifting understanding of how risk was defined for the Games.

Leading up to the Olympics, Chris Shaw made a request to the ISU to publically release documents pertaining to threat assessments. From the documents, he describes how the perceived threat to the games was continually changing:

Their (ISU) initial concerns the first time anyone pried any information from them, was that they were worried of course about that whole terrorism thing. That somehow, Al-Qaeda or Al-Qaeda related domestic or foreign entities would come here and do horrible things. Then they were concerned about crime. It’s the Olympics, people were going to be walking around with lots of money in their wallets; people were going to steal it. Cyber crime

---

4 For example, security for Sydney 2000 was close to $180 million (US), while security for Athens 2004 was $1.5 billion (US) (Giulianotti & Klauser, 2010, p. 50).
could happen, what were we going to do about it? And then they mentioned in the first assessment that we had access to that they worried about domestic protest. Their later assessment had actually shifted the balance between terrorism and protest so that now protest had become their primary concern. So, what it meant to me and I think to others was that a billion dollar security budget that was now creeping out in every possible direction was not really worried about Al-Qaeda, it wasn't really worried about cyber crime, it was worried about protest (personal communication, November 20, 2009).

According to risk assessments prior to the Games, the federal Olympic secretariat ranked the potential for violent protests as the number one threat to the Olympics (Lee, 2008; Mason, 2010; Mickleburgh, 2009). Laura Track, a lawyer with Pivot Legal society who organized several community forums on Olympic security, was alarmed: “The fact that they've identified protestors as the number one concern to justify a billion dollar security expenditure and 15000 people [security personnel] is pretty intense” (personal communication, November 23, 2009). Shaw and Westergard-Thorpe (2009, p. 25) reiterated Track’s point and argued that “soldiers and F18s are not the proper response to demonstrations, at least not in a functional democracy.” Despite protest qualifying as the number one threat to the Games, the potential for terrorism was still used as the baseline for all security planning and the standardized model of Olympic security—referred to earlier—was deployed without acknowledging the local context and low threat levels facing Vancouver. Guided by the unpredictable nature of terrorism, there were no limits to security expansion; every space became a target and every person became suspect.

The necessity for ubiquitous security rests on an inherently contradictory logic. According to Joanne McCormick, “a fundamental of planning and security is that you have to plan to your intelligence” (personal communication, June 3, 2010). Intelligence was gathered by CSIS and disseminated to the ISU and then down through its associated
agencies. Before and during the Games, the threat levels remained low. Stu Dawson, Director General of Emergency Management at CSIS and coordinator for major events in Canada stated: “The threat for the Games in Vancouver was at a particularly low level along the way but we planned for a medium threat” (personal communication, April 19, 2010). This statement clearly reveals the contradiction: regardless of what the intelligence is showing, security planning must address the most unimaginable threats. Essentially, one billion dollars was spent on securitizing the city not for an existing threat, but for one that was imaginable.

Planning for a ‘medium threat’ when no major risk besides protesters had been identified reflects a type of security logic where it is essential to consider and prepare for the worst-case scenario (Clarke, 2006). The way former US Vice-President Dick Cheney’s ‘one percent doctrine’ empowered the US government to pursue wars and security measures without evidence of a particular danger is a prime example of this form of planning (Suskind, 2006). The one percent doctrine posits that even if there is a one percent probability of, say, a terrorist attack on the Olympics, security planners must preemptively prepare and respond as if the threat is certain.

This logic was clearly at work in plans for security during the Olympics. Steve Sweeney (personal communication, November 25, 2009) of the VPD and Gary Wilson (personal communication, May 25, 2010), the manager for corporate security for the City of Vancouver and a former police officer, both suggested that you can never discount the lone-gunman scenario, where one person acts alone. Second, Joanne McCormick argued

---

5 For both Stu Dawson and Joanne McCormick, it was important to plan for a medium threat because it allowed security professionals to escalate their security tactics in an efficient and cost-effective manner to a high threat situation should such a situation arise.

6 The Centennial Olympic Park bombing, committed by Eric Robert Rudolph during the 1996 Atlanta
that intelligence “is only as good as the people that are out there getting it” (personal communication, June 3, 2010). Finally, Gary Wilson (personal communication, May 25, 2010) said that when he would go on patrol as a police officer, he knew 95% of the time what could happen and was prepared for those events. He goes on to state that “it's the 5% of the time where we don't know, that's when it's dangerous.” He believed that it was the same thing with the Olympics: “They never had 100% intelligence. They couldn't. It's impossible. So they needed to prepare for that 5% that they couldn't predict. Hence, all the training, hence, all the planning, hence, all the time, hence, everything that went on to make sure that it went as well as it could.”

As part of the one percent doctrine, contemporary security planning is based on the question, ‘what if’? (Mythen & Walklate, 2008) and considers all threatening scenarios that were previously unthinkable (Boyle & Haggerty, 2009). But if it is impossible to discount the lone-guroman, faulty intelligence, and unknown information, then it is impossible to guarantee zero risk. According to Michael Vonn, Policy Director at the British Columbia Civil Liberties Association (BCCLA), this logic is “a form of insanity”:

It basically says that the only thing that constrains your security measures is budget and even if it's a risk that is outside being hit by an asteroid, which is approximately the risk of dying in a terrorist attack at the Olympics, we need to throw money at it. We need to throw money, hardware and people at this problem that actually doesn't exist (personal communication, November 25, 2009).

In essence, the securitization process is a way to impose a certain ideal on the urban environment that is based on an imagined fear. The sense of security created

---

Summer Olympics, is an example of the “lone-guroman” scenario. Despite extensive security precautions, Rudolph was able to carry out his act of terror, killing two people and injuring over 100 others.
through the implementation of security measures is only an illusion (Beck, 2002; Boddy, 2008). As David Eby, the Executive Director of the BCCLA, states:

There was no acknowledgment that I saw that it was impossible to secure Vancouver... so no matter what, there is going to be some exposure to terror attack. ...The celebration after Canada won the gold in the hockey—there was no gatekeeping function. There were tens of thousands of people in the street. I mean you could walk in with a bomb and set it down and walk out and blow a bunch of people up. And a billion dollars of security is not going to prevent that from happening. And it would be devastating. And it would be awful and appalling. And we could spend 10 billion dollars and not prevent it. I do think it was overkill. I think it was really frustrating to see the blank cheque that was given to security (personal communication, May 26, 2010).

Moreover, this type of planning, does not acknowledge that a certain level of insecurity will always exist. As a result, security planning for events like the Olympics is a method of “controlling the irrational by rational means,” where “fear becomes a basis for rational action” (Ericson, 1994, p. 167). But, what is rational about the escalation of security measures at mega-events when, as Bennett and Haggerty (2011) suggest, it resembles the actions of a country at war? In addition, Shaw and Westergard-Thorpe (2009) argue that Olympic boosterism served to exclude critical scrutiny of the Olympic security apparatus. Such an immense amount of money and planning suggests that security operations are not simply intended to preserve safety during the games. Rather, as the next section will show, security operations were used to criminalize dissent and to preserve Vancouver’s image.

**Ordering the City Prior to the Olympics**

Large-scale events such as the Olympics represent a platform for ordering and controlling the city. These events become catalysts for cleaning up the streets and creating insecurity for some of the most marginalized portions of the population. Five

---

7 Ericson is drawing on Ulrich Beck’s 1992 work on the ‘risk society’ to make this point.
cases in the months leading up to the Olympics clearly demonstrate how the exceptional nature of the Olympics was deployed to legitimize certain controversial forms of planning.

