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INTRODUCTION

FOOTBALL HOOLIGANISM: CONTINUITY AND CHANGE IN BRITISH SOCIETY

The 'hue and cry' which surrounded football spectating in Britain in the 1960's and 1970's was of such proportions that the phenomenon became a "social problem" of national concern. It is the contention of the present study that existing analyses that seek to explain the development of what became known as "football hooliganism" are unsatisfactory in two main respects. Firstly, those who have attempted to explain the phenomenon have misconceived the nature of "social problems." Secondly, a relatively inadequate characterisation of football hooliganism has been provided in that the historical antecedents of the phenomenon have been neglected. These criticisms require elaboration, and attention will be given to the latter reservation first.

A. Football Hooliganism: The Dominant Mythology

The lack of understanding concerning the historical antecedents of football hooliganism is not simply a mark of inadequate scholarship on the part of those who have attempted to analyse it. Rather, it is also a reflection of the dominant mythology which surrounds discussion of football hooliganism in particular and, indeed, of hooliganism in general. Let us first consider the case of football hooliganism.

Association Football, seen by many to be England's "national game," engenders displays of great passion and loyalty. The strong identification which some supporters feel for their team - especially if they are winning - is also coupled with a romanticism concerning past successes - especially if they are losing! Similar romanticism, in fact pervades discussion of what is seen to be a modern development, football hooliganism. David Lacey, for example, writing in The Guardian, in 1980, compared the "docile fans" of the 1930's with the "aggressive tendencies" of spectators at matches in the 1970's and 1980's.¹

Similarly Wilf Mannion, a former England International, harking back in 1981 to memories of the past, claimed that violence at matches was absent and that the relationship between the crowd and players was close in the 1920's and 1930's. In the *Sunday Mirror*, he was reported to have said that "there were no hooligans on the terraces and there was a great relationship with opponents and supporters of both teams."^2^ One further example is also worthy of quotation. In his analysis of the career of Dixie Dean, again spanning the period between the wars, Walsh felt able to claim "that crowd behaviour was excellent" and that there were "no reports of hooliganism or otherwise."^3^

This tendency to assume that, in the past, football in particular and society more generally enjoyed a violence-free, harmonious way of living, is also coupled with a perception that "things are getting worse" and that this is due to the "decline of morals" stemming from the "permissive society." A striking illustration of both these tendencies can be found in the writings on football hooliganism of Edward Grayson. For example, he records:

"Historically the background to the problem is clear out. The world's first 100,000 soccer crowd arrived to see the Tottenham v Sheffield United Cup Final at Crystal Palace, seventy-eight years ago. The first Cup Final at Wembley, in 1923, produced an unofficial 200,000 attendance, later assessed at 126,000 inside the ground.

A decade later, with three million unemployed in Britain, other records away from big cities were established. But on none of these occasions was there evidence of crowd violence.

However, by 1977 a decade of the permissive society had apparently taken effect as the barbaric tartan hordes behaved like zoo animals making cages essential at our national stadium."^4^

^2^ *Sunday Mirror*, 20th December 1981


^4^ Edward Grayson, "We Must Beat the Hooligan" *Sport and Recreation*, 20, 4, (Autumn 1979) p. 28.
In his analysis, based upon unsubstantiated assumptions, there is evident both the romanticism concerning the past and the fear and anxiety concerning the present. But this lack of understanding concerning the historical antecedents of present-day football hooliganism also finds expression in more academic work.

Both Ian Taylor\(^5\) and John Clarke,\(^6\) for example, provide analyses of football hooliganism which are speculatively based. While greater discussion of their work and of other similar research will be undertaken in Chapter One, it is important to note at this stage that both appear to stress, in keeping with the dominant mythology, the notion of a "golden age" when clubs and their supporters, and working class fathers and their sons, enjoyed a close and harmonious relationship in which conflict was absent.

In contrast, the present study starts out with evidence which documents that spectator misconduct at football matches has a longer pedigree than the majority of present-day writers would have us believe. While it is not appropriate at this stage to delve to any great extent into their precise findings, the research by such historians as Vamplew,\(^7\) Hutchinson,\(^8\) and Mason\(^9\) clearly refutes the suggestions made by Taylor and Clarke that no spectator misconduct on a par with present-day football

---

\(^5\) Ian Taylor, "Class, Violence and Sport - The Case of Soccer Hooliganism in Britain" International Symposium on Sport, Culture and The Modern State, Ontario 1979 unpublished paper.


Hooliganism occurred at football prior to the 1960's. The work of these historians, however, focuses on the period prior to World War One and does not seek to explain the present day phenomenon in relation to such findings.

These tendencies to romanticise the past and to express alarm about the present are also a reflection of a wider consensus concerning hooliganism and working class youth. Eric Dunning, for instance, has argued that one of the dominant beliefs of the present age is the perception that we are living in one of the most violent periods in human history. As a result, even innocuous forms of behaviour, such as much of what takes place at football matches, tend to be defined as seriously violent with the consequence that the difficulty of measuring the actual level of violence involved and of identifying trends regarding violence over time is compounded.

Similarly, Geoff Pearson, in his analysis of the "respectable fears" which surround hooliganism, argues that a "tradition of anguished regret hinders understanding" of the phenomenon. In this case, the romanticism referred to above takes the form of reminiscing about a "golden age" when people were able to walk the streets unmolested. At the same time, the sense of alarm and anxiety about the present finds expression in the form of the 'New Right's' demand for 'law and order.' In introducing his analysis of hooliganism, Pearson writes:

"This book aims to cast some old light on new problems. It is about.....the myth of the 'British Way of Life' according to which, after centuries of domestic peace, the streets of Britain have been suddenly plunged into an unnatural state of disorder that betrays the stable traditions of the past."  

---

12 Ibid Rix.
In its own way, the present study also seeks to cast 'old light' on a "new" problem, namely the emergence of football spectating as a social problem. It appears appropriate that an example of this 'old light,' as a foretaste of what is to be documented later, should be cited at this point. In the Birmingham Daily Mail, for example, it was reported in 1885 that:

"Birmingham would appear to be not altogether free from the rule of the roughs yet. The scene at Perry Barr, on Saturday, when a rowdy crowd, without adequate reason mobbed the members of the Preston North End team after their match with the Aston Villa, was a disgraceful one. There had been some dispute threatening fisticuffs in the course of the game, between one of the Preston men, and Dawson, of the Villa, but it passed off without hostilities, and there was apparently no reason at all why the mob should have taken up the dispute, as they evidently did by directing their attentions in the first place chiefly to the man who had quarrelled with Dawson. The Preston men cannot be blamed for standing by their comrade. It was as creditable for their pluck as it was discreditable for the rowdy crowd to attack men inferior to them in point of number. Happily, with the help of the Villa men, the visitors were able to take refuge in the dressing tent, where they remained for some time listening to the yelling and hooting of the mob. The local roughs are solely responsible for the unseemly disturbance; and it is to be hoped some action will be taken to bring the worst of them to justice." 13

Judging by the alarm and anxiety expressed about football hooliganism in the Birmingham newspapers in the 1960's, 1970's and early 1980's, it would appear that the city is still not free from "the rule of roughs!" But, if the historical antecedents of football spectating have been relatively neglected, how has existing research in fact conceptualised the nature of this social problem?

Explanations of football hooliganism tend to revolve around two main themes. Firstly, the violent propensities which human beings in general but in particular the working classes are said to possess. Secondly, the reactions of society in general but, above all, the perceived machinations of the ruling classes. In this sense, it can, in fact be argued that such themes in part reflect the two-sided nature of

13 Birmingham Daily Mail, 11th May 1885.
all social problems, i.e., the fact that they involve some kind of inter-
relationship between the "real" and or alleged "doers" of some violent
or problematic deed and those whose task it is to exercise control.

It is also necessary to recognise that these themes relating
specifically to social problems also find expression in analyses of
deviance more generally and ultimately reflect the type of sociological
perspective employed. This recognition, as will be demonstrated, serves
two purposes. Firstly, it helps existing research concerning the nature
of football hooliganism to be more adequately understood. Secondly, it
provides a context in which the significance of the present study's
central focus, the emergence of football spectating as a social problem,
can be spelt out.

The intention of this section therefore is two fold. Initially, an
attempt will be made critically to review how social problems have been
conceived of generally and how particular research on football hooliganism
can be located within these perspectives. It should be acknowledged that,
at this stage, such references to existing research are intended to be
illustrative of particular research orientations in the study of football
hooliganism: a more detailed and exhaustive analysis of particular studies
is attempted in Chapter One. Having accomplished this initial task, an
alternative conception of social problems is then proposed.

As early as 1941, Fuller and Myers recognised that social problems
contain two main elements, the "objective condition" and the "subjective
definition." They wrote:

"A social problem is a condition which is defined by a con-
siderable number of persons as a deviation from some social norm
which they cherish. Every social problem thus consists of an
objective condition and a subjective definition. The objective
condition is a verifiable situation which can be checked as to
eexistence and magnitude... The subjective definition is the
awareness of certain individuals that the condition is a threat
to certain cherished values."
The objective condition is necessary but not in itself sufficient to constitute a social problem. Although the objective condition may be the same in two different localities, it may be a social problem in only one of these areas. Social problems are what people think they are and if conditions are not defined as social problems by the people involved in them, they are not problems to those people, although they may be problems to outsiders..." 14

Although these authors were not explicit on this score, their analysis, while stressing that, on one level, 'social problems are what people think they are,' does suggest a sense of inter-relationship between the two elements referred to. As will be argued however, despite the contribution of Fuller and Myers, the "subjective definition" was, for a considerable period of time, to be neglected in analyses of social problems and of deviance. Indeed, the notion that these elements are part and parcel of the same social process has never been fully recognised and developed.

At the time Fuller and Myers wrote their analysis and indeed up until the 1960's, a different perspective held sway with regard to social problems and deviance. It is to this perspective that attention must first be directed. This "positivist" perspective, along with particular research orientations in the analysis of football hooliganism, will be shown to share certain common assumptions regarding the proper focus of study in examining social problems and deviance.

For instance, the positivist perspective holds that an observer looking at social behaviour can see which of it constitutes "normal" conduct and which a "social problem." Simply put, deviant behaviour is that which breaches commonly accepted norms: deviance is conceived of as a "given", "out-there" to be investigated. As will be shown in more detail in Chapter One, what might be termed the official position regarding football hooliganism adopts a similar stance. In both the Lang 15 and


Harrington report into football hooliganism, published in the late 1960s, the researchers sought to differentiate between the arrested hooligan and the non-hooligan in terms of the possession of certain individual psycho-physiological characteristics.

But such assumptions are not confined to this official position. In the ethological writings of Desmond Morris and Peter Marsh, similar sentiments are expressed. While it is not appropriate at this stage to delve to any great extent into their perspective, it is important to note that Morris, for instance, feels that football hooliganism serves a valuable social function and that if only 'certain key troublemakers' - presumably those most deviant - were removed, then the phenomenon would be 'less violent and destructive' and thereby not constitute a social problem. In addition, Marsh has argued that behaviour at football matches only constitutes a social problem when outside agencies, e.g. the police, intervene. In fact for Marsh, violent behaviour on the terraces 'arises from breakdowns of ritual and of the tacit rule - framework which governs behaviour on the terraces as a result of the intervention of external agencies.' In examining terrace culture, as will be documented in more detail in Chapter One, Marsh highlights the existence of a career structure in spectating. At its most extreme, for Marsh, is a type of fan which he terms the 'Nutter': the 'Nutter' is the most violent of all supporters and probably corresponds to the 'key troublemakers' which Morris wishes to be identified and rooted out. As with the positivist perspective on deviance in general, so too with the official position and the work of Marsh and Morris: in each case, the

19 Morris, The Soccer Tribe.
focus is on the identification of "the deviants."

There are, however, other key features of this perspective which also require spelling out. Fundamentally, the idea that deviant behaviour constitutes a social problem is accepted without question: it is a "given", and, as such can be seen to be concerned with what Fuller and Myers termed the 'objective condition.' Stemming from this premise, the idea that such behaviour must be eradicated or brought under control is advocated. With reference to football hooliganism, both Lang and Harrington were similarly concerned with its control. For instance, the former believed the object of his enquiry to be the devizing of means 'by which crowd disorder could be reduced.' As has already been noted, both Morris and Marsh felt that it was possible for football hooliganism to be placed within certain "proper" bounds provided both the key troublemakers were removed and no external intervention in relation to the great mass of supporters occurred.

With such an emphasis on control, the bulk of the research from this positivist perspective has been preoccupied with four main themes. Firstly, with differentiating between deviants and non-deviants on the grounds that there is something wrong with or different between the deviant and the law-abiding citizen. Secondly, that deviance can be explained, by examining the personal biographies, background events or circumstances of deviants. Thirdly, that deviant behaviour is seen to be determined: that is, it is the product of some constitutional defect, of some physical or psychological condition or of social circumstances. Fourthly, identification of the causal forces or factors generating this deviance is attempted.

In each of these key respects both the official position and the
perspective held by Marsh and Morris can be seen to hold similar ideas. Both differentiate between the hooligan and non-hooligan; both seek to explain the behaviour with reference to the personal biography of the individual or to the circumstances in which he or she is located, and furthermore, both emphasise the extent to which such behaviour is determined by the individual football hooligan's psychological or physiological condition or by his social background. Crucially, for example, Marsh and Morris perceive football hooliganism as an expression of "innate" aggression which they argue is an inevitable feature of human relations stemming from the psycho-physiological condition of human beings in general.

While such research will be critically reviewed in Chapter One, it is important at this stage to outline certain reservations with this perspective on social problems. In criticising this positivist approach and, at the same time providing the basis for an alternative perspective, Howard Becker argued in 1963:

"The [traditional] sociological view.....defines deviance as the infraction of some agreed upon rule. It then goes on to ask who breaks rules, and to search for the factors in their personalities and life situations that might account for their infractions. This assumes that those who have broken a rule constitute a homogeneous category, because they have committed the same deviant act.

Such an assumption seems to me to ignore the central fact about deviance: it is created by society.....social groups create deviance by making the rules whose infraction constitutes deviance, and by applying those rules to particular people and labelling them as outsiders. From this point of view, deviance is not a quality of the act the person commits, but rather a consequence of the application by others of rules and sanctions to an 'offender.' The deviant is one to whom that label has been successfully applied; deviant behaviour is behaviour that people so label." 22

Crucially, therefore, if Becker is right, traditional explanations of deviance and social problems can be indicted on two grounds. Firstly, too great a stress has been placed on the notion of the objective

condition and insufficient, if any, attention has been given to how deviance and social problems are socially constructed by social rules and norms and by the definitions placed on behaviour by others. Secondly, by emphasising the extent to which behaviour is determined, such perspectives fall foul of the criticisms of "conventional sociology" offered by interpretative sociology in general.\textsuperscript{23} Essentially, Becker was seeking to understand deviance in terms of the processes by which persons come to be defined as deviant by others. As such, this "labelling perspective" may be seen to concern itself with the subjective definition of social problems referred to by Fuller and Myers. For present purposes, two important features of the labelling perspective need to be grasped. Firstly, the rules which deviants are said to have broken are made problematic - instead of seeing norms as absolute, the sanctions placed on human behaviour are called into question. Secondly, emphasis is also placed on the audience reaction: how people react to forms of behaviour and to particular groups is highlighted.

This stress on audience reaction finds expression in analyses of football hooliganism. Whannel, for example, in his analysis of football crowd behaviour and the press is quite clear that he is concerned with media coverage \textit{per se} and that he is not talking about the phenomenon "on the ground."\textsuperscript{24} In outlining his position, Whannel writes:

"My concern is....with the concept of social reaction, specifically with the way that process is structured in and through the media; with the ability of deviance labelling and image construction in the press to generate a formalised model which comes increasingly to structure the ways 'reality' can be understood; and, in the case of football hooliganism, how that model fits into a more general discourse about the game and its problems."\textsuperscript{25}

\textsuperscript{23} See Introduction Section C.

\textsuperscript{24} Gary Whannel, "Football Crowd Behaviour and the Press" \textit{Media, Culture and Society} 1, 1979.

\textsuperscript{25} Ibid p. 328.
For Whannel, therefore, football hooliganism is explicable by reference to how the phenomenon is structured in and through the media. Similarly to Whannel, Stuart Hall in his analysis of football hooliganism is concerned with the way in which the media play a determining role. The characterisation of supporters, the portrayal of their behaviour and the explanation of football hooliganism are shaped by the images and labels applied by the press. The analysis offered by Triesman also focuses on one aspect of this social reaction. He argues that the association made by the press between football's post-war decline and the 'violent-crisis myth' surrounding football hooliganism is 'not only the creation of the media but also underlines that what is understood about football hooliganism is itself largely dependent on how and whether it is reported.'

As noted, however, when it finds expression in analyses of football hooliganism, this perspective is also concerned with the rules which govern people's behaviour. In his analysis, John Clarke takes up this thread when he argues:

"Hooliganism appears as a problem because it contravenes the view of how football spectators should behave.....for the fan, the game is "going to the match," a social event involving both the football and the crowd....The consumer watches, while the fan - or more precisely, the fans....take part in a social event...What we are pointing to here is a gap between the official definition of what football is and how it is to be watched, and a set of unofficial and informal definitions about the game and how to watch it."

In this way, Clarke makes problematic the rules which govern spectating and, implicitly, the dominant rules of society in general are called into question. There is much of value in these positions. Clarke, for example, highlighted the ambiguities and inconsistencies of the official position

26 Stuart Hall, "The Treatment of Football Hooliganism in the Press" in Roger Ingham, Et al Football Hooliganism.
28 Clarke, "Football and Working Class Fans...." p. 57.
and his emphasis on the rules which govern spectating is paralleled in the present study's analysis of the "limits of decent partisanship." In addition, Whannel, Hall and Triesman are correct to point to the interactive relationship between those who commit or who are said to have committed a deviant act and the rest of society. In this sense such writers are in keeping with the work of Howard Becker. In Becker's analysis of this interactive dimension, deviance is seen "not as a simple quality present in some kinds of behaviour and absent in others but in the interaction between those who commit acts and those who respond to them." 29

Two reservations can be made, however, regarding this perspective. Firstly, while it is correct to point to the interaction between those who commit acts and those who respond to them, as much part and parcel of this social process are the acts themselves. Secondly, while avoiding the tendency to accept the status of a social problem as given and placing too great an emphasis on how such behaviour is determined, this perspective, on occasions, does slide into a voluntaristic conception on what is considered normal or deviant.

These weaknesses, it is reasonable to suppose, stem largely from an inadequate sociological analysis of the concept of power. The characterisation of some patterns of football spectating as deviant, for example, may depend in part, on the ability of certain groups to impose their definitions of decent partisanship on the football world and the wider social context and hence to manufacture an apparent consensus about the limits of "proper" and "improper" spectating. In addition, it is also necessary to realise, as the advocates of a critical criminology, Taylor, Walton, and Young have, that the labelling perspective places too much emphasis on the impact of social reaction, and hence on the deviant's present experiences, at the expense of a recognition of his past. 30

29 Becker, Outsiders, p. 14
As a result, these researchers argue that it is necessary to relocate the study of social problems and deviance in a structural context, recognising the reality of existing social relationships while also taking into account the consciousness of the actors and the meaning of their behaviour.

Such considerations, have, not surprisingly, found expression in some analyses of football hooliganism. In his early work, Ian Taylor, for example, sought to come to terms with 'how football hooliganism has come to be subjectively defined as a social problem and also why any real or objective increase in hooliganism may be found to have occurred.' While Taylor is correct to point to these dimensions, the present study, as will be spelt out in detail in Chapter One, has a number of reservations regarding his analysis of the social problem of football hooliganism. At this stage, one main observation needs to be made. While Taylor acknowledges the necessity of accounting for the subjective definition and the objective condition, in the way he formulates the issue there is no sense in which the reciprocal and integrally integrated nature of these dimensions is recognised. It is to an elaboration of this position that attention is now directed.

One of the few writers to recognise the extent to which behaviour and reactions to it are inter-related is Stanley Cohen. In considering the labelling perspective on deviance Cohen wrote:

"To say that society creates its deviance and its social problems is not to say that 'it's all in the mind' and that some nasty people are going around creating deviance out of nothing, or wilfully inflating harmless conditions into social problems. But it does mean that the making of rules and the sanctioning of people who break these rules are as much a part of deviance as the action itself."32

What is being emphasised by Cohen is that the making of rules, the sanctions which underpin and enforce such rules and the forms of behaviour which are governed and controlled by them are best conceived as part and parcel of a single social process. In this key respect, the present study is in full accord with Cohen. In this sense, Fuller and Myers were correct to argue that the 'sociologist must study not only the objective condition phase of a social problem but also the value-judgements of the people involved in it.'\(^{33}\) But what are the key sociological assumptions on which the present study is based?

In most respects, the analysis of football hooliganism offered in this thesis is guided by the figurational approach to sociology first proposed by Norbert Elias. While its main characteristics will be outlined later in this Introduction, it is important to note at this point that figurational sociology is critical of conventional sociological thought which dichotomises such issues as the relationship between - as it is conventionally put - "the individual" and "society," voluntarism and determinism, and action and structure. Similarly, the separation of the nature of social problems into the objective condition phase and the subjective definition is also found wanting. Why should this be the case?

From this figurational perspective, a more adequate sociological analysis should be concerned with the study of how people cope with the problems of interdependence. This statement may sound deceptively simple yet it contains the fundamental recognition, that people have to cope with the problems of interdependence. In fact, the tensions and conflicts which are inherent in social structure and social development are seen as both inevitable and structured: that is, the intermeshing of groups of allies and/or of opponents forms, as Elias has noted, 'the very kernel

\(^{33}\) Fuller and Myers, "The Natural History of a Social Problem" p. 321.
of the process of development. For Elias, the term figuration in this connection is of importance for it refers to the changing patterns created by people in the totality of their dealings with each other. In order to understand social development, therefore, the sociologist has to grasp the structured nature of interdependence. Equally, in order to understand the character of "social problems," the sociologist must grasp the structured interdependent nature of behaviour and reaction. This requires further clarification.

For the present study it is crucial to realise that to see people as interdependent is to see them participating in the processes of development of social figurations. If changes in these social figurations occur, e.g. increases or decreases in the length and complexity of interdependency chains or shifts in power balances between groups, then changes in the constituent individuals also occur. In considering this issue, Goudsblom believes that "a sense of these encompassing interconnections may better enable us to explain certain problems which seem incapable of any solution as long as we approach them with static classificatory schemes." The present study does not disagree. Indeed, predicated on this dynamic and relational perspective, the static and non-relational conceptions of social problems are rejected.

The figurational perspective, therefore, is seen to be more able than other perspectives to grasp the complex interdependence between the lawmaker, the law-breaker, the law-enforcer and the community at large. In criticising the proposal made by Becker that 'social groups create deviance by making the rules whose infraction constitutes deviance,' Goudsblom spelt out the implications of the figurational perspective for

---

the analysis of social problems. He wrote:

"This statement [by Becker] reflects all the naivete of a voluntaristic action model. It glosses over the problem why certain groups have developed certain rules discriminating between deviant and non-deviant behaviour, and how they have managed to maintain these rules. What functions do rules against stealing or murdering have for various groups? Of what figurational developments are these rules and their enforcement a function? When one concentrates solely on the 'we' - perspective of selected 'deviant' groups, these problems recede into the background; for those people labelled as 'deviant' the rules appear as givens, as facts of life dictated by those who 'have power.' A sociology anchored on this basis runs the risk of developing a one-sided incomplete view of society." 36

This analysis by Goudsblom is punctuated with the notion of the necessity of grasping that forms of behaviour and the control of behaviour are interdependent. For the present study, it provides an insight which is of crucial value for the analysis of the nature of social problems. In this way, in examining the limits of decent partisanship and the emergence of football spectating as a social problem, the analysis of why particular groups adhere to specific codes of conduct and why certain groups find such codes more or less problematic can be understood as a function of the figuration in which they occur. On this basis, the present study is in broad agreement with the analysis proposed by Pearson with respect to hooliganism in general. It is necessary, as Pearson notes, to realise that 'historical realism insists that we must find some way of holding on to the realities and specificities of street violence, and the anxieties that surround it, while throwing out the claim of novelty.' 37

By throwing out the mythological claim to novelty and by stressing that it is necessary to analyse both the realities of street violence and the anxieties that surround it, Pearson is, without explicitly making the point, recognising the interdependence of behaviour and reaction. For the present study, by viewing social problems in a dynamic, relational

36 Ibid p. 191.
37 Pearson, Hooligan: A History of Respectable Fears, p. 211.
and developmental way the researcher, it is argued, is in a better position to judge and interpret the precise structured nature of the emergence of football spectating as a social problem. Guided by such thoughts, it is to an alternative conception of football hooliganism that the present study now turns.

B. Football Hooliganism: An Alternative Conceptualisation

In order to avoid the mythologising tendency to which attention has been drawn, it will be necessary for the present study to examine the phenomenon of football hooliganism in its totality and not solely with reference to either the fighting propensities of particular sections of spectators or to observers' perceptions of working class football supporters since the foundation of the Football League. In fact it is the contention of the present study that football hooliganism must be understood, in the first instance, in relation to broader issues, in particular to the competing definitions of codes of conduct and ways of living evident in English society in the past century and a half. Secondly, the particular themes which articulate and reflect such broader issues must be teased out, e.g. the ongoing debates surrounding popular culture and deviance. All of this must also be located in the context of the long-term "civilising process" to which Norbert Elias has referred in explaining the development of Western European societies. In consequence, the focal concerns of the present study are in keeping with the conception of social problems outlined. It is necessary to consider the sociogenesis both of particular codes of conduct and the perception by outsiders of working class football spectators as part and parcel of the same process - as part of the emergence of football spectating as a social problem.

In tracing this conception of football hooliganism in more detail,

the following procedure will be adopted. First, it will be necessary to allude to the broader issues entailed. Secondly, reference will be made to how these broader issues themselves contain themes which must be addressed separately if the analysis is to be adequately conceptualised. Thirdly, the present study must identify how these broader issues and themes inter-penetrate in the focal concerns outlined.

The emergence of football spectating as a social problem will thus be shown to articulate and reflect broader issues, namely that of the competing definitions over codes of conduct and ways of living evident in English society. Crucial in this regard throughout the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, has been a more or less progressive narrowing of the limits of the forms of behaviour that are tolerated in public. There has been a subtle, sometimes overt, sometimes covert, proliferation and tightening of constraints on people's behaviour, particularly with reference to the nature and expression of violence. Illustration of the processes involved can be given by formulating an approach to the phenomenon in the following way. Clearly, for some, many aspects of football spectating during the 1960's and 1970's constituted the breaching of the limits of "decent partisanship" and what was and is considered to be publically acceptable behaviour. But in this connection, several questions arise. First, what constitutes "acceptable" and "decent" behaviour and what are the limits regarding the expression of such behaviour? Second, whose definitions hold sway in this regard? Third, have such definitions changed over time - both in terms of their character and the pervasiveness of their influence? Fourth, do all social groups presently adhere, in their everyday behaviour, to such definitions and have they always done so?

Finally, if changes have occurred, what have been the processes involved, over time, in the production and reproduction of definitions concerning what constitutes publically acceptable behaviour?

While the emergence of football spectating as a social problem will be shown to articulate and reflect both these competing definitions over ways of living in English society and the narrowing of the limits of what is tolerated in public, these issues, as argued, must be understood in relation to particular themes which interweave into any discussion of codes of conduct in English society. As has been anticipated already, two themes in particular stand out. First, the debates surrounding popular culture and deviance. Secondly, the long-term "civilising process" to which Norbert Elias has drawn attention. It will be shown, at specific points throughout the present study, how these twin themes emerge, time and time again, in the focal concerns identified earlier - the social roots of the behaviour of working class football spectators and the perception of these supporters by outside observers since the foundation of the Football League. In order to understand how these levels are dealt with in the present analysis, the format of this study requires some elaboration. But before this is attempted, the theoretical guidelines under-lying such an analysis require spelling out.

C. Theoretical Guidelines

Two central features of most of the sociological accounts of football hooliganism produced so far, are, as argued, a lack of understanding firstly, of its historical antecedents and secondly, of the nature of social problems in general. The present thesis argues that one way of rectifying the first of these deficiencies and of locating these antecedents within the wider context outlined, is by adopting the "sociogenetic" and "developmental" methodology advocated by Norbert Elias and by using con-
temporary newspapers and documents as the primary data source. Such an approach characteristically focuses on the unanticipated consequences of the interweaving of the intentional acts of individuals. In the words of Elias:

"....Out of the interweaving of innumerable individual interests and intentions - be they compatible or opposed and inimical - something emerges that, as it turns out, has neither been planned nor intended by any single individual. And yet it has been brought about by the intentions and actions of many individuals. And this is actually the whole secret of social interweaving - of its compellingness, its regularity, its structure, its processual nature, and its development; this is the secret of sociogenesis and social dynamics." 40

By adopting a sociogenetic methodology, the present study is arguing that social processes are structured and that their structure is an unplanned consequence of the interweaving of the intended acts of innumerable interdependent individuals. Critical in this regard, as will be seen, are the ways in which the structurally generated balance of power between groups creates pressures and constraints on people to modify their behaviour. 41

At this stage, it is perhaps best to explicate, in some detail, what underpins this sociogenetic methodology. At the outset it will be useful to discuss what Johan Goudsblom has termed, some "points of departure." Formulating them as general principles, they can be viewed as a guide to the work undertaken in this thesis. Goudsblom argues:

"(1) Human beings are interdependent, in a variety of ways; their lives evolve in, and are significantly shaped by, the social figurations they form with each other. (2) These figurations are continually in flux, undergoing changes of different orders - some quick and ephemeral, others slower but perhaps more lasting. (3) The long-term developments taking place in human social figurations have been and continue to be largely unplanned and unforeseen. (4) The development of human knowledge takes place

within human figurations, and forms one important aspect of their over-all development." 42

Sociology according to this perspective, as noted, is centrally concerned to study the problems of social interdependence and the ways in which people cope with it. Such a perspective has been most fully developed in the "figurational" - "developmental" writings of its originator, Norbert Elias. Its central concept is that of "figuration."

For Elias (in the following passage, he is developing a games model; hence the reference to players):

".....The concept of figuration.....makes it possible to resist the socially conditioned pressure to split and polarize our conception of mankind, which has repeatedly prevented us from thinking of people as individuals at the same time as thinking of them as societies.....The concept of figuration therefore serves as a simple conceptual tool to loosen this social constraint to speak and think as if 'the individual' and 'society' were antagonistic as well as different.....By figuration we mean the changing pattern created by the players as a whole - not only by their intellects but by their whole selves, the totality of their dealings in their relationships with each other. It can be seen that this figuration forms a flexible lattice-work of tensions. The interdependence of the players, which is a prerequisite of their forming a figuration, may be an interdependence of allies or of opponents.43

The concept of figuration enables the sociologist to observe individuals and the societies they form in a relatively open, dynamic and interrelated manner. Also central to this approach is the fact that its protagonists tend to adopt a long-term or "developmental" perspective.

Writing specifically of modern sports - though the implications of what he writes are more general - Dunning puts it this way:

".....such an approach seeks to clarify the nature of modern sports by viewing them in terms of a wide social and historical perspective. Thus, comparison between the sports of different countries and of societies at different stages of social development makes it easier to clarify the central structural and functional characteristics of modern sports. Viewing them developmentally focuses attention on the processes at work within them, in the past as well as in the present. Sports are not fixed, unchanging entities that have always existed in their modern forms and will always continue to

42 Goudsblom, Sociology in the Balance, p. 6
do so. Their modern character emerged gradually over time and they are continuing currently to change. In order to understand them fully, it is crucial to study both their past and present patterns of development."

The significance of this perspective therefore lies in the fact that, by viewing social structures developmentally, the 'processes at work within them, both past and present' can be focused on. As a result, the idea that sports and other social formations are fixed, unchanging entities can be shown to be inadequate. With this in mind, the observation made by Goudsblom that this developmental perspective can enable the sociologist to overcome what he calls 'today-centered' thinking is more understandable. In noting that 'our whole conceptual apparatus is attuned to permanence rather than change,' Goudsblom observes that:

"We all seem to be afflicted by an aversion to see the present in which we live as transient, as if by ignoring change we could magically avert our own ageing and death. In all of us is a deeply-rooted tendency towards 'hodiecentrism' or today-centered thinking, towards taking as immutable the world as it is now. A certain detachment from the routine of everyday occurrences is required to become aware of long-term developments affecting these daily occurrences, especially since most of these developments are by and large unplanned and unforeseen." 45

In fact, for Elias and his school, the 'essential problem' facing developmental sociology is to discover and explain how later social formations arise out of earlier ones. 46 But adoption of this figurational and developmental perspective is no easy matter. At issue is a particular view of the contested nature of the sociological enterprise, a view which stresses the need for some form of "historical sociology." This requires further explanation.

Apart from Marxism and other, more or less related forms of "conflict perspective," the currently dominant conceptions of the sociological enterprise tend to oscillate between "positivistic" and "interpretative" modes

44 Dunning, The Sociology of Sport p. xvi.
45 Goudsblom, Sociology in the Balance, pp. 7-8
of explanation. However, both these perspectives run counter to the analysis of social life offered by figural sociological conceptions. The conception of the "relationship" between individuals and society can serve to highlight the limitations of these approaches.

While there are a number of variations of positivism, when working within this tradition there is a general tendency to envisage social reality as existing "outside" individuals and as taking the form of objective causal relations between phenomena. In this system, the individual's behaviour is framed by forces not of his making and which are out of his control. Elias is critical of this tradition, arguing that its thought and language hamper sociological investigation. As a result, he claims:

"It is customary to say that society is the 'thing' which sociologists investigate. But this reifying mode of expression greatly hampers and may even prevent one from understanding the nature of sociological problems...... Time and again these reifying concepts encourage the impression that society is made up of structures external to oneself, the individual, and that the individual is at one and the same time surrounded by society yet cut off from it by some invisible barrier...... these traditional ideas have to be replaced by a different, more realistic picture of people who, through their basic dispositions and inclinations, are directed towards and linked with each other in the most diverse ways. These people make up webs of interdependence or figurations of many kinds, characterised by power balances of many sorts."

In contrast to the positivist tradition, the 'interpretative' approach envisages social reality as a product of meaningful social action. Within this framework, the focus of study is the constructs by which "the actor" makes sense of his social world. Unfortunately, this perspective is also unable to grasp the interdependent nature of the relationship between what is traditionally termed "the individual" and "society".

---

47 For further discussion of the various forms of positivism see Anthony Giddens, Positivism and Sociology, Heinemann, London 1976.

Johan Goudsblom expresses, as follows, the fact that, according to the figurational perspective, individual human beings both create their social worlds by acting meaningfully within them, and are created by them in the sense that the interdependency structures inherited from the past act as limiting constraints on what they can believe and how they can act. He lays particular stress, as one can see, on the concept of interdependence:

"To see people as interdependent is to see them as partaking in the processes of development of social figurations. Important changes in the social figurations - such as increases or decreases in the length and complexity of interdependences or shifts in power balances between groups - necessarily imply changes in the constituent individuals." 49

For figurational sociology, the focus of study is thus dependent on recognising that people partake in processes of social development via the meaningful actions they engage in but that they experience constraints and are not entirely free in this connection, and that, out of the interweaving of the meaningful actions of innumerable interdependent individuals something emerges which was neither planned nor intended by any of the participants. As has been suggested, such an approach necessitates adopting a developmental or historical and comparative perspective. Other sociologists, in fact have also recognised this need. C. W. Mills, for example, noted:

"Social science deals with problems of biography, of history and of their intersections within social structures. That these - biography, history, society - are the co-ordinate points of the proper study of man has been a major platform on which I have stood when criticizing several current schools of sociology whose practitioners have abandoned this classic tradition. The problems of our time - which now include the problem of man's very nature - cannot be stated adequately without consistent practice of the view that history is the shank of social study, and recognition of the need to develop further a psychology of man that is sociologically grounded and historically relevant. Without use of history and without a historical sense of psychological matters, the social

49 Goudsblom, Sociology in the Balance, p. 149.
scientist cannot adequately state the kinds of problems that ought now to be the orienting points of his studies." 50

Both the developmental perspective outlined and the thoughts of C. W. Mills trespass on the academic division between history and sociology. But such an approach is necessary in order both to avoid the ahistorical nature of most studies of football hooliganism and to be in a position to probe the socio-genesis of such social problems. By adhering to a 'developmental' approach, it is argued the present study can go beyond a mere narrative account of football hooliganism and provide a more adequately conceptualised analysis of the specific historical evidence which subsequent chapters will present.51

What is being argued, however, is not the simple addition of an historical dimension to sociological investigations. For, as Philip Abrams maintains, the fundamental preoccupation of history and sociology is the same. As Abrams writes:

"Both seek to understand the puzzle of human agency and both seek to do so in terms of the process of social structuring. Both are impelled to conceive of that process chronologically; at the end of the debate the diachrony - synchrony distinction is absurd. Sociology must be concerned with eventuation because that is how structuring occurs. History must be theoretical, because that is how structuring is apprehended." 52

In this way Abrams is centrally concerned with the same issues to which Elias has addressed himself. For Abrams the central issue is:

"...the problem of finding a way of accounting for human experience which recognises simultaneously and in equal measure that history and society are made by constant, more or less purposeful, individual action and that individual action, however purposeful, is made by history and society." 53

51 For further discussion of the relationship between narrative and analysis, see Conclusion.
The analysis of Abrams is not too dissimilar from that formulated within a figurational perspective which argues as noted, that while individuals create their social worlds by acting meaningfully within them, they are, at one and the same time, created by them in the sense that the interdependency structures inherited from the past act as limiting constraints on what they can believe and how they can act.

For Berger and Luckmann this was the 'awesome paradox' of social life - men are makers yet at the same time prisoners of the social world. But is there a mode of explanation which is capable of grasping the interwoven nature of this 'awesome paradox'? For Abrams, the figurational and developmental writings of Elias and his school provide a relatively adequate account of social life. Thus he describes the work of Elias as an:

".....heroic attempt to substitute a conception of a process of mutual formation for the sterile antithesis of individual and society and to ground that conception in a history not of manners as such but of manners as indeed "making man" as part of a general formation of social hierarchies, classes and states....." 55

In undertaking the sociological enterprise, therefore, it is essential it is argued, to grasp what is conventionally termed the 'two-sidedness of society'. In seeking to understand the 'puzzle of human agency,' Abrams is correct both to point out that history and sociology seek to do so in terms of the process of social structuring and that that process must be conceived of chronologically. The task is to discern that historical structuring without sliding into either a deterministic or a voluntaristic frame of reference. In this respect, Elias argues that either frame of reference is inadequate. He writes:

"Historically, 'determinism' has usually denoted a mechanical

56 Abrams, Historical Sociology, p. 2.
determinacy of the kind observed in causally conditioned physical sequences. In contrast, when the indeterminacy, the 'freedom,' of the individual is stressed, it is usually forgotten that there are always simultaneously many mutually dependent individuals, whose interdependence to a greater or lesser extent limits each one's scope for action. In turn, these limitations are an essential part of their humanity. More subtle tools of thought than the usual antithesis of 'determinism' and 'freedom' are needed if such problems are to be solved." 57

These 'more subtle tools of thought' can be, the present study argues, drawn from figurational sociology. The concept of figuration, for example, moves away from the tendency to analyse social life in terms of the antithesis of 'determinism' and 'freedom' and stresses the interdependence to which Elias refers. It seems appropriate, however, to highlight further the characteristics of the figurational approach by referring to one of the broader issues identified earlier in the present study as being of relevance to an attempt to understand football hooliganism.

In considering what he termed the sociogenesis of codes of conduct, Elias stated:

"One of the tasks still remaining to be done is to explain convincingly the compulsion whereby certain forms of communal life, for example our own, come into being, are preserved and changed. But access to an understanding of their genesis is blocked if we think of them as having come about in the same way as the works and deeds of individual people: by the setting of particular goals or even by rational thought and planning. The idea that from the early middle ages Western man worked in a common exertion and with a clear goal and a rational plan towards the order of social life and the institutions in which we live today, scarcely answers the facts. How this really happened can be learned only through a study of the historical evolution of these social forms by accurately documented empirical enquiries." 58

Of crucial importance to the present study is the observation made by Elias with reference to how 'certain forms of communal life come into being, are preserved and changed.' Access to an understanding of their genesis must be based on the recognition that, essentially, individual creations

are seen as purposeful products but social structures cannot be thought of in these terms but have to be seen as the unintended outcomes of innumerable purposeful individual actions. The study of the development of these communal forms has to grasp, according to Elias, three main interwoven elements of historical process in general. Firstly, processes, compulsions and regularities of a relatively autonomous kind; secondly, the relative autonomy of the intertwining of individual plans and actions; thirdly, the way individual human beings are bound by social life. For some writers, e.g., Giddens and Gruneau, however, there are dangers inherent in such an approach, e.g. in its emphasis on the fact that social structures have to be seen as the unintended outcome of innumerable purposeful individual actions.

In this connection, two questions arise. Firstly, by stressing the influence of processes, compulsions and regularities of a relatively autonomous kind is the agency of the acting subject neglected? Secondly, are such processes seen solely in terms of constraints on people as well as structures enabling them to act out their lives? In fact, perspectives which have gained widespread acceptance in present-day sociology and in the sociology of sport in particular can be seen to be at odds with the figurational approach on these issues. For example, Giddens stresses that sociological analysis must concern itself 'with the fact that every social actor knows a great deal about the conditions of reproduction of the society of which he or she is a member.' In proposing his theory of structuration and in stressing what he terms the 'duality of structure', Giddens also notes that it is necessary to grasp the 'time-space relations inherent in the constitution of all social interaction.' Crucial in this regard are what he terms 'practical consciousness' and 'discursive consciousness.' Thus Giddens argues:
The notion of the duality of structure involves recognising that the reflexive monitoring of action both draws upon and reconstitutes the institutional organisation of society. The recognition that to be a '(competent)' member of society, every individual must know a great deal about the workings of that society, is precisely the main basis of the concept of the duality of structure.

But such an approach, quite explicitly, does not seek to overcome the dualisms which figurational sociology takes exception with. The sentiments expressed by Giddens also finds expression in the context of the sociology of sport, for example, in the writings of Richard Gruneau. For Gruneau, in order to understand the role of sport in social reproduction, there is a need to view sport as a 'product of human agency, class inequality and structural change.' In sum, he argues, echoing Giddens:

"...play, games and sports ought to be seen as constitutive social practices whose meanings, metaphoric qualities, and regulatory structures are indissolubly connected to the making and remaking of ourselves as agents (individual and collective) in society.....if we are to avoid the simplistic view that spontaneous play is always an expression of freedom, and that "structured" games and sports are always constraining; or conversely, the view that all games and sports are simply organised expressions of play and thereby guarantee "positive freedom"; then we will have to be more sensitive to the dialectical relationships between socially structured possibilities and human agency."

