THE 2010 WINTER OLYMPIC GAMES:
(RE) FRAMING PROTEST

by

Nicolien van Luijk

BPhEd (hons), University of Otago, 2007

A THESIS SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF
THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF

MASTER OF ARTS

in

THE FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES

(Human Kinetics)

THE UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA
(Vancouver)

December, 2010

Abstract

Previous research has shown that the organization of Olympic Games has had a negative impact on the civil liberties of host communities, including the right to peaceful protest (Lenskyj, 2002). The purpose of this research was to examine how individuals participating in anti-Olympic events (re)framed the right to protest in public space during the 2010 Vancouver Winter Olympic Games. Three research questions guided the study, (i) what are protestor perspectives on how Olympic organizers are framing this issue (ii) how are protestors re-framing the issue, and (iii) what is their assessment of the challenges encountered?

The basis of my theoretical framework is the notion that space is socially constructed and that different actors continuously contest the use of public space (Lefebvre, 1991). In the context of the Olympic Games the use of public space is protected by the dominant actors (e.g., Olympic organizers) and challenged by subordinate actors in the organizational field, in this case those protesting against the Games. This study also drew on the theoretical concepts of institutional logics and framing processes from the Organizational Studies and the Social Movement Theory literature respectively (McAdam & Scott, 2005). These concepts are used to describe the cognitive processes that shaped the behaviours of Olympic organizers and protest participants in relation to the right to protest in public space.

The study involved observations of fifteen anti-Olympic events, one-on-one interviews with six protest participants, and an analysis of related documents. The research found that Olympic organizers operated under three major logics of Olympism, security, and sport and nationalism, which framed protestors in ways that delegitimized their perspectives and limited their access to public space. Protest participants re-framed organizer logics by utilizing civil liberties and corporatization as counter-logics to legitimize their right to be present in public spaces during the Games. While the re-framing engaged in by protestors provided some success, the findings suggest that the dominant logics of the Games maintained long-term power and control over spatial practices. The aim of this study was to fill a gap in the existing critical Olympic literature by examining perspectives of protest participants' first-hand.

Table of Contents

List of Tables

Acknowledgements

Firstly I am deeply indebted to my interviewees. They all provided incredibly insightful and thoughtful accounts of their participation in the 2010 protest events. Their stories are an inspiration and I am excited to share a few of them in this thesis.

I would like to express my gratitude to my supervisor, Dr. Wendy Frisby for her much needed guidance and continued patience throughout this project. I also thank my committee members Dr. Brian Wilson and Dr. Rob VanWynsberghe for all of their support along the way. Thank you to fellow 'annexers', for the endless encouragement, the much needed coffee breaks, and, basically their willingness to chat at any given occasion.

I could not have gotten to where I am today without my family who are spread out in different parts of the world, I am deeply grateful for your continued beliefs in all of my endeavours.

Lastly, I thank my wonderful friends who have become my Canadian family. This project means so much more when I can share my thoughts, frustrations, and revelations with those I hold so dear.

When the police barrier was opened up and we were allowed to move out that was when I just walked down the street and I was done. I had to get to work. [Danielle]

Chapter One: Introduction

In Canada we will be open to opportunities for people to express whatever views they have. There will not be opportunities to break the law, [but] we will make sure there will be full and equal expression throughout the 2010 Olympics.

(Premier Gordon Campbell as cited by Lee, 2008, para. 5)

This research project examined how individuals involved in Olympic resistance framed civil liberties, in particular the right to protest in public space during the 2010 Vancouver Winter Olympic Games. Civil liberties refer to the rights and freedoms that all citizens have in a democratic society (British Columbia Civil Liberties Association, 2009). Within these civil liberties[1], being able to exercise the right to peaceful protest in public is particularly crucial to Olympic resistance groups, as they often rely on these rights to get their perspectives into the public realm (Lenskyj, 2002). Despite the promises made by Premier Gordon Campbell during the 2008 Olympics in Beijing (e.g., as in the opening quote), evidence has shown that access to public space and freedom to peaceful protest had been consistently restricted in previous Olympic host cities (Lenskyj, 2004). Therefore, the aim for this research was to examine how the right to peaceful protest in public space was framed and experienced by individuals participating in anti-Olympic protests leading up to and during the 2010 Winter Olympic Games in Vancouver, Canada.

In the past, the Olympic Games have proved to be so much more than a simple sporting event and more recently it has evolved to the point where its impact on civil society can no longer be ignored (Young & Wamsley, 2005). Rather than being viewed in terms of the athletes and the sports, the public, researchers, and various governing bodies are being challenged to question its immediate and long term impact on the local and global economy, the natural

---

[1] See Appendix I for more information on the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms

1

environment, urban city areas, and other social impacts (Hiller, 1998; Horne, 2007; Whitson & Horne, 2006). Of significance to this study is the growing body of critical Olympic research that has uncovered the negative impacts the Games have on the local host communities (Hiller, 1998; Lenskyj, 2000, 2002, 2008; Milton-Smith, 2002; Whitson & Horne, 2006). For example, Whitson and Horne (2006) claimed that:

> There are many lower-income citizens who will not benefit in any direct way from Olympic related business … moreover, there are others whose quality of life depends upon well functioning public services that is diminished when these services are cut back in order to pay for Olympic infrastructure (p. 84).

Previous Olympic Games have also shown to be associated with the displacement of citizens in certain areas of host cities (Lenskyj, 2000; Milton-Smith, 2002). Knowing some of the negative impacts, it is understandable that the decision to host an Olympic Games is a controversial one, which is why, concealed within the most widely celebrated sporting and cultural event of modern times, one can find a history of protest and resistance.

While researchers have highlighted the importance of critically examining the Olympic Games, only a few have examined Olympic resistance and protest groups specifically (i.e. Burbank, Heying & Andranovich, 2000; Dansero, Del Corpo, Mela & Ropolo, 2008; Lenskyj, 2000, 2002, 2008; Morgan, 2003). The most comprehensive overview of Olympic resistance arguably comes from academic and self-proclaimed activist, Helen Lenskyj (2000, 2002, 2008). Her books provided critiques of the impacts of the Games, discussions about the corruption of the Olympic industry, and accounts of protest and resistance in several Olympic bid and host cities around the world. Of particular importance to this research, she highlighted several factors associated with the ways in which the Olympic Games are organized that limit access to public space, and the right to free speech and peaceful protest. Other authors have also emphasized the

importance of having space for alternative discourses that counter the dominant-ideologies espoused by the Olympic movement (Black & Van Der Westhuizen, 2004; Elder, Pratt & Ellis, 2006; Young & Wamsley, 2005), yet few have investigated this issue from the perspectives of Olympic resisters themselves. As a result, little is known about how counter framings to dominant Olympic ideologies are developed or what impact they are thought to have from the perspectives of those engaged in resistance.

Since their inception, the modern Olympic Games have been promoted as espousing certain moral ideals and values of Olympism. It has been described as a movement that engenders values of humanism, peace, and internationalism, to "place sport at the service of the harmonious development of man, with a view of promoting a peaceful society concerned with the preservation of human dignity" (International Olympic Committee, 2007, p. 11). While several researchers have provided evidence that given the way they are currently organized, the Games do not exhibit these values (Horne, 2007; Lenskyj, 2002; Milton-Smith, 2002), yet, they have become instilled as the dominant ideology and continue to be used to promote it (Young & Wamsley, 2005). Some authors argue that the development of the Olympic ideology has "given rise to a spectacular over-estimation of their [the Olympic Games'] value to the cohesion of the world community" (Hoberman, 1984, p. 6), making it difficult to critique the problems associated with this mega-event. Morgan (2003) suggested that in the Sydney 2000 Summer Olympics, there was the public perception that "to have expressed indifference towards the Games ... would have been akin to covering up some severe moral deviation" (p. 24). The silencing of alternative perspectives to the dominant Olympic ideology in the public realm is made obvious through initiatives adopted by the Olympic movement that essentially work to

limit access to public space by alternative voices, especially those from Olympic resistance groups.

The International Olympic Committee (IOC) is a non-profit non-governmental organization based in Lausanne, Switzerland that holds supreme authority over the Olympic movement. The IOC requires every host city and country to abide by certain rules and regulations as outlined in the Olympic Charter[2]. One of these rules has particular significance for Olympic resistance groups as it demands that "no kind of demonstration or political, religious or racial propaganda is permitted in any Olympic sites or other areas" (IOC, 2007, p. 98). Host cities are therefore legally bound by this Olympic Charter and, in the past, changes have been made to civil laws to accommodate this rule and also arguably to protect against 'ambush marketing' and potential terrorist attacks. For example, at the Sydney 2000 Olympics, there was an increase in the legal powers bestowed to police and security guards in controlling public spaces whereby protests became illegal in public spaces without an authorized permit and most were restricted to a designated area (Cunneen, 2000). Authorized protest zones, as they are commonly referred to have been a feature at every Olympic Games since Sydney 2000 (Eimer, 2008). Protest zones are specifically designed and fenced-off areas within the host city where protestors are legally allowed to assemble with a permit. While the Olympic Charter does not specifically require the development of specified protest zones, these initiatives do ensure abidance to the rules as a stated above. This tactic to seemingly accommodate free speech is increasingly implemented at large international events, as a way of providing for space to protest, yet at the same time retaining control over that space (Herbert, 2007). The development of these

---

[2] Olympic Charter is the `rules` book that host cities and their organizing committees are required to follow when hosting an Olympic Games.

zones was significant to this study as it provides an example of how attempts have been made to restrict the democratic right to protest.

Purpose of the study

The purpose of this study was to examine how individuals involved in Olympic resistance frame and re-frame discussions around the right to peaceful protest in public space in the context of the 2010 Vancouver Winter Olympic Games. My specific research questions are as follows:

(i)   What are protestor perspectives on how Olympic organizers frame this issue?

(ii)   How are protestors re-framing the issue?

(iii)   What is their assessment of the challenges encountered?

To address these research questions, I adopted an ethnographic approach, which involved observations of eight public forums and seven protest events organized and attended by those involved in anti-Olympic resistance and six one-on-one interviews with individuals who participated in anti-Olympic protests during the 2010 Olympic Games. Furthermore, I analyzed documents, including websites and media archives to provide further insights into how Olympic organizers and protest participants were framing and re-framing the right to peaceful protest. As I did not interview Olympic organizers on this topic, I relied on protestor perspectives and secondary sources to determine what dominant logics they were thought to be operating under. Due to time constraints, this study did not extend into the Winter Paralympic Games that were held in Vancouver in March, 2010, although examining similarities and differences in terms of protest in this context is an interesting area for future research.

Theoretical framework

To enable me to analyze the framing of the right to protest in public space, I drew from different theoretical concepts within social geography, Organizational Studies (OS), and Social Movement Theory (SMT). Social geographers have highlighted the importance of studying the role of space, and it constitutes both the context and a theoretical perspective in this study. The notion that space is socially constructed and is where contentious challenges to power, politics, and control are performed (D'Arcus, 2006; Martin & Miller, 2003; Sewell, 2001) forms the basis of my theoretical framework. In order to uncover the ways in which public space is constructed by Olympic organizers and protestors in terms of the right to protest at the 2010 Olympics I utilize the theoretical concepts from OS and SMT literatures respectively.

The anti-Olympic protests involved similar organizing to what has been described as a social movement, which is defined by SMT theorists as "collective efforts, of some duration and organization, using non-institutionalized methods to bring about social change" (McAdam, Tarrow & Tilly, 2001, p. 5). Within the OS literature, Morgan (2006) describes such groups as counter-organizations, which is an oppositional force established to "provide a way of influencing organizations where one is not part of the established power structure" (p. 183). While Morgan's (2006) research interest lay within OS, this description of a counter-organization is comparable to the concept of a social movement because both make attempts at changing the current power structure. The purpose of highlighting these different concepts was not to determine which best fits the movement that was the focus for this study. Rather, my purpose was to uncover the different theoretical approaches that have been utilized to study this type of organizing, enabling me to develop a framework that informed my analysis.

The OS and SMT literatures have some distinctive features in common, starting with the fact that they both study forms of coordinated collective action (Zald & Berger, 1978). Yet, these two lines of thought have developed along somewhat separate paths and surprisingly little work has been done that has employed aspects of both bodies of literature (Campbell, 2005). Traditionally the focus of organizational studies has been "on formal units governed by institutionalized authority" (Davis, McAdam, Scott & Zald, 2005, p. 2), while the study of social movements has focused more on "emergent processes aimed at challenging and destabilizing established organizations and/or institutions" (Davis et al., 2005, p. 2). It is just in the last five to ten years that scholars in these research areas have begun to 'cross over' and draw from one another (Davis et al., 2005). McAdam and Scott (2005) proposed a framework that utilized concepts derived from both theoretical approaches and described it as "a basic tool-kit … [that] has broad relevance for OS and SM analysts alike" (p. 18). This was helpful to my study because Olympic organizers have institutional authority and Olympic resistors are challenging it.

McAdam and Scott (2005) introduce the integrative framework by first describing the term 'organizational field' as the broad unit of analysis. An organizational field refers to "those organizations that, in the aggregate, constitute a recognized area of institutional life: key suppliers, resource and product consumers, regulatory agencies, and other organizations that produce similar services and products" (DiMaggio & Powell, 1983, p. 148). While this description is very much representative of an institutionalized organization, incorporating this into the analysis of a social movement, or in this specific case anti-Olympic resistance, is relevant as it encourages the researcher to examine the wider context within which actors operate (McAdam & Scott, 2005). For this study, the organizational field included all of the organizations, counter-organizations, social actors, corporations, governing structures and

community members that are influenced by and/or influence courses of action in context of the 2010 Vancouver Olympic Games. While the specific focus of this study was but one of these counter-groups, I acknowledge that their resistance efforts took part in this wider context. Because this concept of the organizational field has its origins in organizational studies, other researchers have focused on the dominant actors and dominant logics of action, such as in Cousens and Slack's study on professional sport (2005). This study also recognized the dominant actors and logics, but did so from the perspectives of marginalized actors within the organizational field.

To assist in examining my specific research questions within this organization field, I have drawn on the concepts of institutional logics and framing processes derived from OS and SMT theoretical traditions respectively. Institutional logics are defined as the "belief systems and associated practices that predominate in an organizational field" (Scott, Ruef, Mendel & Caronna, 2000, p. 170). They are thought to determine the types of strategies and behaviors of the actors within an organizational field, who are seen as being both "carriers and indicators of the dominant logic" (Cousens & Slack, 2005, p. 16). Framing processes in the SMT literature are described as the "collective processes of interpretation, attribution, and social construction that mediate between opportunity and action" (McAdam, McCarthy & Zald, 1996, p. 2). Research on framing processes has focused on the values and beliefs of those challenging the dominant ideologies. Both institutional logics and framing processes have been described by McAdam et al. (2001) as the 'cognitive mechanisms' of organizing that serve as a guiding concept to examine the ways in which access to public space and the right to peaceful protest are being framed and re-framed by those involved in Olympic resistance within the broader organizational field that is dominated by Olympic organizers and the IOC.

Vancouver 2010 Winter Olympic Games

Early in 1998, the Vancouver Bid Corporation consisting of business leaders, city developers, and other supporters was chosen to represent Canada in the international bidding process for the 2010 Winter Olympic Games (City of Vancouver, 2010 Olympic bid, 2000). During the bid phase, resistance to the Games became evident as several Vancouver citizens and local politicians argued that the Olympics should not be a priority for the city considering it had already cut spending for more pressing issues such as education, social welfare, and housing (CBC News, 2003). In response, a community coalition was formed, called the Impact on Communities Coalition (IOCC), who were critical of the Games but wanted to use the Olympics as leverage to address these more pressing concerns (IOCC, n.d.). They saw the Olympics as an opportunity to garner support from the provincial government for welfare and health care initiatives that under normal circumstances they may not have received. They considered themselves to be an independent, non-partisan, and community-based coalition that aimed to maximize the positive impacts of the 2010 Games while minimizing the negative impacts.

Another community group who called themselves 'No Games 2010' was formed in the summer of 2002 by individuals who had come together while protesting the G8 Summit in Kananaskis, Alberta earlier that year. Unlike the IOCC, this group did not believe anything positive would come from hosting the Olympics and they aimed to stop the Vancouver 2010 Olympic bid outright. They highlighted their criticisms through various media campaigns, the development of a book titled *Five Ring Circus: Myths and Realities of the Olympic Games* (Shaw, 2008), and a documentary of the same name (Schmidt, 2007). This was a small group and at this point critique against the Games was limited while the boosters of the bid were gathering momentum (CBC, 2003).

Because of the resistance from the public and the need to demonstrate community support, the bid committee collaborated with the IOCC, local, and provincial governments to release the inner-city inclusivity commitment statement (ICICS). The ICICS was a list of promises to be incorporated into the bid that explicitly identified the intent "to maximize the opportunities and mitigate potential impacts in Vancouver's inner-city neighbourhoods from hosting the 2010 Winter Games" (ICICS, 2002, p.1). The ICICS contained 14 areas of concern and 37 specific commitments to be implemented by the organizing committee (which would later be known as VANOC) before, during, and after the hosting of the 2010 Games. As outlined by Eby (2007, p.1):

> The ICICS commitments explicitly promised to ensure Vancouver's inner-city residents would have meaningful input into the processes surrounding the 2010 Olympiad, would experience no undue hardship including homelessness or displacement as a result of the Games, and would enjoy housing and other legacies that would contribute to their community as a result of the Games.

After these promises were made, the City of Vancouver announced they would hold a plebiscite, allowing community members to vote on whether or not they wanted to see Vancouver and Whistler host the Winter Olympic Games in 2010. This plebiscite was non-binding and despite tax payers from the entire province of British Columbia being required to pay for a substantial portion of Olympic costs, votes were restricted to Vancouver residents only (Girard, 2003). CBC cited in a news report that during the plebiscite campaign "the glossy, well financed, and aggressive 'yes' side came out swinging" (CBC, 2003). The 'yes' team operated on a budget of $700,000 and were also provided with $1million of free advertising from CanWest Global[3]. In comparison the 'no' side operated on a budget of $5,000 raised through community fundraising efforts (Tromp, 2002). With the backing of a well-financed public

---

[3] CanWest Global owns the Vancouver Sun, The Province, The National Post, The Vancouver Courier and other VanNet papers. CanWest was also an official sponsor of the 2010 Olympic Games

campaign to garner support from Vancouver residents, and the development of the ICICS promises, community resistance against the Games reportedly dwindled (CBC, 2003), The plebiscite subsequently came through in favour of the 'yes' side. Of the 134,900 residents of Vancouver who voted; 64% voted 'yes' votes, while 36% voted 'no'. The Vancouver Bid Corporation, the local, and provincial governments declared the plebiscite a success and announced it was an indication that the overwhelming majority of Canadians wanted the 2010 Winter Games to be held in British Columbia (CBC, 2003). The International Olympic Committee also praised the potential hosts and claimed that community support for the Games would go a long way for a successful bid. On July 2, 2003, Vancouver and Whistler were announced as the hosts of the 2010 Winter Olympic Games.

Despite the bid being won and the development of the ICICS, several anti-Olympic groups and networks continued to organize and oppose the 2010 Games. As Olympic organizing got underway in the city, the consequences of hosting became more and more evident and various social justice and environmental groups began emphasizing the negative impact it was having and could potentially have on their community.

While there were various different groups and perspectives involved in anti-Olympic organizing in Vancouver the majority did so under the coalition that was formed, called the Olympic Resistance Network (ORN). The ORN was responsible for organizing much of the anti-Olympic events including the protests held during the 2010 Olympic Games. The coalition took a stance where they were not only concerned about opposing the hosting of the Games in Vancouver but were also opposed to the impacts the Games were having around the world. In particular, resistance organizing was focused on opposing the potential impacts of the 2010 Games on indigenous and low-income communities. This was not the first time that an Olympic

bid city had encountered resistance (see Lenskyj, 2000 for a discussion of Toronto's oppositional group 'Bread not Circuses'). There were likely several reasons for the opposition against the Vancouver 2010 Games. First, it was becoming clear that the ICICS promises made during the bid stages of the Games were not being kept (IOCC, 2009). Second, there had been limited community consultation, thus protest and resistance remained one of the only ways to get alternative perspectives heard. Third, the environmental, social, and economic impacts of the Games were quickly materializing, and more and more people were beginning to understand the affects the Games were having on Vancouver and the wider British Columbia area. And finally, the impacts on civil liberties during the Olympics, Vancouver and British Columbia had received much media attention as several new bylaws had been passed that had potential to have an impact on the right for peaceful protest during the Games.

In the next chapter, I review related literature and provide further detail into the theoretical framework that informs this research.

Chapter Two: Literature Review

This chapter locates my research study within the literature by providing a theoretical overview and discussion of the types of studies that have been undertaken in this area to date. The first section focuses on previous Olympic resistance and protest actions and how other researchers have examined resistance groups. Reviewing this literature helped to contextualize my study by highlighting what has occurred at past Olympic Games with respect to public protest. The next section examines civil liberties more specifically and how this has been represented in Olympic organizing. Because previous Games have invoked restrictions on civil liberties, particularly in terms of access to public space and the right to peaceful protest, this has been a topic of contention not only in the Olympic literature but also in previous host communities. I then provide a brief overview of broader societal discussions on different forms of activism. I examine what activism entails and its role in civil society politics. In the final section I discuss my theoretical framework, this is where I examine the social construction of space to highlight how challenges to and control over dominant power structures occur. I also explore the theoretical approaches from Organizational Studies (OS) and Social Movement Theory (SMT) in more depth in relation institutional logics and framing processes to assist in examining how control over space is challenged and maintained. In addition, I review research that has utilized these concepts and discuss how they have guided my own research.

Olympic resistance and protest actions

Research on Olympic resistance and protest events have demonstrated some of the ways by which Olympic resistance groups and the protectors of the dominant Olympic ideology vie for positions in public spaces. While researchers and historical accounts may not have specifically identified these as 'spatial' struggles, by viewing these studies through a 'spatial' lens, I began to

link a wide array of research to provide for the theoretical backdrop for this study. Essentially, protest embodies the desire to challenge the dominant order of how space is utilized and by whom (Miller, 2000).

One of the most violent examples of Olympic space as a site of resistance occurred between student demonstrators and protectors of the Olympic 'image' ten days before the 1968 Mexico Summer Olympics were due to begin. On October 2nd between 10,000 and 15,000 students and their supporters gathered in Tlatelolco square in Mexico City for a peaceful political demonstration (Fournier & Herrara, 2009). During the speeches given by the organizers of the demonstration, 5,000 soldiers and 200 army tanks surrounded the square under the orders of the government, effectively blocking anyone from entering or leaving the space. The historical accuracy of the events that followed may never be known due to a government cover up of the incident, however, it is now believed that the confrontation resulted in the deaths of well over 300 demonstrators (Preston & Dillon, 2004). The official documents released by the government immediately following the confrontation, suggested government officials were violently confronted by the students which forced the army to retaliate. However, later investigations revealed that snipers from the presidential guard located in buildings throughout the plaza had been ordered to fire shots at army personnel to provoke their attack on the students (Gutmann, 2002).

While it is clear that the student demonstrations and the reactions to it were part of a wider political struggle, the Olympic Games were undeniably on the minds of all involved. The student demonstrators aimed to take advantage of the international Olympic stage to dispute the government's use of public money for the 1968 Olympics (Lenskyj, 2004), and to "reveal the realities of poverty, and misery, and corruption in their country," despite the government's

assertion that Mexico was a "modern democratic society" (Gutmann, 2002, p. 71). At the same time, the Mexican government and Olympic officials were particularly concerned the student demonstrations would destroy the illusion they wanted to create of a country dedicated to social justice for an international Olympic audience (Preston & Dillon, 2004). A document written by FBI director John Hoover the day before the ensuing 'massacre' revealed that the concern was really more about the well-being of the Olympics when he warned that: "tensions created by racial and political pressure groups could result in serious detriment to [the] tranquillity necessary for successful outcome of the international Olympic Games"(Hoover, 1968, para. 1). The violent confrontation that occurred October 2nd 1968 demonstrated there was no space for the voices of student protestors who challenged the dominant logic held by those involved in Olympic organizing.