In the first and broadest case, Boyle and Haggerty (2009) show how Project Civil Society, a programme implemented by Vancouver City Council in anticipation of the Olympics, was meant to regulate urban disorder. This project sought to create linkages between various municipal services and to implement different policies and actions that would reduce public issues such as homelessness, drug-use, panhandling or other activities that prevented others from enjoying public spaces. The business community strongly believed that the city’s reputation as one of the most liveable cities in the world was being tarnished by the reputation of the notorious Downtown Eastside (Boyle & Haggerty, 2011, p. 3188). Hence, Project Civil Society was seen as a way to address disorder in the city not because the problems it sought to address reduce life expectancy, limit human potential and cause untold levels of human suffering. Instead, these issues were understood to be problems primarily because they risked undermining the preferred significations of the city that would be broadcast to a global audience of potential visitors, workers and investors (Boyle & Haggerty, 2011, p. 3198).

Just prior to the Olympics, a new municipal government was elected and immediately cancelled Project Civil Society. Even so, the programme is an excellent example of how the Olympics can act as a catalyst towards new practices of controlling disorder.

In the second case—and one of the first controversies related to Olympic security—an undercover police officer was discovered to have driven a bus of demonstrators to an anti-Olympic protest in Victoria months before the actual Games (Hansen, 2009). He took notes and names of the passengers even though there was no violence or reason to consider these protesters suspect (Mackin, 2009). Through these
methods of undercover policing, voices of dissent became associated with the potential for criminal activity. Furthermore, this tactic exposed the scope of the emerging security apparatus. The infiltration of activist groups by covert police officers has become a common security practice in Canada.\(^8\)

The three remaining controversies emerged in relation to the prevention of anti-Olympic symbols or undesirable behaviour. Vancouver’s anti-graffiti law was employed to remove an anti-Olympic art piece from the front of a downtown gallery (C. Smith, 2009). The mural, painted by Jess Corcoran, “depicted Olympics rings as faces—four frowning, and one smiling” (Boycoff, 2011, p. 50). By categorizing the art as graffiti rather than a political or artistic message, the city was able to legitimize their order to remove the art piece. However, the BCCLA argued that it was simply one of the myriad ways the 2010 Olympic planners were trying to limit free speech.\(^9\) Next, the Government of British Columbia passed the Assistance to Shelter Act in November 2009, giving police the authority to remove homeless people from the streets during periods of inclement weather. This regulation came into effect just two months prior to the Olympics and was criticized as a tool for removing homeless people from tourist areas (CBC News, 2009). Instead of keeping a promise to provide new affordable housing or permanent shelters, the government created a new tool to force homeless people from their communities and into shelters anywhere in the greater Vancouver area. Masked by a noble cause, this piece of legislation was an easy mechanism by which the police could control the presence of homeless people in the public spaces of the city.

---

\(^8\) Undercover police officers were subsequently used to monitor protest groups prior to the G20 summit in Toronto in June 2010 (Small & Edwards, 2011).

\(^9\) The BCCLA has a page devoted to the various tools and legal methods used to limit free speech during the 2010 Olympics. [http://www.bccla.org/temp/get%20educated.html](http://www.bccla.org/temp/get%20educated.html). Eventually, the city permitted the gallery to remount the art piece.
Finally, the City of Vancouver revised several by-laws to meet the terms of the Olympic Host City Agreement, signed by Vancouver’s Mayor and the Canadian Olympic Committee in 2003.\textsuperscript{10} Part of the hosting agreement required Vancouver to prevent media and Olympic attendees from seeing “political” protest inside and outside the venues. Furthermore, any activity that interfered with someone’s enjoyment of the Games or detracted from the festive atmosphere became an offence under the City of Vancouver Olympic bylaws (Boycott, 2011).

David Eby clearly explained why this type of regulation was problematic:

The challenge with the Olympics is that it is founded on the idea, which is in many ways an admirable goal, but it's founded on the idea that there are no politics on the sports field, that as a result the Olympics are politics free or a politics free zone. And it's enshrined in the Charter, the Olympic Charter and what they call an anti-propaganda rule in the Olympic Charter and this manifests itself in something called the clean venue agreement that dictates rules around what can and can't be shown in venues and also a set of requirements in the host city contract for the city that hosts the Olympics. All of these combine to create this impression in Vancouver that we were going to create these politics free zones, but they weren't actually politics free zones because they were filled with the advertising of the Olympic sponsors of the International Olympic Committee of the Olympics themselves and it was just the exclusion of other political messages - there is no such thing as a politics free zone (personal communication, May 26, 2010).

According to the Olympic Charter, “no kind of demonstration or political, religious or racial propaganda is permitted in any Olympic sites, venues or other areas” (International Olympic Committee, 2007, p. 98 Rule 51). Accordingly, Olympic host cities have the responsibility to ensure that no non-sponsor commercial signage or propaganda can be displayed in the venues or within the view of television cameras or spectators outside the venues. Activists, supported by the BCCLA, filed a court challenge against the Olympic bylaw, arguing that it contravened the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms. Before

\textsuperscript{10} Host City Contract for the XXI Olympic Winter Games in the Year 2010, (18 June 2003).
the case went to court, the city adjusted the language in the bylaw so as not to criminalize those carrying protest signs. Nevertheless, this was another attempt to limit free speech and control the dissent that was growing around the Olympics.

In all five cases, the exceptionality of the Olympics was used to legitimize the practice of ‘re-ordering’ Vancouver or maintaining control over dissent. Law enforcement officers, those charged with maintaining security throughout the games, were deployed to monitor activists, limit displays of political dissidence, and remove undesirables from the public and festive spaces of the Olympic city. As Boyle and Haggerty argue,

The Olympics coalesced the regulatory abilities of private and public actors in such a way as to fixate on the minutiae of urban design, human comportment and police practice—all of this in an attempt to craft an urban regulatory apparatus that coheres with the preferred meanings of ‘livability’ and ‘quality of life’ promoted by city officials and business boosters (2011, p. 3197).

Hence, Olympic security planning became overly paranoid and intensely pro-active to ensure that nothing could hurt the reputation of Vancouver and Canada during the Games.

Security in the Urban Domain

The unique geography of Vancouver combined with the influx of thousands of people made security planning for the Olympics an arduous task. The magnitude of this task is exemplified in a statement from the Head of the ISU, Bud Mercer:

We had over 30 venues that we had to secure. Each of those venues was different. So, each of the venues had to be tailor made to the environment that we live in. Some of those venues were in downtown Vancouver that bordered on high-rise towers and Costcos. Some of the venues were in mountain areas where you had absolutely impassable, almost impassable sides to the venues with an urban piece to the front of them. Some of the venues were even bordered on water with mountains in the background or highways in the background, water in the foreground and the air over top
Mercer’s description focused on locking-down the venues, the ISU’s main priority, from the larger surrounding landscapes. When Joanne McCormick (personal communication, June 3, 2010) from the VPD was seconded to the RCMP’s ‘Olympic Security Project’ (later the ISU) team in 2004, she promoted a more comprehensive view of security planning for the Olympics. Her priority, which had not yet registered with the ISU or VANOC, was security outside the venues. She was astounded that security for the city—beyond the venues—was not on the agenda and had no funding envelope. She argued that more attention should be given to this part of the project:

So the security committees had to basically acknowledge the fact that there was an urban domain, acknowledge the fact that this urban domain was in fact there because of the Olympics because everyone would always say: well it's not Olympic related. Give me a break. If somebody wants to put on a street party because the Olympics are in town, because all the people are here and they’re going to put something affiliated, a big screen or fireworks at night or whatever, banjos and clowns, it's going to be Olympic related (personal communication, June 3, 2010).

This resulted in the development of a sub-committee on security planning focused solely on the areas outside the venues: the ‘urban domain’. Determining how to address domestic protest and the Olympic related sites outside the venues became the primary focus of this committee (ISU, 2010).

