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‘Hosting the world’
The 2010 World Cup and the new military urbanism

Christopher McMichael

Using the 2010 FIFA World Cup in South Africa as a case study, this paper will explore how security measures for sports mega-events have been steadily militarized with policing operations comparable to war planning. It will be argued that this is representative of the ‘new military urbanism’ in which everyday urban life is rendered as a site of ubiquitous risk leading to the increased diffusion of military tactics and doctrines in policing and policy. While the interpenetration between urbanism and militarism has often been studied against the context of the War on Terror, the paper will argue that in the case of South Africa this has primarily been accelerated by a pervasive social fear of violent crime, which has resulted in the securitization of cities, the remilitarization of policing and the intensification of a historical legacy of socio-spatial inequalities. The South African government used the World Cup to ‘rebrand’ the country’s violent international image, while promising that security measures would leave a legacy of safer cities for ordinary South Africans. However, using military urbanism as a conceptual backdrop, the case studies presented in the second part of the paper argue that policing measures were primarily cosmetic and designed to allay the fears of foreign tourists and the national middle class. In practice, security measures pivoted around the enforcement of social control and urban marginalization while serving as a training ground for an increasingly repressive state security apparatus. The paper will conclude with a discussion of how the global crossover between militarism and urbanism threatens to stimulate and rehabilitate deeply entrenched authoritarian tendencies in South Africa.
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Introduction

Sports mega-events are a major platform for the ‘marketing’ of cities and nations, characterized by organizers attempting to offer ‘world class’ preparations which ‘outdo’ the hosting arrangements of their predecessors (Bennett and Haggerty, 2011). In the case of South Africa, the national government promoted its safety and policing measures for the 2010 Federation Internationale de Football Association (FIFA) World Cup (referred to as the World Cup), as ensuring the conditions for the ‘safest and most secure FIFA World Cup’ (SAPS, 2010b) to date, in which the safety of tourists would be prioritized. Security measures were the
operational responsibility of the South African Police Services (SAPS), the South African National Defence Force (SANDF) and intelligence agencies along with assistance from health, traffic and emergency services. According to police officials, planning was based on the idea ‘that there are no static borders’ and that South Africa was ‘hosting the world’ (SAPS, 2010b) and aimed at creating a feeling of ‘police omnipresence’ (Pruis, 2011, p. 13).

Operating with a security budget of ZAR 1.5 billion (approximately $220 million), the government drafted national security plans which were filtered down and replicated in host cities (RSA, 2009; Mthethwa, 2010). Using a zoning system which designated areas of high priority, stringent restrictions and cordons were applied through the nine host cities, around all stadiums, FIFA fan parks and public viewing areas, team base camps, hotels, restaurants, bars and other tourist venues. Special measures included ‘VVIP’ close protection security for FIFA delegates and visiting Heads of State; heightened security at airports and borders; enhanced maritime controls by the navy; air space restrictions patrolled by Gripen and Hawk fighter jets and the formulation of contingency plans for mass evacuation as a result of chemical, biological or nuclear attack (OA/NATJOINTS, 2008). The simulation of a state of emergency was augmented by the substantial presence of SANDF whose mobilization performed under the auspices of Operation Kgwele, was their ‘most extensive and biggest deployment on home soil’ (Makwetla, 2010) since the transition to democracy in 1994 (Figure 1). Other government institutions were integrated into security measures: for example, the Department of Home Affairs (2010) implemented an electronic Advance Passenger Programming (APP) system to bar ‘undesirables’ such as tourists on INTERPOL’s football hooligan list from entering the country and installed a Movement Control System (MCS) database at 34 priority points of entry to track the movement of visitors in and out of the country (South African Government Information, 2010a).

