Avenues of contestation. Football hooligans running and ruling urban spaces[1]

Richard Giulianotti and Gary Armstrong

'Mind your manors'. Football hooligans, space and the academic field

In the past thirty years, few issues have attracted the breadth of explanation and intensity of debate as that of football hooliganism.[2] Those working from Marxist,[3] social psychological[4] and figurational perspectives[5] have constituted the main protagonists, though others within the overlapping fields of cultural studies,[6] anthropology,[7] and post-structuralist sociology[8] combine fresh ethnographies with critical commentaries upon the previously dominant paradigms. Although the manifestation and attempted social control of football hooliganism is directly concerned with the appropriation and exploitation of urban spaces, none of the recognised schools of thought have examined this issue with sufficient purpose. The trinity of major academic positions assessing the issue of fan violence have each tended to accord the question of

---

[1] We thank Eduardo Archetti, Gerry Finn, Jock Young and two anonymous referees for their comments on a previous version of this paper. Professor Archetti's observation that our reading of young fan confrontations was highly applicable to Argentina was particularly encouraging. Thanks also to David Andrews and Robert Pitter of the University of Memphis for putting the earlier version on the web.

[2] See, for example, Giulianotti (1994) as a genealogical review of the relevant literature; and the arguments contained in *Sociological Review* (1991), and Giulianotti, Bonney and Hepworth (1994).

[3] The lengthiest contributor is Ian Taylor (1971a; 1971b; 1982a; 1982b; 1987), but see also Critcher (1979), Alan Clarke (1992), John Clarke (1978) and Hargreaves (1982).

[4] See the texts of Peter Marsh (1978) and his Oxford research group (Marsh, Rosser and Harré 1978), and the implicit support offered by Morris (1983).

[5] The figurational or process-sociological standpoint is dominated by the group of Leicester researchers following in the sociological tradition of Norbert Elias: see Williams, Dunning and Murphy (1984/1989), Dunning, Murphy and Williams (1988) and Murphy, Williams and Dunning (1990). The Leicester researchers have since undergone a schism within their school (cf. Dunning 1994; Williams 1991), which led to the creation of two parallel football/sports studies institutions at Leicester University.

[6] See primarily Redhead (1986; 1990; 1991; MacLaughlin 1985).

[7] See in particular Armstrong and Harris (1991) and Archetti and Romero (1994).

[8] See Giulianotti (1993; 1994a).

space a dependency relationship to their established theoretical models.[9] Indeed, within the study of football culture overall, only John Bale (1989; 1991; 1993; 1994) has endeavoured to identify the significance of spatial arrangements and sociation. However, Bale's important researches are nevertheless limited to examining the historical and comparative aspects of football geographies. This serves to exclude urban anthropological fieldwork and the critical anthropological assessment of the effects of control strategies upon the utilisation and meaning of particular urban landscapes for football supporters and those represented as hooligans.

In this paper we therefore seek to fill this explanatory lacuna regarding the anthropological nexus of landscape and sport. The discussion draws heavily upon our continuing urban anthropological fieldwork with football hooligan formations, primarily in Britain but also on the continent, which has been undertaken since 1986 (Armstrong 1993; 1998; Giulianotti 1995a; 1999). We begin by establishing the spatial and affective dimensions of football fandom, which parent the cherishing of football grounds by supporters as sacred 'places'. We then turn to examine the nature of football hooligan gatherings, in contrast to the popular assumptions about these supporters which are usually cited by the game's authorities to justify the socio-spatial transformation of football grounds. These issues are important preliminaries to the paper's primary concern, which is with tracing the historical interplay between rival football hooligans and the forces of social control, as witnessed in the creative contestation of space as a crucial, constituting resource. Through focusing upon the intricacy of intra-city hooligan rivalries and the intensification of the policing of hooligans, it is argued that the boundaries of socio-spatial identities and their control are negotiable to the extent of re-creation.

In their own vernacular, hooligans will continue to identify specific spaces as their 'manors' or 'patches', either materially or symbolically. Yet none of these spaces are able to display the fixity – whether in terms of establishing boundaries or permanent ownership – which popular notions of 'territorialism' or 'turf' happily imply. In this sense, we seek to advance a cultural distinction between the American inner city's 'politics of turf', exercised *between* the socio-economic categories of yuppies and the underclass (Wolch 1991; Lash and Urry 1994), and the kind of spatial contestation initiated by football hooligans, that is to say *within* specific generational and cultural categories that are internally divided according to spatial and cultural home.

---

[9] Thus, the social psychologists theorise football hooligans' 'protection' of territory as an aggressive extension of self-preservatory instincts.Marxists have explained violence inside stadia as the outcome of working-class supporters seeking to 'recapture symbolically' the game from middle-class infiltration. As we identify later in this paper, a more complex explanation of space is offered by the figurationalists, through relating the rivalries of fan subcultures to spatially defined social interdependencies and identities.

Football fandom. The anthropology of spatial affinity

As Lefebvre (1991) and Shields (1991) have extensively demonstrated, space does not simply exist as an ontological fact. Crucially, space is socialised, that is to say it is endowed with social meanings and regimes of signification that can be inherently conflictual. The localisation or zoning of space results in the specification of 'places', but a sense of 'place' only emerges through the development of a particular public meaning related to that area. Similarly, anthropologists have highlighted how the meaning of 'landscapes' is socially defined. Hirsch (1995: 5–6) supports Ingold's observation that landscape must be viewed in terms of social process; landscape thus acquires meaning through the interplay of opposed categories such as 'place' and 'space' and 'insiders' and 'outsiders' (*ibid*. 13). In respect of football, Archetti's (1998) analysis of Argentinian urban spaces is of particular value here. Specifically, he helps us to see how *potreros* (urban wastelands) acquire a symbolic significance that seems to invert their commercial worthlessness, since according to the myths of Argentinian football culture, these settings are the vital nurseries for the nation's greatest players.

The construction of spatial meanings contains horizontal and vertical socio-spatial relations. First, the presence of other places may certainly assist, as counterpoints, in bestowing meaning upon particular spaces (Bailly 1986: 83).Second, all spaces are resources in which personal and collective expressions of social agency or imperialising impositions of power are realised and exercised. As Fiske (1993: 11–13) argues, *locales* are geographical areas that involve 'continuities between interior and exterior, between consciousness, bodies, places and times'; and thus, necessarily, 'confronting, resisting or evading imperialization'. In opposition, *stations* are places where the social order is imposed upon an individual; self-constitution is denied. Stated in this way, our concern is with the station that is the football ground, and the arrival and departures of the varying passengers who use it.

Four interconnected strands require unravelling, in relation to the socio-historical spatialisation of football grounds. First, for a football club's supporters, the ground is a focus for *topophilia*, in that it provides for people's affective ties with their environment in a manner that couples sentiment with place (cf. Bachelard 1958; Tuan 1974; Bale 1993). The ground thus emerges as an emblem of local identity, an icon to the community from which the controlling club draws its followers (Cohen 1972; Bale 1991). It exhibits 'the personality of place', to the extent that it acquires the geography of social differences and inequalities contained by its inhabitants and

pilgrims (cf. Portelli 1993). It enables the presentation of communality, through the assembly (or stylized absence)[10] of club colours, banners, badges and other motifs.

Second, since its codification and popularisation in the late nineteenth century, the football ground has been the *locale* of male, working-class leisure *par excellence*. Traditionally, the local football club is inextricably bound up with the menfolk of its ambient, working-class community, alongside surrounding pubs and clubs (Taylor 1971a; 1971b; 1982; John Clarke 1978; Alan Clarke 1992). Accordingly, in Hopcraft's (1968: 179) words, the football crowd is 'always going to have more vinegar than Chanel', containing a frank and raucous following.[11] Fights between football fans have been a longstanding aspect of the attending experience (cf. Hopcraft 1968; Hutchinson 1975; Mason 1980; Dunning *et al.* 1988; Fishwick 1989); and, such spectacles have not always been wholeheartedly condemned by their audiences (Hopcraft 1968: 84–5).

Third, to spectate within the ground is to arrive in a locale that provides for the 'controlled decontrolling of emotions'. Its conventions sanction the supporter's right to shout, dance, gesture and abuse others, which is denied for the most part elsewhere (cf. Bromberger 1992a). One contemporary authority on football states that 'the passions the game induces consume everything, including tact and common sense' (Hornby 1992: 225). Moaning in unison can be gratifying, in a sanitised, airless, pre-packaged society.

Fourth, the ground is also a station for a reflective and refractive accumulation and redistribution of capital, in social and spatial terms. Since its spectacularisation in the late nineteenth century, professional football audiences have always reflected social demarcations. These inherent spatial gradations were no doubt locally bound by variable structuration, according to admission prices, forms of affective male communality, working practices and licensing hours, the intrigues of class ambiguity and social mobility (Mason 1980; Dunning *et al.* 1988; Vamplew 1988; Fishwick 1989). As the French anthropologist Christian Bromberger (1992b; 1993) has demonstrated in European football, an ethnology of stadia discloses the middle classes in the seated stands, the

---

[10] The stylised absence of club colours and motifs has been most graphically illustrated by the 'soccer casual' hooligan style. This emphasises the wearing of quality leisure and sportswear. The style was dominant among young male fan groups in the early 1980s and is now conventional among most British supporter groups (Giulianotti 1993). Though the team affiliation of soccer casuals is immediately unclear, subtle variations in the style and colour of garments can point to the wearers' club/hooligan identity.

[11] More recently, the incipient 'embourgeoisement' of football by the London *literati* has provoked controversy regarding their distaste for the game's popular or plebian culture. After attending one match, the novelist Martin Amis observed, 'The fans all had the complexion and body scent of a cheese-and-onion crisp, and the eyes of pit bulls' (*The Independent on Sunday*, 27 October 1991). In response, some football 'fanzines' have launched scathing attacks on the purported 'take-over' of commentary on the game by those with little biographical or cultural attachment to it.

artisans crafting the game and social ladders on the terracing beneath, with the manual classes and their offspring, both urban and agrarian, swelling the ends with sound.[12] Although football stadia continue to contain these gradations, the advent of the Taylor Report (1990) has revolutionised their architecture. The mandatory creation of all-seated stadia may be promoted as the positive modernisation of traditional fan facilities (cf. Taylor 1991), but it enables a 'calculus of force-relationships' (favouring police, stewards, football authorities, business interests and legislators) that marginalises the affective terrace culture and promotes the entry of discerning, richer consumers (de Certeau 1984: xix).