Kevin Wallinger, the Director of Emergency Management at the City of Vancouver, said the last six months prior to the Olympics “was really focused on getting an understanding of all of those other pavilions, the Olympic related venues outside those islands” (personal communication, May 28, 2010). His apt description of the Olympic sites as ‘islands’ suggests a problematic disjuncture between the spaces designated for Olympic events and the surrounding city. Joanne McCormick had some understanding of
the complications involved in separating the spaces of this city between Olympic and non-Olympic spaces:

Because it is the dense downtown urban environment and when we are trying to put in security measures on a venue like BC and GM place where the template had been set—it had been signed off and agreed to by all the parties of a 100 metre stand-off—good luck achieving a 100-metre stand-off from BC place when you've got 4 major residential towers. You've got a COSTCO, you've got a working operational marina, you've got two nightclubs and a working Casino all within 20 metres. So, how do you do that? How do you achieve that and still allow the world to exist outside of the Olympics. Business goes on (personal communication, June 3, 2010).

The spatial relationship between the city and the venues increased the complexity and challenges of security planning. By initially ignoring the urban domain and then by separating urban domain planning from venue security planning, the city became segregated, creating a type of ‘splintered’ urbanism (Graham & Marvin, 2001), with venues disconnected from the rest of the urban environment. It is difficult to plan security for a unit of the city without considering the repercussions for nearby urban spaces. Taken out of the public realm, venues became privatized enclaves, allowing security planning to legitimize measures that would otherwise come under tremendous scrutiny.

As a result, some security plans were quite controversial and required extensive negotiations with the city.

To address security considerations for the urban venues, special committees and working groups were established and included members from various agencies (P. Judd, personal communication, May 25, 2010). These agencies, however, had different perceptions of how the committee meetings were carried out. According to Bud Mercer (personal communication, June 1, 2010) and Steve Sweeney (personal communication, November 25, 2009), the police had to negotiate with other agencies to determine the best
structure and placement of security measures. They noted that at times, the negotiations were challenging, but all agencies were included and respected. In contrast, Peter Judd (personal communication, May 25, 2010) and his colleague Dale Bracewell (personal communication, May 26, 2010) claimed that security planners held a “trump card” over other considerations. Peter Judd said, “there was a lot of discussion [around security plans] but I wouldn’t say engineering won many of the negotiations around dedication of space for security. That ended up being a given.”

Besides fencing surrounding the perimeter of all venues, road closures were the most obvious security intrusions into the public sphere. A prime example of this security intervention was the closure of the Dunsmuir and Georgia Street viaducts. BC Place, the site of the opening, closing and medal ceremonies, and Canada Hockey place (now Rogers Arena), the site of Men’s and Women’s Hockey, are adjacent to one another and are flanked by the two viaducts (Figure 4.2).

Several years before the Olympics, it was decided that the viaducts would be closed during the Games. According to Steve Sweeney, “there is no way of giving us (the police) suitable stand-off zones for BC Place and Canada Hockey Place with the viaducts in operation. It was just a thing we had to do” (personal communication, November 25, 2009). This was never an official decision, but it was assumed within the ISU that once the games were approaching, the viaducts would have to be closed.
In the fall of 2008, it was time to make a final decision on the viaducts, and the City of Vancouver’s engineering department shocked the security planners by suggesting that closure was not necessarily the best idea. The city’s engineers presented a detailed analysis of transportation patterns in Vancouver and demonstrated that the two viaducts carried thirty percent of traffic in and out of the downtown core every day (Dale Bracewell, personal communication, May 26, 2010; Joanne McCormick, personal communication, June 3, 2010). These traffic studies determined that the viaducts were essentially the neck of the city and that by closing them, there would be an enormous impact on regular traffic elsewhere in the city. For Joanne McCormick,

It was a matter of hard negotiations to try and achieve some of the closures because it seemed to be that we thought a lot to get what we seemed to think as normal—why would you think that we couldn't have them—to what the city is saying is: we need to have our people coming in, our
commuters coming in everyday. Yes, we get that but we're like, security is more important, and they're like no, traffic is more important. So, you have to come to the final point that we have to make this work. It's a three-week gig, how do we make it happen? So, we did (personal communication, June 3, 2010).

But Dale Bracewell claimed that the engineers

understood from the beginning that if security said they needed to close part of the transportation network, it was not for debate…it was important that while our security colleagues always had the final decision on the what, we wanted to make sure that they understood the full transportation impact of that as they look at their entire analysis and they did value that (personal communication, May 26, 2010).

Essentially, the purpose of the engineers’ work—as they perceived it—was to provide details and analysis to the ISU, so that the ISU could make the most informed decisions possible. It was not the job of the engineers to contest the position of the ISU; their role was to provide information to the ISU, create a strategy on how to reduce car trips during the Olympics, and advise the public about traffic restrictions.

At times the negotiations became tense. The case made to maintain Quebec Street as a pedestrian and cycling corridor just east of the Athlete’s Village, revealed some antagonism between the city and the ISU. Peter Judd and Dale Bracewell, the city’s engineers, believed that with so many limitations on automobile traffic, it was imperative to retain parts of some streets for alternative modes of transportation (Peter Judd, personal communication, May 25, 2010; Dale Bracewell, personal communication, May 26, 2010). At first, the ISU was extremely reluctant to provide space on Quebec Street for any form of movement. They did not understand why cyclists and pedestrians could not use Main Street, which is parallel to Quebec Street and only one block east (Joanne
McCormick, personal communication, June 3, 2010). According to Peter Judd (personal communication, May 25, 2010),

In the absence of a physical separation, security people want a minimum distance between a place where people are gathering inside a venue to the nearest place where somebody could get with a car bomb or a bomb of any significance either in a backpack or whatever. So, it was a matter of having enough physical separation distance wise and that is why it became an issue on Quebec Street because there was no physical barrier. The cost of doing a physical barrier wasn't justifiable when you compared that against the pros and cons of moving the fence line out a little bit.

Joanne McCormick (personal communication, June 3, 2010) said that “it was the biggest fight with the City's engineering about closing Quebec,” but in the end the ISU conceded the eastern sidewalk for pedestrians and cyclists. Both the closing of the viaducts and the Quebec Street issue demonstrate how space was contested and transformed in these disputes. Even though the ISU accepted the city’s recommendation to keep the east side of the Quebec Street sidewalk open to cyclists and pedestrians, the ISU had the overarching authority in terms of all spatial arrangements. If it had not been possible to re-configure the fence line so as to provide a large enough setback for the Athlete’s Village, it is unlikely the ISU would have complied with the city’s request.

For most other closures and restrictions, there was never really a debate and the public simply had to adapt. The acceptance of road closures and limits to mobility is simply “the price of security” (Lyon, 2004, p. 310). As Boyle and Haggerty (2009) suggest:

The undeniable presence of intensive security measures at mega-events reinforces the taken-for-granted sense that such measures are required, that they do not unduly infringe upon personal liberties, that certain dangers are pervasive—and more pressing than other risks—and that the existing constellation of security interests is inevitable. The increasingly normalized spectacle of security fosters a sense in which such assumptions become so self-evident that they are beyond critique (p.270).
In other words, the language of security has become so powerful, it has come to legitimize all sorts of restrictions and regulations on urban spaces and the behaviour that goes on in those spaces. Instead of careful risk assessments guiding security planning, the measures being deployed for mega-sport events like the Olympics are steered by the “precautionary principle” where every possible threat must be planned for regardless of its probability (T. Taylor & Toohey, 2011, p. 3260). Like the one percent doctrine, planning based on the precautionary principle allows decision makers to implement security measures to address a potential threat when there is no evidence that this particular threat could manifest. In essence, the process of assessing risk has become separated from reasoned judgement (Boyle & Haggerty, 2009, p. 261). As Taylor and Toohey (2011, p. 3272) argue, “The security-laden narrative provides a legitimised public discourse to justify the imperative to separate and control these event spaces independent from their local community.”