South Africa’s large private security sector was also involved in policing operations, most notably in the form of guard duties at stadiums and FIFA fan parks. While ‘inner perimeter’ stadium security was initially defined as the responsibility of the Local Organising Committee (LOC), government agreements with FIFA required that the state was expected to take control of stadiums in the case of the LOC defaulting (FIFA/OA, n.d.). After a series of strikes caused by poor wage and work conditions, private stewards were replaced by the SAPS for the duration of the World Cup (Grossekathöfer, 2010). Private companies not officially affiliated with World Cup organizers offered close protection services to anxious and wealthy tourists (Plantive, 2010). Government efforts were augmented with international cooperation. INTERPOL provided its ‘largest ever’ major events support team (INTERPOL, 2010), while 225 policemen from countries participating in the tournament were stationed in South Africa (Local Organising Committee, 2010). Joint intelligence sharing and training missions were conducted with other governments, including joint police and military exercises with United States Special Operations Command (SOCOM) (Human, 2010), a combined US military force which carries out secret and specialized ‘black op’ missions (Turse, 2011).

‘Command and control’ was coordinated via the National Joint Operations Command (NATJOINTS) which was replicated at the provincial (PROVJOINTS) and city level. During the tournament, NATJOINTS operated out of a ‘war room’ at SA Air Force Headquarters outside Pretoria (Makhubela, 2010). The SAPS have cited this command and control structure as a major legacy of the tournament and have implied that future ‘interoperability and integration’ (Rakoma, 2010) between the police and military will be re-utilized in their ongoing ‘war on crime’ (Pruis,
The World Cup was used as an experimental training ground for the integration of the security services and criminal justice system into a coordinated Justice, Crime Prevention and Security (JCPS) cluster. Alongside reducing overall crime rates, the ‘concomitant activities’ of the cluster included ‘crime perception management’ and the ‘integration of border management’ which has included the military taking over border security from the police (GCIS, 2010). According to the Minister of Police, Nathi Mthethwa, ‘the resources, the re-skilling of police, expertise and international best practices acquired’ during the World Cup ‘are serving as an enormous arsenal in our fight against crime’ (South African Government Information, 2010b). The show of force during the World Cup was designed to be visible but not overbearing where, as one confidential government planning document described it, ‘maximum security will be planned for, but proportionally implemented’ (OA/NATJOINTS, 2008, p. 10). In practical application, this saw a balancing between displaying ‘maximum security’ and promoting the carnivalesque image of the tournament.

The militarization and securitization of mega-events

The importation of military concepts such as ‘command and control’ and security ‘omnipresence’ into the policing of civilian events is part of a wider global reconfiguration of the security measures surrounding mega-events. Security budgets run into billions of dollars and draw upon a consistent set of procedures and tactics across varying urban contexts. These include joint police and military operations, the application of advanced surveillance and identification technology, enhanced border controls, the regulation of protest and dissent and measures to remove the urban poor (Samatas, 2007; Boyle and Haggerty, 2009; Giulianotti and Klauser, 2010; Bennett and Haggerty, 2011).

While this process predates 9/11, the subsequent panic surrounding urban terrorism has recalibrated notions of the proportionality of security, as organizers plan for attacks whose high consequences are matched by their low probability (Bennett and Haggerty, 2011). Policing measures increasingly pivot around the pre-emptive militarization of
urban space to ensure a maximal degree of securitization and the ability to respond to ‘potential’ threats (Warren, 2002; Finoki, 2007). The dissemination of practices between different hosting environments has been consolidated by the convergence of governments, sporting bodies and the security industry on shared governance models (Boyle, 2011).

FIFA and their corporate affiliates are increasingly influential in the directing of security measures while security companies use mega-events to display their products and services (Klauser, 2008; Eick, 2010). Host governments and sporting bodies share a dual interest in minimizing and controlling risks which threaten the carefully constructed image of safe events (Klauser, 2008). While the scope of security measures seems comparable to war planning, these mobilizations are aimed at creating the successful conditions for urban festivals and global spectacle, rather than as a response to crisis or conflict (Gaffney, 2010). Military and police measures are central to the aesthetic promotion of the host city ‘brand’ through combining the promise of secure leisure with the looming presence of militarization. As a result event security has become ‘as much about managing global branding and TV imagery as it is about keeping risks at bay’ (Graham, 2010, p. 125).

Implemented under the ‘exceptional’ circumstances of major events, the policing measures and legal frameworks established may be left in place long after the event, abetting and normalizing the crossover of militarization and urbanism.