While few scholars have examined these protests as a part of Olympic history, I contend it is important to look into incidents like this to further understand resistance and protest. The student protests were linked to wider political unrest unfolding in Mexico at the time. However, the presence of the Olympic Games and its influence on the immediate context was a trigger event that provides a rare example of the framing and re-framing that can occur between protestors and Olympic organizers regarding access to public space and the right to protest.

Other examples of protest at previous Olympic Games have not entailed such a publicly violent response, which is perhaps one of the reasons why few researchers have examined them in more depth. While public confrontation provides an obvious example of attempts at controlling space, there are other ways in which protest groups may be excluded from these spaces that without in-depth research, we would be unaware of (Horne, 2007; Lenskyj, 2002). As Lenskyj (2004) has argued, we should pay particular attention to resistance as the Olympic

organizers have: "the power to suppress local dissent and to promote the illusion of unequivocal support on the part of host cities and countries" (p. 152). In her extensive work on Olympic protest, Lenskyj uncovered some of the practices used to silence Olympic resistance groups such as when: "the mass media and local politicians capitulate to Olympic industry pressure to censor critical voices and to criminalize peaceful protest in host cities" (2006, p. 92).

Other researchers have also highlighted tactics used to minimize potential protest. Burbank, Heying and Andranovich (2000) examined opposition related to Olympic related city growth in three North American cities including Los Angeles in 1984, Atlanta in 1996, and Salt Lake City in 2002. While their research was not focused on interactions between resistance groups and Olympic organizers, the authors reiterated the power of Olympic promoters when they contended that: "under the auspices of a bid or organizing committee, proponents of Olympic growth are able, to a certain extent, to pick which development battles to fight and which to avoid" (Burbank et al., 2000, p. 354) to ensure that Olympic related developments are able to proceed with minimal disruption. Morgan's (2003) research on indigenous protest at the Sydney 2000 Olympic Games also highlighted the importance of engaging in research with protest groups as they sometimes do not hold an obvious presence in Olympic space. Their exclusion comes about, in part, through the framing of issues by more powerful Olympic organizers. According to Morgan (2003), indigenous groups had intended to use the Sydney Games to protest against the historical treatment of indigenous peoples' in Australia. Despite this threat, Morgan (2003) showed how the level of unrest during the Sydney Games was much less than expected. He suggested this has much to do with Olympic organizers' actions who managed to defuse indigenous resistance by "paying homage to the original owners in the major ceremonies, negotiating the involvement of some prominent aboriginal people, and incorporating

imagery of reconciliation in the rituals of the Olympic Games" (p. 27). This suggested that Olympic organizers were able to generate an institutional logic that insinuated the coming together of indigenous groups within the wider Australian society thereby marginalizing indigenous protestors. Whether or not this was how the protestors interpreted the situation is not clear because Morgan's (2003) research did not uncover their perspectives first hand.

In another example, Italian researchers Dansero, Del Corpo, Mela and Ropolo (2008) carried out a qualitative analysis of opposition to the 2006 Winter Olympic Games hosted in Torino, Italy. They discussed the notion of the Olympics as a disputed space utilizing a framework based on the work of Lefebvre (1991) and Harvey (1973). They revealed conflicting views on how space should be utilized and who should be allowed in that space. Olympic space is often associated with notions of peace, where competition only occurs in a controlled fashion between athletes from different nations. As a result, any voice that suggests otherwise is quickly undermined by the overwhelming domination of positions taken by mega-event organizers (Dansero et al., 2008). While the researchers recognised that protestors and Olympic organizers were contesting space, their analysis did not examine how protest groups attempted to re-frame the use of space from their points of view.

In the next section I examine the issue of civil liberties and what this has meant for Olympic protest groups.

Civil liberties and the Olympic Games

The loss of civil liberties has been a contentious issue at several previous Olympic Games and is also frequently referred to by Olympic scholars as an example of a negative impact of the Games (Lenskyj, 2002, 2006; Milton-Smith, 2002). The Games have often been associated with

changes to citizens' rights to free speech, peaceful protest, and freedom of assembly in public

spaces (Lenskyj, 2006). The restrictions of these rights have a significant impact on Olympic

counter-movements as exercising them can provide one of the few ways of challenging dominant

ideologies and getting alternative perspectives heard and acknowledged (Herbert, 2007; Miller,

2000; Sewell, 2001).

Physical examples of increasing restrictions to public space include the use of barricading

and increased surveillance of these areas (Lenskyj, 2004). All of these measures work to control

what types of bodies are allowed inside certain spaces. The introduction of these heightened

restrictions on public space have been criticised at previous Olympic Games as being an

infringement on basic democratic rights of citizens (Cunneen, 2000). At the Winter Olympics in

Salt Lake City (SLC) in 2001, the American Civil Liberties Union of Utah (ACLUU, 2001, para.

3) referred to SLC plans to create protest zones and other proposed restrictions on civil liberties

as "an attempt to temporarily suspend the First Amendment for the not-so-democratic purpose of

presenting a unified face to the world in February." It was also acknowledged that "these

restrictions will disproportionately affect those who wish to assemble in order to express

viewpoints counter to the 'official' Olympic message" (ACLUU, 2001, para. 3). A spokesperson

for BURN,[4] a local protest group who was against the SLC Games, reported the group would not

apply for a permit to protest in an official zone because by doing so "we would be recognizing

the authority of the state to grant or deny freedom of speech" (Sealey, 2002, para. 11).

The 2008 Summer Olympic Games in Beijing, China, were also criticised by many for

the handling of protesters (Economy & Segal, 2008). Organizers erected 'protest zones'

specifically to demonstrate their commitment to freedom of speech and to subdue internationally

---

[4] Build Underground Resistance Not the Olympics

held fears that protestors' voices would be suppressed. Beijing authorities then required residents to apply for the right to protest in these authorized zones during the Games. Despite reportedly receiving over seventy-five applications, not a single protest took place in these zones (Foster & Spencer, 2008). Seventy of the applications were reportedly dealt with before protests occurred and the remaining five resulted in arrests. One incident highlighted in the international media was the story of two elderly women who had applied for the right to demonstrate against housing evictions, but were arrested and sentenced to one year of re-education through labour (York, 2008).

While Beijing and organizers of other Olympic Games framed the creation of protest pens as demonstrating their commitments to freedom of speech, it has been argued that the fundamental concept of 'zones' transforms 'free' and public space into one that is not conducive to free speech because who is allowed in is controlled (D'Arcus, 2006). In order to regulate these spaces, legislation has been passed in previous Olympic Games to increase policing rights and other security measures. Chinese officials prepared extensively for potential protests by deploying thousands of surveillance cameras throughout the city and training riot squads and special police to silence potential dissenters (Economy & Segal, 2008). Malfas, Theodoraki and Houlihan (2004) contended that the removal of unwanted groups and individuals from Olympic space and the increased powers of police demonstrated "the efforts of the organizers to show a good image, conveniently forgetting the civil liberties at stake" (p. 214). These examples of the transformation of public space at previous Olympic Games illustrate that it is not simply a neutral area where people can freely express their views, rather, its use is clearly linked to the exercise of power, politics, and control (D'Arcus, 2006; Mitchell, 1995; Sewell, 2001).

In the next section, I discuss the role of activism and protest in civil society.

Activism

The previous section explained the importance of access to public space to be able to exercise the democratic rights of freedom of speech and peaceful protest, in this section I examine the role of activism and what it entails as a form of political action. Activism has been described by Reitan (2007) as "a role assumed by individuals or collective actions either to resist what they consider to be politically wrong or to act to bring about political change, through either contained or transgressive tactics" (p. 5). Reitan (2007) explained that these tactics range from the use of "routinized and contained activities of lobbying and information sharing" to "acts of street demonstrations and civil disobedience" (p. 6). The diversity of tactics possible within the field of activism have been integral to ongoing discussion and debate among activists within broader social movements and are often considered influential in the outcomes of a movement.

Public protest is a common form of activism that embodies a diverse range of tactics. The main purpose of protest and public demonstrations as forms of activism is, as Mair (2002/2003) explained "to generate and re-claim discursive space" (p. 232). Describing activism in terms of civil leisure, Mair (2002/2003) argued that re-claiming discursive space provides an opportunity for open and public discussions of political and social issues that challenge hegemonic ideals. Similar to voting in elections, protest is a way in which citizens are able to voice their opinions in a democratic society. Despite this view that political activism is thought to be "integral to 21st century society" (Jordan, 2002, p. 8), public demonstrations are often frowned upon as a form of political action, particularly by the mainstream media but also often by those involved in electoral politics (Grundy & Howell, 2001; Mair, 2002/2003). For example, Grundy and Howell (2001) explained that the mainstream press tends to ignore underlying political reasons behind participation in protest and treats participants as though they were "there to be fashionable or to

have a good time" (p. 123). Mair (2002/2003) also suggested that by discussing protest actions as 'deviant' and/or 'violent,' those in power are able to de-legitimize the goals of activists. It is perhaps no surprise that those who hold power in electoral politics are inclined to dismiss the voices of activists as often the purpose of protest is to challenge the current hegemonic power structures.

While there are many examples of the delegitimization of protest tactics, at the same time, researchers have been discussing the increasing use of large-scale protests, particularly by the emerging transnational anti-globalization movement (Conway, 2003; Grundy & Howell, 2001). The anti-globalization movement has been described as "representing one of the most significant illustrations of social conflict and contentious political behaviour of the past several decades" (Ayres, 2004). The movement developed out of criticism of the growing globalization of capitalism and neo-liberalism in the early 1990's, which are often attributed to the widening gap between rich and poor both within and between different countries, increases in the rate of poverty globally, and also the destabilization of the international economy. The grievances held by anti-globalization activists are broad and the groups and individuals involved in the movement come from a very diverse range of backgrounds. The movement has tended to target and protest international forums such as the World Trade Forum, G8 meetings, and The Free Trade Area of the Americas Summit. Describing anti-Olympic activism, Lenskyj (2008) explained that resistance to the Olympic Games often fits within the anti-globalization movement as it attempts to stop or minimize the societal impacts of the Games, like the gentrification of low-income communities within host cities. Furthermore, the Olympic Games is an international mega-event that represents similar capitalist and neo-liberal ideologies that the other international forums also uphold (Lenskyj, 2002).

The broad ranges of perspectives and groups that make up the anti-globalization

movement have been echoed at previous Olympic protests. Kidd (1992) wrote that in the 1996

Toronto bid, the Olympic resistance group known as Bread Not Circuses (BNC) included inner-

city housing activists, church groups, and labour organizations. Similarly, a coalition of

resistance to the 2000 Berlin bid represented politicians, churches, labour unions, anarchist

groups, anti-poverty networks, and academics (Kidd, 1992; Lenskyj, 2000). While the overall

goals may be similar for different groups involved in the broader social movement, tactics and

strategies used may not be the same. For example, the more institutionalized organizations

within a movement may engage in letter writing, lobbying, and peaceful demonstrations and may

not condone tactics such as vandalism that more radical members of the movement utilize.

Researchers have highlighted that these different strategies and actions has led many

members of the anti-globalization movement to call for respect for diversity of tactics, especially

from those institutionalized organizations and non-governmental organizations (NGOs) involved

in the movement (Ayres, 2004; Conway, 2003). This involves "an ethic of respect for and

acceptance of, the tactical choices of other activists" and the "explicit agreement not to publicly

denounce the tactics of other activists" (Conway, 2003, p. 511). The purpose for the respect for

diversity of tactics lies in the need for solidarity in the success of a movement, it allows for a

broader range of activists and broader range of strategies to work together under common goals.

This has not eliminated debates surrounding the use of different tactics, which continue within

the anti-globalization movement, and may also sometimes threaten to break up the movement

(Conway, 2003). Perhaps one of the major reasons why respect for diversity of tactics is

encouraged by so many members of social movements is to allow for groups and individuals

who are traditionally marginalized in other aspects of societal decision making to get their voices

heard. But as Grundy and Howell (2001) have emphasized, protest based-politics is mediated by factors such as social class, gender, race, sexuality and nationality in similar ways as in other areas of society. I highlight this because even though public demonstrations and protest push some marginalized perspectives into the public realm, it is important to understand and consider how other perspectives are still left out. Access to protest is dependent on time availability making it difficult for those to participate who are unable to get time off work or single mothers may also have some problems attending because childcare limits their attendance. Increase in border control also limits those without citizenship status to attend protests. Furthermore, the increasing threat of a criminal record at public demonstrations can also be a deterrent, especially for those who are already subjects of police targeting including "low-income people, people of colour, aboriginal peoples, street-involved and homeless people, young people, queer people, and people with mental health issues" (Grundy & Howell, 2001, p. 126).

Taking into consideration both the diversity of tactics and potential limitations in the ability to protest highlights some of the complexities involved in examining protest activities. In the final section, I develop the theoretical framework that assisted in examining struggles over the use of public space by Olympic organizers and anti-Olympic protestors.

Theoretical framework

Previous sections have demonstrated some of the ways in which the right to peaceful protest in public space may be challenged and or controlled by Olympic organizers. It has also described conceptions of space as part of the social processes in which these struggles occur. In order to uncover how individuals involved in anti-Olympic events are reframing the right to public protest in these spaces, I drew on the theoretical concepts of the social construction of

space from Social Geography, institutional logics from Organizational Studies (OS) and framing processes from Social Movement Theory (SMT).

Social construction of space. Lefebvre's (1991) notion of space as socially produced has played a major role in the ways in which it has been written about and theorized by others such as Harvey (1973), Soja (1996), and Gottdiener (1994). Lefebvre emphasized the idea of "space as an integral part of social life, both affecting and affected by social action" (Martin & Miller, 2003, p. 145). He conceptualized three types of social space: perceived, conceived, and lived. Perceived space denotes peoples' spatial practices in daily life where social production and reproduction occurs (Martin & Miller, 2003). Conceived space is the domain of the creators, for example, planners, engineers, and politicians. How these spaces are created is closely linked to social control and regulation (Merrifield, 1993). Lived space, represents the interaction of both perceived and conceived space, where we can find "not just the spatial representations of power, but the imposing and operational power of spatial representations" (Soja, 1996, p. 68). As Soja (1996) explains, this is where spaces of resistance to the dominant order can arise.

Scholars of spatial practices have often utilized the concept of place alongside space. Researchers have made the slight distinction between the two terms by suggesting that place is a moment of space, it "is the terrain where basic social practices are lived out" (Merrifield, 1993, 522). Lefebvre (1991) incorporated the notion of place when he described space as simultaneously embodying the actual place that is lived and the process and production of a place. Scholars in sociology of sport have utilized both these concepts to examine sport and the body (Vertinsky & Bale, 2004). Sport has been explained as being both a space and place, where social relations are constantly being determined, contested, and negotiated (van Ingen, 2003). Much of this scholarship has challenged the naturalized assumptions underlying the organization

of sporting spaces in a bid to re-examine how they are socially produced by those in power (e.g., Fusco, 2004; van Ingen, 2003; Vertinsky, 2004).

Vertinsky (2004) examined the construction of the War Memorial Gymnasium at the University of British Columbia in Canada and the power struggles associated with this sporting space. She described how the building "evolved into an arena of contested spaces and functions around gendered, racial, and sexualized bodies as well as bodies of knowledge and the shape of disciplines" (p. 14). In another study, Fusco (2004, p. 160) examined the sporting locker room and uncovered the dominant discourses of "public, hygiene, private and public health and the body" that prevailed in this space. She went on to discuss the ways in which bodies are constrained and how behaviours appropriated within this space. These examples demonstrate the ways in which spaces are imbued with dominant discourses and practices that are often taken for granted.

Researchers who have focused on the contentious politics linked to the use of public space have also examined its' contested nature (D'Arcus, 2006; Martin & Miller, 2003; Sewell, 2001). For example, Sewell (2001, p. 68) described space as "an object and a matrix of power" explaining that the challenges to and protection of power is spatial in nature. Public space not only provides an avenue for marginalized voices to be heard "to represent themselves - make themselves politically visible – before larger publics" (D'Arcus, 2006, p. 21), this space is also constructed and produced by social constructions of it. Thus, space is not a static phenomenon. While it has the potential to constrain the alternative voices of social movements, it can also be a site for agents of change where social movements can produce new spatial relationships (Sewell, 2001).When space is viewed in this way, we can understand the importance of studying its role in the organization and development of counter-movements.

Having control over space denotes how power shapes relationships, interactions, and behaviours (Staeheli & Mitchell, 2008), which in turns influences the exclusion and inclusion of certain bodies within that space. In the context of the Olympic Games, there is an increased sense of the need to control public spaces in an attempt to silence voices of dissent. As a result, only those bodies that conform to the dominant Olympic rhetoric are usually welcome in Olympic spaces. As Foucault (1978) attests: "where there is power there is resistance, and yet, or rather consequently this resistance is never in a position of exteriority in relation to power" (p. 95). Resistance can develop within this same space, but the absence of vocal or visual resistance is just as meaningful as the presence of it because the potential for oppositional viewpoints is always present. For example, Morgan's (2003) findings that Aboriginal protests at the Sydney 2000 Games were much more subdued than expected is not necessarily evidence of decreased resistance, as it could be the result of increased control over Olympic space. Without the in-depth study of resistance groups in the context of spatial politics, the way in which space is utilized by these groups and the impact will remain unclear. Sewell (2001) maintained that "in studying the role of space in contentious politics we should be especially attentive to the ways that spatial constraints are turned to advantage in political and social struggles and the ways that such struggles can restructure meanings, uses, and strategic valence of space." (p. 55).

Organizational field: Institutional logics and framing processes. As has been outlined in the introduction, I begin with the broad concept of the organizational field to describe the social construction of space at the 2010 Olympic Games. Fligstein (2001) referred to the organizational field as "situations where organized groups or actors gather and frame their actions vis-a-vis one another" (p. 108). Actions in this sense are viewed as a social process, both impacting and being impacted by others in context. McAdam and Scott (2005) advocated for this

approach to research organizations and/or social movements rather than focusing on any one organization in particular. For this research, I refer to the organizational field as involving those internal and external actors, organizations, and governmental agencies that both affect and are affected by the reframing of the use of public space at 2010 Vancouver Olympic Games. While, I will not be studying the entire organizational field in-depth, I will move beyond a simple organization focus by acknowledging the influence of other actors involved in the (re)framing engaged in by protest participants.

Studies on these social and political processes within organizational fields originated in Organizational Studies and have been theorized in numerous ways. To date, few researchers have also utilized approaches from the Social Movement Theory literature. McAdam and Scott (2005) discussed the differences and similarities between these two literatures in the opening chapter of the book *Social Movements and Organization Theory* (Davis et al., 2005). They argued that there are some similarities as both OS and SMT theorists examine forms of collective action. However, OS scholars have focused more on the structural processes of formal organizations, while SMT theorists have examined emergent social processes of less-structured groups (McAdam & Scott, 2005). These researchers highlighted the benefits of adopting an approach that incorporates both formal and informal organizations and groups because the OS literature provides insight into the institutional logics that explain the often taken-for-granted beliefs that inform the dominant practices within an organizational field. In addition, SMT researchers have emphasized how emergent organizations frame issues in certain ways to challenge dominant institutional logics. My research examined not only dominant institutional logics within the Olympics as an organizational field, but will also examine the framing processes that are being developed by Olympic resistors to counter these dominant logics.

Institutional logics. Institutional logics describe the belief systems inherent within institutions and organizational fields that guide appropriate behaviour and practices (Friedland & Alford, 1991; Thornton & Ocasio, 2008). Institutional logics therefore represent the ideologies of the powerful actors within an organizational field that have become naturalized to the extent where they are accepted by most people with minimal thought or critique (Meyer, Sahlin, Ventresca & Walgenbach, 2009; Thornton & Ocasio, 2008). The concept is closely related to the notion of ideology, however where the concept of institutional logics combines both the symbolic constructions and material practices of institutions, ideologies refer to only the former (Vogel, 2009). That is, an ideology is more of an ideal that underpins institutional logics in many ways, yet is not necessarily represented in the actual behaviours and material practices of an institution.

The concept of institutional logics has been utilized by researchers to examine changes in organizational fields (Cousens & Slack, 2005; Mutch, 2009). For example, Cousens and Slack (2005) explored North American major league professional sport over time to examine the changing nature of shifting institutional logics promoted by dominant actors and organizations. They showed that the shared practice of promoting sport-specific qualities of the teams evolved to emphasizing the value of the league to investors and promoting the entertainment aspects of professional sport. This new practice subsequently became institutionalized and widely accepted by actors within the field. In another study, Mutch (2009) examined institutional change over a ten year period in the UK brewing industry. He found that the industry transferred from an institutional logic of production to a logic of retailing and showed how industry practices transformed to align with the new logic.

The majority of research that has examined institutional logics has focused solely on dominant logics within certain organizational fields. However, both Mutch (2009) and Cousens and Slack (2005) acknowledged there are secondary or counter logics that may be present within an organizational field that are not considered. Mutch (2009) explained that logics are full of contradictions and even if they are accepted and practiced by the majority of actors, there is always space to develop alternatives that embody different practices and beliefs that challenge and/or oppose the dominant logic (McAdam & Scott, 2005). Research has also shown that under certain circumstances, such as in periods of change or in different contexts, dominant logics may become less stable and are subject to increasing contestation from counter logics (Thorton & Ocasio, 2008).

In the context of the Olympic Games, the dominant logics, while perhaps seeming to be stable are under considerable contestation from counter logics such as those espoused by Olympic resistance groups. Counter logics, unlike dominant logics are not readily accepted by actors of an organizational field as they often represent the interests of marginalized groups who are attempting to challenge the status quo. Groups and actors who construct these counter logics are likely to be more openly political and strategize more in order to legitimate their claims to the general public (Weik, 2009). This is where SMT literature on framing processes provides some insight.

Framing processes. Framing processes, as McAdam & Scott (2005) explained, are similar to the concept of institutional logics because: "both refer to ideas and belief systems, and recognize the role they play in providing direction, motivation, meaning, and coherence". Framing impacts the ability of actors "to recruit adherents, gain favourable media coverage, demobilize antagonists and win political victories" (Polletta & Ho, 2006, p. 188). Because this

process has mostly been examined by SMT researchers the focus has been on how marginalized groups have engaged in framing in opposition to dominant logics. This has led some researchers to suggest that framing is the domain of subordinate ideas, in other words involved in the development of counter-veiling logics present within an organizational field. However, it is clear that dominant groups also need to engage in framing, especially during times where there is no widely accepted institutionalized logic within the organizational field.

Roberta Coles' (1998) research on the 'framing-contests' between social movements and dominant actors during the Persian Gulf conflict of 1990-1991 demonstrated the ways in which counter-logics are developed and created by actors. Coles' (1998) paper stressed that particularly in times of 'crisis' (as she describes it) framing becomes quintessential, not just to social movements but also to the dominant actors within an organizational field. She argued that: "collective action framing is not carried out in a vacuum and that to study only the framing that social movements do is to forget that framing is an interactive process" (Coles, 1998, p. 371). Regardless of whether or not the issue surrounding the right to protest in public space during the 2010 Olympics can be referred to as a 'crisis', it is important to consider the logics and framing processes being created by both the dominant and marginalized actors within this organizational field.

While the concepts of framing and institutional logics were born from different theoretical traditions, it is clear that they overlap in various ways. They were both utilized to provide a theoretical lens through which I was able to uncover the ways in which protest participants and Olympic organizers were negotiating, protecting and/or challenging their perspectives on the right to protest in public space in the context of the Vancouver 2010 Games. While very few researchers have made the connection (D'Arcus, 2006), I believe that framing

theory and institutional logics lend themselves well to the conceptualization of power and space. As spatial theorists have attested, space is socially constructed and a site of power and resistance. Actors within space are constantly seeking to create meaning, to "strategically manipulate, subvert, and resignify places" (Leitner, Sheppard & Sziarto, 2008, p. 161). Actors engage in framing and develop institutional logics to signify the meaning that space has for them. It is the interactions of competing frames/logics within space that is of interest in this research.