At the core of this problem is the disconnect between security planning processes and community involvement in such processes. The casual acceptance of these measures as a given hinders the possibility for more democratic forms of security planning in line with conventional forms of spatial planning. As mobility is restricted and freedoms relinquished, public voices are ignored in the name of security. Mega-event security planning is therefore part of what Moss (2009, p. 67) believes to be a political and social climate of the last 30 years that has permitted the erosion of civil liberties and freedoms in favour of more ‘security’. The discourse of security has enabled this form of planning to operate in a way that is inconsistent with the principles of contemporary planning.
The Undemocratic Nature of Security Planning

Security planning for the Games was a top-down process where high-ranking police officers and bureaucrats made decisions about how to securitize the city.\textsuperscript{11} The security professionals I interviewed understood the job of security planning as the project of experts and did not see value in consulting the public. As Steve Sweeney clearly states: “If consultation means you go to the public to ask them how do we secure the games, I am not sure there's a lot of benefit to that because that's not what they do” (personal communication, November 25, 2009). Kevin Wallinger from Emergency Management made a similar remark: “How far do you take democracy? If every time you had to plan for a major event or some type of a crisis response, you are absolutely not going to be going to the public” (personal communication, May 28, 2010). Despite this comment, Wallinger eventually recognized the possibility of a more democratic form of security planning: “Should we allow them or give them the opportunity to say well no don't do it that way, you have to do it this way? Well I guess there's a democratic way to do that too as opposed to the operational, bureaucratic way to do it.”

This type of attitude is perhaps a result of the bureaucratization of the police, something Dandeker (1990, p. 125) claims “has enabled the police to become subordinate officials of the state and autonomous experts.” As a result, expert rationality or knowledge was the key defence mechanism security planners used to discredit the consultation process. To disregard the voice of the public in security deliberations for mega-events ignores the many ways in which communities have been involved in security planning for their cities and neighbourhoods. In many U.S. states public

\textsuperscript{11} This form of planning follows the rational-comprehensive approach to planning described in the Introduction chapter.
consultations are integral to policies such as natural hazard mitigation and crisis response (Godschalk, Brody, & Burby, 2003). In another example, community policing has become a way for police forces to work with neighbourhood groups to solve problems of crime and security (Kelling & Moore, 1988). Terrorism, however, tends to be treated as its own issue, resulting in the exclusion of community voices (Shaftoe, Turksen, Lever, & Williams, 2007). Even so, Coaffee and Rogers (2008) show that in addition to the more militarized form of urban security that has proliferated since 9/11, community engagement has become a major component in resilience planning. But in a study on security at Australian sporting events by Taylor and Toohey (2011), community involvement in the security planning process was non-existent. In the case of Vancouver, Taylor and Toohey’s findings are reinforced.

Despite promises from the ISU to hold consultations with the public about security planning, such community participation never materialized. Even Vancouver City Council had urged VANOC “to hold open community consultations…before security plans (were) finalized, as VANOC had originally pledged to” (Shaw & Westergard-Thorpe, 2009, p. 28), but the security planners did not see the value in this process. The decision to backtrack on a promise to hold consultations with the public on security matters led some critics to question the democratic legitimacy of the Olympic security operation. According to David Eby (personal communication, May 26, 2010), a “know-all” attitude characterized the actions of the security planners. While he understood that security had to be part of the games, Eby claimed that community consultations pertaining to security were supposed to have taken place several years prior to the Olympics:
We expected security planning and in fact we hoped for and advocated for security planning that involved the community, which is more expensive right? You go out to the community and you say: here is what we are thinking about doing, how is that going to affect your access to Insite? How is that going to affect your access to your parking lot? How is that going to affect your access to your business? None of that stuff happened. The planning all happened in some back room somewhere and then after the planning was complete and they came out and said ok here's the plan and that is the complete opposite of how things were supposed to go.

Laura Track of Pivot Legal concurred with Eby on the lack of consultation that was initially supposed to be part of the security planning process:

Groups pushed and pushed and pushed for that to happen, some kind of consultation around civil liberties and security planning that was meaningful and that took in perspectives and that used those perspectives to inform the security plans. It just never happened. So in March, Pivot contacted the ISU and said well there is no way to do a real consultation, your security plans are basically made but the least you could do is come and give us some information. Come and tell this community about how these security plans are going to impact the neighbourhood and so they did (personal communication, November 23, 2009).

The imposition of security measures on a city, when no public input has been solicited, can have dangerous consequences. When the police are left to make up the rules as they see fit, in secret and without any public debate or parliamentary scrutiny, it is possible that exceptional measures can limit protest or dissent through unlawful or at least questionably lawful means. For example, in June of 2010, just four months after the Olympics, another one billion dollars was spent on securitizing Toronto for the G20 summit. Over the course of three days, over 1000 people were arrested, the largest mass arrest in Canadian history (Mahoney & Hui, 2010). The police planned and implemented security measures and tactics that resulted in the arrest of mostly law-abiding citizens unaware of the new restrictions placed upon their rights and freedoms. Erosion of legal rights is a slippery slope: If security planning is left unchecked, it can quickly become an
excuse for authoritarian actions to control public spaces.

In the case of the Vancouver Olympics, the ISU used the predominance of security logic to place restrictions on urban space. It decided to create ‘safe assembly areas’ near venues where protestors could demonstrate, thinking that this would be a reasonable way to allow protestors to be seen and heard without disrupting the games (Hui, 2011). Prescribing the spaces where protests are permitted and where they are not, “allows security agencies to claim that they are simply finding an appropriate balance between rights to protest and security” (Epstein & Iveson, 2009, p. 277). However, this plan received considerable criticism from activists claiming the right to protest anywhere in public space (Hainsworth, 2009). In the end, the safe assembly areas existed but protestors were not restricted to these zones (B. Mercer, personal communication, June 1, 2010). Regardless, spaces of dissent were extremely circumscribed, because all venues and Olympic-related spaces were off-limits or tightly controlled, making the task of monitoring protest groups or controlling demonstrations a more predictable function.

The hegemonic discourse of security served to legitimize both the undemocratic process of security planning and the proliferation of spatial restrictions during the Games. Such undemocratic processes can have numerous effects. First, the public is left in the dark about security restrictions. Plans were made in secret and eventually presented to the public as a non-negotiable fait accompli. In more legal terms, Michael Vonn suggests that “there is sort of the department of homeland security rationale which is, just trust us, we're really nice people, we'll exercise our discretion in a way that's really excellent. And no part of understanding what your rights are is investing trust in the people who are supposed to be duly constrained in the exercise of their power” (personal communication, 12 This was actually one of the key recommendations from the APEC Commission.
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November 25, 2009). In responses to letters written to CSIS and the ISU by the BCCLA, neither agency would confirm nor deny that they were going to use methods of policing such as *agents provocateurs* during the games. Such a response to a concerned public does little to inspire confidence.

Furthermore, the Olympics were leveraged to circumvent certain democratic processes. For years, the VPD had been trying to acquire surveillance cameras to monitor various troublesome areas of the city (Haggerty, Huey, & Ericson, 2008). But according to Michael Vonn (personal communication, November 25, 2009), there had never been the political will from City Council to acquire the technology. Once Vancouver was awarded the Games, the VPD changed its tone regarding surveillance cameras. Rather than requesting the cameras to monitor signs of “urban decay” such as drug-dealing and prostitution, the VPD wanted the cameras to monitor civil unrest and terrorism (Boyle & Haggerty, 2011, p. 3196). The ISU argued that the measures would be temporary but in reality the measures were just mobile, to be redeployed whenever necessary. While the security cameras did not remain in place following the games, the measures were implemented with relatively little backlash, making it more likely that such measures will eventually become permanent.13

A second major problem with a security planning process that omits public consultation is the way it permits planners to mobilize their own “expert” understanding of the city, ignoring social differences and the complexities of urban spaces. David Eby clarifies this point when he asks the following question: “Who is the expert in knowing security issues in a particular neighbourhood or vital services that people need in a

---

13 Following the Stanley Cup Riots in June of 2011, there have been serious discussions about deploying the surveillance cameras on a more permanent basis. Each event tends to lend more legitimacy to the security measures and garners more support from elected officials (The Canadian Press, 2011)
particular neighbourhood? It's not the police. They may have some ideas about it but to
discount the voice of the public in security planning and the essential role of the public in
security planning is a real mistake” (personal communication, May 26, 2010). According
to Molotch and McClain (2003, p. 680) planners and urban analysts are often in a better
position to address problems of urban living because they are more familiar with the way
people interact in the physical and social space. They go on to suggest that planners must
take a more active role both in the security agenda and in defending public involvement
in such processes (Molotch & McClain, 2003, p. 687). Signs of this have started to
emerge in places like Manchester, where there is an increasing focus on how the public
can assist in the securitization process (Coaffee & Rogers, 2008). However, this body of
research tends to accept the security logic paradigm and seeks ways to improve upon the
practice of security rather than questioning the reasoning behind the securitization agenda
in the first place (Sorkin, 2008).