The new military urbanism

The security operations at mega-events can be contextualized as part of what Stephen Graham has defined as the ‘new military urbanism’ (2010), characterized by the application of military techniques, conceptual frameworks and technologies to civil spaces, in which cities are regarded as:

‘a source of targets and threats … this development incorporates the stealthy militarization of a wide range of policy debates, urban landscapes, and circuits of infrastructure, as well as whole realms of popular and urban culture. It leads to the creeping and insidious diffusion of militarized debates about “security” in every walk of life. Together, once again, these work to bring essentially military ideas of the prosecution of, and preparation for, war into the heart of ordinary, day-to-day city life.’ (p. xiv)

The rendering of cities as boundless ‘battle spaces’ does not have a single source but is circulated through transnational, national and urban scales across a range of political, economic and social circuits. From the security industry to popular culture, such as video-games which picture a present and near future of permanent urban warfare, these circuits combine to increase the ‘deteriorialized’ (Coaffee and Murakami Wood, 2006) penetration of international security concerns into urban life. While post-9/11 security measures which envision terrorism as a potentiality lurking in cities has been crucial in bringing war home, cities are not ‘passive backdrops to the construction of security … the way cities and urban space are produced are seen actually to help constitute these strategies and fantasies, as well as their effects (and vice versa)” (Graham, 2010, p. xxvi).

Militarized concepts of urban space, particularly those developed by the US and allied militaries, are premised on a Manichean and neo-colonial distinction between the cities of the Global North and South, leading to different strategies in response to perceived threats. The cities of the Global South are viewed as sites of political dysfunction, ‘feral’ megalopolises as described in the formulation of US military theorist Richard Norton (2003), which threaten the stability of the Northern centres of global financial and political power. The tactics used to counter these threats have included efforts to achieve total ‘area dominance’ over cities such as Baghdad and Gaza. By contrast,
cities of the Global North are militarized as an extension of open-ended ‘securocratic public safety wars’ (Feldman, 2004) against crime and terror including heightened surveillance, the fortification of buildings and the dramatic extension of police and military powers.

Military urbanism is characterized by an extraordinary degree of pessimism about the future of cities, as security establishments envisage scenarios of economic and environmental collapse and ‘ungovernable’ populaces (Carr, 2010). While these apocalyptic imaginaries are used to legitimate the extension of militarism and pre-emptive response in the present, they betray a sense of the fears elites feel about the fragility of the global system and the consequences of growing inequality.

Developing on what Foucault (2004) described as the ‘boomerang effects’ of colonialism, in which political apparatuses and techniques developed in the Global South were brought back to the North, Graham elaborates on contemporary urban boomerangs. Modern warzones have become sites of security experimentation, with technology that has the cache of being ‘field tested’ sold through the global security market. For example, Israel’s homeland security industry has become one of the largest in the world through offering equipment and services tested in occupied Palestine (Graham, 2010, pp. 226–262).

Cities of fear

While broadly in agreement with the military urbanism thesis, Marcelo Lopes de Souza (2010, p. 461) argues that Graham relies on an overly binary distinction between North and South, which underestimates the intense divisions which persist within semi-peripheral countries such as Mexico, Brazil and South Africa, which combine advanced capitalist infrastructures with high levels of inequality. Linked to these disparities are long histories of authoritarian rule and militarization. As evidenced by the proliferation of gated enclaves and paramilitary style policing in cities such São Paulo and Johannesburg, securitized enclosure and exclusion are becoming a universal urban phenomenon (Davis and Monk, 2007). Despite differences between social, historical and regional context, urbanism is globally characterized by the perception of city life as war: in what de Souza calls the ‘phobopolis’ or ‘city of fear’ (2010, 2011) urbanization is decisively influenced by the fear of violence.

The crucial difference between North and South is in what provides the engine of fear:

‘from a Global North based perspective, terrorism and the experiences of certain countries such as the USA and UK have often been privileged (although ordinary criminality still is a crucial component of the discursive landscape and a key market for the security market especially in the USA) ... in contrast to this from a Global South based viewpoint, ordinary criminality ... have understandably deserved more attention (although terrorism is sometimes not completely absent as a real or potential threat’. (Souza, 2011, p. 7)

The proximate reality of violent crime creates a socio-psychological atmosphere of fear which transcends class, particularly as it is the poor who are most vulnerable (Souza, 2009). However, legitimate concerns for public safety can be instrumentalized by governments, the media and the security industry to ‘reinforce militarization’ (Souza, 2011, p. 4). Ever radicalizing security policies and techniques invigorate anxiety and entrench the singular perception of cities as fundamentally dangerous leading to greater social fragmentation, increased violence between the state and criminals and a more hostile and paranoid urban landscape.