Where football's spatial arrangement of supporters once reflected wider socioeconomic gradations and attitudes, the game today attempts to exploit and reconstruct favourable financial hierarchies. Previously, employment security could enable a minority to acquire the status of guaranteed entry through season-ticket possession or supporters club membership (a substitute for the impecunious). With some top clubs already holding waiting lists for future season-ticket holders, today's fan can only guarantee admission through joining one of a portfolio of investment schemes, based loosely upon degrees of fandom.[13] Personal investment in the club is no longer calculated in emotional terms and symbolised through wearing club colours or motifs; it is now financial (indeed, corporate-orientated) and realized through holding club bonds, credit cards and other business accoutrements.

Perhaps the example par excellence of this commodification of space is the process and surrounding vocabulary of sponsorship, advertisement and corporate investment in the club. It is now the intention of all leading European clubs to generate over half of all revenue from beyond the turnstiles. With fan 'investment' in the club now given a disenchanted, financial meaning, club emblems and locales become 'products' and publicity spaces for the corporate logos of the supreme 'supporters'. Each club's core psycho-social spaces – club shirt, scoreboard and pitch

---

[12] Our ethnographic research points to variations on this model, according to club history, cultural context and the design or redevelopment of the stadium. Sheffield, for example, has no historical record for more subtle demarcations in the ground other than the base distinction of stand and terrace. In part, this is due to the ground's cricketing origin and the absence of one terracing side until 1975. More significantly, it is also due to an egalitarian, working-class civic culture that promoted a cross-class carnivalesque within the ground at Yorkshire cricket matches during the 1930s, and beyond.

[13] The organisation of space within football stadia has been transformed by investment and debentures schemes, sold through the received mantra, 'membership has its privileges'. Faced with the immense capital outlay of ground redevelopments following the Taylor report, many British clubs have sought to raise revenue from the sale of various tiers of club membership (obtained either through share issues or seat sales).

perimeters – are sold for advertising, with track-side adverts emerging as symbolic barriers between supporters in the stands and players on the pitch.[14]

The transition of UK soccer stadia, from locales to stations, is bound up inextricably with the spatial war waged on football hooliganism by the judiciary, police and football authorities. Major geographical rearrangements of football grounds – segregation, perimeter fencing and all-seated stands – have each been justified according to the need to eliminate the phenomenon of fan violence so that the game's appeal to corporate or bourgeois finance may continue. Such measures have continually proceeded on the basis of unresearched, received wisdoms on the social nature of football hooligan formations: that their practices are purely concerned with violence, and that they are essentially criminal rather than football-orientated individuals who may be dismissed as 'not real fans'. The fact that these 'necessary' measures have been introduced within and without stadia at different times since at least the 1960s suggests the phenomenon is more adaptable and durable than public assumptions would otherwise allow. It is therefore important to outline the properties of football hooligan gatherings, before turning to examine the historical trajectory of contemporary football hooliganism and its particular uses of urban landscapes.

Football hooligan gatherings. Resource networks of time, identity and information

Hooligan formations are composed predominantly of young men aged 16–35, employed in a cross-section of white- and blue-collar work, though this varies according to the opportunities available within their home locales. Hooligan formations aggregate as the particular representative 'mob' of a single club or, in exceptional cases such as Dundee, of a two-team city. Most hooligans are also committed football supporters, with a broad knowledge of watching and playing the game. They share with each other a variable interest in particular leisure spaces (pubs, football grounds, nightclubs) and consumption patterns (quality menswear, sports media, music, drinking/hedonism) at specific times of socialisation outside work. They also share, to varying degrees, a commitment to engage in theatres of rivalry with their peers following other clubs which involve varying degrees of intensity, violence and subsequent injury. Serious injuries are rare, and more commonly accidental than premeditated. Each hooligan aggregate tends to have a specific *nom de guerre*, the capacity to produce supportive paraphernalia (calling cards, badges, t-shirts), and an array of 'internal secrets' which function to enhance communion and mutual

---

[14] At European Champions League ties it is common practise for the front rows in particular ground sections to be kept vacant to ensure fan paraphernalia do not obstruct the advertising boards. In Italy, one often finds supporters' banners and flags are draped across advertising boards. The loudspeaker admonitions of club spokespersons to remove these items are also routinely abused and ignored by the crowd.

assistance (and excite media speculation on the formation's nature; cf. Goffman, 1959: 143–4). Accordingly, rival hooligans are recognisable to one another either through prior interaction and personal familiarity, or more generally through a subcultural 'body idiom' of style, comportment and situational location.[15] *Pace* the media's moral panics about football hooligans, there are no justifiable 'vocabularies of motive' to suggest that hooligan formations initiate violence against 'ordinary' (i.e. non-hooligan) supporters.

Within each hooligan aggregate there are no 'Leaders'/'Generals' with overall authority.[16] However, 'top boys' possess status through extended involvement in football hooliganism, and their 'gameness' in confrontations with rivals. At the everyday level, the hooligan gathering or 'turn out' is voluntarily mustered and therefore significantly mutable in individual composition, scale and interest in fighting opponents.[17] The match-day objective of the gathering is to secure or enhance its status, by taking on opponents successfully, through 'standing' them in fights collectively, 'doing' them or 'running' them.[18] Achieving these objectives is dependent upon avoiding police impositions (segregation, escorts, detainment or arrest) against any fan disorder. Travelling to and from fixtures is arranged privately, involving either service trains or coach hire, but certainly not 'official' (supporters' club) transport.[19] Until relatively recently football

---

[15] Goffman (1963: 33) locates the communicative dimension of 'body idiom' in 'dress, bearing, movements and position, sound level, physical gestures such as waving or saluting, facial decorations, and broad emotional expressions.' With football hooligans, we are talking here of minute variations on shared fashions (expensive menswear), cohabitation of contested leisure-spaces (city centres, outside stadia), and the confrontation of alien accents. We should add that these encounters of shared but rival idioms are temporally situated, specific to match-day contexts.

[16] We have identified elsewhere this absence of formal 'organisation' and hierarchies within hooligan formations (Armstrong 1994 and 1998; Giulianotti 1994b; Giulianotti and Armstrong 1995; cf. Finn 1994; Hobbs and Robins 1991). Particular attention has been drawn to the role of police, politicians, the media and many academics in speculatively constructing these images of hooligan organisation. Ironically, the hierarchical models which they read into the groups studied are more prevalent within their own professional institutions – the constabulary, parliament, the newspaper and the academy.

[17] The hooligan collective replicates the nation as an 'imagined community' in the sense of being 'always conceived as a deep, horizontal comradeship', while still possessing 'finite, if elastic, boundaries, beyond which lie other nations' [or rival hooligan groups] (Anderson 1983: 7).

[18] 'Standing' opponents refers to 'standing one's ground', not moving when confronted, even by greater numbers; 'doing' opponents involves gaining the upper-hand in violent exchanges with opponents; 'running' opponents involves alarming the opposition to the extent that they turn and run from the scene, but under pursuit. Significantly, these terms are all discursively active and signify the power of the hooligan group to act (as a collective subject); their more negative opposites ('being done' or 'getting run') point to the hooligan group's range of actions being curtailed, to the extent that it is acted upon (as object).

[19] This finding calls into question the strength of findings by Williams *et al.* (1984; 1989), as much of the ethnographic research with English 'hooligans' was carried out with fans travelling abroad on official, registered excursions.

hooliganism was rarely 'organised' to the extent that rivals meet at pre-arranged venues (see later discussion on mobile phones).[20]

Hooligan contests are essentially concerned with preserving or prosecuting claims to honour and status within the hooligan network. As Bourdieu (1977: 105) recognises, honour can only be legitimately claimed through challenging, or responding to the challenge of, an equal. Accordingly the contestation of honour underwrites the horizontal political economy of football hooliganism – that is to say, *mutatis mutandis*, that each hooligan formation has an equal right to attempt to trade in the hooligan market-place in this pursuit of status. Equally, this encloses the contest and underpins the discriminatory dimension of hooliganism as there is nothing to be gained, and often 'face' to be lost, in disputing honour with non-equivalents such as 'ordinary supporters' or those considered incapable of violence. However, vertical relationships exist between some hooligan groups. These are not always due to the one-sidedness of previous contests, but are often explained by the perceived 'dishonourable' practices of the stigmatised formation e.g. throwing missiles instead of exchanging punches or using the media to invent notoriety not among rivals but among the public at large. Such contextual re-evaluations of the opposing formation serve to unify internally the individuals within the hooligan formation (they are everything which the deviant 'other' is not); and to justify the apparent failure of the formation to respond propitiously to any apparent challenge to honour afforded by rival peers.

There are tacit, hooligan codes of legitimate action which are negotiated and contested to varying degrees, both within hooligan groups and across the rival formations. As we argue through this paper, a key aim of all hooligan groups relates to control over specific spaces and successfully challenging rivals in confrontations. Hooligans argue that they do not engage in confrontations with the aim of seriously harming their opponents – unless in their view there are extenuating circumstances (the significance of which can be highly contested, even among those who are part of the same hooligan group).[21] A clearer source of division over a code of engagement concerns the use of weapons, which usually takes a geographical form. Some cities or regions (such as the west of Scotland) have a long cultural tradition of weapon-carrying (notably knives) by young people; others do not. Hooligans from the latter cultures tend to advance moral arguments, that

---

[20] Young male fan violence is essentially an outgrowth of a symbiosis of football, youth and civic/regional culture. Other, external, factors such as the seeking of media 'notoriety' or the role of political extremism, have no significant impact on precipitating disorder or attaining status for each hooligan formation.

[21] 'Extenuating circumstances' point to the prior breaking of informal codes of conduct, which thus weaken the norm-following habits of those who feel slighted. Thus, these situations might arise from the perceived 'bullying' of one group of fans by others; the prior assault of individual rivals who are in the company of females; the prior use of excessive force or dangerous weaponry when beating opponents.

weaponry is employed to compensate for a lack of fighting prowess and thus is dishonourable. Most commonly, hooligan confrontations produce a number of incidents whose *post facto* meaning is highly negotiable and open to contestation. Hence, apportioning honour between contestants is very rarely settled in full. Disagreements between rival groups can become important reference points in sustaining a stronger rivalry with dissenting opponents.