The weakness which Giddens and Gruneau have in common, is that both tend to perpetuate the misleading structure/agency dichotomy. As argued, from the Eliasian standpoint, action is always structured and structures are always actions. In this regard Abrams has provided a pertinent observation:

"The task of the historical sociologist.....is to discern the specifically historical structuring of action without falling into the trap of separating structure from action or postulating a theory of history in which a succession of

---

60 Richard Gruneau, *Class, Sports and Social Development*, University of Massachusetts, Massachusetts, 1983 pp. 50-51.
structural types - like the parade of ghostly kings in Macbeth - has an existence independent of the creation of structure through action." 61

In contrast, Giddens and Gruneau are, in fact caught up in the dominant framework - they provide, it is reasonable to argue, little more than an eclectic amalgam of competing sociological interpretations.

The reader may still want to ask whether the figurational perspective can come to terms more realistically than other perspectives with such dualisms as voluntarism - determinism; individual - society; agency - structure? An answer to this question will be sought in this thesis in the context of the substantive research and directly tackled in the conclusion by reviewing methodological issues which have arisen and by probing the significance which the present study - although its central focus is on football hooliganism and the emergence of football spectating as a social problem - has for research into popular culture, leisure and working class youth and the analysis of the sociology of sport.

At this point, however, in considering the sociogenesis of communal life, especially with reference to popular culture, further clarification of the developmental and figurational approach adopted is required. In fact, this analysis of communal life reflects the more general problem of conceptualising development. In this connection, it is important to recognise that the approach adopted by the present study seeks to overcome static, non-relational conceptions of development and tries thus to avoid the tendency to see the social world as a set of conditions. These static conceptions of development stem from two main sources. Firstly, the today-centered thinking and short timescale conventionally employed to explain the social world. Secondly, the mistaken perception of the

61 Abrams, Historical Sociology, p. 108.
slowness and unstructured nature of change. As a result, structures are conceived of in a static sense which precedes processes.

In his study of English society between 1580 and 1680, Keith Wrightson rejected such ideas and stressed that 'society is a process, it is never static' and that 'even in its most apparently stable structures are the expression of an equilibrium between dynamic forces.' In order to grasp the development of these dynamic forces, Wrightson utilised the notion of the changing balance between continuity and change. In this way he felt able to analyse what he termed the 'enduring characteristics of English society' as well as the changes which have occurred. The present study also utilises the terms of continuity and change in social development, but does so in the light of the developmental and figurational approach proposed. In order to understand how these terms are employed it is necessary to clarify how social development is conceptualised.

Reference to the changing balance between continuity and change provides a form of explanation of the development of societies. But, for the present study, underpinning this is a more adequate formulation which stresses that the analysis is dealing with long term figurational sequences. They are, figurations in flux. But to argue this is to advance the analysis too far. First, it is necessary to refer again to the sociogenesis of these figurational sequences.

As argued, the development of a society stems from the interweaving of innumerable individual acts or intentions out of which something emerges which was neither planned nor intended by any single individual. These complex, intermeshing processes of change, though they result from the actions and intentions of individuals, proceed blindly and are

---

unplanned. They elude the control and even the comprehension of the majority of individuals who are enmeshed in them. These changes, however, are not chaotic - they have order and regularity; they are structured. In referring to how he utilises 'game models' to highlight the working of these processes, Elias has provided an analysis which clarifies how the present study conceives of the notion of the changing balance between continuity and change. He writes:

"Though it is unplanned and not immediately controllable, the overall process of development of a society is not in the least incomprehensible. There are no 'mysterious' social forces behind it. It is a question of the consequences flowing from the intermeshing of the actions of numerous people, the structural properties of which have already been illustrated by means of game models. As the moves of thousands of interdependent players intertwine, no single player nor group of players acting alone can determine the course of the game, no matter how powerful they may be.......

Development involves a partly self-regulating change in a partly self-organising and self-reproducing figuration of interdependent people, the whole process tending in a certain direction. We are dealing with states of balance between two opposing tendencies towards self-regulation in such figurations: the tendency to remain as before and the tendency to change. They are often, but not always nor exclusively, represented by different groups of people. It is perfectly possible that by their own actions, groups of people consciously orientated towards preserving and maintaining the present figuration in fact strengthen its tendency to change. It is equally possible for groups of people consciously orientated towards change just to strengthen the tendency of their figuration to remain as it is."

Crucially, Elias refers to the fact that the analysis of development is 'dealing with states of balance between two opposing tendencies towards self-regulation in such figurations - the tendency to remain as before and the tendency to change.' For the present study, such an analysis has two applications. Firstly, it provides the means by which explanation of the development of English society over the last century and a half is possible. Secondly, it highlights how the present study conceives of and employs the notion of the changing balance between continuity and change. The structured nature of social development, with

---
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its blind, unplanned processes, necessitates an analysis of what
Elias termed the 'partly self-organising and self-reproducing figurations
of interdependent people:' the notion of the changing balance between
continuity and change assists in explaining the tendencies which develop
in such figurations.

This broad issue - of how certain forms of communal life come into
being, are preserved and changed - in fact, also finds expression in and
is a reflection of the two themes identified earlier, i.e. the debates
surrounding popular culture and deviance and the long-term civilising
process to which Elias has referred. It seems pertinent, at this stage,
to consider such themes, both in the light of the theoretical guidelines
just discussed and as a precursor to the outline of the format of the
present study which will be attempted in the next section of this
Introduction.

D. Issues and Themes of the Present Study

The debates concerning popular culture and deviance centre around
three main issues. Firstly, the conception of how change occurs in
culture. Secondly, and related to this issue, the ability of the
participants to "make" their own culture, and the meaning and significance
of the actions they engage in. Thirdly, the features seen to be
characteristic of particular cultures. If an appraisal of these issues
is attempted, based on the figurational and developmental approach just
outlined, it becomes clear that the production and reproduction of
cultures, or ways of living, cannot be explicated with reference to one
group in isolation. Too often, approaches veer in one direction or
another.\textsuperscript{64} Commenting on this overall issue, Stuart Hall has remarked:

\textsuperscript{64} For an overall discussion of this area see Richard Johnson,"Culture
and the Historians" in John Clarke, Chas Critcher and Richard Johnson,
\textit{Working Class Culture}, Hutchinson London 1979 and Stuart Hall, "Cultural
Studies: Two Paradigms" in Tony Bennett, \textit{Et al Culture, Ideology and
"We understand struggle and resistance, nowadays, rather better than we do reform and transformation. Yet 'transformations' are at the heart of the study of popular culture. I mean the active work on existing traditions and activities, their active re-working, so that they come out a different way: they appear to 'persist' - yet, from one period to another they come to stand in a different relation to the ways working people live and the ways they define their relations to each other, to 'the others' and to their conditions of life. Transformation is the key to the long and protracted process of the 'moralisation' of the labouring classes, and the 'demoralisation' of the poor, and the 're-education' of the people. Popular culture is neither, in a 'pure' sense, the popular traditions of resistance to these processes; nor is it the forms which are superimposed on and over them. It is the ground on which the transformations are worked.

In the study of popular culture, we should always start here: with the double-stake in popular culture, the double movement of containment and resistance, which is always inevitably inside it." 65

By stressing the notion of transformation, Hall is wishing to avoid studying popular culture from what he sees as two unacceptable poles: "pure autonomy" or "total incapsulation."66 In fact, Hall's analysis is entirely consistent with the relational orientation of figurational sociology: by adopting such a perspective, it is argued, these extremes are more easily resolved and understood. Thus it is necessary to avoid adhering to either, the dominant group perspective or to the romanticisation of the subordinate group. As was noted earlier in connection with deviance, by focussing solely on the 'we' - perspective of those labelled deviant - the underdogs - the complex nature of the sociogenesis of deviance is overlooked. Furthermore, by not only focusing on the deviant's perspective but also taking the side of the underdog,67 such a sociology runs the risk of developing, as Goudsblom observed, a 'one-sided incomplete view of society.'

66 Ibid. p. 227.
This is not to suggest that the 'we' - perspective of those labelled deviant and indeed those who define what is deviant and attach labels to particular groups and forms of behaviour should be overlooked. Involvement and identification is a necessary part of the analysis. It is also necessary, however, to exercise a degree of detachment. Only in this way is it possible to analyse why particular groups - in relation to popular culture or the question of deviance - adhere to specific codes of conduct and why certain dominant groups find such codes more or less problematic. By the adoption of a degree of detachment, the sociologist can step back and trace the pattern of interdependence and grasp that such social conduct must be understood as a function of the figuration in which it occurs. But such a task as Goudsblom has noted, is not easy:

"The challenge for sociologists, then, lies in combining identification and detachment. The 'we' - perspectives of various groups in a figuration are to be examined, not because any one of them may reveal the 'truth,' but because they are all constituent parts of the figuration. The next step has to be an inquiry into how these constituent parts are interconnected." 68

In the study of popular culture, then, while it is necessary to examine the 'we' - perspectives of the working classes and those of the dominant groups, the next step is to analyse the interconnections which are evident and which are part and parcel of the transformations to which Hall refers.

The inadequacies of viewing popular culture in terms of "pure autonomy" or "total encapsulation" i.e. in a non-relational manner, are exacerbated when particular groups are seen to be the sole arbitrators of the "making" of their culture. Too often there is a tendency to over-stress the relative power potential of one group in relation to

---

68 Goudsblom, Sociology in the Balance, p. 192.
another: a succession of writers, including Cunningham, Stedman Jones and Storch, while correctly emphasising the element of human agency, fall into the trap of attributing too much to the ability of one group - more specifically, to subordinates.

But this tendency to over-stress the relative power potential of one group in some research is also coupled with an inability to attempt to perceive popular culture "as it really is" not as what it "ought to be." In particular, research into this area has failed to probe the continuities which exist between the violence of pre-industrial culture and the values which persist today in certain lower working-class communities. To argue this is not to slide into some crude notion of popular culture - of seeing the mass of "ordinary" people as the "dangerous classes." Recognition, firstly, of the ability of people to make and recreate their culture - albeit in situations not of their own choosing - and secondly, that the manifestation, in various forms, of this culture, continues to have meaning for these particular people over time, is important. Indeed without this ability, popular culture could truly have been, to utilise the phrase commonly employed to describe the changing balance between continuity and change in popular culture in the early nineteenth century,
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"smashed." Such an observation, exemplified in E.P. Thompson's analysis of the "moral economy" of the crowd, must also, however, be informed by an understanding of how, to use Elias's terms, 'certain forms of communal life come into being, are preserved and changed.' In addition, it is crucial in the context of the present study that the fact that a number of continuities exist between the violence of pre-industrial culture and certain values which persist in lower working class communities today is fully recognised. In this respect, two features require consideration: it is to these that attention must now be directed.

Stuart Hall, in examining the transformations that occurred in popular culture with the development, first of agrarian and then of industrial capitalism in Britain, sought to emphasise what he termed the 'more or less continuous struggle over the culture of working people.' The nature of this struggle was a reflection, he argued, of the 'changing balance and relations of social forces.' More specifically, he wrote:

"Throughout the long transition into agrarian capitalism and then in the formation and development of industrial capitalism, there is a more or less continuous struggle over the culture of working people, the labouring classes and the poor. This fact must be the starting point for any study, both of the basis for, and of the transformations of, popular culture. The changing balance and relations of social forces throughout that history reveal themselves, time and again, in struggles over the forms of the culture, traditions and ways of life of the popular classes." 76

Richard Johnson, in his analysis of nineteenth-century mass schooling, provided a complementary perspective to that of Hall but wrote in even more forceful terms:


76 Hall, "Notes on Deconstructing the 'Popular'" p. 227.
"Modern industry did need new elements in human nature, did require the learning of new relations. Early Victorian moralism, then, was not some gratuitous bourgeois aberration. Cultural aggression of this kind was organic to this phase of capitalist development. That is why 'class-cultural control' is a better, more explicit, expression to use than the looser term 'social control'. Even this term does not quite catch the aspect of movement: not control merely, but transformations were required. All the distinctive liberal social policies of this phase should be seen in this light: the creation of a new labourer by the deterrent mechanisms of the New Poor Law; the moralisation of factory children through compulsory school attendance; the continued attack on 'football' and all 'brutal sports'; the encouragement of temperance and rational recreation, etc. Education was part of this overall drive, a drive which became a partly conscious strategy in the minds of men, such as Edwin Chadwick, Dr. Kay and Nassau Senior, with the percipience to see the long-term interests of capital as a whole." 77

The present study does not seek to deny this "overall drive" or the fact that it became "a partly conscious strategy" in the minds of certain men. Indeed, such a "strategy" seems to have informed both the perception of working class football spectators by members of the upper and middle classes and the forms of control adopted to manage crowd disorderliness after the formation of the Football League. Nevertheless, having said that, the excesses of a crude "conspiracy theory" have to be avoided and Elias, with his stress on the way in which the plans and intentions of innumerable individuals interweave to produce an unintended, yet structured, result, provides, on the whole, a more useful guide. Brian Jackson has similar reservations with the application of a crude conspiracy theory to the analysis of youth and has provided a pertinent observation in this regard:

"The mutual envy of the young and the old, and the violent actions that provoke or meet each other, have an ancient history that can't be labelled as the 'contradictions' in an industrial capitalist society." 78


To accept this is not to adopt uncritically a crude theory of "mass culture" or "deprivation" and apply it mechanically to the working classes at various stages in their evolution, within that of British society as a whole. This, again is a point that requires further elaboration.

"Mass culture" or "mass society" theories do not share a unified body of theory but rather consist of a number of loosely defined views and key concerns which appear to be rooted in an ambivalent and antagonistic response to industrialisation and urbanisation. The fear which such theories have regarding working class culture centres around the combined effects of four main concerns - mass production, mass consumption, mass communication and mass democracy - on the populace in general. 79 Viewed from this perspective, the impact of these changes has led to an undermining of traditional values and the destruction of the individual's "moral fibre." Research into these concerns has been coupled with an analysis of the presumed hereditary, genetic and/or environmental defects or disadvantages characteristic of the working classes and their culture.

In reviewing these theories, Stephen Humphries identified two main weaknesses which they display. He wrote:

"The theoretical orientation and the evidence produced by the mass-society conception has two principal defects that blur our vision of the cultural forms of working-class youth. The first is that much mass-culture theorizing has an in-built elitist or class bias - a bias that is particularly evident in the value - laden labels frequently used to stigmatize working-class youth.....

The second major criticism of mass-culture theory is that it disguises political problems of class inequality and exploitation by its use of the depoliticized concepts of the individual as opposed to the masses and the masses as opposed to the elites." 80

80 Ibid pp. 11-12.
Focusing on research which purported to be "objectively" examining the psychology of working-class crowds, Susanna Barrows' analysis - that such research was but a reflection of the writer's own bourgeois anxiety about violence - tends to reinforce the argument presented by Humphries. In rejecting the characterisation of the working classes in terms of their alleged 'authoritarianism' and 'viciousness,' Humphries, in fact, argued that acceptance of such a portrayal would lead to a neglect of what he termed 'the potential evidence of class-based resistance.' For Humphries, instead of viewing the working classes as "hooliganism," a more appropriate label would be in terms of their "rebellion."

But while "mass culture" theories may portray the crowd in terms of the "herd" and working class youth as "hooligans" and while researchers such as Johnson might seek out acts of resistance or rebellion towards the "overall drive" outlined above, neither are satisfactory ways of examining history. Peter Burke, in fact, has highlighted the dangers of such tendencies:

"It's terribly easy to slide into a view of history as essentially a struggle between virtue and vice; a Whig or Romantic view of history. The signs have now been reversed, and the bourgeoisie, once the hero of the epic, has become the villain of the piece, but the basic structure of interpretation is the same.

I should like to conclude by suggesting that whatever group you take as the hero of your epic - bourgeoisie or proletariat, or the blacks, or womanhood - the result is always mystification. A history constructed around heroes and villains makes it impossible to understand how the past happened as it did. The value of the study of history is surely that it reminds us of awkward truths, such as the truth that not everyone on our side - whatever that side is - is necessarily good or intelligent, and
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that not everyone on the other side is necessarily bad or stupid." 84

Yet Burke is only partly correct. While his observation makes an important point, it will be argued that it is also necessary, in order to provide what Elias terms a "relatively detached" perspective, to avoid the use of evaluative and emotive concepts like "good or intelligent," "bad or stupid." In fact, the need for Burke to make such an observation reflects the "relatively involved" position from which the social historians and sociologists who treat this issue have so far failed to extricate themselves. 85 While the present study therefore appreciates the appropriateness of viewing the transformations which occurred in popular culture in the nineteenth century in terms of what Johnson has termed 'class-cultural control,' there is also a need to examine the sociogenesis of these forms of communal life in terms of the relatively autonomous processes which have been and are features of the development of English society as a whole. It is in this connection that discussion of what Elias has described as the 'civilising process' is appropriate.

In the following quotation, Elias himself summarises what he takes the principal "mechanisms" and characteristics of the civilising process to be. He writes:

"It has been shown in detail how constraints through others from a variety of angles are converted into self-restraints, how the more animalic human activities are progressively thrust behind the scenes of men's communal social life and invested with feelings of shame, how the regulation of the whole instinctual and affective life by steady self-control becomes more and more stable, more even and more all embracing. All this certainly does not spring from a rational idea conceived centuries ago by individual people and then implanted in one generation after another as the purpose of action and the desired state, until it was fully realised in the "centuries of progress." And yet, though not planned and intended, this transformation is not merely a sequence of unstructured and chaotic changes.
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What poses itself here with regard to the civilising process is nothing other than the general problem of historical change. Taken as a whole this change is not "rationally" planned; but neither is it a random coming and going of orderless patterns." 86

For Elias, it is the 'order of interweaving of human impulses and strivings which determines the course of historical change.' Crucially, however, Elias does not deny that in the course of the civilising process what he terms the 'established upper group' can intentionally permeate with its own patterns of conduct, the 'lower, outsider class.' 87 But such a process is neither one-sided nor non-relational. That is, the course of historical change in general and of the civilising process in particular, and indeed the development of the codes of conduct and ways of living that have come to be characteristic of English society, cannot be explicated with reference to one group in isolation. This is not to deny the at least partly "hegemonic" nature of the transformations which occurred in popular culture in the nineteenth century, for example. What is being attempted here, however, is a more adequate analysis of such transformations based upon the figurational and developmental sociology outlined earlier which gives due emphasis to the relatively autonomous processes which involved all classes.

In his study of the civilising process, Elias was essentially concerned to trace the development of both the personality structure of individuals and the social standards that have been formed in European societies since the Middle Ages. By examining changes in etiquette and manners, Elias documents a trend towards greater control over the expression of affect. The key features of this long-term, on-going process are the gradual acquisition of stricter and more all-embracing forms of emotional restraint and instinctual renunciation. Closely
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interwoven with this process on the level of social structure have been a lengthening of interdependency chains and state formation, a central aspect of which, according to Elias, was the monopolization of violence by the state and a concomitant process of "domestic" i.e. internal pacification.

For Elias, the civilising process thus marks an increase in the degree of control which men are expected to exercise over their emotions and the expression of their impulses. But how has this process unfolded? According to Bryan Wilson:

"The general process might best be seen in the shift from the prerogatives of a courtly class to the reformed idea of the Homme Civilise to the concept.....of the civilisation of society itself." 88

That is, this progressively stricter control of impulses and emotions was first significantly developed, according to Elias, in court circles, more particularly in the courts of the absolute monarchs, and later, as the lengthening of interdependency chains and the process of state formation continued, percolated down the social scale, gradually leading in urban-industrial societies to the majority of individuals exercising relatively automatic self-restraint.

The civilising process, as Dunning argues, can best be conceptualised in relation to what Elias calls, the 'triad of basic controls.' 89 Essentially these are criteria by which different stages of long term social development can be identified and measured. These 'controls' involve society's control over, firstly, "natural events;" secondly, society's control over "social relationships;" and thirdly, the control each individual in society exercises over himself. 90 For Dunning therefore:

89 Elias, What is Sociology? p. 156.
"Reduced to its core, what Elias's theory of the "civilising process" holds is this: that, on the level of social standards in the societies of Western Europe since the Middle Ages, the blind, unplanned course of social events has led, despite several short-term fluctuations towards the increasing elaboration and refinement of manners and etiquette and towards increasing social pressure on individual people to exercise self-control. On the level of personality, the same course of events has led, over time, to a deeper internalisation of social taboos, producing a dominant personality-pattern in which a relatively stable, continuous and almost automatically operating conscience similar in many respects to what Freud called the 'super-ego' is a major characteristic. As part of this there has occurred an advance in what Elias calls the "threshold of repugnance" regarding natural functions and an advance in the "frontiers of modesty and shame." Elias explains this process sociogenetically, i.e. by reference to the immanent figurational dynamics of the emergent structure of unintended interdependencies which moulded the directly observable nexus of events and which, in that sense, formed the "deep structure" of the long-term social process. Crucial in this connection, according to Elias, were the process of state-formation and the correlative lengthening of interdependency chains. Since the secular, upper classes were the principal producers of social standards during the period he considered, Elias focused his attention mainly on these groups, arguing that they became "more civilized," first of all as a consequence of increasing social pressure "from above," i.e. from the agents of the developing state, and later as a consequence of increasing social pressure "from below", especially since the lengthening of interdependency chains was conducive, according to Elias, to what he calls "functional democratisation," i.e. an equalising change in the power-ratios of rulers and ruled. 91

While Dunning is correct to point to the influence of the dominant strata as the standard-setting groups at an earlier stage in the civilising process, in relation to the present study, it is the lengthening of interdependency chains and functional democratisation - and all that went with these processes - which are of more immediate importance. These two aspects, in fact, developed in connection with what Elias terms state formation. By focusing on these two aspects, an explanation of how relatively highly centralised state-societies developed out of far less centralised and differentiated social units is more adequately based than conventional accounts of the emergence of industrial societies. In order

to assist in this explanation, however, a sociogenetic analysis which stresses how the immanent figurational dynamics of the emergent structure of unintended interdependencies mould more directly observable events, must be adopted.

During the course of the transformation from less centralised and differentiated social units to relatively highly centralised state-societies, there occurred an astonishing increase in the number of occupational groups - in fact, such a process marked the onset of the urban-industrial division of labour. A significant aspect of this transformation was the emergence of longer and more differentiated interdependency chains: there occurred greater functional specialisation and the integration of functionally differentiated groups into wider networks. The impact of this development was three-fold. Firstly individuals became caught up in ever-lengthening chains of interdependency which constituted for them what Elias terms "functional nexuses" beyond their control. Secondly, at the same time it meant that, in comparison to the less centralised and differentiated social units of earlier periods, power chances in these more highly centralised state-societies became less unevenly distributed and the reliance of interdependent positions on each other became relatively less one-sided and more relational. With this increase in reciprocal dependency, there developed patterns of multipolar control within and among groups. As a result of power chances becoming less unevenly distributed, i.e. with the increase in the relative power of lower groups, the higher strata, in order to maintain their distinctiveness and hence their privilege and power, were forced, as a means of distinguishing between "insiders" and "outsiders," to elaborate still further their already differentiated standards of social conduct. This need, in fact, necessitated the exercise of greater self-control over
their behaviour. Thirdly, as the process of functional differentiation gathered momentum, so that more and more people at many levels, became interdependent, simultaneously they became more dependent on the centre for their co-ordination and integration, i.e. the state, as we know it today, was emerging.

The further elaboration of the higher strata's already differentiated standards of social conduct in fact embraced all aspects of their behaviour, no more so than with respect to violence control. What implications has this, however, for the focal concerns of the present study? Elias himself addressed this very linkage when he wrote concerning the "civilisation" of games that:

"...The fluctuating level of civilisation in game contests must remain incomprehensible if one does not connect it at least with the general level of socially permitted violence, of the organisation of violence control and with the corresponding conscience formation in given societies." 92

In examining the problem of violence in sport, Dunning has further elaborated on this theme. His analysis is two-fold, offering both an understanding of football and violence in a developmental perspective and of violence more generally and its relations to different forms of social bonding. It is important to note, however, that both themes are closely interwoven. Thus Dunning argues, echoing Elias' analysis, that

"...a central aspect of the development of modern sport has been what Elias would call a "civilising process" regarding the expression and control of physical violence. Centrally involved in this process - whatever short-term fluctuations there may have been - has been a long-term shift between violence in its affective and violence in its instrumental forms." 93

Affective violence is seen as a form engaged in as an emotionally satisfying and pleasurable 'end in itself.' In contrast, instrumental
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violence is rationally chosen as a means for securing a given end or goal. But there is no rigid separation between these forms. The formulation outlined is concerned with what Max Weber would call "ideal types" - in reality these forms overlap and can be transformed into one another. For the present study, violence is more adequately understood as varying around a complex of overlapping and interdependent polarities - in analysing violent conduct it is a question of degree - more or less instrumental, more or less affective.

This long-term shift in the balance between violence in its affective and violence in its instrumental forms, it is claimed, is connected to a shift in the pattern of social bonding. Locating it within the context of state formation, Dunning argues that the 'civilising transformation' involved in the development of modern sport occurred correlative with a change in the balance between "segmental bonding" and "functional bonding," in favour of the latter, and that one of the consequences of this has been a parallel shift in sport in the balance between affective and instrumental violence. Despite this 'civilising transformation,' however, there are still groups in British society, Dunning suggests, whose:

"......members remain locked in social configurations that are reminiscent in many ways of the pre-industrial forms of segmental bonding and that correspondingly generate acute forms of aggressive masculinity. The intense feelings of in-group attachment and hostility towards out-groups of such segmentally bonded groups mean that rivalry is virtually inevitable when their members meet. And their norms of aggressive masculinity and comparative inability to exercise self-control mean that conflict between them leads easily to fighting. Indeed, much as was the case with their pre-industrial counterparts, fighting within and between such groups is necessary for the establishment and maintenance of reputations in terms of their standards of aggressive masculinity and particular individuals take positive pleasure in performing what, for them, is a socially necessary role." 94
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But what are the central characteristics of communities marked by segmental or functional bonding? Essentially the main difference between these two forms of communities is that, in those characterised by segmental bonding, ascriptive ties of family and residence are more important while in communities marked by functional bonding, achieved ties determined by the division of labour gain greater prominence. The members of segmentally bonded communities tend to exercise physical strength and emphasise the ability to fight. In addition, such communities possess few power resources and tend to experience unfamiliar territory and people as potentially threatening and hostile. In fact, only in the company of kin and other local groups do such individuals feel a relatively high degree of social assurance - in consequence these positive feelings are projected onto territory and a strong sense of local identification is established.

In contrast, communities characterised by functional bonding push physical violence 'behind the scenes' and establish greater self-controls and restraints. Individuals, in fact, tend to enjoy a range of opportunities, are relatively affluent and their status is dependent less on physical prowess than it is on such things as occupation, education, artistic and sporting ability. Where physical violence is openly expressed, this tends to be done in socially acceptable situations, e.g. in sports demanding a high degree of physical prowess.

As Dunning noted, however, members of segmentally bonded communities value aggressive masculinity - this, combined with a comparative inability to exercise self-control results in fighting between segmentally bonded groups from different communities or sections of a community when they meet. While functionally bonded communities express physical violence through participation in sports valuing physical prowess, the members of segmentally bonded groups who attend football matches for example, find
this arena, as Dunning observes, to be:

"....a natural setting for the expression of such standards because norms of manliness are intrinsic to it; it is basically a play fight in which masculine reputations are enhanced or lost. Its inherently oppositional character means that it lends itself readily to group identification and the enhancement of in-group solidarity in opposition to a series of easily identifiable out-groups, the opposition team and their supporters. To the extent that some fans are drawn from communities characterised by segmental solidarity, football hooliganism in the form of fighting between gangs of rival supporters is an almost inevitable result.

Football hooliganism is a present-day counterpart to the folk antecedents of modern football, though superimposed on and intermingled in a complex manner with the more differentiated and civilised game of today." 95

In his analysis of football hooliganism, Dunning is correct to probe the social roots of such behaviour. In examining the transformations which have occurred in popular culture in general, it is necessary for the present study to consider both the "social roots" of this transformation and the upper, established class's attempts to permeate the lower, outsider class with its own standards of behaviour in order to secure their own relatively powerful position of ascendancy. Stuart Hall captured the complexity of this process when he wrote:

"....I think there is a continuous and necessarily uneven and unequal struggle, by the dominant culture, constantly to disorganise and reorganise popular culture: to enclose and confine its definitions and forms within a more inclusive range of dominant forms. There are points of resistance; there are also moments of supersession. This is the dialectic of cultural struggle. In our times, it goes on continuously, in the complex lines of resistance and acceptance, refusal and capitulation, which make the field of culture a sort of constant battlefield. A battlefield where no once-for-all victories are obtained but where there are always strategic positions to be won and lost." 96

The changes in a "civilising" direction that Elias and his followers detect not only reinforce but also reflect the 'cultural struggle' to which Hall refers. Both the social roots of football hooligan violence, its forms and control, and the perception by powerful outsiders
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of working class football spectators since the foundation of the Football League, are bound up in such themes which are themselves a reflection of the whole process of the sociogenesis of the codes of conduct evident in English society. But while Hall is correct to point out that 'once-for-all victories' cannot be obtained, the distinctive feature of the nineteenth century in this connection, as was argued earlier, was a marked narrowing of the limits of what would be tolerated in public and a subtle, sometimes overt, sometimes covert proliferation and tightening of constraints on all people's behaviour, particularly with reference to the nature and expression of violence. Such a development is a consequence of the inseparably linked civilising process and cultural struggle to which reference has been made. And it has affected all classes, the upper, middle and working classes, though to differing degrees. What we have come to know as "football hooliganism", along with other activities involving working class youth, has been caught up in such a process. The task of the present study is to discern the nature of the entanglement of "football hooliganism" in this process. At this point, it is appropriate to spell out the format in terms of which this task will be attempted.

E. The Format of the Present Study

The intention underpinning this attempt to spell out the format of the present study is two-fold. Firstly, it will help the course which the thesis takes to be more adequately understood. Secondly, the arguments and analyses contained within specific chapters and the links between chapters, will, hopefully become more apparent.

Reference has already been made to two weaknesses of existing accounts of football hooliganism - the lack of understanding concerning both the nature of social problems and of the historical antecedents of
the phenomenon. Whatever the balance between its deficiencies and merits, such research has played a part in informing the contemporary understanding of football hooliganism. As a result, it needs to be critically examined in the present context. It can be located within five broad orientations. More particularly, the analysis conducted in Chapter One focuses on what is termed, the "official position," and then, successively, on the premises that: (i) football hooliganism is understandable as a reflection or aspect of the "crisis," firstly, in the game and secondly, in the wider social context; (ii) that it is a "construction" of the media; (iii) that it is an expression of an "innate" aggressiveness and therefore an inevitable feature of human relations; and (iv) finally, the one or two historical examinations of spectator disorderliness at football which have been undertaken are examined. While critical of the prevailing research orientations and the work they have led to, the present study is not entirely dismissive. In fact, the intention is to weave the partial insight of each particular orientation into a more all-embracing synthesis.

While the present study's conception of the phenomenon and the theoretical guidelines which underpin the approach adopted have already been described, the methodological problems involved must not be overlooked. In fact, the methodological dimension discussed in Chapter Two centres around three main issues, each of which, in its own way, relates to the theoretical guidelines outlined above. Firstly, consideration is given to the themes pervading this and other research in relation to analyses of leisure and popular culture. In this connection, three themes are identified as being worthy of discussion - the nature of the historical process, with specific reference to the ability of people to "make" their own history; the nature of source material in relation to this perceived ability; and thirdly, the assumptions which sociologists and historians adopt concerning the "relation-
ship" between theory and evidence and their identification with and detachment from the phenomena under investigation. These themes also relate to the second issue which the analysis of the methodological dimension centres around, namely the "adequacy" of the evidence. In this context, attention will be given both to criticisms of conventional accounts of leisure and popular culture, paying special attention to histories of football. In this way, the analysis of the third issue, the problems encountered in relation to the specific form of research conducted, can be undertaken in the light of the examination of the two preceding issues.

In order for the logic of particular chapters and the relationship between them to be understood it is also necessary to identify the purpose which they have in common. Each is meant to serve an iconoclastic, i.e. a debunking, purpose. The images which surround football hooliganism in particular, and popular culture and deviance in general, are thus opened up for critical scrutiny. It is quite appropriate that this should be attempted in the chapter on methodology. For as Peter Berger has remarked;

"....the roots of the debunking motif in sociology are not psychological but methodological. The sociological frame of reference with its built-in procedure of looking for levels of reality other than those given in the official interpretations of society, carries with it a logical imperative to unmask the pretensions and the propaganda by which men cloak their actions with each other." 97

Studies of popular culture and deviance, permeated as they are by official interpretations of society and formulated within the existing academic division of labour and the prevailing sociological perspectives, have served to limit the theoretical and methodological scope of analyses of football hooliganism. The present study, informed by approaches which challenge this overall conception, seeks to provide insight into and to form the basis of an alternative perspective. In so doing, it also

attempts to keep faith with the guidelines which Elias set himself. He writes:

"It was not so much my purpose to build a general theory of civilization in the air, and then afterward find out whether it agreed with experience; rather, it seemed the primary task to begin by regaining within a limited area the lost perception of the process in question, the peculiar transformation of human behaviour, then to seek a certain understanding of its causes, and finally to gather together such theoretical insights as have been encountered on the way." 98

In its own way, the present study is similarly concerned with the primary task to which Elias refers, namely the transformation of human behaviour. To assist in this task the processes of observation and theory formation - as with the guidelines proposed by Elias - are seen as interwoven.

The analysis contained in Chapter Three echoes the discussion of popular culture and deviance undertaken in the Introduction and in the chapter on methodology. In examining football, leisure and popular culture in nineteenth-century England, it attempts to provide a developmental analysis of a violent milieu. By focusing upon the changing balance between continuity and change in popular culture and the tendencies in the civilising process of what Elias termed "attraction" and "repulsion" as a means of explaining the retention of particular ways of living and codes of conduct, Chapter Three should be seen as a precursor to the substantive sections of the present study which are then presented.

The format of the substantive sections is shaped by two main factors. Firstly, it is designed to escape from the "official interpretations" of football hooliganism and to provide, in Elias' terms, an 'accurately documented empirical enquiry.' Secondly, the analysis seeks to go beyond the conventional approach to empirical enquiries in the sense of acquiring facts and providing explanations solely in terms of individual meaning and action: rather, the present study seeks to examine the structured processes

---

involved. It is not a question, however, of it being either/or - a complex balance must be struck. In examining the crowd in history, Rudé has provided a set of questions which serve to guide such examinations. In refuting the stereotypes which characterise "the crowd," he asks:

"How then, do we escape from these stereotypes.....In the first place, by asking a number of questions, beginning with: what actually happened, both as to the event itself, and as to its origins and its aftermath? That is, we should attempt from the start to place the event in which the crowd participates in its proper historical context; for without this, how can we hope to get beyond the stereotypes and probe into the crowd's outlook, objects and behaviour? Next: how large was the crowd concerned, how did it act, who (if any) were its promoters, who composed it, and who led it? Such questions are important, as they will help us to determine not only the general nature of the crowd and its behaviour but also its components - by picking out what Asa Briggs has called "The Faces in the Crowd" in terms of the individuals and groups that compose it, their social origins, ages (sometimes), and occupations. Next: who were the target or the victims of the crowd's activities? This is also important, as it may help to throw further light on the event itself and tell us something of the social and political aims of those that took part in it. But, more specifically, we need also to enquire: what were the aims, motives, and ideas underlying these activities?.....A further relevant question is: how effective were the forces of repression, or of law and order?.....Finally, what were the consequences of the event and what has been its historical significance?"

The set of questions which Rudé proposes as the means to refute the stereotypes with which existing research characterises the crowd, i.e. in terms of 'the herd' or 'the people', does serve one main purpose. These questions emphasise the extent to which the researcher must ground himself in substantive research without a rigid preconception as to what the evidence will support or deny. But while the initial formulation for Chapter Four, which documents the forms and control of football hooligan violence since the foundation of the Football League, orientated itself around such questions, there is, as Abrams has argued, a need to integrate experience and abstraction in an analysis. That is, as noted above,

100 Abrams, Historical Sociology, Chapter Seven.
in more adequate analyses, there is a need to recognise that observation and theory formation are interwoven. In Rude's research there is a sense in which the evidence generated by the questions he proposes will speak for itself—this is not the case. There has to be an uninterrupted, two-way traffic between observation and theory formation—otherwise, as Elias has noted, the former, if not sufficiently informed by the latter, remains 'unorganised and diffuse' and the latter, if not sufficiently informed by the former, remains 'dominated by feelings and imaginings'.

In Chapter Four, therefore, particular themes in the development of football as a spectator sport are identified and the documentation is interwoven within and between them.

Similarly, Chapter Five seeks to probe the meaning of particular behaviour which took place within the structured processes involved. In this way, the analysis of the emergence of football spectating as a social problem seeks to "gel" the issues and themes outlined earlier in this introduction. Having undertaken this task, an analysis of two case studies, is then undertaken. Both Chapter Six, the case study of Leicester City F.C., and Chapter Seven, the case study of Millwall F.C., seek to integrate the overall analysis and go some way to filling some of the lacunae and resolving some of the puzzles which remain. Finally, in the Conclusion, the many threads which run through the study are drawn together and a sketch of the pattern produced is outlined. In this way, both specific and more general observations will, hopefully, emerge.

In setting out on this endeavour, it is useful to remind oneself that sociology is concerned with the analysis of the ways in which people cope with the problems of interdependence and that the rationale of the sociological enterprise must always bear this in mind. In this respect, the "sensitising concepts" which Goudsblom refers to can serve as a guide.

For Goudsblom:

"......The concepts of precision, systematics, scope and relevance.....refer to real problems experienced by real people: problems of acquiring precise information; of finding clear and consistent principles of classification and explanation; of grasping the wider implications of events; of knowing how to make their knowledge of some avail in arranging their lives. They refer, in other words, to problems of orientation in the social world as one particular variety of the problems of social existence in general." 102

By emphasising one or another of these sensitising concepts in isolation from the others to which Goudsblom refers, traditional sociological accounts have produced a lop-sided view of the social world. For the present study, these concepts need to be seen as integrated and, in the course of research, reflected upon at one and the same time. By keeping them to the fore, a more adequate analysis of the problems of social existence which figurational sociology seeks to examine is possible and it is with a synthesis of these "sensitising concepts" in mind that the present study sets out on the task outlined.

F. Summary

At the outset of this Introduction exception was taken to the dominant mythology in which analyses of football hooliganism are seen to be located. Criticism was made of such analyses with respect both to their relative neglect of the historical antecedents of the phenomenon and their inadequate conception of social problems in general. In contrast, the adoption of a developmental perspective, sensitive to an analysis of the historical antecedents of football hooliganism, was proposed. In addition, an alternative conception of social problems - based on premises derived from figurational sociology - was outlined. By focusing on either the 'objective condition' or the 'subjective definition' of social problems a lop-sided and non-relational analysis it was argued, is produced. By first grasping that people have to cope with the problems of interdependence and that the tensions and conflicts which are inherent in social develop-

102 Goudsblom, Sociology in the Balance p. 198.
ment are inevitable and structured, the analysis in fact, is then better placed to conceive of the reciprocal and integrally integrated nature of social problems. In order to capture this, a dynamic, relational and developmental perspective was proposed. Therefore, in examining the limits of decent partisanship and the emergence of football spectating as a social problem, the analysis of why particular groups adhere to specific codes of conduct and why certain groups find such codes more or less problematic can be understood as a function of the figuration in which such processes occur.

From this position, an alternative conception of football hooliganism was proposed. Essentially, football hooliganism needs to be understood, initially, in relation to the competing definitions of codes of conduct and ways of living evident in English society in the past century and a half. But such competitiveness is both a reflection of and finds expression in the ongoing debate surrounding popular culture and deviance, which in turn is caught up in the more longer term civilising process to which Elias has drawn attention. In order to understand how, throughout the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, there has been a more or less progressive narrowing of the limits of the forms of behaviour that are tolerated in public and a concomitant proliferation and tightening of constraints on people's behaviour, it is necessary, it was argued, to adopt an analysis which considers the sociogenesis of this structured process.

As noted, the alternative conception of social problems in general and of football hooliganism in particular developed in this thesis are based on premises derived from figurational sociology. Before a brief summation of the issues and themes which mark the present study is attempted, it is useful to remind oneself of the basic tenets of this approach.
By adopting a sociogenetic methodology, the present study is recognizing that social processes are structured and that their structure is an unplanned consequence of the interweaving of the intended acts of innumerable interdependent individuals. Crucially, the structurally generated balance of power between groups creates pressures and constraints on people to modify their behaviour. This is not to deny that individuals create their social worlds by acting meaningfully within them, but, they are, at one and the same time, created by them in the sense that the interdependency structures inherited from the past act as limiting constraints on what they do and believe. In order to discern this "inheritance," it is necessary to recognize that, although out of the intermeshing processes of change wrought by the actions and intentions of individuals something emerges which proceeds blindly and in an unplanned manner, it also has an order, a regularity, a structure to it. In order to explain how later social formations arise out of earlier ones, it is necessary therefore, to examine the changing balance between continuity and change in these structured processes.

As suggested already, in examining the competing definitions over ways of living and codes of conduct in English society in the past century and a half, it is important to analyze the twin interwoven issues of the 'cultural struggle' and the civilizing process which find expression in the debate surrounding popular culture and deviance. In relation to this debate, the cultural struggle referred to is seen to revolve around three themes - the conception of historical change, the ability of working class groups to make their culture and the characterization of popular culture. With respect to the civilizing process, the key features were identified as being the gradual acquisition of stricter forms of emotional restraint and instinctual renunciation. The civilizing process thus marks an increase in the degree of control which people are expected to exercise
over their emotions and the expression of impulses, e.g. with respect to violence control. According to Dunning's interpretation of this position, as noted, there has been a long term shift, in a relative direction, from the expression of affective violence to the use of instrumental violence and this, in its turn, is seen as connected to a shift in the pattern of social bonding. This observation is crucial in that it is the balance reached between segmental and functional bonding which helps, in part, to explain football hooligan violence. But the 'social roots' of football hooligan violence and the interwoven perception by outsiders of working class spectators since the foundation of the Football League are, as noted, in fact bound up in the whole process of the coming into being, the preserving and changing of communal ways of living. And to explain how, throughout the nineteenth and twentieth centuries there has been a proliferation and tightening of constraints on people's ways of living, this development has to be viewed as a consequence of the inseparably linked civilising process and cultural struggle to which reference has been made. The contemporary phenomenon of football hooliganism and indeed the emergence of football spectating as a social problem in general has been caught up in these structured processes. The task for the present study, as noted, is to discern the nature of their entanglement.
CHAPTER ONE

"FOOTBALL HOOLIGANISM": AN ANALYSIS OF THE PREVAILING RESEARCH ORIENTATIONS

Existing analyses of "football hooliganism" can be seen to revolve around a number of particular research orientations. That is to say, the phenomenon has been conceptualised in a variety of distinct ways. Three points need to be made in this connection if the analysis contained in the present chapter is to be more adequately understood. Firstly, each orientation tends to be informed, implicitly at least, by a range of theoretical perspectives. Secondly, such orientations are not conceived by the present study to be mutually exclusive, but rather to possess the potential to be interwoven. Thirdly, research by particular authors tends, in fact, to straddle the different orientations. The important feature to grasp, however, is that no one who has written on the subject of football hooliganism so far has accomplished anything more than a partial perspective. The intention of the present chapter is to weave the partial insights of each particular orientation into a more all-embracing, albeit at this stage still largely abstract, synthesis.