A final effect of this expert approach is the way it enables the further expansion
and entrenchment of security practices in the everyday management of cities. Giulianotti
and Klauser (2010, p. 54) point out six ways that security-related strategies remain
significant following a sport mega-event. First, most cities are left with an updated and
more extensive security infrastructure after a mega-event concludes. This was certainly
the case with the Athens Olympics, where an entire surveillance network remained in
place after the games (Samatas, 2007). In Vancouver, new surveillance technology was
acquired and was linked to a modernized monitoring facility. Second, new security
practices are implemented, such as the creation of an integrated security unit and the use
of private security for monitoring and controlling public spaces. The creation of the ISU
and the use of private security for the venues and ‘Live-city sites’ is an updated model of security planning that reached its most sophisticated point during the Olympics. This model was copied for the G20 in Toronto just four months later. Third, new government policies and legislation tend to remain after the event—The Assistance to Shelter Act being a notable example. The final three involve broader changes to the city in terms of social control, inter-societal relationships and urban redevelopment. Several dozen homeless people were removed from beneath the Georgia and Dunsmuir viaducts during the Games (L. Track, personal communication, November 23, 2010) and Project Civil Society served to refashion the image of the city (Boyle & Haggerty, 2011).

Above all, Boyle and Haggerty (2009, p. 267) argue, “mega-events are consciously leveraged as developmental opportunities for long-term security enhancements, providing the justification and finances for security and surveillance surges designed to leave an infrastructure of urban surveillance.” In fact, the IOC and the potential host city actually use this feature as a way to sell the Games to the public (Bader, 2009; Inwood, 2009). One year prior to the Vancouver Games, the President of the IOC, Jacques Rogge, stated: “Security investments always leave a good legacy of security for the country. Whenever the Games are finished, everything that has been built, the expertise that has been acquired, the hardware that has been put in place, is serving the country and the regions for decades to follow” (quoted in Bader, 2009). Once again, security for the Olympics is framed within a normative understanding of improving the city. However, the necessity of such measures is rarely questioned following the Games.

Mega-events are the testing grounds for new forms of urban securitization. The exceptional nature of an event allows security plans to circumvent democratic scrutiny
more characteristic of traditional planning processes. When a city is securitized for a mega-event, Epstein and Iveson (2009, p. 292) suggest “that ‘extraordinary’ measures…can quickly become ‘ordinary’ once they have been put in place for one event…with each event involving a refinement of security measures established in previous events.” As citizens are forced to accept increased security during mega-events, they will become more accustomed to and perhaps more accepting of further security restrictions in their everyday lives. The lack of a more open and democratic discussion about the level of risk the public is willing to accept, ensures that the prevailing security logic remains unchallenged. These discussions are avoided because security planning is treated as the task of experts.

The Normalization of Security?

Securitizing Vancouver was legitimized not through a democratic process but by playing on the Olympic exception. As Laura Track points out: “The Olympics just have this sense of exceptionalism to them, that anything is justified because it is for the Olympics…The Olympics weigh ten pounds and everything you can pile on the other side of the scale just never comes close to balancing things out to get any kind of accommodation for any other interests of needs or priorities” (personal communication, November 23, 2009). In Helen Lenskyj’s (2000) study of the Olympic industry, she shows how planning for the Sydney Olympics in 2000 lacked transparency, democratic involvement and community participation. Essentially, the Olympic ‘exception’ tends to allow governments to operate in a manner that is beyond scrutiny. But, in terms of security, what happens when the exceptional measures for the Olympics become the normal way to control urban activities? In this final section, I outline how security
measures become normalized through event security and can easily find a new purpose after their utility for the mega-event has elapsed.

There is certainly an adjustment period for residents of an Olympic city. For three weeks, residents may have to alter their daily routines to make accommodations for the Olympics and its operations. However, once the Vancouver Games began, Gary Wilson (personal communication, May 25, 2010), the manager for corporate security for the City of Vancouver, believes people just adapted. For Joanne McCormick, “it wasn't like everything all of a sudden closed. People got used to it. Starting in January, they started to see - oh ok, changes. Ok adapt. Oh, ok that's changed, ok adapt” (personal communication, June 3, 2010).

People just adapted because there was no way of contesting the inevitability of the Olympics. David Eby was actually surprised people adapted so quickly. In particular, he was shocked at how quickly the installation of the surveillance cameras became normalized. He states,

People saw the cameras going up and there was some sort of sense of unease about it. You know here are these cameras, who is watching the cameras, what is happening with the footage, who is watching me, you know that kind of feeling that people get around surveillance cameras. But then very quickly, they just become part of the background, that sort of legacy of surveillance and that this is just something that is normal or just happens as part of these international events (personal communication, May 26, 2010).

Ericson (1994) suggests that people are willing to trade their discomfort with uncertainty for the illusion of certainty. Taylor and Toohey’s (2011) Australian study found that security managers at sporting venues believed that the potential threat of terrorism in the post-9/11 period had actually created an atmosphere where people had become more accepting of security measures. But whether people adapted to or simply accepted the
security measures, it is certain that a combination of insecurity and Olympic exceptionalism allowed for the expansive security project.

However, this does not mean that security for the Olympics went unchallenged. In the evening of Monday, 14 February 2010, there was an anti-securitization/militarization protest, which attracted hundreds of participants. Using creative ways to challenge the security apparatus, the march suggested that adapting to and accepting security expansion is not a natural process but an imposed solution to a dubious problem.

In general, exposure to security restrictions during mega-events is the primary way these security methods and tools become more normalized. The various actions of the security agencies during the Olympics were part of the normalization of exceptional security that will make it easier the next time there is a special event to engage in similar and more enhanced methods of securitization (D. Eby personal communication, May 26, 2010). Once a particular type of securitization is used successfully for one event, its deployment then becomes reasonable for subsequent events. Therefore, it is not a matter of seeking out expertise to address a security threat; it is about ensuring that security planning is never subjected to public consultation or scrutiny, thus foreclosing debate on whether or not the legacy of security was actually desirable in the first place. Each adaptation is also a process of normalization until security measures become so common that they constitute an unquestionable norm.

Many security measures for the Olympics were deemed legitimate because of their temporary nature. But the security apparatus is never just temporary: it is mobile. The technologies and techniques of security can be deployed at a different time in the same city or can travel from city to city, leaving behind a legacy. This is not a byproduct
of the event, but a ‘deliverable’. In the case of the 2012 London Olympic Summer Games, years have been spent learning from the security professionals who worked on previous events. This is also one of the first Games where “security practitioners, planners and urban designers have developed a guidebook for venue security, which utilises ‘Secure-by-Design’ principles to secure the venues territorially” (Coaffee et al., 2011, p. 3319). These measures, conceived as a counter-terrorism tactic, will then serve as a crime prevention technique in these spaces following the Games (Ibid., p. 3321). This demonstrates not only the further integration of security planning within urban design, but it also shows the increasing sophistication and malleability of security measures.