Within each hooligan gathering, disagreements and debates arise, regarding how effectively the formation has acted collectively within the specific circumstances. Hence, the viewpoints of available 'neutrals'[22] are significantly valued and sought out to provide a kind of 'looking-glass self' through which hooligans come to understand the ways in which their actions and reputations may be judged by their 'significant others' (other hooligan groups throughout the country). There are no single, authoritative judges of hooligan incidents; respect for an individual's interpretation of an event tends to be proportionate to his depth of knowledge of hooliganism (particularly at national level) and record of personal engagement within confrontations. 'Neutrals' and more critical hooligans may serve to deflate those individuals with exaggerated egos regarding their hooligan prowess. More routinely, the opposing formation may target and seek to humiliate the rival individuals who are guilty of a hooligan hubris.

The hooligan network is an informal and increasingly transnational phenomenon that has evolved gradually and rather haphazardly, particularly since the early 1980s. In most instances, it comprises individual hooligans from different formations who have met (usually fortuitously) and exchanged personal details, with a view towards sharing subcultural information regarding fan violence or other common interests. In other circumstances, the network serves to tie some different hooligan groups through more formal friendships. More recently, mobile telephones provide a greater basis for regular exchanges between individual hooligans on both sides on match-day, to discuss and potentially to plan a possible confrontation. Small groups within hooligan formations are able to communicate more anonymously through message boards provided via the internet and world-wide-web.

In a wider anthropological sense, we argue that football hooligan identity may be regarded as a single constituent of 'a basket of selves which come to the surface at different social moments as appropriate' (Cohen, 1993: 11, paraphrasing Ralph Turner). This has three consequences upon participation. First, time is critical in determining the exact degree of 'fit' between social context

---

[22] The best 'neutrals' comprise individual hooligans who are visiting for the day, non-hooligan fans who are knowledgeable regarding the hooligan network, or local ex-hooligans.

and [self]-identity though anticipation of the former need not always be transparently correct. It may appear obvious, for example, that on the season's completion, no hooliganism is possible until the next one. However, this does not preclude the odd 'chance' of violent encounters outside football contexts, with rivals or others (e.g. pub bouncers, holidaymaking scuffles). Second, the hooligan self must be combined with many otherselves, perhaps simultaneously, as workmates, family, girlfriends/wives and non-football friends are encountered or accompanied within designated football spaces (pubs, the ground, train stations). Third, within hooligan gatherings, there is a multiplicity of self identities available to participants, not only defined by degree of involvement in fighting, but also the internal humour and self-parody afforded by the

hooligan 'court society' – 'fashion victim', 'joker', 'colonel', 'thief', 'bandit player', 'beer monster', 'quiet man', 'boxer', 'gambler', 'pervert', 'daftie', 'brother' and so on.[23] The hooligan formation generates a distinctive *communitas* (cf. Turner 1974; Bauman 1992) and exists as one of the anthropologist Maffesoli's (1991: 12) postmodern 'neo-tribes' which 'attract and collide with each other in an endless dance, forming themselves into a constellation whose vague boundaries are perfectly fluid' (cf. Armstrong and Harris 1991; Giulianotti 1993).

A further theoretical depiction of football hooligans may be derived from the anthropologist Sandra Wallman's (1984) conception of social 'resource networks'. These work according to key ontological characteristics of time, information and identity; exist within urban milieux; and have mutual properties promoting the emotional and material well-being of the group's individual constituents.

1. Time is a critical requirement, for in a straightforward sense without this resource there is no possibility of engaging with fellows and rivals. At the individual level, time may also be interpreted in a more biographical sense, for a 'football hooligan' identity carries with it more significant others (peers) than later stages in life will allow. At the collective level, time is also

---

[23] These roles and identities are both accorded to individuals by the group, and played up to by the individuals themselves, as part of their dominant personal identities, with varying degrees of seriousness. The 'fashion victim' is renowned for a bizarre or slavish pursuit of youth styles; the 'joker' enlivens the gathering with wit and humour, both visual and verbal; the 'colonel' plays up to group jokes or police thinking regarding a central leadership role; the 'thief' is a useful resource for trading in stolen goods; the 'bandit player' takes up the peripheral space within pubs where gaming machines are in use; the 'beer monster' tends to be overweight and primarily interested in heavy drinking; the 'quiet man' is comparatively introverted but, somewhat ironically, is given a public identity to render him more visible; the 'boxer' is keen on the aesthetics of pugilism; the 'gambler' over-extends himself financially in the casinos or the turf accountants; the 'pervert' engages in some relatively deviant sexual interests; the 'daftie' lacks common sense, particularly by entering situations that appear unduly hazardous; the 'brother' is known principally for having a more famous sibling, either within the hooligan group or in the wider civil society.

cultivated by the resource network in designating periods when it is legitimate or otherwise to act aggressively.

2. Shared identities are vital. Identification with a particular team is a general precondition, but within this commonality, there must be generally shared cultural identifications regarding the formation and its cultural practices, particularly the reproduction of male leisure practices.

3. Information and its exchange provide the circulation of knowledge that links the structuring of the group by time with the preconditions of shared identification. Information here relates to the formation's cultural collateral, specifically regarding issues and news conjoining time and identity; its control and dissemination distinguishes participants and non-participants.

The most articulate academic explanation of football hooligan formations according to the spatial questions has been advanced by the 'process-sociologist' Eric Dunning and his colleagues at Leicester University. Drawing upon Gerald Suttles's (1968; 1972) studies of urban ecology in Chicago ghettos, the figurationalists argue football hooligan formations are produced through a process of 'ordered segmentation' (see Dunning *et al.* 1988). In short, this thesis posits that hooligan formations emerge as the product of the aggregation of various, geographically distinguished rival local gangs faced by the challenge of a greater 'other' (i.e. opposing football fans). In this thesis, hooligan formations conjoin according to geo-subcultural scale: for example, the threat of a reputed hooligan gang from London will lead to youth gangs in Leeds joining together under the local club's banner.

We have several criticisms which we seek to extend to 'ordered segmentation'. First, it misunderstands the demographic composition of major club support in general, and the ecological construction of hooligan formations in particular. In brief, major clubs draw their fans from across the country, and from locales that are so diffuse they can hardly be said to consist of segmented rivals. Moreover, club affiliation in any of these locales is hardly homogenous. Thus, the major hooligan groups draw participants from all types of these locales, and these again may hardly be said to be in conflict.[24]

A related criticism concerns the cultural and geographical ascription of the masculine trait of 'hardness'. Hooligans follow dominant cultural norms (and some academic research!) in correlating violent identities with the lowest socio-economic groups, whose personal identities

---

[24] Our particular ethnographic evidence underlines this criticism. In Sheffield, there are no single locales which simply conjoin to form a club-level hooligan force, but which then collapse after the match to return to internal feuding. In Edinburgh, Hibs hooligans are adamant that their first meetings with fellows from other locales did not take place through inter-local rivalry, but as Hibs fans seeking to oppose rival fans.

are most popularly known according to the stigma of their location. Crucial here, however, is the imputation of this 'hardness' with sociopathic criminality (some of it violent); with powerful resource networks of intrinsically 'violent, masculine types'; and with cultural (sometimes ethnic) values alien to the white, 'respectable' working class. In line with Damer (1989: 150–2), therefore, these stigmatised spaces are associated with an unpredictable, unquantifiable, 'heavy' and 'mental' form of 'hardness'; in other words, with a philosophy of violence that is not promoted within the hooligan gathering. Ironically, those typified by the hooligans as violently criminogenic are sufficiently 'incorporated' within the mores of the wider society to join the public choruses of disapproval at the latest hooligan 'outrages'.

Third, the figurationalists' choice of Leicester for supporting ethnography leads to a particularly under-developed application of 'ordered segmentation'. As Leicester is essentially a one-club city, they are unable to explain adequately the kinds of complex social interaction that underlie hooligan identification in two or multi-club cities.

Fourth, it is unclear from the figurational position how exactly the process of 'ordered segmentation' operates, and through what causal dynamics (save the arrival of opposition on the 'home turf'). Is ordered segmentation an innate sociological inevitability, precipitated by some psycho-social gang dynamics? Or, more likely, is it a principle more instrumentally applied by the (in fact, mythical) football hooligan 'generals'?

Fifth, and perhaps most importantly, the thesis of 'ordered segmentation' does not allow for acute temporal and cultural variations in any manifestation of football hooliganism. Against the theory of 'ordered segmentation' as it presently stands, our research has found the prevalence of changing friendships and animosities between hooligan formations in Italy and Germany respectively; rivalries between hooligans and housing estate gangs in one-club cities; and, intra-city alliances and violent rivalries in two-club cities, when confronted by visiting hooligans. And as we seek to show below, temporally specific developments within football hooliganism are central to the appropriation of space by these 'resource networks'.

Shifting the goal posts. Football hooliganism, geography and social control

The precursory form of *contemporary* football hooliganism began between the mid-1960s and late 1970s.[25] At this time, the classic architecture of British and most European stadia consisted of

---

[25] We should point out, of course, that 'football hooliganism' in Scotland has been prevalent since the late nineteenth century (Murray 1984). This disorder has centred upon the practices of sectarian subcultures, particularly

one seated 'main' stand running the length of the pitch and three standing ground sections ('terraces'). For financial and social class reasons, only the main stand was segregated from the other ends. Freedom of passage allowed those fans offering the strongest support for their side to follow it inside the ground by standing behind the goals which it was attacking. This spatial arrangement required fans to mirror the ritual on the pitch by 'changing ends' at half-time. Interaction with opposing supporters was routine throughout the match, but was intensified during the break through the simultaneous movement and passing of large groups of committed young fans.

The home side would have a preferred 'end' for 'shooting into', and this would be reflected in the location of young home fans at the start of the match. 'Away' fans, being in the minority and in comparatively unfamiliar territory, were expected to gather at the opposite end, where groups of less participatory home fans would also be habitually congregated. The pre-match 'toss' between the teams, to decide who kicked off and which ends the teams would play into, rarely upset these fan expectations. This predictability was partially due to the players' wish to avoid the collective wrath of fans before a ball had been kicked. But it also reflected the common perception within the game that strong fan support (especially at the end being played at) could give footballers a psychological lift (cf. Finn 1994; MacClancy 1995). In this sense, the spatial, stationing barrier between fans and players – off and on the pitch respectively – could be surmounted through affective noise and colourful identification on the terrace locales.