Initially, the focus of attention will be on what is termed the "official position" - in this context, the evidence gathered and conclusions offered by official reports will be examined. From this basis, the analysis will then shift to undertake a close inspection of the other orientations. More particularly, consideration will successively be given to the orientations which stress that "football hooliganism" can best be conceptualised as a reflection of a "crisis" in the game and in the wider social context; that it is a "construction" of the media and that it contains expressions of an innate aggressiveness that, on account of its alleged "innateness," are an "inevitable" feature of human relations. Analysis of the small number of historical studies of football hooliganism is then attempted. Finally, such orientations are juxtaposed with an alternative conception of football

1 See Taylor,"Class, Violence and Sport: The Case of Soccer Hooliganism."
hooliganism.

One further point needs to be made at this juncture. In the appraisal
of these orientations, the analysis is attempting, not simply to highlight
the inadequacies of particular researches, but at the same time to draw
out partial insights which can be incorporated into a more all-embracing
and hopefully more adequate synthesis. A review of the existing orient­
ations will also serve as a useful framework against which to contrast the
theoretical perspective used in the present study.

A. The Official Position

This section seeks to accomplish two main objectives. Firstly,
identification of the general findings of the official reports on football
hooliganism is attempted. But, as noted, this is not its sole intention.
Rather, to the extent that they have both reinforced the dominant official
conception of and influenced policy discussions regarding football hooli­
ganism, such reports form a not unimportant part of the substantive focus
of the present study. The analysis is also directed to these links.

In tune with the growth of concern surrounding football hooliganism -
which the Harrington Report was subsequently to acknowledge\(^2\) - the Chester
Committee's 1968 investigation into the "state of football" noted that the
number of cases of spectator misconduct dealt with annually by the FA had
almost doubled in the seasons 1961 - 1962 to 1966 - 1967 as compared to
the period 1946 to 1960. More particularly, 195 cases of "disorderly
conduct" by spectators were brought to the attention of the FA in the
latter period, an average of thirteen per season, whilst in the former
period, the total number was 148, an average of twenty-five per season.\(^3\)
Despite acknowledging that such a trend was a "cause for concern" to the FA and the Football League, no further analysis was attempted in the context of that report.

Such attention, however, was a harbinger of reports to come. Indeed, though the Chester Report had devoted only two paragraphs to the issue of football hooliganism, the implication that research was needed into it reflected what sociologists such as Ian Taylor, John Clarke and Chas Critcher have envisaged as the "crisis" in the game. The "state of football" in short, was already at that early stage an increasing cause for concern.

From the outset, the Harrington Report - it was published in 1968 - accepted the then prevailing conception of football hooliganism. There was, it was argued, a "wave of disorder" occurring at football matches and football hooliganism was both increasing and of serious proportions. Citing the violence of folk football, a historically informed explanation of the contemporary scene was offered. More particularly, Harrington argued that there appeared to be 'a recent regression to older and long-forgotten patterns of behaviour.' Unfortunately, neither a close analysis of the properties of folk football and its social context was undertaken, and nor were the links between this and the development of football as a mass spectator sport investigated. Equally, though acknowledging the existence of spectator disorder in the modern game as far back as 1919, the report erroneously argues, as will be demonstrated later, that it was not until the 1960's that episodes of rowdism on the terraces began to be a subject for comment.

---

4 Taylor, "'Football Mad': A Speculative Sociology of Football Hooliganism.'
5 Clarke, "Football and Working Class Fans: Tradition and Change."
6 Charles Critcher, "Football Since the War" in Clarke, Etal Working Class Culture.
7 Harrington, Soccer Hooliganism: A Preliminary Report p.4
8 This is, in fact, the link which Chapter Three seeks to examine.
9 See Chapter Five.
The extent of the problem having been defined, the Harrington research team focused on the contemporary phenomenon. Although utilising an 'array' of different methods and sources - questionnaires, press reports, information from the police, direct observation of match days and interviews with 'offenders,' followed up by psychological studies of these individuals - the findings and recommendations of the investigation centered on the "control" of the 'problem,' rather than on questioning its status. Indeed, criticism of its overly psychological approach - which Ian Taylor has argued tended to reinforce the acceptance of the 'problem' as a "given" and not as problematic - links in with the observation that the findings and recommendations of the report centered on the "control" of football hooliganism. Taylor concluded:

"The Harrington Report....was a characteristic example of psychiatric positivism, with its primary concern being to differentiate the (arrested) hooligan from the non-hooligan in terms of the possession of certain individual psycho-pathological characteristics." 10

This tendency to focus on the behavioural propensities of particular individuals is not, as will be seen, unique to the Harrington Report. But what were the particular findings of the report and how do these relate to the prevailing common-sense perception of the 'problem' and the formulation of official policies in the late 1960's and the 1970's?

For Harrington, the types of behaviour involved were varied - football hooliganism was an umbrella term incorporating 'rowdyism,' 'horseplay,' 'threatening behaviour,' 'riots' and 'vandalism.' In keeping with the psycho-pathological perspective noted, Harrington argued that there was a tendency for different types of individuals to be involved in particular activities. At one extreme, those involved in "horseplay," for example may well have been very young boys or adult middle class supporters whilst,

10 Taylor, "Class, Violence and Sport: The Case of Soccer Hooliganism" p. 42
at the other extreme, those involved in "football riots" may well have been violent working class youths with a delinquent record. In this connection, Harrington further argues that males are 'biologically more prone to aggression than females' and that the 'violent reactions' which find expression in football hooliganism are 'triggered off by the amount of aggression within the individual.' Considered within this framework, the essential purpose of football spectating was to "release pent-up feelings" and to displace aggression. Such a perspective of crowd psychology also holds sway in other analyses of spectating and will be further considered in the context of the later examination of the premise that football hooliganism contains expressions of an innate aggressiveness that are an "inevitable" feature of human relations.

Running concomitantly with this model of crowd psychology other 'factors' were singled out as being of importance. More particularly, connections were also made between outbursts of football hooliganism and alcohol, player misbehaviour and poor refereeing. Such piecemeal findings tended both to confirm existing measures against football hooliganism and to legitimise further steps such as the imposition of restrictions on the sale of alcohol and a 'clampdown' on particular forms of player behaviour. The 'deeper roots of hooliganism' - as Harrington terms them - were not deemed to be of immediate concern. For while he claims they were of great importance, he concluded that 'they cannot alone explain the phenomenon of football hooliganism.' The report does not delve further into this issue and instead makes recommendations which can be seen to

12 Ibid p. 15.
13 See Chapters Four and Five.
14 Harrington, Soccer Hooliganism: A Preliminary Report p. 54.
flow from the particular perspective on crowd psychology utilised.

Several recommendations were, in fact, made, all of them intended as means for increasing "control" over crowd disorder. More particularly, Harrington argued:

"The most immediate step that might be effective in dealing with the problem would be the apprehension of a greater proportion of offenders; harsher punishments are only secondary to this....

Hooliganism may to some extent be prevented by the separation of rival fan groups in different pens, the proper use of appeals over the public address system during matches, making it much more difficult for invasions of the field to occur, and the prohibition of banners and other potential weapons. If alcoholic drinks are sold, the bar should be as far away as possible from the playing area and glasses, cans and bottles should not be used. Other preventative measures discussed include all ticket matches, fully seated stadiums, and the restricted admission of juveniles." 15

Though Taylor may have been correct when he argued that the report 'had no major significance for state policy at the time,' 16 subsequently there have been repeated calls for the type of measures which the report included in its recommendations. The official perception of football hooliganism, moreover, still remains similar to that conceived by Harrington. That is, it is perceived in terms of "control." 17 It can be argued, therefore, that the report set the scene in which much of the work carried out later was to be conceived.

Some months following the publication of the Harrington Report, an official governmental enquiry, headed by John Lang, was set up to investigate "Crowd Behaviour at Football Marches." 18 Lang's analysis is in keeping with Harrington's in at least two main respects. Firstly, Lang's report shows similar historical sensitivity to that exhibited by

---

15 Ibid p. 56.
16 Taylor, "Class, Violence and Sport: The Case of Soccer Hooliganism" p. 42.
17 See Chapter Five.
the Harrington Report. Secondly, Lang, like Harrington, conceives of the "problem" in terms of "control." In connection with the former point, he writes:

"The problem we were asked to consider is not a new one: it has existed in varying degrees as far back as any of us could remember. Nor is it confined to Britain. It sometimes occurs with other sports or on other occasions leading to the assembly of large crowds...." 19

While the present study is in agreement with the assertion that the phenomenon is of long-standing, that it is not confined to Britain and that similar forms of behaviour have occurred at other sporting venues, no further elaboration was attempted in the Lang report. Simply to rely on the collective memory of the research team is not a sound basis on which to conduct social scientific research. The Lang report, in fact, like Harrington's, eschews the study of the past, and instead centres on issues which are perceived to be of more 'direct' and immediate relevance. Such strategies are indicative of the 'today-centered thinking' which, according to Johan Goudsblom, is so prevalent nowadays.20

Lang's analysis, as noted is similar to Harrington's in one other respect: the emphasis on conceiving of the 'problem' in terms of its 'control.' Thus Lang deemed the object of the enquiry to be the devising of means 'by which crowd disorder at or in conjunction with association football matches could be reduced.'21 In this regard, particular reference was made to several issues, namely, crowd mobility and crowd control in grounds; facilities for police and police control inside and in the vicinity of grounds; seating facilities; the influence of player behaviour and control by the referee; the assistance of supporters' clubs; communication between clubs and the public; and advice to the public.22

---

19 Ibid p. 4.
20 See Introduction.
22 Ibid p. 4.
Conceiving of football hooliganism in terms of its "control," Lang felt able to conclude:

"Probably the three most important of the findings of the Working Party are:

1. Maximum co-operation between a football club and the police.
2. Absolute acceptance of the decision of the referee by everybody.
3. The provision of seats in place of standing accommodation for spectators." 23

In this way, while arguing that no 'simple' solution to the 'problem' was possible, Lang suggested that hooligan behaviour is:

"...liable to arise on any occasion when large crowds assemble, especially if the circumstances are exciting, and which is a form of social malaise not at all unusual in the state of relaxed discipline which is a feature of modern society." 24

This notion of there being some "relaxation of discipline" also links to a further observation which Lang makes. The findings and recommendations made, he claims are:

"...important in the contribution they can frequently make to keeping the inevitable excitement of a football match within reasonable bounds, and so minimising the likelihood of it leading to misconduct among the crowd." 25

As will be documented in considering the emergence of football spectating as a social problem, similar sentiments have recurrently surfaced in the debate over working class leisure and, as part of it, over football spectating, that has been going on in this country since the nineteenth century. The notion of what is deemed "reasonable" and "decent" has been a hotly contested issue and one which has provided several attempts to control popular culture with an overall justification for intervention.

Published, Taylor claims, in a period of renewed anxiety concerning football hooliganism, the Lang report again tended both to confirm the

23 Ibid p. 3.
24 Ibid
25 Ibid
appropriateness of existing policies and to legitimise the conception of the phenomenon in terms of its control, that is in terms of the conception which was and is so prevalent in official circles. The two reports of Harrington and Lang have thus proved typical of the genre. The main focus of their analysis - on "control" of the spectators and the common recommenda­tions - greater policing, more seats and "penning", coupled with the attempts to correlate links with alcohol, player violence and non-acceptance of the referee's authority, have subsequently found expression in other reports.  

The most comprehensive and theoretically informed official report to date, however, and one which sought to incorporate the analyses of social scientists, is the joint Social Science Research Council - Sports Council report, Public Disorder and Sporting Events. It is to this that attention will now be directed. This report tackled two main dimensions of the problem of football hooliganism. Firstly, it examined the contemporary scene and sought to establish who was involved and in what forms of behaviour. It then attempted to outline the context in which it was and is located, focusing on the part played by the police, the courts, the clubs and the media. From this basis, the report then considered some theoretical explanations for this behaviour. An appraisal of both these dimensions - and of their possible influence on official policies - is thus required.

The initial step of the report was to consider the extent of the "problem", or, as it was termed, "who is affected by football hooliganism." Though it rightly observed that the term football hooliganism is a somewhat amorphous one, since it refers to a variety of behaviours involving different people and in different contexts, the report concludes that those


'more directly affected' are the clubs and their supporters. Suggesting that the decline in spectating since the post-war peak may be attributable to such disorder, the report goes on to acknowledge that:

"The most pervasive objection to football hooliganism comes from the wider public and is expressed (though some may say in exaggerated form) through the media. This reaction may, in fact be an expression of an anxiety about rapid social change, particularly affecting young people, that goes far beyond the events taking place on the football terraces." 28

Further explication of this feature is not attempted in the "joint report." It is considered sufficiently important in the present study, however, to form a focus of attention in examining the emergence of football spectating as a social problem. 29

In developing its analysis of those involved in football hooliganism, the "joint report" also highlights the "growing" involvement of the police and the courts. In addition, it points to the existence, though not at a significant level, of 'serious injuries' resulting from spectator misconduct. In this respect, it observes:

"A problem that is widely felt is not resolved by pointing to other problems that are much larger. But it does lead one to ask why this one is so highly publicised......The public has either considerable fear or distaste (or both) for violence and disorder and there is no reason to expect that these profound feelings would necessarily be a reflection of injury statistics or financial costs." 30

The report, however, fails to investigate such "fears" in any systematic empirical manner. Such "fears," it will be argued later, in fact, constitute a not unimportant feature of the figuration within which football spectating has been and continues to be located. 31 In this connection, the "joint report," despite focusing on the contemporary milieu, can be seen to have neglected the "moral panic" over hooliganism among the general public.

29 See Chapter Five.
30 Public Disorder and Sporting Events p. 3.
31 See Chapter Four.
While considering football hooliganism within its "typical" Saturday match-day context - examining the activities of the fans before, during and after the game - the report concludes that the characteristics of known offenders are similar to those established by the Harrington Report. Those centrally involved are seen to be males and drawn from the ranks of the unemployed and from unskilled or semi-skilled working class occupations. The social characteristics of those involved in football hooliganism more generally, however, are, the "joint report" argues, more difficult to discern. The "fan group" as a whole is also seen to offer a number of roles. These include the 'aggro' leader; the 'aggro' follower; the 'hard' men; the 'chant enthusiast'; the 'comedian'; the 'learner'; the 'looney' and the football 'brain.' The different roles, in fact, the report argues, attract different sections of the working class. Such an analysis, based on the work of Marsh, Rosser and Harre, is said to provide insight into the 'career structure' of spectating.

Turning their attention to what they term the "processes of control," the SSRC - Sports Council team sought to examine the societal reaction to football hooliganism with direct reference to the actions of the police and the courts. Specifically in relation to the issue of control, they felt able to conclude:

"Such evidence as exists on the scale of arrests, ejections, injuries to persons and damage to property suggests that police operations are proving quite successful especially when one considers the intractable nature of the problem facing them." 35

The report thus examines the "effectiveness" of the actions of the police, but fails to undertake at any length a critical appraisal of the

32 Public Disorder and Sporting Events p. 3.
34 See section C which considers the premise that hooliganism contains expressions of aggressiveness which are inevitable features of human societies.
appropriateness of such policies. It does, however, serve a valuable purpose from the standpoint of the present thesis in that it documents a further stage in the trend towards "control" which the Harrington and Lang reports initiated and legitimised. The actions by the clubs, restrictions on the sale of alcohol, the admission of fans and the movement of spectators inside the ground, are all present in the report's findings. It concludes, however, that none of the measures so far undertaken have had any lasting effect. In addition, the wisdom of introducing seating to combat football hooliganism - something which Harrington and Lang advocated - was questioned. While such documentation and analysis serve a useful purpose, the report is limited by its ahistorical perspective on the development of policies of control. Indicative of this is the analysis of the introduction of the police to deal with disorder inside the ground. The report puts it this way:

"Although the legal responsibilities of the police to maintain public order still apply within the football ground there is a duty upon the football clubs to pay for the policing at a level which is agreed as adequate by the police. Gone are the days when clubs could rely upon their own stewards to keep order." 36

An unquestioned assumption in this passage is that there was a period in which the police were not required at football matches and that the stewards of each particular club could keep order on their own. Yet, as will be demonstrated, the "processes of control," and here reference is being made to external control and not just to self-control by the clubs, are of a far more complex and long standing order.37

The ahistorical nature of the findings of the "joint report" in fact reflects the general theoretical perspectives which were considered to be of relevance. In keeping with Harrington and Lang, the Sports Council -

36 Ibid p. 28.
37 See Chapter Four and Chapter Five.
SSRC group eschewed the task of gaining an understanding of the "roots" of the behaviour and instead focused on the means by which, in their view it can be "managed."

While greater discussion of the theoretical perspectives utilised in the "joint report" will be attempted within the context of a discussion of the other main research orientations, some appraisal at this stage is still required. Highlighting three main areas - theories of aggression and crowd behaviour, conceptions of culture, and the relationship between sport and the wider social context - the report did attempt to provide a social scientific appraisal of football hooliganism from a range of disciplines and did not rely solely on a psychological perspective.

Although the "joint report" did, as argued, focus on the means by which, in their view, crowd disorder could be managed, it did acknowledge that a more theoretically informed understanding was also required. In considering both short-term solutions and long-term explanations, the report concluded.

"......while the immediate measures should include some that are addressed to causes, others should simply try to block the consequences from happening by reducing opportunity or by containing the behaviour when it occurs." 38

In arguing this, the report attempted to dovetail together competing theories of aggression, crowd psychology and cultural development, without explicating the relationship between them. Such a weakness is compounded by the lack of historical awareness referred to earlier. In short, the report is characterized by eclecticism in the worst sense of the term. In no way can the amalgam that is produced be described as a synthesis.

As far as official policies were concerned, the "joint report" wished to avoid giving direct advice. More particularly, it was stated that 'it was not the intention of this report to set out recommendations

38 Public Disorder and Sporting Events p. 35
for public action.\textsuperscript{39} The report did, however make a number of recommendations for research. Such projects were envisaged as aids to existing policy and were not conceived as forming the basis of some alternative strategy. Such an observation is borne out by the report's own conclusion:

"It is hoped that some of the facts, some of the new ways of analysing the problems of football hooliganism, and the exploration of relevant theories of human and animal behaviour that have been presented here may help \textit{[official]} bodies with their task. However, given the likely shape of public policy for the future, certain recommendations can be made for research to help inform, monitor and implement that policy."\textsuperscript{40}

This relates to the general orientation of the report and its compilers' conception of their task as that of finding evidence to assist in 'managing' the phenomenon. But what were the recommendations made? In its call for further research, the report focused on the need for work on crowd psychology in general and tended to downplay the need for research "solely concerned with football spectating." As Peter Marsh observes, the report and its recommendations in fact: 'closed as well as opened doors to explanations and finished with a diversion away from something which, even now, retains an enigmatic quality.'\textsuperscript{41}

It is this "enigmatic quality" which further research has sought to probe - something which, if the research recommendations of the report had been utilised, would have been neglected. In this regard, the research strategy of Dunning and Murphy, in seeking to examine what they term "Working Class Social Bonding and the Sociogenesis of Football Hooliganism," explores this enigmatic quality. That is to say, it involves probing the social roots of football hooliganism and by so doing, will be shown to provide a relatively more adequate understanding of aspects of

\textsuperscript{39} Ibid p. 48.
\textsuperscript{40} Ibid p. 49.
One of the areas which the report made reference to, but did not fully develop, was the idea of a subculture of violence. The present study argues that the existence of such a subculture is crucial to understanding the phenomenon - See Chapter Seven.
the phenomenon. 42

The present study, in fact, developed out of the proposal of Dunning and Murphy and is similar in two main respects. Firstly, concern with the "social roots" of football hooligan violence is held to be of paramount importance. Secondly, the present study is similarly predicated on a rejection of the research orientation advocated in the "joint report." Above all, it is clear that, similar to the official reports which preceded it, the Sports Council - SSRC report served again to legitimise the prevailing conception of spectator misconduct. As a result, the present analysis has not a little sympathy with the sentiments expressed by Roger Ingham in the concluding remarks of his critique of official reports in general. He wrote:

"A rather critical approach has been taken towards the reports......This is certainly not because of any feelings that no efforts should be made to deal with the phenomena involved, but rather due to the belief that without any attempt to consider the total context it is difficult to come up with any meaningful recommendations. Previous reports have, on the whole, failed in this attempt." 43

The present study is in agreement with Ingham that, while the more immediate facets of football spectating require examination, i.e. the actual forms of disorder, the 'total context' of the phenomenon also requires a detailed and substantive analysis. It is to this end that the present study is directed.

B. Football Hooliganism: A Reflection of the "Crisis" in the Game and in the Wider Social Context

The basic tenet of this research orientation rests on the premise that football hooliganism is explicable in terms of changes so far-reaching that they constitute a "crisis" in the game and in the wider

42 Dunning and Murphy, Working Class Bonding and the Sociogenesis of Football Hooliganism.

Football hooliganism is seen as a reaction to particular changes—especially in changes set in motion in the immediate post-war period. The behaviour is perceived, essentially, as a defensive protest by sections of the working class. As such this research orientation should be viewed in the context of the ongoing cultural struggle referred to above. That such "resistance" takes a violent form, Taylor, one of its exponents argues, relates to the fact that the values of masculinity, excitement and victory are traditionally highly prized in working class communities. While the adherence to such values is not doubted, the present study does take exception to the premise that football hooliganism is explicable solely in terms of some reaction to changes in post-war English society. That is, while the nature and extent of the phenomenon has been affected by more recent changes, it is also necessary to grasp, at one and the same time, the more long-term, slowly changing features of English society.

Whilst no clear demarcation between the perceived changes in the game and the perceived changes in the wider social context is made in the research which constitutes this orientation, for the purpose of analysis, they will be dealt with separately. In this way, while reference will need to be made to the work of particular researchers at different points in the text, a clearer conception of the changes such authors have in mind and their putative relationship with football hooliganism will hopefully emerge.

1. The Crisis in the Game

In this section, attention will be given to the particular arguments

---


45 See Introduction

46 Taylor, ""Football Mad": A Speculative Sociology of Football Hooliganism" p. 359.
proposed by John Clarke, Ian Taylor and Chas Critcher, and to the failings and inadequacies which the work of these authors arguably have in common. For John Clarke, for example, the "crisis" in the game relates both to changes which have occurred and to continuities which have persisted in the post-war period. The interaction between these processes, he argues, has led to the rupturing of the traditional relationship between the spectator and the game. In examining these changes, Clarke's fundamental aim was to highlight how 'football hooliganism emerges out of the changing relationship between football and its audience.' But what are these changes which have allegedly altered the relationship between football and its audience?

Essentially, two main elements of change are identified. Firstly, the "professionalization" of the game. There has been, Clarke argues, an increasing calculatory awareness on the part of Football League players, managers and coaches of the technical requirements for success - tactics, training and physical fitness have become more formalised and less influenced by chance. One consequence of this has been the alleged tendency for teams to stress the need to avoid defeat rather than to achieve victory. Another feature of this "professionalization" of the game has been the trend towards the reform of the facilities of the clubs - new seats, bars, social clubs and "executive boxes." For Clarke, two things are implied in these changes:

"First, the image of the spectator as someone who can only be tempted to watch the game if it offers standards of physical and social comfort which he would expect elsewhere. Second, it implies a particular way of watching the game. Seated, dispassionately critical, the new spectator waits to be entertained. The show is something out there, not something of which he is part." 51

47 Clarke, "Football and Working Class Fans: Tradition and Change."
48 Taylor, "'Football Mad': A Speculative Sociology of Football Hooliganism."
49 Critcher, "Football since the War."
50 Clarke, "Football and Working Class Fans: Tradition and Change" p. 44
51 Ibid p. 47.
Reinforcing the trend outlined, Clarke continues, has been the tendency for the game to undergo a process of "spectacularisation" - that is, there have been attempts to make the game more "entertaining," more "spectacular." Pre-match entertainment, balloon races, American style cheer leaders, and the introduction of 'sudden-death' competitions, like the "Texaco" and "Watney" cups, Clarke argues, highlight this trend. But such changes are less important than the change which has occurred in the relationship between the game and the media. In this connection, he writes:

"The transformation of the football match into a spectacle, designed for passive consumption, has reached its highest point in televised football. For televised football is not a game of football, it is one piece of televised entertainment, and as such is subjected to all the various codes and practices involved in the televised reconstruction of events." 52

This "spectacularisation" again has implications for the spectator of the game. More particularly, the role of the spectator is seen to have changed from an active to a passive one. 53

Such an analysis has many similarities with that of Ian Taylor. It is to the latter's analysis that attention will now be turned. From this basis, the present analysis can then probe why, according to Taylor, Clarke and Critcher, the perceived reaction to these changes has taken a violent form and why, within this research orientation, football hooliganism is seen, at least in part, to be explicable in terms of the changing relationship between the spectator and the game.

Ian Taylor's early work - he was the first sociologist to study the phenomenon - probed what he called the "Bourgeoisification" of the game. In this connection, he argued that the changes in the game in the post-war period reflect the wider process by which previously working class activities are legitimised for the middle classes and affluent

---
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workers. Taylor also refers to the "professionalization" and the "internationalization" of the game. "Professionalization" has a similar meaning to that outlined by Clarke, while the "internationalization" of the game refers to the growth of competitions involving clubs from other countries and competitions between different nations. Such 'structural changes' in the game had been brought about, according to Taylor, as a result of changes in the wider social context. That is, with the commercialisation of entertainment in general and sport in particular, there occurred a 're-definition' - in which both the representatives of football and the press were involved - of the game. In "Soccer Consciousness and Soccer Hooliganism," Taylor argues that the outcome of these changes has been a rupture in the traditional relationship between the club and its supporters. No longer can a supporter feel that the club is his club.

The analysis of Taylor is, in fact, speculative in many respects. In particular, his assertions concerning the historical dimension of football spectating are not based on any systematic and substantive research. With regard to the origins and ownership of Football League clubs, Taylor is at pains to stress the involvement of and control by the working classes. Developed in the industrial centres of nineteenth century Britain, he argues, football clubs emerged from the activities of factory workers - as organisers, players and spectators. He argues that 'the establishment of professional football and the moves which led to it were carried out within the working classes.' This argument

---
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however, is undermined by the work of several historians. Charles P. Korr's study of the development of West Ham United, for example, casts light on the issue of the part played by the working classes in the emergence of modern football. As he notes:

"In the case of West Ham United, the 'working classes' did not 'claim the game as their own' if this means their exclusive domination of the club....

In this (the formation of the football club), as in so many other areas of English life, working class participation was limited to work, either as players or supporters. But at least in this case, work had an emotional element that provided a sense of individual and communal pride lacking in most other occupations." 57

As will be shown, the distinction which Korr makes between those who own and those who play for the club is of importance. His analysis is, in fact, borne out by the more recent work of Tony Mason. 58 Mason's systematic empirical documentation reveals a range of groups involved in the formation of clubs - clergymen, former public school boys, teachers, clerks, and working men in heavy industries such as steel-making and mining. In considering the formative stage in the development of football as a spectator sport, Mason's study in fact reveals that:

"It is clear that professional football clubs were not primarily profit-making institutions and what profits were made were usually ploughed back. They were, by the end of our period, mostly limited liability companies with a largely middle class body of shareholders and a directorate whose occupational composition would almost certainly reflect the economic structure of the town." 59

While such an analysis requires to be supplemented by a sociological perspective, Mason's work, along with Korr's, does cast some doubt on Ian Taylor's claims. Eric Dunning's analysis of the social origins of soccer is largely supportive of the position held by Korr and Mason, and while the present study is in broad agreement, reservations must be made.

58 Mason, Association Football and English Society
59 Ibid p. 49.
Chapter Three will attempt a more detailed discussion of the issues surrounding the role of the working class in the making of popular culture, including the development of Association Football, but, one point, at this stage, must be made. While the present analysis accepts that the position of Ian Taylor in relation to the origins and ownership of football clubs is untenable, Dunning himself acknowledges that 'it was the spread of soccer to the working class that formed the main precondition for its development as a spectator and professional sport.'

In this context, while it is not suggested by Dunning that the working classes owned and controlled the clubs, what he does argue is that they were not without influence in the development of football as a spectator sport. As with other phases in the development of football as a sport, this issue has to be located within the wider figuration involved in the struggle over the character of popular culture. Furthermore, attention has to be paid to the ability of the participants in that culture to contribute to its "making." Writing of this particular period, Mandle's work - to a greater extent than Dunning's - emphasises a sense of greater control by the working classes over their use of leisure time. He argues:

"The working classes had asserted themselves in the world of sport, not taking it over, they did not do that in industrial society at large, but they had helped to strike a balance of strength between Aristocracy, genteel middle-class, manufacturing middle-class and themselves, that was very like the balance of power in England itself at the turn of the century...."

While, therefore, the present study disagrees with Taylor, any analysis which failed to consider the particular part played by the working class in the "People's Game" - and in the overall development of

---
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popular culture - would be unnecessarily flawed. Connected to the assertions referred to as characterizing his approach, Taylor does make an attempt to consider this element by examining the changing nature of the relationship of the supporters to the club they follow. To reinforce his analysis, he argued that football hooliganism was a reaction by the remaining "traditional" supporters to changes in the contemporary period in their relationship to the clubs. More particularly, Taylor claimed that this relationship in the 1920's and 1930's was marked by a sense of "participatory democracy." There are two versions of this notion and Taylor is not crystal clear which of them he was proposing. In the first - and stronger version - it is argued that the supporters exercised factual control over the club, its players and directors through a series of informal, democratic channels. The second, weaker version, claims that the supporters held an "illusory" perception of the extent to which they participated in the crucial decisions taken by their club. As noted at the outset, however, such an analysis is based on speculation and not on any systematic and substantive research. Equally, Taylor's claims concerning the nature of spectating during the inter-war years and post-war period are based on a speculative understanding of the development of football as a spectator sport. In many ways, in fact, his analysis is inadequate. For instance, Taylor is incorrect to imply that "conflict" was absent from the early history of professional football. As the work of Vamplew and Hutchinson reveals, spectator disorder and, therefore, at least specific forms of conflict, was far from being absent. Indeed, the period before the First World War was marked by what Dunning terms
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the "proletarianization" as well as "bourgeoisification" of the game.

The significance of this lies in the fact that, as the professional game was then still in its formative stages, it seems unlikely, as Dunning argues, that the increasing numbers of working class spectators who were attending the game in that period and who were the principal agents in the crowd disorders that occurred can have been protesting against what they perceived as its usurpation by the middle classes.\textsuperscript{67} In fact, the middle classes, at that stage, far from usurping the role of the working classes were disengaging from the game in terms of participation and spectating.

Despite these criticisms, there is one particular area in which Taylor's analysis is of use. The formulation he proposes regarding the development of football hooliganism as a "social problem" offers some scope and is incorporated into Chapter Five. Taylor's own historical account, however, is somewhat wayward. Thus he feels able to claim that hooliganism, as a "troublesome matter," was dealt with by the police alone until 1960.\textsuperscript{68} Such a claim, however, is refuted by the work of a number of historians who have documented the involvement of, for example, the FA and the Football League.\textsuperscript{69}

In addition, Taylor, in both his earlier and more recent work, argues that, prior to 1961, there are very few recorded instances of pitch invasions and that the crowds' attempts to distract goalkeepers were "interventions which would also not have been thought of by spectators prior to the 1960's."\textsuperscript{70} Again, however, as will be seen, such assertions are contradicted by the

\textsuperscript{67} Dunning, Soccer: The Social Origins of the Sport and its Development as a Spectacle and Profession p. 24

\textsuperscript{68} Taylor, "Football Mad": A Speculative Sociology of Football Hooliganism p. 373.

\textsuperscript{69} See Vamplew, "Sports Crowd Disorder in Britain, 1870-1914: Causes and Control."

work of Vamplew,\textsuperscript{71} Hutchinson\textsuperscript{72} and Mason.\textsuperscript{73} Nevertheless, as has been said, Taylor's concept of the development of a social problem has its uses and will be incorporated into and developed in the section of this thesis that deals with the emergence of football spectating as a social problem.

Critcher's analysis is complementary to those of Clarke and Taylor. The central thrust of his "Football since the War," for example, points to how deeply embedded football was in working class culture. More particularly, he asserts that 'the core values of the game as a professional sport, masculinity, physical emphasis and regional identity meshed with other elements of that (male dominated) working class culture.'\textsuperscript{74} Although sections of the working class are held still to cling to such values, Critcher claims that a change in the traditional values underpinning football has occurred. While the working class spectator still continues to express himself as he has always done, the game has moved on. In this way, Critcher continues:

"By the late sixties there was a deep sense of crisis in English professional football. Not only did the players and management seem short of imagination, but the essence and flow of the game were disrupted by deliberate fouls, perpetual dissent, feigned injuries and other forms of gamesmanship. Add to that the controversial behaviour of some players off the field, and it is not a pretty picture. But this was not all. In the same period there emerged problems amongst those who for too long had been taken for granted as the economic and cultural base of the game. The spectator, one way and another, seemed to be in revolt.

The revolt of the spectator took three main forms: a disinclination to continue supporting the local team regardless of its achievements; a predisposition to violence, mainly but not wholly amongst younger supporters; a preference for armchair viewing of weekly televised excerpts and the occasional live big game. These
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forms do not all happen at the same time, but rather follow each other, until by the late sixties they form together the composite crisis of the spectator." 75

In this connection, two points need to be made. Firstly, Critcher argues, mistakenly as the work of Vamplew and Hutchinson demonstrates, that the problem of hooliganism arose for the first time in the 1960's. Secondly, while it can be shown to be historically inadequate, Critcher's analysis, like those of Clarke and Taylor, does contain insights into the role of the spectator and his relationship to the game that are of potential value. The "revolt" of the spectator against the changes that were taking place, however, took a partly violent form and for these authors, the explanation for this lies in an understanding of football and its place in the working class culture. It is to this that attention must now be directed.

In attempting to answer why the response by spectators to post-war changes in their relationship to the club has taken, among others, a violent form, Clarke, Taylor and Critcher adopt a common stance. For Clarke, in order to understand why such popular protest has been permeated with violence, it is necessary to probe the values underpinning football and working class life. The central position which football occupies in working class culture, he argues is 'due to the reflection in the game of certain central values of that culture, notably those of excitement, physical prowess, local identity and victory.' 76 Within the setting of football, therefore, it is hardly surprising that expressions of protest do sometimes take a violent form. Clarke, in commenting that violence

75 Chas Critcher, "Football since the War: A Study in Social Change and Popular Culture" Occasional Paper Centre for Contemporary Cultural Studies University of Birmingham 1976 pp 10-11.
76 John Clarke, "Football Hooliganism and the Skinheads" Occasional Paper. Centre for Contemporary Cultural Studies University of Birmingham 1972 p.1
was an acceptable part of life and that "toughness" was a mark of
esteem for working class men concludes:

"Both in football, and in male working class life, this
idea of toughness sanctioned certain types of violence as normal -
'a man's got to be able to look after himself.' But it is
important to understand that only some types of violence were
legitimate." 77

For Clarke, the distinction between legitimate and non-legitimate
types of violence is important. The legitimate type essentially involved
the use of fists in a "fair fight," while the non-legitimate was seen to
involve the indiscriminate use of weapons. Significantly, Clarke also
asserts that the violence between sets of fans is a "new" extension of
the traditional forms of spectatorship. More particularly, he observes:

"The violence between the sets of fans is part of this
participation in the game - part of the extension of the struggles
of the game on the field to include the terraces too. All of this is
the new extension of the traditional forms of spectatorship - it
still values masculinity and toughness, as can be seen from the
ritual insults levelled at players suspected of being afraid of
physical challenge." 78

While such links between the "traditional" and the "modern" forms of
spectating are not denied - indeed the present study sees such links as
crucial to understanding the phenomenon - the work of Mason, for example,
has documented the existence of fighting between sets of supporters as
early as the 1880's. 79 Such confusion over the development of football
spectating lies in the fact that Clark's analysis, like Taylor's and
Critcher's, is speculative and seeks to explain football hooliganism
solely in relation to more recent changes. If a more substantive historical
study had been undertaken, it would be less likely that Critcher - echoing
the analysis of Clarke - would have been so bold as to claim:

78 Ibid p. 55.
"In so far as it can be traced historically, the problem of 'hooliganism' seems to stem from the early and middle 1960's; at least there is little evidence of it before that period. What is important is what new forms of spectator behaviour especially amongst the young, can reveal about the attitude of football authorities to the spectator, and what the 'hooligans' own self-perceptions can reveal about their relationship to the game . . . .

In symbolically displaced ways they reassert the traditional values which are being discredited in the organisation and ideology of the game. They are not selective consumers but totally committed supporters of their team alone; not individual spectators but part of a collectively responding crowd; not politely passive in their appreciation, but critically interventionist." 80

While the present study does not dispute that the traditional values held by supporters during the inter-war years - and in the late Victorian and Edwardian periods - were usurped by the emergence of the spectator as a "passive" consumer, it is quite a different matter to claim that there is little evidence of "hooliganism" before the 1960's. 81

The analysis presented by Critcher is in many ways similar to that offered by Taylor - for the latter, as noted, interprets football hooliganism in terms of a popular protest against changes which have occurred in post-war society. Taylor concludes that football hooliganism is one of the 'expressions of a populist rebellion within working class youth against middle-class domination, on the one hand, and proletarian subordination, on the other.' 82

But in his analysis of "Spectator violence around football: the rise and fall of the 'working class weekend,'" Taylor also argued that one must:

"......Place the violence of youthful football supporters in Britain in the mid-1970's in the context of youthful weekend activity, and to interpret that violence......as a reassertion of

80 Critcher, "Football Since the War" pp 171-172.
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the traditional working class weekend, as it was developed in the latter half of the nineteenth century." 83

Although the violence of football hooliganism is thus acknowledged, it is not altogether clear whether Taylor is suggesting that such violence is a popular protest against changes which were seen as a threat to the traditional working class weekend, or whether such violence is also a reassertion of the violence of the traditional working class weekend. Some clarification is, however provided by Taylor when he speculateively argues that a 'striking feature of the early history of professional football and its rapid implosion into the working class weekend is the absence of conflict or contradiction. 84 As noted earlier, however, the period in question was far from being free of conflict. 85 Despite the reservations stated, at this point it is appropriate to provide a summary of the position held by Clarke, Taylor and Critcher in relation to the changes which they perceive as having occurred in the game and the traditional supporter and how these contributed to the "revolt" of the 1960's.

The "revolt" which Critcher refers to originated, according to this perspective, from the post-war changes centrally connected with the 'professionalization' and 'internationalization' of the game and the concomitant influence of these changes on the role of the spectator. In reconsidering the impact of these trends, Clarke concluded:

"We have been dealing so far with the changes in the game, and trying to give especial emphasis to the relation between these changes and the role of the spectator. To summarise, these post-war changes imply a very different role for, and activity on the part of, the spectator than was involved in the pre-war traditions of football support..." 86

From the perspective adopted by Clarke it is clear that the

83 Ibid p. 4.
84 Ibid p. 5.
85 See Hutchinson, "Some Aspects of Football Crowds Before 1914."
professionalization and the internationalization of the game are envisaged as having been perceived by working class spectators as a detrimental trend; hence, for Clarke, football hooliganism is explicable in terms of a defensive response by working class youth. In this way, for Clarke, hooliganism arises out of the way in which the traditional forms of football watching have been adapted to the 'professionalization' and 'spectacularisation' of the game. Hooliganism is perceived as one of the consequences of the changing relationship of the audience to the game. The reaction to the process of 'bourgeoisification' which Taylor has referred to can also be interpreted in this way. As he remarked in relation to professionalisation:

"...the process involved a transformation of the stereotype of the football supporter......From the participatory and masculine values of the working-class supporter and from an exclusive concern with victory, football turned its attention to the provision of spectacle, skill and efficient performance - values understood to be important to the stereotypical i.e. middle-class supporter." 87

But, Taylor argues, there remains a group of traditional supporters, a "rump," which still adheres to values which are no longer appropriate and which run counter to those of the new stereotypical supporter. This "rump", Taylor claims, resists the imposition of this view of the role of the spectator and thus hooliganism can be seen as a democratic response to the bourgeoisification of the game. Taylor puts it this way:

"There is a rump, consisting of those left to carry locally the traditions of the subculture, which refuses to be seduced by worldly alternatives to the old type of ground and by the middle-class values which are being offered in place of the traditional working-class ones.....

Fighting - violence in its most general sense - and "hooliganism" are seen here, then, as the final assertion of traditional values - as the democratic response by the rump of a soccer subculture to the bourgeoisification of their game." 88

87 Taylor, "Soccer Consciousness and Soccer Hooliganism" p. 363.
Such an analysis is supported, as noted, by Chas Critcher. After probing the "new" forms of spectator behaviour to see what they reveal about the attitudes of the football authorities to the spectator, he concluded:

"In symbolically displaced ways they reassert the traditional values which are being discredited in the organisation and ideology of the game. They are not selective consumers but totally committed supporters of their team alone; not individual spectators, but part of a collectively responding crowd; not politely passive in their appreciation, but actively interventionist......they look to football not as an excuse for a punch-up, but for a regeneration of football's role in working-class culture." 89

But, as noted at the outset to this section, changes not only in the game but also in the wider social context are said by these authors to have contributed to football hooliganism. Clarke, for example, argues:

"What is different in these continued forms of the traditions of football watching is not the values and meanings given to the game, but a crucial change in the social relationships of the audience, in the relationships between young and old in the football crowd itself. This change emerges out of the changing social position of working class youth." 90

It is to these changes in the social position of working class youth that attention will now be turned.