Selling South Africa

‘Phobopolization’ has a particular relevance to the World Cup security measures as
South Africa has one of the highest recorded rates of violent crime in the world, with the SAPS (2010a) registering 2.1 million serious crime cases in the 2009/10 financial year alone. The government saw the World Cup as a ‘golden goal’ (Burger, 2007) for the security forces: no expense was to be spared in delivering measures which were portrayed as offering fast track urban development and encouraging future investment through displaying safe cities. As Brij Maharaj (2011) observes, such boosterism is common to mega-events but particular to the South African case was the linkage made to the concept of the ‘African Renaissance’ as the government and FIFA argued that the tournament would help to restore a sense of dignity to the continent. Security measures were used to highlight South Africa’s international citizenship by ensuring an incident-free ‘world class’ event to counter essentialist and racist portrayals of a ‘failed’ continent ringed with hopeless ‘feral cities’.

Some international media coverage of South Africa ahead of the World Cup pandered to stereotypes about the ‘brutality’ and ‘incompetence’ of black Africans, such as the infamous Daily Star’s (UK) prediction of a ‘Machete Race War’ during the World Cup (Hammet, 2011). However, tourists have to a large degree been insulated from crime in South Africa (Rosa Luxemburg Stiftung, 2010) with the previous hosting of international sporting events such as the 2009 Confederations Cup passing without major incident.

However, despite the rhetoric about ‘Africa’s turn’, national security throughout the World Cup was amalgamated to FIFA’s bottom line: the airspace restrictions enforced over stadiums during the tournament served as a dual countermeasure against the ‘possibility of the utilization of aircraft for ambush marketing and terrorist attacks’ (OA/NAT-JOINTS, 2008, p. 47). FIFA’s influence over the security measures extended to declaring ‘invisible but nonetheless demarcated’ (Cape Town Partnership, 2009) commercial restriction zones throughout host cities, which were policed by special SAPS units to prevent unofficial advertising.

Due to FIFA’s control over marketing rights and the direction of security measures, combined with exemption from South African taxation and exchange control laws, the association was able to ring fence $3 billion in direct revenue from the World Cup (Cornelissen, 2010; FIFA, 2011). By contrast, the immediate economic benefits for South Africa were muted, with many of the positive impacts predicted for employment, income and taxes failing to materialize (du Plessis and Maennig, 2010). This contrast between initial projections and end results has been made explicit in the South African context owing to the extent of poverty and the diversion of public funding from priorities such as housing, health and education (Pillay et al., 2009; Steinbrink et al., 2011).

Though much critical effort has gone into assessing the socio-economic impacts of the World Cup for South African cities, the security measures have mostly been given a ‘free pass’ as a result of the government’s success in ensuring that the tournament went ahead without major incident and are cited as a model for future emulation. As the theme of one criminology conference put it, cities can learn from ‘the lessons of the World Cup’ (Institute for Security Studies, 2010). Indeed, the South African security measures are being promoted as a template for other Southern countries, with organizers from the LOC consulting with their Brazilian counterparts in the 2014 World Cup committee (Wilson, 2010).

**Crime and urban security in South Africa**

Crime in South African cities is a direct product of the legacy of colonialism and apartheid, which created an exceptionally violent and brutalizing urban environment (Kynoch, 2008). White authorities worked to protect ‘European’ suburbs and inner cities from ‘African’ areas (Ballard, 2002). Militarized policing, which served almost exclusively as
a tool of political repression, ignored and in some cases tacitly supported violent crime as long as it did not encroach into white areas (Biko, 2004, p. 82; Steinberg, 2008). The collapse of apartheid urban controls and the transition to democracy saw unregulated access to public space and increased black residence in formerly white areas. However, the establishment of non-racial democracy in 1994, which saw the ANC become the governing party, coincided with a dramatic upsurge in violent crime, exacerbated by South Africa’s reintegration into the global economy which provided a wide circulation of consumer goods for criminal targeting (Centre for the Study of Violence and Reconciliation, 2009). Although the fear of crime has been used to perpetuate racist anxieties (Hansen, 2006), a pattern of victimization largely determined by a legacy of skewed socio-spatial distribution in which violent crime is concentrated in poor, black areas creates a profound fear throughout society (Lemanski, 2004, p. 104).