Subsequently, the emergent rivalry between opposing groups of young fans carried a strong spatio-symbolic dimension within the ground (Clarke 1978; Marsh 1978). At either end, these young fans would attempt to offer the most intensive support – chanting the names of home players, denigrating opposition players and fans, responding volubly to debatable refereeing decisions, waving in unison the colours of the supported team etc. The fandom afforded the footballing sides was never purely mechanistic in nature; organic rivalries between young fans also emerged that were relatively autonomous to the game. The fan groups' subcultural names reflected the strong symbiosis between young male fandom and their specific territorial claims

---

in Glasgow, which led to the early establishment of segregation within the grounds of Rangers and Celtic. However, ground segregation procedures elsewhere in Scotland were more concertedly applied at approximately the same times as in England. In this context, we would argue that Scottish sectarianism represents a kind of 'traditional' fan violence from which the more contemporary or 'modern' Scottish hooligans, the Scottish casuals, consciously differentiate themselves.

on ground space.[26] However, the fact that attendance of these ends was still competitive and affective rather than disinterested and impositional in nature meant that 'taking the ends' of rivals became the focus for young supporters (cf. Marsh *et al.* 1978). For as Sack (1986: 76) argues, control of geography cannot be merely notional, but is synonymous with the exercise of power; territoriality does not exist unless there is an attempt by individuals or groups to affect the interaction of others. Local hooligans within the ground would, like the wider fan groups, refer to the ground as a 'home'; hence their attempts to expel the visiting hooligans represented an attempt by the 'insiders' who 'live' within the landscape to remove the 'outsiders' who held a more objectified attitude towards this space (Williams 1973, in Hirsch 1995).

Young supporters' choice of procedure would be largely influenced by the reputation, and potential or actual number of their rivals. Away supporters could, before the match, walk around the ground, locate the home fans' kop, enter it, and confront the home 'mob'. Alternatively, home fans could enter what was ostensibly the away end, await their rivals and act after evaluating the situation, with the balance of numbers a major though not determining factor. During subsequent confrontations and fights, non-participants caught in the midst of proceedings would back away; a 'hole' of empty space across the terracing would appear around which stood members of the rival factions packed close together. Invariably, within half a minute one side would recommence hostilities, rushing across the space; punching and kicking would ensue (cf. H. Davies 1972: 107; Ward 1989: 25–6, 93). Possible results ranged between complete victory for one side (signified by the disappearance of opponents into other spaces, including on to the pitch); a short moratorium on further hostilities that was broken following events on the pitch; or the postponement of a genuine conclusion, usually due to police intervention. The latter intensified as this most visible form of young rivalry attracted popular political and media attention.

In the mid-1970s, perimeter fencing within and between ground terraces was introduced, to prevent the movement of large numbers of young fans, effectively segregating the rivals from one another. This process of stationing fans in their favoured ends was compounded by the rise in all-ticket matches (thereby controlling the end's composition, so long as fans continue to declare their affiliation honestly). Police were seconded to monitor the club loyalties of supporters entering through specific turnstiles, but their segregation of fans also came to extend beyond the ground and match hours. It became common practice for visiting supporters

---

[26] Most young fan formations tended to carry some reference to locus in their names – for example, the 'Beach End Boys' at Aberdeen, the 'Gorgie Boys' at Hearts (where the club's ground is), the Shoreham (end) Republican Army at Sheffield United, the North Bank at Arsenal, the 'Shed' end at Chelsea.

travelling by rail or coach to be met by police on arrival and then escorted directly into one ground section. After matches, visiting fans were held inside the ground while home fans were dispersed from the ground and its environs.

The segregation of football supporters within grounds continues to have three dysfunctional and unforeseen consequences. First, the initial segregation of supporters tended to be spatially incomplete. Those spaces such as toilets or food kiosks, traditionally associated with more decorous and pacified behaviour outside grounds, often remained accessible to opposing supporters, and thus became new venues for the engagement of rivalries. Although now very infrequent, deficiencies in segregation (open spaces, unlocked gates, errors in police escorting methods) still occasionally emerge as facilitators of brief, unanticipated 'aggro'. Second, the attempted stationing of supporters within designated sections can be eluded on purpose. Sneaking through the turnstiles into the opposition's territory, purchasing blocks of tickets for alien spaces, stealing complimentary tickets for the opposition's players, are effective ways of evading control strategies. Third, and more substantively, the stationing of fans by segregation precipitated a transformation in the geographical arrangement of supporters. Segregation enabled vocal, young supporters still gathered in the ends, to deride opposing fans, knowing that their targets of abuse would be unable to offer a violent response. Additionally, effective policing of fans inside the ground meant that the earlier football hooligans no longer felt compelled to 'defend' their end from possible incursion.

Finally, the attempted stationing of young fans at particular ends failed to anticipate the evasion of constrictive control strategies and the effects of the 'ageing process' upon previously 'juvenile' hooligans. Therefore, being within a group of fellow fans no longer carried the 'edge' or 'buzz' derived from defining itself continuously and hazardously against opponents. Stylistically, it was also becoming increasingly *passé* for young men to attend matches bedecked in the colours of their youth. Gradually, therefore, the spatial semiotics of hooligan intent were recodified for the new era of segregation. The home ends were abandoned by the hooligans to the 'shirts', 'cavemen', 'sweaties', 'Christmas Trees', 'canaries' and 'beer monsters', the 'loyal' supporters of the team. Generally, away football hooligans would be corralled into their traditional end at each ground visited, but they would now be greeted and mocked by the 'home' hooligans, who had sacrificed their old end and moved into the stand nearest to the visitors.

The intensification of masculine style within 1980s football hooliganism partially resulted from segregation. Rival mobs seated adjacent to one another provided captive targets for ceremonies

of public degradation (Garfinkel 1967); the preferred audiences for irony, sarcasm and scatology became fellow fans and possibly neutrals. Indeed, an outside audience also came into play to a far greater extent, as the semiotics of hooliganism were spectacularised for national consumption through television. The sight of dressed-up rival fans draped nonchalantly across ground seating and glancing contemptuously at one another underscored the ground's geographical transformation, from locales of territory to stations of semiotic resistance. Though segregation between ends was increasingly constrictive, opportunities remained for more material objections to impositions e.g. smashing seats in the visitor's end or throwing coins and other missiles into the opposition's end.[27] Another strategy for violating segregation within the ground is to attempt a pitch invasion. Although having a lengthy pedigree (cf. Taylor 1971a; Mason 1980), pitch invasions are extremely rare; for this reason they attract disproportionate media attention, but also extremely indecisive results due to police intervention or lack of opposition.

It was not long before the flight of hooligans to those stands adjacent to their opponents was followed by the vocal, young non-hooligans. Here, questions of time and cultural identity conspired to displace the hooligan groups from their adopted ground locales. For while the latter were still outside the ground, associating in nearby pubs or seeking confrontations with rivals, their non-violent fellows were stationing themselves within the ground in readiness of supporting the home team and mocking the awaited visitors. Partially reflecting the extended definition of 'football hooliganism' that covers such increasingly nebulous forms of behaviour as shouting, swearing and abusing opponents, police came to stigmatise these young fans' purely participatory fandom as 'hooliganism'.

For the real football hooligans, therefore, the geographical meaning of the ground had been transformed by segregation and the attendant relocalisation of fan groups. A decade earlier, it had been the deeply symbolic epicentre for enacting hostilities, the 'front region' in which rivalries were publicly played out (Goffman 1959). Now it was a 'back region' in which interaction between the competing hooligan teams was denied, but still where analysis and post-mortems between rivals could be shared and disputed via the epithets and humour which flew over the segregated 'no man's land' (such as empty terracing or thick fencing). The new locales for enacting rivalries therefore became more context-bound and variable, such as train stations, public houses, court-houses and city centres; and, also the streets en route to these sites, the avenues of contestation themselves. Football hooliganism became increasingly dominated by

---

[27] *Pace* Korem (1994: 71), there is no direct cultural correlation between losing and ground-wrecking. It is also not entirely unknown for home fans to break up seats within the ground to throw at opponents or police.

temporal rather than spatial considerations. Rivalries were fought within the general time specifications of 'match-day'; thus, the spaces in which these could be legitimately played out expanded proportionately. The growth of time–space specificities also served to expand the potential audience for hooligan performances. Bauman (1992) argues that the spectacle of 'street battles before and after football matches' have their greatest impact in the 'capturing of human imagination', whether on film (virtual) or experienced live (real). Episodes of stylised non-violence became almost equally significant forms of public theatre, with smartly dressed young men in mobs of over one hundred sauntering through the unfamiliar territory of their rivals' city centres, visibly tensed for a response to their polluting presence.

One index of the broadening of hooligan spatial parameters is in the creation of new formation names, particularly those relating to transport methods. As Wittgenstein once averred, 'the only place where real philosophical problems can be tackled and resolved is the railway station.' It may safely be assumed that his trainspotting did not include the football specials of the 1960s, nor the hooligan formations founded in the late 1970s and early 1980s such as the Portsmouth 6.57 Crew, the West Ham Inter-City Firm, or the Capital City Service, arriving express from Edinburgh's Easter Road. For train stations became one of several key termini at which the disembarkation of visiting rivals may have been reasonably expected. The attendance of a local 'welcoming committee' is reliant upon precedents, guess-work, the relative effrontery of opponents, and the predictability of police strategies.

Time intervenes here in two key respects related to the new hooligan locales. First, premature and unprecedented attendance carries with it no possible accumulation of honour. The earning of honour by the formation is relatively available, on a loosely calibrated sliding-scale according to the likely and expected maximisation of opposition numbers; in short, supreme honour is gained by arriving at a 'reasonable' hour before kick-off, attacking the peak numbers of home hooligans for that day and running them. This does not necessitate violence and injury, but is the most spectacular and coveted victory available to either side.

Second, where aggressive or violent exchanges do take place, they are actions which are knowingly conducted in areas such as rail termini, where the greatest number of police tend to be routinely congregated. Accordingly, the police, expectant or otherwise, will intervene to minimise the duration of conflict, and thus latently serve to minimise the level of injury sustained by either side.