2. The "Crisis" in the Wider Social Context

In tracing the putative changes in the wider society which are said to have contributed to the emergence of football hooliganism, Clarke stresses the process of "fragmentation" which, he argues, has occurred in the working class. In particular, this coupled with relatively greater social, economic and cultural freedom of young working-class people nowadays, has resulted in the "dislocation" of the latter and it is this, he maintains, that principally accounts for football hooliganism. In reviewing post-war changes, Clarke asserts:

89 Critcher, "Football Since the War" p. 171.
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"The combined effects of the post-war changes in education, housing, the occupational structure and the distribution of incomes have been to alter the relationship of working class youth to their parent culture. More precisely, these changes have had the combined effect of fracturing some of the ties of family and neighbourhood which bound the young and the old together in a particular relationship in pre-war working-class life." 91

This process of fracturing is said by Clarke to have lessened the degree to which older members of the working class can control their younger generation. Such an analysis is supported in many ways by the analysis proposed by Pearson. He, too, sees post-war developments as having resulted in a lessening of the degree of control exercised by the older members of working class communities over their youth. At the same time, he argues a gradual "incorporation" of the elders into a mainstream culture has occurred and thus leads them to view the traditional activities of working class youth as increasingly a cause for concern. 92 But, while acknowledging the "mutation of community structures and the erosion of street cultures," Pearson, like Clarke, does not address the conditions which generate the forms of "hooliganism" which he rightly observes have a long history in English society. 93

The perspective of Clarke and Pearson is shared by David Robins. In his analysis, it is suggested that the violence at football stems from the post-war "fragmentation" of working-class lifestyles. One of his central arguments is that, although masculine prowess was valued by the working class community in the past, it was regulated by the family and community. Indeed, Robins observes in relation to speedway:

"It is a sport......blessedly free of aggro. The speedway stadium is one place at least where working class youth and parent cultures find common ground and display a visibly peaceful co-existence." 94
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Yet Robins also notes that speedway meets in the 1950's - which often attracted some 50,000 to 60,000 spectators - had a reputation for disorderliness similar to parts of soccer crowds today. What he fails to elaborate on is that football and speedway are both suitable media for the expression of the masculinity norms characteristic of the lower working class. It seems possible, from what Robins writes, that speedway was considered a more appropriate venue than football for the "Teddy Boy" "gang warfare" of that period to which he draws attention.95

While Taylor's initial work, as has been highlighted, considered football hooliganism mainly in relation to changes in the game, his later work has increasingly focused on changes in the wider social context. Thus in "Class, Violence and Sport - the case of Soccer Hooliganism in Britain," he modifies his theoretical position, arguing that the liberal ideology permeating his previous writings blocked an adequate analysis of class relations.96 His basic historical schema, however, remains intact. For Taylor, the problem is to theorise the significance of soccer violence in Britain and violence in sports in general "within the primary relations of class and the state."97 In concluding his analysis, Taylor introduces the notion that changes in post-war British society - centering on the decomposition of the institutions and communities of the working class, the restructuring of urban space and the destruction of traditional labour markets - have shaken the traditional working class community and that one manifestation of such changes is "football hooliganism."

From this basis, Taylor calls for a fundamental re-appraisal of the nature of society and the construction of a society based on an alternative to the division of man from man characteristic of the capitalist mode of
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production. In such a society, the involvement of the working class with a passive, spectator sport - dominated by capital and "massaged" by the sports news in the mass media of capitalist society - would be severed.

In keeping with such a critical perspective, David Triesman directs attention to the need for a restructuring of the organisation of the game. In this, he argues for a more democratically based football in which supporters are "members" of their clubs. In citing the example of the Portuguese club, Benfica, a possible model in this connection, he comments:

"It currently has over 60,000 club members. They contribute through subscription and buying various services provided by their club, some 50% of its income each year. They, in the final analysis control Benfica. It is not a football club with which one associates either chaos or lack of success. It could happen here."

Yet before such proposals are too readily accepted as a "solution" to football hooliganism - however egalitarian and democratic they purport to be - a more circumspect analysis of these authors' findings is required.

Two central weaknesses can be demonstrated as permeating the writings found in this research orientation. Firstly, as noted, writers such as Taylor, Clarke and Critcher have been content to speculate on the phenomenon and to use data drawn, often haphazardly, from present-day newspapers rather than conduct systematic and substantive research. Secondly, such authors have sought to explain football hooliganism in terms of a variable, i.e. post-war changes either in the game or in the wider social context. As was stated by reference to the work of Vamplew and Hutchinson, however, football hooliganism appears to be a social phenomenon of long standing.
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i.e. one which, in certain aspects, has more the properties of a "constant."

Taylor, Clarke and Critcher are correct to point to the traditional links
between football spectating and working class culture. They also provide
some insights into the forms of spectator misconduct characteristic of the
1960's and 1970's. But they fail to grasp the need to trace what the
similarities and differences are between the football hooliganism of today
and the forms of spectator disorderliness of earlier periods.

C. Football Hooliganism: A 'Construction' of the Media

There is a weak and a strong version of the research orientation which
stresses the involvement of the media in the phenomenon of football hooli­
iganism. The weak version emphasises the active role of the media in creating
images of the phenomenon. The strong version actually argues that football
hooliganism itself is a "media construction" of the 1960's and 1970's. The

task of the present analysis is to consider particular research within
this framework and to draw out any possible insights it may offer regarding
the current phase in the emergence of football spectating as a social
problem.

Consideration will initially be given to how the development of media
coverage of the game relates to the changes already discussed and to how
football hooliganism has been interpreted as a popular protest against such
changes. From this basis, an analysis of Stuart Hall's study of the treat­
ment of football hooliganism in the press\textsuperscript{101} will be undertaken, in con­
junction with a probing of the idea that media "labelling" has created
the 'social problem' of football hooliganism. Both general and more
specific features of the latter idea will be considered and contrasted to
the more recent approach offered by Ian Taylor.\textsuperscript{102}

\textsuperscript{101} Hall, "The Treatment of Football Hooliganism in the Press"

\textsuperscript{102} Taylor, "Class, Violence and Sport - The Case of Soccer Hooliganism in
Britain."
Chas Critcher, in tracing how changes in the values underpinning football have led to the usurpation of the "traditional supporter" by a "passive spectator," explicates this analysis in relation to several features of the development of football as a spectator sport. With reference to the relationship between these changes and the media, in particular, he argues:

"What is at stake here is the effect of television and the press on the footballing sub-culture: on the large-scale perception of a popular cultural activity. It has not been anything but debilitative. They have brought to the game their own definitions of newsworthiness (the sensational, the dramatic), their own ways of personalizing events ('great men under strain!'), and their own self-interpretation as experts ("it is my job to tell you what all this means"). Far from understanding or defending the traditional role of the 'supporter,' they have sought to educate him out of it into the world of technical sophistication and managed melodrama which they fondly believe to be an accurate and desirable presentation of the game." 103

For Critcher, therefore, the media "construct" images of the game and do not merely reflect reality. 104 In consequence of the particular images presented, the traditional supporter, he argues, has been further distanced from any sense of participation in the game. 105

As was briefly noted earlier, such an idea has also found expression in the writings of John Clarke. He observes in this connection that the "spectacularisation" of football has centrally involved the relationship between the game and the media. He writes:

".....The major developments in the spectacularisation of football have not taken place at the level of the game itself, but in the relationship between the game and the media, especially in televised football." 106

This "spectacularisation" of the game - especially in relation to
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media coverage - has led to the decline of the partisan supporter and
to the rise of a new spectator. Developing this idea, Clarke comments:

"For the new spectator, football is a provided entertainment,
something which goes on out there; rather than something which
/he/ is involved and /which is/ created by the relation between what
goes on on the pitch and /in/ the crowd. The new spectator is dis-
tanced from the game, able to make critical judgements about it,
and able to pick and choose, between this and other alternative
entertainments. For the watcher of TV football, this implied role
of the spectator is taken even further. No need to go to the ground,
all will be provided....." 107

Considered in this light, hooliganism is held to arise out of the
way in which traditional forms of football-watching encounter this
"spectacularisation" of the game, together with the "professionalization"
to which reference has already been made. That is, the processes of
spectacularisation and professionalisation are said to have led to a shift
between the game and the supporters. Avid partisanship by committed
supporters who identified with their team was no longer desired or required -
instead passive consumption was the order of the day. Little wonder then,
according to Taylor, that the "rump" of traditional supporters reacted
angrily to such developments. Indeed, if the "rump" which Taylor refers to
were indeed "revolting" against such changes, then the growth in and manner
of televised soccer, with its inherent stress on armchair consumption,
brought to the home courtesy of 'experts' who would manage the presentation
of the game, would have contributed to such a process.

While Critcher made reference to the role of the media in constructing
particular images of the game, it is Stuart Hall who has made the most
extensive analysis to date of the nature of press reporting of football
hooliganism. With reference to this, he remarked:

"The media provide the principal source of information about
this problem for the vast majority of the public. It is therefore-
worth asking what the nature of that information is - how it is
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constructed, what it highlights, what it leaves out." 108

A feature of some work carried out within this research orientation lies, as noted, in the notion that football hooliganism is a "construction" of the media. In this context it is important to note that Stuart Hall, while acknowledging that there is a problem concerning the nature of press coverage, does not claim that the press has simply made it all up. In focusing on the tendency of the press to use dismissive labelling and stigmas as descriptions of the phenomenon, he observes:

"The press has some responsibility both for exaggerating and sensationalising the character of the problem and for isolating the violent and sensational aspects from their proper social context. I believe that this press behaviour is (a) a problem in its own right - the effect which the press has in constructing a social problem - which deserves analysis and criticism; and (b) that it has had the effect of increasing the scale of the social problem it sets out to remedy and contain - largely by suppressing what the true nature of the problem really is. I therefore want to try to persuade you that, over and above the so-called 'problem of football hooliganism,' there is also the problem of the nature of the press coverage given to football hooliganism and its retroactive effect on football hooliganism." 109

In this way, Hall feels able to argue that, while the "problem" of football hooliganism is not a conspiracy of the press, there has been a "moral panic" concerning the phenomenon and that the selection of what was considered newsworthy and the manner in which it was reported reflected, in part, the authoritarian concerns of the "law and order" lobby.110 As with the official reports, spectator disorder has been conceived in terms of its "control" - the press, according to Hall, has eschewed the task of probing the true nature of the problem.

While Hall is correct to highlight the complex nature and pattern of press reporting, his analysis is limited in some respects. Hall's analysis is fruitful when he refers football hooliganism as belonging to a "cycle
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of occurrences" involving working class youth dating from the 1950's and that it is seen as a symbol of moral decline. But Hall's analysis does not go far enough: while a developmental perspective would not necessarily undermine his arguments, it would provide further insight into the assertion that football hooliganism belongs to the 'cycle of occurrences' involving working class youth, a cycle which has attracted a massive degree of media attention.  

Despite this reservation, Hall does provide one particular insight which has implications for the position which argues that football hooliganism contains expressions of innate aggressiveness that are an inevitable feature of human relations. He claims that the process by which the press applies labels which stigmatize and degrade the actions of others, serves to conceal the conflict of interests and outlooks in British society. More particularly, he recognises in this regard the existence of socially generated class differences in the standards regarding the expression and control of violence. Thus, he writes:

"We imply that the standards of conduct which guide middle class society are universal for all classes; whereas we know that a certain measure of social violence has been for long a marked characteristic of traditional working class communities - a phenomenon which has a perfectly rational source in the conditions of life and work in which working class men, women and young people are obliged to live, and which is indeed implicit in their very position as a class with a more or less permanent subordinate position in society."  

It is these differences in standards concerning forms of conduct and ways of living - their sociogenesis and the concomitant clash concerning their expression - that the substantive section of the present study seeks to consider.

While Hall has reservations about laying all the blame for the phen-
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omenon of football hooliganism at the door of the media, David Triesman seemingly has less doubts. Triesman argues that the idea that football hooliganism is the cause of football's crisis is a construction of the media. In dismissing this "violence-crisis myth" and eschewing the search for "simple causal explanations," he concludes:

"Not only are such associations of events largely the creation of the media, but they underline graphically that what is understood about football hooliganism is itself largely dependent on how and whether it is reported. What is evidently neither understood nor reported is that the characteristics of bored or unemployed boys do not suddenly alter as they come off the train and walk to a football ground. They bring into football those problems and experiences they have outside it, the difference being that they are collected into a large group and presented with a powder keg of territorial loyalties and a contest laden with passion...." 113

While not denying the propensities of the press to amplify the phenomenon which Triesman highlights, he does not directly address those "problems and experiences" of working class youth and their correspondence to the "powder keg" of territorial loyalties and a contest laden with passion. Equally, while Hall did not deny that the press had constructed a particular image of football spectating, in keeping with Triesman he also noted the existence of values and experiences which gave rise to it. But the criticism offered of the former applies equally to the latter - no explication of the long-term and persistent character of a phenomenon which predates the moral panic of the 1960's is attempted.

While Triesman is not 'laying all the blame for the phenomenon at the door of the media,' he is attributing to the media the idea that football hooliganism is the central cause of the 'crisis' in the game, especially of falling gates, Chris Lightbown takes an even more extreme position. In highlighting the involvement of the press he noted in 1974:

"Whatever the press may say, football hooliganism is all but over.....

If only everyone had not been on their particular hobby-horse

on this issue, it could have been settled for once and for all in the last two years. I personally think things will not get bad again, but this is no thanks to anyone in football, the media or any position of power." 114

The idea that there is "nothing to bow a  about" dovetails, to an extent, with the argument offered by Triesman in relation to the "violence-crisis myth." Lightbown is suggesting that the "panic" about the phenomenon has been created by the press. Unlike Triesman, however, Lightbown does not appear to be concerned with the consequences of such alleged "social myths." In this respect, the joint SSRC - Sports Council report, *Public Disorder and Sporting Events*, has a pertinent contribution to make.

Commenting on this issue, the report observes:

> "Whilst the media have probably not created these problems they do keep them alive in the national consciousness; and whether the problems are real or not the action taken to suppress them has real consequences." 115

In a fashion not dissimilar to Hall, the report argues that, since the 1950's, youth "problems" have become the focus of public attention - football hooliganism being the latest and most persistent. Again in keeping with Hall, the report regretted the style of press coverage, particularly with regard to its tendency to sensationalise incidents. In concluding, however, it fudged its position, arguing that such observations are, at present, speculation. While calling for empirical evidence, it does not provide any itself. 116

In keeping with this research orientation's idea that, in different ways and to different degrees, the phenomenon of football hooliganism has been "constructed" by the press, Whannel seeks to explain the phenomenon with reference to "deviance labelling." In this context, he remarked:

> "Football hooliganism has generally been presented in the press as a new phenomenon....But there have been plenty of
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incidents that predate the present moral panic from the 1880's to the 1950's. Incidents in football crowds are not simply a product of the sixties; the norms of crowd behaviour have always been based on commitment and involvement." 117

Whannel thus lays especial emphasis on the role of the press in the formulation and construction of the particular image attached to the behaviour of football supporters. In this way, he contends:

"My concern is... with the concept of social reaction, specifically with the way that process is structured in and through the media; with the ability of deviance labelling and image construction in the press to generate a formalised model, which comes increasingly to structure the ways 'reality' can be understood; and, in the case of football hooliganism, how that model fits into a more general discourse about the game and its problems." 118

Whannel, while stressing the importance of the role of the media, is aware, to an extent, of the longevity of crowd violence at football. By focusing on the contemporary scene, however, he seeks to relegate the importance of such a legacy. He thus felt able to assert:

"Links between violence and football, it has been suggested are as old as the game itself. Indeed, the pre-nineteenth century history of football, in as much as it has been written at all, is largely a tale of violence and attempts at suppression. This violent history is sometimes evoked in the course of discussion of present day crowd behaviour, although its relevance is questionable. Firstly, available sources on pre-industrial football are pre-dominantly official records, court reports and an occasional reference by the learned or literate.....Secondly, the link between pre-industrial football and the rise of the game amongst the urban working class in the nineteenth century is indirect and tenuous." 119

Each of these qualifications rightfully requires analysis. In subsequent chapters, attention is given to the problems of interpretation, and the relationship between pre-industrial football, modern football and popular culture is closely probed. On that basis, Whannel's claims that such links are tenuous can be more closely examined. One point can, however,
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be made at this stage. Whannel's analysis, focusing on more recent events, exemplifies a mode of "today-centered thinking." As a result, while he shows some sensitivity to the historical dimension, he is unable to incorporate an understanding of the developmental character of the phenomenon into the labelling perspective which he utilises.

This is not the only failing which the work of Whannel contains. Although, along in particular with Taylor and Clarke, he notes the affinity of the values of the game with those held in working class communities with, e.g. their stress on masculinity and physical prowess - he fails to probe the basis of these values in working class culture. He remains content simply to explain the phenomenon of football hooliganism in terms of the re-definition in the type of audience deemed appropriate to the changes which have been occurring in the game itself, and as such, gives tacit support to the positions of Clarke and Taylor. This may help, in part, to explain the latter stages of the emergence of football crowd behaviour as a "social problem," i.e. the stages dating from the 1960's, but a more adequate account would seek to examine the figuration in which this and the previous outbursts of crowd disorder he refers to occurred. It is precisely these connections which the present study seeks to probe. Unwittingly, perhaps, Clarke, in fact confirms how this process continues to occur. For he himself argues, as noted, that the spectator violence of the 1960's is a new extension of the traditional forms of spectatorship. That is, although Clarke seeks to explain football hooliganism in part in relation to the discontinuity which those who adhered to traditional forms of spectating felt towards this post-war development, he does not deny that the central values underpinning the spectator
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violence of the 1960's are directly connected to the values which underpinned forms of spectating in the period between the wars. The emergence of football spectating as a social problem is, as will be demonstrated in Chapter Five, explicable in these terms.

The analysis offered by John Graham in this regard, is in keeping in two main respects with that of Whannel. Firstly, the theoretical framework he utilises is drawn from a labelling perspective and secondly, similarly to Whannel, he shows a limited measure of historical sensitivity. With regard to this latter dimension, he focuses on the folk football of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, and draws a comparison with the modern emergence of football hooliganism. For the present, however, consideration must be given to how Graham perceives the relationship between football hooliganism and the mass media. For him, the focus of attention needs to be on: 'an analysis of the role of the mass media as producers and carriers of the conditions that later crystallized into 'football hooliganism'.

From this basis, he argues that football spectating developed as a social problem partly as a result of the manufacture of news around incidents at football matches and that, through changes in the press and the wider social context, football hooliganism "crystallized" through the mediation of newspapers and television.

In this manner - drawing on a deviancy amplification perspective - he outlines the process by which the problem of football hooliganism is constructed by the media. Graham puts it this way:

123 No further explication of this dimension will, however, be attempted at this stage - more detailed discussion of the interpretations of the historical development of football as a spectator sport will be attempted later.

"...Behaviour which is predominantly harmless in itself is seen as constituting a threat by others, who wish to control it (in this case the nuisance - running onto the pitch - provides the initial impetus to oppose the behaviour). The implications of the behaviour are then projected into the realms of fantasy which in turn bolsters its 'potential threat value.' This strengthens appeals for control. The roots of the threat are identified and measures for increasing control suggested. These control measures are in turn equated with the projected threat rather than the actual behaviour, based on the: 'it must be nipped in the bud' principle. The discrepancy between actual behaviour and the control measures prescribed is resolved by redefining the actual behaviour to fit the suggested controls. Ultimately, a mythical situation is arrived at whereby recommendations are made to 'close stadia' in order to 'control mob hysteria.' This process is a familiar theme in the short history of football hooliganism and recurs in further discussions of the role of the mass media in defining and developing football hooliganism as a social problem."125

But despite the prominence given to the role of the media, Graham, in similar vein to Taylor and Clarke, stresses changes that have occurred in post-war British society in order to explain the phenomenon. In examining the social, economic and cultural climate of post-war Britain, Graham argues that the ruling classes desire to maintain power led to what he terms the "control culture" and the birth of a "law and order society."126 For Graham, therefore, with this trend towards "control" - echoing the analysis presented with regard to the stance held by "officialdom" in relation to football hooliganism - and the emphasis on law and order, the behaviour of football crowds came to be seen as a threat during this period. For him:

"Once the threat was identified, projected and reacted to by the control culture, the groundwork was laid for the amplification or deviancy spiral that ensued. A circular and reinforcing process of moral reinforcement and control legitimation is discernible. A fan is arrested and found guilty; the magistrate gives a sentence grounded in calls for 'tougher measures' and 'clamping down'; the press quote the magistrate and his summing up, reinforcing his sentiments; editorials refer to increasing public anxiety and concern which backs up the magistrate's sentiments; the magistrate on subsequent sentencing, grounds his use of deterrence in 'public concern' as reflected in the press. Meanwhile pressure is exerted on the police to 'control' the growing problem; they employ more resources; more arrests are made; the problem is 'seen' to be getting worse etc. This is a concerted move towards closure in the control culture.

125 Ibid pp. 188-189.
126 Ibid p. 333.
At the same time images and stereotypes of the 'football hooligan' developed, expectations to act in specific ways on specific occasions actually reinforced the likelihood that such expectations would become reality, and the football fan increasingly came to resemble the public stereotype. Similarly 'status hungry' individuals could see a possible venue for the satisfaction of their needs, and their violations of the rules provide just exactly those incidents that confirm public negative stereotypes of football fan behaviour. The institutionalisation of football hooliganism is complete." 127

Graham, however, shares a common weakness with most others who have researched this problem. By focusing almost exclusively on the period after World War Two, a period marked by an especially intense manifestation of spectator misconduct, he fails to address the more long-term and persistent aspects.

Despite this and the other reservations expressed, some insights have emerged from this research orientation. Three points in particular stand out. First, both Critcher and Graham are correct to argue that the changes in media coverage in the post-war period altered the status of the phenomenon - to an extent. More correctly, the emergence of football spectating as a social problem was reflected in and articulated by the attention of the media. Second, Hall is correct to point to the active nature of press reporting and how images of football hooliganism have thus been created for those with no first-hand experience of match-days. Third, Graham's analysis of the development of the 'control culture,' as he terms it, reinforces the point made earlier here regarding how official reports have considered crowd disorder in terms of its 'control.' In fact, such reports have to be seen as forming part of this "control culture". Other perspectives, however, seek to probe the "actual" behaviour involved in football hooliganism and it is to the analysis of the premise that behaviour of this sort contains expressions of an innate aggressiveness that the present chapter must now turn.

Ibid pp 335-336.
D. Football Hooliganism: An Expression of Aggressiveness that is an Inevitable Feature of Human Relations

It would be foolish to suggest that football, despite its present global appeal, will inevitably retain this ascendancy. Equally, it cannot be claimed with any great certainty that "hooliganism" will always be a pervasive feature of football spectating. A group of researchers working within the orientation at present under discussion, however, argue that football hooliganism contains expressions of an innate aggressiveness that they consequently interpret as being an inevitable feature of human relations. Closer inspection of an assertion as bold as this is called for and it is the intention of the present section to consider how such a perspective analyses football hooliganism.

The chief exponent of this research orientation is Peter Marsh. His analyses of football hooliganism are located within a conception of social relations which lays stress on the inherited legacy of aggression in people's behaviour, albeit articulated in particular social contexts. In conjunction with Harre and Rosser, he sees aggression:

"...as a property of human beings in virtue of which they are prone to direct action upon others in a typically thrusting and imperious way....We do not wish to deny that the tendency to act aggressively may have a biological basis, that is be related to some heritable feature and explicable from the point of view of evolutionary advantage. But the social forms that the manifestations of the tendency take are very various and both historically conditioned and culturally determined. In particular we shall show that there is good reason to distinguish ritual aggressive action made up of elements of symbolic or metonymic violence from physical violence directed in an aggressive way towards another human being. We shall use the generic term 'aggro' for ritual manifestations of aggression in symbolic or metonymic violence." 129

It is important to note that while Marsh et al qualify their position, they do not deny that successive generations of people in the past and in the future, may be prone to aggressive acts as a result of
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some genetically determined endowment. In qualifying their position, reference was made to the need to distinguish between ritual aggression and physical violence. As such aggressive behaviour is seen to be a deep-rooted and persistent feature of human history and Marsh argues that man has found it necessary to find ways to manage this and channel it into less destructive settings. In this way, Marsh et al stress the role of ritual aggression. Referring to football hooliganism as one example of ritual aggression, they conclude:

"Not only do rituals such as the one with which we have been concerned have the clear effect of limiting death and destruction, there seems to be something of a 'universal' character to them.... Quite simply, we suggest that aggro is one contemporary social means available to man for coping with aggression. In other words, the function of aggro is precisely that of its analogues described by animal ethologists. Whilst animals may rely on instinctive patterns of motor co-ordination to direct their ritual displays of threat and submission, man develops social systems which rely on culture for their transmission. But the end-product is the same - order.....

Implicit in what we have been saying is the notion that aggression is inevitable. But this is not necessarily to commit ourselves to the idea that aggression, in any simple sense, is innate - only to the assumption that at one stage in our evolution it might have been so. We accept that, in all probability, there is something in the biochemical and neurological make-up of people which provides for an aggressive process but the actual arousal of aggression would seem to be very much a cultural affair." 131

In order to offer an explanation of football hooliganism, Marsh et al seek to examine the function that "aggro" plays in society. The events on the terraces, they argue, constitute a contemporary example of ritual which serves the function of reining in the possibility of violence in relatively enclosed areas of social life. For Marsh, therefore,
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football hooliganism is best conceived as one example of the
"ritualised" expression of aggression. Accordingly, for him, little
serious physical violence or injury occurs in the course of football
hooligan encounters. Indeed such ritual behaviour, he argues, is
governed by complex rules and only when these are interfered with, do
outbursts of serious violence occur. For Marsh, therefore:

"Working inside the soccer culture it is possible to reveal
a distinct social order - a pattern of social action which is
directed by a set of tacitly held rules of conduct. One out­
come of the existence of this rule framework is a powerful
internal constraint on violence and destructive behaviour.....It is
this inside system of informal social control, however, that has
been steadily eroded over the past few years as external inter­
vention has become increasingly prominent....As a result, the
more deviant fringe - the 'Nutters' - have come to the fore and
are gaining increased status on the terraces." 132

The rituals of the terraces, the fights, the demasculizing chants
and songs, hold in check what Marsh sees as an inevitable feature of
human relations - the aggressiveness of man. But the football ritual
is a fragile one and if it is disturbed, he argues, behaviour far more
serious and destructive can result. Such a situation if it occurs, is a
result of incidents of "external intervention" into football hooliganism
because such intervention leads to a breakdown in the rituals which
govern spectator behaviour. As Marsh himself puts it: 'such incidents
arise from breakdowns of ritual and of the tacit rule - framework which
governs behaviour on the terraces.'133 In fact, 'such breakdowns may
result from the intervention of external agencies.' 134

Criticism can be made, however, of the interpretation of the
historical dimension which Marsh relies upon to support his position.
In common with other researchers - and although he has attempted to
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locate "aggro" in an historical context - he lacks an adequate historical sensitivity towards the development of football hooliganism. He is seemingly unaware, for example, of the development of football as a spectator sport, of the forms of and reactions to spectator behaviour over time, and of the involvement within this process of the struggle over popular culture. If, indeed, his analysis was so informed, then his assertions concerning the inevitability of 'aggro' and of the character of terrace life may have been more circumspect. That there is no universal agreement concerning conceptions of acceptable violence makes problematic the position of Marsh, and the involvement of sections of the "rough" working class, over time, corresponding possibly to the "Nutters" identified by him, requires a more sociological explanation than he is capable of. But let me turn for a moment to the historical analysis he has attempted.

In his examination of 'folk football' Marsh claimed:

"'Folk' players at 'footebal' knew what they were doing and although they fought each other....they fought according to rules. In those days, however, society accepted 'fair-fighting,' or 'fisticuffs,' as a legitimate activity. Today, the same conduct results in censure, outrage and external investigation." 135

Three further criticisms emerge in this connection. Marsh is unaware of the process to which Elias has drawn attention, namely the "civilising process" which has occurred in western societies. Marsh views history - at least recent history - as moving in a de-civilising direction as a result of progressive attempts to control and interfere with aggression in its ritual form. Seeing innate aggression as an inevitable feature of human relations, Marsh argues that if left alone, such aggression takes a ritual form; if interfered with, a destructive form ensues. As a result, he cannot conceive of the process involving the gradual internalisation of standards concerning the expression and control of violence. Secondly, and this relates to the process cited, he does not question why, in earlier
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stages of the development of British society, "fair-fighting" was accepted as a legitimate activity, whilst it is not by sections of contemporary society. Thirdly, he appears to assume that the censure and outrage in contemporary society are 'universal', yet - and this is integral to the notion referred to - no comparison of the norms on which "aggro" is based, is made with the norms of violence-control dominant in society at large. Marsh is thus not able to recognise the existence of the differentiated standards concerning the expression and control of violence that exist in a society such as ours.

As with other aspects of his analysis, the historical perspective adopted by Marsh is a superficial attempt to reinforce his assertion that football hooliganism is explicable in terms of "ritual aggression". Lincoln Allison, in adopting a perspective similar to Marsh, also attempts to relate the violence of folk football to that of football hooliganism. In this context, he writes:

"....modern football represents the adaptation to modern urban conditions of recreational institutions which express emotional needs that are present in all human societies. The institution is thus appropriate to all modern urban societies regardless of their prevailing ideology or class structure. Particularly, the evolution of modern football in Victorian England was such a process of adaptation. In its relations to other social forces it was an integral part of a general stabilization of social conditions and an improvement in the quality of social life which had as their concomitant the substantial incorporation of the working class into the mainstream of English life." 136

While the connections he makes between folk football and soccer are not disputed, the criticisms made of Marsh earlier apply equally to Allison's own conclusion. For example, he felt able to assert:

"It follows from my analysis that the "hooligan" element in English soccer is not something endemic only in our "sick" society, but represents an element in any society. It must be dealt with not, as is fashionably argued, by attacking mythical "causes" such as unemployment, but by increasingly sophisticated techniques of social control." 137
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This is precisely the link which ties Allison’s analysis, the work of Marsh and the official reports together. All stress the need to "control" the phenomenon. While Marsh rules out direct intervention, he does argue for the need to contain violent conduct in controlled settings. As a result, all eschew the task of searching for a deeper understanding. For the moment, this position will remain unchallenged, for as will be seen, it has found expression in the writings of other researchers. For example, in a manner not dissimilar to Peter Marsh, the work of Desmond Morris supports the idea that football hooliganism is explicable in terms of an ethological perspective which lays stress on the similarity between the ritual displays of what Morris terms the 'soccer tribe' and those of most other animal species. For Morris, the problem of football hooliganism is one of isolating the more "extreme" element involved but not upsetting the overall ritual of spectating. For him, therefore:

"It seems extraordinary that if investigators studying soccer violence can identify these key trouble-makers with ease and can even obtain interviews from them, the police cannot employ undercover strategies to track them down and ultimately bring them to justice. All this requires is a master-plan organized by the police in co-operation with the soccer authorities, and in a comparatively brief period it should be possible to rid the sport of its savage minority, without alienating the mass of ordinary, if boisterous, young fans who have no intention of cracking skulls or drawing blood, and who are quite prepared to restrict themselves to symbolic forms of aggression - ritual displays of threat and counter-threat, insult and gesture. These rituals may intimidate the tender-hearted (as they are intended to do) but they cause no physical injury. In this they are similar to the hostile displays of most other animal species.

Many would like to see even these verbal and visual displays eliminated totally from the world of the Soccer Tribe, and the match-day events become more of a happy family outing, with gentle applause and the singing of cheerful club songs, like some school outing or boy-scout jamboree. They want to domesticate the wild soccer events and convert them into a quiet, civilised pastime. But such ideas disturb even those supporters who are the most vociferous opponents of soccer fan aggro. They suddenly realise how much excitement the pent-up tension of the typically belligerent soccer crowd gives to the sport. Take away that tension and the powerful symbolic significance of the tribal rituals would be lost, their deeper meaning crushed.
The trick for the future, clearly, is to retain this tension, this intensity of involvement of the tribesmen, but at the same time to dispense with its most extreme and destructive forms of expression. The trouble is that any fire which warms you can also occasionally burn your fingers, and the Soccer Tribe has yet to invent the perfect fireguard. Hopefully, it will do so before the rest of society loses its patience and douses it with water." 138

Morris' analysis has been cited at some length in order to do justice to his position. Several criticisms, however, can now be levelled. Firstly, Morris assumes, without any substantive support that what he terms, the "soccer tribe" is led by key troublemakers and that if such a group are safely neutralised, then the ritual can go on. Secondly, Morris argues, similarly to Marsh, that such rituals "cause no physical injury." But ritual and violent conduct are not mutually exclusive. It is possible both to conceive of rituals which are violent in form and violent conduct which is ritualised. Indeed, as Murphy and Williams have demonstrated, Marsh appears to have deliberately neglected to analyse the serious injuries which are documented in his own research findings. 139

Thirdly, while the symbolic significance of the behaviour of football spectators is not denied, it is quite a conceptual jump to equate such symbolism with tribal rituals. Finally, for Morris, soccer is in fact, a modern counterpart of the hunting pattern of early man. To cope with this 'hunting pattern,' Morris argues that a master-plan, organised by the police and soccer authorities, and designed to round up the "key trouble-makers" would result in the "mass of ordinary fans" restricting "themselves to symbolic forms of aggression." Once more, therefore stemming from the premise that the innate aggressiveness which finds expression in football hooliganism is an inevitable feature of human relations, the phenomenon is envisaged in terms of its management and "control."

Such sentiments, as noted, have also found expression in the
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official reports on football hooliganism. In the Lang Report, reference was made to 'keeping the inevitable excitement of a football match within reasonable bounds, and so minimising the likelihood of it leading to mis-behaviour among the crowd.' \(^{140}\) In a manner similar to this, the Harrington Report also considered the 'causes' of hooliganism and concluded:

"Our researches so far suggest that those with a delinquent or criminal record, particularly those with a record for assault and violence, are more prone to disturbances at soccer matches. Biologically human males are more disposed to aggression than females....." \(^{141}\)

For Harrington, even middle-class supporters get caught up in the experience. He comments:

"While misbehaviour from such people would probably be unthinkable in other public places, on the terraces and stands it is generally harmless and does not often seem to upset other spectators." \(^{142}\)

Spectating, for Harrington - and this is similar to the perspective adopted by Marsh and Morris - thus serves as a safety-value through which "ritual aggro" can occur. Regarding such issues, he concluded:

"The psychological importance of football to the young should not be underestimated.....A football match is seen by people of all ages as an opportunity to let off steam and discharge pent-up feelings, particularly those of aggression." \(^{143}\)

As noted earlier, the "ritual" aspects of spectating form an integral part of the career structure of supporters. It is to a consideration of this, with reference to the work of Marsh and that of Harrison, Murray\(^{145}\) and Jacobson,\(^{146}\) that attention will now be directed.

In examining 'life on the terraces,' Marsh claims that it is a social
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world governed by shared meanings and forms of collective action. Reinforcing his overall conception that little serious physical violence occurs, he argues that clashes between fans are confrontations of honour governed by ritual. In this context he claims:

"I'm not suggesting for one moment that people never get injured at football matches. Nor do I wish to imply that all is hunky-dory because there is order and control on the terraces. I raise the issue of fights and violence at this stage because it is in the episodes of conflict and antagonism that the presence of order is most strikingly revealed. But how is this order learned by those whose actions are constrained by it?" 147

While such an assertion will be subject to criticism later, this question leads Marsh to argue that it is necessary to examine the "career structure" of the terraces. In this regard, he believes:

"The football terraces provide an alternative career structure - an orderly framework for making progress in the society of the terrace. Unlike careers in the outside world there's no financial reward to be gained. The pay-off is in social terms." 148

The central reward for the supporter is "status" among his peers - for football fans are engaged in the business of character enhancement and status achievement. As with any society, there are newcomers or "novices". Nine, ten and eleven year olds are drawn to the terraces by the prospect of a group which offers excitement and, Marsh claims echoing Morris, a "tribal sense of belonging." The model for "novices" to follow is provided by the "Rowdies". This group forms the core membership of the terraces. For Marsh:

"Rowdies form the core membership of the terrace culture. Their average age is 15 or 16 and although there are no initiation rites or entry ceremonies - in fact any supporter can join in a superficial sense - the 'men' are separated from the 'boys' in situations which demand specific action. Only by matching up to the standards expected, and by demonstrating commitment to the commonly held values and ideals, can the Rowdy hope to be recognised by his peers." 149
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Even within the rowdy group, there are particular roles to aspire to—in particular, Marsh highlights the "aggro leader" or "hardcase." This latter group are the fans who lead running charges and figure prominently in the scuffles and fracas which breakout in and around football grounds. Crucially, he argues, the hard-case wins his reputation, not by inflicting serious injury on rival supporters, but by being fearless. According to Marsh:

"....He does it not by causing serious injury to other people, but by consistently demonstrating a determination to stand up for himself and his group. But his fearlessness is limited. For the total absence of fear is an aspect of character more typical of the Nutter than the hard-case." 150

In order to achieve and maintain their status the rowdies have constantly to prove themselves and to perform. They must be seen, as Marsh argues, to 'be wearing the appropriate tokens of allegiance, like scarves and banners.' But by graduating to the 'Town Boys,' former rowdies escape these requirements. 'Town Boys' wear no special clothes nor, in most cases, scarves or favours. But they hold very senior positions in the career structure of the terraces: this seniority stems from their ability to do the real 'sorting out' in times of trouble. At the extreme of this group, in terms of their propensity to involve themselves in serious fighting, are the 'nutters.' The existence of nutters is important in the context of Marsh's overall argument. The nutter, while apparently contravening the tacitly accepted rules of the terraces, in fact, confirms their acceptance, according to Marsh. In this connection, Marsh provides the following further explication:

"Nutters 'go crazy' or 'go mad' - they go beyond the fans' limits of acceptable and sane behaviour. In doing so, however, everybody else on the terraces comes to understand more clearly where those limits lie. In fact, the existence of Nutters is proof of the existence of order in the first place. If random action was the norm, Nutters would be indistinguishable from anybody else. But the
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fact that they are viewed, from the inside, as deviant, provides us with a very useful way of assessing the nature and extent of the informal terrace rules.” 151

This "career structure" therefore performs two main functions. Firstly, it is the framework in which ritual aggression is managed; and, secondly, it provides young people with a sense of individual achievement. While the present analysis does not deny that spectating has ritual aspects, nor that it is a meaningful experience for those involved, Marsh's conclusion is open to serious doubt. He writes:

"The moral career structure, from apprenticeship through to graduation, and eventually retirement is the social mechanism through which order is transmitted. It allows for rules to be learned and shared meanings realised. It allows for achievement and for sharing of collective pride. And it's this that marks aggro off as a very special kind of violence. Life is orderly and fights are orderly." 152

While Marsh seeks to demonstrate the rule-governed nature of behaviour on the terraces and emphasises that even the hard-cases are not involved in serious violence, he is, in fact, attempting to reinforce the idea that football hooliganism centrally involves "ritual violence." Two points need to be made in this regard. First, the serious nature of some of the violence conduct recorded in Marsh's work, but downplayed, even ignored by him, will be documented in Chapters Four and Five. Second, it is one thing to demonstrate the ritual aspects of spectating but quite a different matter to then rely upon an ethological framework to support the premise that such aggressiveness is innate and therefore an inevitable feature of human relations. Other research, however, has also sought to make this connection, and it is to such work that attention must now be turned.

Paul Harrison's account of spectator behaviour at a match involving Cardiff City and Manchester United in 1974, concluded with the description
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of it as "an astonishing spectacle." While noting the fact that the press portrayed this particular meeting as a potential 'bloodbath,' Harrison was critical of the conventional explanations of the phenomenon. More particularly, he remarked:

"It was an astonishing spectacle, and for an unfamiliar observer it was as ritual, as incomprehensibly alien, as stone age war in New Guinea. After conversations snatched with dozens of fans while dodging the missiles, I find none of the conventional explanations adequate, except as factors in a much more complex equation. The state of the game - though it may have been at the origin of football hooliganism in the late sixties - doesn't seem to play a part any more. Of course, violence on the pitch condones violence among fans, and the gradual departure of the working class family man for the T.V. in his own lounge, has left the terraces with no sobering influences.

There is an element of truth in the boredom/deprivation explanation. Most of the committed rowdies met at the match on Saturday came from just a few areas. In Cardiff, from Canton and Grangetown, rows of terraced houses with few open spaces, and from Llanrumney, a massive council estate with an appalling record of violence....

All this might help explain who joins in the rowdy gangs, but it doesn't explain the weird activities the gangs get up to." 153

While such comments concerning the communities from which those centrally involved in football hooligan violence are drawn are of interest - of more immediate relevance is Harrison's explanation of spectator disorder. 154 Harrison argues that 'all these things combined reinforced the impression of a new tribalism, which as well as these externals has its own mythology, rules, stereotypes and values.' 155

While his theoretical framework is not made explicit, his references to the "frustrated aggression" and "tribalism" of the spectators leads one to infer a similarity between his position and that articulated by Marsh and Morris. Focusing on the spectator's mass chanting and ritual
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gestures - something which Simon Jacobson incorrectly believes dates from the mid-1960's, Harrison concludes:

"Only a few fans were really vicious in this way: but the fans reach the pitch full of frustrated aggression, which has been built up by successive minor clashes with police....."

The working class people of Ninian Park Road had the misfortune of being in the way as targets for the redirected aggression. It was frightening to see how the incidents had brought out the potential for violence in them too."

The reference to "frustrated aggression" and the "potential for violence" are also indicative of the position held by Jacobson. In this connection, Jacobson focuses on the language and songs of football fans and argues that if there 'were no football, where would this young, largely working class rebelliousness be directed?' No examination, however, of the social roots of such aggression is attempted in his work. In similar fashion, Chris Murray eschews explanations which place the blame for the disorder on the media or suggest that such behaviour is explicable as a resistance movement to changes in the game. In contrast, for Murray, there is 'a genuine problem of disorderly behaviour - over and above the normal problem of preserving order in emotionally charged groups of individuals.'

Focussing on what he terms the 'soccer hooligans honour system,' Murray argues that there is a need for the crowd to develop a form of self-government. For Murray, being a fan in fact allows young people to establish a personal identity but, at the same time, at the paradoxical cost of subjecting the self to peer-group norms which prescribe the enactment and re-enactment of behaviour designed to preserve the group's honour. With respect to the group's honour, he argues that 'systems of shared memories
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cycles of retribution are associated. As a result of young fans identifying so strongly with their club, their personal honour is perceived to be at stake. Thus when a defeat at the hands of a rival team occurs, confrontations between opposing groups of supporters are the outcome. For Murray, the spectators' identification with and protection of the hooligan's honour system lies at the core of the disorder. While arguing that internal regulation of the honour system is required, he also combines this with a plea - again similar to the official reports - for effective policing.

Several reservations concerning this research orientation must be noted. Criticism has already been made of the theoretical framework which underpins the work of Marsh and Morris. Even if such criticisms were not tenable, the particular research strategy adopted by Marsh is open to doubt. Marsh appears to have imposed a theory onto the evidence and does not modify the former in the light of the latter. Patrick Murphy and John Williams write in this connection:

".....the notion of football hooliganism as essentially an expression of ritualised aggression did not so much emerge in the course of the research, but was an initial commitment on the part of Marsh et al; a commitment which led them to select and present their material in such a way as to point inevitably to this conclusion." 162

This tendency was also reinforced by Marsh's view that the press have tended to exaggerate the extent of the violence involved. By minimizing the violent and destructive content of the disorder, this perspective stresses the orderly nature of terrace life. While the present study does not deny the complex, rule governed nature of football hooliganism, the main focus of Marsh's study is on the details of the patterns of behaviour.
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involved and there is a failure to locate fans within the wider social structure. Harrison gets closer to this with his reference to the communities from which those centrally involved are drawn. Marsh's work, however, focusing on behaviour inside the ground and thus ignoring the disorder before and after the match and the place of such behaviour within the lives of those involved, is more typical of this genre.

By adhering to the perspective on aggression outlined, Marsh et al., along with the official reports on football hooliganism, make no attempt to explore the possibility that such behaviour might be structurally generated and, possibly, valued within specific social milieux.  