Since 1994, the government has negotiated between transforming the police from a despised tool of political repression into a public service, while also trying to robustly reduce rates of violent crime (Altbeker, 2007). Civilianization has faced resistance from an authoritarian institutional culture within the police (Hansen, 2006) while the militarization of crimes such as cash in transit hijackings has fuelled calls for proportional response. From 2009, the administration of President Zuma, which has been marked by the increased power of the security cluster in government (De Waal, 2011), has attempted to rebrand the SAPS as a paramilitary force. Claiming that ‘command and control … flew out of the window’ (Duncan, 2010, p. 21) as a result of post-apartheid militarization, the police have reintroduced a military ranking system, issued bellicose calls for ‘shoot to kill’ policies, introduced boot camp training methods for new recruits and adopted a new slogan: ‘Together pushing back the frontiers of evil.’ The rehabilitation of a historically blurred demarcation between police and military functions has been accompanied by an intensification of police violence against dissent and the poor (Pithouse, 2011).

‘Phobopolization’ has a marked impact on the form of post-apartheid cities. Municipal authorities and commercial developers have followed the neo-liberal playbook of ‘world class cities’ by building securitized city ‘improvement districts’, malls, casinos and stadiums (McDonald, 2008). Gentrification projects which aim to control ‘disorderly’ (Murray, 2008) cities have often reinforced spatial segregation and penalized the black urban poor (Samara, 2010). The built environment has become more fortified with the proliferation of walled ‘lifestyle’ estates, access control boom gates, electrified fencing, security gates and razor wire. This has replaced the absolute partitions of apartheid with a more fragmented and defensive micro-geography of secured spaces, reinforced by the emergence of an often heavily armed private security sector, which has mushroomed in the post-apartheid period and substantially outnumbers the police (Taljaard, 2008).

As Kempa and Singh (2008, p. 335) argue, South Africa renders global trends in ‘stark relief’, as enclave urbanism fuses with historical and institutional legacies of spatial exclusion. While the securitization of space is used to manage the fallout from entrenched inequality, it also dramatizes the extent to which South Africa remains a country of two worlds, with Ballardian gated communities bordering on townships and shack settlements. During the World Cup, the government’s experience in managing these fissures would become a strategic asset in the delivery of a ‘world class’ security regime.

2010 and military urbanism

‘Mobile green zones’

Policing measures centred on the creation of a linked series of ‘mobile green zones’
A concentric zoning system was established in the areas around stadiums: the SAPS promised a ‘planned ring of steel’ (Joseph, 2010) which included traffic restrictions, fencing and road barricades, the linkage of CCTV to mobile command centres and the visible presence of South African and international security officials. Special measures were implemented for all key sites: hotels used by FIFA and participating teams were declared ‘island sites’ (OA/NATJOINTS, 2008, p. 29) entailing the deployment of SAPS units and private security on ‘dedicated floors’.

Security zones served a dual process: through focusing on areas of high tourist concentration and media visibility, the government highlighted the extent of its preparations while the parcelling of urban space into manageable zones also aided FIFA’s marketing regime. Urban space was micromanaged to present commercial infractions. For example, while FIFA fan parks were presented as a public space, security measures within them included the deployment of SAPS officers specially trained to identify perceived attempts at ambush marketing, alongside more general crowd control measures (Cape Town Partnership, 2009).

The usage of securitized restriction zones reflects how the governance of mega-events has been imbued with notions of cities as sites of ubiquitous risk, with security measures worked into even the most quotidian aspects of planning. For example, traffic restrictions enacted to prevent congestion around stadiums also entailed the deployment of vehicle checks as countermeasures to improvised explosive devices (IEDs) (SAFA, 2003, 9.4.7).