Arrival points for visiting rivals tend to be monitored on a voluntary and informal basis by individual home hooligans, in car or on foot, in anticipation of potential conflict throughout the day. Where these witnesses are sufficient in number and confidence, they may present themselves to the visitors as seeking confrontation; where the visitors are already greeted by a police escort, they will also appear, this time to signify awareness of their opponents' arrival. In both scenarios, this appearance produces the first dialogue between rivals over the proper apportionment of honour. For example, a common form of calumny relates to rivals' dishonourable sheltering behind police protection in order to enter new territory without challenge.

However, it is the objective of both sides to be spatially removed from public (and police) observation, from the stations of the street to the private locales of self-determination. Public houses are the primary spaces for hooligan rendezvous, and the reproduction of numbers and communality. The pub functions as a holding point for the 'turn out', the uncertain number of the home hooligan neo-tribe that congregates for that day. Pubs for these meetings need to be set within the mutually accessible landscape of city centres, along public transport arteries or within striking distance of the stadium. Pubs also require an accommodating (but still profit-orientated) manager and staff. Down-sides to the realisation of match-day rewards include the occasional inconvenience of broken windows or the secondary stigma of others (police and nonfrequenting public), whereby the pub is viewed as a 'hooligan' home. For the visitors, established drinking-places in the host city tend to be more stations than locales. There may be a degree of choice available to the visitors, but this is always exercised within the range offered by police designations of sociable spaces.

Police monitoring of public transport routes for the arrival and escorting of away fans is particularly acute at train stations. To avoid 'capture' for the day (i.e. a permanent police escort), away hooligan formations have responded to re-establish degrees of self-control on match-days by seeking alternative travel arrangements. The most popular practice is to hire private coaches; convoys of cars or transit vans can also be utilised. The selection of transport tends to depend upon the recent history and successes of prior travel methods; the reputation and reliability of those that set themselves up as potential transport 'organisers'; and, upon the likely numbers of those attending, relative to the kudos to be accorded the awaiting rivals.

The selection of coach transport rather than rail has two major consequences. First, the coach provides for a greater degree of spatial control, regarding entry to and activities within the

host/rival city. Police escorts may be eluded with the result that the visitors may exercise a fuller autonomy in choosing pubs for pre-match congregation. Indeed, these venues may be decided upon beforehand at the recommendation of more knowledgeable members of the party to enable numbers to be swollen by those arriving on alternative transport. More commonly, coach travel serves to collapse the distinction between disembarkation point and private congregational spaces, with drivers asked to drop off the party at particular pubs, thus avoiding the public spectacle of having to stroll an uncertain distance through the host city with police escort (a pointless exercise) or without one (a hazardous exercise devoid of choice). Second, coach travel also enables the construction of transient hooligan landscapes; along the main arteries linking the visitors to the host city, other disembarkation points may be found where confrontations can be sought with 'third party' forces. In contrast to the activities in the host city for the match, these additional opponents need not have a football input, but may instead simply be any aggregation of young men gathered in a core space (public house, city centre streets, market squares, motorway services, seaside promenades, night-club car-parks). Importantly, such confrontations, where they do occur, should not be interpreted as instrumental variations upon a sinister hooligan agenda. They are instead historical continuations of the male working-class tradition of revelry in liminal, recreational spaces resulting in occasional brawls, typically with willing locals (Waites, Bennett and Martin 1982; Humphries and Gordon 1994).

The identification of group with setting results in the construction of mutually dependent concepts of violation and defence in hooligan exchanges. They permit the enactment of various hooligan strategies for those within the pub and for those that seek to approach it as aggressors. The most common ritual is the 'walk round' in which one set of opponents do not enter the pub, but walk past it; for the walkers, honour is perceived to be earned by intimidating their opponents to the extent that no response is offered from the pub. Claims of moral victory are dismissed by those inside on the grounds of unfulfilled promise, in that neither an attack nor entry has been attempted. For those outside, such a defence may be anticipated and negated through a phone-call to an known adversary inside the pub, and a declaration of the group's intent. In this circumstance, the element of surprise in arriving outside the pub is forfeited in the interest of provoking an 'off'.[28] This is not always acted upon nor believed by the respondent. Hoaxes and 'wind ups' are consistently exploited by football hooligans as techniques for ridiculing opponents. More commonly, no prior warning may be given of attacks, which when initiated from the outside tend to be limited to the surrounding of pub doors (the boundaries

---

[28] An 'off' refers to a hooligan confrontation involving violence. It relates to the verb, 'going off', which is typically related to a fight between rival mobs.

between the opposing groups), the smashing of windows (breaking down false perimeters) and the exchange of missiles (bottles, bricks, glasses). On these occasions entry to pubs is hardly ever attempted. Those inside participate in the exchanges to the extent of throwing missiles, but typically remain inside unless their numerical superiority is unquestionably established. However, the often exaggerated term of 'pub wrecking' encapsulates the practices of those outside only; social etiquette decrees that where pub management and staff have welcomed those inside, no serious or concerted damage will be done to the premises.

There is, of course, a final scenario in which pub space as territorial power may be further contested and confused, when one group knowingly enters the public geography previously established by their opponents as their own.[29] There are three general instances in which this procedure may be applied and each is known, through colloquial expression, by idioms embodying the contextual application of idealized masculine norms.

1. 'Sounding out'/'sussing', by *intrusion*. The entrants are unknown or unrecognised by their rivals, and effectively 'pass' as ordinary pub customers; the significance is only immediately meaningful for the entrants, and in its retelling to fellows in other circumstances, although useful tit-bits may be learned about the nature and identity of opponents.
2. 'Acting wide' or 'Giving it the big un', as *transgression*. A recognised individual or group of hooligans enter their rivals' pub, but in a fashion which is ambiguous to their hosts because of the timing (outside match-day hours) or low numbers.
3. 'Taking liberties'. The hooligans consciously *trespass* into the rivals' pub as part of a transparently oppositional collective ('mob-handed' or 'firmed up'), with the intended impact of 'winding up' the hosts to precipitate a violent response, procuring fight or flight.

The difference between 'sounding out', 'acting wide' and 'taking a liberty' within the other's social space is really determined, firstly by the extent to which the entry is recognised by rivals, and secondly by the time–space context within which entry is made. Greatest status is inevitably reserved for those willing to make the most public and offensive arrivals upon their rivals' spaces, though these occasions tend to be relatively rare outside match-day contexts (when such sudden appearances are jeopardised as much by police impositions as by the larger numbers of

---

[29] There is another scenario in which two rival mobs may meet primarily by chance in 'neutral' spaces (such as pubs *en route* to games). There is no inevitable outcome: some drink together and leave shaking hands; some may refuse to talk while those with rivals might converse for hours; occasionally, both parties define the situation as hostile and disturbances proceed accordingly. Yet the core ambiguities of these encounters often mean that all three practices occur before the most definitive interpretation is provided by a violent, single action (usually from an individual) which subsequently escalates, sometimes to full-scale disorder.

opponents). For example, a hooligan group is flagrantly 'taking a liberty' when it 'packs out' (with its own participants) a pub that is associated with a rival formation. This form of trespass represents for the affronted group, a deliberate profanation of a relatively sacred space; hence, the polluting matter (the rival group) must be expunged, to restore the local social order, and to recover face in the light of this slight.

Intrusions or transgressions are the more regular modes of entry, with the latter containing stronger social tensions (and anthropological interest). Its situational content is principally reflected in the breadth of the pub's clientele. Pre- or post-match, it may be an overtly 'football' social space, but outside these hours the pub welcomes other associations. In the working-class cities of northern England and Scotland, it may witness sexually demarcated groupings on Friday evenings; the coupledom of Saturday evenings; the 'stag' or 'hen' parties on Thursday night; and the evenings for sparse groups of regulars and shift workers in mid-week. And it is within these sociotemporal configurations that the rival hooligans may attempt to fit.

Both sets of opponents will have variable levels of information regarding the potential or actual rendezvous point of the other. Such knowledge where it is available does not necessarily entail action automatically. The police, in their role as umpires between these contesting factions, have the *a priori* duty of preventing any form of contestation in and around public spaces. Through tracking or discovering hooligan movements and occasionally being tipped off by paid 'insiders', the police can often emerge as the day's victors in preventing any contestation of urban landscapes bar that which they are unable to eradicate (e.g. banter and posturing between the rival factions). Indisputably, police consider themselves to be part of a contest, but in contrast between that involving the football rivals, it is not one to which all players consent. Police engagement depends upon their publicly affirmed access to information regarding the presence and general intentions of hooligan gatherings; their highly contextual negotiation of their legal powers *vis-à-vis* the perceived potential of disorder; and their uses of sophisticated crime prevention technology.

All of these strategies are beholden to the core assumption that the natural *status quo* of civil society is one of predictable public tranquility. This institutional philosophy is a practicable one in circumstances whereby rivals arrive within a couple of hours of kick-off, attend the match and leave soon afterwards. There are two contexts in which this ideal scenario does not obtain, and each gives rise to the specific renegotiation in the politics of urban landscapes. The first situation has its roots in the historico-cultural identity of club fandom and relates to *intra*-city rivalries; the

second emerges in opposition to constrictive police impositions applied outside the ground. It is to an examination of each of these that we now turn.

Intra-city rivalries and spatial specificities

In most instances of popular football fandom, greatest club-centred rivalries focus upon antagonisms with neighbouring clubs, particularly other city clubs. Intra-city rivalries give rise not only to the interminable rituals of argument and insult, in locations of work especially. They also germinate an ensemble of contrapuntal identities around each football institution so that the rival clubs symbolise opposing values and interpretations within the civic setting: rich versus poor, left versus right, suburban versus inner-city, ethnic minority versus majority people, localist versus nationalist in vision. In the past, the fan demographics and values of specific clubs would be determined largely by the setting of the ground and club headquarters.[30] Today, however, images of neat socialisation into fandom, according to one's place of birth and childhood, are no longer spatially so secure. The spatial contribution to club–fan identity is now more encoded with normative, metaphorical contents, regarding the perceived endogeny or exogeny of club/city status.[31] These spatial differences, more latent yet more definitive and articulate, are often dressed in the convenient vocabulary of 'tradition' and 'modernity', and are said to be played out at more minor levels in most football cities. Rangers, Hearts, Sampdoria ('modernity') versus Celtic, Hibernian, Genoa ('tradition'). This is not to say that the sense of participating rivalry is in any way diminished; once an allegiance is chosen, it is out of the question to transfer it to opponents. But, we do aver that the moment of confirmation, of support for one or other club, may be decided by individual response to a range of social factors, ranging from familial or peer socialisation, consumer experiences or sheer serendipity.