Planning in the Aftermath of Olympic Security

The normalization of security-related urban alterations and the ease with which people seemed to adapt in Vancouver could in one sense be beneficial for the future of cities. The closure or reduced capacity of many roads, including major thoroughfares, and the pedestrianization of several streets, is a major concern for contemporary planners. Michael Gordon (personal communication, November 19, 2009), a senior planner with the City of Vancouver, Dale Bracewell (personal communication, May 26, 2010), and Peter Judd (personal communication, May 25, 2010) all saw the various security alterations during the Olympics as an experiment in what is possible for achieving progressive planning goals. According to Michael Gordon, “a high level objective for the city is to heavily shift the mode split over to transit and walking and cycling.” Dale Bracewell makes a similar point:

So the lesson was is you have to plan for more trips than you normally would accommodate all while, because of security and other reasons, with less cars.
That's a lesson learned that we needed for the games that we want to adopt. We want to continue to be a downtown that grows in residents and businesses so that means more trips not less but meanwhile our mode split for walking, cycling and transit would get higher and higher as we call it the sustainable mode split would go higher and higher so, that's something that we want to do (personal communication, May 26, 2010).

Both Gordon and Bracewell hoped that the security restrictions for the Olympics, which forced people to use other methods of transportation besides a private automobile, would be a catalyst that pushed the city towards a less car-centric future. They believed that if people could adjust for a three-week period, perhaps they could adjust to more permanent changes. For example, Michael Gordon (personal communication, November 19, 2009) noted that closing the viaducts during the Olympics allowed planners to discuss the possibility of eliminating the elevated structures all together like other North American cities. While Toronto has only contemplated dismantling its elevated highway through the downtown core, Boston has actually gone ahead and buried its central artery through the core of the city in what is known as the ‘Big Dig’ megaproject. Furthermore, Gordon thought that the pedestrianization of certain streets during the Olympics would perhaps allow the city to permanently close some of those streets to auto traffic in the future.

For Bracewell (personal communication, May 26, 2010), the ability to plan for more trips than normal with fewer cars—as a result of security restrictions during the Olympics—is a model he wants to adopt on a permanent basis for the city. Peter Judd concurred with Bracewell but also stated that the benefit of Olympic security restrictions has been more profound. Because of the closures during the Olympics, he argued that people have become more accepting of increased automobile restrictions and as a result, are more willing to change personal transportation behaviour (P. Judd, personal communication, November 19, 2009).
communication, May 25, 2010). He provided the example of a 20 percent increase in public transit ridership over the course of 2009-2010 and then specifically discussed the construction of a dedicated bike lane on Dunsmuir Street:

Had it not been for those closures during the Olympics people would be, drivers would be outraged by the fact that that's [bike lane on Dunsmuir] happening and we would have had to do a lot more work than we did do around transportation plans and messaging around this but I think people have kind of realized that it is possible and they understand that there are different ways to get around (Ibid.).

For both of these engineers, the Olympics represented what was possible for the future of the city, especially in terms of long-term transportation goals. Just as security transformations contribute to a normalization of such measures and their increasing acceptance, Judd and Bracewell acknowledged the influence of security restrictions on the future of planning. They believed the ease by which the public accepted the security measures could be leveraged towards attaining better planning practice. Clearly, security planning influenced the way they saw the city and how they saw the future of planning.

In a deeper sense, both the VPD and City officials realized that after 16 years of restrictive planning—partly a result of the 1994 Stanley Cup Riot—Vancouver could host a large-scale event and maintain public order. According to Peter Judd, “the Olympics gave the police and the city a lot more confidence that we could hold big events safely and that I think the police developed even more expertise than they already had in dealing with the element that gets involved in those that are disruptive” (personal communication, May 25, 2010). Kevin Wallinger reiterated this point and said, “as an organization, as a city organization, as city entity I think there is a legacy in the sense that you know you can do these things, regardless of the scale of it” (personal communication, May 28, 2010). Now, Vancouver might be able to rid itself of the label ‘no-fun city’, but
as it becomes more accepting of and accustomed to security restrictions such as those deployed during the Olympics, it is plausible that only spaces of controlled fun will flourish.

**Exceptional Security**

As the largest security mobilization in Canada’s history, the 2010 Vancouver Olympics represented a milestone in Canadian security planning. Not only was the cost of security unprecedented in Canadian history, the scale of the operation exceeded all former security operations. Furthermore, the integration of various security agencies and the extensive tools of spatial control were the product of years of preparation. While the most probable threat to the Olympics was violent protests, security professionals planned for even the most unlikely risks. In the end, most resources for security initiatives were directed towards the prevention of terrorism when, as Taylor and Toohey (2011) point out, it is localized issues such as rowdy behaviour that tend to cause the most problems.

Without democratic influence or scrutiny, security planning for the Vancouver Olympics was legitimized using a normative security logic and the Olympic exception. While this form of planning always presents itself as ‘exceptional’, it is becoming more pervasive. The Vancouver Olympics represented a catalyst for the encroachment of powerful security measures into the spaces of the city and helped to normalize certain tools and restrictions of the security apparatus.

The case of the Vancouver Olympics indicates that security as a governing framework for mega-events is becoming more entrenched in urban management, whittling away at the notion of democratic planning. Today, the urban planning process is likely to employ democratic strategies such as participation and consultation. Many
planners believe that soliciting the views of local citizens can lead to more considerate and inclusive plans. These values are currently being displaced by the growing hegemony of security logic, which relies on technical solutions and elitist forms of knowledge and decision-making to implement security alterations in urban environments. As such, a certain feeling of hopelessness seems to come with questioning security planning. As planners, we must take notice if we are going to preserve the open character of our cities.

When security measures are presented as “an inevitable feature and future of urban life” there is no room for debate about “the necessity, desirability and inherent dangers” of such initiatives (Boyle & Haggerty, 2009, p. 271), While a more democratic security planning process may not guarantee more considerate and accountable security plans, more community involvement could serve to highlight that not all forms of security are useful or required.

Considering this case from a planning perspective, we begin to see how security planning not only alters urban spaces, but the process of security planning is also embedded within an undemocratic and murky structure comprised of security experts and police. Despite the hopes of some planners that security restrictions will allow for more progressive planning in the future, the potential for better urbanism lies in accepting that the best ‘security’ might be a result of increased democracy.
Only four months after the Vancouver Olympics, another major security operation took place in Canada: the G20 summit in Toronto. After holding the G8 in Kananaskis in 2002 and again in the rural Muskoka region north of Toronto just a week before the G20 in 2010, the federal government decided to bring an economic summit back into an urban setting. An integrated security unit—similar to the one established for the Olympics—used many of the same tools and tactics deployed in Vancouver to securitize Toronto. Over the course of three days, the downtown core of Toronto became so securitized it was unrecognizable.

Hours prior to the official lockdown of the security zone surrounding the Metro Convention Centre, I approached the fence-line, hoping to traverse the area on my way to an event on the other side. I was stopped and questioned by a police officer from Halton, a municipality to the west of Toronto, who was monitoring one of the access points to the security zone. The officer asked where I was going and requested to see my identification and to search my bag. I was living in Toronto at the time, but the address on my driver’s license was from my previous residence in Ottawa. The officer deemed this suspicious and asked what I was doing in Toronto. After several minutes of interrogation, I challenged the relevance of her line of questioning. She told me that due to the influx of “protesters” into the city, it was her “duty” to ask such questions. In other words, the fear of disruptive protesters was now—like APEC and the Olympics in Vancouver—a major concern for security planners involved in the G20. I never asked her—although I should
have—why she was in Toronto and whether or not she would abide by the same principles and ethics of the local police force.

Security operations for the G20 were a continuation and enhancement of the security planning from the Olympics. The integration of security units, the use of advanced surveillance technologies, and the imposition of spatial disciplinary controls such as fencing and police barricades were clearly an extension of the security tools used in Vancouver. The police also had an extra legal tool—unknown at the time—that afforded them additional powers around the security zone in downtown Toronto.

When a student refused to show identification outside the fence line, he was arrested and jailed (Tyler, 2010). Under a little known piece of legislation called the Public Works Protection Act 1990 (PWPA), the police have the power to request identification and search anyone entering or approaching a “public work” (Government of Ontario, 1990). Just weeks before the G20 Summit, the Ontario government adopted a new regulation under the Act that extended the powers of the police to the five-metre area surrounding the security fence—now defined as a public work—for the duration of the G20 Summit. This measure was never debated in the Legislature and created a space of exception around the security zone. By the time the public became aware of the regulation, it had already expired.