In the following chapter I explain the methods utilized to address my research questions.

Chapter Three: Methodology

In this chapter, I discuss the rationale for the qualitative methodology, data collection processes, and ethical considerations. I also discuss some of the methodological challenges encountered and the limitations inherent in this study.

Qualitative methodology

The methods chosen to conduct research essentially depend upon "the nature of the research question and the objectives of your research" (Gratton & Jones, 2004, p. 25). A qualitative ethnographic approach was considered most appropriate for this study as it enabled me to gain rich descriptions regarding the right to protest in public space (O'Reilly, 2005). I conducted semi-structured interviews with individuals and observed several public forums and protest events. Because I did not engage in personal interviews with Olympic organizers, I examined secondary sources such as media articles and press releases to gain an understanding of how they were framing and reacting to anti-Olympic protests.

While I utilized ethnographic methods, I am reluctant to refer to my research as a full ethnography. The reason for this is because the term ethnography involves the immersion of the researcher into a culture as a participant for long periods of time (O'Reilly, 2005). I did not become a member of the Olympic Resistance Network (ORN), nor did my research involve full immersion into the culture of the group. At the same time, researchers have highlighted the complex nature of the term ethnography, stating that it "does not have a standard well-defined meaning ... its sense has been reinterpreted and re-contextualized in various ways in order to deal with particular circumstances" (Hammersley & Atkinson, 2007, p. 2). While my research did not engage in ethnography in the traditional sense, there were aspects of ethnography (e.g. the use of qualitative observations and interviews) that I utilized.

Ethnography has been described by several researchers as being especially suited for the study of social movements (Edelman, 2001; Plows, 2008; Wolford, 2006) as it "can capture the detail, nuance, a deeper appreciation of social reality, especially among latent, emergent underground networks ... off the radar of the public sphere" (Plows, 2008, p. 1529). Furthermore, Plows (2008) explained that ethnographic methods enable the researcher to identify "key issues, such as the way actors are framing the stakes of engagement, in circumstances where visible protest activity is often the tip of the iceberg" (p. 1524).

Participant observations: Entering the field

This project began in September of 2008 when I started attending anti-Olympic meetings and public forums where the impacts of the 2010 Vancouver Games were being critically discussed. Attendance at these meetings continued throughout the seventeen months leading up to the staging of the Games, which is when I also included protest events in my research observations. Observations are a common ethnographic technique when gathering data in a natural setting. It was important for me to be in attendance at as many protest events as possible to understand more fully the complexities of the contexts in which protest and critical Olympic interactions took place (Patton, 2002). Furthermore, being involved and present at the events enabled me to obtain perspectives on the physical spaces and the interactions taking place that I would have been unable to obtain from interviews.

I engaged in what could be considered 'participant observations' where generally those around me were not aware that I was present as a researcher as I was observing and participating in the actions that were happening at the time (Lichterman, 1998). My observations took on two different forms. Figure 3.2 provides an overview of the meetings and forums I attended, seven occurred before the commencement of the Games and one during the Games. The meetings and

forums varied in size, purpose, attendance, and design; however all were focused on critically discussing the impacts of the impending Olympic Games. Most of the meetings and forums were organized by either the ORN or the Impact on Communities Coalition (IOCC).

      Figure 3.3 presents an outline of major anti-Olympic protest events that occurred during the Vancouver Olympic Games from February 11 to 28, 2010. The figure provides the name, date, where the event took place, and a brief description of what occurred. I personally attended all seven of these events as part of my field observations for this project. At least two of the interviewees were present at every single event.

Table 3.1 Meetings/Forums observed

Date	Meeting	Where	What
October 25, 2008 (10:30am-5:30pm)	Why Resist 2010?	SFU Harbour Centre	A conference on the 2010 Vancouver Olympic Games, topics included: Myths and Realities of the Olympics Industry; Impacts on Indigenous Peoples and Lands Corporate Control of the Olympics; Vancouver's Olympics Legacy: from homelessness to migrant labour exploitation Olympics; Security Apparatus and Criminalization of Resistance + Getting involved in the Movement
November 5, 2008 (6pm-8pm)	The Question of Housing, Human Rights and the 2010 Olympics	Gallery Gatchet, East Cordova st, Vancouver	Forum hosted by Vancouver Flying University engaged discussions on the gentrification and economic distortion of Vancouver's inner city in the lead up to the Olympics. Presenters took a critical view of displacement, private security expansion, changes in policing policies and the development of concepts and positions which limit the right to the city and the processes by which they have become normalized in the civic imagination.
February 10, 2009 (6:30pm – 8:30pm)	Winners, Losers and the Olympic Industry	The Centre for Socialist Education, Clarke Drive	Olympic Resistance Network hosted an evening talk and discussion with activist, researcher and author Prof. Helen Lenskyj.
September 28, 2009 (7pm – 9pm)	The Right to the City: Civil Liberties and the 2010 Olympics	SFU Harbour Centre	Public forum hosted by the Impact on Communities Coalition (IOCC). This discussion took a critical view of the policies and framework that were established and contextualized these processes as part of broader urban development schemes in the inner-city and methods of criminalizing dissent.
January 21, 2010 (4pm-6pm)	Politics in the Ring	UBC Student Union Building	Organized by the ORN, award winning author David Zirin held a discussion about the politics of sport and mega sporting events.
February 4, 2010 (5pm – 8:30pm)	Impacts of the Olympics: Past and Present	Spartacus Books, East Hastings st, Vancouver	Pink Resistance (member of ORN) hosted a discussion on the impacts of the Olympics towards queer and trans people, pre-Olympic cutbacks to HIV and AIDS services, and concerns about Olympic Pride House
February 7, 2010(6pm-8:30pm)	Women and the Olympics	Rhizome Cafe, East Broadway	Women's International League for Peace and Freedom presented a panel discussion on Women and the Olympics.
February 20, 2010	Diversity of tactics: A Diversity of opinions	W2 Media Arts Centre,	A panel discussion with Harsha Walia and Derrick O'Keefe, activists involved in anti-Olympic protests debating the legitimacy of the use of black bloc tactics in protest

Table 3.2 Protests observed

Date	Protest	Where	What
Feb 11, 2010 (4pm-9pm)*	Torch protest	University of British Columbia	150 students and activists protested the passing of the torch
Feb 12, 2010 (8am-10am)	Torch protest	Commercial Drive and Victory Square	A few hundred activists blocked the passing of the Olympic torch at two major intersections in Downtown Vancouver
Feb 12, 2010* **(12pm-8pm)**	Take back our City: Opening Ceremonies	Started at Vancouver Art Gallery and marched throughout city streets to stop outside BC Place where Olympic opening ceremonies were being held	Organized by a coalition of 50 different groups. Including members of ORN. Attended by over 4,000 people. Touted as a peaceful family-friendly event. The march was the largest seen over the 2 weeks of the Olympic Games.
Feb 13, 2010 (8am-2pm)	2010 Heart Attack	Began at Thornton Park in East Vancouver, marched through Downtown Vancouver to bottom of Lions Gate Bridge the intended end destination	400 people attended the protest from a diverse range of groups, Black Bloc tactics were involved. A few large corporate businesses (Hudsons Bay Company, TD Bank) in the downtown core were targeted by some involved in the protests and their windows were smashed. Aim was to disrupt and clog Olympic traffic. The Lions Gate Bridge connecting Vancouver to Whistler was blocked for a few hours.
Feb 14, 2010 (12pm-4pm)	Women's Memorial March	Began at Carnegie Community Centre and took a route around the community back to the start	This march has occurred every year for the past 19 years. Not associated with anti-Olympic protests but attended by many of those who were involved, anti-Olympic organizing stood down for the day. March is held to remember and bring awareness to the number of missing and murdered women in the city.
Feb 15, 16, 2010 (12pm-6pm)*	Olympic Tent City	Began with a brief rally on the first day and involved the occupation of an empty lot in the DTES	A tent village was created by activists to highlight the need for social housing the increasing number of homeless in the city. The lot was occupied by activists and community members without homes for two weeks, other rallies and protests were held throughout to spread the message about the cause.

Table 3.2. Protests observed

Date	Protest	Where	What
Feb 28, 2010 (12pm-5pm)	Games Over Rally: Resistance Lives!	Began in downtown intersection near BC Place and travelled through the city stopping at several intersections for speeches. Rally ended at Olympic Tent Village for celebrations	This rally was organized with less than a week's notice and was attended by over 200 people. Organized to demonstrate ongoing resistance to the Games and a celebration that the Games were now over

The protest events identified by an asterix in figure 3.3 refer to those that I attended as a 'legal observer' (LO). This role was a voluntary position and was part of a larger effort organized by the British Columbia Civil Liberties Association (BCCLA) to watch for human rights violations by police officers, private security guards, and Canadian armed forces during protests at the Olympic Games. In the BCCLA training manual the LO is described as a "calm, independent, objective witness to the activities of security forces" (Eby & Price, 2010, p.6). When volunteering as an LO, I wore a bright orange t-shirt that made me recognisable to protestors and security officials who had been made aware of our purpose as neutral observers. As I was required to jot down field notes for the position, I was able to continue collecting data for my research observations.

I made the decision to volunteer as an LO for two main reasons. First, because I was not sure how safe the protest events would be to attend I felt that taking on this role would enable me to get closer to the action without compromising my safety, as the orange shirt distinguished me from protestors and enabled me to appear somewhat neutral. Second, putting my research interests aside, as a resident of Vancouver I was genuinely concerned about the protection of the civil liberties of individuals involved in anti-Olympic protests.

I was present as an LO four times during the protests and my shifts generally lasted for about six hours. LO's started and ended their shifts at a makeshift office in downtown

Vancouver. The office was run by a host of volunteers who provided materials, information, and off-site assistance to LO's heading out into the street. The office was locked at all times and we had to identify ourselves as LO's (and not police officers) before we were allowed in. This tactic was used to decrease the possibility of being infiltrated by police officers. The office contained confidential information that could potentially be used to criminalize individuals and BCCLA did not want police officers tainting the project. At the beginning of a shift, we would partner up with one other person and be given a run down with what to expect for the day ahead. The type of protest and the potential safety concerns in terms of where the protest was staged, how many people would be expected, and what police reactions might be likely were discussed. We wrote down an emergency number in permanent marker on our arms in case we were in need of legal assistance and we entered the street with one notebook, video camera, and still-camera between a pair. In our rucksacks, we carried personal identification, a cell phone, police misconduct reports, handkerchiefs, and eye protection to protect ourselves from any potential tear gas or pepper spray coming from the police lines. I never required this form of protection and to my knowledge the police did not use tear gas on protestors in the duration of the 2010 Winter Games.

Wearing my LO uniform I felt somewhat safer as I was identifiable and protestors tended to provide us with more room and expressed gratitude that we were there. Some police officers were respectful and one mentioned he thought we were doing a great job. On other occasions, I felt that the police did not want us there and they engaged in unnecessary behaviours such as taking photos of us close up several times, perhaps in an attempt to intimidate us. During my shifts there were no arrests and I did not have to make any reports on police misconduct. However, I did keep extensive notes on police behaviour and their interactions with protestors. This included any type of force used, inappropriate language, blocking traffic and escape routes,

and their overall demeanour. I was required to report on every incident of police surveillance encountered and this kept me busy during many of the shifts.

During the other protest observations, although I was focused on observing and recording field notes, my presence without an orange t-shirt at the protests made me unrecognisable as a researcher as I blended in with the protest group. To protestors, onlookers, and police officers alike I was perceived as a participant in the protest. This enabled me to experience how onlookers and police officers were framing me as a white, young, female protestor. Looking back I can see the benefits of observing the protests both as an LO and as a participant. Being an LO I was able to observe the action that was occurring from somewhat of a neutral, thus presumably safer position, whereas as a participant I experienced protest activities from more of an insider perspective. When I was present as a participant I attended the protest alone and interacted casually with other protest participants, but did not engage in extensive conversations with anyone. I kept to the edges of the protest at times when I felt uncomfortable and I could see that others would do the same.

Data collection consisted of keeping handwritten field notes of my observations and experiences of both the meetings/forums and protest events. I began each observation by recording details about the specific contexts, identifying the purpose of the gathering, general area of discussions (in particular for the meetings), approximate number of people present, and anything else deemed relevant. For example, the presence of undercover police officers at some of the events was a pertinent observation for my research. Immediately after each observation I transcribed the written field notes and expanded on them to further describe what had been observed. At this time I also engaged in personal reflections regarding my own perspectives of the situations and overall research process. The purpose of observational analysis "is to take the

reader into the setting that was observed" (Patton, 2002, p. 23). It was my aim to take an open-ended approach to everything I observed, as Lichterman (1998) maintained that during observations "nothing should be taken for granted and nothing should be assumed as uninteresting" (p. 100). In my field notes I worked to document everything as thickly as possible, including the verbal and non-verbal behaviours, emotions, and discussions.

There were times during the observations when I encountered challenges and questioned this approach to data collection. I had personally never attended a protest in Vancouver before and certainly not one associated with the Olympic Games. I did not know what to expect and was somewhat wary of potential safety issues. There was a lot of talk about police presence and potential arrests, and there were also warnings from police and mainstream media about potential violence coming from protest participants. I refer back to this in my findings section, where I discuss the framing of protestors as violent as being part of the dominant security logic that Olympic organizers operated under to legitimize the need for the overwhelming police presence at protest events.

Personally I was not overly concerned about individual protest behaviour because I had attended several of the meetings and there was no discussion of violent behaviours being organized for protests. For times where more confrontational actions were considered individuals were encouraged to go off on their own so others would not be forced to join in. Despite feeling this way before the protests, actually being present in a crowd of hundreds of people with lines of police officers surrounding the group with batons and machine guns, I must admit that I did fear for my safety constantly. There were no guarantees that individuals in the crowd were going to stay peaceful, just as there were no guarantees that the police officers would not use their weapons. Because I often stayed at the edge of the protests, there were occasions where I found

myself in direct contact with police officers who formed rows around the group. This made me feel uneasy because an accidental shove from one of the hundreds of individuals behind me could have sent me into their line.

These were some of the first times in my life where I did not feel safe under the police officers' gaze. I wondered whether they going to use their weapons? Who would they use them on? Why were they wearing armour? What are they preparing for? These questions continuously went through my head even though I knew I was not breaking any laws. There were two occasions where I personally was shoved by officers to move back and I saw more than several physical altercations occur between the officers and other protestors. For example, during the Saturday 'Heart Attack' protest I saw officers use their batons against protest participants in an attempt to get them to disperse. I am not sure how these batons felt, but the force that they seemed to use made it look incredibly painful and terrifying. Rarely did the police make eye contact or respond to questions asked by protest participants. There was one incident where I was required to move back by an officer and physically could not because I came up to a hedge with a one and a half metre drop underneath. When I told the police officer to stop pushing as I needed time and space to get down the ledge safely, he responded "sorry these are my orders" and proceeded to push past the hedge. I was not injured. However, the situation was disconcerting. My wariness of the police did not deter my attendance, although I did work to keep my distance at the times when it felt uncomfortable.

One safety aspect that I did not consider until I had attended a few of the protests was the reactions from the public who were out in support of the Games. For the most part, Olympic tourists kept their distance and simply watched the protest or quickly passed by. However, there were tourists who reacted in a negative and frightful manner. Often they were white males

dressed in Canadian hockey jerseys who took it upon themselves to berate the protestors. I refer back to these incidents in the following chapter. Most of it was verbal abuse, but it did generate some heated reactions from protest participants and I observed a few physical altercations between the apparent opposing sides. Perhaps because of my physical appearance as a white young female and because I did not react to the verbal abuse, I did not experience any negative interactions directed at me personally.

In terms of jotting down field notes during a protest, this was often just not feasible. It felt safer to have my hands free of objects in case of sudden movements in the crowd. It was also a reality that I had often been on my feet for up to six to eight hours and the energy to take notes seemed excruciating because my hands would be numb from the cold weather and the rain making it near impossible to write anything legible. Rather than writing I sometimes used my cell phone to type in keywords to assist in jogging my memory for writing notes when I made it home after the protests. When I did finally get home I made it a priority to sit down at my desk and recount the events and there were times I would go back to the notes the next day to provide more detail after I had slept on it.

Because of the number of meetings and forums organized leading up to and during the Game, there were many events I was not able to attend and others that I did not even know had occurred. While the number of events obviously highlighted the importance of this topic to protesters and gave me some encouragement in terms of the relevancy of my research project, the vast amount of information I was presented with was sometimes overwhelming. Because of this, I often could not figure out where my research fit in and what to take from these meetings. I struggled with questions like what was important for me to record. At the time I recorded as much as I could but I still could not cover everything that had been said or done. It was really

only after my observations of the protests and interviews with protest participants that I began to see the significance of being in attendance at meetings and other events. My insider knowledge obtained through these observations assisted in discussions with interviewees and perhaps also provided me with some credibility with potential interview participants.

Interviewing

Semi-structured interviewing is a common ethnographic technique that encourages study participants to speak openly and freely about their opinions and thoughts (Patton, 2002). These interviews also allow for the potential of unexpected data to emerge from perspectives other than the researcher's that can prove crucial to the depth of information gathered. Social movement researchers have utilized semi-structured interviews to gain insight into the perspectives of participants that may not be observable at public events held by these groups (Blee & Taylor, 2002; Chase, 2003). I engaged in six one-on-one interviews with participants of anti-Olympic protests during the 2010 Games.

Interview process. Initial contact was established via email with all of my interview participants. With each initial email I sent an official letter of information (Appendix II) and ethical consent form (Appendix III) via electronic attachment. After receiving confirmation of their interest, a time and location was organized with the participant for the interview to take place. Participants all chose their own locations and five interviews took place in cafeterias located around Vancouver, and one in a participant's office. The interviews were conducted between January 2010 and April 2010 and lasted 60-140 minutes in length. Before commencing each interview, I produced hard copies of the contact letter and consent form to allow the participant to re-read them if desired and this was also the time when the consent form was signed and questions regarding the interview and research were discussed. Because of the

potential sensitive nature of this research, I reiterated that it was not my intention to deceive interviewees, rather the purpose was to discuss some of the unvoiced experiences of the Olympic Games to determine the way in which protest participants were framing their right to protest in public space. I reminded them their rights as research participants that their personal information would remain confidential, and asked if they would mind being audio recorded. After receiving informed consent I began the interview.

Each interview followed a semi-structured interview guide but also remained flexible so participants could discuss what they felt was most important to them (Bryman, 2004). I began each interview by explaining why I became interested in this topic. I told them that I was of the opinion that perspectives of those involved in protests are important and need to be included in critical Olympic scholarship. I also made them aware of my own attendance at the protests. I felt it was important to provide this initial opening as I was aware of potential hesitations about speaking openly about protest involvement. At that time, undercover police officers had been following several anti-Olympic activists and their families, and my affiliation with UBC which was an Olympic and Paralympic Games host, could also have deterred some participants from being open. After I gave my opening statements, I asked the participants about their story of how and why they became involved in anti-Olympic activities. While the purpose of the interviews was designed to provide participants with the opportunity to express their opinions and experiences, I was often asked what my own opinions were. When questions were asked of me I was open and truthful in my replies, however, I often refrained from providing extensive comments to avoid influencing the interviewees' answers.

Despite my initial concerns, all participants seemed at ease during their interviews and appeared to speak openly and candidly about their experiences. As a result there were only very

few times when I had to work to encourage conversation to continue. Initial interview questions often prompted responses that led into further interview questions and I was able to pull from their own conversations if I required further elaboration. This style of interviewing helped to uncover more in-depth responses from the interviewees (King, 2004; Bloom & Vallee, 2005).

To close the interviews, I thanked each individual for their time and asked if I could contact them via email if I had any further questions. All expressed they would be willing to provide follow up information should this be requested. I also made sure interviewees knew they could contact me at any time if they had any further questions or comments they wanted to make. I emailed Chris after the Olympic Games with some additional questions to provide him with the opportunity to reflect on the protests as he was the only participant I interviewed before the Games were to begin. He responded with some further insights, which I included in my data. I have also remained in contact with one other participant regarding their experiences in the G20 protests that took place in Toronto in July, 2010. I emailed all of the participants early October, 2010 with additional demographic questions (information provided in Table 3.1). This was where participants received another chance to choose their own pseudonym for the project or to request to have their real name used. Two interviewees cited their willingness to keep their real first names and the remaining four were given pseudonyms.

Interview sample. Before I began the data collection process, I had intended to focus my research on members of a specific group identified as the Olympic Resistance Network (ORN). I knew from attendance at ORN organized forums and viewing their online website that they played a prominent role in anti-Olympic organizing at various levels, from educational forums to the development of media releases, and importantly, they seemed to be organizing most of the street demonstrations and protests during the Olympic Games. As I came in contact with more

and more people involved in the anti-Olympic protests, however, I realized that the level of involvement with the ORN varied considerably. From various media descriptions and observations from my own attendance I estimated that there were roughly 300 involved who attended more than two of the protests during the Games (including my interviewees) and another 1,500 individuals who participated in at least one of the protest events. However, participation in protests and attendance at their forums did not denote an affiliation as members of the ORN, despite supporting and engaging in their activities.

Knowing this, and because of other challenges encountered in obtaining interviewees as described below, I altered some of my initial requirements for participation in the research. Instead of just focusing on members of the ORN, I broadened my research participant requirements to participation in anti-Olympic protest events organized by the ORN. Despite this change the ORN is still important to this research because it provided the necessary context and history of anti-Olympics organizing and was instrumental in providing space for alternative voices to be heard. In addition, all of my interviewees, three of whom were members and three of whom were non-members, were well aware of the ORN and its significance in anti-Olympic organizing in Vancouver.

I began my interview recruitment process before the Vancouver 2010 Olympics by emailing five known organizers of the ORN using email addresses obtained from the public ORN website. These contacts received copies of the study's Letter of Information (Appendix II) and Consent Form (see Appendix III), and were encouraged to pass along the information to others involved in the ORN. Through these initial efforts, I yielded one interviewee who forwarded the information on to the ORN mailing list, which is when I received two other responses with requests to be contacted after the Games because this was a very busy time for

anti-Olympic organizing. For various reasons there were several protest participants and organizers who were unwilling or unable to participate in this project. Challenges included time constraints as many involved in protests had full-time jobs, families, and had little spare time for interviews. Some also cited their unwillingness to engage in an interview with an individual associated with the University of British Columbia, a capitalist institution that had contributed funds and support for the 2010 Olympic Games. While this was frustrating to hear, I understood and respected their concerns.

During the Olympic Games, as friends and individuals I met through attendance at protests became aware of my research, I received requests for my contact details from people who were willing to speak out about their involvement in anti-Olympic activities. I obtained five more participants through this process. The majority of my interview participants were white, middle class, and college educated. I was not able to deduce whether or not this demographic was reflective of the broader protest community but was cognizant (and some of the interviewees acknowledged this) that this demographic held a certain social privilege over other individuals who may not have been able to protest or speak with a graduate student because of time constraints and fear of being targeted by police (Grundy & Howell, 2001)   I had not intended to recruit participants in this manner and was concerned about the limitations this could put on the potential participant pool I would pull from. However, in speaking with the interviewees I felt comfortable with their participation in the project because my research questions referred to individual perspectives on logics and framing processes and there was no voice that would be considered more important than another. However, I do recognize that there are many perspectives involved in anti-Olympic resistance and also many individuals negatively affected by the 2010 Games who were not able to participate in the protests that I did not hear from.

During and after the Olympic Games, I continued my attempts to get in contact with ORN organizers, however, my requests proved fruitless. After six interviews and countless personal observations, it was clear that information was available to examine the research questions. Table 3.1 lists all of the interviewees with their chosen pseudonyms, age, gender, self-identified ethnicity, country of origin, years lived in Canada, current occupations, and educational backgrounds.