From this, we identify two major ingredients of intra-city rivalries involving football hooligans: first, at the everyday level, there is a stronger contextualisation of time and space in distinguishing the legitimate and illegitimate pursuit of rivalries; second, at a more diachronic level, there is an expression and extension of culturally embedded 'vocabularies of motive', for tying antagonisms and violent rivalries to existant club-fan oppositions.

---

[30] The two great clubs of Milan were socio-economically and spatially distinguished in support, with the aristocratic and working-class side of AC Milan followed in the suburbs and Internazionale the side of the city's professionals. In Scotland, of the three major intra-city derbies that are played, only Edinburgh retains a spatial definition through the general identification of the city's various locales with support for either team: Hearts more obviously in the north and west; Hibs in the east and south.

[31] In the post-industrial spaces of Manchester and Turin, City and 'Torino' therefore claim to play as representations and expressions of the home cities. Both clubs labour under the shadow of their more cosmopolitan neighbours, United and Juventus, both global soccer enterprises; their residences are often derisively said to be conjunctural and open-ended, mere stages for the apotheosis of sporting icons.

Intra-city animosities therefore tend to be functionally suppressed within working hours and contexts, limited at least to verbal exchanges and 'football banter'. Alternatively, leisure periods typically carry the possibility of becoming engaged in more intensive exchanges with city rivals. At any juncture, some form of balance in the distribution of access to leisure resources will have been achieved. In city centres, particular pubs and streets will be routinely (and confidently) regarded as established territory for one side or another. The entry of opposing groups to these spaces is thus regarded as consciously transgressive and assumed to be intimidatory, unless otherwise explicable. However, in the majority of social spaces – places of work, shops, cinemas, night clubs, public parks and thoroughfares – intra-city rivalries are regarded as sanctioned only within match-day contexts. To enable the continuation of other forms of social identity – work-mate, salesman, consumer, husband/boyfriend, pedestrian/ motorist – the intra-city rivals' full dispensation to initiate violence is therefore rather inhibited. Outside these hours, further ambiguity pervades the identification of football and non-football spaces; the sting is never allowed to be entirely neutralised, as the continuation of close-season disputes demonstrates. Additionally, the personalisation of animosities between individual rivals, usually founded in prior engagements, can threaten to break into a restoration of collective violence.

Further complexity is added to intra-city rivalries by the match-day entry of an outside hooligan formation which is following its visiting football side. The hooligan code of honour requires their city match-day opponents to intervene and effectively 'police' the home spaces, by confronting the visitors with maximum menace. If the hosts fail to respond sufficiently, they lose face in the eyes of both the visiting hooligans from outside the city and those 'disinterested' intra-city rivals whose club is not competing on that day.[32] For this latter hooligan formation, four honour-seeking strategies are available when confronted by a match that involves intra-city rivals and visiting hooligans:

1. Act with complete lack of interest, arguing neither possible opponent has sufficient status or capability to merit their attention or the danger of being arrested. This is a comparatively risky option, however, as hooligan status is rarely gained or reproduced from inaction. It also undermines the principle of effective group re-assembly, against the rival others, upon which the hooligan formation is essentially predicated.

---

[32] The 'host' hooligans may be informed in numerous ways of their shameful failure to respond to a challenge. Visiting hooligans will taunt them at the match and outside with shouts and songs, such as 'you're supposed to be at home'. The intra-city rivals will taunt the hosts over a longer period of time, at individual and collective level, at work, in pubs and through personal relationships. Both visiting and intra-city rivals may also spread information through the informal hooligan network, regarding the day's events, resulting in further possible loss of face and status for the 'hosts'.

2. 'Wind up' local rivals by monitoring the visitors' practices more closely than the real match-day opponents. This may extend to treating some visitors as 'guests' and showing them around the town before appalled local rivals. The danger of this strategy relates to the lack of hooligan status derived from neutral or positive interaction with visiting fans; honour is only gained indirectly through intimidating city rivals into non-intervention.

3. Challenge *either* the visitors *or* the city rivals. If adopted, this strategy should be directed at the most potent formation present, as little honour is gained from challenging the formation with lowest numbers and/or hooligan status.

4. Take on *both* visitors and city rivals. This offers by far the greatest scope for attaining honour, and the possibility of reproducing rivalries over an extended period of time on match-day.

Generally, intra-city rivalries highlight the capacity of hooligan confrontations to lack match-day antagonisms, but which are still based upon traditional, football-related animosities. There are other scenarios in which the geographical relationship of violence to football can prove more tenuous and, ironically, more derivative of police intervention upon the phenomenon of hooliganism. Accordingly, in the concluding section, we turn to examine recent trends and future developments in what Foucault would term the 'economy' of surveillance and control over football supporters.

The intensification of police control strategies. From segregation to surveillance

To explain the popularity of sports spectacles, Fiske (1993: 82) introduces Foucault (1979) to argue,

> The football stadium is the panopticon turned inside out. Instead of the one in
> the centre monitoring the bodies and behaviours of hundreds around the
> perimeter, the thousands around the perimeter monitor the behaviour of the
> few in the centre.

Although nominally accurate in the distinction of spectators and performers, this pays little attention to the technologies of power and knowledge employed against football supporters. The zoning and partitioning of supporters into segregated stations was merely a crude prelude to the introduction of more complex strategies of surveillance and control; what Baudrillard would term the 'pornography of policing', ensuring every act of fan 'violence' is captured in obscene, explicit detail (cf. Giulianotti 1994b; Armstrong and Giulianotti 1998). Today, closed circuit television and plainclothes police officers are stationed within the ground where 'problem' supporters are gathered (Bale 1993). The 'knowledge' generated on these fans, in the form of photographs and dossier reports, is filed with the ground's Football Intelligence Officer, who

then relays the information to the National Criminal Intelligence Service's football unit in London. Perhaps where once the principles of the panopticon were reversed within football grounds, today there are no exceptions to its dedicated application.

Control strategies inside football stadia have moved from establishing segregation to panopticism throughout the 1970s and 1980s. Since 1985, this process has also intensified outside stadia; football hooligans are now one of the major public demons referenced for the political legitimisation of CCTV in city centres (Norris and Armstrong 1999). For police officers themselves, this technologising process represents an intensification in the 'scientific management' of control over public order.[33] Politically, the major justification for this new economy of control relates not only to the public disgust that spectacular displays of aggression generate among witnesses; but also the everyday danger that 'law-abiding citizens' may be caught up in the cross-fire.[34] These instances are extremely rare and are usually the site for expressing as much moral righteousness among hooligans privately as among the media and police publicly. *Pace* Robins (1995: 215), the vicissitudes of hooligan status ensure honour is lost rather than earned when one group allows or promotes attacks on passers-by.

During the 1970s and 1980s, media representation of the hooligan 'epidemic' identified two classically vulnerable groups of 'victim' supporters – women and children. Subsequently, substantial sociological debate has centred upon the efficacy of women's attendance in engineering a 'decline' in hooligan behaviour. One position akin to the ideology of bourgeois domesticity contends that by 'getting the family back into football', the 'feminising' properties of women will serve to pacify ('civilise') aggressive male posturing within the stadium (cf. Dunning *et al.* 1988), through what Bourdieu and Passeron (1977) would term 'the enslaving violence of the agreeable'.[35] It is assumed that the presence at football matches of inherently decorative and passive women will underwrite the adoption of a 'critical distance' among males towards their

---

[33] The principles of Taylorism revere the separation of a task's conception from execution, thereby undermining the accumulation of 'skill' and wisdom for the employee. For the police officer, it is no longer a case of interpreting the actions of individuals as 'criminal' or otherwise, and thus promoting on-the-spot decision-making on the basis of experience or 'feel' for the occasion. CCTV invites the officer to simply respond to orders given from the cameras' console room or, if employed there, simply to log images of public events for future interpretation by a more 'qualified' (superior) officer.

[34] We make this point in response to queries from Jock Young and others about the validity of media and political 'moral panics' on football hooligans. The sole potential justification for such 'discourses of crisis' relates to the involvement of other, non-hooligan, fans in violence between rival formations; as we note here and elsewhere, this is extremely rare and usually coincidental (cf. Giulianotti and Armstrong 1996).

[35] Within the stadia, as elsewhere, authorities and experts are pursuing what Sennett (1977) terms the 'purified community'. The city comes to be regarded as a disorganising influence on life, as individuals become obsessive about privacy and self-enhancement rather than engagement in public life. An intolerance of difference and fear of change characterises this society, 'willing to be dull and sterile in order not to be confused or overwhelmed'.

experience of football, rendering the ground's atmosphere akin to that of a theatre (cf. Bale 1995). Male fans will also be expected to practice more chivalrous behaviour towards one another before ladies. Failure to observe such Edwardian mores precipitates closer surveillance and arrest. The gender essentialism and ahistoricism underlying this policy-orientated strategy has been effectively deconstructed by Jennifer Hargreaves (1994). Moreover, Alan Clarke (1992) questions the ethics of manoeuvring uninterested female spectators into spaces of dangerous masculinity, in order to promote their auto-emasculation.[36] Finally, our researches and those of others (Dal Lago and De Biasi 1994; Finn 1994; Roversi 1994) evidence the participation of some women within hooligan formations in Scotland, England, Germany and Italy. We have also found evidence of exploitative and sexist treatment of women by fan groups associated with gregarious, but non-violent practices (Giulianotti 1994a; 1995b).

In characteristically maverick style, Baudrillard (1993: 79–80) deciphers a 'hyperreal' consequence to football culture's control strategies against hooligans and supporters generally. The biggest danger presented by violent fans is not any physical one against ordinary 'supporters', but rather a symbolic threat whereby the hooligan spectacle may come to overshadow events on the core space, the pitch itself. In reply, the authorities effect a prohibition of problem fans, though success may only be guaranteed through playing fixtures in empty stadia before the cameras, which 'is why the public must simply be eliminated, to ensure that the only event occurring is strictly televisual in nature'.