The G20 is interesting for many reasons, but to provide a complete analysis would require another chapter. What is most alarming about this case is the difference between police actions during the Olympics and the G20. Even though anti-Olympic sentiment had been mobilized for years before the Olympics and presented itself in the form of several protests and direct-action tactics during the Games, the police maintained order
without becoming over-zealous in their crackdown of protesters. Only four months later, security agencies deployed a similar operation for the G20, resulting in the mass arrest of innocent people and an abuse of police power. By briefly comparing these two cases, we see how the security apparatus, in all its different forms, is malleable and transferable. We also see how legislation, police actions, or physical tools used in one situation can be adapted and applied to another circumstance with different outcomes. Therefore, there is no simple or standard form of security planning. Rather, the mobility and transferability of continually changing juridical, disciplinary and security mechanisms represents a form of planning which is becoming increasingly part of city life.

The securitization of cities is one of the most influential processes currently affecting urbanity. While the incorporation of anti-terrorism urban design schemes is common in cities throughout Israel, the United Kingdom and the United States, Canada has experienced only minimal visible changes over the last four decades. Barriers around high-profile buildings in Ottawa, security cameras in public transit vehicles in Toronto and limited access to port areas in Vancouver and Halifax hardly constitute a dramatic shift in securitization processes. More significant are the subtle ways in which the Canadian security apparatus has been continually reworked and transformed.

By examining the October Crisis (1970), the APEC Summit (1997), and the Vancouver Olympics (2010), I have tried to trace these changes over time. The urban scale of this history of security planning was set up in the October Crisis chapter. The silencing of politics through the imposition of the War Measures Act (WMA) was the most extreme form of spatial control ever enacted in Canada and was essentially used to prevent a further escalation of the crisis and to eliminate the growing support for the
FLQ. The case of APEC showed security measures becoming more spatially focused. The securitization of UBC campus in particular resulted in stifling restrictions on freedom of speech and assembly. Unlike the October Crisis, political dissent was allowed to exist but became highly circumscribed as bureaucrats and law enforcement agencies defined the spaces for protest. In the case of the Olympics, where Vancouver was transformed by a major security operation, a particular form of expert-driven planning characterized the political geographies of security planning. Throughout all the cases, security plans were legitimized using a normative logic and rationalized based on improbable threats.

State officials and security planners defined a particular ‘threat environment’ and a subsequent security response during each event. Faced with an “apprehended insurrection” during the October Crisis, political authorities countered by deploying the military to control and defend the spaces of three major Canadian cities and by suspending civil liberties across Canada despite the localized nature of the crisis. Terrorism and the potential for embarrassing situations for dignitaries guided the security planning for APEC. This resulted in severe spatial limitations not only for protesters, but for residents as well. Security planners relied on intelligence, pre-emptive arrests, fencing, and pepper-spray to secure the event. Finally, security planners deemed terrorism and disruptive protests that would tarnish the city’s image as the primary threats to the Olympics. The division between venue and urban domain security meant that different measures had to be deployed in different milieus. What was common to both environments was the use of advanced security technology and officer vigilance to maintain order throughout the city.
From 1970 to 2010, the methods and tools used to address a crisis or secure a mega-event have changed in three significant ways. First, there has been a tactical shift in the way urban spaces are policed. In the case of the October Crisis, the military was deployed in Ottawa, Montreal, and Quebec City, while the police were given extraordinary powers to search and arrest. The Canadian government had been preparing the military for a showdown within an urban milieu and this crisis represented an opportunity to test these new training methods. But armed soldiers monitoring the streets of a city is generally not tolerated in Canada. As a result, the military played more invisible roles during APEC and the Vancouver Olympics, out of sight from the urban settings. In the meantime, the police have become more militarized in terms of law enforcement techniques and security equipment. This became apparent at APEC and even more so during the Olympics.

A second notable change has been a shift in approaches to security. Essentially, security planning has become more spatially aware, resulting in the proliferation and technological enhancement of boundaries and borders during mega-events. Security measures are focused on controlling specific event spaces rather than suspending the rule of law writ large as in the October Crisis. In the cases of APEC and the Olympics, security planners began to recognize the fluid and complex spaces of cities and concentrated their energies on trying to understand and control these spaces. So, the use of the WMA during the October Crisis was a legislative suspension of rights in all spaces, whereas the security restrictions during the two subsequent events became more circumscribed and focused. When security is framed in terms of specific spaces rather than through a juridical order like the WMA, it is presented and often understood as more
legitimate; restrictions target only the most ‘vulnerable’ spaces while the rest of the city appears to remain in its usual state. But this type of logic evacuates the complexity of cities. The more selective securitization of urban spaces results in a precise segmenting of a city, which is not distinct from the broader attempt to securitize the city as a whole. To say that only part of a city will come under increased forms of spatial restrictions and control ignores relationships between urban spaces and the people that live them.

Finally, security planning has shifted from a reactive approach to one that is more pre-emptive. In the October Crisis, the various levels of government responded to a particular event for which it was seemingly unprepared. However, there was evidence that the government was becoming more pro-active in preparing soldiers and police for this type of unrest. The response to the APEC protests was both reactive and pre-emptive. While the federal government and the police employed pre-emptive measures such as the fortification of APEC venue sites and the traffic restrictions along motorcade routes, some of its responses were a reaction to unforeseen forms of urban unrest. In the final case, security for the Vancouver Olympics stemmed mostly from the perceived threat of terrorism initiated by 9/11. This form of securitization is purely pre-emptive. Even though Canadian cities have not had to endure a serious terrorist incident in the last decade, terrorism guided Olympic security planning. This threat served to legitimize a variety of pre-emptive strategies, including the monitoring of activists opposed to the Games. In the end, police were equipped and prepared to deal with any inevitability, terrorist attack and civil disobedience alike.

Security planning has become more integral to the traditional planning process. Cities are chosen to host global summits based on their special design characteristics
conducive to urban security while, in some places, planners are being trained to design-out terrorism (Boyle & Haggerty, 2011; Coaffee et al., 2011). As urban security becomes more important, traditional planning will either have to address the issue of security through pre-emption, or non-traditional planners—security professionals, for instance—will be charged with the task of altering the urban environment to meet security needs. But as my research affirms, “counter-terror measures can contribute to an atmosphere of fear and a culture of surveillance that have consequences for social control and freedom of movement, potentially leading to a reduction in the democratic involvement in urban planning and often facilitating the increasing militarization of urban design” (Coaffee & Rogers, 2008, p. 102).

The consequences of this form of planning are innumerable. Coaffee et al. (2009, 219) point out the importance of examining the “impact of security on the city before and after the event, and the redefinitions of urban spaces through expert security rhetoric and practice.” While urban spaces were redefined in all three cases, it was only beginning in the APEC case and amplified in the case of the Olympics that we see how security discourse used by security ‘experts’ fostered a security planning framework that was beyond democratic scrutiny. The result of such a development is the rejection of any kind of community influence in security planning and an obfuscation of security costs and arrangements.

In each case study, the security agencies simply assumed that the threat posed by terrorism was so great that there was no level of vulnerability society was willing to sustain. As a result, the lack of community involvement allowed for new forms of spatial control. Through legislative frameworks, militarized boundaries, and surveillance
technologies, the boundary between private and public space has become increasingly blurred or circumscribed. As such, spaces for protest become more and more limited. In the October Crisis, dissent was outlawed by the WMA, whereas in the other two cases, dissent gradually became the object of police concern.