Table 3.3 Participants

Name	Age	Gender	Ethnicity	Country of Origin	Years lived in Canada	Occupation	Education
Chris	60	M	White /Jewish	USA	31	University Professor/ Research Scientist	Post-Doctoral Studies
Danielle	29	F	Metis/ Mexican	USA	25	Assistant Food Coordinator/Program Assistant	Degree in Criminology
Stevie	31	F	White	Canada	31	University student	College educated
Cayce	25	queer	Caucasian /earthling	'Canada' (denies legitimacy of the construct)	25	Grocery store clerk/union organizer/writer	BA (English/Women's and gender studies)
Myriam	24	F	White	Canada	24	Elementary School Teacher	B.A, B.Ed, M.Ed
Abe	23	M	Serbian	Former Yugoslavia (present day Bosnia & Herzegovina)	14	University Student	Bachelor of Human Kinetics

Interviewee backgrounds. The six interviewees were all involved in at least three of the protests that occurred during the two weeks of the 2010 Winter Olympic Games. Three considered themselves to be members of the Olympic Resistance Network (ORN), while the

other three attended the protests organized by the ORN as concerned members of the community. These six interviewees were by no means representative of the protest community, but their stories do represent some of the perspectives held by those involved in the protests. All of them had their own individual reasons for wanting to participate in the protests and below I provide a brief background on each interviewee. This helps to provide background information that explains how they framed their protest activities.

Interviewee #1 – Chris. I interviewed Chris a month prior to the Games. Chris, a 60 year old white male, had been involved extensively in anti-Olympic organizing and worked as a professor for one of the major universities in Vancouver. He had helped create one of the first groups during the bid phase of the Games that spoke out against the Vancouver bid and helped organize votes for the 'no' campaign for the plebiscite in 2003. He also wrote a book focused on some of the controversial aspects of Olympic Games organizing, both in previous host cities and in Vancouver. After the Olympics were awarded to Vancouver, Chris continued to engage in public debates and press conferences about issues surrounding the Olympics and had openly stated he was involved in protest planning during the 2010 Games. My interview with Chris provided considerable information about the background of the ORN and resistance to the Games and his perspectives on protest and public space. I had the opportunity to talk with him briefly after the Olympics where he reflected on the protests and shared some of his perspectives in hindsight of how the protests were framed during the Games.

I initially asked Chris how he became engaged in social activism in general and in the anti-Olympic organizing more specifically. He explained that he came out of the anti-globalization movement that was surfacing over 10 years ago. He took part in the anti-globalization protests at the APEC Summit in Vancouver in 1997 and later at the WTO in Seattle

in 1999. These protests prompted his interest and he became involved in the demonstrations in Quebec at the Summit of Americas in 2001 and most recently at the G8 Summit in Kananaskis in the summer of 2002. It was in Kananaskis that Chris and a few fellow activists started to hear about the Olympics. At this time he began to educated himself about the Olympic Games, how they were organized, what had happened in past host cities, and what could potentially happen in Vancouver.

Interviewee #2 – Danielle. I interviewed Danielle during the Olympic Games just after two major anti-Olympic protests had taken place in the city that she had participated in. Danielle, a female in her late 20's and a student at a university in Vancouver, was eager to discuss her background with me. She told me she had attended protests in and around Vancouver before, but described the anti-Olympic protests as nothing like she had ever experienced because of the heightened security response. She felt that protest serves an important role in resolving social justice issues when she commented: "When has any human suffering been alleviated through not having conflict? Only has there ever been consensus from conflict, you need to have the opposition, there is always opposition you need to have that."

Danielle explained she became interested in getting involved in Olympic resistance for various reasons. At her university, she had attended a class where she learnt and engaged in research about some critical Olympic issues. Danielle also volunteered at a women's drop in centre in the Downtown Eastside of Vancouver, which was where she really began to experience first-hand some of the changes to that community in the lead up to the Olympic Games. She described to me how it felt to work in the Downtown Eastside (DTES) during this time.

It felt like serfdom, like I was a serf, like everybody had been demoted to a serf, everybody was floating around like peasants nowhere to go, you were all just sort of pushed out and this is how we were told to go, I don't know I felt really like there was a huge gap between everybody else and us, like I had been demoted, class-wise and I had done nothing it was really bizarre, the women [at the drop in centre] felt it, they felt even lower than before.

It was the way in which police officers in the community treated the women [who attended the drop-in centres] that was a major concern to her.

They [the women] were all being stopped by cops and just asked to dump their bags on the street, with the cops calling them hey you and just not even saying I'm an officer just completely not identifying themselves, following them home, bogus reasons to come raid their room. I mean, just, you're walking too slow on the sidewalk, I want to ticket you, you're riding your bike, I want to ticket you, where is your helmet? I'm going to ticket you $145 fine for jay walking. She can't pay that fine. She's never going to pay that. Do you know how hard she has to work? A woman at [this drop-in centre] has to work to get that money? What she has to do to get that money? You know, she's going to be criminalized doing that as well, it is complete discrimination what they're doing. It doesn't apply to my neighbourhood, it doesn't apply to anybody else's neighbourhood it's specifically to this, it is social cleansing it's all it is.

These experiences had an influence on the way in which Danielle viewed the Olympics. After becoming more and more disenchanted with them, Danielle was determined to participate in the protests that would be organized against them.

Danielle attended the ORN workshops that were held the week before the Games were set to begin. She expressed her frustration of getting colleagues at the university to be as active as she was in anti-Olympics demonstrations. While she thought other students held similar views to herself about the Games and their intentions to attend the workshops and protests, Danielle was the only member of her class who ended up participating. She explained that she and her colleagues were discouraged from attending Olympic resistance workshops and protests by law professors who told them they would get arrested if they went:

They [the professors] told us if you go down there and make yourself present you could be criminalized. I tried to tell my professor I don't think any protestors have been arrested at this point, like so I don't see why they would take a student who is just at a hall listening to something. They [the professors] said no no if you want to be a lawyer or a police officer you don't want this on your record you don't want to be a part of it, it's a small world, people know people and you could be on camera, and so in the end it was just me that showed up, the other students got scared and that was it. It was over before it began.

Interview #3 – Stevie. The third interview occurred a few weeks after the Olympic Games had been held in Vancouver. This interviewee, Stevie, a white female in her early 30's, identified herself as an anarchist. She had just begun her first year of studies at a University in Vancouver working towards her Bachelor of Arts degree. She also worked for a labour union in Vancouver, where she described some interesting experiences with activism against the Olympics. Stevie requested that the union not be named because of her concern that her opinions could jeopardize her position in it.

I began the interview by asking Stevie how she became involved in protest against the Games and she explained that she and her partner have always been heavily involved in social justice:

We just started reading up in our own time, plans that were going to be going on we had intended on going to the Heart Attack march for the past two years the reason we wanted to was because we live in the city, we see the unbalanced distribution of wealth.

She added that:

The thing that people don't understand is that we don't have anything against the Games themselves but when you see this money being spent and people being shipped off because they don't want people to see them, that was our main reason for getting involved, just seeing the police oppression and corruption going on.

Her experiences working and talking to people in the DTES had an impact on her interest in getting involved in anti-Olympic movement. She also discussed the limits of being involved in the labour union as an activist and wanting to protest against the Olympic Games.

While the union had many discussions about their position in anti-Olympic demonstrations

regarding worker rights and had intentions of organizing protests and rallies during the

Games, a few weeks before the event began, Stevie explained that:

> The labour movement kind of became complacent and wanted to be silent because they wanted the employers they have deals with or are trying to get deals with, they wanted to not rock the boat. So I decided it was clear to me that I was going to have to break off and do everything separate from the union and I didn't have their support.

She said that there is only one other person she knew of who worked for the union and

participated in the protests against the Games.

Stevie spoke at length about the role of protests in Canadian society and the ways in

which people are often led into complacency.

> I think it is easier to bury your head in the sand and just follow the status quo and continue on thinking as long as it doesn't affect my little bubble then everything is fine. People would rather have somebody do the work for them, to have an opinion on something means you have to make a commitment and people aren't willing to make a commitment that might affect anything in their lives.

While Stevie was obviously very passionate about social justice and working for societal

change, she acknowledged that it is a slow process, as revealed in the following quotation:

> I'm an anarchist and in order for people to actually take that as a possible way of continuing our society is through changing minds, it is through education, and it is through people to come to that conclusion themselves, to force anyone to do that wouldn't be the anarchist way. It is slow but we can't just give up, nothing happens over night, the society we live in today didn't happen over-night. It takes a few to make change and keep it going so it is just about every time I meet somebody, friends, co-workers, whatever we just constantly enter into respectful debates. I think through debate there is always education from both sides and eventually just hopefully the majority will be open minded rather than complacent to oppression.

Interview #4 – Cayce. This interviewee, Cayce, a female in her mid-20's, had just

finished her studies at a university in Vancouver. She was now working full-time and

expressed interests in journalism and activist writing. Her partner also participated in this

research as an interviewee. Cayce spoke at length about her opinions and thoughts on the Olympic Games. She discussed the protests that occurred and her positioning within them. Unfortunately I have no direct quotes from her as the tape recorder failed to record and thus I was left without an exact record of our oral discussions. I did however, record field notes immediately after our conversation.

Cayce participated in several of the protests during the Games, including the Friday opening ceremonies march, Saturday Heart Attack protest, Olympic tent city, and the closing ceremonies march. She identified herself as an anarchist and mentioned that she had decided not to become a member of the ORN because she did not want to be involved in their politics. Rather, she wanted to demonstrate discontent with the Olympics and solidarity with other resistors.

Cayce had previously participated in protests, including several associated with LGBTQ[5] rights. She spoke about the large number of queer activists in the Vancouver community, but recognized that few of them chose to take part in the anti-Olympic protests. She felt that many involved in LGBTQ activism were still committed to bringing the queer identity into the mainstream and thus did not associate themselves with more radical perspectives. These groups worked at raising LGBTQ awareness within the Olympic movement rather than critiquing its role in suppressing it.

Interview #5 – Myriam. This interviewee contacted me via email after she had found out from a friend that I was looking to interview people involved in Olympic resistance. We met in a coffee shop and spoke for just over an hour. A white female in her mid-20's, Myriam identified

---

[5] Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender and Queer

herself as an anarchist, but she also admitted she only was starting to think in this way in the past few years. At the time of the interview she was finishing her graduate studies and worked as a teacher at a school in Vancouver proper.

While Myriam was involved in Olympic resistance during the Olympics, she admitted she had voted for the Olympic Games to come to Vancouver during the bid phase in 2003. She was 17 years old at the time.

> Funnily enough I think I was actually here and I think I actually voted for the Olympics so before things started happening I had no idea and frankly I thought like most people probably still do like oh it will kind of be cool it will be a sporting event...and the resistance movement at the time was very small and they weren't getting a lot of press or were just seen as like these you know activists who are just causing crap as they always do.

Over time however, her opinions and views of the Games evolved "the older I got and every time I would come back because I was living in Quebec, I would talk to people and I realised how awful it was going to be and then noticed what was taking place in the city and then I became more involved". Myriam went into more detail about why she became involved in Olympic resistance after her initial reactions to the protests.

> Before I had a greater analysis of it I just noticed basically what it was doing to our city and I noticed in the DTES the gentrification that was taking place and I was noticing that people were getting kicked out of their buildings, that condos were being put up and people weren't blinking an eye. The more I looked into it the more I realized how messed it was and then when you started looking at how much money was getting put into it and all the other things that weren't benefiting from it, it just didn't seem right. So it was like all of these social justice issues, whether it is about poverty, or homelessness, or you know like our schools or whatever it was like all these social justice movements that were coming together over all of these different types of oppression that were taking place.

In 2008, two years before the Olympics was when Myriam moved back to Vancouver and began attending Olympic resistance meetings and educating herself about the Games. She

spoke of being "enlightened" when realizing how "messed up it was". I ask her what led her to

actively oppose and speak out against the Games, she responded:

> I think part of it is working in the DTES, I think seeing what it is doing and what it did
> and what it is still doing to the community there and the people there. I met a group of
> people who I felt had really similar values as I did and through that came education
> and then kind of solidarity and a lot of things, I think both meeting people who shared
> the same interests as me, same philosophies and then also being there and being a part
> of the community that was being fucked over.

> As she spoke of her involvement in resistance, Myriam mentioned that she had changed a

lot of the past few years and that she has been "growing apart from a lot of the important people

in my life." For her, the involvement in the resistance movement was changing the ways in

which she viewed society and this is highlighted in one part of our conversation when she talked

about being an activist and what that means to her now:

> In the past I was an activist and now I wouldn't define myself as an activist. I would
> define myself as an anarchist that is the difference. I always went to a lot of anti-war
> protests and things like that but it was always about peaceful protest and it was more
> kind of like a hippy way of looking at and of speaking out. I think with the Olympics it
> switched. That's when it switched for me and I started looking at things differently
> and I was looking at resisting in a different way.

During the course of the interview, Myriam spoke of the challenges involved in negotiating her

shifting perspectives and values with those promoted at her workplace as an elementary school

teacher in Vancouver. In one example she explained the difficulties of attempting to host an anti-

Olympics curriculum workshop for teachers at her school.

> I was going to host a workshop at my school and somehow the media got a hold of it.
> It was front page of the newspaper, which said like teachers are brainwashing kids
> with anti-Olympic curriculums. I mean this workshop that was happening in my class
> was a workshop for teachers, the same as having a workshop after school for literacy. I
> would offer my space, it wasn't even like people were coming in to talk to my kids. It
> was for teachers. I was eventually told I wasn't allowed to have it. We had a two hour
> staff meeting where 65 of the staff members showed up and were like what is this?
> And why are we letting anarchists into the schools? It was just, the whole thing just

blew up and the media was all over it, the principal then made the decision not to have them in our school

When I asked Myriam if she implemented the curriculum in her own class, she mentioned:

> At that point I became really visible in my school as somebody who hated the Olympics and because there was another incident with red mittens where I refused to give them to my kids. So at that moment I decided that I wouldn't you know, I thought about things I could do in my class. I thought I'm not going to do it, it just isn't worth it. I mean I also got in shit when I didn't bring my kids to the torch ceremonies and other things came up so some families were upset.

These types of incidences at the school caused Myriam to rethink her career as a school teacher. She talked about her belief in anarchism, but had issues with bringing those values and perspectives into her classroom.

> I mean I've run into some issues because we have a community cop that comes into our school and I've basically told the cop just in my body language that I'm not interested in having him in my class but how am I going to explain that? Nobody is going to get that on your staff, none of your kids, none of your families are going to get that so you have it is just weird you feel like you are in a different world.
>
> ***Interview #6 – Abe.*** This interview was conducted several weeks after the Games.

Abe, a male student in his early 20's, had just finished his undergraduate degree at a university in Vancouver when I met with him. He immigrated to Vancouver from Eastern Europe in 1996 and he referred to his experiences there when discussing his interest in becoming involved in the anti-Olympic protests.

> For me it was just like I'm from the Balkans so we're all political people, so even though I'm not in political science in school I still constantly watch the news. I'm also very, I have things I'm against or for or whatever, like the homelessness issue is important to me, so that, from everything that was going around [to do with the Olympics] that kind of made me a bit angry, like females not allowed to ski jump. I'm from Bosnia, partly Serb, partly Croat, partly Bosnia so the whole idea of war and poverty, and class differences are very important with us. Like class issues and stuff like that is always in the back of my head.

Despite his clear opinion of the Games during the interview, similar to one of the other interviewees I spoke with, Abe admitted that back in 2003 when Vancouver won the bid to host the Olympic Games his reaction was quite different:

> I was here when they had just won the bid and I was very happy because as a 16 year old all I cared about was sports and girls, so sports would be coming and I was sure that tourist girls would be coming too so I was all for this but this was before I made morals and after that it wasn't so fun.

He found out about potential protest during the Games when he came across a 'Riot 2010' tag on public transit and one of his friends mentioned that there would be protests occurring, Abe mentioned:

> I knew that I'd go to one of these and then I saw it on facebook and the internet they also had a website 'No Olympics on Stole Native Land'. I kind of basically kept up with the website a good year before the Games I knew I was going to protest I just wanted to see what type of protest was going to be organized but I was sure I was going to go.

Abe had been to other demonstrations before, in Vancouver and also back in Eastern Europe, so participation in these anti-Olympic protests was not new to him. He attended the Opening Ceremonies protest and spent a couple of days at the Olympic Tent City demonstration. He had planned to attend the Saturday Heart Attack protest but slept in. In the interview he expressed some regret that he had missed it. For Abe it was important to know that he had participated in the protests:

> People basically showing that they oppose what you're doing, I know for a lot of people it was just the ability to express yourself that you are the opposition. It is a democratic right to do so. I think a lot for me personally it was important to actually do it just for me so I know that I have done it. Otherwise there would be no way to really oppose what actually happened. Like I can say I'm against the Olympics and don't watch any of it but the truth is if there was no protests and I just stayed at home and ignored everything for two weeks I wouldn't have felt like I protested at all. At least in this way I felt like I actually constructively opposed it, I actively did.

Despite Abe's own passion and involvement in sports he could not justify supporting

the Olympic Games because of what they did to the community. He spoke about the differing

opinions of his friends and family members and how he negotiated that when he commented:

> Most of my other friends were very pro-Olympic, I had some who were sympathetic to
> this, it was just that they had basically made up their minds before the Olympics and
> this was how they viewed it, there was no changing anything. Some people were
> sympathetic to the movement but thought there was no point to protest. They just
> thought I want to enjoy myself because this is a once in a lifetime chance. They were
> kind of like yea you go protest, I'll go party at the end everything will be fine. And
> then I have a couple of friends that are literally obsessed with the Olympics like it is
> their life they collect everything. They were very angry with me for participating in
> the protests, but I think everyone of course is open to whatever they want.

Secondary data

Over a one year period from March 2009 to March 2010 I utilized online media archives

(Lexis Nexis, Google), documents (Olympic charter, IOCC report cards, Vancouver 2010 Bid

Book, VISU, ICICS) and websites (www.olympicresistancenetwork.com,

www.olympicresistance.net, www.vancouver2010.com, www.olympic.org, www.iocc.ca,

www.bccla.org, www.bc.rcmp.ca) to gain further insights into how Olympic organizers and

protest participants were framing and re-framing the right to peaceful protest. Coles (1998)

reiterated the importance of considering framing as an interactive process when she described it

as a "discursive dance" (p. 371) that reveals the "causes and effects of social movement framing

content" (p. 371). Because I did not interview Olympic organizers public documents and

observations of public forums provided secondary data on the ways in which they framed the use

of public space for protest.

Lastly, I examined the website created by ORN members. Much of the research that has

examined framing of organizations and/or social movements has relied on the analysis of written

documents to uncover logics and counter logics (Benford & Snow, 2000). I made use of the

details from websites and media archives to provide a detailed overview of Olympic resistance in Vancouver, which offered a description of the development of resistance to better understand the social context in which my research was occurring.

Ethical considerations

Aside from obtaining official university ethical approval to conduct this research there were some other ethical issues that I had to take into account. Conducting research as a participant observer of the protests I had to consider the ethical implications that not everyone around me was aware that I was conducting research whilst observing. Furthermore, because of the sensitive nature of this topic and despite my good intentions the information obtained through this research could and may still negatively impact protest participants.

During the anti-Olympic protests I acted as both a legal observer and a protest participant and at all of the events I was present at I was also acting as a research observer. During the observations I attended as a protest participant, I was not visually recognizable as a researcher and very few people were aware I was conducting research. I was cognizant that this could have ethical implications as I may have been privy to information that could identify or incriminate protest participants without their knowledge. If I observed illegal actions what would this mean to my research? Could I include this in my research data and potentially implicate someone in the process? Was I legally bound to give evidence to police? These questions that I had were part of the reasons I decided to volunteer as a legal observer. Through participating in this program I was able to learn about my legal rights and had connections with BCCLA lawyers in case I was witness to, or involved any incidents that required legal attention. At no point during my observations did I require this attention. In writing up my field notes I worked to ensure that I

was not making protest participants identifiable, I did not focus on incriminating incidents and physically kept a distance from any if I were to be witness to them.

During my interviews, I was sensitive to the fact that interviewees may not feel comfortable giving detailed personal information. While the majority of my interviewees were confident that the activities they engaged in were legal and a part of their democratic right some were also wary that their participation in the protests could have negative implications on other aspects of their life, namely work. I have not named any workplaces or other identifying information in my document. I made the decision before conducting interviews that if interviewees discussed any incidences that could potentially incriminate them I would leave that out of my research data.

Despite my efforts at keeping protest participants anonymous and despite my own good intentions in engaging in this research I have been concerned that my research could have negative implications, not only to individual protest participants but also on the broader anti-Olympic protest movement. While I am personally confident that there is no information in this document that could be used to undermine protest participants I have to acknowledge that there are potential implications involved in writing about this protest movement that I did not intend.

Data analysis

Data analysis and data collection was a constant iterative process throughout my research. Initially, I analyzed texts as I gathered them. This involved the continual transcribing of interviews, writing of thirty pages of observational field notes, and the collection and analysis of secondary data from documents. This enabled me to identify relevant issues to reflect upon in subsequent interviews and observations (Sparkes, 2000).

To begin my analysis I transcribed the interviews and field notes into electronic documents in Microsoft Office Word. I read through each document several times to increase my familiarity of the data. I then adopted a qualitative content analysis approach to organize the data into meaningful themes. I went through all of the data and summarized every interview quote and field note into a relevant theme (identified by a keyword or short sentence). I did this by highlighting the specific quote and/or paragraph and attaching a comment bubble with the keyword. I referred to each as a 'data bite'. This was undertaken inductively as the themes came from the data themselves and not according to an existing framework (Patton, 2002). After going through all of the data in this way I then went back and grouped similar data bites together from the different interviews and field notes. This required me to combine the data into one document where I identified each interviewee with a number and each field note observation with a date under the themes and sub-themes that were emerging from the data analysis.

Through this process I identified broader themes that encompassed some of the more specific keywords that I had created. Because I was working through over 100 pages of data it felt like a fairly messy process because several data bites could represent various themes and I had a difficult time remembering what themes had already been created earlier on in the document. But after reading and sorting through the data several times I began to feel more comfortable with the groupings. In a separate document I wrote down all of the themes at the various levels to see if I could identify any major themes occurring or similarities between the themes that I had not been able to recognize earlier. This is where I utilized a deductive approach and I began to refer back to my research questions and the literature to see how these themes could be utilized to answer them. I decided to generate six overarching themes including: Vancouver Olympic context, Interviewee background, organizer framing, protest framing,

protestor challenges, and framing strategies. Because I was so familiar with my data at this point I began to see where the more specific sub-themes could fit under these overarching ones.

The first and second themes focused on providing the social context needed to discuss the background of 2010 Olympic resistance and interviewee backgrounds. I felt it was important to uncover these details as this is an under researched area and very little is known about who is involved in anti-Olympic protests. I found that through the quotes obtained from interviews and field notes a narrative started to develop around each of these themes. By utilizing these quotes and pulling from my theoretical framework I began to write my findings into a coherent narrative, linking back to the relevant literature when appropriate.

Researcher role

In qualitative inquiry, the researcher is considered the instrument of data collection (Patton, 2002). Because of this, the biases, values, and interests of the researcher inevitably shape the study. Therefore, it is important for me to be reflective about the role I played in the inquiry and to acknowledge my own "personal biography and how it shapes the study" (Patton, 2002, p. 182). The reader is invited to question "is there adequate self-awareness and self-exposure for the reader to make judgements about their [the researcher's] position" (Richardson, 2000, p. 16).

Reflexivity. I am a 24 year old white-European female from a middle class background. I have only recently become a resident of Vancouver since moving here from New Zealand. In the past, I was a fervent supporter of the Olympic Games. However, the focus of this research arose from my own concerns and critiques associated with the way in which the 2010 and other Olympic Games served to further marginalize groups and negatively impact those who want to protest against them. This concern evolved not only from my reading of past research, but also

from my own (albeit distanced and short lived) experiences as a resident of Vancouver over the past two years. Inevitably the findings of this study are shaped by my background, beliefs, and experiences which have continued to shift and develop during this research process. I recognize that this thesis demonstrates just one way of obtaining, analyzing, and interpreting the data at hand and my social positioning has influenced that (Miles & Huberman, 1994).