There is a sense in which this sanitised *mise-en-scène* is being realised, but outside rather than within the ground. Police impositions outside stadia have extended to removing hooligans from their preferred social spaces. A long-standing practice has been to 'clear' pubs of their hooligan clientele in a bid to undermine these fans' venue for association. Ironically, this strategy of forcing hooligans out onto the streets can lead to greater policing problems, particularly when groups of opposing hooligans are also in town. Concerted harassment of pub landlords over confiscation of licences may also succeed in shifting hooligans from their chosen locales. More recently, however, in Scotland especially, police tactics have extended into completely eliminating 'known undesirables' from the match-day context. No longer is it deemed sufficient to patrol and set boundaries on these supporters' locales. Today, at particular fixtures, visiting supporters are either prevented from travelling (coaches are turned back or rail passengers are sent home on

---

[36] Reputable surveys of British football grounds continue to place female attendance at below 20 per cent, usually at around the 15 per cent mark.

the next train), or on arrival are taken into police detention and then released in the evening. Home supporters receive similar treatment.[37]

However, Baudrillard fails to recognise the scope available to his 'terrorists',[38] the football hooligans, in reworking the meaning and significance of their relationship to specific spaces in the light of police impositions. A long-standing example to demonstrate this point is found in the effect of police interventions during hooligan confrontations. For individual hooligans, the immediate outcome of arrest is the pacification of rivalry within the liminal spaces of police van, interview rooms and prison cells. In these areas, the undeniable presence of opposing others is tolerated but generally ignored. Where court proceedings are initiated, non-verbal exchanges expand into direct communication regarding the sharing of interests, evidence, innocence and often defence counsels.

Similarly, more recent police control strategies serve to further the process of reducing interest, while attachment to surveillance strategies is increasingly utilised against young fans, within and immediately outside football stadia and also indirectly in city centres. 'Football hooliganism' has provided a *de facto* social test for the general application of closed-circuit television within the newly 'pacified social spaces' of city centres (Armstrong and Hobbs, 1994).

De Certeau (1984, 1986) notes that resistant practices can be employed to challenge the strategies of domination that are spatially mediated. For example, he uses the term *la perruque* (the wig) to describe the evasive ruses of French workers in resisting their workplace surveillance and disciplining (de Certeau 1986). Inevitably, some hooligans have employed *la perruque* to challenge police control strategies by enlarging the permissible spatial boundaries for group association and confrontation. For them, no longer are the core sites of football ground, train station and favoured pubs the venues for routine reproduction of numbers and competitive intent. Other

---

[37] As *The Guardian* (8 April 1995) reports, these impositions under the Criminal Justice Act 1993 have germinated a 'new social movement' with the acronym FFACJA (Football Fans Against the Criminal Justice Act) aimed at protecting the liberties of football fans. Routledge's (1996) work on social movements, space and domination/resistance has relevance here. The apparatuses of 'governmentality' that aspire to the social control of hooligans is, as we have argued, highly advanced. However, we do not view football hooligans themselves as constituting a 'social movement' in the strict sense of the term, given their general lack of interest in political causes and goals.

[38] Baudrillard's depiction of hooligans as 'terrorists' is not simply allegorical in substance. One media report claimed that Scotland Yard's Anti-Terrorist Squad (SO13) was about to begin monitoring the Neo-Nazi Combat 18 group (which has less than 150 members) because it was 'blamed for orchestrating the Dublin riot at the Ireland–England football friendly, abandoned after 27 minutes in February [1995]' (*The Mail on Sunday*, 9 April 1995). Three weeks later, *The Guardian* (29 April) produced damning evidence of the 'intelligence' linking Combat 18 to the violence. According to the Special Branch, the supposed cue for hooliganism inside the ground had been the chanting of 'Seig Heil' by a group of Brighton neo-fascists. In fact, these 'neo-fascists' were chanting 'Seagulls', the nickname of their home side, Brighton FC.

landscapes are temporarily transformed into hooligan venues, though they lack the affective or symbolic content of prior hooligan spaces. These territories are pragmatically located, well away from the observing eyes of police cameras or plainclothes officers. The time and location for such exchanges is agreed upon beforehand through personal communications via the hooligan network. Mobile telephones can provide a vital, virtual medium for the negotiations between sides, as to which spaces may be functional, legitimate settings for violent exchanges.

We are talking here of the potential 'privatisation' of football hooliganism. Football's political economy is increasingly orientated towards commercial values and the apotheosis of the privatised, suburban family. Accordingly, the spatial relationship of its hooligans is being driven from the public locales of stadia, surrounding streets or city centre to the private, hidden, 'safe' (police-free) landscape of quiet pubs, service stations and industrial estates. For ex-hooligans, engagement with 'virtual' hooliganism (through hooligan books, videos and, in future, even video games) advances this privatisation of fan violence. Like the changes within the football crowd's class composition, the privatisation of actual hooliganism remains incomplete and potentially reversible. For many active hooligans, a violent exchange in surroundings devoid of an affective input represents a concept alien to the match-day experience. But its recent manifestation does point to the logical outcome of the consistent increase in police restrictions upon the use of public space by football hooligans.

Negotiating the hooligan landscapes

Our argument has centred on the role of space in the manifestation and attempted prevention of football hooliganism. Our analysis of football hooliganism confirms the historical and comparative position of anthropologists regarding the processual meaning of landscapes. This variability of spatial meanings is negotiated both synchronically and diachronically, within the hooligan formation and through the relations of football hooligans with rival supporters, the police and wider civil society. Hooligan groups are not structured through a quasi-military hierarchy of power, so on specific match days the hooligan 'turn out' will shelter a variety of views on which spaces are the most propitious for a confrontation with rivals. Hooligans themselves have many other social identities, so they will try to define or redefine the meaning of specific places according to the presentations of self that they are seeking to deploy. Outside match-days, and in the company of non-hooligans, a hooligan 'place' might have no significant meaning.

A degree of negotiation also needs to take place between the rival hooligans regarding which specific spaces are the most important and worthy of 'taking' or 'defending'. Within the ground, the opposing 'Kop' ends were particularly valued until the successful advent of segregation. Latterly, outside the ground, specific public houses are known as key spaces for respective groups. Various degrees of challenge may be thrown down before rivals by entering these symbolic spaces: we have argued that these tactics may range from the less serious 'intrusions', through to 'transgressions', and up to 'trespass' (in which the rivals' pub is flagrantly 'packed out'). The police play a critical role in the hooligans' pragmatic redefinition of urban geography relative to confrontations. Synchronically, on any specific match-day, the police seek to curtail hooligan confrontations through their control of the urban landscape: the spatial surveillance and segregation of supporters is central here, so that in extreme cases, some roads may be blocked off and some pubs temporarily closed. Historically, the police have introduced numerous measures to reshape the landscape to their advantage: segregation fences in grounds, banning spectators from specific ground sections, escorting supporters as they arrive and depart from the ground, filming spectators inside and outside the ground, and monitoring hooligan groups over days and weeks prior to 'high-risk' fixtures (at which confrontations are thought most likely). We noted that in cities and regions with more than one major club, the negotiation of legitimate hooligan confrontations can be more contextual and complex. On these occasions, up to four collectives contest control of specific spaces: the hooligans following the two teams who are playing that day, the police and the local fans who have no formal interest in the fixture. In its simplest sense, the apparatuses of social control have contributed greatly to a fundamental spatial realignment of football hooliganism as the phenomenon has gradually moved from the central, core place (the football ground) towards more peripheral settings. In its most instrumental manifestation, fan violence may be relocated to the purely functional, 'non-places' of our supermodern societies, that have no symbolic relationship to the specific football games or the teams that contest them (cf. Auge 1997).[39]

The discussion raises a number of broad social questions within the realms of urban anthropology. In an immediate sense, it requires reflection on the way in which modern societies understand and respond to large congregations of young men at leisure, particularly when these gatherings come into forms of physical conflict. More seriously, the responses of the various authorities and their functionaries (notably the police) require assessment, in terms of their impact upon public and private spaces, and the public culture and wider civil societies that these

---

[39] Such non-places here may comprise impersonal housing estates, empty industrial estates, or transport termini that have no apparent significance for rival hooligan groups.

landscapes enable to exist. In Britain, the policing of football hooliganism has been a critical laboratory for the piloting of sophisticated technologies of surveillance which have since been transferred, with remarkable political facility, to the monitoring of public spaces *per se*. Finally, we may consider the cross-cultural, comparative possibilities. In previous work, we have sought to advance a cross-cultural, interpretive reading of football cultures (Armstrong and Giulianotti, 1997, 1999, 2001). Here we would wish to conclude that a deeper understanding of football hooliganism specifically, and of the political anthropology of landscape in general, will be facilitated through comparative research at a worldwide level, which we hope this paper may encourage.

References

Alt, J. 1983. 'Sport and cultural reification. From ritual to mass consumption', *Theory, Culture and Society*, 1: 93–107.

Anderson, B. 1983. *Imagined communities*. London: Verso.

Archetti, E. P., and A. Romero. 1994. 'Death and violence in Argentinian football', in R. Giulianotti, N. Bonney and M. Hepworth (eds.), *Football, violence and social identity*, 37–72. London: Routledge.

Archetti, E. 1998. '*The Potrero* and the *Pibe*. Territory and belonging in the mythical account of Argentinian football', in N. Lovell (ed.), *Locality and belonging*, 189–210. London: Routledge.

Armstrong, G. 1993. 'Like that Desmond Morris?', in D. Hobbs and T. May (eds.), *Interpreting the Field*, 3–43. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

1998. *Football Hooligans: knowing the score*, Oxford: Berg.

1994. 'False Leeds. The construction of hooligan rivalries', in R. Giulianotti and J. Williams (eds.), *Game without frontiers. Football, identity and modernity*, 299–326. Aldershot: Avebury.

Armstrong, G., and R. Giulianotti (eds.). 1997. *Entering the field. New perspectives in world football.* Oxford: Berg.

Armstrong G. and A. Giulianotti 1998. 'From another angle. Police surveillance and football supporters', in C. Norris, J. Moran and G. Armstrong (eds.), Surveillance. Closed circuit television and social control. Aldershot. Ashgate.

1999. *Football cultures and identities*. London: Macmillan.

2001. *Fear and loathing in world football*. Oxford: Berg.

Armstrong, G., and R. Harris. 1991. 'Football hooligans. Theory and evidence', *Sociological Review*, 39: 427–58.

Armstrong, G., and D. Hobbs. 1994. 'Tackled from behind', in Giulianotti *et al.* 1994, 196–228.