**Targeting inward**

The geography of controls was central to the projection of the sanitized ‘brand’ of South African cities. Graham (2010, p. 125) suggests that in the absence of purported enemies such as terrorists, the bulk of mega-event security measures turn inward, targeting the urban poor and political dissent. FIFA and the host cities used the exceptional circumstances of the World Cup to securitize both political protest and the visible signs of poverty.

FIFA regulations classified ‘political and religious demonstrations’ (Cape Town Partnership, 2009) within areas of commercial restrictions as forms of ambush marketing. Evidence also suggests that in the lead up to the tournament the SAPS informed municipalities, which are responsible for issuing permission for gatherings, that all demonstrations and marches were in principle banned for the duration of the tournament, with the police claiming that having to perform crowd control at protests would direct resources away from the World Cup (Duncan, 2010).

‘National security’ was used to intimidate potential dissenters: in April 2010, the Minister of Police said that the SAPS would show ‘no mercy’ to ‘criminal acts that are disguised as service delivery protests or labour related demands... We will unapologetically deal with such criminal acts decisively and we require no permission with [sic] anyone’ (Biyela, 2010). While unions did not go ahead with a proposed strike during the World Cup (Bauer, 2010), the police response to stadium stewards may be indicative of the planned measures for protests near tournament venues. A few hours after the Germany–Australia match at the Moses Mabhida stadium in Durban on 13 June, police charged strikers outside with percussion grenades, tear gas and rubber bullets, while similar scenes occurred in Cape Town the next night (Libcom, 2010). Exploited stadium stewards facing the full force of state security were clearly the last image that the government wished relayed by the international media. However, the coercive response may be the logical outcome of security measures which were utilized to camouflage the social antagonisms that contradicted the neatly packaged image of ‘Brand South Africa’.
The World Cup became a pretext for increased evictions from inner cities. For example, the eThekwini municipality in Durban ‘relocated’ street children to the notorious Westville prison prior to the tournament draw in 2007 (Packree and De Boer, 2007) while people were forcibly removed from around Cape Town as part of a ‘beautification’ drive, which activists from the Western Cape Anti-Eviction Campaign (2010) described as a clear effort to hide the gap between rich and poor in order to maintain the pristine image of the World Cup.

Working with a ‘strange past’

While security measures were marketed as offering a counter to Manichean renderings of South African cities, along with providing a legacy of safer cities for ordinary South Africans, existing socio-spatial fragmentation was instrumentalized by the government to obscure and hide the problems which under-mined the narrative of safe and fun cities. According to Destination 2010 (SkyMedia, 2009, p. 28), an official publication covering planning and preparation a year prior to the tournament, tourists had little to fear from a ‘high violent crime rate and safety issues … most analysts blame crime on poverty and unemployment and point to the fact that the bulk of cases occur in teeming, poverty stricken townships’. Danny Jordaan, CEO of the LOC, noted that ‘South Africa’s strange past’ augmented security measures through the presence of a large private security industry (SkyMedia, 2009, p. 34). Policing measures worked to secure a form of ‘garrison tourism’ (Graham, 2010, p. 101) which attempted to minimize the exposure of foreign visitors to the everyday reality of violent crime. Simultaneously, this was used to perform an internal function by the government, enticing the national middle classes into cities they ‘otherwise (feel) completely dislocated from with their gated communities, private healthcare and exorbitantly priced schools’ (Tolsi, 2010).

The theatre of omniscience

Security measures served a ‘theatrical’ (Graham, 2010, p. 148) purpose in dramatizing the government’s ability to ‘neutralise any potential threat’ (Ndebele, 2009). A month before the World Cup, Police Minster Nathi Mthethwa (SAPS, 2010b) claimed:

‘Police will be everywhere … This is the epitome of our security plan: we will cover every corner because we do not have no-go areas … Our comprehensive plan looks at the smallest of issues, whether it be the protection of a soccer ball to the biggest form of criminality such as terrorism.’