Throughout the research process and in this thesis I have worked to open up about my own perspectives and preconceived notions and have made a conscious effort to set these aside when confronted with alternative viewpoints. I have to admit that at the beginning of the research process, I was influenced by the framing of protest participants not only by mainstream media but also University professors and others close to me. When I initially proposed this project, I was made aware of the safety concerns and potentially violent protestors and law enforcement. This fuelled my own perspective of protest participants and reflected the common reaction to Olympic protest from those outside the 'protest-sphere'. As a result, because of these pre-conceived notions, in the beginning it was a struggle for me to feel comfortable attending anti-Olympic meetings. At the same time as this was happening I was also aware that protest participants are often framed in this way regardless of who they are and what issues they are concerned about (McCarthy et al., 1996). Therefore, I was hesitant to assume that each protest(or) was unsafe given that the motive behind these public demonstrations was often one in which I felt was important (e.g., protection of civil liberties) and in need of further critical examination.

Partly as a result of this early struggle, I initially wanted to portray protestors in a positive and peaceful light and found myself being concerned that I would come across findings where protest participants could be viewed negatively by others. For example, during the interviews, I

sometimes felt disappointed when participants cited their support for certain types of vandalism. I felt that this would limit a support or sympathy from readers and thus was reluctant to delve further into these areas. Looking back now I view my thoughts as somewhat naive and believe that I was attempting to buy into mainstream views of what a protest should look like. Having spent more time attending protests, speaking with protest participants, and immersing myself in that social context, I now view every different perspective as relevant and important as they are all socially constructed. Just because I do not sometimes understand a perspective does not mean I should attempt to cover them up in order to look 'pretty' for the reader. The theoretical framework I utilized for my research, aspects of which were based upon the notion that space is socially constructed and that there are always differing viewpoints vying for power over that space (Lefebvre, 1991), was a useful tool in my attempts at being reflexive. It highlighted that alternative perspectives are always present within space and it is sometimes only a matter of time before they become the institutionalized or mainstream perspectives. In the next chapter my findings are presented.

Chapter Four: Findings and Discussion

In this chapter I describe and analyze the ways in which the use of space was framed and re-framed by Olympic organizers and anti-Olympic protestors' based on my findings from interviews with protest participants, observations of anti-Olympic protest events, and various documents and websites concerning the 2010 Games. I have made extensive use of quotations from my interviews, field notes, and documents to both provide the reader with a more in-depth insight into Olympic protest, and to more adequately incorporate protestor voice which has been missing from much of the other research that has been done in this area. The aim of this research is not to create a generalizable narrative reflective of the 2010 Olympic Games protest sphere. Rather, I have considered a few perspectives from some protest participants and it is these that I draw upon in conjunction with participant observations and secondary data to address my research questions.

Five major themes emerged throughout the data collection process and they provide the overarching structure for this chapter. The first section *'context and background of Vancouver Olympic resistance'* emerged as a theme that was mostly derived from documents and websites. The section provides an overview of the history of resistance against the 2010 Olympics from the bid stage in 2003 to just before the Games began in 2010. As such, it describes the setting in which organizer and protestor frames and logics were developed.

In relations to the first research question, I uncovered three major logics utilized by Olympic organizers that impacted their framing of anti-Olympic protestors. A logic of Olympism justified the hosting of the 2010 Games, a security logic emphasized the need to control space, and sport and nationalism logic were engaged in by Olympic proponents to de-legitimize protestor activities. Protestors strove to re-frame these dominant Olympic organizer logics by

emphasizing logics of corporatization and civil liberties to legitimize their protest activities in public space and these findings address my second research question.

Rather than addressing each research question in order, the dynamics of framing dominant and counter logics are best discussed in relation to each other. As a result, in each of the four sections that follow the context and background each discuss: i) how organizers framed a dominant logic regarding the right to protest, and ii) how protestors re-framed that logic through counter logics, including iii) the challenges they encountered in doing this, which relates back to the third research question. To illustrate, the second section, *'Olympic organizers: Engaging in a dominant logic of Olympism'* touches on the Olympism logic utilized by organizers and goes on to unpack and question this by uncovering alternative logic of corporatization as presented by interview participants. The third section *'Violent and a threat to the safety of the community?: Organizer framing'* focuses on some of the ways in which 2010 Olympic organizers' reacted to the development of alternative logics by engaging in a security logic and framing those involved in protests as violent and a threat to the community. This section includes exploring how the civil liberties counter logic was adopted by protestors to challenge the security logic and to vie for power within public spaces. The final section, '*a logic of sport and nationalism: Creating the 'untouchable sporting event'* examines the ways in which the logic of sport and nationalism was utilized by Olympic proponents to dismiss protestor voices. This section also uncovers some of the unique challenges protestors faced in opposing this dominant logic. Throughout the chapter, I draw on the language of my theoretical framework that presented the Olympics as playing a role in a disputed space where there are conflicting views of how space should be utilized and who is allowed in that space. Utilizing theoretical concepts of framing and logics from SMT and OS

literature respectively these conflicting views are presented through the framing and re-framing engaged in by dominant and marginalized actors. As the results demonstrate, the dominant actors (the Olympic organizers), worked to protect and simultaneously create Olympic space as it is currently imagined while marginalized actors (protest participants) worked to challenge that. By examining the ways in which opposing groups are framing and utilizing different counter logics we can begin to uncover the way in which space is socially constructed in the context of the 2010 Olympic Games.

Context and background of Vancouver Olympic resistance

After the bid was won and as Olympic organizing got underway the consequences of hosting this event became more and more evident as various social justice and environmental groups began to make the link between the Olympics and the impact it was having and could potentially have on the issues they were advocating for. In the latter stages of 2005, resistance to the development of various projects in and around Vancouver were targeted by several groups. These protests were not explicitly anti-Olympic in their message, but focused more on stopping or mitigating the singular issues at hand. For example, in April 2006, different community groups staged a protest against the re-development of the Sea to Sky highway (connecting Vancouver to Whistler) through Eagleridge Bluffs, which was described as a unique wetlands habitat (Eagleridge Bluffs, n.d.). The concern was that the expansion of the highway through these bluffs would destroy native and non-native trees and endanger animal and plant life. Indigenous groups and other residents in the surrounding area organized a blockade in an attempt to stop construction. However, the construction company filed an injunction and activists were told to either leave or be arrested. At the protest and as part of their media campaign, these activists held signs that read 'No Olympics on stolen Native Land' and also made reference to

the contradictions of what was being touted as the 'environmentally friendly Games' (Zig Zag, 2010). Around the same time in Vancouver proper, advocacy groups such as the Pivot Legal Society and No One Is Illegal were staging protests against the gentrification of the Downtown Eastside, illegal evictions of low-income renters, and increases in homelessness. Activist groups were requesting that local and provincial governments invest in social housing units and create laws to protect residents from being evicted due to Olympic related gentrification of the area. The general message of the protests was heard by voices that chanted 'Homes not Games' on city streets. Protestors began to frame the Olympic Games as the cause of gentrification and environmental destruction in and around the city.

Between 2007 and 2009, resistance against the Vancouver Games grew as disparate groups and individuals realized they were all being impacted by the Games, as one interviewee described:

> It is interesting because every single organization that fights for a piece of some sort of social action in Vancouver all came together under this one umbrella of the Olympics and it is amazing how it affected every single organization. Every organization had a role to play in this if you were anti-fur, anti-capitalist, anti-slavery, anti-torture, anti-poverty they all had a role to play and it was pretty amazing that one topic did it. [Danielle]

Another interviewee spoke about the lack of follow through of the commitments made in the ICICS statement as a "miracle" in the sense that it bought these different groups together to resist the Olympics.

> The miracle that happened is the local organizers and the local governments simply jettisoned the things they had promised to get people on side for the games. As they jettisoned those promises more and more people began to question the entire enterprise and that created the basis for the Olympic Resistance Network. So what was created was a coalition of groups that had individually seen those promises made to them broken and began to see across their own individual interests that there was a larger picture. Eagle Ridge was not different in kind from what was happening in the

> Downtown Eastside, which was not different in kind from what was happening in other spheres. It was basically the powers that be had lied to the public in general to get the things they wanted and that created anger and a sense of need to fight back. So in some sense the whole Olympic Resistance Network is built on broken promises. [Chris]

This list of 'broken promises' created a sense of solidarity among different groups and as the interviewee explained this created the basis for what became known as the Olympic Resistance Network (ORN).

The ORN was a loose coalition of groups and individuals who worked to protest against the negative impacts of the 2010 Olympic Games. It became the primary organizer of Olympic opposition and "was based on a radical anti-colonial and anti-capitalist analysis" (Zig Zag, 2010, p. 14). Similar to anti-globalization networks it adopted a diversity of tactics as part of 2010 resistance organizing in an attempt to ensure different protest tactics would be respected. The network engaged in a wide variety of strategies in an attempt to limit and increase awareness of the negative impacts of the Games. ORN members maintained that protest was only one strategy used to raise awareness and help mobilise people, and added that they would stop disruptions and protests once they were given equal opportunity to speak to the public about the Games just as Olympic proponents were (Mullins, 2008).

Despite what seemed to be a growing opposition, the mainstream media and Olympic organizers continued to dismiss protestor issues, often framing them as hooligans and criminals (CBC News, 2009; The Canadian Press, 2008). It was also becoming clear through discussions in the media and those involved in the organizing that anti-Olympic groups were being framed as a security threat. Several members of the ORN and their friends and families described being followed and questioned by officers working for the Vancouver 2010 Integrated Security Unit (VISU). VISU was a unit created for the 2010 Olympics that

collaborated on security planning with VANOC and was responsible ensuring the safety and security of the Games (Vancouver 2010 Integrated Security Unit, 2010a). It was led by the Royal Canadian Mounted Police (RCMP) and had members from Vancouver police department, West Vancouver police department, the Canadian Forces, and private security personnel. Undercover police officers working under VISU had also been identified at ORN meetings and public forums that I was present at. This was becoming a reality for those openly critical of the Games. People were not just faced with visits from the police, but there were also several discussions of changes being made to city bylaws that would potentially affect the ability to protest in public space.

It is important to note that the ORN is but one coalition that was critical of the Games, several other individuals and groups who were not necessarily members of the ORN were involved in the anti-Olympics protests as well. As it became clear that civil liberties were being infringed upon and would potentially be restricted during the Games, more and more people came out to express their concerns. A forum I attended in September 2009 titled 'The Right to the City: Civil liberties and the 2010 Olympics' attracted a capacity crowd, over 400 members of the public. It was at this time that civil liberties arguably became one of the major counter logics for those critical of the Olympics.

As anti-Olympic organizing was growing in the lead up to the Games, it was becoming more and more clear the ways in which both Olympic and anti-Olympic organizers were framing the right to protest in public space. The next section focuses on how anti-Olympic protestors were able to develop their opposition by rejecting and re-framing the dominant logic espoused more generally by the Olympic movement.

Olympic organizers: Engaging in a dominant logic of Olympism

In all aspects of organizing and promoting the event, the 2010 Olympic Games fully embraced the institutionalized logic of Olympism as historically espoused by the IOC, the supreme authority of the Olympic movement. The 2010 bid book made claims that the "Sea to Sky Games are about endless possibilities of human endeavour and the unlimited reach of Olympic ideals" (Vancouver 2010 Bid Corporation, 2003, p. 3). Furthermore, it stated that "Vancouver OCOG [Olympic organizing committee] will create events that honour the athletes; that rejoice in the peaceful gathering of the world's peoples; that respect IOC protocols; and that celebrate the Olympic Movement in keeping with Baron Pierre de Coubertin's ideals" (Vancouver 2010 Bid Book, 2003, p. 127). After the Games was won, the mission of the 2010 Olympics as outlined on VANOC's website was to "touch the soul of the nation and inspire the world by creating and delivering an extraordinary Olympic and Paralympic experience" (VANOC, n.d.).

It is not a surprise that the Vancouver Games embraced a logic of Olympism to promote the 2010 Olympics, this logic is so intertwined with the Olympic movement that it arguably would not be the Olympics without it (Elder et al., 2006). At the same time, researchers have demonstrated that this logic, which the Olympic movement claims to stand for are a misrepresentation of how they actually operate (Black & Van Der Westhuizen, 2004; Elder et al., 2006). Thornton and Ocasio (2008) suggested that institutionalized logics such as these are often so engrained in how people operate in an organizational field that they become naturalized with minimal thought or critique. This helps to explain why Olympism continues to be utilized to attract an international audience and promote the Olympic event. However,

institutionalized logics are not immune to critique and despite their apparent dominance in space there is always opportunity to develop alternative logics (Mutch, 2009).

Corporatization: A rejection and re-framing of this dominant logic. In speaking with the interviewees it was clear that they did not view the Olympic Games through the logic of Olympism. However, they were well aware of this dominant logic and several expressed their desires that this be a true reflection of the ways in which the Olympic Games are really organized. Two of the younger interviewees admitted they supported the dominant logic of the Games when the bid first went to a public vote in 2003. They were both in their teenage years and were excited about the prospect of being a part of the international sporting event. However, as Olympic organizing got underway, they both became aware of the ways in which the host community was being affected and how this did not align with the espoused or official logics that the Games claimed to represent. Thus their perceptions evolved:

> The more I looked into it the more I realized that actually there was more to this than just this big event. They were actually kind of renovating the city and it was the biggest and one of the most powerful corporations of the world that organizes this event under the guise of a sporting event, which it is not. It is about money and making profit. [Myriam]

Other interviewees also challenged the dominant way of viewing the Games by framing them through a counter logic of corporatization, claiming that the Olympics were not just about sports or the athletes. Chris described the Games as "a corporate parasite, everything is for profit and the corporatization of public space, corporatization of society becomes the goal." He felt that the Olympics are just a symptom of the larger problem "no different from the sponsors RBC, Coca-Cola and McDonalds, the entities that do destruction around the planet and that subjugate people and make the governments of the world do the bidding for the profits of the

shareholders." It is with these opinions and perspectives that Chris became involved with the

ORN, not only educating the public but also in organizing protests during the two week event.

Danielle described how her work in the Downtown Eastside (DTES) in Vancouver really

opened her eyes to what the Olympics were really about when she said that:

> I really want to support the athletes I really do I just don't understand a lot of the
> things that have happened, like a 20 million dollar face lift to Vancouver only to a
> specific area not to other areas that could actually need it. [Danielle]

Abe also touched on his desire to support the athletes but how this conflicted with his

perspectives on the ways in which the Olympic Games are organized: "I try and be sympathetic

to it and supportive of it especially because I'm such a sports person. I'm very into sport, but I

personally couldn't see many of those things, I couldn't enjoy them." These interviewees felt that

the Olympic organizers used the current dominant espoused logic to promote the event, but did

so at the expense of other issues that were impacting the community. By rejecting this dominant

logic, these interviewees were able to view the Games through a different lens and thus present

alternative perspectives on the Games. Chris summed up his perspective of the Olympics by

saying:

> Do I really care about the Olympics? I don't but it is a vehicle the same way the
> Olympics have been used as a vehicle to deliver products and services for the IOC and
> for the local developers. But a tool is a tool and I saw it as a tool that we could use to
> deliver the countervailing message, it is a tool to show the opposite vision of what the
> world could look like, versus the corporate vision with which the IOC has come to so
> thoroughly personify. [Chris]

This quotation reiterates the argument that the ways the Olympic Games are currently promoted

by the organizers are not the only ways by which these Games can be viewed. Olympic

organizers hold power over how 'Olympic' spaces are perceived and shaped because of the

dominant logics currently associated with the Games. Anti-Olympic organizing presents a

challenge to the Olympic brand by rejecting these dominant logics and actively opposing them. The next section discusses the ways in which Olympic organizers responded to those actively opposing the Games by operating under a security logic and framing the anti-Olympic protestors as violent in an attempt to delegitimize their voices to retain power and therefore, control over space.

Violent and a threat to the safety of the community?: Olympic organizer framing

In this section, I demonstrate how Olympic organizers operated under a logic of security that was focused on protecting the espoused dominant logic of the Games. Utilizing this logic, organizers framed anti-Olympic protestors as violent and a threat to the safety of the public, and this worked to legitimize their need to retain control over space, thus potentially limiting the impact of these protests. Whilst still voicing a commitment to civil liberties, this logic reinforced the need for undercover investigations of potential protest participants, changes to public by-laws, the immense police presence during protests, and an overall sense of ensuring that the organization of the Olympic Games would not be impeded by those holding alternative views. While my research did not focus on obtaining the perspectives of the Olympic organizers, this frame came through strongly in public statements, in the media, and furthermore, experiences described by several of the interviewees and my own observations. This section is presented into three sub-sections, the first focuses on the development of the security logic before the Games began, and the second examines the security logic in practice during the actual protests. This third section examines the ways in which anti-Olympic protestors utilized the logic of civil liberties to re-frame the security logic.

Development of security logic: Leading up to the 2010 Games. In the lead up to the

Games, public statements made in the media by the head of 2010 Olympic security and

Vancouver chief of police created the idea that security officials would support peaceful

protest and that the civil liberties of Canadians would be a priority. The chief of police in a

media press release came out in response to concerns about potential suppression of peaceful

protest during the Olympics to say:

> I would like to make the record perfectly clear. Our goal for the 2010 Olympics is that
> they be safe, accessible and welcoming…we want the world to appreciate that Canada
> is an open and free society that places the highest values on the rights of the
> individual, not the least of which are the right to free assembly and speech. (Hume,
> 2009, para. 1)

Despite these guarantees at the same time both emphasized they would not tolerate violence

nor any other illegal actions, the head of Olympic security went on to state that he had reason

to believe that protestors were organizing violent demonstrations and claimed that this was

one of the reasons why the security bill was expected to exceed $1 billion (Bramham, 2009).

At a Vancouver City council meeting on July 8 2009, he stated that:

> I can assure council as I stand before you here today, that locally, provincially,
> nationally and internationally, there are groups that are considering or planning to
> engage in criminal protests during the 2010 Games (Inwood, 2009, para. 3).

> He used this 'proof' to justify the reasons why several anti-Olympic activists and their

friends and families had been followed and questioned by undercover police officers.

> During my first interview with Chris, before the Olympic Games occurred, he argued

it was the police officers themselves who would be most likely to display violent behaviors

against dissent, when he said:

> No one [in anti-Olympic organizing] is talking about anything violent and they never
> have and VISU visiting all of us thinking that we are violent terrorists coming to

destroy the city it's Bud Mercer's[6] fantasy…but there is nothing like that, the only violence that will happen in 2010 will come from the cops. [Chris]

Chris also felt that the framing of anti-Olympic activists as violent was perhaps a way to cover-up the underlying desire to silence dissent.

> What they are really afraid of is protest, the IOC [International Olympic Committee] cannot have protest it spoils the image, it spoils the marketing so that's what they are defending against, that for them is the security, they're afraid that someone is going to do a banner drop inside BC Place, they're afraid someone's going to have a messy demonstration in the street and two athletes are going to be late for their events. It's not really security, it's security theatre because real terrorism they can't stop, something really dangerous to people they can't even begin to stop. The only thing that this security is keeping us safe from is being embarrassed as a government, from the fact that there is dissent and ghastly poverty in the streets. [Chris]

In this quote, Chris challenged the security logic by suggesting that the security, which Olympic organizers were engaging in was not really about the ensuring safety of the public, but was rather about protecting the Olympic image by limiting the potential for alternative logics to be heard. Chris continued to dismantle the idea that anti-Olympic activists were a potential threat when he argued:

> They've [Olympic organizers] gotten to think that the threat is really from people like me and others who are like me that somehow may be, just possibly we could do something bad, and they've forgotten to go back to the basics and look at the assumptions all over again. Is there really a threat from these guys? Are they annoying? Yes. Are they going to say bad words? Maybe. Are they going to disrupt traffic? Could be. Are there TV cameras and is the IOC going to hate this to pieces? Yea. Okay, so what is the world going to see? Democracy is going to be seen in Canada, okay so what? Once you start defining this as a threat then that whole mentality of how you deal with threats kicks in, that's why you've got to visit people and tap their phones. Now you're locking into that security mentality which needs a $1 billion budget. [Chris]

From Chris' perspective, Olympic organizers had framed anti-Olympic protestors in such a way that their dissenting voices were considered a legitimate threat to the Vancouver community, but in reality, they were a threat to the 'image' and espoused logics of the

---

[6] Head of 2010 Olympic security

Olympics rather than to the host community itself. Zajko and Beland (2008) suggested that this is something that frequently occurs at international mega events when they found that the behavior of police officers at the APEC Summit hosted by the University of British Columbia in 1997 was not necessarily in response to increasing safety but was about creating space that was free of dissenting voices, this is what Chris referred to as 'security theatre'.

These findings build upon Lenskyj's (2000, 2002, 2004, 2008) work where she has argued that peaceful protest continues to be criminalized at Olympic host cities to put forth the image that dissent against the Olympic Games is limited. Unlike the Tlatelolco massacre where 300 protestors were killed a few days before the 1968 Olympic Games, there was limited physical violence apparent at the 2010 Olympic protests, however, it is clear that physical violence is not the only way to suppress protestor voice. Other critical Olympic scholars have also picked up on the framing of protestors as violent and argue that rather than accepting this logic, there is a need to challenge the large amount of security at these events (Horne, 2007).

During my observations of the meetings and forums attended and organized by anti-Olympic activists, it became clear that security was a major topic of conversation. While these people were well aware that they were being described as a potential threat to the safety of others, the activists spoke at length about concerns for their own safety. Despite agreeing that participation in protest discussions and demonstrations was not only protected under the Canadian Charter of Rights, but also an important part of a functioning democratic society, they were concerned about their own personal safety through their involvement in anti-Olympic organizing. One person, who was not one of my interviewees but an attendee at an Olympic resistance information session that I was present at, expressed his concern to me

about being arrested and assaulted by police officers. He explained that he had been assaulted by the police before and did not want to go through that again. At the same time he felt that he did not want to be intimidated into staying at home and was prepared to get his perspective across and to support the protest movement. Another person who joined our conversation found it odd that increased security was being described as making people safer, yet we were discussing how we felt increasingly unsafe. He finished the conversation by suggesting that it was only safe if you buy into the Olympic propaganda. The security frame was dismissed by many of those involved in anti-Olympic organizing as a scare tactic to potentially discourage people from participating in activities critical of the Games.

At a 'No 2010' forum I attended early 2009, there was discussion of anti-Olympic activists being followed by members of the VISU in the media, but I really could not gauge the extent to which this was occurring or the implications. I arrived at the forum, which was the first meeting I attended, a little late and sat down at the back of the small room, which had been cleared and filled with seats. Someone at the front was speaking about the negative impacts 2010 Games organizing was having on members of the community. I was sitting next to a white male middle aged male. He was wearing a baseball cap, which did not mean much to me at the time but looking back now I see that this identified as a trademark clothing item for undercover police officers. One of the organizers of the forum was standing at the back of the room went up to him to ask if she could chat with him outside. He did not abide by her request and stayed seated until the audience began directing attention toward him. They then stepped outside and engaged in a conversation. About two minutes later the woman stepped back in and the male did not return. During a break she explained to everyone that a member of the VISU had been identified and was asked to leave. This was the first time where I really

sensed the impact of having an uncover police officer listening to these conversations and it felt violating. This experience really highlighted to me, the ways in which dissenting against the Games was being framed as a security risk by those involved in Olympic organizing.

These tactics such as the surveillance of individuals before and during the anti-Olympic protests, the criminalization of individuals involved, and the delegitimizing voices of dissent all served to stifle protest before it entered public space. These findings are not unique to this type of event as several other researchers have discussed the use of these types of tactics in an attempt to ensure control is maintained by police officers during protest events (D'Arcus, 2006; Wahlstrom, 2010; Zajko & Beland, 2008). Engaging in undercover surveillance and questioning of potential protest participants mobilizes officers to gather more information about what is proposed to occur and also works to potentially intimidate individuals from turning up to these events. It also suggests to the broader community that protest participants are planning on engaging in actions that should be a concern to the police. Zajko and Beland (2008) described these as 'scare tactics' that work to covertly limit protest actions that give the impression that dissent was minimal.