Acceptance of such a critique is not to deny the value of the detailed knowledge of the career structure of terrace life unveiled by Marsh and his colleagues and by the other researchers identified as belonging to this research orientation. Nor is it claimed that ritual aspects of football hooliganism do not exist. Nevertheless, given the criticisms that can be made, it would appear that a greater measure of caution is required in relation to this research orientation in general and that Critcher's assertion that Marsh's research is a "seminal work" is somewhat premature.  

Indeed, the relatively uncritical reception of this orientation by 'radical sociologists' can be viewed as part of a 'romantic' wish to deny or at least to avoid the more violent aspects of lower working class culture. Such criticisms as have been made here are, in fact, borne out by the conclusion which Marsh, Rosser and Harre reach:

---
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"...without doubt, we will be unable to suppress entirely the aggression and the striving to subdue rivals that has been characteristic of young males in all human societies at all times in history. Given this, we must look to ways of managing hostility and violence rather than naively hoping that they will go away. If we accept that there are, from one significant standpoint at least, rules of disorder, we might be able to develop management strategies which have far more purpose and effect than those which have currently emerged from the atmosphere of moral outrage and collective hysteria." 165

While there are undoubtedly 'rules of disorder,' the notion of the "inevitability" of such inherited aggression which this research orientation adheres to - coupled with its view of the historical development of hooliganism - is more open to doubt. It is to an appraisal of this historical development, that attention must now be turned.

E. Football Hooliganism: Interpretations of its Historical Context

The analysis contained in this section seeks to accomplish two main tasks. Firstly, to examine existing accounts of the development of football as a spectator sport. Secondly, to posit an alternative explanation for the phenomenon of football hooliganism. In order to accomplish the first of these tasks, three main issues are identified. Consideration will successively be given to the part played by the working classes in the development of football, to their characteristic patterns of spectating, and to the perception by outsiders of such patterns over time. In this way, the present study argues that such an approach provides both a relatively adequate appraisal of the available literature and, at the same time, forms part of the basis for the alternative conception of the phenomenon which is then presented.

1. The Development of the Modern Game: The "Part" Played by the Working Classes

The origins of the two modern forms of football that have spread most widely around the world, that is, soccer and rugby, lie in the folk...
games of the middle ages. Between about 1750 and 1850, the majority of these folk games died out or were abolished, but in the context of the public schools they were modified and subsequently a codification of rules took place. With this latter development, a growing divergence between soccer and rugby occurred, a divide accentuated in 1863 by the establishment of the Football Association, mainly by southern based clubs. By 1872, the FA Cup was inaugurated to encourage competition between teams chiefly of public school origin. During the next decade a significant increase in the number of teams occurred. In addition, as the game developed, increasing numbers of spectators were attracted to the rudimentary stadia. With the commercial side of the game rapidly expanding, the onset of the professionalisation of football teams was not far behind. By 1888, the Football League, initially with twelve member clubs, all from northern or midland towns and cities, was established.

Studies which attempt to account for the development of the modern game are legion. Journalists, footballers, historians and latterly, sociologists, have made contributions. They vary greatly, however, both in terms of the scope of their enquiries and the relative adequacy of the analyses provided, and only a few have thus far addressed the development of football as a spectator sport. Of those who have, most suffer from the conceptual inadequacies outlined in the introduction. Journalists from 'respectable' newspapers, such as David Lacey, as argued, portray the crowds of the 1920's and 1930's as 'docile and orderly.' Edward Grayson, writing for the Sports Council, claims, categorically, that there was no disorder at football matches in the inter-war years. Sociologists such as Ian Taylor and Chas Critcher, as noted, have been
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content to speculate about such aspects. Whannel, as documented, while acknowledging the violent aspects of folk football, cannot, given the labelling perspective he adopts, conceptualise the historical roots of the contemporary phenomenon. Marsh, in contrast, utilises the historical dimension to support his argument concerning "ritual aggression," but, his view of history - at least of the history of "aggro" is one which has no place for development and change.

Other researchers, however, have examined aspects of the development of Association Football with varying degrees of success. Those who have provided a relatively more adequate account include Morris Marples and Geoffrey Green. The latter, in his History of the Football Association, documents the control and organisation of football's governing body as 'belonging to middle-class groups.' Utilising the records of the FA, he shows that, for the FA, the growth of "uncontrolled partisanship" was the "pressing problem" of the 1890's.168 Various steps were taken, he acknowledges, but still concludes, 'perhaps the issue had all been largely exaggerated.' Exaggerated or not, the 'pressing problem' identified, clearly requires further analysis. While Green does not probe the continuation of "uncontrolled partisanship" in the inter-war years, as the Harrington Report noted, episodes of spectator misconduct did occur at least in 1919. The work of Morris Marples considered the same "pressing problem" in similar fashion. Regarding such issues he observed that 'these aspects of the game are not often mentioned in histories of football, but they existed, and still exist, though in a modified form.'169 While this is in no way as systematic as the work of later researchers such insights do offer some sense of the legacy which is being considered.

---

But, while Marples stresses a certain sense of continuity in spectator disorder from the foundation of the Football League to the 1950's, he, too, offers no further explanation. The work of other historians has, however, produced evidence concerning the characteristic patterns of spectating of the crowd as a whole. Percy Young's analysis, for example, while containing no direct reference to spectator misconduct, does consider the transformation, in the 1890's, of the social composition of the crowd. He contends:

".....what had previously been a matter of football, within an astonishingly brief period - of six or seven years - had achieved a widespread popularity. In a sense this was by way of being a return to first principles: the pastime of the masses was in process of being restored to the masses....." 170

Such observations, however, need to be supplemented by a consideration of the work of a later generation of historians who focused, particularly, on the issues referred to. Not all the work of these early historical forays into the world of football and popular culture were equally successful. James Walvin, with an over-reliance on secondary sources, merely offers a rehash of previous writings. 171 He envisages that the expansion in football crowds in the second half of the nineteenth century was related to the Factory Act of 1847 and the subsequent institutionalization of the Saturday half-day. While this feature of the phenomenon is not denied, a far more complex web of actions and unintended consequences must also be considered. 172

The more recent incursions into this area have produced more adequate explanations. Returning to the issue of the "part" played by the working class in the development of football, several historians have contributed to our understanding. As has been noted, the issue is not as clear cut
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as Ian Taylor, for one, would have us believe. Kerr, for example, has argued, with reference to the development of West Ham United, that the working classes by no means "dominated the club" in its early stages. The part played by the working classes, for Kerr, as in other areas of English life, was limited to work, either as players or supporters.173

In his more extensive research, Mason also considers the part played by the working classes, and argues that a diverse range of social groups were involved in the development of football clubs.174 In this connection, Day, too, has produced a pertinent analysis:

"......Professionalism under working class control is so tender a flower that it can never flourish and that the popularity of professional football as a spectator sport attracts most sorts, and conditions of men with almost as many different motives....."175

While Mason rightly stresses the control of clubs in relation to the prevailing economic structure, and that the motives of directors were, as Day suggests, varied, the formation of the earliest football clubs requires further sociological consideration. Association Football, as a game-form, developed in the top public-schools and in the higher reaches of the upper middle-class. For Dunning, this phase can be seen as part of the "incipient modernisation of football." 176 Yet attention must also be paid to the late Victorian period, for as Dunning observes, the prominence of clerks in the formation of clubs:

"......suggests the possibility that upwardly mobile young men, perhaps striving to consolidate their mobility by aping the leisure practices of 'gentlemen' members of the 'public school elite,' may have played an important part in the early diffusion of Association Football down the social scale. However, there are also examples of clubs that appear to have been formed directly by
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working men, independently of help from the upper and middle classes." 177

Significantly, he refers to the game, by and large, diffusing down the social scale. But though football was provided for, not made by the working classes, to present a too one-sided analysis would not hold with the more general appraisal of change in popular culture already outlined.178 While the development of the sport along professional lines required large numbers of working class spectators, for Mason, the issue of which path would be taken - amateur or professional - was determined by a clash which occurred within the higher classes. In order to understand the social sources of the professionalisation of the game it is, in fact, necessary to examine the changing pattern of class relations in the nineteenth century and the tensions it gave rise to. It follows, as Dunning and Sheard argue, that it is also necessary to 'look closely at the location within the developing class structure of the groups involved in professionalisation and at their relations with one another and with wider social groupings.'179 More particularly, their argument runs as follows. With the onset of industrialisation, urbanisation and the related process of embourgeoisement, the foundations on which the dominance of the landed classes rested began to be eroded. As their power crumbled, a process which was accelerated under the mounting bourgeois threat, sections of the aristocracy and gentry began commensurately to experience status insecurity.180 The activities of bourgeois businessmen attracted increasing criticism. But what is the connection of this
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with the outcry against professionalism and indeed how is one to explain the social origins of the professionalisation of the game?

With respect to the latter it is clear that, according to Mason, those centrally involved in the professionalisation of the game were middle class. It is important to note, however, that clerks and other men from the working class were involved in this process, too. While the evidence is not clear cut, what is available sensitises the researcher to the need to abandon the crude, dichotomic distinction between the middle and the working classes. As Dunning notes further research must consider: (i) the entire class structure; (ii) intra as well as inter-class differences; (iii) local differences of class structure; (iv) the complex interplay of factors such as property ownership, inheritance and acquisition, education and occupational status in the determination of relative class positions and (v) the degree to which local strata were integrated into national groupings.181

The hostile reception which the aristocracy gave to the professionalisation of the game is, in fact, bound up with the dimensions to which Dunning refers. In analysing the split over amateurism and professionalism Mason, in fact, begins to show similar sensitivity to the need to have a more all-embracing and differentiated analysis of class relations. He contends:

"Clearly there is no simple gentlemen v the rest dichotomy here. There were undoubtedly ex-public-school men on both sides of this controversy.....But the division among the gentlemen was really in essence a tactical one. Did you fight the monster and refuse to recognise its existence or did you accept that it had grown too large to fight but might be tamed by a controlled environment?" 182
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Here too, however, the growing power of the working-class spectator - in this instance with regard to professionalism - is evident. While the working classes were not, as Ian Taylor mistakenly argues, in control, those who were, were increasingly having to accommodate to the wishes of the working class. Thus, while it is correct to observe firstly, that the upper and middle-classes retained control over the organisation and administration of football, secondly, that, as Dunning notes, the modern game diffused down the social scale, and thirdly, that by and large, the working classes became the spectators and players of the game, a more fundamental issue is involved. While Dunning documents the diffusion of the game down the social scale, its acceptance by the 'masses' rested upon their adherence to values common to both football and popular culture. Without this, its development as a spectator sport would always be in doubt. Such an observation relates to the issue of how the ongoing clash over popular culture found expression in this context and how, albeit within particular situations not necessarily of their own choosing, the working classes did participate in the making of popular culture. Historical processes are not one-sided affairs, determined by the actions of particular interest groups. Rather, historical processes have to be understood as being structured yet allowing for the intentions and actions of groups within a complex interdependent pattern. What can be witnessed in the birth pangs of the modern game is precisely that - what Hall has termed the "dialectic of cultural change." The involvement of the working classes in the early development of the game as a spectator sport was neither decisive nor derisory - it mirrored the relative power balance which then existed. Such an observation, not found in the work of Vamplew, Hutchinson, Mason or indeed Taylor, is crucial to understanding the "part" played by the working classes in the development of football.
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as a spectator sport in general.

ii. Characteristic Patterns of Spectating and the Perception by Outsiders of such Patterns

Existing evidence concerning the overall patterns of spectating between the foundation of the Football League and the present day largely focuses on the Victorian period. For Dunning, the 1890's witnessed, what he termed, the "proletarianization" of football. Mason, with regard to the general issue of spectating has also remarked:

"There is no doubt that in the 1880's at least, a significant proportion of a good many football crowds were made up of the better off or middle classes....

As the crowds grew larger from the mid-1880's on, the evidence suggests that they became increasingly working class in composition with the 'stand' a bourgeois island in a sea of working class faces." 185

An analysis of this dimension must, however, consider several facets - the class, age and sex composition of crowds and possible regional variations in these regards. Referring to such issues, Mason concludes:

"In the 1870's the proportion of middle-class people in the crowd was greater than it was to be later. This was especially true of matches in London and the south....But as the popularity of the game increased, notably in the north and Midlands in the 1880's, and match records grew so the proportion of middle class spectators fell as the proportion of working class watchers increased. There may not have been any absolute decline in the number of bourgeois spectators. But most watchers were now working people.....Although it is impossible to document, it was probably only in the inter-war years that association football in England was watched by representatives of all sections of working men more or less in proportion." 186

While Mason's analysis of football up until 1915 is based on empirical investigation, it is important to note that his assertions concerning the inter-war years are based on speculation. In relation to
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to the early period, however, he did document a number of cases of disorderliness based on anecdotal evidence. With regard to this disorder, Mason felt unable to provide an analysis of the social composition of those involved but did argue that the disorders could be placed in three categories - those arising from particular decisions and acts of referees or players, those arising from overcrowding and those arising from crowd dissatisfaction with some decision reached by the club. He writes in this connection that:

".....there was never sufficient in the way of crowd disturbances at football matches involving police intervention, arrests and charges to discover a meaningful occupational sample....

Bad crowd behaviour was, of course, much more interesting to the newspapermen than good crowd behaviour.....Disorders at football matches before 1915 can probably be placed into three main categories. The first, and almost certainly the largest number was a result of anger at the decisions of the referee or at the attitude of the opposing team or of individual players within it.....The second most important cause of crowd disorder at football matches was the overcrowding of spectators on the ground. The third major cause was crowd dissatisfaction at some decision of the club, or other authority about how to play the match or indeed whether to play it at all." 187

Mason's analysis can be criticised in several respects: the position of the police - vis-a-vis violence, football matches and the involvement of the working classes, for example, is not probed. The analysis also fails to identify the process by which "incidents" were reported and pays insufficient attention to the status of the evidence utilised. The lack of arrests and charges, for example, may, in part be indicative, not necessarily of a lack of crowd disorderliness, but of a relative tolerance by or lack of power of, the police and magistrates to intervene. A related issue is the inability of Mason to differentiate between 'reported' disorder and behaviour not considered sufficiently problematic by reporters

187 Ibid pp 154-159-160.
which, though it may have occurred, may not have been encountered by them and which thus would not have appeared in the texts of contemporary newspapers. Finally, while the categories of disorder which Mason identifies are somewhat simplistic, a more serious weakness - and this is typical of prevailing social-historical approaches - is the failure to provide an explicit theoretical explanation for such phenomena. The "social roots" of crowd disorderliness are neglected.

Similar criticisms can be levelled at the work of other social historians. Wray Vamplew, for example, while documenting, in marked contrast to Mason, the existence of spectator disorder on a substantial scale in the 1880's and 1890's, fails adequately to examine its context, in particular, the onset of the development of football as a spectator sport. What he does purport to have documented is the existence of forms of disorder, the control of such forms and the gradual decline of such disorder prior to the First World War. In attempting to accomplish this, he sought to examine the motivation of the spectators and noted that it is likely that deep rooted structural strains and social tensions underlay many of the disturbances and provided a set of conditions conducive to disorder. These "deep-structural strains" are not, however, probed and greater attention is given to utilising the Mann and Pearce categories of sports and crowd riots. These categories involve a five-fold interpretation of the motivation of unruly spectators. The particular categories refer, firstly, to a form of "frustration" disorder where spectators' expectations concerning the game are thwarted by some

---

188 See Eric Dunning, Joe Maguire, Pat Murphy and John Williams, "The Social Roots of Football Hooligan Violence", Leisure Studies 1, 2, 1982.
incident or decision. "Confrontation" disorder breaks out when rival spectators come into contact. "Expressive" disorder involves the intense emotional arousal which accompanies victory or defeat and results in "uninhibited" behaviour. "Outlawy" disorder occurs when groups of violence-prone spectators use sports events to express such values and finally, "Remonstrance" refers to forms of political protest. Vamplew argues that the first four of these categories are evident in the period in question.

As will be noted, the sole use of such categories is inadequate on three grounds. Firstly, the use of such categories places too great a reliance on the "objectivity" of anecdotal source material. Secondly, by using such categories, Vamplew cannot grasp what the phenomenon meant to those involved, something that is essential if an analysis wants to explain the motivation of the spectators. Thirdly, such categories are grafted on to Vamplew's analysis in an ad hoc manner, and, as a result, the relationships between football spectating and the wider social structure remain unexplicated.

Despite these reservations, attention can still be given to his empirical findings. Regarding these categories he argues:

"Of these five types of disturbances all but the remonstrance type can be found at soccer grounds in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, though the majority of incidents appear to have been of the frustration or confrontation varieties." 192

Yet Vamplew provides no quantitative documentation for such an assertion. He merely cites 'anecdotal' evidence in relation to each of the categories under consideration. In addition, no attempt is made to determine the adequacy of the documents studied. Nor is a distinction made between spectator disorder encountered and perceived as a "cause

191 Thompson, "The Moral Economy of the English Crowd in the Eighteenth Century."
for concern" and other forms of spectator behaviour. Further, while citing the claims of Hutchinson and Walvin that the majority of the crowd were lower white collar workers, from the upper levels of the working class and from its industrial sections, he fails to differentiate between this majority of the crowd and those involved in disorder. Equally, while he rightly noted that grounds were situated in working class areas, no reference is made to the attendance of sections of the middle class in the grandstands to which Mason has drawn attention.

In considering the issue of soccer crowd disorder and the 'sustained campaign of action' adopted by the FA and the Football League, Vamplew felt able to conclude:

"It might have been anticipated that soccer crowd disorder would worsen. Possibly, in the absence of such a sustained campaign of action and reform from the football authorities and the clubs since the 1890's, this would indeed have been the case: as it was the behaviour of the soccer crowd improved just as strikes became more numerous and violent, suffragettes took to direct action and the gun-runners of Ulster prepared to stand and fight. Evidently not all the indicators of public order on the eve of the First World War point in the same direction."

In order to support such a contention, Vamplew utilises evidence concerning the number of clubs cautioned by the FA between 1895 and 1912. But he does not make such evidence problematic. That is, he fails to take account of the possibility that it may be symptomatic, not of a "decline" in spectator disorder per se, but simply in those particular forms which the officials of the FA were sensitive to. Equally, it may be indicative of a differing sensitivity by the referees whose responsibility it was to report incidents which were deemed to have "interfered with play," or, a relative lack of power on the part of the FA to control and regulate the conduct of the spectators on the terraces. However, none of those inter-related dimensions is explored by Vamplew. He remains con-

193 Ibid pp 16-17.
tent with a bland assertion that spectator disorder declined.

Hutchinson, in common with Vamplew, confines his analysis to the period prior to the First World War. As a result of his analysis, he feels able to conclude that spectator disorder was a fairly well-established aspect of football matches in that period. He writes:

"Riots, unruly behaviour, violence, assault and vandalism appear to have been a well-established, but not necessarily dominant pattern of crowd behaviour at football matches, at least from the 1870's." 194

For Hutchinson, of equal significance is the need to place the violence of the soccer spectator of the late Victorian and Edwardian periods within the context of the violent history of football. As he expressed it:

"In many ways this threat of violence was to be expected. Football, since its days as an annual inter-village battle, had always been associated with violence, and had been recognised as a form of institutionalised warfare......

Football was, for players and spectators, a deliberately conceived tension situation between two antagonistic but mutually dependent groups. It was always recognised that without organisation it would degenerate into open warfare, but without spontaneity it would be dull and repetitive. For the players, there were rules to which all had more or less to adhere, or face sanctions, and so within this conflict situation, there was consensus. But for the crowd, the rules were less clearly defined; there was conflict but less consensus. As a result, this conflict broke out into open aggression against other spectators, administrators, the referee or specific players, and property." 195

The importance of such links is not denied in the present study. Elias and Dunning, in fact, have written with reference to this issue.

In considering the development of modern football, specifically, the decrease in socially tolerated violence that accompanied the incipient "civilization" of the game, Elias and Dunning assert that:

"The danger of this decrease of permitted violence was quite obviously that the game in its changed form would become

194 Hutchinson, "Some Aspects of Football Crowds Before 1914" p. 11.
uninteresting and dull. The survival of the game evidently depended on a peculiar kind of balance between, on the one hand, a high control of the level of violence, because without it the game was no longer acceptable to most players and most spectators in accordance with the now prevailing standards of "civilised" behaviour, and on the other hand, the preservation of a sufficiently high level of non-violent fighting without which the interest of players and public alike would have flagged." 196

At this stage it is best to attempt to weave together the partial insights of the research orientations examined and to provide the outlines of an alternative perspective from which to view the phenomenon of football hooliganism. In order to weave together the partial insights offered by existing research, it is first necessary to restate how the present study conceives of an adequate analysis of social problems. While it was acknowledged in the Introduction that there are two aspects to social problems, i.e. the objective condition and the subjective definition, it was also argued at that stage that these aspects must be conceived of in a reciprocal and integrally integrated manner.

Based on a figurational perspective which stresses that the focus of sociological study should be on how people cope with the problems of interdependence, it is argued that in order to understand social problems the sociologist must seek to grasp both the structured interdependent nature of behaviour and reaction, and also the reciprocity that exists between the law-maker, the law-breaker the law-enforcer and the community at large. In this way, as noted, in examining the limits of decent partisanship and the emergence of football spectating as a social problem, the analysis of why particular groups adhere to specific codes of conduct and why certain groups find such codes more or less problematic can be understood as a function of the figuration in which they are located. How helpful is the present literature relating to football hooliganism in

196 Norbert Elias and Eric Dunning, "Dynamics of Sports Groups with Special Reference to Football," In Dunning, Sociology of Sport p. 73.
The work of Taylor and Clarke with regard to the values evident in both football and working class culture is of relevance to the analysis of the codes of conduct which particular groups adhere to and why certain groups find such codes more or less problematic. In this respect, Taylor and Clarke note a close correspondence between the values of working class culture and football - masculinity, excitement and victory are pivotal working class values that are expressed in working class participation in the game as players and spectators. In addition, while Taylor and Clarke seek to explain football hooliganism in terms of the revolt by supporters against changes occurring in the post-war period, the recourse of such supporters to violent acts, they argue, occurs precisely because of their adherence to these values. Unfortunately, neither researcher sought to probe the social roots of such values.

Despite this, their general observation is of importance. In fact the work of Marsh, in part, reinforces the image of masculinity and excitement to which Taylor and Clarke refer. In examining the career structure of the terraces, Marsh, highlights the role of the "town boys," "hard men" and "nutters" in the more violent incidents. Presumably it is this group who most strongly adhere to the values to which Taylor and Clarke draw attention. But Marsh fails to provide an appraisal of the social composition of these groupings of supporters. In this respect, the Harrington Report and the joint SSRC - Sports Council Report are of greater use. In these reports, the involvement of working class youths, registered as unemployed or employed in unskilled or semi-skilled occupations is highlighted. Such evidence dovetails quite well into the analysis provided by Dunning et al into the social roots of football hooligan violence. This requires spelling out.
In relation to football hooliganism Dunning argues, that an analysis should seek to locate the phenomenon within its wider social context and to examine the manner in which the behaviour involved and the norms and values expressed in it, are structurally generated within given social milieux. Dunning therefore hypothesises, basing his conclusion in the first instance on an analysis of spectator disorder in the 1890's, that:

"...Football hooliganism is, in certain key respects, an expression of behaviour that is characteristically working class, e.g. of masculinity norms that lay stress on physical violence." 197

While Taylor and Clarke do not explain football hooliganism in quite these terms, clearly there is connection between the values to which Dunning refers and the close correspondence of the values of masculinity, excitement and victory in football and working class culture to which Taylor and Clarke draw attention. Further explanation of the theoretical perspective offered by Dunning, especially as he has developed it in conjunction with his colleague, Patrick Murphy, seems appropriate at this stage.

While the joint SSRC - Sports Council Report had referred to the values which underpin people's behaviour, Dunning and Murphy, in rejecting the report's conclusion that football hooligans are marked by "a lack of control due to ineffectual socialisation," argued that:

"...football hooligans display, not 'ineffective internalisation of social controls' or the 'breakdown of normal controls' in a crowd situation, but controlling norms or standards that are different from those of the dominant groups in society at large....

These standards seem to us to differ from those that are dominant in society at large principally in the stress they lay on aggressiveness and fighting." 98

The central tenet of their argument appears to be that the standards

---

regarding the expression of violence in the lower working class of today are reminiscent of standards that were more general at an earlier stage of the civilising process. The lower working class, however, is not some kind of constant. The class structure has continually changed: increasing incorporation and civilisation of the working class are, they argue, key aspects of that change. For them, the lower working class of today are the section which has experienced the least degree of incorporation and civilisation. Taylor's and Clarke's analyses are flawed with respect to the fact that they seek to explain the phenomenon solely by reference to variables, e.g. changes in post-war society and/or the post-war game.

In contrast, Dunning observes that football hooligan violence is produced by interactions between long established, and, more recent aspects of the social process. With regard to this issue, he remarks:

".......earlier authors have failed in their explanations of football hooliganism to strike an adequate balance between the deep-rooted, only slowly changing characteristics of the British working class that generate a relatively persistent tendency for sections of working class youth to engage in what is officially perceived as disorderly behaviour at football matches and elsewhere, and the more recent changes, whether in football or the wider society, which may also have contributed to the phenomenon." 199

In considering the phenomenon of football hooligan violence, Dunning et al further hypothesise that youths from what they call "segmentally structured" communities are the most centrally and persistently involved. 200 Such an analysis is based on an appraisal of lower working-class communities which stresses that norms of aggressive masculinity flourish in such contexts. While this perspective is considered in more detail in Chapter Seven, several points need to be made at this stage. Communities which are marked by "segmental structures" or what the American, Gerald Suttles

199 Dunning, "Notes on the Sociogenesis of Football Hooliganism" p. 2.
calls, 'ordered segmentation,' are characterised by a resistance to control by the state and its agencies, territorial unity, solidarity, segregation of the sexes, dominance by an age-graded all-male fighting stratum and feuding between families, neighbourhoods, and street-corner gangs. Adolescents are relatively free of adult control and tend to interact violently with one another and to develop dominance hierarchies based on age, physical strength and toughness. Those males who are willing and able to fight gain great prestige. In addition, they develop a love for fighting, seeing it as a source of meaning and gratification in life. Violent conduct, in fact, is normatively rewarded and perceived as pleasure-producing. In this way, Dunning et al argue that:

".....adolescent 'gangs' and a violent masculine style are generated by specific structural characteristics of lower working class communities and by the manner in which such communities are integrated into the wider structure of social interdependencies. The areas of social life outside lower working class communities where these violent propensities have found expression have tended to shift under the influence of changing fashions. However, it seems that one relatively permanent context for such behaviour has been provided by Association Football." 202

While the incidence of disorder over time may well depend on the changing attraction of the game to the lower working class and to the changing proportion of communities in society at large whose structures approximate to 'ordered segmentation,' in order to explain the nature of the social problem of football hooliganism in its totality it is also necessary to consider an interrelated dimension, that of the perception, by outsiders, of working class football supporters in general.

As argued, the intention of this section of the present chapter is to weave together the partial insights offered by existing research. Of
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what assistance is this literature with respect to analysing the perception by outside observers, of working class supporters? Significantly, Taylor and Clarke highlight how the changing relationship between the club and its supporters is important in explaining the emergence of football hooliganism. The merits of such an analysis have been discussed earlier. What is of importance in the present context is that these researchers argue that working class spectators were increasingly perceived of as 'problematic.' That is, dating from the post-war period, the traditional manner of spectating became inappropriate to the modern packaging of the game. The official view of spectating advocated a more passive and detached role for the working class supporter.

The negative perception of traditional working class spectating was compounded by the fact that those supporters who clung most forcefully to the traditional patterns "revolted" in a violent manner. Subsequently, as Hall observes, in the context of a trend towards a "law and order" society football hooliganism was perceived as being symptomatic of the "moral decline" of the country. The out-dated traditional role of the spectator, actively involved in supporting his team, was further undermined by the 'bad press' which football hooliganism received.

In fact, the treatment by the press and by television reinforced, as Whannel argues, the process outlined. In concentrating solely on the societal reaction to football hooliganism, Whannel argues that the press have played a decisive role in the formulation and construction of images. Graham, as observed, goes one step further and argues that the mass media played a significant role in producing and developing the conditions which 'crystallized into football hooliganism'. Underpinning this development, he argues, was, in fact, the onset of what he terms the 'control culture.'
For the present study, there is a lot of value in such a perspective. The possible changing official definition of what constituted appropriate spectator behaviour is of significance and is probed in Chapter Five. Where the analysis of Taylor and Clarke is faulty in this respect is their failure to grasp that the traditional form of working class support may well have been permeated, to a greater or lesser degree, by the violent masculine style evident in football hooliganism of the 1960's and 1970's and that the official definition over what constitutes appropriate spectating may well have been at odds with the perception which working class supporters had of their role since the foundation of the Football League. The present study attempts to tackle such issues and the observation made by Hall is also not without significance. In fact, the connection which Hall documents between the codes of conduct underpinning football hooliganism and the perceived connection with the supposed "moral decline" of the country also relates to the alternative conception of the phenomenon outlined in the Introduction. That is, that such codes of conduct and the perception by outsiders of such codes of conduct, are bound up with the whole question of the competing ways of living evident in English society. Furthermore, the reference by Graham to the onset of what he terms the 'control culture' in the period following the Second World War again relates to the idea that the phenomenon of football hooliganism is explicable in terms of the cultural struggle and the concomitant narrowing of the limits of what is and has been tolerated in public in English society over the last century and a half. As this formulation suggests, however, Graham's analysis may well be found wanting in terms of historical accuracy: more long-term as well as more short-term changes are involved. Graham's analysis, like Whannel's, may also be found wanting with respect to the fact that both are content
to analyse the societal reaction dimension to football hooliganism and fail to grasp, as the present study has advocated, a more integrated and mutually reinforcing conception of behaviour and reaction. As argued, one is dealing with both the production and reproduction of specific codes of conduct and the concomitant perception by all groups in the overall social figuration of such codes of conduct. With this in mind it is perhaps best to restate briefly the alternative conception of football hooliganism presented in the Introduction.

As argued, football hooliganism must, in the first instance, be understood in relation to the competing definitions of codes of conduct and ways of living evident in English society dating from the early 1800's to the present day. It is necessary to consider the sociogenesis both of particular codes of conduct and the perception by outsiders of working class supporters as part and parcel of the same process, as part of the emergence of football spectating as a social problem. A distinctive feature of this class-cultural struggle has been, during the last century and a half, a more or less progressive narrowing of the limits of the forms of behaviour that are tolerated in public. In fact, there has been a progressive proliferation and tightening of constraints on people's behaviour, particularly with reference to the nature and expression of violence. Football spectators in general and working class spectators in particular have not escaped the influence of such structured processes - for the present study, the limits of decent partisanship and the emergence of football spectating as a social problem are explicable in these terms. It is to a substantiation of such an analysis that attention must now begin to be directed.
CHAPTER TWO
PROBLEMS AND ISSUES OF METHODOLOGY

The analysis contained in the preceding chapter sought to provide an overall picture of existing conceptions of football hooliganism. Attention focused on particular research orientations and on the inadequacies of the approach of social historians and of adherents to prevailing sociological perspectives. This task was located within the context described in the Introduction. A synthesis of these approaches was provided and consideration was given to its implications for the phenomenon under investigation. An analysis of the methodological issues raised in this connection, however, has to form an integral part of this process, as aspects of this directly relate to the areas so far discussed.

The following analysis of methodological issues centres around three main subjects. Firstly, consideration must be given to the question of the themes pervading this and other research in relation to the theoretical explanation of the development of leisure and popular culture. Crucial in this regard, again are three themes. More particularly examination is undertaken of, firstly, the nature of historical processes - with specific reference to the relative power potential of people to "make" their own history; secondly, of the nature of source material in relation to this perceived power potential, and thirdly, of the forms of investigative procedure which historians and sociologists most usually adopt. With reference to the examination of the overall issue of the development of popular culture and leisure, the work of Stedman Jones, Eileen and Stephen Yeo, Stephen Humphries, Hugh Cunningham and John Stevenson will be the subject of particular attention and critical scrutiny.

The nature of both the source material and of the modes of investigation adopted by historians and sociologists also relate to the second subject
which this analysis of methodological issues centres around, namely, the adequacy of the evidence. In examining this second subject, attention will be given both to criticisms of "conventional" accounts of leisure and popular culture in general and histories of football in particular. With respect to the latter, a close analysis of the critique offered by Hugh Cunningham of the conventional histories of football is undertaken. Such critiques, however, also contain weaknesses of a more general kind and the analysis of the adequacy of the evidence concludes with the alternative approach to such problems proposed by Norbert Elias.

Finally, the third subject, that of the problems encountered in relation to the specific form of research conducted by the present study, is considered in the light of the examination of the two preceding subjects.

A. Perspectives on Leisure and Popular Culture

The academic study of sport, as already noted, has a legacy of neglect. At best, social historians and sociologists have perceived the analysis of sport - indeed, of leisure generally - as peripheral to their work. While one cannot foretell future developments, some are willing to take stock and consider, within the context of theories of cultural development, what has been achieved.

Stedman Jones addressed this latter question and took issue with certain tendencies which he identified as dominant in the analysis of leisure and working class culture. More specifically, he argues:

"Certain well defined themes have emerged and this has encouraged research along a few oft-trodden routes, while leaving large parts of the landscape almost unmapped. Research has tended to concentrate upon the advance of a methodical capitalist rationality and the disappearance or decline of traditional forms of popular recreation in its wake....

There are other areas too, which, if not unknown, are certainly underplayed in the prevalent approach to the subject. Far more attention has been paid to the ways in which entrepreneurs or the propertied classes attempted to change popular uses of leisure time..."
than to the ways in which craftsman, artisan or working class activists attempted to organise their non-work time."

For Stedman Jones, then, recent analyses of the social history of leisure focus on the "advance of a methodical capitalist rationality and the disappearance of traditional forms of popular recreation." In so doing, the emphasis of these analyses is on the role of entrepreneurs and the propertied classes. At stake is the issue of the "making" of the historical process: the activities of one group are emphasised, the culture of other groups neglected. In consequence, Stedman Jones argues:

".....The cumulative picture conveyed by research into popular recreation and leisure is out of perspective. The sharply delineated foreground is occupied by puritan, methodist and evangelical moral reformers, gentry deciding where to place their patronage, prescient magistrates, calculating employers, prurient municipal elites, entrepreneurial publicans and rationalising merchants of leisure. Behind this obtrusive phalanx, we can just make out the blurred and rather undifferentiated features of the rural and urban masses. Once or twice, their generally dim profiles are illuminated by 'a flashpoint of class conflict.' Forms of resistance may momentarily be discerned. But since, at this distance of time, evidence of their resistance can only be found generally in non-verbal activity - a burnt hayrick for example, or a pitched street battle - it is then difficult to situate these 'flashpoints' in their surrounding terrain." 2

But why should the 'cumulative picture' conveyed by research into popular recreations and leisure be so "out of perspective?" For Stedman Jones, the answer lies at both a conceptual and a methodological level. With respect to the latter dimension, greater attention will be given in this thesis when the analysis of the adequacy of evidence is undertaken. With regard to the conceptual dimension, Stedman Jones argues that prevailing approaches have conceived of the making of the historical process in general and the social history of popular recreations and leisure in particular, in terms of "social control." While not denying

2 Ibid p. 163.
that attempts to control popular culture have been legion, Stedman Jones
takes exception to how the term has been utilised. He concludes:

"It is as if class-conflict in England has been a largely
one-sided affair conducted by capitalism and its representatives;
as if the rural and urban masses, like the newborn child in Locke's
psychology, were simply a blank page upon which each successive
stage of capitalism has successfully imposed its imprint." 3

But why has the class-conflict involved been viewed as a largely
one-sided affair? For Eileen and Stephen Yeo, reinforcing the analysis
offered by Stedman Jones, a form of ideological bias pervades analyses
of popular culture. In examining the different "ways of seeing" the trans­
iton of popular culture, these researchers argue:

"We want to suggest that even, or perhaps especially, in
Britain the transition - whatever that means - has been and is
being made with much effort, much struggle (notable from above) and
with noticeable incompleteness.

The struggle was often, perhaps usually, initiated from above....
remaking customs, re-forming people or removing alternative practices
actively produced and practised in common among large numbers of
people.

Such imposition was often violent in the simplest sense of
that word. Even where it was not, there was so much "heat and
thundering noise!" about "the reformation of one class by another"
that phrases like "cultural revolution" or "cultural imperialism"
capture the process much better than sociological ones like
"incorporation" or "social control." 4

Exception is thus taken by these researchers to conceiving of the
development of leisure in terms of the activities of a hegemonic elite or
ruling class. In emphasising the need to view the changes that have
occurred in terms of "struggle," the Yeos wish to promote what they term
a "creative social history" - one which allows the craftsman, the artisan
or working class activist some part to play in the making of the historical
process.

3 Ibid p. 163.

4 Eileen Yeo and Stephen Yeo, "Ways of Seeing: Control and Leisure Versus
Class and Struggle" in Yeo and Yeo, Popular Culture and Class Conflict
p. 137.
In examining popular disturbances, John Stevenson also notes the relative neglect by historians of this facet of social history. Indeed, when attention has been given to them, a dominant conception of such disturbances, similar to what, according to Stedman Jones is the dominant way of conceiving popular culture in general, informs such analyses.

For Stevenson:

"...The study of popular disturbances [for earlier generations of historians] remained somewhat incidental to the main concerns of historians. The presence of 'riots' or other kinds of violence has more often been treated as the inevitable outcome of distress and the absence of an efficient police force than as a subject worthy of study in its own right...." 5

Even the recognition of the existence of such violence for earlier generations of historians, according to Alan Macfarlane, must be treated as problematic. For it is only relatively recently, in Macfarlane's words, that the "re-discovery of violence" has occurred. How is it possible to explain such conceptions of English society? Macfarlane writes in this connection:

"There are a number of reasons. One stems from the underlying theories concerning the whole development of English society. Those who believed strongly in the continuity of English history were unlikely to expect or to see a period of violence and revolution as one type of society was shattered by another. On the other hand, those who have a general model of the emergence of modern capitalism and the nation state in the sixteenth century have a theory which predicts violence in the transition, and this makes it easier to find. They also have a view that people were basically 'peasants' up to the seventeenth century, and analogies with other peasant societies have suggested to them that peasants are often characterized by mutual suspicion, hostility, physical violence. In other words, it has only been with the widespread acceptance of sociological theories of the great transition from 'traditional,' 'peasant' societies to 'modern' and 'capitalist' ones that historians have really been able to approach the documents with expectations of violence and brutality...." 6

"Ways of seeing" popular culture therefore reflect not only the ideological bias of particular researchers but also the conceptual framework.


utilised. In this connection the analyses of Stedman Jones and the Yeos of popular culture, and the analyses of Stevenson and Macfarlane of popular disturbances and the "re-discovery of violence," dovetail together in the work of Stephen Humphries. In considering whether the history of working class youth between 1889 and 1939 can be interpreted in terms of "hooliganism" or "rebellion," Humphries argues:

"The behaviour that I contend can be regarded as resistance is the persistent rule-breaking and opposition to authority characteristic of working class youth culture that has traditionally been viewed as indiscipline or delinquency. ..." 7

The "traditional" view of working class youth culture, he claims stems from the utilisation of two bases - theories of mass culture and theories of deprivation. In considering these theories, Humphries concludes:

"The theoretical orientation and the evidence produced by the mass-society conception has two principal defects that blur our vision of the cultural forms of working class youth. The first is that mass-culture theorizing has an in-built elitist or class bias - a bias that is particularly evident in the value-laden labels frequently used to stigmatize working-class youth. The second major criticism of mass culture theory is that it disguises political problems of class inequality and exploitation by its use of the depoliticized concepts of the individual as opposed to the masses and the masses as opposed to the elites. ...

Clearly, acceptance or partial acceptance of such theories of deprivation and evidence of psychological deficiency would seriously undermine any attempt to demonstrate the rational and discriminating resistance of working class youth to authority. However, the historical value of these psychological theories is extremely limited, for there is much evidence to suggest that adolescence is not a universal experience but has been created artificially through a convergence of social, economic and demographic changes." 8

What can be made of the analyses discussed so far? The perspective offered by Stedman Jones and the Yeos emphasises that the role of the working classes in the making of the historical process and the meaning of

7 Humphries, Hooligans or Rebels p. 1.
8 Ibid pp 11-12, p. 17.
their actions has been denied importance. The development of popular culture has thus been viewed in terms of "social control." Such sentiments were also commented on by Stevenson. Popular disturbances in general have been relegated to a position of little importance, and when consideration has been given, such disturbances are viewed as a consequence, for example, of "inefficient policing." Disturbances of this nature also relate to the whole question of violence in English society.

For Macfarlane, as a consequence of the adoption of particular sociological perspectives, a "re-discovery of violence" with reference to the populace of England has occurred. In concluding his analysis, Macfarlane in fact, rejects such perspectives - presumably those to which Humphries refers. For Humphries however it is clear that:

"...these concepts have tended to be accepted uncritically by sociologists, psychologists and historians and elevated into mass culture and cultural deprivation theories that in the past century have devalued or denied the class-based resistance of working-class youth." 9

While the present study accepts that, in a number of analyses of popular culture, the ideological bias to which Stedman Jones and the Yeos refer does exist and that the role of and meaning given to the actions of working-class people, over time, have been downplayed and denigrated, such critiques of perspectives on leisure and popular culture are not without their own weaknesses. It is to these that attention must now turn.

While the implications of the analyses so far presented will become more apparent in the context of the appraisal of the adequacy of the evidence, three points need to be made at this stage. Firstly, there is a tendency in the analyses considered - especially those of Stedman Jones, Humphries and the Yeos - to conceive of the development of popular culture and working class youth culture as an either/or. Either it is "class

9 Ibid p. 27
expression" or "social control;" either it is "control" or "struggle;"
either it is "hooliganism" or "rebellion." But, as will be demonstrated
in Chapter Three, the characterisation of change in popular culture
does not have to see such aspects as mutually exclusive. Indeed, this
observation links to the second weakness which such analyses contain
-namely, the conception of the making of the historical process. While
rightly pointing to the relative neglect of "craftsmen" and "artisans"
in earlier accounts, such analyses tend to swing to the other extreme of
what Hall has termed the "unacceptable poles" in studies of popular
culture. It is equally foolish, Hall claims, to think of the working
class as "autonomous" as it is to view them as "cultural dopes." Such a
weakness also falls foul of the analysis presented in relation to
figurational sociology - at root, such studies fail to understand the
interdependent relationships between history and sociology and individuals
and the societies they form. Central in this regard is the inability
of such authors to understand the pattern of freedom and constraint in
the making of the historical process. Little wonder, then, that such
studies employ such false dichotomies as "class expression" versus
"social control!" In this connection, Peter Bailey was correct to assert
that:

"The best of the new work [in analyses of leisure] has been
cal to study and understand them not only in the context
of their own culture but in relation to the structure of society
as a whole and the wider patterns of social change." 13

An attempt must therefore be made to examine popular culture from a
figurational perspective, one which does not see the subcultures of

10 Hall, "Notes on Deconstructing the 'Popular'" p. 228
12 Abrams, Historical Sociology p xiii.
13 Peter Bailey, Leisure and Class in Victorian England Routledge and Kegan
specific classes as autonomous entities or view them as unimportant remnants of pre-industrial culture.