Although measures practically focused on the creation of security zones rather than the total coverage of urban space, such claims served an important symbolic role in bolstering the state’s project of asserting its control over crime. The declarations of police ‘omnipotence’ achieved through planning and technology bear parallels with military attempts to develop security systems which allow for the ‘close-in, continuous, always-on support for military operations in urban terrain’ and the realization of the long-standing dream of rendering ‘treacherous’ urban environments ‘transparent’ (Graham, 2010, p. 165). Central to the government’s declaration of uncompromising, total control of urban space was the assertion that they were prepared for all risks, regardless of likelihood, claiming that it was better to ‘over-prepare than be found wanting’ (Bryson, 2010).

Security measures became a performative space for the ritual of promising ‘no mercy’ and ‘zero tolerance’ to criminals. Using Churchillian phrasing, SAPS general Bheki Cele vowed that:

‘South Africa must be safe for 2010 and beyond … we will keep the structures to make sure we chase the tsotsis. We chase them in the houses. We chase them in the hills, in the mountains, in the valleys, in the rivers. And I’ve been told we will be chasing them in the churches too.’ (Mouton, 2009)
Beginning in 2007, the military and police undertook a series of joint security exercises in the host cities to publicly highlight the scope of the government’s preparations. In a May 2010 operation, the police and army ‘occupied’ the Sandton financial district in Johannesburg with ‘a convoy of dozens of vehicles and staged mock operations by elite security forces, including a helicopter drop of commandos onto a car hijack and abseiling down the side of a media building’ (Potwela, 2010). This security show, accompanied by a large crowd of onlookers, highlighted how the World Cup became a soundstage for a self-aggrandizing display of state power.

Technophilia

The SAPS and the host cities promoted their purchase of security systems as ‘silver bullets’ (Graham, 2010, p. xxii) both to police the World Cup and as future assets in the ‘war on crime’ (Figure 2). A SAPS-sponsored press article called ‘Safety through Technology’ (Nel, 2009, pp. 37–38) elaborates on purchases including six Robinson Raven 2 helicopters linked to mobile command centres, new cameras for the SAPS air wing estimated to be as ‘effective as 25 police members operating on the ground in tracking a suspect’, flexible body armour and water cannons. The same article singles out the purchase of eight bomb disposal remote operated vehicles (ROVs) ‘used extensively by US forces in Iraq’ (p. 39). However, attempts to purchase unmanned aerial drones (UAVs) were unsuccessful: while the SAPS were adamant that they would be buying a fleet for surveillance purposes, opposition from the South African Civilian Airspace Authority (SACAA), due to concerns about the legality of drones in civilian airspace, scuppered the plan (Africa, 2009).

The technophile PR of the SAPS reveals the extent to which military fantasies of technological omnipotence and absolute precision are imported into civilian policing (Graham, 2010, pp. 153–182). Automation (‘effective as 25 police members’) is presented as the ultimate countermeasure to human error. The coordination of aerial equipment with ground-based command centres envisions an absolute rendering of host cities,
allowing for seamless response times and hegemonic dominance of the urban fabric. Technology is portrayed as the instrument for the achievement of a maximal level of dominance over South African cities. It is revealing that the language used to describe the acquisition list bears distinct parallels with the marketing pitches used by the private security industry. Each piece of equipment is portrayed as totally precise and beyond reproach in effectiveness and operation, ‘world class’ and ‘cutting edge’. By aligning the devices of military urbanism with their international branding strategy, the South Africa government was pitching its own ‘product’: spectacular and safe cities. Thus, security technology becomes a signifier of state prestige, an exemplifier of ‘cutting edge’ urban governance.

The official fetishism around security technology portrayed the extension of advanced forms of tracking and surveillance as an unproblematic public good. This was underpinned by the belief that such technology would add another layer of security to South African cities, expediting response times to crime. However, this eludes the potential for abuse and repression inherent in advanced security technologies. To promote the augmentation of its existing CCTV network, local government in Cape Town issued a press statement titled ‘Big Brother is Making our City Safer’ (Hamilton, 2010), while another communiqué noted ‘Criminals Beware: Big Brother is Watching’ (City of Cape Town, 2010). These unwitting references to Orwellian nightmares of totalitarian control provide an ironic example of the increased normalization of surveillance technology, which in the case of South African cities is accelerated by the authorities focus on keeping apace with ‘world class’ security developments.

Security legacies?