Operation of security logic during 2010 Olympic protests. At the protests staged during the Olympic Games, there was an undeniably large police presence. Some officers were dressed in everyday police uniforms, while others were fitted out in full riot gear with shields and what looked like machine guns carried in front of their chests. Most officers who were not wearing the riot protective gear were on bicycles or horseback, using these modes of transport as a block between them and the public walking around them. It was estimated that six thousand law enforcement officers were brought in from around the country for security during the Olympic Games and there were also 4,500 Canadian Forces deployed in case of a

80

'security breach' (Vancouver 2010 Integrated Security Unit, 2010b). While security throughout the Olympic Games was not in place simply in case of protests, their presence during the demonstrations created an atmosphere where several of my interviewees mentioned they felt like they were being treated like criminals. One interviewee, Abe, even compared it to being in the war zone he had experienced as a child in Bosnia in the early 1990's.

> I actually saw a semi-armored vehicle, I can't describe what it is like, it is not a tank, it has got wheels like a car but it is mostly metal, it was used for public transport in Bosnia during the war. The last time I saw one of these was before I left the war, and now I see one the day before the Olympics start, I'm like what the hell? That angered me a little, everyone was talking about Olympism and I was like wow it is a bad de-ja-vu for me. I read earlier as well that they were setting up police on the top of buildings around the city and I started wondering they could be sharp shooters. Fun, I feel right at home [back in Bosnia] (laugh). [Abe]

Danielle spoke of an incident during one of the protests where she felt like she was being framed as a criminal when an officer asked her to drop her drink bottle as if she was going to use it as a weapon.

> There was a point where there was a police officer who just started yelling at me to drop my weapon, my water bottle?! I had heard of this, the literature where anarchists have wrote that police go on record saying that they had weapons and their weapons are umbrellas and water bottles and the public never really thinks because they use the word weapon and I'm just like really? My water bottle? My plastic water bottle? And my bare skin and black sweater up against your tear gas cannons, your masks, your protective gear, your knee pads, elbow pads, your gloves? You are a half-human cyborg and you tell me to drop my weapon? My dasani water bottle that I ripped the label off of? It took me a few minutes I honestly thought who put a weapon on me? Because I couldn't, I was so like what the hell are you talking about? And then I realize and I looked at my hands and thought am I holding a weapon? And I just dropped my water bottle and I ran. [Danielle]

The field notes I recorded during my own observations of and participation in the protests reveal some of my own reactions to the police presence and feelings in those moments:

It feels strange and odd to be involved in the protests surrounded by police officers, and having the sounds of helicopters flying overhead. While under normal circumstances I would feel safe under the guise of an officer, the way that they enclose the people involved in the protest, I feel like I'm on the other side, these officers are not here to protect myself, they are here to protect others from myself, it's a weird feeling and it is frustrating to know that this is happening and I know that I'm not doing anything wrong. May be I'm being sensitive but to me they are watching my every move just in case I do something wrong. They are constantly taking photos of me, which makes me feel a little uneasy. At the same time they look past me as if I'm not there, there is no interacting with them, I'm unimportant to them. [Field Notes]

During the Saturday "Heart Attack" protest, I found myself on the outside of one of the small groups who were demonstrating. Police had encircled the group, which meant that even had I wanted to I could not join the demonstration as it was enclosed by lines of police officers. Standing on the outside I would occasionally see a glimpse of a person with a placard through the gaps in the bodies of police officers but it was difficult to see what was actually occurring in the demonstration. Because of the way in which the law enforcement provided 'protection' it was incredibly difficult to understand why the demonstration was going on in the first place. This presented the idea to both outsiders and those involved that these people were engaging in illegal activities and the voices of the protestors were effectively lost.

These findings complicate the simplistic notion that public space is a space where social movements are able to make themselves politically visible to others (Mitchell, 1995) there are many other factors involved that limit their visibility. Even though individuals were able to access some type of public space to express alternative perspectives it was very much controlled by those operating under the security logic as they held the power in that space. Because the aim of protest is arguably to challenge the dominant order of how space is utilized (Miller, 2000), the fact that the authorities maintained control of how the protests evolved suggests that the impacts of the protests were being limited. Other researchers have also discussed the ways in which police erect boundaries, block certain streets and direct protest traffic enables them to maintain

control over how that space is represented and determine how alternative perspectives were received in public (D'Arcus, 2006; Sewell, 2001; Wahlstrom, 2010). The framing of those involved in protests as criminals and as threats to the safety of others justified the actions of the police officers and Olympic organizers to engage these in protest control tactics. Protests at other mega events, in particular those involved in alter-globalization protests are also often framed as violent (Fernandez, 2005), despite as Starr (2006, p. 62) argues "a glaring absence of contemporary violence" present at the protests. The implications of security behaviours was not lost on the people involved, as demonstrated in the next section they engaged in counter-framing the security logic to justify their protest actions.

Civil liberties: Re-framing the security debate. Despite the challenges presented by the framing of anti-Olympic protests as a security and safety threat, anti-Olympic advocates and activists worked to re-frame this debate in an attempt to get their perspectives heard. One of the major logics that was used to counter the increased security and attempts to restrict freedom of movement is what I refer to here as the 'civil liberties logic'. This institutionalized counter logic has legitimacy as it is connected to the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms that supports the rights of citizens for freedom of expression in public spaces. I present my findings about this counter logic in three sections. The first *'re-framing the security logic as restricting the legal right to protest'* demonstrates how the notion of civil liberties and rights were used to argue that protesting against the Olympic Games was not only legal but was also constitutional right of individuals and groups living in a democracy. Next, I look at the *'rejection of the security logic in action'*. This section focuses on the ways in which some protestors covered up their identities as an act of defiance against security procedures that were used to identify them. The last sub-section *'protecting re-claimed space'*

uncovers some of the ways protestors protected the spaces that they occupied from being taken over by actions linked to the dominant Olympic security logic.

Re-framing the security logic as restricting the legal right to protest. Chris spoke at length about his and anyone else's right to protest in Canada. He rejected any idea that those operating under the dominant logics of the Games could control where, when, and how people can protest during the Games, yet he was still concerned and convinced that they would attempt to do so. Chris launched a lawsuit against the local government to ensure that a new bylaw enacted by the City would not be used to interfere with his right to raise a placard in public space. The by-law was passed through for the Olympics supposedly to ensure that ambush marketing could not legally occur on the streets during the Games. However, many civil liberties advocates (including Chris) saw the potential for it to be used by officials to make it illegal to hold a placard in protest against the Olympics. The British Columbian Civil Liberties Association (BCCLA) provided the lawyers who worked on Chris' case and they were able require that the City amend the by-law to ensure that the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms would not be infringed upon. In Chris' words:

> Any place in the city that is public domain belongs to me, belongs to you, and to anyone else and if I want to raise a placard to have my words heard then I will do that. If you don't use your civil liberties then you will lose them, that is a guarantee from history and so we are going to exercise our civil liberties in ways we think we are allowed to do as free human beings and as members of this society. [Chris]

When organizers publicly announced their willingness to work with anti-Olympic activists in terms of organizing protest routes and spots during the Games, Chris reacted:

> I just reject that thesis that we need to discuss our plans with them. We don't need their permission, I'm not going to ask the police who essentially should be serving us for permission to do what I think I have the right to do. I do not need to discuss it with them. [Chris]

These sentiments were echoed by others involved in protest organizing. At the public forums I attended before the Games began, speakers often reiterated the problematic tendency for Olympic organizers to operate in ways that negatively affected the civil liberties of those with opposing views. They also emphasized that it was important for citizens to continue to exercise and fight for their civil liberties because security operations had the potential to not only restrict those rights during the event, but may also introduce new laws and security procedures that would continue to restrict those rights after the Games. These discussions thus framed the Olympic Games in such a way that viewed the actions of Olympic organizers and security not in terms of protecting the safety of individuals, but rather as actions that restricted the rights of individuals.

In accordance with previous Olympic host cities, the Vancouver Games saw the development of protest zones for protest outside Olympic venues. VISU named these zones 'optional safety assembly areas' and attempted to engage with the civil liberties logic by framing the construction of these areas as demonstrating their commitment to freedom of expression whilst striking a balance with the 'celebration of sport'(VANOC, 2009). However, much of the public rejected these sentiments and re-framed these designated areas as restricting civil liberties and access to public space to accommodate the International Olympic Committee (IOCC, 2010). To my knowledge none of the 'optional safety assembly areas' were recognized or utilized by anti-Olympic protestors during the Games. Chris explained: "I think we were unified in this that there is no such thing as a free speech zone, in our country everywhere is a free speech zone." Utilization of the civil liberties logic was successful in ensuring that protest was not restricted to officially designated areas during the 2010 Olympics.

As I attended anti-Olympic forums in the lead up to the Games it became clear that the civil liberties logic was being used to attract individuals and groups to join and/or support the protests. To protest against the Olympic Games was no longer limited to those inherently against the Games themselves, but also by those involved who were simply concerned about the restrictions being made on the institutional logic of the right to freedom of expression. My interviewees also discussed this frame in terms of their own participation in the protests.

I asked Abe what he thought was the purpose of protesting and he responded: "I know for a lot of people it was just the ability to express yourself that you are the opposition it is kind of a whole like democratic right to do so." Danielle utilized the civil liberties logic when referring to a police officer's request for her to move in public space. She explained that she had arrived at the opening ceremonies protest early which was set to begin outside of the Vancouver Art Gallery. In this area the Olympics countdown clock had been erected and tourists were taking photos of the clock at the time. She recalled:

> I was wearing the t-shirt that had the Olympic rings with the sad faces on it and I decided to stand right in front of the clock to expose that everybody that took a picture would have me in it. A police officer came up to me and said would you mind moving? And I said I would mind moving. I don't want to move, everybody else is standing here, and he said do you realise what you're wearing and I said oh yea. He's [the officer] like got no leg to stand on. It's public space. I'm allowed to stand here, the person from VANOC is allowed to stand here, the German tourist is allowed to stand here, the Surrey girl [I] can stand here. [Danielle]

Although Danielle was aware that the police officer's request was not something she had to lawfully abide by, she acknowledged that many people would concede to the request simply because they are not aware of their rights and assume that police officers operate within these rights. She went on to say:

> I think especially in Canada you're raised to always answer a police officer, always do what he says. Always, you know just from a very young age, to go against that is just

complete astonishment from all ends people are just looking at you like why aren't
you doing what he's telling you to do? [Danielle]

People involved in organizing the Olympic protests worked to ensure that attendees were

educated about their rights to avoid situations where officers could potentially take advantage of

their perceived power over community members. At several of the protests I attended, I was

handed pamphlets by protest organizers outlining my legal rights and what I should do if

confronted by a police officer. When I attended the protests as a legal observer, my specific job

was to ensure that the civil liberties of protestors were being protected. As legal observers we

were part of the counter-framing that challenged the dominant logics of Olympism and security

by protecting the right for alternative logics to be present in public space.

Rejection of security logic in action. Some interviewees and others engaged in the

protests demonstrated their rejection of the security logic not only by discussing their rights as

free citizens but also by physically making themselves unrecognisable during the protest events.

Three of the six interviewees and another few hundred of the protestors chose to cover

themselves in black clothing from head to toe, a tactic commonly referred to, and associated with

'black bloc' tactics. These tactics have been seen at many other protest events throughout Europe

and North America (Starr, 2006), although have not often been seen at other protests staged in

Vancouver. While not all of my interviewees covered up during the protests, they all expressed

their support for those who chose to do so. Having always been on the outside of this protest

tactic myself, listening to the interviewees perceptions on covering up helped explain another

approach to countering a dominant logic.

Abe was one of the interviewees who covered up during the Friday night protest. He

explained:

I definitely covered up, not because I was planning to be violent or anything like that, but they put up 900 cameras. If anything it is my own personal way of opposing. If you can spend that much money on 900 cameras and I can still not give my identity then I won't. If you go up against dudes with machine guns I think a scarf is fair enough. [Abe]

I could relate to these sentiments, I personally felt uncomfortable and quickly noticed the presence of cameras and other identifying devices during my observations of the protests. The number of police officers walking around with cameras attached was often overwhelming. The purpose of these video cameras was not immediately clear to me, but I did know that every movement I made was caught on tape I was identifiable, they could use this as evidence for any behaviour that I engaged in. After this experience, I could definitely sympathize with people who wanted to cover up, not just to protect their identity but as an act of resistance to the police wanting to know their identity.

While the interviewees highlighted that covering up was used as a tactic to make it more difficult for security to identify them thus making them feel safer. They also recognized that they were taking risks in covering up. Stevie explained that protestors covered in black from head to toe were being targeted by police because "they don't like autonomy, they don't like anonymous anything." Danielle also spoke about anonymity in terms of giving the protestors' some power but at the same time creating violent reactions from police officers.

The power of being anonymous in the group really frightens the police, I challenge anybody to put on a black mask and join a group. Violence will rain down on them like they have never known before, it changes the way you look at the state forever. For the police not to be able to identify you they find super threatening. [When you cover up] there is this weird barrier because the police see you as something completely different, because in a mask if you are built a certain way they don't know if you are a man or a woman and that really freaks them out. They are trained to see your face, to identify, to go off your physical queues, body language and if they can't see any of that they just go through this weird panic mode they just blow everything completely out of proportion. [Danielle]

The rejection of the security logic by covering up their identity enabled protestors to obtain some power in public space, albeit for the short period of time. The reactions from police officers demonstrated their attempts at limiting this power by framing those as covered as violent and a threat to security. In public statements made to the media, VISU framed those who covered up as criminals who had infiltrated the peaceful protest and they suggested this signalled a split in the protest movement (Wintonyk, 2010). This framing legitimized the increasing repressive behaviour toward protestors as it suggested to the public that protestors were unable to control the demonstrations themselves. Despite these reactions from police officers, Danielle felt that it was just as much the protestors' right to evolve their tactics in the same way that security had in terms of their ever developing 'riot' gear they wore at the protests and demonstrations:

> It was absolutely insane how they [the cops] were covered. I don't feel as though we should have even met that opposition but it's come to a certain point in time that that is just how it has to be. It is how protest has evolved in the same way that military regimes have evolved, the police have evolved in the same way, but why can't people evolve in that way? And join together and be somewhat organized? [Danielle]

My findings suggest that covering up during protests has been utilized by individuals to reject the security logic as touted by Olympic organizers and to practice and engage in their legal rights as individuals to protest against the need to identify and profile those choosing to attend protests. Oliver and Myers (2003) discussed the actions of social movements in a way that highlighted the need for these movements to co-evolve with the ever changing environment around them, including security tactics in order to regain power within space.

Protecting re-claimed space. One of the concerns reiterated by interviewees, which was also discussed at length at public forums and in the media was the conversion of public space to 'Olympic' space. This made it difficult not only for individuals to legally occupy those spaces to engage in protest, but also transformed them into what was represented the dominant and

espoused logic of the Games leaving little room for alternative perspectives. One of the

interviewees, Myriam, spoke about how she reacted to people who attempted to voice their

opposition to anti-Olympic protests during the demonstrations. During the Friday opening

ceremonies protest outside the Vancouver Art Gallery, she explained:

> There was a guy who had a sign that said 'you say protest I say party' and I just went up to him and grabbed his poster and ripped it up and he was like hey, I have the right and I said no actually I'm not going to give you that right, right now. You guys own this space and so for once this is our space so I'm not going to give you that privilege right now. [Myriam]

Another evening Myriam was occupying the street outside 'Olympic Tent City' and there was

another incident with a passer-by.

> We were taking the street outside tent city and this guy came and he was loaded and was leaning over this other guy's face in our group, we were just sitting so I turned around and was like what the fuck are you doing? And he was like hey I'm talking and my friend was like no you're not you're in this guys fucking face what is your problem? And then there was this confrontation and he was like I'm allowed to be here too, freedom of speech and stuff, and again I told him well actually you're not, we have a block and you have the rest of the city so like you know you need to get the fuck out of here. [Myriam]

Myriam promoted and fought for the right to engage in freedom of speech in public

spaces but also realized that freedom was not equal because some were privileged over others. In

her view she needed to protect the spaces in which people were citing their opposition to the

Games, as others who supported them already had the opportunity to do so wherever they go

within the city. This utilization of space represents an example of how resistance to the dominant

order can arise (Soja, 1996; Sewell, 2001), where the protestors engage in actions to maintain

control over the space they occupy by attempting to disallow carriers of the dominant logic of the

Games into these spaces.

Logic of sport and nationalism: Creating the 'untouchable sporting event'

My findings suggest that the dominant logics associated with the Olympics presented some unique challenges involved in protesting against them. Working within the dominant espoused logic of Olympism were two specific logics of sport and nationalism promoted and adopted by Olympic supporters and organizers alike that were used to dismiss anti-Olympic protestors. Under these logics, to protest against the 2010 Olympic Games suggested you were anti-sport and anti-Canada, and to be framed in this way was viewed as a moral indignation. This logic was so closely tied to the Olympic Games that interviewees believed much of the public failed to notice or critically examine the potential negative impacts that hosting an Olympics would entail. Abe spoke to this point:

> To me it seemed like the biggest part of the population did not really see the protests to be legitimate in some ways. During the Olympics you had this whole like Canadian nationalism being promoted which I've never experienced. This was new. It was this whole connection of everything good would be celebrated as Canadian, connect everything good from the Olympics with Canadian values and then at one point it was like the Olympics and this whole Canadian nationalism was so connected that it was basically like if you protested against the Olympics you were just anti-Canadian. It didn't matter if you were anti-Olympics because you loved Canada and maybe you oppose what you think it is going to do to it. You just became anti-Olympics because you were anti-Canada. [Abe]

This statement suggests that these frames generated by Olympic proponents worked to delegitimize the protests in terms of how the general public viewed them and thus enabled them to retain the Olympic image and control over space. Myriam explained:

> In Vancouver everyone was on board. Everyone was in this zombie state walking along with these red Olympic mittens and quatchi, and just like dressed in Canada red and white and it was just gross. It was like everyone was on crack for two weeks or something and nobody was paying attention. [Myriam]

These positive links to nationalism and sport made it difficult for protestors to breakdown the dominant logic associated with the Games, they even spoke about their own conflicting

interests in wanting to support these logics, but realizing that in reality this was not what the Olympics represented. As Abe explained earlier: "I try and be sympathetic to it and supportive of it especially because I'm such a sports person, I'm very into sport but I personally couldn't see many of those things, I couldn't enjoy them."

During the 'Games Over! Resistance Lives!' protest on the final day of the Olympics, I personally encountered some of the reactions from onlookers and Olympic tourists who immediately branded the protest as both anti-Canadian and anti-sport as an excerpt from my field notes revealed.

> When we (the protest march) started getting closer to bars and the downtown core of Vancouver, more and more Olympic tourists were taking up space and noticing the presence of the march. The Canada versus USA men's hockey final was occurring at the time of the march and you could tell people were watching it in their condos up above us, Canadian flags were flying everywhere and many people were dressed in red colours. I could hear several people jeering at us up above. They had come out onto their patios to see what the noise was and recognising it as a protest they seemed to get upset. I heard several people yelling 'fuck off' 'get a job' etc. One person from above us threw a can of beer, luckily it missed any heads. Without knowing what the protest was about, caring what is was about these fans screamed and shouted at the march – calling protestors 'anti-Canadian', abusing them for not being supportive of the hockey team and ruining the Canadian image, told to stop whining and get a job, several took the protest extremely personally. One man suggested that he should not have to deal with this protest, he'd worked every single day of his life he did not deserve to have to go through this. [Field Notes]

One of the interviewees who was also present during that protest spoke about her own experience:

> Everyone dressed in Canadian China sweatshop made jerseys were bucking up their chests and getting ready to brawl, basically we were chanting 'we like hockey, we hate the state' I mean it is nothing against the sport itself but nobody will listen to that or refuses to even understand that. When they're yelling at you to get a job how is that relevant?" [Stevie]

These findings suggest that sport and nationalism became a part of the institutionalized logic of the 2010 Olympic Games, and for many it overrode the rights and civil liberties of

individuals who were engaging in alternative logics. If you were unable or unwilling to adopt the dominant logic, you were often framed as anti-Canadian and anti-sport, which, as the reactions from Olympic supporters suggested in the context of the 2010 Olympic Games caused a moral concern.

Vancouver 2010's use of these symbols is not unique as there has been much discussion by previous researchers about the use of nationalism and civic pride to generate enthusiasm around hallmark events such as the Olympic Games (Tufts, 2004; Waitt, 2001). While it has generally been referred to in terms of creating collective identities amongst the host community to produce strong support for the Games, this research was able to demonstrate how the use of these symbols directly impacts the counter-framing of those critical of the Games. Furthermore, it could be argued that the production of a collective logic does not necessarily have to be fully achieved to be able to exert control, but rather what seems to be occurring here is the delegitimization of those who present alternative logics. Waitt (2001) briefly spoke to this when he suggested that Sydney Olympic organizers implied an absence of activism and thereby reinforced the development of a collective nationalistic logic by exerting their social control over the planning processes and the media at the time.

While interviewees discussed the challenges of being involved in anti-Olympic protests, they also did not accept that they were inherently part of the way in which Olympic protests were to be perceived. That is, they recognized the role of the media, the current power and organization of the Games, and the IOC as perpetuating and encouraging these perceptions and reactions. Stevie spoke to this when she said: "When you have one particular news outlet that has complete control over anybody else, however they choose to spin, is how the story is going to be told." Danielle also spoke about the role of mainstream media when

93

she mentioned that: "The media framed the protestors as hooligans just out to breach it, they [the media] definitely had filters over things." Abe shared his point of view, when he commented that the media played a role in connecting the Vancouver Olympics with Canadian nationalism. In his opinion:

> I thought the media played a big role in [delegitimizing protests] because before the Olympics it was like there are a certain amount of people that are going to oppose the Olympics, and then during the Olympics you have the whole like Canadian nationalism going on and suddenly everyone is changing their minds about protesting. [Abe]

Carragee and Roefs (2004) argued that journalistic framing does not operate in a political vacuum but rather is shaped by the framing engaged in and around them.

Struggling to re-frame the dominant logics. While interviewees utilized a corporatization logic to re-frame the dominant and espoused logics associated with the Olympic Games, they also recognized that the corporatization of the Games was part of the ways in which the Olympic movement had garnered so much power and control in our society. They discussed the difficulties of protesting against that and impacting any kind of change. Danielle provided me with this insight:

> You're going against people that are corporate images, they're defending capitalism, a capitalist state. You're going against much more than just a person, you're going against a lifetime of ideology that has been doctored into them, into both the Olympic organizers and followers. The arguments they give you are just so vague and you can't attack them properly, they start losing sight and it's just easier to get lost in the argument over why I'm here and why you're over there [Danielle]

> Abe spoke about the fact that it has come to the point where everything at the Olympic

Games is treated as a commodity, and unfortunately protests were not even exempt from that:

> I have a feeling that when we walked through [the city during a demonstration], the tourists took pictures to show them to people and put them on the internet to say, look protestors! It was an event for them, like oh happy it is practically like part of the

Olympics, like pretty much scheduled but free! Other than that I don't think the tourists cared about the protests.

The reality is that the dominant logics the Olympic Games operates under as an event promoting peace through sport limits any kind of debate or critique against it.

From the perspectives of interviewees, the use of sport, nationalistic pride and notions of Olympism was a way for the event to obtain support to further their corporate agenda.

The Olympics are not what people see it as, they see it as a wholesome fun sporty thing and it's not, it is about branding and it is about mass displacement and just covering up poverty, oh it is horrible. [Danielle]

When I asked my interviewees what they thought it would take for change to occur in the way in which the Olympic Games operated, they drew from the corporatization logic, because to them this is what the Olympics represented. Abe concluded:

It appears that money is the only important thing to these people in power so when it seems like things are going to start to lose money I think is when they'll be like okay we have to change this. [Abe]

By examining the ways in which different groups frame and utilize different logics this research has uncovered how space was being socially constructed in the context of the 2010 Olympic Games. This is discussed further as I bring my research findings to a conclusion and develop recommendations for future research in the final chapter of my thesis.