Augé, M. 1995. *Non-places. Introduction to the anthropology of supermodernity*. London: Verso.

Bachelard, G. 1958. *The poetics of space*. New York: Basic Books.

Bailly, A. S. 1986. 'Subjective distances and spatial representations', *Geoforum* 17: 81–8.

Bale, J. 1989. *Sports geography*. London: E. and F. N. Spon.

1991. 'Playing at home', in J. Williams and S. Wagg (eds.), *British football and social change. Getting into Europe*, 130–43. Leicester: Leicester University Press.

1993. *Sport, space and the city*. London: Routledge.

1994. *Landscapes of modern sport*. London: Leicester University Press/Pinter.

Baudrillard, J. 1993. *The transparency of evil*. London: Verso.

Bauman, Z. 1992. *Intimations of postmodernity*. London: Routledge.

Bourdieu, P. 1977. *Outline of a theory of practice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bourdieu, P., and J.-C. Passeron. 1977. *Reproduction in education, society and culture*. London: Sage.

Bromberger, C. 1992a. 'Le football comme vision du monde', *Le Monde Diplomatique* (June): 10–11.

Bromberger, C. 1992b. 'Lo spettacolo delle partite di calcio. Alcune indicazionie di analisi etnologica', in P. Lanfranchi (ed.), *Il calcio e il suo pubblico*, 183–219. Napoli: Edizione Scientifiche Italiane.

Bromberger, C. *et al.* 1993. 'Fireworks and the ass', in S. Redhead (ed.), *The fashion and the passion*, 89–102. Aldershot: Avebury.

Clarke, A. 1992. 'Figuring a brighter future', in E. Dunning and C. Rojek (eds.), *Sport and leisure in the civilizing process*, 201–20 Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Clarke, J. 1978. 'Football and working class fans. Tradition and change', in R. Ingham (ed.), *Football hooliganism. The wider context*, 37–60. London: Inter-Action Imprint.

Cohen, A. P. 1993. *Self consciousness. An alternative anthropology of identity*. London: Routledge.

Cohen, P. 1972. 'Sub-cultural conflict and working class community'. *Working Papers in Cultural*

Studies no. 2. Birmingham: University of Birmingham Centre for Contemporary Cultural Studies.

Critcher, C. 1979. 'Football since the war', in J. Clarke, C. Critcher and R. Johnson (eds.), *Working class culture. Studies in history and theory*, 161–84. London: Hutchinson.

Dal Lago, A., and R. de Biasi. 1994. 'Italian football fans. Customs and organisation', in R. Giulianotti *et al.* 1994: 37–72.

Damer, S. 1989. *Glasgow. Going for a song*. London: Lawrence and Wishart.

Davies, H. 1985 [original 1972]. *The glory game*. Edinburgh: Mainstream.

De Certeau, M. 1984. *The practice of everyday life*. London: University of California Press. 1986. *Heterologies*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Dunning, E. 1994. 'The social roots of football hooliganism. A reply to the critics of the "Leicester School"', in R. Giulianotti *et al.* 1994.

Dunning, E., P. Murphy and J. Williams. 1988. *The roots of football hooliganism*. London: Routledge. Elias, N. 1982. *The civilizing process. State formation and civilization*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Finn, G. P. T. 1994. 'Football violence. A societal psychological perspective', in R. Giulianotti *et al.* 1994: 90–127.

Fishwick, N. 1989. *English football and society, 1910–50*. Manchester: Manchester University Press. Fiske, J. 1993. *Power plays, power works*. London: Verso.

Garfinkel, H. 1967. *Studies in ethnomethodology*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Giulianotti, R. 1991. 'Scotland's tartan army. The case for the carnivalesque', *Sociological Review*, 39: 503–27.

Giulianotti, R. 1993. 'Soccer casuals as cultural intermediaries. The politics of Scottish style', in Redhead 153–205.

Giulianotti, R. 1994a. 'Social identity and public order. Political and academic discourses on football violence', in R. Giulianotti *et al.* 1994: 10–26.

Giulianotti, R. 1994b. 'Taking liberties. Hibs casuals and Scottish law', in R. Giulianotti *et al.* 1994, 229–61.

Giulianotti, R. 1995a. 'Participant observation and research into football hooliganism. Some reflections on the problems of entrée and everyday risks from a comparative study', *Sociology of Sport Journal*, 12: 1–30.

Giulianotti, R. 1995b. 'Football and the politics of carnival. An ethnographic study of Scottish fans in Sweden', *International Review for the Sociology of Sport*, 30: 191–223.

Giulianotti, R. 1999. *Football*, Cambridge: Polity Press.

Giulianotti, R., N. Bonney and M. Hepworth (eds.), 1994. *Football violence and social identity*. London: Routledge.

Goffman, E. 1959. *The presentation of self in everyday life*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.

1963. *Behavior in public places. Notes on the social organization of gatherings*. Glencoe: Free Press.

Hargreaves, J. 1994. *Sporting females. Critical issues in the history and sociology of women's sports*. London: Routledge.

Hirsch, E. 1995. 'Landscape. Between place and space', in E. Hirsch and M. O'Hanlon (eds.), *The anthropology of landscape. Perspectives on place and space*, 1–30. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Hobbs, D. and D. Robins. 1991. 'The boy done good. Football violence, continuities and changes', *Sociological Review*, 39: 551–97.

Hopcraft, A. 1988 [original 1968]. *The football man*. London: Simon and Schuster.

Hornby, N. 1992. *Fever pitch*. London: Gollancz.

Humphries, S., and P. Gordon. 1994. *Forbidden Britain. Our secret past, 1900–1960*. London: BBC Books.

Hutchinson, J. 1975. 'Some aspects of football crowds before 1914', paper to the conference, 'The Working Class and Leisure', University of Sussex, June 1975.

Korem, D. 1994. *Suburban gangs. The affluent rebels*. Richardson, Texas: International Focus Press.

Lash, S., and J. Urry. 1994. *Economies of signs and space*. London: Sage.

Lefebvre, H. 1991. *The production of space*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Lovell, N. (ed.). 1998. *Locality and belonging*. London: Routledge.

MacClancy, J. (ed.). 1995. *Sport, culture and ethnicity*. London: Berg.

Maffesoli, M. 1991. 'The ethic of aesthetics'. *Theory, Culture and Society* 8: 7–20.

Marsh, P. 1978. *Aggro. The illusion of violence*. London: Dent.

Marsh, P., E. Rosser and R. Harré. 1978. *The rules of disorder*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Mason, A. 1980. *Association football and English society*. Brighton: Harvester.

Morris, D. 1983. *The soccer tribe*. London: Jonathan Cape.

Murphy, P., J. Williams and E. Dunning. 1990. *Football on trial. Spectator violence and development in the football world*. London: Routledge.

Murray, B. 1984. *The old firm. Sectarianism, sport and society*. Edinburgh: John Donald.

Norris, C., and G. Armstrong. 1999. *The maximum surveillance society*. Oxford: Berg.

Portelli, A. 1993. 'The rich and the poor in the culture of football', in Redhead 77–88.

Redhead, S. 1986. *Sing when you're winning*. London: Pluto.

1990. *The end-of-the-century party. Youth and pop towards 2000*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

1991. *Football with attitude*. Manchester: Wordsmith.

Redhead, S., and E. MacLaughlin. 1985. 'Soccer's style wars', *New Society*, 16 August.

Robins, D. 1995. Book review of R. Giulianotti *et al.* 1995, *Sociological Review*, 43: 213–16.

Routledge, P. 1996. 'Critical geopolitics and terrains of resistance', *Political Geography* 15: 509–531.

Roversi, A. 1994. 'The birth of the *Ultràs*. The rise of football hooliganism in Italy', in R. Giulianotti and J. Williams (eds.), *Game without frontiers. Football, identity and modernity*, 359–80. Aldershot: Avebury.

Sack, T. 1986. *Human territoriality. Its theory and history*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Sennett, R. 1977. *The fall of public man*. London: Faber and Faber.

Sharp, J. P., P. Routledge, C. Philo and R. Paddison (eds.). *Entanglements of power. Geographies of domination/resistance*. London: Routledge.

Shields, R. 1991. *Places on the margin*. London: Routledge.

Suttles, G. 1968. *The social order of the slum*. Chicago: Chicago University Press.

1972. *The social construction of communities*. Chicago: Chicago University Press.

Taylor, I. 1971a. 'Soccer consciousness and soccer hooliganism', in S. Cohen (ed.), *Images of deviance*, 134–64. Harmondsworth: Penguin.

1971b. 'Football mad. a speculative sociology of soccer hooliganism', in E. Dunning (ed.), *Sociology of sport*, 352–77. London: Frank Cass.

1982a. 'On the sports-violence question. Soccer hooliganism revisited', in Jennifer Hargreaves (ed.), *Sport, culture and ideology*, 152–96. London: Routledge.

1982b. 'Class, violence and sport. The case of soccer hooliganism', in H. Cantelon and R. Gruneau (eds.), *Sport, culture and the modern state*, 39–96. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

1987. 'Putting the boot into a working class sport. British soccer after Bradford and Brussels', *Sociology of Sport Journal*, 4: 171–91

Taylor, I. 1991. 'English football in the 1990s. Taking Hillsborough seriously?', in Williams and Wagg (eds.), 1994: 3-24.

Taylor, P. (chairman). 1990. *Inquiry into the Hillsborough Stadium Disaster. Final Report.* London: HMSO.

Tuan, Y. F. 1974. *Topophilia.* Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Turner, V. 1974. *Drama, fields and metaphors. Symbolic action in human societies.* Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Vamplew, W. 1988. *Pay up and play the game.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Wallman, S. 1984. *Eight London households.* London: Tavistock.

Ward, C. 1989. *Steaming In.* London: Simon and Schuster.

Waites, B., T. Bennett and G. Martin (eds.). 1982. *Popular culture. Past and present*, London: Croom Helm.

Williams, J. 1991. 'Having an away day. English football spectators and the hooligan debate', in J. Williams and S. Wagg 160–84.

Williams, J., E. Dunning and P. Murphy. 1989. *Hooligans abroad* (2nd ed.). London: Routledge.

Williams, R. 1973. *The country and the city.* London: Chatto and Windus.

Wolch, J. 1991. 'Urban homelessness. An agenda for research', *Urban Geography* 12: 99–104.