The securitization of the city for all three cases went beyond preventing an insurrection or a terrorist incident. When such extreme measures are deployed, there are going to be spill-over effects. During the October Crisis, the military was used to intimidate Quebec separatists and the WMA operated as a way to quell the rising support—at least ideologically—for the FLQ. In APEC, it seemed that the clamp-down on UBC campus was actually fuelled more by the need to protect President Suharto from embarrassment than by the desire to maintain security. Similarly, many of the arrangements made for the Olympics ensured that protesters remained at a distance from venues and that any sort of agitation was handled swiftly to avoid public embarrassment. In each case, juridical, disciplinary, and security mechanisms were mobilized, not only to order and manage the urban environment, but to curtail the spaces and signs of dissent as well.

Security agencies created an elevated sense of insecurity in all three cases, requiring enhanced forms of securitization from shifting perceptions of threats. Security measures were legitimized by deploying the rhetoric that some freedoms had to be curtailed, albeit ‘temporarily’, in order to maintain collective security. These moments of ‘exception’ suggest that there is a fundamental contradiction at the root of liberalism because there are reoccurring situations where the state is required to resort to violence or oppressive tactics in order to protect freedom. However, within liberal ideology, this is
not seen as a contradiction, but as an issue of ‘balance’. As I have demonstrated throughout this dissertation, security planners and politicians continually invoked the language of ‘balance’ to expound the necessity of such measures while preventing critique of their actions. Thus, security planning is a way for the state to exercise its prerogative on an ongoing basis. It is treated as the exception to the daily form of liberal planning but has become a normal part of liberal governance.

At the heart of this dissertation is the assumption that the urban scale is the ideal level where democratic politics can be carried out. Therefore, when John Friedmann (2008, p. 213) suggests that planners have made little contribution to questions of democracy because our primary focus is on the local scale, he misses the democratic potential of urban space. Throughout this project, I have tried to show how processes of securitization have the effect of limiting the democratic possibilities of cities. As the public spaces of the city become increasingly colonized by security measures, there will be less space to express political dissidence or rights to the city.

The substantial investment into security measures during moments of crisis or during mega-events is often understood outside the traditional planning process. If we consider security planning as a component of city planning, then it is possible to understand security through a planning framework. However, security planning often lies outside democratic scrutiny, resulting in urban securitization performed by security ‘experts’ without public input. By keeping the public out of the decision-making process security planners are able to exert their control over the urban environment much like their planning counterparts in the early days of institutionalized planning. In other words, this is one of the primary ways that the rational-comprehensive model of planning
becomes re-invigorated and continues to shape our cities.

Reflections on Cities, Security, and Research

This project is an urban study. It is a dissertation about the dialectical nature of cities and their ability to act as both emancipatory and repressive spaces. To get to the heart of this issue, I have considered how the mechanisms of urban security planning during periods of crisis management highlight these contradictions. But despite this emphasis on urban cases, I certainly recognize that many security interventions around the world have occurred in rural or suburban locations. It is important to acknowledge how such spaces are intertwined and connected through elaborate and often complicated relationships of power and governance. While this project is limited to three particular urban contexts, future research could include both urban and peri-urban interventions as a way to interrogate the interconnectedness of such spaces and the overlapping tools and techniques used to securitize such seemingly disparate worlds.

In a book examining the work of Henri Lefebvre, Goonewardena, Kipfer, Milgrom, and Schmid (2008) politicize ‘the urban’ through a careful reading and analysis of Lefebvre’s key geographical insights. For Lefebvre, the urban was defined as a mediating social reality of the global:

It is a middle or mediating level situated between the private level, the nearby order, the realm of everyday life, on the one hand; and the global level, the distant order, the realm of the global market, of the state, of knowledge, of institutions, and of ideologies, on the other (Kipfer, Schmid, Goonewardena, & Milgrom, 2008, p. 290).
As a level of analysis, then, the urban or ‘the city’ is not simply the built form; it is the various components of both local and global factors that influence and structure our social reality. Opening up our understanding of the urban provides more room to examine the effects of power structures and other phenomena such as neoliberalism and globalization on securitization processes. But despite these global dynamics, the nation-state continues to play a central role in realms such as security planning.

Federal governments rarely enter into our analyses of urban planning. However, in my three cases, it played a central role in the shaping and response to a ‘crisis’. For example, the WMA was a federal regulation imposed on the entire country and yet it was targeted at sites in Montreal. During APEC, Prime Minister Jean Chrétien and his staff played an influential role in determining specific security measures such as the fence line on UBC campus. Before and during the Vancouver Olympics, the security apparatus was one of national scope, where federal agencies such as CSIS contributed to local planning. In other words, these cases are undoubtedly urban, but they are also threaded through the nation state. This dissertation is a major step towards inserting federal institutions and the national scale within planning scholarship.

When pursuing historical case study research, there will always be a concern that some crucial cases have been left out. While it would be impossible to include every significant moment in the history of security planning, I have tried to at least gesture to several additional cases, which fall within the historical scope of my dissertation, even if they did not receive a full assessment. For example, both the Montreal Olympics in 1976 and the Calgary Olympics in 1988 are two obvious ‘mega-events’ staged in Canada over the last four decades. While it would be a useful project to consider the planning for these
events, I am not convinced that these cases would alter my conclusions, nor am I
convinced that these cases would provide a deeper understanding of security planning.
The extraordinary security planning for the Vancouver Olympics, on the other hand, does
fill this gap. Nonetheless, such additional cases could enhance our reading of the
evolution of security planning and provide a more nuanced perspective on the effects of
security actions for urban life. Similarly, an inquiry into the more mundane aspects of
security planning may also serve to highlight the everyday successes of securitization.

Security is a term I have used throughout the dissertation, and I have
acknowledged that it can be defined in many different ways. I derive my own
understanding of security primarily from the work of Michel Foucault, who emphasized
discipline and governmentality as key tools in the control and regulation of social
circulation and order. Foucault’s explanation of security may not be satisfactory to some
security scholars. In fact, his interpretation of security is quite distinct from the work of
academics at the renowned ‘Copenhagen School’ (see Buzan, Waever, & de Wilde,
1998). But these scholars largely consider security and securitization from an
international relations perspective, which seems removed from my aim to merge the
scholarly worlds of security and planning, and to ground security practices in urban
spaces. Scholarship in geopolitics and international relations is gradually drawing closer
to more localized interpretations (see Coaffee & Murakami Wood, 2006), and as this
work advances, it will surely offer new insights into the questions and conclusions in this
dissertation. Above all, my thesis concerns urban planning, and I hope I have opened up
planning research to a novel area of inquiry.
Inevitably, there will be new research possibilities related to this project. Some of the questions posed throughout this dissertation could also benefit from a re-evaluation from different theoretical and conceptual frameworks. Even so, this project has deployed an innovative research technique, involving the study of archival documents, media sources, and interviews related to three critical moments in the history of security planning in Canada. In all three cases, security, whether reactive or pre-emptive, became the governing framework. This securitization framework has manipulated cities in a way that goes to the root of planning and its disciplinary objectives. It has also normalized certain actions and provisions as part of the transforming security apparatus. To broaden the scope of planning, it is essential to include all actors who have an impact on changing the physical and social nature of the city. To ignore security as an integral part of the planning discipline is to miss a crucial aspect of understanding why our cities are the way they are.
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Appendix A

Sample Interview Questions

What is/was your position during the time of the event?

What was the perceived threat?

What was your initial reaction to the security operations being planned?

How were you involved in these plans and what was your role?

How did you work and interact with other agencies?

What kinds of deals or information sharing practices were employed?

What sort of professional framework were you working within? In other words, what influenced the decisions that were made? I.e: experiences from the past, observations of security crises abroad, theory of best practices etc.

How were cities understood? Did your department have some sort of guideline for large-scale security operations in a city?

At times, did you feel that your security operations were exaggerated? Similarly, did you feel at times that your security operations were understated (your agency was not doing enough to plan and prepare for a threat)?

How do you think the security associated with this event impacted the city and the future of security?

What were the lessons learned?

Did the security plans go through any public consultation?

In what ways do you think people were impacted by the security?

What does this event mean for the future of security planning?

How do you think the security actions protected the freedoms of people? Hindered the freedoms?
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