As indicated throughout this work, my research has sought to explore the ways in which the right to protest in public space was framed and re-framed by Olympic organizers and anti-Olympic protestors in the context of the Vancouver 2010 Winter Games. From the start, I have demonstrated that the ways in which the Olympics are currently organized leaves little room for alternative perspectives to evolve (Hiller, 1998; Horne, 2007; Lenskyj, 2000, 2004; Milton-Smith, 2002). I argue here that the findings of this research builds on this body of work on critical Olympic scholarship. Utilizing three theoretical concepts: the social construction of space, framing processes, and institutional logics, this research aimed to understand the ways in which anti-Olympic protestor perspectives were repressed by Olympic organizers by interviewing protestors, observing protest events, and analyzing various documents and websites. In this final chapter, I summarize my findings and discuss the contributions to the literature. I then provide recommendations for future research and practical recommendations before ending with my concluding remarks on this study.

Summary

Viewing public space as socially constructed enabled this research to move beyond the dominant ways in which the organizational field of the Olympic Games is conceived and uncover some of the marginalized voices that operate within it. Through the use of the concepts of framing and institutional and counter logics, the research demonstrated that this organizational field was a contentious space where challenges to and protection of power and control were consistently performed and contested.

With a focus on the issue of the right to protest in public space during the Games, the findings suggest that the framing of institutional and counter logics was a reiterative social

process that occurred back and forth between dominant (Olympic organizers) and marginalized (anti-Olympic protestors) actors to legitimize and delegitimize different spatial practices. In relation to the first research question the findings revealed that Olympic organizers engaged in three dominant logics that influenced their framing of the issue of the right to protest. The logics of Olympism, security, and sport and nationalism all worked to protect the power they held over Olympic space. In response to this, and as pertaining to the second research question, the research found that anti-Olympic protestors re-framed these logics with two counter logics of civil liberties and corporatization to legitimize their access to public space.

The framing of the right to protest against the Olympic Games essentially began with the dominant espoused logic of Olympism. By engaging with previous research (Lenskyj, 2000, 20002, 2004, 2008), IOC documents, VANOC bid book, and mainstream media accounts of the Olympics, it was clear that Olympism was the espoused logic that Olympic organizers utilized to promote their event. This logic is deeply engrained historically within the Olympic movement and previous researchers (e.g., Black & Van Der Westhuizen, 2004; Elder et al., 2006; Young & Wamsley, 2005) have suggested that the moral values that it claims to uphold make it incredibly difficult to protest against. My research demonstrated that 2010 protest participants rejected this logic as representing the Olympic Games, thus enabling them to oppose Games organizing without having to denounce or accept this espoused logic. Instead they framed this event through the counter logic that pointed to corporatization and corruption. The Olympic Games to those interviewed, represented an international mega event that mainly benefited a small elite whilst negatively impacting many members of the host community. This perspective of the Olympic Games reflects those of anti-Olympic activists at previous Games (Burbank, et al., 2000;

Dansero, et al., 2008; Lenskyj, 2000, 2002; Morgan, 2003) and is also reflected by scholars

taking a critical perspective on the Olympics (Hiller, 1998; Horne, 2007; Milton-Smith, 2002).

My findings suggested that to maintain the power of the espoused logic and to control the

development of counter logics within Olympic space, 2010 Olympic organizers engaged in a

logic of security. Under this logic anti-Olympic protestors were framed as potentially violent and

a threat to the safety of the community. This framing legitimized their use of overwhelming

surveillance of protest participants before and during the Games. The framing of protestors in

this way is something that is consistently seen at mega events worldwide. Other researchers have

discussed how anti-globalization protestors at international world meetings have been

criminalized and referred to as violent in order to legitimize increasingly repressive security

tactics (Fernandez, 2005; Herbert, 2007). My observations of security behavior during the

protests suggested that security tactics were not as openly repressive as in some previous

Olympic Games. For example, it was not comparable to the massacre that occurred before the

1968 Olympics in Mexico nor did it come close to the repression of protestors at the 2008

Beijing Olympics. However, it did demonstrate some of ways in which Olympic security worked

to limit the power of alternative voices by controlling protests in public space.

While previous Olympic Games, including Sydney, Salt Lake City, and Beijing have

seen the creation of protest zones to physically control protestor movement in space, Vancouver

saw the rejection of these zones through the development of counter logics, and protest was seen

in public spaces throughout the city. Arguably, my findings suggest that protest participants

successfully re-framed the construction of protest zones from organizer framing as 'safety

assembly areas' to suggesting that they represent a violation of civil liberties as stipulated in the

Canadian charter of rights and freedoms by limiting access to public space. The data I obtained

through observations and interviews suggested that protestors were utilizing the civil liberties counter logic which itself can be viewed as an institutionalized logic because of its basis in law in response to much of the surveillance behavior engaged in by Olympic security. This logic worked to mobilize protest participants and legitimize the right to protest in public space during the Olympic Games.

In an attempt to render security practices illegitimate, the civil liberties logic argued that not only was protest legal but it is an essential part of a working democracy. By engaging with a logic that was already a part of the dominant order, anti-Olympic protestors were more likely to attract potential supporters and present a more widely accepted challenge to the security logic. However, staying within the boundaries of this already institutionalized logic could have limited the potential for protestors to offer alternative logics and ways of viewing the Games (Coles, 1998; Maney, Woerle & Coy, 2005). For example, focusing on the logic of civil liberties to legitimize their right to protest in public took the focus away from some of the other issues regarding the impacts of the Olympic Games that they were protesting against (e.g., impacts on homelessness, funding to public education and healthcare, aboriginal rights, and environmental impacts). By framing the protestors as violent, organizers essentially forced protestors to legitimize their presence before being able to advocate for other issues.

Olympic organizers picked up on the power of the civil liberties logic, and through their framing of protest zones as 'safety assembly areas' and their repeated commitments to civil liberties, sought to convince the public that they were operating under the same logic as protestors. Coles (1998) discussed the incorporation of counter-logics as a strategy engaged in by dominant actors to decrease the power of alternative perspectives. This tactic may have worked to some extent, however, evidence of increased surveillance from previous Olympic Games and

the actual behaviour of security personnel before and during the 2010 Games left protest participants and some members of the wider public unconvinced of Olympic organizer commitments to civil liberties.

Arguably the success of the civil liberties logic assisted in generating the level of protest that was present during the 2010 Olympic Games. However, and in relation to my third research question there were several other challenges that protestors encountered and my findings suggest that the voices heard during these protests continued to be delegitimized by dominant logics espoused by Olympic organizers and proponents. This was demonstrated in Olympic supporter reactions to protest participants when they framed them as anti-sport and anti-Canadian. The logic of sport and nationalism was unabashedly promoted during the 2010 Olympics, so much so that supporters of the Games failed to separate being in opposition to the impacts of this mega event from these espoused logics. This limited the potential for protestor perspectives to be considered by those in support of the Games. Despite attempting to highlight their support for sport and Canada, protestors struggled to compete with the dominant logics associated with the Olympic Games.

From the perspectives of my interviewees the framing of protests as violent and in opposition to sport and nationalism in the mainstream media amplified the challenges in the way in which they were perceived by the general public. Previous researchers who have focused on the framing of social protest in mainstream media have suggested that the media tends to guard the dominant paradigm rather than presenting a critical viewpoint of why protests are occurring in the first place (McCarthy, McPhail, & Smith, 1996; Owens & Palmer, 2003). During the Olympic Games, interviewees felt that the media played a powerful role in perpetuating the dominant logics of the Olympic Games and influencing public perspectives of them. Some of the

interviewees even acknowledged that the only way organizers would listen to them is if they were able to impact the underlying corporate logic of the Olympic movement by impacting the monetary revenue the IOC made from the event. .

These findings suggest that anti-Olympic protestors engaged in various strategies to re-frame they ways in which protest was framed during the 2010 Olympic Games. However, it seems that the espoused logics associated with the Olympic movement continue to maintain long-term power and control over spatial practices, despite growing evidence that they are not conducive with the ways in which the Games are currently organized (Horne, 2007; Lenskyj, 2002; Milton-Smith, 2002).

Contributions to the literature

This research provides unique insights into the ways in which anti-Olympic protestors were framed by Olympic organizers in terms of the right to protest in public space and how they engaged in the re-framing of this. While it has been acknowledged in critical Olympic scholarship that protest has consistently been evident at previous Olympic Games (Lenskyj, 2002, 2004), there is a dearth of research that has examined these protests, even less so from the perspectives of the protest participants using ethnographic techniques. Methodologically, qualitative observations of protest events, one-on-one interviews with protest participants, and an analysis of related documents including websites and media releases, provided an opportunity to consider the perspectives of those who may otherwise be left ignored or misunderstood. At the same time, it is important to acknowledge that a limitation of the study was that it was not possible to talk to more protestors who may have had similar or different perspectives. Lenskyj's (2002, 2004) arguments that previous Olympic Games organizing limited access to public space and the right to free speech and peaceful protest was reaffirmed in these findings with specific

examples. The findings here suggest that the logics that Vancouver organizers engaged in were no different to previous Olympic host city organizers despite their outwardly stated commitments to civil liberties. It also reaffirmed previous research that has suggested that the moral ideals associated with the Olympic movement, namely Olympism, makes it difficult to express critique of the negative impacts associated with the event. This study builds on the current literature by not only examining the ways in which alternative voices are limited through the dominant framing of Olympic space, but by also considering how these alternative voices resist dominant logics though reframing processes.

The research therefore also adds to the literature on framing processes in social movements by acknowledging that framing is a reiterative process that impacts and is impacted by different actors within an organizational field (Coles, 1998; Maney et al., 2005). While I focused on the perspectives of protestors and how they framed the right to protest in public space, it was also important to consider the framing engaged in by Olympic organizers through secondary sources. By considering both protestor and organizer framing, this research has led to new understandings of the ways in which framing and logics shaped one another within the Olympic organizational field.

Aside from filling a knowledge gap by engaging in research on anti-Olympic protests, this research adds to social movement literature more generally by engaging in an ethnography of 'a hard to reach' protest movement. This helped to demonstrate some of the ways in which social protest continues to be delegitimized through framing engaged in by those in power. The security logic that Olympic organizers utilized to frame protestors as potentially violent to legitimize surveillance of protestors is comparable to government reactions to protests against international mega events more generally (Fernandez, 2005; Herbert, 2007). This research

suggests that the Olympic Games should be viewed in a similar vein to other international mega event organizing.

Future research

Echoing the recommendations of other researchers (Horne, 2007; Lenskyj, 2008), I would recommend that research continue to critically examine the Olympic Games and the impacts that they have on host communities. Because of the sheer size, organization, and globalization involved in hosting an Olympic Games, there are many community members who are negatively impacted and whose voices we need to uncover and consider. By engaging in ethnographic type research, researchers themselves have a role to play in uncovering dominant and counter logics and the effects they have on multiple stakeholders.

To build on from this research I suggest that it would be beneficial to obtain the perspectives of Olympic organizers as well as protestors in the same setting. While this research recognized the interaction between Olympic organizers and protestors within the organizational field it did not obtain first-hand perspectives of Olympic organizers. It could be useful for future research to obtain these perspectives to gain a more in-depth understanding of how they perceive anti-Olympic protests and how protestor framing impacts organizer framing and logics. In this research I was not able to gain an understanding of whether all organizers operated under the same logics and this would be something to be considered in future research. Obtaining interviews with Olympic organizers may prove to be difficult as controls are often put on who they talk to and what they are willing to talk about. However, interviewing Olympic organizers after the Olympic Games have occurred could be a feasible option and could provide more honest and frank information as organizing constraints may have lessened and this information could serve as guidance for future organizers.

While this research was able to provide an insight into 2010 protests that may otherwise have been left unconsidered there were many perspectives that were left unheard and many aspects of anti-Olympic organizing that I was not able to uncover. Future researchers may consider engaging in larger research projects involving a more in-depth study of anti-Olympic protest. Interviewing larger numbers of protestors may uncover opposing framing and use of logics within the protest movement that was not found in this research. Furthermore, interviewing protest participants before, during, and after the Olympic Games may prove useful to gain a more in-depth understanding of the ways in which they framed and re-framed their right to protest in public space.

The theoretical concepts of space, framing processes, and institutional logics were utilized as a tool to help understand the Olympic Games from a marginalized lens. Little research has utilized all three of these concepts, however, I suggest there is other research that could benefit in utilizing a similar framework. These concepts all recognized the role of power and control and allowed for the consideration of both dominant and alternative perspectives.

Practical recommendations

While acknowledging and discussing protestor perspectives may prove to be fruitless in changing the ways of the Olympic movement considering their global power, I would suggest that this type of research could be beneficial for potential bid cities to better gain an understanding of the types of impacts that they might have by considering protestor perspectives instead of delegitimizing them. I would suggest to future Olympic bid and host city organizers that they provide for more opportunities and space for protest against the Games, during the bid, organizing, and hosting stages. While the supreme governing body of the Olympic movement, the IOC, may have developed rules to suppress protest during the Olympics I would argue that

104

the power to create change (if desired) could come from organizing committees as well as community protests. It seemed in this research that Vancouver Olympic organizers were at least talking about their commitment to protect civil liberties and willingness to listen to alternative perspectives, however, in the end they appeared to adopt logics that reflected IOC values. IOC requirements do not always reflect the values of a host city/country and I would insist Olympic bid and host city organizers challenge that.

This research could prove to be useful for future anti-Olympic organizing to be able to refer to previous examples of anti-Olympic protest in order to develop their own protest tactics and perspectives. Currently there is very little research out there that has covered this (Lenskyj, 2000, 2002, 2008). I propose that those involved in opposing Olympic bids think about the potential impacts of their framing strategies. The findings in this research suggest that utilizing the civil liberties logic may have increased the protest participant base and was perhaps an important issue to acknowledge, however, it may have taken away from other protestor issues that formed some of the reasons why they were protesting against the hosting of the Olympic Games in the first place. My advice to potential host community members who are concerned about potential impacts of the Games would be to mobilize as soon as they can to ensure that Olympic bids do not succeed in their cities. It seems that in the current way Olympic Games are organized, after bids are won the espoused logics of the Olympics take precedence and alternative perspectives struggle to obtain any power within those spaces.

Concluding remarks

I opened this document with a quotation from Vancouver Premier Gordon Campbell:

> In Canada we will be open to opportunities for people to express whatever views they have. There will not be opportunities to break the law, [but] we will make sure there will be full and equal expression throughout the 2010 Olympics. (Lee, 2008)

This was his criticism to the ways in which protestors were reportedly treated at the 2008 Beijing Olympic Games. On the surface, these comments may have seemed rather noble and reassuring for individuals wanting to protest against the Vancouver 2010 Winter Olympic Games. This research has demonstrated that the 2010 Games were not much different to previous Olympics in terms of the framing of dissent despite these efforts to reiterate Canada's commitments to civil liberties.

Even though protest was present at the Vancouver Olympics, and unlike at Beijing, alternative perspectives were expressed in (some) public spaces, this research has demonstrated that full and equal expression is much more than simply having the right to freedom of speech. It is much more than simply being able to gather in public space and opening your mouth to express your views. What is just as important is the ways in which individuals are able to occupy space, how their voices are heard, and how they are considered by those that they are speaking to, and why. This research has demonstrated that while officials utilized overt control to suppress dissent, we also need to be cognizant of the other ways in which this was achieved. This is why the framing of alternative perspectives is so important to uncover as it impacts the quality of the voices and perspectives heard. Public space is not simply a neutral area where people can freely express their views as its use is clearly linked to the exercise of power, politics, and control (D'Arcus, 2006; Mitchell, 1995; Sewell, 2001).

While my conclusions suggest that re-framing the espoused dominant logics of the Olympic Games through protest is a challenging venture. I want to reiterate that I believe protest plays an important role in providing critique and opposition to Games organizing. Protest

continues to be one of the only ways that alternative voices are able to get their perspectives into

the public realm and it is important that we recognize this.

References

American Civil Liberties Union of Utah. (2001). Free speech and the Winter Olympic Games. *Progressive News.* Retrieved November, 15, 2009, from http://www.acluutah.org/01upnet.htm.

Ayres, J. M. (2004). Framing collective action against neoliberalism: The case of the "anti-globalization" movement. *Journal of World-Systems Research*, 11-34.

Benford, R. D., & Snow, D. A. (2000). Framing processes and social movements: An overview and assessment. *Annual Review of Sociology, 26*(1), 611-639

Black, D. R., & Van Der Westhuizen, J. (2004). The allure of global games for 'semi-peripheral' polities and spaces: A research agenda. *Third World Quarterly, 25*(7), 1195-1214.

Blee, K. M., & Taylor, V. (2002). Semi-structured interviewing in social movement research. In B. Klandermans, & S. Straggenborg (Eds.), *Methods of social movement research*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Bloom, G. & Vallee, C. (2005). Building a successful university program: Key and common elements of expert coaches. *Journal of Applied Sport Psychology*, 17(3), 179-196.

Bramham, D. (July 8 2009). Olympics security head warns of possible violent clashes at Games. *Canwest News Service Columnist*.

British Columbia Civil Liberties Association. *About us.* Retrieved November, 22, 2009, from http://www.bccla.org/05about.htm

Bryman. A. (2004). *Social research methods*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Burbank, M. J., Heying, C. H., & Andranovich, G. (2000). Antigrowth politics or piece meal resistance? Citizen opposition to Olympic related economic growth. *Urban Affairs Review, 35*(3), 334-257.

Campbell, J. L. (2005). Where do we stand? Common mechanisms in organizations and social movements research. In G. F. Davis, D. McAdam, W. R. Scott & M. N. Zald (Eds.), *Social movements and organization theory* (pp. 41-68) Cambridge University Press.

CBC News (February, 12, 2009). 2010 Olympics countdown festivity greeted with celebrations and protest. CBC News. Retrieved November 18, 2010 from http://www.cbc.ca/canada/british-columbia/story/2009/02/12/bc-olympics-countdown-festivity.html

CBC News (June 30, 2003). *Using the Vancouver Bid for social change*. Retrieved April 9 2009, from http://archives.cbc.ca/sports/olympics/clips/8392/

City of Vancouver (2000). *2010 Olympic Games bid: Appointment of city representative*. Administration Report. Retrieved April 9 2009, from http://vancouver.ca/ctyclerk/cclerk/000912/A13.htm

Chase, S. E. (2003). Learning to listen: Narrative principles in a qualitative research methods course. In R. Josselson, A. Lieblich & D. McAdams (Eds.), *Up close and personal: The teaching and learning of narrative research* (pp. 79-99). Washington, D.C: American Psychological Association.

Coles, R. L. (1998). Peaceniks and warmongers' framing fracas on the home front: Dominant and opposition discourse interaction during the Persian Gulf crisis. *The Sociological Quarterly, 39*(3), 369-391.

Conway, J. (2003). Civil resistance and the "diversity of tactics" in the anti-globalization movement. Problems of violence, silence, and solidarity in activist politics. *Osgoode Hall Law Journal, 41*(2 & 3), 505-530.

Cousens, L., & Slack, T. (2005). Field-level change: The case of North American major league professional sport. *Journal of Sport Management, 19*, 13-42.

Cunneen, C. (2000). Public order and the Sydney Olympics: Forget about the right to protest. *Indigenous Law Bulletin.* Retrieved November, 15, 2009, from http://kirra.austlii.edu.au/au/journals/ILB/2000/8.html

Dansero, E., Del Corpo, B., Mela, A., & Ropolo, I. (2008). Olympic Games, conflicts and social movements: The case of Torino 2006. *Mega Events and Civil Society*. Retrieved October, 30, 2009, from http://www.greenpolitics-ecpr.org/gpsg_wiki/uploads/Main/Torino%202006%20conflicts%20and%20social%20movements.pdf

D'Arcus, B. (2006). *Boundaries of dissent: Protest and state power in the media age.* USA: Routledge.

Davis, G. F., McAdam, D., Scott, W. R., & Zald, M. N. (2005). *Social movements and organization theory* Cambridge University Press.

DiMaggio, P. J., & Powell, W. W. (1983). The iron cage revisited: Institutional isomorphism and collective rationality in organizational fields. *American Sociological Review, 48*(2), 147-160.

Eagleridge Bluffs (n.d.). Eagle Ridge Bluffs. Retrieved November 18, 2010 from

http://www.firstnations.eu/development/eagleridge_bluffs.htm

Eby, D & Price, C. (2010). *Olympic legal observer information and training guide*. BC Civil Liberties Association and Pivot Legal Society.

Economy, E. C., & Segal, A. (2008). China's Olympic nightmare: What the Games mean for Beijing's future. *Foreign Affairs, 87*, 47.

Edelman, M. (2001). Social movements: Changing paradigms and forms of politics. *Annual Review of Anthropology, 30*(1), 285-317.

Eimer, D. (August 9, 2008). Beijing Olympics: China designates special 'protest zones'. *Telegraph UK.* Retrieved December, 1, 2009, from http://www.telegraph.co.uk/sport/othersports/olympics/2529489/Beijing-Olympics-China-designates-special-protest-zones.html

Elder, C., Pratt, A., & Ellis, C. (2006). Running race: Reconciliation, nationalism and the Sydney 2000 Olympic Games. *International Review for the Sociology of Sport, 41*(2), 181-200.

Fernandez, L. (2005). Policing dissent: Social control and the anti-globalization movement. Brunswick, New Jersey: Rutgers University Press.

Fligstein, N. (2001). Social skill and the theory of fields. *Sociological Theory, 19*(2), 105-125.

Foster, P., & Spencer, R. (2008) Beijing Olympics: Chinese pensioners punished after applying to protest. *UK Telegraph.* Retrieved November, 15, 2009, from http://www.telegraph.co.uk/sport/othersports/olympics/2590024/Beijing-Olympics-Chinese-pensioners-punished-after-applying-to-protest.html

Foucault, M. (1978). *The history of sexuality*. New York: Pantheon Books.

Fournier, P., & Herrera, J. M. (2009). "Mexico, 1968": Among Olympic fanfares, government repression and genocide. In P. Funari, A. Zarankin & M. Salerno (Eds.), *Memories from darkness: Archaeology of repression and resistance in Latin America*. Springer.

Friedland, R., & Alford, R. R. (1991). Bringing society back in: Symbols, practices, and institutional contradictions. In W. Powell, & P. J. DiMaggio (Eds.). *The new institutionalism in organizational analysis* (pp. 232-263). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Fusco, C. (2004). The space that (In)difference makes: (Re)producing subjectivities in/through abjection – A locker room theoretical case study. In P. Vertinsky & L. Bale (Eds.) *Sites of sport: Space, place, experience (*p. 159-176). London & New York: Routledge.

Girard, D. (January 11, 2003). Vancouver's sprint to the finish line. *Toronto Star.* Retrieved November, 11, 2008 from http://proquest.umi.com.ezproxy.library.ubc.ca/pqdweb?index=35&did=421002111&SrchMode=1&sid=2&Fmt=3&VInst=PROD&VType=PQD&RQT=309&VName=PQD&TS=1277247482&clientId=6993.

Gottdiener, M. (1994). *The social production of urban space.* Austin, TX: University of Texas Press.

Gratton, C., & Jones, I. (2004). *Research methods for sport studies*. London: Routledge.

Grundy, J. & Howell, A. (2001). Negotiating the culture of resistance: A critical assessment of protest politics. *Studies in Political Economy, 66*, 121-132.

Gutmann, M. C. (2002). *The romance of democracy: Compliant defiance in contemporary Mexico*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Hammersley, M., & Atkinson, P. (2007). *Ethnography: Principles in practice* (3rd ed.). London; New York: Routledge.

Harvey, D. (1973). *Social justice and the city*. London: Edward Arnold.

Herbert, S. (2007). The 'Battle in Seattle' revisited: Or, seven views of a protest zoning state. *Political Geography, 26*, 609-619.

Hiller, H. (1998). Assessing the impacts of mega-events: A linkage model. *Current Issues in Tourism, 1*(1), 47-57.