The tendency to examine leisure in the context of particular cultures or subcultures relates to the third weakness which such studies have. While it is important to document "forms of resistance" in the non-verbal acts found in popular culture, a danger also lies lurking for the unwary. Stevenson, in commenting on this trend remarked:

"There are obviously dangers here, principally that of investing incidents with too much significance. The sources at our disposal are often inadequate for a completely satisfactory appraisal of the motives and rationales of those who participated in popular disturbances and one of the subtler forms of condescension in historical writing is to see all violence as 'protest' and all the participants in riots as sober-sided and self-conscious proletarians." 14

It is here, in fact, that the analysis of the "ways of seeing" popular culture and leisure inter-relate with the study of the second issue referred to at the outset, namely, the adequacy of the evidence. Such a link requires clarification and is undertaken in the context of the examination of this second issue.

B. The "Adequacy" of the Evidence

The weaknesses of existing analyses of popular culture, for Stedman Jones, stem from, not only a distorted conception of the making of the historical process, but are also a function of the source material available to later generations of historians. He argues:

"...If the problem is to be posed adequately, then the case of the accused cannot satisfactorily be deduced from even the most discerning reading of testimonies bequeathed us by the case for the prosecution. But not all work has escaped the temptation to translate archival silence into historical passivity. Combined with the relative absence of studies examining active working class attempts to determine the use of their non-work time, the composite picture presented of capitalist development, class relations and 'leisure' appears unduly slanted in one direction." 15

14 Stevenson, Popular Disturbances in England p. 4
15 Stedman Jones, "Class Expression Versus Social Control?" p. 163.
From his perspective, no matter how 'discerning one is in reading the testimonies bequeathed by the case for the prosecution,' the end result cannot be satisfactory. Any attempt to discern 'how it really was' is doomed to failure. But he is not alone in recognising that such problems exist. In reviewing this issue in relation to tackling the phenomenon of popular disturbances, Stevenson remarked:

"In many cases the only accounts of disturbances that we possess come from the educated upper classes. Although many were clearly well-informed and sensitive to the situations around them, they often reflect characteristic prejudices which limit their value in providing evidence of the feelings of the people actually involved. As a result they are frequently more useful as evidence of attitudes among the governing classes than of the events themselves." 16

Applying such sentiments to the analysis of working class youth culture, Humphries similarly declared:

"...Any account of an under-privileged and largely anonymous group like working class youth requires a methodological approach different from that ordinarily employed by historians. Since the control of manuscript and printed evidence by adults...is absolute, most documentary sources present a biased and distorted view of the resistance of working class youth." 17

Clearly such ideas call into question the adequacy and interpretation of encountered evidence in any study which purports to examine popular culture. By questioning the status of written evidence and the ability of historians to establish 'how it really is or was,' such an analysis has similarities with the critique which Raphael Samuel offers concerning the relationship between history and theory. 18 He concentrates in this connection on the criticisms offered by "structuralism" of the practice of historians. In his analysis, Samuel outlines several reservations which structuralism offers of the practice of historians. Firstly, the approach challenges what is seen as the inductive method they use - it rejects the idea that arguments and concepts can be derived from facts. Secondly,

17 Humphries, Hooligans or Rebels p. 3.
18 Raphael Samuel,"History and Theory" in Samuel, People's History and Socialist Theory pp XL-LVI.
language, not reality is seen to structure thought - such a reservation has implications for attempts to establish 'how it really was.' Thirdly, the claim that historical structures can be explained by their genesis is also dismissed. Conceptualised within this framework, the focus of attention is on how the historian "constructs" the past. Samuel concludes:

"By focusing on the forms of knowledge, and the ways in which meanings are mediated, structuralism necessarily makes us more aware of the contingent nature of historical representations, and forces us to consider them as ideological constructions rather than as the empirical record of past events.....Any historical work (structuralism alleges) imposes a false unity on its subject in the very processes by which the subject is defined. The themes, whether descriptive or analytical, are necessarily selected by the historian, and so too are the selectivities and excursions. Periodisation, however convincing, is always arbitrary; detail, however 'immediate,' is necessarily partial; while the choice of problematic is trimmed, in greater or lesser degree to what the frame of reference will accommodate.....Historians thus do not reflect the past - they signify and construct it: meaning is in the eye of the beholder." 19

The analyses of Stedman Jones and Humphries clearly originate, in part, from this structuralist critique. In these accounts, historians are seen as the inevitable victims of their own perceptions and the empirical evidence of the past is irretrievably contaminated. While such observations require clarification and critical appraisal, at this stage an attempt will be made to highlight the way in which some research within this area has, in fact, committed the errors described by Stedman Jones and the Yeo's, and has failed to explore the adequacy of the evidence utilised.

An example of this lies in the work of Lowerson and Hyerscough, especially their book, *Time to Spare in Victorian England*. They contend:

"The best but inadequate evidence of who attended football matches in Sussex is contained in photographs of crowds, which suggest that the spectators were generally drawn from amongst the lower middle class tradesmen and artisans rather than from the poorest working class men. Nonetheless, both the large and

19 Ibid p xliiv.
orderly crowds at football and cricket matches, as well as the healthy players in Saturday or Wednesday afternoon matches, were proof enough of the triumph of Victorian values and virtues in the field of play...." 20

While the analysis contained in the substantive section of the present study is in broad agreement with their analysis concerning the social composition of football crowds in that period, no such support can be given to the subsequent contention that these crowds were passive and orderly. As will be documented, such a picture of the late Victorian and Edwardian periods is misleading. This inadequacy stems not simply from the particular source material utilised. True, photographic evidence does give some insights into sections of the crowd, but rarely in the development of football as a spectator sport - at least up until the late 1950's - have scenes of disorder been captured in photographs or on film. No, the inadequacy of Lowerson and Myerscough's analysis lies in their overall conception of popular culture. While they are correct to consider the hegemonic character of middle class actions in creating the leisure patterns of the working classes - they also stress that the working classes accepted such patterns without resistance. For these researchers, the historical process is portrayed as predominantly the result of the actions of entrepreneurs: they claim that 'Victorian virtues triumphed on the field of play.' Considered within this framework, the working classes are viewed as cultural dopes, that is, as totally lacking in autonomy.

Other research from social historians and sociologists also tends to lack either a sociological awareness or fails to grasp that cultural change has a developmental character to it. In this respect as documented, the work of Walvin and Grayson, Taylor and Marsh exhibits such

shortcomings. It is important to understand, however, that it is not simply an inability on behalf of the individual authors cited, but a pervasive tendency in dominant social historical and sociological perspectives. In keeping with this tradition, Armitage, in commenting on the impact of the First World War on football match attendances observed that:

"The hopeful spirit of the first decade of the century and the elation after the end of the war in 1918 were dead and in their place was despair or cynicism. Attendances at football matches were enormous...There was little aggression on the terraces then, for the physique of those who might have been aggressive was poor and, in any case, the war for the time being had diminished man's desire to fight and provoke." 23

The only aspect of this quotation that can be agreed with is that relating to the size of attendances in the period immediately following the end of World War One. The analysis falls foul of the critique offered by Stedman-Jones in two ways. The notion of a "hopeful spirit" is undermined by the false and romanticised conception of the Edwardian period as a "Golden age." This fondness for constructing a romantic view of the past relates to the belief that the problems of British society can be explained with reference to recent changes. The today-centered thinking outlined, coupled with the notion that we live nowadays in an excessively violent period tends to produce a longing for a past "when things were different." Even if one was to accept the somewhat problematic idea that the present is an excessively violent period, from a figurational perspective in order to understand this social fact it would be necessary to probe how such violent conduct had arisen, i.e.

21 See Chapter One.
22 Abrams, Historical Sociology Introduction.
how the later social formations that produce it had arisen out of earlier ones.

The second failing of Armitage lies in the assertion that there was "little aggression" evident on the terraces and this he attributed to the war. But, substantively he is incorrect - the terraces of football clubs and indeed the streets of Whitehall and the centres of a number of other English cities in 1919 witnessed scenes of disorder. This failing may, in part be explained as resulting from an inadequate analysis of the evidence. More crucially, however, it appears to stem from an assumption which Armitage held prior to his substantive research concerning the origins of aggression in human behaviour. By implicitly advocating an instinctual view of aggression, he assumed that it would be satisfied by the battle-excitement of the Somme and Gallipoli.

The more sophisticated analysis of Vamplew is also characterised by relatively inadequate assertions - a reflection, in fact, of his interpretation of the evidence utilised. In examining the FA records, for example, Vamplew appears to have accepted this source as an adequate indicator of the nature and extent of spectator disorder. In Samuel's terms, Vamplew viewed such records as an "innocent text." Having

25 See Chapter Four and Chapter Five.

26 Such a perspective on aggression is seen as inadequate on several grounds. For example, the archaeological evidence concerning the social relations of man's ancestors is not clear cut and recently Leakey has taken exception to the "Killer Ape" analysis underpinning this position. Secondly, the model of man involved is inappropriate. Neither the "Killer Ape" nor the 'Freudian' interpretation of aggression can be said effectively to capture homo ludens. Thirdly, the animal and physiological studies utilised to substantiate this perspective entail a conceptual leap which ignores the meanings and intentions evident in human cultures.

George Gaskell and Robert Pearton, "Aggression and Sport" in Goldstein, Sport, Games and Play

27 Samuel, "History and Theory" pp XLVII-XLIV.
gathered together a number of examples, he appears to have focused on these with reference to press reports. What he fails to appreciate is the problematic nature of the source material. But, as will be demonstrated, such use of the evidence inhibits the analyst's ability to get at "how it really was." It appears that the FA were centrally concerned with spectator misconduct which was deemed to have interfered with the game. Other forms of disorder were not reported to the FA by the match officials.28

In a similar, unexplicated manner, Peter Bailey, in writing of football crowds in the Victorian period, states:

"Reports of brawling in the crowd and altercations on the field of play were common, and seemed proof that ideals of fair play and ungentlemanly conduct......had given way to a fashionable brutality...." 29

As the present study will indicate, however, reports of "brawling in the crowd" were not common - relative to the reporting of other issues and other facets of crowd behaviour. This raises a more difficult methodological issue - namely, that of reported behaviour as against behaviour which was not considered either a sufficient cause for concern to warrant inclusion in reports, or which was not encountered by newspaper writers. Those critics operating within a structuralist perspective would claim that the exercise is doomed to failure - the historian cannot rely upon the evidence and, in any case, he brings with him a set of assumptions, as the work of Armitage illustrates, which blinker his analysis.

But what is the present study to make of such a critique? Tony Mason recognised the problems involved when he observed:

"It is a common enough complaint among historians who write about the attitudes of working people that these are difficult to discover. Working men, for example, did not leave behind them the

28 See Chapter Four.
relatively rich documentary materials which some members of
the middle classes have bequeathed to later generations....In
order, therefore, to reconstruct some of the ideas and perceptions
of working men we have to view them through the sometimes narrow
and often misty lens of what middle-class observers thought and
felt and said about them." 30

But recognition of the problem is not enough. Whereas, perforce,
analyses have to view popular culture through the "narrow" and "misty
lens" of what middle-class observers thought and felt about the working
classes, the researcher still has to assess how 'narrow and misty the
lens' actually was. The onus is on the historian to analyse such
evidence and to account for the assumptions which he adheres to. Samuel
addressed this issue when he wrote:

"It is true, as structuralism argues, that there is no such
thing as an innocent text, and it is right that we should be asked
to consider the ideological context in which our documents are
produced....(But) A large part of the historian's work consists
in subverting or escaping from - the categories of thought in
which the documents are conceived." 31

If, indeed, the historian must attempt to subvert or escape from
the "categories of thought in which the documents are conceived," how
is he to do so? When faced with similar problems in attempting to
document popular culture in early modern Europe, Peter Burke chose to
adopt what he termed an "oblique approach." Commenting on the issues
involved, Burke concluded:

"The essential point is surely to accept the fact that we
cannot often reach the craftsmen and peasants of early modern
Europe directly, but that we can reach them via preachers,
printers, travellers, officials. These men were brokers between
learned culture and popular culture....Given that a direct approach
is impossible, an oblique approach to popular culture via these
mediators is the least likely to put us on the wrong track....One
oblique approach is to study texts when what one wants to recover
is the performance....A second approach to popular culture might
be described as socially oblique. It consists of studying the

30 Mason, Association Football and English Society p. 22.
31 Samuel, "History and Theory" p. XIVii.
Crucial in this regard, for Burke, is the selection of appropriate texts and the recognition that the upper classes, in particular periods, genuinely participated in popular culture - they would have understood the activities of popular recreation from the inside. While the present study does not deny the importance of such insights, a more detailed explication of the process of ascertaining the adequacy of the evidence is required. This explication will be attempted both in the context of a case study which examines the work of Cunningham and, in a more detailed fashion, when reference is made to the work of Norbert Elias.

In his study of Leisure in the Industrial Revolution Hugh Cunningham confronts several of the issues and themes relating to the analysis of popular culture and leisure. Echoing Stedman Jones, the research undertaken by Cunningham seeks to redress the existing balance of analyses of working class culture. Arguing that the conventional modes of thinking about the history of leisure treat the people involved merely as objects, Cunningham attempts to provide empirical support for his theoretical contentions.  

Cunningham is critical of the notion that, during the early nineteenth century, pre-industrial forms of working class urban and rural recreation were 'smashed.' He rejects the idea that the "vacuum" allegedly thus formed was filled from up the social scale by the exponents of "rational recreation" who offered leisure forms which, in turn, the urban working classes readily embraced. As Cunningham expresses it:

---

32 Peter Burke, Popular Culture in Early Modern Europe Temple Smith London 1978 pp 78-79.
33 Cunningham, Leisure in the Industrial Revolution pp 195-196
34 Ibid pp 195-196.
"In all the flurry of argument about leisure it is easy to portray the working class as passive consumers. From one kind of left-wing stance they are seen as being tricked, fobbed off with a diet of commercial entertainment which anaesthetised their political instincts. And from a far right-wing stance they are incapable of standing on their own two feet when tempted by the trivialities of that commercial entertainment. Neither of these stances does justice to the role of the working class in the making of leisure.

In the first place the growing working class demand for leisure affected not simply the amount but also the form of what was offered. The diffusion of leisure up as well as down the social scale continued into the second half of the century - and indeed continues....

Secondly, the direction of working class demand put an end to many of the wilder hopes invested in leisure, and led to a resigned acceptance on the part of the middle class of the ways the working class chose to enjoy itself.

And thirdly, while parts of the popular culture expanded to flourish in the world of mass entertainment of the nineteenth century, other parts remained immune from outside influences. Although the campaign to make working-class leisure public had much success it was not completely successful. Much of working-class leisure remained privatised in the sense of being class-bound and invisible to those outside the culture."  

Comment on the theoretical implications of Cunningham's analysis will be reserved for later. For the moment, it is the significance of his empirical research for the present study that will be discussed. Of central relevance in this connection is the fact that, in considering the history of football, Cunningham is explicitly critical of the work of Dunning and Mason. Rejecting what he calls the 'conventional history' of the game, he argues:

".....seeing things through public school spectacles, it ignores the continuous history of football as a popular sport. It is true that those local, traditional, annual matches ranging over huge spaces and involving whole populations had for the most part been abolished during the first half of the century. But it seems highly likely that the more casual practice of kicking a ball around, a practice much closer to the modern game of football, survived..... This kind of football, precisely because it was so casual, was unlikely to leave behind it many records; that however is no indication that it was rare. At this stage of historical research one can do no
more than speculate that the middle-class missionaries found it unnecessary to spend time converting the working class natives; the latter were already enthusiastic lovers of the game....

Listing the ultra-respectable origins of the leading clubs implies that middle-class ideology permeated the game and all its players. What seems more plausible is that football as developed by the amateurs required a defined space and some capital investment, and that such access to land and money was beyond the working class. Hence they needed sponsors, and the middle-class amateurs were sponsors more than missionaries. As such, they might be little more than a respectable facade to be cast aside when necessary.... The sponsorship and patronage of the rich certainly did not imply a submission to their control and values....

We may conclude indeed that middle-class claims for their own impact on the game have had more influence on the historiography of football than they have had on its practice." 36

While these developments will be considered in more detail in relation to football and working class leisure in the nineteenth century later in the thesis, at this point several reservations need to be made with regard to Cunningham's analysis. Firstly, Cunningham fails to distinguish between folk forms of football and its incipient modernisation and "bifurcation" into 'soccer' and rugby. 38 In consequence, he fails to appreciate that, even though working class males, may have played casual "kick-around" football, they had to be trained to play the newer, public school forms such as soccer. It has to be admitted that the evidence for such a process is somewhat limited. But accounts appear in Marples which suggest that workers were made to play with a shilling in their hands to prevent them from handling the ball. 39 The significance of this lies in that a key distinguishing feature of soccer was the absolute taboo on the use of hands, something that was non-existent in the folk forms. The transition from folk

---

36 Ibid pp 127-128.
37 See Chapter Three.
38 Dunning and Sheard, Barbarians, Gentlemen and Players pp 98-100
39 Marples, A History of Football, Chapter XII.
to the other, more modern form, in short, was no easy matter. While Cunningham is therefore correct to observe that "football" continued to be played in the streets - despite, as will be shown, the efforts of the police - amid the "back to back" squalor of Victorian England, but it cannot be assumed, as he does, that a close correspondence existed between this form of "football" and the modern game of soccer. This is not to deny, however, that there was an "enthusiastic" response to soccer in the 1880's and that such enthusiasm related to the affinity the game had with popular culture. This requires elaboration.

The modernisation of the folk forms of football had resulted by the late nineteenth century in two relatively more "civilised" versions, but the qualities of physical prowess and masculinity remained integral features. These qualities had been central aspects of popular culture during the period in which folk football had been the dominant form and continued to be central in the period when soccer was emerging. It is probably the case, of course, that not all sections of the working classes adhered to these values with the same intensity, but what is being argued here is that some sections identified, not only with the game, but were, to varying degrees, "enthusiastic lovers" of the values underpinning it. Indeed, this notion of varying intensity links to a third reservation that can be articulated regarding Cunningham's analysis. A conception of the working class as autonomous and undifferentiated permeates what he writes. Cunningham thus fails to distinguish between the more "respectable" and the "rougher" sections of the working class. In consequence, he falls into the trap of "mystification" in arguing that, while the "working-class" used the facilities provided by middle class "sponsors," they did not

---

40 See Chapter Three.
embrace their bourgeois ideology. This however, runs counter both to the analysis of the complex development of popular culture which the present study sees as crucial to adopt and which was outlined earlier in this chapter, and to the developmental perspective which, as argued, assists in an explanation of spectator misconduct and other features of popular culture since the foundation of the Football League.

Briefly stated, it is being suggested that, during the nineteenth century, sections of the working class, the "respectable" elements - those more responsive to covert 'civilising' influences and those more susceptible to overt control by the police, the state and the employing classes - were becoming "incorporated," over time, into "mainstream" culture. But not all sections of the working class had been or have been thus "incorporated" - and it is from these sections which, according to Dunning and Murphy, football hooliganism springs. In the late nineteenth century working class social configurations generally approximated much more closely to "ordered segmentation" than is the case today and it is to that feature which the present analysis is, in part directed. Such an analysis is explored within a developmental perspective on football and working class leisure and an attempt is made to substantiate such an analysis by reference to spectator behaviour since the foundation of the Football League.

If the present study considers the analyses offered by Stedman Jones and Cunningham jointly, it becomes apparent that they share a common perspective. While the former takes issue with the undue emphasis attributed to the role of entrepreneurs in history, stressing that archival

---
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silence should not be interpreted as passivity, Cunningham seeks to demonstrate empirically the active role of the working class in the "making" of their leisure. The present study readily accepts the active involvement of the working classes in the figuration described. It agrees with the notion that "optimistic," "pessimistic" and "dismissive" analyses of the role of the working classes in the "making" of their leisure have been inadequate. The analysis can also concur with the idea that aspects of working class leisure remained relatively "privatised" and that, at the same time, the diffusion of leisure forms occurred up and down the social scale. Indeed this latter point is explicitly made by Dunning and Sheard.

Reservations remain, however, with regard to Cunningham's analysis of the history and historiography of football. Firstly, Dunning's analysis of the public schools relates explicitly to the "incipient modernization of football:" i.e. to the process in the course of which the modern Association and Rugby games were formed, a process which indisputably took place in the public schools and in which members of the public school elite were centrally involved. Dunning and Sheard do not deny the active part played by the working classes when they became involved in those new forms, from about the 1870's onwards. Secondly, Mason does stress that the formation of Association Football clubs involved a diverse range of groups from the middle and working classes. Cunningham is thus incorrect to assert that the 'conventional' history of the game ignores the part played by the working class. While it is true, for example, that Mason

---
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explores the continued attempts by middle class reformers to use the
game as a means to promote social harmony and for the betterment of
the 'masses' moral and physical welfare, he also attempts to examine
the part played by the distinctive attitudes of the working classes in
the development of the game. In addition, it is not disputed here that
the urban working classes had continued to play 'street football.'
Cunningham, moreover assumes that folk forms of football had all but died
out by 1850. But, as Punchard documented in 1928, some sixteen "survivals"
of folk football still persisted at that time - seven in England and
nine Scotland. The unravelling of the development of popular culture
is a far more complex affair than Cunningham would have us believe, and
such complexity requires the present study to detail the alternative
conception of methodology required for an analysis of this kind.

In examining the emergence of football spectating as a social problem,
the present study makes extensive use of newspapers as source material. In
analysing what he termed 'Crowd-Pleasing Spectacles in Eighteenth-Century
England,' Wiles similarly utilised newspapers to a significant degree.
Reliance on such a source prompted Wiles to consider the adequacy of the
evidence available to him. He rightly asks in this connection:

"Is it authoritative?......how can the news and advertisements
of provincial newspapers adequately represent the mores of the
whole nation?......Can any assemblage of items from newspapers
fairly represent a whole century? 53

Unfortunately, Wiles exhibits the same lack of sociological imagin­
ation that has been attributed here to social historians more generally.

51 Mason, Association Football and English Society pp 222-250.
52 Frank Punchard, Survivals of Folk Football School of Hygiene and
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53 Roy Wiles, "Crowd-Pleasing Spectacles in Eighteenth Century England"
In particular, he does not make problematic the construction of news and thus, the adequacy of the evidence remains unclarified. For example, he naively observes:

"In spite of editorial precautions, erroneous and misleading reports did find their way into print from time to time, as they do today; but if editors themselves did not correct mistakes - and they often did - their rivals promptly and mercilessly exposed them. A public statement is soon challenged if it is false. The newspaper accounts which I am using are in general trustworthy." 54

What therefore does the concept of "adequacy" as used by Wiles entail? Wiles' conception rests on the assumption that, as a result of the competitive character of the press, the "truth" will emerge. Any articles containing inaccuracies which were printed would quickly be withdrawn or revised by the particular newspaper concerned. Alternatively, they would be severely criticised in rival papers. While the present study does not dispute the competitive element in the quest for increased circulation, what Wiles fails to appreciate is the notion that the reporters and editors of several papers, even of papers in competition, can share - over particular issues - a common perspective or set of assumptions. 55 Such a notion is central in considering the position of the press in the emergence of football spectating as a social problem and substantiation of this feature will be attempted in the relevant context.

Further qualification of the methodological issues involved with the concept of adequacy is still, however, required. In this regard, Tony Mason concluded:

"All historians are prisoners of their sources and none more so than the historian of British sport in the nineteenth century.....many amateur cricket and football clubs either did not last long, or kept no records, or the scantiest of minutes."

54 Ibid pp 90-91.
55 Hall, "The Treatment of Football Hooliganism in the Press" pp 15-36
The professional clubs have not been good record-keepers either.... Similarly Association Football and Athletics are poorly served by the secondary literature. It is not entirely clear why, although the fact that football is largely watched and played, although not controlled by the working classes may be significant.  

In similar fashion, Dunning and Sheard have observed the need for caution in considering the "adequacy" of the evidence utilised. For them, the "relative adequacy" of the evidence is dependent on the precise pattern of interdependency between classes and groups, and central in this regard is the balance of power between them. Hence the analysis should focus on both the level of participation by the observers of particular events in the events in question, and on the pattern of tension and conflict evident in the relationship between observers and observed. The forms of distortion which permeate evidence are dependent on particular circumstances. The "insider's" account will give you the minutiae and emotional resonance; the "outsider's" account is likely to give you a more objective view but may be distorted as a result of, e.g. class bias. An analysis, therefore, ideally needs both but when one cannot get them, "verstehen" analysis based on the relative positions of groups in a figuration and knowledge of the balance of power and of tensions within that figuration can be used to work out an hypothesis. For example, the "relative adequacy" of the evidence in relation to folk football is assessed in the following manner by Dunning and Sheard:

"The regular participation of aristocrats and gentlemen in folk-football is indicative of a central aspect of the social structure of pre-industrial Britain: namely of a class structure which despite - or, more probably, because of - the existence of massive inequalities, permitted non-status - exclusive patterns of association to develop in the leisure sphere. This means that the writings of gentlemen such as Carew, Owen and Moor were based on direct observation and, very often, participation in the games they were describing.....Since these authors had no axe to grind, it follows that such accounts can be taken as reliable descriptions of folk football 'as it really was,' a wild and dis-

---
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orderly affair." 58

The relatively powerful upper-classes could participate without any sense of being threatened - this direct participation would allow such groups to provide relatively adequate accounts of folk football, relatively free from the class tensions which, in contrast, mark commentaries on the incipient professionalisation and democratisation of football in the 1880's and 1890's. It should be noted, however, that such an analysis is also underpinned by Elias' theory of involvement and detachment 59 and that of the inseparably interwoven processes of observation and theory formation on the part of the sociologist encountering particular evidence. These issues too require elaboration.

Elias addresses the issue of involvement and detachment by tracing the development of these qualities in human behaviour over time. Conceived of as "tools of thinking," no rigid dichotomy is seen to exist between them. In fact, as Elias states:

"...Social life as we know it would come to an end if standards of adult behaviour went too far in either direction. As far as one can see, the very existence of ordered group life depends on the interplay in men's thoughts and actions of impulses in both directions, those that involve and those that detach keeping each other in check. They may clash and struggle for dominance or compromise and form alloys of many different shades and kinds - however varied, it is the relation between the two which sets people's course. In using these terms one refers in short to changing equilibria between sets of mental activities which in man's relations with men, with non-human objects and with himself (whatever their other functions may be) have the function to involve and to detach." 61

In their study of the physical and biological levels of reality, Elias argues scientists have been able to hold in check this sense of involvement and the community of natural scientists places in high regard

58 Ibid p. 45.
59 Elias, "Problems of Involvement and Detachment"
60 Elias, What is Sociology? p. 40
the quality of relatively detached perspective. By adhering to "professional" standards, natural scientists are able to attempt to consider problems relevant for all human beings and all human groups and not simply to satisfy the whims of particular interest groups. This is not to suggest that other, more involved forms of thinking have disappeared in the study of the "natural" world or, indeed, that a relatively detached perspective has gained ascendancy in the study of the social world. In probing this latter issue, Elias concluded:

"Paradoxically enough, the steady increase in the capacity of men, both for a more detached approach to natural forces and for controlling them, and the gradual acceleration of this process, have helped to increase the difficulties which men have in extending their control over processes of social change and over their own feelings in thinking about them." 62

While men have therefore gradually exercised greater control over physical and biological processes, the social world is still characterised by "blind, uncontrolled" processes, and the participation of the sociological observer in these makes for difficulties in attaining the necessary degree of detachment. People, Elias claims, are:

"... incessantly faced with the task of adjusting themselves to changes which though perhaps of their own making were not intended by them. And as these changes frequently bring in their wake unforeseen gains for some and losses for others, they tend to go hand in hand with tensions and frictions between groups which, at the same time, are inescapably chained to each other. Tests of strength and the use of organized force serve often as costly means of adjustment to changes within this tangle of interdependencies; on many of its levels no other means of adjustment exist.

Thus vulnerable and insecure as men are under these conditions, they cannot stand back and look at the course of events calmly like more detached observers." 63

This is, however, only partly the answer. For there is a qualitative difference in the relationship of the "natural" and social scientist with regard to the object of investigation. In commenting on this issue, Elias

62 Ibid p. 231.
also outlines the task of and the problem faced by sociologists:

"The task of social scientists is to explore, and to make men understand, the patterns they form together, the nature and the changing configuration of all that binds them to each other. The investigators themselves form part of these patterns. They cannot help experiencing them, directly or by identification, as immediate participants from within; and the greater the strains and stresses to which they or their groups are exposed, the more difficult is it for them to perform the mental operation, underlying all scientific pursuits of detaching themselves from their role as immediate participants and from the limited vista it offers.... The problem confronting them is not simply to discard the latter role in favour of the former. They cannot cease to take part in, and to be affected by the social and political affairs of their groups and their time. Their own participation and involvement, moreover, is itself one of the conditions for comprehending the problem they try to solve as scientists. For while one need not know, in order to understand the structure of molecules, what it feels like to be one of its atoms, in order to understand the functioning of human groups one needs to know, as it were, from inside how human beings experience their own and other groups, and one cannot know without active participation and involvement.

The problem confronting those who study one or the other aspects of human groups is how to keep their two roles as participant and as inquirer clearly and consistently apart and, as a professional group, to establish in their work the undisputed dominance of the latter." 64

Other differences between the "natural" and the social scientist's task have implications for the present analysis. In questioning the aim of sciences in general, Elias casts doubt on the procedural quest for "truth." In that context, he comments on both the notion of adequacy and processes of observation and theory formation:

"It certainly happens in empirical investigations that people make statements which are simply found to be false. But often enough rough dichotomies like "true" and "false" are highly inadequate in their case. People engaged in empirical research often put forward propositions or theories whose merit is that they are truer than others or, to use a less hallowed term, that they are more adequate, more consistent both with observations and in themselves. In general terms, one might say it is characteristic of these scientific as distinct from non-scientific forms of solving problems that in the acquisition of knowledge, questions emerge and are solved as a result of an uninterrupted two-way traffic between two layers of knowledge: that of general ideas, theories or models and that of observations and perceptions.

64 Ibid p 234-pp 237-238.
of specific events. The latter, if not sufficiently informed by the former, remains unorganised and diffuse; the former if not sufficiently informed by the latter remains dominated by feelings and imaginings." 65

Samuel, too, is critical of the tendency in structuralism to ignore the relationship discussed by Elias. In different language and with a change in emphasis, Samuel states:

"The starting point of the structuralist critique, that theoretical propositions can't be derived from empirical evidence, is a correct one. But it by no means follows that the inverse of this is true, i.e. that the construction of new theoretical concepts can proceed by a purely deductive process of reasoning without reference to empirical work.....Theory-building cannot be an alternative to the attempt to explain real phenomena....." 66

Unfortunately, Samuel does not link such issues with the problems surrounding the balance between involvement and detachment. Continuing the analysis begun in his earlier work, in What is Sociology? Elias concludes:

"Even today, this distinction between.....sociological detachment and ideological involvement focusing on short-term present-day problems and values is beyond the grasp of many people, either in thought or action.....Despite all the past and present evidence, it is still hard to come to terms with the idea that though the developmental processes of human society can indeed be explained, they have no pre-existing aim or significance."67

Adoption of such a perspective is necessary in order to provide a relatively adequate account of the developmental process evident in nineteenth and twentieth century English society with special reference to the interrelated problems of the conflicted emergence of popular culture and spectator disorderliness in the context of the emerging game of Association Football. In order to achieve this, the present study proposes to strive for a relatively detached approach and concomitantly to grasp the precise pattern of interdependency within this process.

66 Samuel, "History and Theory" pp XLVIII-XLIV.
67 Elias, What is Sociology? p. 154
between classes and groups and the balance of power between them.

By so doing, however, the analysis is not forsaking the notion of
"experience" referred to, of getting inside - or at least attempting
to do so - the minds, perceptions and feelings of the historical
agents themselves. In conclusion, as Elias argued, the sociologist
should not build a general theory in the air and then apply it to the
evidence in question. Similarly, E. P. Thompson, the best known
advocate of the notion of "experience," recorded:

"If you want a generalization I would have to say that the
historian has got to be listening all the time. He should not
set up a book or a research project with a totally clear sense
of exactly what he is going to be able to do. The material itself
has got to speak through him. And I think this happens." 69

C. Specific Problems: The Source Material

In embarking on a developmental analysis of this nature, more
specific problems arose both in the initial, formative stage and as the
research unfolded. In this regard, Tony Mason faced similar dilemmas:

"Most of the sources used.....were published sources. The
vast majority of football clubs of the period 1863-1915 have
disappeared without trace and particularly without leaving behind
them such things as written records.....

Outside the clubs the Football Association, the Football
League and the Professional Footballers' Association were all as
helpful as they could be but none of them possessed the detailed
records which might have illuminated, for example, the occupations
and age groups from which the Victorian and Edwardian professional
player was recruited. This thinness of organisational or manu-
script material, together with a relatively weak secondary liter-
ature meant that considerable use had to be made of contemporary
newspapers.....Contemporary attitudes to the game were occasionally
revealed in leading articles or editorials. Sports reporters
sometimes strayed outside their immediate brief by describing
something of the context in which particular matches took place
but much searching of newspapers often produced very little in
terms of hard data or opinion....." 70

---

68 See Eric J. Hobsbawn, Primitive Rebels: Studies in Archaic Forms of
Social Movements in the Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries Manchester
University Press Manchester 1959.

69 Edward P. Thompson,"Interview with E. P. Thompson" Radical History

70 Mason, Association Football and English Society p. 6.
The limitations outlined by Mason apply equally to the present study. However, while Mason does consider some of the limitations the researcher faces with regard to the scope and range of the available source material, he does not fully examine, theoretically, the problems involved in the use of newspapers as a source of quantitative and qualitative evidence. It is to an understanding of the degree of "adequacy" of this source material on which the present study has necessarily very heavily to rely, that the following discussion is addressed.

While the sociological analysis of the media has been a relative growth area in the 1970's, few analyses have considered the historical development of the press or the mass media more generally. One exception to this is the work of Raymond Williams. The development of the popular press in the 1880's and 1890's, Williams argues, was marked by a process of "incorporation" of the reader's experiences.

"...It is crucial for that kind of popular press... that the real interests of the majority of readers within existing society be spoken to. You had to include their interests - the crime was there, the scandal was there, because people wanted to read them. The sport was there as organised sport developed. Without these incidents the old independent political papers of the first half of the century could not compete...." 71

Williams' analysis, however, rests at this point: even in considering the popular press in The Long Revolution, 72 Williams failed to consider the position of sports coverage, or the growth of the sporting press. Thus while the notion of "incorporation" is worthy of attention in itself, though it, too, requires elaboration, it does not provide assistance in ascertaining the adequacy of the evidence utilised here. Williams'

analysis in *Communications* is also indicative of the relative academic neglect of the study of sport. In this study, Williams defines communications as the 'institutions and forms in which ideas, information and attitudes are transmitted and received.' For Williams, therefore, communication refers to 'the process of transmission and reception.' On this basis, Williams then refers to the development of the theatre, the cinema, the press and television, but, despite his sensitivity to popular culture, no reference is made to the history of sport. In consequence of such a failing, the present research is again, by necessity, forced to provide a provisional sketch regarding this issue.

Further light on this blurred area can be drawn from Lee's analysis of *The Origins of the Popular Press*. In this, Lee depicts the growth of sports coverage and the popular press as being perceived by contemporaries primarily in negative terms - especially by respectable middle class Victorians:

"Unfortunately, it seemed to many Victorians, not only was this interest in sport essentially trivial and distracting but it also constituted a standing temptation to gamble....

With sport and gambling went sensation. It had always been the staple diet of the Sunday papers....Generally it was confined to those which traded heavily on the news of crime and criminals." 

Although Lee does briefly consider the control of the sporting press in the provinces, many questions remain unanswered. For instance, what was the editorial policy of particular newspapers and what type of assumptions did reporters hold regarding the social issues of their day? With respect to the present study it is essential to establish - or at

---
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least to probe - the relationship between the development of football as a spectator sport, through its different stages, and the growth and decline of a specialised sporting press and the expansion of press coverage of football in the general newspapers. It is important to note, that the present study envisages such a relationship as a crucial part of the figuration examined. 76

Exemplification of this inter-relationship can be drawn for present purposes from the period of the incipient professionalisation of the game. Ensor, in 1898, in considering what he called the Football Madness, commented on the role of newspapers as follows:

"The newspapers fatten upon the garbage; in fact, the behaviour of the press is one of the most lamentable features of the football mania.

In these days the mission of the press is to "lead its regiment from behind," to follow in the wake of public opinion, and exaggerate to the utmost the feelings and belief of the moment. The newspaper world has seen in the football madness chances of increased circulation, and they have devoted themselves, not so much to chronicle the results of matches, which is of course in their sphere of duty, as to produce spicy columns of scandal and slander. The Football reporters hang about the grounds, interview players and managers, publish anything they can discover or invent.....Now that everybody can read their influence is great, for there are millions of people, especially of the class that supports professional football, who take whatever they see in print as gospel....." 77

Further elaboration of this theme is contained in Mason's analysis. He writes:

"There was never any doubt in the minds of both newspaper proprietors and editors that racing results and tips sold newspapers. Football coverage probably helped too. Moreover, the publicity given to the game by all sections of the press was in part a stimulus to growth and popularity, part a recognition of its news value and an indicator of its importance...." 78

76 See Chapter Five.
See also William McGregor, "Gossip on the Game" Birmingham Daily Mail January 27th 1900.
The football press remains a mystery in several respects. We know comparatively little about who owned it and who wrote for it. We do not know much more about who read it. It would be fascinating to have some detailed knowledge to compare, for example, the socio-occupational backgrounds of Football Chat readers with that of Athletic News readers. But the evidence is never going to materialise. 78

Although the pessimistic tone of Mason's conclusion in this regard probably reflects an unavoidable fact, an attempt must still be made to provide a developmental account of the sporting press and the coverage of football in general newspapers. An account of this nature is relevant to the analysis of the adequacy of the evidence. For example, the comments made by Ensor highlight the "active" role which newspapers took in the phenomenon. In this respect, the fact that newspapers produced what Ensor termed 'spicy columns' in relation to the more 'lamentable features of the football mania' is indicative of the extent to which sections of the press reflected and reinforced the amateur ideology which was dominant amongst the upper and middle classes. The 'technical' development of the press, however, also requires consideration.

During the 1880's, with the rapid and extensive growth of the provincial sporting press, reports of matches were relayed to the newspaper office from the ground via pigeons. From this rudimentary stage, and with the increasing demand for the Saturday night editions of the sports newspapers to 'reach the streets' quickly, the technical development of sports reporting evolved. 79 According to Mason:

"The technical basis for the frenetic expansion of the sporting evening paper was the telegraph and later the telephone and, inside the newspaper machine shop, the web-fed rotary presses and from the 1880's, the linotype machines in the composing room." 80

78 Mason, Association Football and English Society p. 195.
79 See also Alfred Gibson and William Pickford, Association Football and the Men Who Made It 2, London 1906.
80 Mason, Association Football and English Society p. 192.
Following World War One, though the exact structure and extent of the system and its relationship with the coverage of football remains unclear, there was established the Press Association, with a more efficient news service using the Creed-Wheatstone system; a system which involved the co-ordination of material by means of the gathering of reports from particular sources and their dissemination to other newspapers. Whereas, prior to World War One, it is possible to speculate that there was a less formalised arrangement between newspapers and reporters concerning the coverage of matches, there appears to have existed, in the inter-war years, a general source from which reports could be drawn.

An example from 1930 exemplifies this point. The Birmingham Post recorded:

"A Scene at Homerton.
Towards the end of the match at Homerton between Clapton Orient and Queen's Park Rangers, the police had to stop fighting between rival spectators behind the goal which the Rangers were defending. There was no demonstration against the referee or the players." 82

In similar fashion the News of the World and The People noted:

News of the World
"Police stop a Fight.
Towards the end of the game the Police had to stop fighting between rival spectators behind the goal which the Rangers were defending. There was no demonstration against the referee or the players....." 83

The People
"Police at Homerton. Spectators fought while the Rangers were Winning.
....Towards the end of the match the Police had to stop fighting between rival spectators behind the goal which the Rangers were defending. There was no demonstration against the referee or the players." 84

82 Birmingham Post 24th February 1930.
83 News of the World 23rd February 1930.
84 The People 23rd February 1930.
It would appear from the repetition of the wording, that there was, by this time, some general source from which national and local newspapers could draw. Unfortunately, while it is possible to point to examples of this nature, little is known concerning the system utilised, or the ownership and operation of such an organisation. While more detailed knowledge of this would greatly assist the present analysis, it is nevertheless possible to attempt some provisional 'grounded speculation' as to how this more efficient and standardized reporting would effect the adequacy of the evidence. The consequences of this advance to a more standardized form of reporting are likely to have been at least two-fold. Firstly, the extent to which local issues would emerge would be that much more limited - the "insights" which local reports contained would be lost. For, as noted, the less direct the observation, the relatively less adequate the description is. Secondly, it may be that such reporting would be less "involved" - in terms of identification with particular issues - but this, in itself, is no guarantee of a concomitant increase in the degree of detachment.\textsuperscript{85}

During the inter-war years several newspapers are known to have been owned by individuals or family businesses - the Tillotsons of Bolton who owned large sections of the Lancashire press, being one such example.\textsuperscript{86} The importance of establishing this and the editorship of the newspaper lies in gaining an understanding of the policies adopted by different sections of the sporting press over time. Thus, as Mason observes, the \textit{Athletic News} made strenuous attempts to justify the initial development of professionalism in football in the 1880's.\textsuperscript{87} Little is known, however,

\textsuperscript{85} See Chapter Seven.
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about how and in what ways these attitudes towards professionalism and professionalization were affected by the social positions of the owner(s) and editor(s) of that journal. As the chapter examining the emergence of football spectating as a social problem reveals, however, writers such as Ensor and Edwardes were as vociferous in their condemnation of the incipient professionalization of football as the Athletic News was in defending it. 88

At another level, particular matches prompted different regional interpretations by the sporting press. In Sheffield, in 1905, a Birmingham player was reported to have been attacked by a local spectator. While the Birmingham press were strident in their criticism, the Sheffield press tended to emphasise the misdeeds of the player. 89 Similarly, the Birmingham Daily Mail had concluded in 1900 that:

"The Lancashire press have grossly misrepresented the McClure incident at Birmingham last Saturday. Here is one report: "Garratty was knocked down, and while on the grass he kicked the Rovers half-back. The outcome was that on Garratty rising both men came to blows, and McClure was ordered off the field, the Referee's decision being greeted with groans." How does this tally with the official report of the Referee? "McClure was ordered off the field for striking Wheldon who had been knocked over and was regaining his feet." The Referee also adds that he interviewed McClure after the match and that the player stated that when Wheldon was on the ground he kicked him, and that he received a blow from Wheldon's elbow under his chin which caused him to lose his temper, and then he struck Wheldon, which he was very sorry for. A full enquiry has already been instituted." 90

This example indicates the possible extent to which the local press would be supportive of the club of their own town. It also opens up a related question, which the Millwall FC case study reveals, namely, whether local newspapers, have, over time, both "amplified" in some ways

88 See Chapter Five.
89 Birmingham Daily Mail 9th December 1905.
90 Birmingham Daily Mail 27th January 1900.
and "deamplified" in others the nature and extent of spectator misconduct. In this context, though the previous example refers to a case of player violence, it is apparent that the Birmingham press were at pains to downplay the extent of the involvement of McClure, the Birmingham player. In contrast, the Lancashire press appear to have emphasised or amplified the role of the Birmingham player.