Within days of the tournament ending, organizers were citing the security measures as a total success, with President Zuma stating that the tournament was a perception management victory: ‘[the world] has discovered that we are a winning nation of very humble, hospitable people. They learned too that we are efficient’ (2010).

The undermining of racist and xenophobic beliefs about South Africa and Africa may appear a laudable outcome of the security measures: indeed, it is these same pernicious ideas which are reflected in the extension of military urbanism throughout the world. However, while the government strived to argue that security concerns were overstated, if not generated by an underlying racism, the security services’ constant reassurance that it was prepared to deal with all threats implied that the World Cup was in some way menaced by a demonology of armed criminals and of opportunistic terror cells eager to prey on naïve tourists. The combination of assurance with ‘the seeding of anxiety’ (Graham, 2010, p. 147) reinforces military urbanism by generating an implacable sense of fear: no city can ever be ‘secure’ enough and no policing measures can ever be ‘comprehensive’ enough to defeat a world of anticipated horror.

As one police consultant has admitted (Botha, 2011, p. 16), independent deductions about the success of the measures in reducing violent crime during the World Cup can only be made after the release of national crime statistics in September 2011, which were not available at the time of writing. Many of the structures and equipment used during the tournament have subsequently been re-used. Alongside the augmentation of existing technology, such as CCTV systems, the Home Affairs MCS tracking system is still in use at national points of entry, while the NAT-JOINTS structure has been established as a permanent feature of major events: it was reactivated during local government elections in May 2011, with the SAPS and SANDF using a similar zoning system to the World Cup (SAPA, 2011). SANDF are also becoming increasingly concerned with urban warfare, building a training ground in an abandoned mining site near
Johannesburg to test combat readiness (Szabo, 2011).

**Conclusion**

The post-World Cup period has been marked by a continuation and intensification of the militarization of public policing. Housing evictions and crowd control have become more overtly warlike, reflecting the adoption of ‘shoot first’ pre-emptive response tactics, as witnessed in the nationally televised killing of activist Andries Tatane by the SAPS in April 2011.

In a revealing interview (3rd Degree, 2011) on the question of police violence against community protests, Nathi Mthethwa tellingly suggested that the problem could be resolved by encouraging the use of the ‘non-lethal’ weaponry purchased for the World Cup. In the boundless ‘war on crime’, policing is a question of improving equipment, tactics and raising budgets to ensure greater ‘efficiency’ which ignores the social, political and economic dimensions which fuel public ‘disturbance’. Taking a wider view, this also discounts the factors that create violent crime. As de Souza (2009, p. 29) notes ‘the roots of phobolization’ are ‘much more of a social challenge than a mere task for the police—and by no means is it a military problem’.

While coercive measures were constrained by the considerations of international image, the World Cup was used both to restock arsenals and to experiment with the containment and sanitization of urban space as part of a wider reconfiguration of state security. Arguably, the heightened climate of repression in South Africa reflects the government’s unspoken fear of losing control over a volatile powder keg of structural inequality. The advantage of the military urbanism thesis is that it highlights the global dimension of developments in South Africa which have, for the most part, been understood in isolation as a response to the national crime situation. Graham’s work allows for a contextualization of post-apartheid urban security as more than just the continuation of historical practice in the present. Rather the entrenchment of the politics of fear has kept space with international developments.

The extent to which military urbanism is becoming a deterritorialized urban ‘best practice’ has a particular danger in the South African context. The global normalization of conceptions of urban life as a perpetual war has ‘boomeranged’ into South Africa as ‘world-class’ governance techniques, reinvigorating and reinvigorating authoritarian tendencies under a new veneer. The experience of semi-peripheral countries such as South Africa, in which the fear of violence is combined with the management of inequality to produce increasingly polarized cities, has a global resonance. The global economies’ state of permanent turmoil, growing inequality and the international crisis of authority witnessed since the beginning of 2011 from the Arab Spring to civil unrest across Europe, have sparked a sense of panic among elites about ‘populist anger’ (Harkinson, 2011) which threatens to extend the grip of militarism over cities as governments attempt to pre-emptively harden their grip on power. This makes the task of identifying and challenging the global circulation of militaristic conceptions of urban space, which serve to protect a fundamentally unjust and untenable socio-spatial order, all the more urgent.
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