Hoberman, J. (1984). *The Olympic crises: Sport, politics and the moral order*. New Rochelle, NY: Caratzaes Publishing

Hoover, J. E. (October, 1, 1968). *Olympic Games, Mexico City: FBI confidential letter* (No. 97). USA: Federal Bureau of Investigation.

Horne, J. (2007). The four 'knowns' of sports mega-events. *Leisure Studies, 26*(1), 81-96.

Hume, M. (October 23, 2009). Protesting is okay at Olympics but violence isn't police warn. *Globe and Mail*. Retrieved July, 15, 2010 from http://www.lexisnexis.com.ezproxy.library.ubc.ca/us/lnacademic/results/docview/docview.do?docLinkInd=true&risb=21_T9751181933&format=GNBFI&sort=RELEVANCE&startDocNo=1&resultsUrlKey=29_T9751181936&cisb=22_T9751181935&treeMax=true&treeWidth=0&csi=303830&docNo=1

Inner-City Inclusive Commitment Statement (2002). Retrieved November 15 2008, from http://www.vancouver2010.com/dl/00/34/95/-/34952/prop=data/1vz8hos/34952.pdf

Inwood, D. (July 8, 2009). Olympic security force of 16,500 prepares for 'criminal protests'. *The Province.* Retrieved November 18, 2010 from http://www.theprovince.com/entertainment/Olympic+security+force+prepares+criminal+protests/1771576/story.html

IOCC. (n.d.). *About the IOCC*. Retrieved April 18 2009, from http://iocc.ca/about_IOCC.php

IOCC (2007). *IOCC Report Card*. Retrieved November 18 2008, from http://intraspec.ca/IOCCreport.pdf.

IOCC. (2010). Interim Report Card 3. Retrieved November 18, 2010, from http://iocc.ca/documents/2010-02-25_IOCC_3rdInterimReportCard.pdf

International Olympic Committee. (2007). *Olympic charter.* Retrieved May 15, 2009, from http://multimedia.olympic.org/pdf/en_report_122.pdf

Jordan, T. (2002) *Activism!: Direct Action. Hacktivism and the Future of Society*. London: Reaktion Books.

Kidd, B. (1992). The culture wars of the Montreal Olympics. *International Review for the Sociology of Sport, 27*(2), 151-164.

King, N. (2004). Using interviews in qualitative research. In C. Cassell, & G. Symon (Eds.), *Essential guide to qualitative methods in organizational research* (pp. 11-22). London: Sage.
Publications.

Lee, J. (August 12, 2008). Campbell fires back at Chinese critics. *Vancouver Sun.* Retrieved October, 15, 2009, from http://www.canada.com/vancouversun/news/story.html?id=c6c8fea0-740a-4026-8b03-09b8a3f1389b

Lefebvre, H. (1991). *The production of space*. Oxford, UK; Cambridge.

Leitner, H., Sheppard, E., & Sziarto, K. M. (2008). The spatialities of contentious politics. *Transactions-Institute of British Geographers, 33*(2), 157.

Lenskyj, H. J. (2000). *Inside the Olympic industry: Power, politics, and activism*. Albany: State University of New York Press.

Lenskyj, H. (2002). *The best Olympics ever?: Social impacts of Sydney 2000*. Albany: State University of New York Press.

Lenskyj, H. J. (2004). Making the world safe for global capital: The Sydney 2000 Olympics and beyond. In J. Bale, & M. Christensen (Eds.), *Post-Olympism? Questioning sport in the twenty-first century*. Oxford: Berg.

Lenskyj, H. (2008). *Olympic industry resistance: Challenging Olympic power and propaganda*. Albany: State University of New York Press.

Lichterman, P. (1998). What do movements mean? The value of participant-observation. *Qualitative Sociology, 21*(4), 401-418.

Mair, H. (2002/2003). Civil leisure? Exploring the relationship between leisure, activism and social change. *Leisure/Loisir, 27*(3/4).

Malfas, M., Theodoraki, E., & Houlihan, B. (2004). Impacts of the Olympic games as mega-events. *Municipal Engineer, 157*(3), 209-220.

Maney, G. M., Woehrle, L. M., & Coy, P. G. (2005). Harnessing and challenging hegemony. *Sociological Perspectives*, *38,* 357–381.

Martin, D. G., & Miller, B. (2003). Space and contentious politics. *Mobilization: An International Quarterly, 8*(2), 143-156.

McAdam, D., McCarthy, J. D., & Zald, M. N. (1996). Opportunities, mobilizing structures, and framing processes–toward a synthetic, comparative perspective on social movements. In D. McAdam, J. D. McCarthy & M. N. Zald (Eds.), *Comparative Perspectives on Social Movements* (1–20).

McAdam, D., & Scott, W. R. (2005). Organizations and movements. In G. F. Davis, D. McAdam, W. R. Scott & M. N. Zald (Eds.), *Social movements and organization theory* (pp. 4–40) UK: Cambridge University Press.

McAdam, D., McCarthy, J. D. & Zald, M. N. (1996). *Comparative perspectives on social movements.* UK: Cambridge University Press.

McAdam, D., Tarrow, S. G., & Tilly, C. (2001). *Dynamics of contention*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

McCarthy, J. D., McPhail, C., & Smith, J. (1996). Images of protest: Dimensions of selection bias in media coverage of Washington demonstrations, 1982 and 1991. *American Sociological Review, 61*(3), 478-499.

Merrifield, A. (1993). Place and space: A Lefebvrian reconciliation. *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers, 18*(4), 516-531.

Meyer, R.; Sahlin, K.; Ventresca, M. J. & Walgenbach, P. (2009). Ideology and institutions: Introduction. *Research in the Sociology of Organizations, 27*, 1-15.

Miles, M., & Huberman, A. (1994). *Qualitative data analysis*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Miller, B. A. (2000). *Geography and social movements: Comparing antinuclear activism in the Boston area.* University of Minnesota Press.

Milton-Smith, J. (2002). Ethics, the Olympics and the search for global values. *Journal of Business Ethics, 35*(2), 131-142.

Mitchell, D. (1995). The end of public space? People's park, definitions of the public, and democracy. *Annals of the Association of American Geographers, 85*(1), 108-133.

Morgan, G. (2003). Aboriginal protest and the Sydney Olympic games. *International Journal of Olympic Studies, 12*, 23-38.

Morgan, G. (2006). *Images of organization*. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.

Mullins, G. (2008*). Do anti-Olympic protestors really scare children and hate rainbows? The war measures act*. Retrieved April 5 2009, from http://garthmullins.blogspot.com/2008/09/do-anti-olympics-protesters-really.html

Mutch, A. (2009). Dominant logic, culture, and ideology. *Research in the Sociology of Organizations, 27*, 145-170.

Oliver, P. E. and Myers, D. J. (2003). Networks, diffusion, and cycles of collective action' in M. Diani and D. McAdam (eds). *Social movements and networks: relational approaches to collective action*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 173–203.

O'Reilly, K. (2005). *Ethnographic methods*. London; New York: Routledge.

Owens, L., & Palmer, L. K. (2003). Making the news: Anarchist counters public relations on the world-wide web. *Critical Studies in Media Communication*, 20, 335–361.

Patton, M. Q. (2002). *Qualitative research and evaluative methods*. Thousand Oaks, California: Sage Publications.

Plows, A. (2008). Social movements and ethnographic methodologies: An analysis using case study examples. *Sociology Compass, 5*(2), 1523 - 1538.

Polletta, F., & Ho, M. (2006). Frames and their consequences. In R. E. Gooden, & C. Tilly (Eds.), *The Oxford handbook of contextual political analysis* (pp. 187) Oxford University Press, USA.

Preston, J., & Dillon, S. (2004). *Opening Mexico: The making of a democracy* (1st ed.). New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux.

Reitan, R. (2007). *Global activism*. London, UK: Routledge.

Richardson, L. (2000). New writing practices in qualitative research. *Sociology of Sport Journal, 17*(1), 5-20.

Scott, W. R., Ruef, M., Mendel, P. J., & Caronna, C. A. (2000). *Institutional change and healthcare organizations*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Sealey, G. (2002). Olympics officials keep eyes on protesters. *NGOs and Advocacy.* Retrieved October, 1, 2009, from http://www.globalpolicy.org/component/content/article/168/30852.html

Sewell, W. H. (2001). Space in contentious politics. In R. R. Aminzade; J. A. Goldstone; D. McAdam; E. J. Perry; W. H. Sewell; S. Tarrow & C. Tilly. (Eds.), *Silence and the voice of contentious politics*. UK: Cambridge University Press.

Soja, E. W. (1996). *Thirdspace: Journeys to Los Angeles and other real-and-imagined places* Cambridge, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.

Sparkes, A. C. (2000) Autoenthnography and narratives of self: reflections on criteria in action. *Sociology of Sport Journal, 17*, pp. 21–43.

Staeheli, L. A., & Mitchell, D. (2008). *The people's property? Power, politics, and the public*. London, UK: Routledge.

Starr, A. (2006). '... (Excepting barricades erected to prevent us from peaceful assembling)': So-called `violence' in the global north alterglobalization movement. *Social Movement Studies,* 5:1, 61-81.

The Canadian Press (January, 20, 2008). CSIS on lookout for violent protests at 2010 Games. CBC News. Retrieved November 18, 2010 from http://www.cbc.ca/canada/british-columbia/story/2008/01/20/csis-olympic-security.html

Thornton, P. H., & Ocasio, W. (2008). Institutional logics. In R. Greenwood, C. Oliver, K. Sahlin & R. Suddaby (Eds.), *The Sage handbook of organizational intuitionalism* (pp. 99-129). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Tromp, S. (2002). Let the voting begin! *Vancouver Courier*. Retrieved November 11, 2008, from http://archive.vancourier.com/issues03/023203/news/023203nn1.html

Tufts, S. (2004) Building the 'competitive city': labour and Toronto's bid to host the Olympic Games. *Geoforum* 35.1, 47– 58.

Vancouver 2010 Bid Corporation (2003). Vancouver 2010 Bid Book. Retrieved November 18, 2010, from http://www.vancouver2010.com/dl/00/08/81/bidbook-theme17_58d-wM.pdf

Vancouver 2010 Integrated Security Unit (2010a). About Us. Retrieved November 18, 2010 from http://v2010isu.com/ViewPage.action?siteNodeId=394&languageId=1&contentId=-1

Vancouver 2010 Integrated Security Unit (2010b). Q&A with A/Commr Bud Mercer. Retrieved December 1, 2010 from http://v2010isu.com/ViewPage.action?siteNodeId=511&languageId=1&contentId=13369

VANOC (September 19, 2009). A balance of interests: freedom of expression in public spaces, athletes competing at their best and spectator enjoyment at the 2010 Games. Retrieved November 18, 2010 from http://www.vancouver2010.com/olympic-news/a-balance-of-interests--freedom-of-expression-in-public-spaces--athletes-competing-at-their-best-and-spectator-enjoyment-at-the-2010-games_79444Sz.html).

VANOC (n.d.). Vision, Mission and Values. Retrieved November 18, 2010 from http://www.vancouver2010.com/more-2010-information/about-vanoc/organizing-committee/mission--vision-and-values/

Van Ingen, C. (2003). Geographies of gender, sexuality and race: Reframing the focus on space in sport sociology. *International Review for the Sociology of Sport, 38*(2), 201.

Vertinsky, P. A. (2004). 'Locating a sense of place:' Space, place, and gender in the gymnasium. In P. Vertinsky & L. Bale (Eds.) *Sites of sport: Space, place, experience (*p. 159-176). London & New York: Routledge.

Vertinsky, P. A., Bale, J. (2004). *Sites of sport*: *Space, place, experience*. London; New York: Routledge.

Vogel, R. (2009). Paradigm shifts as ideological changes: A Kuhnian view of endogenous institutional disruption. *Research in the Sociology of Organizations, 27*, 85-114.

Wahlstrom, M. (2010). Producing spaces for representation: racist marches, counter-demonstrations, and public order policing. *Environment and Planning D: Society & Space, 28*, 811-827.

Waitt, G. (2004) A critical examination of Sydney's 2000 Olympic Games, in: I. Yeoman, M. Robertson, J. Ali-Knight. (Eds.) *Festivals and Events Management: An International Arts and Culture Perspective,* p. 391–408. Oxford: Elsevier Butterworth- Heinemann.

Weik, E. (2009). "Birthing" versus "being delivered": Of bodies, ideologies, and institutions. *Research in the Sociology of Organizations, 27*, 171-202.

Whitson, D., & Horne, J. (2006). Underestimated costs and overestimated benefits? Comparing the outcomes of sports mega-events in Canada and Japan. *Sociological Review, 54*, 71-89.

Wintonyk, D. (February 14, 2010). *Three charged in violent Vancouver protest.* CTVBC. Retrieved November 18, 2010, from http://www.ctvbc.ctv.ca/servlet/an/local/CTVNews/20100214/bc_protesters_charged_10 0214?hub=BritishColumbia

Wolford, W. (2006). The difference ethnography can make: Understanding social mobilization and development in the Brazilian northeast. *Qualitative Sociology, 29*(3), 335-352.

York, G. (August 21, 2008) IOC criticizes Beijing over unused protest zones. *Globe and Mail.*

Young, K., & Wamsley, K. B. (2005). *Global Olympics: Historical and sociological studies of the modern games* (1st ed.). Amsterdam; Boston: Elsevier/JAI.

Zajko M. & Beland, D. (2008). Space and protest policing at international summits'. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space,* 26, 719 – 735.

Zald, M. N., & Berger, M. A. (1978). Social movements in organizations: Coup d'etat, insurgency, and mass movements. *The American Journal of Sociology, 83*(4), 823-861.

Zig Zag (2010). *From protest to resistance: A report on the campaign against the 2010 Winter Olympics*. Retrieved November 18, 2010 from http://vancouver.mediacoop.ca/sites/mediacoop.ca/files2/mc/anti-2010-report1.pdf

Appendix I: Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms

Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms

The fundamental freedoms outlined in Section two "are set out...to ensure that Canadians [and everyone in Canada] are free to create and to express their ideas, gather to discuss them and communicate them widely to other people..." (Canadian Heritage, 2008, Section two-Fundamental Freedoms, http://www.pch.gc.ca/pgm/pdp-hrp/canada/guide/fndmtl-eng.cfm)

Section 2: Everyone has the following fundamental freedoms:

(a) freedom of conscience and religion;

(b) freedom of thought, belief, opinion and expression, including freedom of the press and other media of communication;

(c) freedom of peaceful assembly; and

(d) freedom of association. (Canadian Charter of Rights & Freedoms, 1982, http://laws.justice.gc.ca/en/charter/1.html)

"All activities conveying or attempting to convey meaning are expression for the purposes of s. 2(b). An exception has been suggested where meaning is communicated directly via physical violence, but no exception based on the repugnance of the content of the expression (such as hate propaganda or pornography) has been recognized...While the freedom of expression does not encompass the right to use any and all government property [public space] for purposes of disseminating views on public matters, it does include the right to use streets and parks dedicated to public use, subject to reasonable limitation to ensure their continued use for the purposes to which they are dedicated" (Canadian Charter of Rights Decisions Digest, 2004, **http://www.canlii.org/en/ca/charter_digest/s-2-b.html**)

THE UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA
Faculty *of* Education UBC

January 4, 2011

School of Human Kinetics
210 War Memorial Gym
6081 University Boulevard
Vancouver, BC, Canada V6T 1Z1

Dear (participant),

Tel: 604-822-3838 Fax: 604-822-6842

I am a Masters of Arts student in the School of Human Kinetics at the University of British Columbia working on a study on Olympic resistance groups and the challenges they face with respect to civil liberties and the 2010 Vancouver Winter Olympic Games. I am working under the supervision of Dr. Wendy Frisby who has led previous studies in Vancouver on sport and social equality. The title of my study is, "2010 Games and Civil Liberties: Perspectives of an Olympics Resistance Group" and will focus specifically on how the group is perceiving access to 'public space', freedom of speech and the right to peaceful protest (civil liberties) in regards to the 2010 Games. Resistance groups are rarely heard from in the academic literature and their perspectives and the challenges they face in regards to achieving their aims is relatively unknown. This study will focus on these perspectives to gain a better understanding of these points of view and to provide a critical lens to Olympic research.

The purpose of this letter is to request your participation in a one-on-one interview, to take place in the next couple of months. The interview will be scheduled for one hour. The interview will be audio recorded to ensure accuracy and will only be available to Dr. Frisby and myself. Your name will be kept anonymous in any written work emerging from this study, unless you request that your real name be used. Your participation is entirely voluntary and you are free to withdraw from the study at any time.

I have attached a research protocol to provide a more detailed description of the study and a consent form. If you have any further questions or concerns, you can contact me at 778-836-1756 (email: nicolien@interchange.ubc.ca) or Dr. Frisby at 604-822-6445 (email: frisby@interchange.ubc.ca). I hope you will consider being a part of my study, as your participation will help me uncover differing perspectives of the 2010 Games that may otherwise not be heard. If you are interested, please contact me in the next couple of weeks and we can arrange a time and place to meet for an interview at your convenience.

Thank-you for your consideration, I look forward to hearing from you soon.

Sincerely,

Nicolien van Luijk

THE UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA

Faculty *of* Education   UBC

School of Human Kinetics
210 War Memorial Gym
6081 University Boulevard
Vancouver, BC, Canada V6T 1Z1

Tel: 604-822-3838 Fax: 604-822-6842

Consent Form

Olympic Games and Civil Liberties: Perspectives of an Olympics Resistance Group

Student-Investigator: Nicolien van Luijk, Master of Arts degree candidate from the School of Human Kinetics at the University of British Columbia. Contact information: 778-836-1756 (email: nicolien@interchange.ubc.ca)

Principal Investigator: Dr. Wendy Frisby, professor in the School of Human Kinetics at the University of British Columbia. Contact information: 604-822-6445 (email: frisby@interchange.ubc.ca)

This study is part of a graduate degree that will be carried out by Nicolien van Luijk under the supervision of Dr. Wendy Frisby.

Research Protocol

Purpose: The purpose of this study is to gain insights into the perspectives of members or affiliates of an Olympics resistance group. Specifically the purpose is to learn about the perspectives on access to 'public space', freedom of speech, and the right to peaceful protest in regards to the Vancouver 2010 Winter Olympic Games. You are being invited to participate in this study because of your affiliation with the Olympics resistance group.

Study Procedures: 8-12 members of this community organization will be asked to participate in this study based on their involvement in the group. Participation in this study is completely voluntary.

One-on-one Interviews: Interviews will be scheduled for one hour and will occur in mutually agreed upon locations. The interviews will discuss your perspectives of the 2010 Games, in particular the topic of public space and the right to peaceful protest and what role you believe these factors play in the work of the organization. All interviews will be audio-recorded.

Potential Risks: You may benefit from this study by simply having the opportunity to discuss your perspectives of the 2010 Games. Furthermore, the group may benefit from this project by generating dialogue on the 2010 Games from the perspectives of the Olympics resistance group. A summary report from the student investigator will be sent to you or dropped off in person once the study is complete.

Interviews will discuss your own perspectives on the subject, if at any times you feel uncomfortable during these discussions; you are free to refrain from answering any question(s) and to withdraw from the study.

Confidentiality: Individual names will not be referred to in any documents emerging from the completed study. All documents will be identified only by code number and kept in a locked filing cabinet. To ensure accuracy, interviews will be tape recorded and transcribed verbatim. The transcripts will be saved on a password-protected computer and hard copy transcripts and audiotapes will be securely locked in a cabinet. Only the Student and Principal Investigator will have access to this data. All data will be kept at UBC.

Contact Information: For questions or additional information regarding the research project, please contact the Student-Investigator Nicolien van Luijk at 778-836-1756 or the Principal Investigator Dr. Wendy Frisby at 604-822-6445.

For any questions or concerns about the treatment or rights as a research subject, please contact the ***Research Subject Information Link (RSIL) in the UBC Office of Research Services at 604-822-8598 or by email at*** <u>***RSIL@ors.ubc.ca***</u>***.***

_____

You have read the above information and understand the nature of the study.

You understand that your participation in the study is entirely voluntary and that you may refuse to participate or withdraw from the study at any time.

Your signature below indicates that you have received a copy of this consent form and agree to participate in this study. Please bring this form to the interview.

_____

Name (please print)

_____

Signature   Date

Appendix IV: Sample Interview Guide

At the beginning of each interview I will state the purpose of my study and the reasons I am interested in learning more about the perspectives of members of an Olympic resistance group and the work that they do concerning civil liberties. I will tell them that I have received ethical approval from the ethics board at the University of British Columbia. I will remind them of my ethical guidelines that I will be following, such as keeping information gained from each of my participants' confidential, using anonymity in my written work, allowing my participants to refuse to answer any questions and to withdraw from the study at any point in time. I will also tell them the reasons I am tape-recording each interview.

Background Questions
1. Tell me how you became involved in this Olympic resistance group? And why?
2. What are the objectives of this organization?
3. Does the organization have allies who are assisting them in this work?

RQ1: How are Olympic organizers framing the right to protest in public space in the context of the Vancouver 2010 Games?
1. How are Olympic organizers addressing/discussing the right to protest in public space?
2. Has this organization discussed this topic with Olympic organizers? If yes, what have these discussions looked like? If not, why not?
3. What do you think about the way in which Olympic organizers have discussed and addressed this topic?
4. Do you feel that the Olympics resistance group has control over what kind of impact the right to protest in public space has on the organization?

RQ2: How is the Olympics resistance group counter- framing the right to protest in public space in the context of the Vancouver 2010 Games?
1. What does 'protest' and 'public space' mean to this organization and/or to you?
2. Can you talk about issues of public space and the right to protest?
3. Is the right to protest in public space discussed often in the organization? Why/why not?
4. How do issues pertaining to the right to protest in public space affect the organization? Examples?

RQ3: What is your assessment of the challenges encountered?
5. How are you responding to potential challenges to your right to protest?
6. What strategies is the organization using to counter Olympic approaches? How effective have these been? Are there other strategies that could be considered?
7. What challenges are being encountered when implementing these strategies?

Appendix V: Certificate of Approval

The University of British Columbia
Office of Research Services
Behavioural Research Ethics Board
Suite 102, 6190 Agronomy Road,
Vancouver, B.C. V6T 1Z3

CERTIFICATE OF APPROVAL - MINIMAL RISK

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR:	INSTITUTION / DEPARTMENT:	UBC BREB NUMBER:
Wendy Frisby	UBC/Education/Human Kinetics	H09-02721

INSTITUTION(S) WHERE RESEARCH WILL BE CARRIED OUT:	
Institution	**Site**
UBC	Vancouver (excludes UBC Hospital)

Other locations where the research will be conducted:
For interviews, the location will be determined by the subject. The goal is for the subject to be comfortable in the location, and to be in a location that is convenient to both the participant and the researcher. Sites will include the participant's office, a private room in the participant's workplace, a university office, a university classroom or conference room, and a public location of the subject's choice. The observations will be carried out at public forums and public meetings that are accessible by the general public.

CO-INVESTIGATOR(S):
Nicolien S. van Luijk

SPONSORING AGENCIES:
N/A

PROJECT TITLE:
2010 Games & Civil Liberties: Perspectives of an Olympics resistance group

CERTIFICATE EXPIRY DATE: November 26, 2010

DOCUMENTS INCLUDED IN THIS APPROVAL:	DATE APPROVED: November 26, 2009	
Document Name	**Version**	**Date**
Consent Forms:		
Consent Form	Version 1.1	November 1, 2009
Questionnaire, Questionnaire Cover Letter, Tests:		
Sample Interview Guide	Version 1.1	November 1, 2009
Letter of Initial Contact:		
Contact Letter	Version 1.1	November 1, 2009

The application for ethical review and the document(s) listed above have been reviewed and the procedures were found to be acceptable on ethical grounds for research involving human subjects.

Approval is issued on behalf of the Behavioural Research Ethics Board
and signed electronically by one of the following:
Dr. M. Judith Lynam, Chair
Dr. Ken Craig, Chair
Dr. Jim Rupert, Associate Chair
Dr. Laurie Ford, Associate Chair
Dr. Anita Ho, Associate Chair