Examples of this nature can be replicated throughout the development of football. Such regional variation, however, will be more fully examined, in relation to specific cases and general themes, within the context of the case study of Millwall FC. These facets are the more visible examples of the construction of news by the press. If the analysis was left at this stage, however, as in Mason's case, then it would have limitations. Subtler dimensions of the treatment of football as a spectator sport by the press would remain unexplored. It is in this area, in particular, that the analysis must strive to establish the adequacy of the evidence utilised.

Support in this connection can be drawn from Stuart Hall's insightful study of the ideological base of press accounts of football hooliganism. As he expresses it:

"The media provide the principal source of information about this problem for the vast majority of the public. It is therefore worth asking what the nature of that information is - how it is constructed, what it highlights, what it leaves out." 92

What is being argued here is that an analysis must make problematic the reports located in newspapers. Analysis of the quantitative and qualitative aspects of the treatment of football by the press, over time, must consider what is more usually termed the 'objective condition' and

91 See Chapter Seven.
92 Hall, "The Treatment of Football Hooliganism in the Press" p. 15.
the 'subjective definition' in a way which recognises their reciprocal and integrated nature. By conceiving of social problems in this manner, a more adequate grasp of the evidence is possible and hence the present study can avoid, to a greater extent, erroneous interpretations. As a result, particular features and perceived trends in the development of football as a spectator sport can be more readily understood. Dunning and Murphy have made a similar observation in tackling this problem:

"One difficulty in this connection is posed by the fact that the periodicity of crowd disorderliness at football might be a question either of the phenomenon itself or alternatively of official and public perceptions of football spectators and perhaps of large working class congregations generally. Furthermore, the "phenomenal" and "perceptual" levels of the problem - i.e. crowd disorderliness as a form of behaviour in contrast to the perception of such behaviour by the media and officialdom - might be directly related and interacting or, alternatively, they might be entirely unrelated or related only indirectly...

While no further elaboration will be attempted here, this way of conceptualising of social problems in general will be repeatedly utilised in relation to specific cases and themes which are encountered in the substantive section of this thesis.

D. Summary

During the course of the analysis presented in this chapter, reference has been made to the need both to examine perspectives on popular culture and leisure, and, the process by which the researcher ascertains the adequacy of the evidence utilised. In relation to the first of these issues, the work of Stedman Jones and Eileen and Stephen Yeo was seen as relevant. At that point, it was argued that these researchers were correct to highlight how the "well-trodden routes" of and the "ways of seeing" popular culture and leisure reflect, to an extent, ideological bias which devalues working
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class lifestyles and denies the contribution of the working class to the making of their culture. Crucial in this regard was the conception of the making of the historical process: for these researchers, as the work of Humphries confirms, the historical process has traditionally been seen in terms of "social control" and as at the mercy of entrepreneurs and other, similarly powerful groups. However, their own analyses do not adequately conceptualize the balance between freedom and constraint in the making of the historical process. Furthermore, the fact that their analyses veer towards one of what Hall has termed the "unacceptable poles" in analyses of popular cultures, negates, to an extent, their contribution. Such an observation links to a second reservation which the present study has, namely, that their blanket dismissal of archival evidence and the perceived inability of researchers to get at 'how it really was' goes too far. True, as Peter Burke has remarked, one is dealing with an "elusive quarry," but such elusiveness should not dismay the researcher. An "oblique approach" to the study of popular culture is possible and in this connection, a framework, based on the writing of Norbert Elias, was expounded, in order to ascertain the relative adequacy of the evidence utilised. In this way, whilst striving to maximize the level of detachment and to use theory and observation in a constantly interpenetrating and hopefully illuminating way, the present study seeks to be in keeping with the analysis offered by Elias when he wrote:

"....In the more developed sciences the main yardstick is the relationship of newer findings to older available knowledge. This is not something which can be expressed in static polarities like 'true' or 'false', but only by demonstrating the difference between old and new; this becomes apparent through the dynamics of scientific processes, in the course of which theoretical and empirical knowledge becomes more extensive, more correct, and more adequate." 97

96 Burke, Popular Culture and Early Modern Europe p. 78.
97 Elias, What is Sociology? p. 53.
It is by means of such a perspective that an attempt will be made in what follows to construct a more adequate account of football hooliganism and changes in its forms, rates and 'reception' over time, than has been achieved by other contributors to the field.
CHAPTER THREE

FOOTBALL, LEISURE AND POPULAR CULTURE: A DEVELOPMENTAL ANALYSIS OF A VIOLENT MILIEU

The analysis attempted in the present chapter seeks to discern and locate the folk antecedents of the modern football within the general culture of nineteenth-century working class leisure - noting both the changes wrought by the ongoing clash over its character and the continuity resulting from the relatively obdurate nature of facets of popular culture. In this way, the analysis is attempting to explain how the emergence of football spectating as a social problem was produced and reproduced partly as a result of the way in which the game developed out of such earlier social formations.

In order to accomplish this task, it is necessary to adopt a developmental perspective. The adoption of such a perspective sensitises the researcher to the fact that, in order to discern and locate the folk antecedents of the modern game within the general culture of nineteenth-century working class leisure, it is vital to take into account two main aspects of social development. Firstly, the pervasive influence of the structured processes which were at work needs to be recognised. Secondly, the importance of the cultural struggle which was evident in the nineteenth century, itself both a reflection and reinforcement of the structured processes referred to, must also be grasped. Further elaboration of these two aspects will help clarify their significance.

The development of a society, as argued earlier, stems from the interweaving of innumerable individual acts or intentions out of which something emerges which was neither planned nor intended by any single individual. These intermeshing processes proceed blindly and in an unplanned manner, yet are, nevertheless, structured. As far as these structured processes are concerned, the researcher is dealing with states of balance between two
opposing tendencies in such figurations - the tendency to remain as before and the tendency to change.\(^1\) In order to understand both the changes wrought by the struggle over the character of popular culture and the elements of continuity in this regard it is necessary to explore the pattern of these structured processes more deeply.

To say that processes of social development proceed blindly and are unplanned is not to deny that particular groups may seek to control aspects of them. In commenting on the development of the processes of restraint and self-control, Elias indirectly considered the possibility of such attempts to shape its outcome. He wrote:

".....The restraint and self-control characteristic of all phases of civilisation up to now, result not merely from the necessity for each individual to co-operate constantly with many others; they are no less determined by the split of society into upper and lower classes.....

If the outline of these processes is followed over centuries, we can see a clear tendency for standards of living and conduct to be equalized and contrasts levelled out. In each of the waves of expansion which occur when the mode of conduct of a small circle spreads to larger rising classes, two phases can be clearly distinguished: a phase of colonization or assimilation in which the lower and larger outsider class is still clearly inferior and governed by the example of the established upper group which, intentionally or unintentionally, permeates it with its own pattern of conduct, and a second phase of repulsion, differentiation or emancipation, in which the rising group gains perceptibly in social power and self-confidence, and in which the upper group is forced into increased restraint and isolation, and the contrasts and tensions in society are increased.

Here, as always, both tendencies, equalisation and distinction, attraction and repulsion, are certainly present in both of these phases; these relationships too are fundamentally ambivalent. But in the first phase.....the tendency for the upper class to colonize the lower and for the lower to copy the upper is more pronounced. In the second phase, when the social power of the lower group is increasing while that of the upper group declines, the self-consciousness of both groups increases with their rivalry, with a tendency to emphasize differences and - as far as the upper class is concerned - to consolidate them. Contrasts between the classes increase, the walls grow higher."\(^2\)

\(^{1}\) See Introduction.
Significantly, for Elias, the development of restraint and self-control is marked by two main phases. Firstly, a phase of colonisation or assimilation in which the upper classes, intentionally or otherwise, permeate the lower classes with their own pattern of conduct and the lower classes copy their 'masters.' Secondly, and in contrast to the phase characterised by what Elias termed 'attraction,' a phase of 'repulsion' occurs where the upper classes seek to emphasise the differences between their codes of conduct and those of rising groups, and thereby maintain their distinctiveness, prestige and power. It is argued here that the transformation in popular culture which has occurred in Britain since the early nineteenth century and indeed, the 'cultural struggle' in general which took place in this connection is, in large part, explicable in this way. That is, that the narrowing of the limits of what was and is considered to be publically acceptable and the concomitant proliferation and tightening of constraints on people's behaviour is understandable in the terms spelled out by Elias.  

As a result of grasping aspects of social development such as these, it is argued that the task of locating the folk antecedents of modern football within the general culture of nineteenth century working class leisure and, in turn, the explanation of the emergence of football spectating as a social problem, can be more adequately tackled. Before substantiation of this is attempted, it is first necessary to spell out the format of the present chapter.

In order to examine how many of the values that underpin modern football spectating, and the perception by outsiders of such spectating, have their roots in earlier social formations, the analyses focuses on three areas. Firstly, the characteristics of folk football, as identified by Elias
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and Dunning, are scrutinised and connections are made to the phenomenon of football hooliganism of the present day. Secondly, recreations in general are analysed and since, as Malcolmson is correct to assert, such recreations arose directly out of the 'fabric of common interests and common sentiments among working people themselves,' attention is also given to popular culture. Finally, an attempt is made to analyse how the changing balance between continuity and change with respect to aspects of the recreational forms of popular culture finds expression in the incipient modernisation and the modernisation of football.

A. Continuity and Change in Folk Football

Dating back to at least the fourteenth century when "football" was the name given to some among a whole range of "folk games," such activities represent the roots from which rugby and soccer emerged. While the development of these folk games from the 1300's up to the nineteenth century is itself of sociological interest, the present study is concerned primarily with the period from about 1800 onwards. In order to clarify the developmental relationship between folk football and the modern phenomenon of football hooliganism, it is necessary to consider two main features of folk football. Firstly, attention will be given to the characteristics of folk football and its place in popular culture. In this context, the features which the behaviour involved in folk football and football hooliganism have in common will be noted. Secondly, consideration will be given to the processes which led, firstly, to the decline of folk football, and secondly, to the incipient modernisation of the game. In this way, analysis can be undertaken of how, while many of the more gregarious features of folk football were more
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or less effectively controlled, the mores which underpinned them continued to be produced and reproduced over time in specific contexts. That is, such mores, though influenced by upper and middle class attempts to colonise popular culture, did not always and everywhere immediately succumb to the attack by more powerful groups. In fact, these mores continued to have meaning for those involved and eventually found expression in the modernised versions of folk football e.g. soccer and rugby, which developed in the latter part of the nineteenth century. At this point, it is appropriate to consider the characteristics of folk football and to attempt to outline some dominant features of it.

Folk football - the matrix out of which both Association Football and Rugby developed - was a conglomeration of loosely organised activities based on traditional customs. In considering its characteristics, it would be unwise to ignore the fact that, as in the case of sports more generally, its development did not simply involve changes internal to the sports per se, but rather, reflected and reproduced the structure and dynamics of the wider social context.7

In order to probe the peculiar characteristics of folk football, it is useful to view them by contrast to the modern forms. Thus examination reveals that the organisation of folk football, its rules and format were much looser compared to its modern counterparts. Scrutiny of contemporary records also reveals that the participants - and it is important again to note that the distinction between participants and spectators was blurred - exhibited a higher degree of emotional spontaneity in the "play-fight." Indeed, the manner of playing folk football was marked by a tradition of physical fighting with relatively few restraints. Those which existed were derived from local customs not from centrally instituted formal rules, the

7 Ibid.
development of which is indicative of an increase in socially demanded self-control. As Dunning and Sheard express it:

"These games were....spontaneous, often ad hoc affairs, characterised by traditions of physical fighting. Such restraints as they contained were imposed by custom rather than elaborate formal regulations which have to be learned from an early age and which require players to exercise a high degree of self-control. As a result, the basic game pattern - their character as between groups, the open enjoyment of excitement akin to that aroused in battle, the riotousness and relatively high level of socially tolerated physical violence - was everywhere the same." 8

But why were such 'ad hoc affairs' characterised by 'traditions of physical fighting'? How was it that "the basic game pattern" emphasised an "enjoyment of excitement akin to that aroused in battle" and that the 'relatively' high level of physical violence involved was socially tolerated? Dunning and Sheard make reference in this connection to Elias' conception of the civilising process as providing a guide to explanation. They write:

"These folk games were rough and wild, closer to 'real' fighting than modern sports....Injury was frequent, built into the structure of a type of games which reflected, on the one hand, the violent tenor of life in society at large and on the other, the comparatively low 'threshold or repugnance' with regard to witnessing and engaging in violent acts which, as Elias has suggested, is characteristic of people in a society which stands at an earlier stage in a 'civilising process' than our own." 9

But are Elias, Dunning and Sheard correct? Was the societal context in which folk football was located marked by a "violent tenor of life"10 and did the types of violence that were preponderant take, on balance, the form of what Dunning has termed "Affective" violence? The characterisation they offer of the tenor of life in pre-industrial and early industrial Britain is, in fact, borne out by other research. In arguing that working class communities became 'less violent and less spontaneous,' between 1780 and 1830, and that the passing of mortal combat for prize money should not
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be lamented, E.P. Thompson also acknowledged that, in the late 1790's and early 1800's, a central desire of the upper and middle classes regarding those below them in the social scale was to 'tame the ferocity of their unsubdued passions, to repress the excessive rudeness of their manners.'

In similar fashion, Bailey observes that:

"Popular leisure was public and gregarious, and both its great and small occasions were heavily bound by the prescriptive ties of communal custom reinforced by a powerful oral tradition. The general good humour of the common people at play was punctuated at fairly regular intervals by the rituals of violence and excess: cruelty to animals and other kinds of brutality were commonplace as entertainment, and certain major holidays evoked the ancient licence of carnival when all social restraints on the human appetite were lifted and eating, drinking, fighting and love-making were celebrated in orgiastic fashion." 12

Though popular recreations were marked by eruptions of violence and the people involved exercised a comparatively low degree of emotional restraint, such activities were located in a context in which the authorities - pace the attempts documented by Storch 13 and Delves 14 - found difficult to intervene and regulate the behaviour involved. Additionally, as Dunning and Sheard argue, another factor played a significant part which only emerges when an analysis makes use of an 'sociogenetic methodology': namely, the emergence of a specific social configuration which protected folk football against its enemies. 15 More specifically, they argue, sections of the aristocracy and gentry were, for a time, involved in these games as patrons, organizers and direct participants, and by their very involvement, acted as its guardians. According to Dunning and Sheard:

".....The emergence of a social configuration.....enabled the ruling classes to retain a degree of independence from the monarchical state. This........enabled them to resist total absorption into court society and to retain a life-style containing strong rural elements and with a heavy emphasis on outdoor pursuits....."

15 Ibid.
Consequently, it was outside the context or the court, namely on their country estates, in rural villages and in the public schools that the more elastic, less rigid stylized and ritualised antecedents of modern sport grew up. 16

As a result of their involvement, the aristocracy and gentry were able, to an extent, to protect folk football from the attacks of the rising middle classes. But this situation was not to persist for too long into the nineteenth century. To state this, however, is to advance the analysis too far. At this point it is necessary to sum up the findings so far presented.

As argued the characteristics of folk football centred around traditions of physical fighting involving relatively few restraints. Such restraints were imposed by custom rather than by highly elaborate formal regulations. Folk football was centrally concerned with "struggle" - a struggle of a communal and intensely emotional nature. As will be documented later, such characteristics have proved to be, to a greater or less extent, persistent features of football spectating since the foundation of the Football League. By adopting a comparative approach, Dunning and Sheard have pointed out that participating in and spectating at football in the 1880's and 1890's was, relative to their undifferentiated equivalents in folk football, more "civilised." But the "break" was not complete. It is important to note that the issue is of the relative nature of this transition. An explanation for this transition, noting the changes in and yet the persistence, in soccer participation and spectating in the twentieth century, of the values that permeated these older contests can be found via an examination of the decline of folk football that traces the way in which contemporary analogues of aspects of these earlier contests have continued to be produced and reproduced.

16 Dunning and Sheard, Barbarians, Gentlemen and Players pp 269-270.
As was suggested earlier, the transition from the folk to the modern forms of football reflected and reproduced the structure and dynamics of the wider social context. An understanding of this transition can only be obtained by tracing in some detail the particular pattern of development which occurred. In considering this issue, Dunning and Sheard claim that the period, 1750 to 1850, witnessed a "civilising spurt."

That is, they maintain, an advance occurred in people's 'threshold of repugnance' with regard to engaging in and witnessing violent acts. They quote in support of this contention the analysis of Harold Perkin. He wrote:

"Between 1780 and 1850 the English ceased to be one of the most aggressive, brutal, rowdy, outspoken, riotous, cruel and bloodthirsty nations in the world and became one of the most inhibited, polite, orderly, tender-minded, prudish and hypocritical. The transformation diminished cruelty to animals, criminals, lunatics, and children (in that order); suppressed many cruel sports and games, such as bull-baiting and cock-fighting, as well as innocent amusements, including many fairs and wakes....."

As will be shown, this transformation involved an attack upon the whole gamut of working-class leisure activities, and tracing the form and effects of this onslaught forms a focal point of the present chapter.

Malcolmson documents this transformation in similar fashion, though along with Perkin, he lacks the sort of overall theoretical perspective which Dunning and Sheard utilise. Despite this, what he writes is worthy of quoting at some length:

"Before about 1750 most gentlemen had been prepared (at the least) to tolerate the common people's recreational customs; indeed, gentlemen often patronized and supported, or even sponsored, certain festivities and sporting events. Many gentlemen, with their respect for antiquity, were favourably disposed to tradition, to ritual and ceremony, to robust and manly sports, to festive indulgences, (as long as they were not too disorderly or expensive), to old, time-honoured customs; they were little inclined, during these years of vehement anti-Puritanism, to meddle with the people's affairs on the grounds of
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religion or reforming morality. However, from around the mid-eighteenth century these easy going attitudes were noticeably in retreat. Customs which had previously been generally accepted came to be questioned and often vigorously condemned, and this newly mobilised hostility could hardly fail to have a significant impact on the recreational practices of plebeian society, especially when the strictures came from legislators and magistrates, employers and zealous clergymen. There is, indeed, much evidence of an increasing willingness among people of authority to intervene actively in opposition to these customary practices - and some of their attacks certainly succeeded. By around 1800 the undermining of popular recreations was already well underway, and the process was to continue for at least another half-century. The concern for moral 'improvement,' refined manners, and orderly conduct steadily grew in prominence; these 'virtues' were accorded appreciating value by polite society; and consequently popular and genteel tastes became increasingly dissociated from each other. Upper and lower class standards for evaluating recreational behaviour came to have little in common - considerably less certainly, than they had had around 1700 - and the customs that the people continued to honour were increasingly regarded from above as primitive, disorderly, often immoral, and usually at odds with certain elementary standards of social propriety."

Although he provides valuable documentary evidence and useful explanatory insights, Malcolmson does not go as far as Dunning and Sheard in examining this transformation or what they call "civilising spurt." The fruitfulness of their approach lies in their recognition that this process reflected and reproduced several changes in the structure and dynamics of the wider social structure. Thus, while the connections they trace are complex, what they argue is that the process usually referred to as "industrialisation" centrally involved a change in the balance of power between classes, and thus Dunning and Sheard argue, had significant implications for folk football. More particularly, they suggest, the power chances of bourgeois groups increased and with this change in the balance of power between classes, the aristocracy and gentry felt less secure and subsequently withdrew their traditional involvement and support from folk football and comparable activities. Concomitantly with this, the state's monopoly of the legitimate use of force increased and the power of the

authorities to intervene in activities which groups with the greater access to state power were opposed was enhanced. As Dunning and Sheard put it:

"...[the decline of folk football] did not occur simply because people chose to abandon folk football or were constrained to give it up by circumstances which arose in conjunction with the balance reached in the early nineteenth century between advance and regression in social standards. In part, it was forcibly suppressed.....the authorities had tried for centuries to abolish folk-games. During the nineteenth century, they began to meet with success for two principal reasons. Firstly because members of the aristocracy and gentry withdrew their support; and secondly because an improvement occurred in means of social control." 19

Dunning and Sheard's explanation of the demise of folk football thus involves consideration of the shift in the balance of power connected to the changes that occurred in conjunction with industrialisation. As part of this process, improving means of transport and communication, and institutional developments such as the introduction of the police, are held to have increased the power of the authorities to intervene and, at the same time, to have enhanced the monopoly over the use of violence by the state. What they do not refer to is the fact that a 'moral crusade' entangled with 'class-cultural' conflict occurred concomitantly with this "civilising spurt," a process in which such groups as the Evangelicals and the "rational recreationalists" strove to transform the manners and culture of the masses. The result, as Dunning and Sheard express it, was that:

".....By the end of the nineteenth century, the folk forms of football were virtually extinct. However, by that time, Rugby and soccer had arisen to take their place....People who found the roughness of the old forms distasteful or who were prevented from playing by the new-found power of the authorities, were presented with alternative models more consistent with the demand for greater orderliness and more 'civilised' behaviour characteristic of an advanced industrial society." 20

It is on these aspects of the process, those of covert persuasion and overt oppression that the following examination of the development of

19 Dunning and Sheard, Barbarians, Gentlemen and Players p. 41
20 Ibid p. 44.
of popular culture in general and popular recreations in particular must focus.

Though Dunning and Sheard are correct to assert that the folk forms of football were, by the end of the nineteenth century, 'virtually extinct,' it is important to bring out more clearly than they do that the transition was not complete. Some folk variants of football "survived" - in modified form - in such places as Hallaton and Ashbourne. More particularly, however, the mores which underpinned the earlier versions continued to persist in other aspects of popular culture - including participation in and spectating at football as late as the 1890's. In order to understand why the process should have taken this form, greater attention must be given to popular culture in general and the recreational forms of this culture in particular. It is to these wider aspects of the problem that the present analysis now turns.

B. Continuity and Change in Popular Culture and Popular Recreations in Britain in the Nineteenth Century

Justification for the assertion that the mores underpinning folk football persisted and found expression in the form of the values underpinning football participation and spectating in the 1880's and 1890's can be presented in the context of an analysis of themes which emerged in the course of the examination of popular culture and popular recreations undertaken for this part of the present thesis. Firstly, though attempts were made by more powerful groups in the nineteenth century to control popular culture, and in many ways these were successful, they did not succeed in abolishing those aspects of this culture to which they were opposed. In other words, the relative power of the working classes and hence their ability to contribute to the making of the historical process ensured that their incorporation into the hegemonic culture of the ruling classes would
not be total. Secondly, the relatively obdurate nature of popular
culture also ensured that the mores which persisted continued to have
meaning for those involved; hence they were actively supported.
Thirdly, the "tentacles of respectability" which groups such as the
rational recreationalists were spreading out into working class neighbour­
hoods involved a relative shift in a "civilising" direction, not a com­
plete break: as will be documented, the versions of soccer and rugby
which appeared still contained, as Dunning and Sheard argue, elements of
the "play-fight" which they outlined in relation to folk football. Before
consideration is given to the precise characteristics of and transform­
ations in popular culture that occurred in the nineteenth century,
attention must be given to an analysis of the themes relating to popular
recreations just outlined.

1. Popular Recreations

The repressive and reforming tendencies discussed in the previous
section were not directed solely against folk football: in the nineteenth
century, the whole gamut of popular recreations was perceived as problem­
atic by different upper and middle-class groups. Folk football, however,
along with other similarly public working class leisure activities, could,
by virtue of its gregarious character, be more easily abolished and, in
time, such leisure forms proved susceptible to the 'civilising' influences
that were percolating down the social scale. However, many aspects of
traditional popular culture were withdrawn from the public arena and
this can be interpreted, in Eliasian terms, as being symptomatic of the
process of "pushing behind the scenes" those things considered "distasteful"
by "civilised" men, and possibly the participants themselves. Storch has
written in this connection that:
"In the case of activities which had either traditionally been centred on the pub or had been forced to migrate behind their doors the police operated at something of a disadvantage; with little trouble gambling, illegal drinking, brutal sports and prizefighting could be shielded from their eyes and often from their knowledge. In the case of the traditional popular fete however, the terms of the situation were reversed. By definition popular celebrations were public affairs and had to come off in the open. Here the police were both willing and able to actively intervene confident of achieving a great measure of success. In fact they had to intervene in this area both they and the magistrates were politically very much on the spot. Respectable citizens might have heard whispers or rumours of dogfights prizefights or other such activities in the locality, but were rarely in a position to witness them. It was easier to convince such people that after all the police were acting in such matters and that the situation was under control. It was quite otherwise in the case of football through the town, stang-riding, Guy Fawkes celebrations or other highly visible lower-class fetes. Either the police acted to suppress them or the resultant loss of face could be severe. Failure to stop these activities could leave the police open to the charge that they were failing in one of their primary missions, the preservation of municipal order and decorum." 21

Though he does not make use of the theoretical framework associated with Elias's concept of the "civilising process," Storch reinforces the analysis offered earlier. But why were these lower class activities considered so troublesome and by whom were they perceived as posing a threat? As already noted, industrialisation, urbanisation and the related process of embourgeoisement had and were continuing to lead to profound changes in English society. 22

In this context, even though the labour force was being more "effectively disciplined" than its predecessors had been, e.g. by the harsh reality of factory life, a new-found "freedom" stemming from the compartmentalising of life, above all, from the growing separation of the "work" and "leisure" spheres - a separation inherent in the process of industrialisation which was occurring in the rapidly expanding towns - was simultaneously resulting. Indeed, the very expansion of towns decreased the effective social control which was possible in the close knit communities of pre-industrial society.

22 Dunning and Sheard, Barbarians, Gentlemen and Players p. 78.
But there were other, historically more specific, forces at work as well. In fact, nineteenth century urban working class leisure was thrust onto the stage amid the alarm expressed about what was seen as Napoleonic intrigue, Chartist insurrection and the deeper and more lasting process, the "civilising spurt" or transformation identified earlier. Further elaboration of the latter process is, however, still required.

The transformation in the codes of conduct which governed popular culture which began occurring around 1750, also found expression in popular recreations. This transformation, as argued earlier, is explicable with reference to the structured processes which were at work in British society at that time: the 'civilising spurt' referred to above is one example of such structured processes. But to say that this 'civilising spurt' proceeded blindly and was unplanned is not to overlook the fact, as Elias himself acknowledged, that as part and parcel of this structured process, the upper classes sought, in phases of "colonisation," to permeate the lower classes with their own patterns of behaviour and, in phases of "repulsion," to emphasise the differences between their codes of conduct and those of the "lower orders" as a means of emphasising their distinctiveness and hence of retaining their power. Recognition of this is fundamental to an understanding of the cultural struggle which found expression in popular recreation in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries.

During the early part of the nineteenth century, in fact, it is clear that, in Elias's terms, a phase of colonization occurred. The leisure of the urban working class was perceived by contemporary members of the higher social classes as in many ways both socially subversive and morally

23 For further explanation see the analysis contained in section C of the present chapter.
offensive. For these higher social classes, therefore, there was a need co-relatively to counter the threat to civil order which they perceived as inherent in many popular leisure activities and to reform the manners of the people. According to Storch:

"The impulse both to moral and social reform in this period was in turn pervaded and conditioned by another related and deeply disturbing problem: the vital question of the preservation - in the first instance - of a stable pattern of civil and moral order congenial to local elites in a fluid and turbulent urban context... These apprehensions reflected a deep concern over the absence of a commonly affirmed array of values linking the different classes in society....Equally, the intense interest shown by the middle classes in what the working classes did after their release from the salutrious discipline of Mill or workshop, reflected anxiety about the social implications of unsupervised working class leisure... All middle class reform movements concerned with the altering of popular leisure and culture evoked two images of the working man: as he was and how he might become after 'treatment.' The goal was clear: the English working man was to be morally sanitised (and politically neutralised in the process) by an extensive reworking of his character structure." 24

Of these higher social classes, it was the middle classes in particular, within what Storch terms a "fluid and turbulent urban context," who perceived themselves as forming small bastions of "gentility" and "civilisation" in a sea of restlessness. At that stage, they lived in relatively close proximity with the working "masses" and, in consequence, perceived them increasingly as a threat. The issue at stake, as Storch and Delves25 note, was the lifestyle of the working 'masses.' The old paternal relationship was gone; the rupture which had sounded the death knell for folk football also had wider consequences. In this respect, Storch has provided some insight into the developments which occurred in those years. For him:

"The urban middle classes knew all about this rupture which, in addition to being social and cultural, was also political, and made strenuous (and sincere) efforts to recreate new patterns


25 See Delves, "Popular Recreations and Their Enemies" p. 2.
of deference and patronage either in the context of the workplace itself, or by reaching out into the working-class neighbourhood with conventicles of respectability and domestic missions. The object was to create a new kind of urban paternalism which would bypass, ignore and refuse to compromise with the old popular culture." 26

In this context, two points need to be made. Firstly, though strenuous efforts were made, as Storch himself acknowledges, 'only in some areas and to a limited extent' did such an enterprise succeed.27 As a result, the "survival" in popular recreations of aspects of the old culture was ensured. Indeed, this relates to the second point which needs to be made. While there were some extremist groups involved in these strenuous efforts to create a new urban paternalism - such as the Sunday Sabbath movement - the "rational recreationalists" attempted, by and large, to adapt traditional recreational patterns in a relatively "civilising" direction. The values underpinning traditional forms of popular culture were thus able to find expression in the new forms of recreation which were developing - albeit in a more controlled and circumscribed manner. But why did these efforts only succeed in a limited way? An explanation of this lies in tracing the distinguishing characteristics of and transformations then taking place within popular culture by means of examining the relative power potential of the particular groups involved. In commenting on the transformation which is occurring now, Hall has provided a framework which can assist in an explanation of the phenomenon currently under question. He observes:

"The cultural industries do have the power constantly to rework and reshape what they represent and, by repetition and selection, to impose and implant such definitions of ourselves as fit more easily the descriptions of the dominant or preferred culture. That is what the concentration of cultural power - the means of culture-making in the heads of the few - actually means. These definitions don't have the power to occupy our minds; they

26 Storch, "Persistence and Change in Nineteenth Century Popular Culture" pp 2-3.
27 Ibid p. 3.
don't function on us as if we are blank screens. But they do occupy and rework the interior contradictions of feeling and perception in the dominated classes; they do find or clear a space of recognition in those who respond to them. Cultural domination has real effects - even if these are neither all-powerful nor all-inclusive. If we were to argue that these imposed forms have no influence, it would be tantamount to arguing that the culture of the people can exist as a separable enclave, outside the distribution of cultural power and the relations of cultural force. I do not believe that."

The analysis proposed by Hall is similar in certain respects to that offered by figuralational sociology. The emphasis is on the interrelated nature of power and cultural development. In this way, Hall is correct to assert that the 'cultural industries have the power to reshape what they represent' but that its consumers are not blank sheets on which to record whatever those in control of these industries wish. Equally, however, the 'culture of the people' cannot exist as an autonomous entity; it is caught up in a whole series of figuralational nexuses and sequences of change in these. The transformation of popular recreation in the nineteenth century can be understood in similar terms. The transformation was not one-sided but rather involved a struggle between groups whose power potential was different. No 'clear victories' were won, though there was, as argued earlier, a marked narrowing of the limits of the behaviour that would be accepted in public. With this stress on the relational nature of cultural development, how is it possible to analyse what popular culture and its recreational forms in the nineteenth century comprised and to account for the processes of change that occurred within it?

Echoing the debate considered in Chapter Two; Delves has argued that the prevailing conception of this culture is dominated by a negative image. He stresses, in keeping with Stedman Jones and Cunningham, the ability of the working classes to contribute to the making of their culture - a feature which, it is claimed, is not reflected in the archives. Thus, while the

---

28 Hall, "Notes on Deconstructing the 'Popular'" pp 232-233.
existence of brutal sports is acknowledged, Delves believes such activities have been extracted from their wider recreational context. As a result, he argues, there exists a false sense of what was representative. The question of whether a false sense of what was representative exists raises two issues which are important in accounting for the fluctuating balance between continuity and change in popular recreations in the nineteenth century. Firstly, the "significance" of popular disturbances needs to be interpreted. Secondly, the "socio-genesis" of people's actions needs to be accounted for.

While Elias, Dunning and Sheard are correct to point to the "violent tenor of life" which existed prior to and in the early stages of industrialisation, the "symbolic" nature of popular disturbances, as Thompson terms it, tends to be neglected in their writings. In examining the semi-organised and symbolic nature of the actions of the crowd, Thompson stresses the 'moral economy' of people's behaviour. In keeping with this, he seeks to interpret the actions of the participants from their perspective. Some elaboration of this perspective seems appropriate at this stage. For authors like Raymond Williams and E. P. Thompson, the term "culture" is central to the cultural theory which they work with. Seen as a "constitutive social process, creating specific and different ways of life," the task then is to describe the actual forms of popular practices and beliefs as experienced by the historical actors themselves. In this way, the dominance of the particular and the analysis of the concrete class experience of cultural forms is stressed. It

29 Delves, "Popular Recreations and Their Enemies" p. 11.
30 See Introduction.
31 Thompson, "The Moral Economy of the English Crowd in the Eighteenth Century".
32 Williams, The Long Revolution Chapter Two.
33 Ibid p. 57 See also Hobsbawn, Primitive Rebels: Studies in Archaic Forms of Social Movement
is thus argued, processes - and meanings - can be grasped which are beyond or beneath analytical distortions. In this context, however, it is useful to remind oneself of the observations made by Philip Abrams:

"The shaping of action by structure and transforming of structure by action both occur as processes in time. It is by seizing on that idea that history and sociology merge and that sociology becomes capable of answering our urgent questions about why the world is as it is; about why particular men and women make the particular choices they do and why they succeed or fail in their projects.

...Even in these small-scale social settings - teasing out historical processes, the sociology of becoming, is for the sociologist the best way of discovering the real relationship of structure and action, the structural conditioning of action and the effects of action on structure. What we discover when we treat small scale social settings in this way is merely a history in which ordinary individuals loom larger than usual and in which the detailed inter-dependence of the personal and the social is accordingly that much more easily seen." 34

The dilemmas which E. P. Thompson raises can, therefore, be resolved; we are not dealing simply with an either-or situation. It is possible to account for cultural change and to examine popular culture in terms of human agency and the processes of social structuring. While the probing of popular culture "as it really is" has been stressed - hence the attention given to the existence of a "violent tenor of life" in pre-industrial and early industrial Britain - and while it is important to seek out the symbolic nature of the actions of people and to interpret their actions from their perspective, the sociogenesis of these actions and the customs expressed in them must also be considered, that is, they must be located within an overall figuration. How do such observations relate to explaining the character of popular culture and the processes involved in the changing balance between continuity and change which occurred within it? Delves, in commenting on these issues in general and on what he perceived of as a

34 Abrams, Historical Sociology pp 3-7.
false representation of popular recreations, claimed:

"Undoubtedly there was much that was by today's standards violent and cruel in the most popular of recreations; the problem is to assess the importance of such activities in terms of their frequency, numbers involved and satisfactions derived as compared with other more elusive strands in the same recreational tradition which were more seldom the object of enquiry or conflict. In the words of E. P. Thompson we should not 'underestimate the creative culture - forming process from below.'" 35

Any such analysis, however, must be treated with some caution. While the present study readily accepts the notion of the "creative culture - forming process from below" - indeed, it is seen as essential to the analysis - Delves' observation may be significant only at what one might call a "perceptual" level: that is the middle-classes in the early nineteenth century may themselves have had a false or exaggerated sense of the threat to civil and moral order posed by working class leisure. In addition, by concentrating on the creative culture-forming process from below, the relational character of the structured processes to which reference has already been made can easily be neglected.

Storch, while acknowledging the line followed by Delves, also admits the factual existence of a violent milieu. He writes:

"It was above all at play that the worker was evoked as a kind of savage, an alien being with alien customs; a creature who would have to be morally reformed if whatever bonds of social cohesion there were, were to hold fast.

But beyond this, three decades of experience had demonstrated the intimate connection between popular fetes and the threat of disorder or even insurrection. Popular fetes were increasingly feared because they could so easily explode into sudden and seemingly meaningless violence, or into riot or protest." 36

In other words, however exaggerated the sense of anxiety felt by the middle classes, it was not without foundation. John Stevenson acknowledged in this regard:

35 Delves, "Popular Recreations and Their Enemies" p. 11.
Eighteenth-century England had a rich calendar of annual wakes, fairs, trade holidays, and popular festivals. From the perspective of the Victorian era, these events contributed to the 'disorderly' and riotous character of eighteenth and early nineteenth century life. A long campaign to regulate or abolish these activities accompanied their erosion under the impact of changing attitudes and conditions. The Victorian perception of popular celebrations as 'disorderly' was far from unfounded, but it was one which needs to be qualified. Although much of the fighting, quarrelling, and general rowdiness which accompanied many of these events can only be described as casual and accidental, there was also a sense in which they were an almost routine expression of conflicts between different groups or localities. Faction fighting has been called the principal pastime of young adults (usually males) in the early modern period. Faction fights between different parts of a town, between different villages and towns, between the men from rival counties, and between different occupational groups, provided not only an outlet for high spirits but also expressed an intense localism.  

The contention of the present thesis is that such "faction fighting" is exactly the link between the rowdyism of folk football and the spectator disorder surrounding soccer in the late nineteenth and twentieth centuries. The present analysis thus follows Cunningham's argument that some traditional mores did not merely 'survive,' in the sense of being produced and reproduced over time, but were maintained and to some extent transformed as part of this 'creative - culture-forming process.' Crucial, however, is the fact that these forms of behaviour were embedded in a social milieu that was in many ways not susceptible to the control and civilising influences of the state. Though Dunning and Sheard fail to probe the "symbolic" nature of folk football, agreement can be reached with them when they write that:

"Ritual and actual violence, we would like to suggest, is an almost inevitable concomitant of the meeting of groups characterized by mechanical solidarity. Such groups have been subjected to civilising pressure's externally, e.g. from the higher classes and the state, but their lack of internal differentiation means

38 Cunningham, Leisure in the Industrial Revolution See Introduction.
that they have not been subject endogenously to the pressures of multipolar controls to the same extent as other groups....

The behaviour of the so-called football hooligans, however, appears to be only marginally related to football....their behaviour appears to be more centrally bound up with traditional working class rivalries of a mechanical solidarity kind, such as those between North and South, London and the provinces, adjacent towns and sections of towns....Indeed, these formal, secondary play-fights....seem to be, in many ways, an urban counterpart of the old folk-contests with their expression of community rivalry and opportunity to pay off old scores. Such a parallel is not surprising if we were right to argue earlier that contemporary football hooliganism is largely rooted in the continued existence of social structures which generate close approximations to pure forms of mechanical solidarity." 40

It is, however, also important to note an inter-related issue. The less public dimensions of working class leisure, as Storch observed, remained largely unamenable to control by the police and to the 'civilising' agencies of the Evangelicals and 'Rational Recreationalists'. Indeed, the stress on physical prowess and manliness permeating these activities may have been subsequently reinforced by the "muscular Christianity" which developed in the second half of the nineteenth century and which found expression both in the curriculum of the elementary schools and in the modern forms of football - soccer and rugby. However, this is to advance the analysis too far. While these more general observations impinge directly on the issues being discussed in the present chapter, more specific attention must now be given to the character of popular culture and the transformations which occurred within that culture in the nineteenth century.

2. Popular Culture

In considering the first of these issues, some questions arise immediately: to what extent did popular culture involve violent pastimes and what was the nature of the satisfactions derived by the people from participating in and watching such pastimes? In this regard, Thompson, in contrast

40 Dunning and Sheard, Barbarians, Gentlemen and Players pp 284-285 For further discussion of this see Chapter Seven.
to some other social historians whose work was reviewed earlier, appears
to strike a more adequate balance in relation to the first of these
questions. He writes:

"To many men in the post-war generation, such as Lovett, it
seemed that it was the methodists who were uncouth and backward.
And this reminds us of the extreme difficulty in generalising as
to the moral tone and manners of working-class communities during
the industrial revolution. It is clear that between 1780 and 1830
important changes took place. The 'average' English working man
became more disciplined, more subject to the productive tempo of 'the
clock,' more reserved and methodical, less violent and less sponta-
taneous. Traditional sports were displaced by more sedentary
hobbies....

It is here that evaluation becomes more difficult. While
many contemporary writers, from Cobbett to Engels, lamented the
passing of old English customs, it is foolish to see the matter only
in idyllic terms. These customs were not all harmless or quaint....
The passing of Gin Lane, Tyburn Fair, orgiastic drunkenness, animal
sexuality and mortal combat for prize money in iron-studded clogs,
calls for no lament." 41

While detailed analysis of first-hand descriptions of the sorts of
customs referred to by Thompson lies outside the bounds of the present study,
the conclusions of various social historians cited in this section do
indicate the general trends in popular culture and recreation in nineteenth
century England. Indeed, according to the work of Richard Holt, similar
trends are evident in the development of sport in modern France. 42 He
comments:

"No history of modern sport should neglect....changes in the
behaviour of the young and their rites of violence. This is
because modern sport often proved to be both a means by which play
was civilised and an occasional outlet for atavistic ferocity. In
principle, the newly codified games of the late nineteenth century
prohibited gratuitous aggression in the name of skill and stamina;

41 Thompson, The Making of the English Working Class pp 450-451
Though a comparative analysis is also beyond the scope of the present
research, the importance of this dimension should not be under-estimated.
Further work, particularly on the spread of soccer and other sports
developed in the British context to mainland Europe and South America -
and the existence of forms of spectator disorder and popular disturbances
in those continents - would provide a valuable cross-cultural perspective
on such processes.
but in practice, twentieth-century sport has frequently generated openly violent and provocative behaviour from players and spectators. To imagine that rowdyism in sport is somewhat an abnormal, or even a pathological form of behaviour, shows how short our memories have become and how completely the traces of traditional culture have been expunged from official thinking. New games and contests with their elaborate rules concerning non-violence and fair competition provided a useful framework for physical recreation in an increasingly urbanised and technocratic society, but innovations such as these could hardly transform immemorial traditions of play at a stroke. A good deal of the old wine found its way into the new bottles." 43

While Holt's explanation for such "rowdyism" is not, in all respects, the same as that offered in the present thesis, his work does illustrate the existence of a phenomenon in mainland Europe similar to that which developed in nineteenth-century Britain.

From the evidence and analyses cited so far it seems that there is a fair measure of consensus on one major issue: namely, that a number of leisure activities of the working class in the early nineteenth century involved a higher degree of open violence than is characteristic of the leisure activities of their present day counterparts. Evidently they enjoyed such activities, experienced them as pleasurable and, as a result, it seems reasonable to conclude that the balance between "affective" and "instrumental" forms of violence in their lives veered towards the former. 44

A concomitant part of examining popular culture 'as it really was' is the need to trace the transformations which occurred within that culture. Attention must focus in this connection on: the particular middle-class groups who attempted to control and/or "civilise" the populace; which sections of the "masses" were most effectively "civilised" and/or "repressed;" and which groups managed, relatively, to escape these attempts, i.e. that were less amenable to "incorporation," "colonisation" and reform. In this

43 Ibid pp 133-134.
regard, Stuart Hall has made a pertinent comment on the issue of popular
culture in general:

"...What is essential to the definition of popular culture is
the relations which define 'popular culture' in a continuing tension
(relationship, influence and antagonism) to the dominant culture. It
is a conception of culture which is polarised around this cultural
dialectic. It treats the domain of cultural forms and activities as
a constantly changing field. Then it looks at the relations which
constantly structure this field into dominant and subordinate
formations. It looks at the process by which these relations of
dominance and subordination are articulated. It treats them as a
process: the process by means of which some things are actively
preferred so that others can be dethroned. It has at its centre the
changing and uneven relations of force which define the field of
culture - that is, the question of cultural struggle and its many
forms.....

Cultural struggle of course, takes many forms: incorporation,
distortion, resistance, negotiation, recuperation......We need to
expand and develop this rudimentary schema. The important thing is
to look at it dynamically: as an historical process." 45

In the cultural struggle of the nineteenth century, the fury of the
'rational recreationalists' - those members of middle-class groups primarily
captured up in and representative of the 'civilising spurt' referred to earlier -
was directed not only at the working classes, though they were the chief
targets, but also at those elements of the aristocracy and gentry still
involved in popular pastimes. Thompson noted in this regard that 'the
Evangelicals exhorted the upper classes to reform their own manners as an
element to the poor.' 46 It is the Evangelical movement, coupled with
'liberal recreationalists' - the latter wishing to foster activities for
the masses under middle class auspices - which composed the 'rational
recreationalists.' Indeed, the whole essence of rational recreation, with
its emphasis on 'regulated' and 'controlled' activities can be interpreted
in two ways. Firstly, as symptomatic of the 'civilising spurt' which was
evident in this period and, second as indicative of the more general

45 Hall, "Notes on Deconstructing the 'Popular'" pp 235-236.
narrowing of the forms of behaviour that were considered to be publically acceptable.47

The Evangelicals consisted of three main groupings— the Temperance movement, the Sunday Sabbath movement, and the Royal Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals. For Brian Harrison, the onslaught by these middle class groupings on traditional working class recreations can best be understood in terms of a culture-conflict model not a class one. Whereas the analysis so far presented is in broad agreement with Harrison, his analysis is somewhat lacking in the conception of class employed. The cultural struggle occurred over time, and involved divisions within and between classes, and, these divisions had no fixed boundaries. Harrison appears to utilise a conception of class which does not take this into account: it appears undifferentiated and too static. Despite this, Harrison is correct to stress the "traditional" nature of nineteenth century popular culture. In considering the RSPCA campaigns, he noted:

"By encouraging kindness to animals, the society hoped eventually to civilise manners, and hence to make the masses more receptive to religious instruction......

Although cruelty to animals certainly owed much to the cruelties of industrial exploitation, it is dangerously exhilarating and energizing to attribute all the evils of a society to a single relationship. Cruelty to animals stemmed partly from ancient rural customs and attitudes removable only through education; some form of Temperance and Humanitarian movement would have been needed in nineteenth century England even had Marx's utopia been realised." 48

As this process developed, the liberal recreationalists organised activities under their own auspices. In doing this, they were attempting to establish, in Bailey's terms, a "play-discipline" for the "lower orders" 49 and, at the same time, as Delves notes to "rationalise" their own recreational

47 Bailey, Leisure and Class in Victorian England Conclusion.
interests.  

The fears of the middle classes concerning social upheaval and moral degeneration found expression both in overt police controls and in the exercise of more covert civilising influences on traditional recreational pastimes. These led to their relative decline. As argued, however, this struggle was only part of a broader issue, namely middle class concern over the life-style of the working classes. In this regard, the work of Gatrell and Stevenson is of relevance. In his research, Gatrell considered the decline of violence in Victorian and Edwardian England and argued that this occurred as a consequence of the activities of religious, educational and environmental reformers. Gatrell puts it this way:

"In default of the closer study of Victorian violence which we sorely need, there is little we can do but concur in the general plausibility of the diagnosis implicit here; namely, that it did not decline in response to the deterrent effect of judicial action since the violent offender as an ideal type was least likely, for temperamental reasons, to pay heed to that deterrent pressure. If that be so, we are, like Chadwick, forced to explain the decline in terms of heavy generalisations about the 'civilising' effects of Religion, Education and environmental reform." 51

In similar fashion, Stevenson attempts to document what he terms the "transition to order." 52 In arguing that there was a definite trend away from violence and public disturbances from the mid-Victorian period onwards, Stevenson nevertheless noted:

"England did not suddenly change overnight from the disorders of the hungry forties into a perfectly peaceful and orderly land. Popular disturbances continued on a number of issues, notably over religion and ethnic conflicts, at election times, in labour disputes, and during political demonstrations in the capital...." 53

---
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Conspicuous by its absence in his analysis, however, is reference to the continued existence of disturbances surrounding popular recreations. Nevertheless, Stevenson rightly observes, although somewhat inadequately as he neglects to make any reference to the underlying structural changes, that such a trend was bound up with the attitudes and beliefs of the Victorians. The underlying structural changes in fact centred around what Elias has termed "state formation and the lengthening of inter­dependency chains," that is, in Britain during this period, i.e. the late eighteenth and early nineteenth century, the transformation from a less centralised and differentiated society to a relatively highly centralised and differentiated state society gathered momentum. Two factors are crucial in this regard. Firstly, there was an astonishing increase in the number of occupational groups and these groups became more functionally specialised yet integrated into wider networks. In fact, the urban-industrial division of labour was emerging. Concomitantly with this, however, as more and more people became interdependent, they also became more dependent on the centre for their co-ordination and integration. The structured process of state formation was developing.

The "decline" in violence - at least in particular forms of violence - of popular recreations in the nineteenth century was bound up with the structured processes referred to. As Stevenson acknowledges, this decline in violence was perceived by the Victorians themselves as one of the many signs of the 'social improvement' that was then occurring. But disturbances did continue and, periodically, gave rise to concern by the middle classes. It was in this context, particularly from around the 1860's, that the notion of the "dangerous classes" began to be employed. They were characterised as a "residuum," a notion which allowed the belief in continued improvement sought by Victorians to be sustained. As Stevenson observes:
"Thus when disturbances appeared in the capital in the 1860's, the dangerous classes provided an explanation for disorder which did not contradict the main tenets of 'improvement.' Violence was the product of a residuum which remained to be brought under the ameliorative influences of Victorian philanthropy." 54

Such a perception, Stevenson argues, was not self-deception and indeed persisted into the twentieth century. However, the structural sources underpinning both the continued existence of disorder - more pronounced in particular groups - and the overall transition to greater orderliness are not fully explored by Stevenson. It is to increasing our understanding of these underlying structural sources that the present analysis is directed.

In summing up, what observations can be offered in relation to the changing balance in the nineteenth century between continuity and change in both folk football and other aspects of popular culture? Storch has offered some pertinent observations in this connection:

"Any analysis grounded upon the notion of a mere response to the challenge of disorder loses its power to explain as soon as such questions are posed. Why the perpetuation of the typically bourgeois impulse to remould the inner man, to transform him morally, after the immense social crisis which lasted from Waterloo to the last Chartist petition had been weathered?

...What were the ultimate purposes of all this activity, and how can it be viewed under the rubric of social control? Certainly a number of formal mechanisms of manipulation and coercion were created in our period: one need go no further than the implantation of the new poor law or new police....On the other hand, there was a greater emphasis on the need for the diffusion of a standard set or array of norms which might (and should) be shared by individuals, across class lines and throughout society.

It might be thought that the early Victorian middle classes were pulled in two ways when they were contemplating the great task of civilising and taming the masses. Some indeed did not view the road of moral reform and social reform as completely harmonious....On the actual plane of society itself it was perhaps otherwise, for were not moral reform, cultural missionising and the creation of conventicles of respectability not simply the other side of the coin of policing or sanitary inspection? There was nothing innately discordant about them in the final analysis." 55

54 Ibid p. 299.
The process alluded to by Storch reflected changes in the structurally generated balance of power between groups that were implicated, both as causes and consequences, in what are traditionally called "industrialisation" and "urbanisation." Closely involved in this was the genesis, within English society, of 'pressures and constraints' which led groups to modify their behaviour. Crucial in this regard is both an understanding of the civilising spurt referred to earlier and the use of the terms colonisation and repulsion - which Elias proposed in relation to the development of self-control and restraint in general - to explain the ongoing cultural struggle between and within classes.

The issue of the changing balance between continuity and change can be explained in the following way. With respect to the most manifest changes which occurred, these are no better illustrated than via the "control" and "civilising" dimensions of the transformation which developed in relation to the expression of violence. Increased police intervention, coupled with the growing involvement of the rational recreationalists in popular culture, directly relates to the advance, as Dunning and Sheard note, in people's 'threshold of repugnance' with regard to engaging in and witnessing violent acts. The culture of the working classes was being, in Elias' terms, 'colonised.' These intentional and/or unintentional forays into working class culture can be seen both as symptomatic of the growing monopolisation of the use of violence by the state and of the authorities' and higher classes' own advance in a civilising direction. As such, they were but the other side of social control and "effective" policing, different but complementary parts of the same overall social process. Storch is correct to assert that, in the final analysis, there was 'nothing innately discordant' about such trends.

56 Dunning and Sheard, Barbarians, Gentlemen and Players p. 40.
The sense of continuity evident from the appraisal of the mores which underpinned both popular culture and the patterns of football participation and spectating in the late Victorian and Edwardian periods also requires some concluding remarks. These mores were able to persist, albeit in a more "emasculated" form, despite the efforts made by members of the higher classes to "colonise" popular culture because of four main factors. Firstly, such mores had meaning for those involved and as a consequence of the 'creative culture-forming processes' identified by Thompson, continued to be produced and reproduced over time. Secondly, the relatively obdurate nature of popular culture ensued that the overt and covert attempts to control and civilise such a culture could not achieve total success. Thirdly, those groups who were attempting to control and civilise popular culture were offering only a relatively more civilised version. Fourthly, and most decisively, while the power resources of the lower orders were relatively few, those which they did possess enabled them to resist upper and middle class attempts at colonisation. In particular, the lower orders proved adept at finding locations where they could avoid being detected by the authorities or which were immune from control as the police were powerless to intervene. Chesney, in accounting for what he termed these, 'Citadels of the underworld,' highlighted the importance of the densely packed slums and "low" public houses. He wrote:

"...the solidarity of the poor against those they considered their professional oppressors, the vagaries of the law, and the densely-packed buildings of many poor districts often made it impossible for [the police] to keep any real control over the swarming back quarters. The rule of law was apt to stop at the alley-corners, beyond which the police appeared less as custodians of public order than as raiders in hostile territory....[As a result] Low public houses were often the scenes of all sorts of brutality, including savage and illegal sports, carried on under the open patronage of the landlords who clearly had no fear of losing their licences." 57

The patronage offered by the landlords was matched, to an extent, by the tacit, less public support of some sections of the aristocracy and gentry for such sports as prize-fighting.\(^{58}\) Though 'pushed behind the scenes,' in the 'swarming back quarters,' the mores of popular culture continued to be produced and reproduced over time. In fact, these mores remained a firmly evident part of the structured processes which were shaping English society at the time. Evidence of this, as will be documented more fully later, is provided by the fact that the mores which persisted proved to have a strong affinity with the values of "Muscular Christianity," those evident in the public schools "games cult" and in the game of soccer which began to attract growing working class support in the late 1870's and early 1880's. It is to these issues, in particular that of the incipient modernisation and the modernisation of football that attention must now turn.

C. The Incipient Modernisation and the Modernisation of Football

In examining the incipient modernisation and the modernisation of football, an appraisal of three main issues is required. Firstly, attention must be given to the transformation which occurred in the early stages in the modernisation of the old folk versions. Secondly, consideration must be given to what is termed the "bifurcation" of football into its modern forms, soccer and rugby. Thirdly, an analysis has to be undertaken of what can be termed the "démocratisation of the game." In particular, attention will have to be paid in this connection to how the changing balance between the persistence of particular mores and the changes which occurred in popular culture relates to the latter stages in the modernisation of football.

1. The period 1750 to 1840 witnessed, as argued, both the gradual decline

of folk football in its urban and rural milieux, and the adoption of
variants of it within the privatised setting of the public schools.
Indeed this latter development, as Dunning and Sheard have noted, enabled
folk football, though punctuated by rowdism and still relatively
"uncivilised" to "survive." Indeed, within this setting it posed no direct
threat to the agencies of social control, a factor which probably helps
to explain why it could persist in these schools in a period when it was
dying out in society at large. A second component in its "survival" and
subsequent development in the public schools, was the power relativities
of pupils and masters. Crucial in this regard was the ability of the pupils
to resist any attempts by the masters to control their leisure time. There
is no need in this context to follow through the analysis offered by Dunning
and Sheard in all its details. It is enough just to focus on what they
call the "incipient modernisation" of football, its bifurcation and the dis­
semination of these "civilised" forms into society at large. Considering
the pre-conditions for modernisation, Dunning and Sheard comment:

"Social changes more fundamental than any which occurred in pre­
industrial Britain were required to free football from its traditional
mould and transform it into a modern sport. It was in the public
schools in conjunction with industrialisation that such changes took
place. In these schools, starting in the 1830's the game began to
change fundamentally and in a specific direction. More particularly,
it began to be organised more formally, to become more complex and
the rules began to be written down. It also grew more 'civilised'
in at least two senses: players began to be required to exercise
greater self-control and some of the wilder features began to be
eradicated or subjected to more stringent control."

For these researchers, such processes must be understood in terms of
an analysis of the interrelationship between "micro-sociological" changes
in the public schools and "macrosociological" changes in the wider society.
Thus Dunning and Sheard emphasise the influence of embourgeoisement - the
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change in the balance of power between the landed and industrial classes in favour of the latter — on the public schools. It is important to stress once more in this connection that Dunning and Sheard use this term in a different sense from its present sociological usage. Thus while embourgeoisement usually refers nowadays to the assimilation of the working into the middle classes, Dunning and Sheard use it to refer to the gradual emergence of the bourgeoise as the ruling class, to their increasing control of major institutions, and to the consequent spread of their values through society. Considered within this light, all cultural activities experience embourgeoisement: this analysis is supported both by Thompson's evidence, which, as noted, illustrated that, during this period, the Evangelical movement successfully 'exhorted the upper classes to reform their own manners' and by the efforts of the middle-classes, to colonize popular culture through rational recreation.

One of the manifestations of this process of embourgeoisement according to Dunning and Sheard was the status rivalry which grew up between the older, more aristocratic public schools such as Eton and Harrow and the newer, less aristocratic public schools such as Rugby. This rivalry, Dunning and Sheard argue, occurred at all levels of their relationships, no more so than in the sports and games played by the boys. In consequence, when the Rugbeians gained widespread acclamation for the new form of football emerging at their school, the Etonians, being the leading example of the older, more aristocratic public schools, reacted by producing a new and distinctly different version. Let us briefly examine the initial emergence of the distinctively Rugby way of playing football.

At Rugby the reforms which Thomas Arnold undertook between 1828 and 61

1842 led to the emergence at the school of a social structure which proved conducive to modernizing innovation. It was in that context, Dunning and Sheard argue, that "incipient modernisation began to take place." However, the establishment of such a structure formed a 'necessary' not a 'sufficient' condition for the occurrence of this process. Dunning and Sheard put it this way:

"In order to explain why the boys at Rugby acted in ways which unintentionally led to the transformation of their game in a modernizing direction, reference has to be made to another causal sequence. [It was] initially set in motion by industrialization and embourgeoisement. Important among the links in this second causal chain were an intensification of status - competition within and between the upper and middle classes and, as part of it, an increase of status - rivalry among the public schools. Also significant was the transformation in the ideal of 'gentlemanly' behaviour which occurred in that connection." 62

In this context, the rules and organisation of the game at Rugby began to become more formal and, gradually, written rules, embodying more "civilised" conceptions of what was permissible violence in the game emerged. According to Dunning and Sheard:

"What happened at Rugby in this period was that there emerged, for the first time, a social configuration which was not simply conducive to innovation in the leisure-sphere but in which the necessary stimuli existed to motivate the boys deliberately to change the structure of their football. The 'catalytic' agents in this process were a complex of interrelated tensions which arose due to contradictions inherent in the structure, composition and position of Rugby School in the early nineteenth century. Class tensions and tensions associated with status rivalry between public schools were important in this respect. So, too, were tensions which arose due to the attempt of Arnold and his successors to instil more 'civilised' values into the boys.

It was this complex of tensions which led Rugby boys to embark on a process of changing and differentiating their football. It began, as a result, to develop into a more complex, restrained and 'civilised,' i.e. more modern type of game." 63

In order for football more generally to move in such a modernising direction, however, the increase in status-rivalry among the public schools
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was crucial. More particularly, when the Rugbeians began to gain widespread acclamation for the new forms of football emerging in their school, the Etonians, in rivalry to Rugby, reacted by producing a distinctly different version. Its most distinctive features were an absolute taboo on the use of hands and scoring goals below rather than above the goal-posts. In other words, bifurcation began when the Etonians developed a game diametrically opposed to that at Rugby. The Harrovians followed suit and subsequently modified the strict, Rugby type of offside rule. But the bifurcation was only finally accomplished in 1863 when the Rugby clubs walked out of the meetings held to form the Football Association, subsequently forming their own Rugby Football Union in 1871. Further explanation of the processes involved in this process of bifurcation is required.

2. Crucial to this process of bifurcation was the "games cult" in the public schools. As Dunning and Sheard observe, the "games cult" reflected and, at the same time, helped to create and sustain social conditions in which modern football could more easily develop. The "games cult" was one consequence, in fact, of the continuing transformation of society wrought by the "civilising spurt" cited earlier and of the related processes at work in the public schools. Dunning and Sheard write in this regard:

"...the games cult reflected and, at the same time, helped to establish social conditions conducive to the spread of modern football in its embryonic forms, above all playing a part in transforming Rugby and what was to become soccer into status-enhancing activities for adult 'gentlemen'...the games cult was connected with an upgrading of ball games relative to field sports in the leisure-preferences of the upper classes and [therefore] it is...best conceptualised as, in part, a 'civilising' change." 64

The importance of the "games cult," however, lies not only in the fact that games, especially ball games, became a form of status-enhancing

---
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activity for adult 'gentlemen.' Indeed, the importance of the "games cult" cannot be explained solely in terms of its pervasiveness as the dominant ideology of the late nineteenth century public schools with their stress on team games and the concomitant development of character. Reference must also be made to the influence of the concept of "manliness" in the games cult. This requires some elaboration.

Underpinning the "games cult" was a concept of "manliness" which is crucial to an understanding of the mores which permeated folk football, which continued to hold sway in the playing of soccer and which corresponded to the values held - in varying degrees - by the working class spectators of the Victorian and Edwardian periods.

Though lacking the overall theoretical framework used by Dunning and Sheard, Haley has argued that the late Victorian period held "manliness" in high esteem and that this was connected to the rise of modern sport. Although he was unsure of what had generated manliness as an ideal, Haley was certain that throughout the late Victorian period most people, including many intellectuals, came to regard it as the most estimable male character trait. While Haley's account contributes to an understanding of the "games cult," it is of less direct use in gaining an explanation of the spread of the new forms outside the public school context. Support for a possible analysis can, however, be drawn from contemporary accounts. Considering "The Football Fever," Abell noted in 1902:

"Many of the old blackguard sports became illegal; much that not long before had been deemed essential to the making of a fine fellow was now considered unbecoming a gentleman; our aesthetic tastes

---
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did not improve but the heart of the nation became sounder and wholesome.

Then came the athletic craze among the classes; for more than twenty years they kept the epidemic to themselves and just as among late Georgian and early Victorian gentlemen it had been deemed degrading to indulge in pastimes which had hitherto been the peculiar property of the masses, so it now seemed to be the main object of many young lives to excel in them." 67

The demand for more "civilised" forms of leisure, as indicated by the "games cult" and the dissemination of the modern forms of football, also relates to the bifurcation of these modern forms of football. In particular, the gradual emergence within the upper and middle classes of values demanding stricter control of aggression, produced distinctive attitudes to the types of physical violence deemed permissible. Such perceptions directly influenced the gradually emerging written rules of soccer and rugby and the less formal conventions which continued to underpin both forms of the game.

Utilising Dunning and Sheard's conception of the process of embourgeoisement, the present study noted the gradual development of more "civilised" forms of football within the status-conscious public schools. As argued, the incipient bifurcation of football was closely related to the status-rivalry which existed between particular public schools, especially Eton, Harrow and Rugby, which led the former to develop a game diametrically opposed to that of the latter. The complete "break" occurred, however, when the Rugby clubs walked out of the meetings held to form the Football Association. In commenting on these trends, Dunning and Sheard conclude:

"Consequently, the bifurcation into Rugby and soccer set in motion by Rugby - Eton rivalry in the 1840's was perpetuated on a national level and marked by the formation of separate ruling bodies, the Football Association in 1863, and the Rugby Football Union in 1871." 68
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But, in itself, Dunning and Sheard claim, embourgeoisement does not completely explain the issue concerning the bifurcation of football into soccer and rugby. For them:

".....A complete explanation of the bifurcation cannot be attained by reference to embourgeoisement alone. The 'civilising process,' more specifically the gradual emergence within the upper and middle classes of norms demanding stricter control of aggression, was equally important. Thus, one of the central issues on which the Rugby and Soccer parties were divided was that of the types of physical violence henceforth to be permitted in football. The former adhered to a traditional concept of 'manliness' which stressed courage and physical strength; the latter advocated 'manliness' of a more restrained and 'civilised' kind." 69

Symptomatic of this demand for stricter control of aggression within the upper and middle classes was the controversy, during the inaugural meetings of the Football Association, surrounding "hacking." Two important points need to be grasped in relation to bifurcation: soccer, the more 'civilised' version of the two forms of football, was more reflective of this growing demand for stricter control of aggression. Contemporary commentators sometimes argued in similar fashion. According to C. B. Fry, for example:

"It is the barbarian in us that loves football. The game is exceedingly civilised and scientific nowadays; but clothe it as you will in law and order, it nonetheless fascinates and appeals to us by reason of that in us, which desires the stress and excitement of fighting. In olden times the game was nothing more or less than a free fight; now it is, as it were, a very refined form of the same. Indeed, the game has become almost too refined. It was at its best when just entering upon its civilised stage, before there were quite so many rules and regulations....." 70

Soccer was more compatible with the values of those middle-class groups who were coming to regard aspects of rugby as odious and 'distasteful' on account of the elements of open violence which that form of football continued to exhibit. Secondly, this continued stress on "manliness," albeit in a

more 'civilised' form, found favour in working class communities still adhering to the traditional mores on which folk football had rested and on which, in those areas of popular culture where it "survived," it continued to rest. It was the antecedents of football spectating which the previous sections of this thesis sought to examine and it is in this area that the links between folk football, popular culture and the spectator disorder of the late nineteenth and twentieth centuries become more apparent. Equally, the anxieties and fears which form part of the emergence of football spectating as a social problem have a longer pedigree than the 1960's, and similar anxieties and fears can be traced back to the attempts to "control" popular culture and its recreations in the nineteenth century. At this point, however, it is appropriate to consider some further aspects of the modernisation of the game, and to examine, in particular, both its "professionalisation" and "democratisation."

3. Professional soccer emerged during the 1870's and 1880's as a type of sports professionalism very different from that based on aristocratic patronage that had existed earlier, in cricket, for example. The financial base of professional soccer depended on exploiting the commercial opportunities presented by the crowds who flocked to the game in urban centres. For Dunning and Sheard this process involved 'a diffuse relationship between players and an anonymous mass of paying fans,' which was, 'mediated by those able to gain control of the gate-money from which the players' wages were principally paid.' The control of gate-money, in fact, was overwhelmingly in the hands of local businessmen - it was these entrepreneurs who handled the "democratisation of the game."

The "professionalisation" and "democratisation" of the game first
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developed in the industrial midlands and the north and then diffused, gradually, throughout the country. This development was, in fact, briefly analysed when the work of Mason, Vamplew and Hutchinson was considered. However, the aspects outlined which highlight the continuity of values between folk football and its more developed forms, were not considered at that point, though contemporaries were not themselves unaware of this continuity, they tended, for the most part, to characterise the "democratisation of the game" - which for Dunning and Sheard refers to the shift in control over these games that occurred concomitantly with their spread - in negative terms. Abell, for example, wrote as follows on this issue:

"The masses of Britain had neither time nor inclination for the games and physical contests which were remaking our gentry...How the revolution was developed which made the honest, wholesome pastime of the classes the all-absorbing subject of interest to millions of people whose fathers hardly knew if it was played on land or water, is not material to our purpose. At any rate the people became football-mad, but, be it particularly noted, not as players...It would have been delightful to be able to record how the men of this village or of that county town, of this factory or of that mill, had formed themselves into football and other clubs, instead of boozing and gambling and quarrelling at low boxing matches, rattings and cock-fightings, as they had been so long accustomed to do.

But it was not so. At first, no doubt, the masses did play football themselves, but very rapidly the best performers separated themselves from the common herd.....The spiteful yells which arose, the torrents of foul abuse which were poured forth, the fierce brandishings of sticks and fists, the almost carnivorous expression on the passion-deformed faces, made up a terrible picture of an English crowd taking its pleasure on a Saturday afternoon.....

....If the young gentlemen of Britain had not become so severely bitten with the athletic mania, it is at least likely that our industrial centres would never have been infected with the football fever.

If asked why the disease should have been peculiarly associated with football and not with any other form of sport I should answer that football appeals more closely than any other game to the character, inclinations, and instincts of a section of our community which is rough and ready in manner and speech, which has a good deal of the fighting animal in its composition, and which, above all, has never appreciated bodily exertion for its own sake. The youth of the class from which the huge football crowds are drawn throws off with boyhood his fondness of sport and especially competitive sport, for barren honour..." 72

The distinction made in Abell's text between the "classes" and the "masses" is an important one and requires elaboration. In the context of nineteenth century idiom, it would appear that the term "classes" referred to those sections who were refined and "civilised" - namely the middle and upper classes. In contrast, for these contemporary commentators, the "masses" referred to the "great unwashed," or as Abell remarked, the "common herd," who he believed, "had a great deal of the fighting animal in its composition." The very term used to describe the industrial working classes, the majority of them living in the poverty and degradation of the Victorian slums, betrays the sense of anxiety felt by the middle-classes and carried, concomitantly, negative overtones.

With this legacy in mind, despite the pleas to use football as a means of "rational recreation," the 1880's and 1890's witnessed, as the article by Abell illustrates, growing criticism by members of the relatively 'civilised' middle-classes of outbursts of "feeling" by players and spectators, especially the latter. Indeed, the professionalisation of the game resurrected the shibboleths of the Evangelicals and the Temperance movement. In that way, drunkenness, gambling and "physical deterioration" were linked to the image of spectators during this period. It was this "spectatorial element" which was, as Almond claimed, increasingly spoiling the game. Indeed Edwardses was prompted to state in 1892 that:

---
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"The new football is a far more effectual arouser of the unregenerate passions of mankind than either a political gathering or a race meeting.... It all depends upon the measure of civilisation in your locality whether there is or is not a good deal of fighting after the match. Of drinking it may be taken for granted that there is abundance." 77

In similar fashion, a person writing under the pseudonym 'Creston,' claimed in 1894:

"The crowds are a great danger and disadvantage to football. A game is a very stirring sight to see, and the impetuous mob are not always judicious observers of it; it is overmuch for their nerves sometimes. As a rule they do not go to see the football; they go to see their own side win, and that is all they care about. Swarms of ragged urchins hoot and yell at anything, however objectionable, that tickles their fancy. They know nothing whatever of the game. Charging, done fairly and straightforwardly, was once part of football; now it has come to such a pitch of unfairness that any symptom of it is punished in the North as rough play. A mob of any kind is always absolutely the most foolish and worst judge of any given question. Consequently the practice of mobbing the referee, though pleasant and humorous, is not by any means a logical one." 78

Such sentiments, in fact, reflect the changes occurring at the time in the structurally generated balance of power between groups and which created pressures and constraints on groups to modify their behaviour in concomitant fashion. Of crucial importance in this connection was the slowly growing power of the working class. Dunning and Sheard explain such developments in the following way:

".....the dawning realization by the working class of its latent power and the increase in the frequency and intensity of overt class conflict led the upper and middle classes to feel beleaguered. They came, correspondingly, to view the working class increasingly as a threat. As part of the same overall process, the belligerence of the working class towards those above them increased, with the result that the central precondition for the earlier trend toward class integration in sport - relative harmony in class relations - began to be whittled away.....As a result, soccer which had started out as a game of the most prestigious members of the public school elite, i.e. of old Etonians and Old Harrovians, began to slip downwards in Britain's status hierarchy of sports and accordingly, to be regarded by members of the upper and middle classes as inconsistent with the behavioural standards expected of a 'gentleman'.....Nevertheless, despite their renunciation of playing contact with working-class teams and even their growing abandonment of

of soccer, the public school elite managed, for a considerable time, to retain a share in the overall control of the game and, above all, to maintain a nationally unified structure of rules and organisation."

79 Dunning and Sheard, Barbarians, Gentlemen and Players pp 196-197.

The trend away from class integration in British sport requires clarification. During the period between 1850 and 1880, according to Dunning and Sheard, there developed a state of relative harmony in class relations in general. Such a development also found expression in the context of sport. As a result, during the late 1860's and 1870's, under the impetus of what was termed at the time the "athletic craze", there was a greater mingling of classes in sports, or rather, a greater degree of middle and upper class involvement in working class activities.

The analysis is, in fact, supported by the argument proposed by Abell in 1902. In reviewing the development of the "football fever" Abell as noted, argued that, in the 1860's and 1870's, Victorian "gentlemen" began to 'indulge in pastimes which had hitherto been the peculiar property of the masses.' From the 1880's onwards however, there was an increasing trend for Victorian gentlemen to withdraw from active involvement in such sports. Under the impetus of both increasing class conflict and of what Dunning and Sheard term the 'dawning realization by the working class of its latent power,' those middle and upper class groups who adhered to an amateur ideology perceived the twin developments of the professionalisation and the democratisation of football in negative terms. In fact, the codes of conduct of the working classes in general and of working class spectators in particular aroused a sense of 'repulsion' in the middle and upper classes.

By utilising the terms employed by Elias to explain the emergence of self-control and restraint in general, the early phase in the development outlined can be characterised with reference to the ideas of 'attraction' and...
'colonisation.' But the 1880's and 1890's, with their increasing class tension, were marked by the development of self-consciousness among the groups involved which, in turn, increased their rivalry. Concomitant to this was the greater tendency for the differences between classes to be emphasised and, as a result, for a sense of 'repulsion' to emerge, i.e. for the upper classes to consolidate their power and status 'behind closed doors' in increasingly status-exclusive settings from which the "repulsive" lower orders were debarred. At the same time, members of the upper and middle classes increasingly advocated an amateur model of sport as the only one 'fit' for a gentleman, whilst stressing the physical and moral deterioration of the population at large. In this climate, the professionalisation and democratisation of football, the latter referring not so much to the spread of the game down the social hierarchy as to the changing patterns and problems of control that were consequent upon that process, inevitably attracted the type of criticism which writers such as Edwardes, Ensor and Almond levelled at it.

D. Summary

In attempting to provide a broad canvas on which to place both this "democratisation of the game" and subsequent developments regarding the expression and control of violence by spectators in and around football grounds and the related issue of the position of football spectating as part of the clash over popular culture, the present study has been at pains to stress the long-term processes involved: hence, the advocacy of a developmental perspective. It is to a consideration of these long-term, structured processes that it is now necessary briefly to return.

The "decline" of folk football stemmed from changes in the balance of power between groups that occurred correlatively with the processes of industrialisation, urbanisation, state formation and the civilising "spurt" referred to earlier. During the early part of the nineteenth century the
attack on folk football which contributed centrally to its decline was only part of a more general onslaught on popular recreations and popular culture which stemmed from the middle and ruling classes' desire to colonize working class culture. This desire reflected a perception held by these groups that, in the wake of the changes, then occurring, no commonly affirmed array of values linking different classes existed. For these middle-class groups, there was a need, however dimly perceived, not only to "improve" the public's health but also the public's values and codes of conduct. By so doing, their own grasp on power would be made more secure.

Despite such "moral sanitation," folk football was embedded in mores which formed part of pre-industrial popular culture and expressed the leisure preferences of the lower classes. Not all aspects of these mores declined during the nineteenth century. Those less amenable to control and/or to the "civilising" influences of the middle-classes, 'survived,' were actively participated in and had significance for sections of the working classes. Indeed the work of Rude and Tholfsen suggests that there was resistance to the process of "incorporation." More particularly, as Rude puts it, there was no 'slavish' adoption by the working classes of all aspects of middle-class values. That is, some sections of the working classes had sufficient power to ensure that the production and reproduction of traditional mores would continue.

Though folk football in its more gregarious forms declined, the public schools, in their adoption of it, provided a haven in which more civilised versions could appear. The status-rivalry between public schools such as
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Rugby and Eton, combined with the walk-out by the rugby clubs at the inaugural meetings of the Football Association amid the controversy surrounding "hacking" resulted in the bifurcation of football. While the "games cult" assisted in the spread of the modern versions of football in the public schools and in the social circles directly influenced by them, it was the "athletic craze" which led to their spread to a wider social context. Crucially, though in a more "civilised" form, there was a continued stress in the emerging, more modern forms of football on masculinity. The new game of "soccer" gradually spread to the "masses," a process which signalled the development of football as a spectator sport. But, given the increasing class tension and class awareness of the 1880's and 1890's, this diffusion and democratisation of the game began to be characterised by middle class observers as a "football fever"\(^{83}\) and a "football mania."\(^{84}\)

In this way, as the modern game returned to the working class milieu where the traditional mores which had governed folk football persisted, in varying degrees and in more "civilised" forms, spectator disorder was subsumed into the more general debate surrounding working class youth. In the period preceding the outbreak of "The Great War," a "culture clash" was evident and different middle-class groups mobilised to confront this "threat."\(^{85}\)

\(^{83}\) Abell, "The Football Fever."
\(^{84}\) Edwardes, "The New Football Mania."
\(^{85}\) See Chapter Five.
CHAPTER FOUR

AN ATTEMPT TO DOCUMENT THE FORMS OF FOOTBALL HOOLIGAN VIOLENCE AND THEIR CONTROL SINCE THE FOUNDATION OF THE FOOTBALL LEAGUE

The need for substantive research into football hooligan violence emerged from three main sources. Firstly, the recognition of the specific inadequacies of existing research, especially that of Taylor and Clarke with their stress on changes in post-war British society as an explanation for the phenomenon. Secondly, and stemming from this initial recognition, the fruitfulness of adopting a "developmental" approach was appreciated. While the writings of Mason, Vamplew and Hutchinson have highlighted, to an extent, the historical dimension, and in doing so, undermine aspects of the perspectives presented by Taylor and Clarke, the present analysis seeks to explain how the later social formation, clustered around the term "football hooliganism", has arisen out of the earlier social formations which the previous chapter sought and the present chapter seeks to document. Thirdly, and connected to this second point, reference was made in the previous chapter to the interrelated concepts of continuity and change. In the present chapter, an examination will be undertaken of the balance between continuity and change in the forms of spectator behaviour and the perception by outsiders of such behaviour, since the foundation of the Football League.

In this way, an attempt is made to provide a basis for the "grounded speculation" which informs the following analysis of the emergence of football spectating as a social problem. It is important to note, that this and the succeeding chapters are envisaged as interwoven and mutually reinforcing. In addition, it should be noted from the outset that the present study is not simply offering a record of what individuals did. Rather, an explanation of the sociogenesis of the phenomenon of football hooliganism is being presented.¹

¹ See also Abrams, "History, Sociology, Historical Sociology."
In this context, it is useful to remind oneself what Norbert Elias has written in this regard:

"plans and actions, the emotional and rational impulses of individual people, constantly interweave in a friendly or hostile way. This basic tissue resulting from many single plans and actions of men can give rise to changes and patterns that no individual person has planned or created. From this interdependence of people arises an order sui generis, an order more compelling and stronger than the will and reason of the individual people composing it. It is this order of interweaving human impulses and strivings, this social order, which determines the course of historical change...." 2

So, informed by the writings of Elias, the present study attempts to provide a more adequate account of the forms of football hooligan violence and their control since the foundation of the Football League than any which have been produced so far.

The format for such an approach initially centered around the orientating questions posited by Rude in his analysis of the crowd. 3 Documentation of who was involved, the forms of behaviour they engaged in and what was the reaction of particular groups, provided the seedbed from which a relatively more adequate analysis could spring.

The processes which are under consideration are viewed as interwoven. Thus, while the documentation of the forms and control of football hooligan violence is divided into specific periods, this should not be taken to imply a failure to grasp that one is dealing here with long term processes that have a degree of continuity and that do not conform to arbitrary time periods. The documentation is presented in this fashion in order to display, in as clear and concise a manner as possible, those pieces of the jigsaw which have been gathered and pieced together.

Chiefly anecdotal and narrative based, the evidence encountered, this will become more apparent as the chapter unfolds - obviously influences

---

3 See Introduction.
the nature and extent of the 'grounded speculation' which can be attempted and, the manner in which such attempts are presented. Evidence was gathered by means of a systematic survey of newspapers throughout the development of football as a spectator sport. Analysis of Birmingham local newspapers at five-year intervals, looking at every issue of the Birmingham Mail and Birmingham Post for the years selected, i.e. 1885, 1890, 1899, 1900, 1905, 1910, 1914, 1920, 1925, 1930, 1935, 1939, 1946, 1950, 1955, 1960, 1965, 1970, 1975 - allowed a broad coverage of clubs to be undertaken, especially during the Victorian and Edwardian periods when several clubs from the West Midlands area were prominent members of the Football League. Evidence was also drawn from the official index of The Times. Further documentation was collected from the local newspapers of South-East London and Leicester. In this connection, case studies of Millwall FC and Leicester City FC were undertaken. These form the basis of subsequent chapters. Such newspaper reports were also supplemented by a systematic analysis of the minutes of meetings of the Football Association's Emergency and Disciplinary Committees each year between 1895 and 1975. Various contemporary journals, articles and publications were also consulted.

The accounts of spectator misconduct which have surfaced in the press tend to take a narrative form. More particularly, incidents of disorder and the people involved are described within the context of match reports, and few actual names or occupations are recorded. Understanding the nature and extent of such reporting involves consideration not only of the persistence of and changes in the forms of football hooligan violence but also the persistence of and changes in the perception of such forms by outsider groups.

---

4 During the period between 1890 and 1920 the Birmingham press were titled the Birmingham Daily Post and the Birmingham Daily Mail.

5 With regard to the Leicester Daily Mercury, the generous assistance given by Patrick Murphy was appreciated.

6 See Introduction and Chapter Three.
In order for forms of disorderliness to be reported and for the people involved to be identified and socially located, groups in the society have to be, in some sense, "sensitive" both to the behaviour and to those who participated in it. The reporters, too, have to be in accord with the opinions of these groups, to feel that their views have a right to be published. Alternatively, they have to be under pressure, e.g. from their owner or editors, to publicize behaviour of this kind. Yet again, they may perceive a "sensationalistic" component in such behaviour and believe that reporting it will help to sell their newspaper and perhaps improve its market position relative to that of competitors.

Doubts concerning the adequacy of such narrative-based evidence remain. Indeed specific problems, illustrative of such limitations, were sometimes raised by contemporary observers. For example, writing in the Leicester Daily Mercury, a reporter commenting on a match in 1905, wrote:

"Estimating a Crowd.

I was greatly amused at the various estimates of the crowd at the Palace. So much had been written about the sale of tickets and the cash there would be from the gates, that many people believed that all the available space would be occupied. When the London evening papers came out some said there were 100,000 present others 80,000 and the more careful from 60,000 to 70,000. Now the official returns are published, and we learn that the total attendance was only 45,000..." 7

Of more importance is the problematic status of the socially defining terminology of reporters' descriptions of those involved in reported forms of disorderly behaviour. Thus reference is repeatedly made, as will be seen, to "blackguards," the "lower element" and "roughs." While these labels have to be treated with a great deal of caution, the present study nevertheless argues that the existence, over time, of "rough" and "respectable" elements of the working class, is an important feature of the phenomenon being dis-

7 Leicester Daily Mercury, 9th December 1905.
cussed. Harold Perkin has also recognised the significance of this division within the working class. He observes in this regard:

"...The most important division in the working class is not that of the statisticians between the skilled and the unskilled but between the 'respectable' and the 'roughs'...To the insider, the difference between rough and respectable neighbourhoods, or between the rough and respectable ends of the same street, is more significant than the divisions between the middle and working classes...." 8

The significant of this division will be demonstrated both within the present chapter and in the analysis of the emergence of football spectating as a social problem.

A. The "Démocratisation of the Game" And the Dominance of the "Roughs": 1880-1914

Commenting on trends that were evident to contemporaries, the Birmingham Daily Mail posed the following question in February 1895:

"How comes it that the introduction of Professionalism has degraded the spectator to such an extent that 'Démocratisation of the game' has become synonymous with ruffianism and unjust partisanship and has banished Gentlemen from the football field?" 9

Similar "concern," as already observed, found expression in the journals of the day. Writers such as Edwardes and Ensor were highly critical of these developments in football. To some, the "démocratisation of the game" was synonymous with the evils of drinking, betting and violence. 10 Crucially, as will be noted, such connotations were connected with the changing perception of youth which was also evident in this period. 11 This, combined with the anxiety felt by the middle-classes towards working class culture which persisted throughout the nineteenth century, reinforced and reflected the alarm expressed about football spectating in the 1890's.

But what did the "démocratisation of the game" entail? As noted in the preceding chapter, the analysis could not adequately understand these develop-

9 Birmingham Daily Mail 4th February 1895.
10 See Chapter Three.
11 See Chapter Five.
ments without placing them within the context of an examination of the inter-related elements of football, leisure and popular culture. In this way it is possible to appreciate that the democrationisation of the game refers to a long-term process connected with the spread of the game which, in this period, led control to be taken more and more out of the exclusive hands of the public school elite and usurped, to an increasing extent, by more provincial and lower-level members of the middle-classes. As this occurred, members of the public school elite and members of the non-public school sections of the middle classes were withdrawing from both participating in and directly spectating at football. Indicative of the sort of behaviour that underlay this trend is a report drawn from November 1888. In this report a writer for the Birmingham Daily Mail noted:

"Fracas in the Football Field.

Fracas on the football field are a matter of far too common occurrence. The fierce and unruly partisanship of the spectators has on several occasions been stimulated to a dangerous extent by the example of the contending players on the field itself. Foul and disgusting language....has still further disgraced the game and imperilled its reputation with respectable people...."

Despite this democrationisation of the game, its administration, both nationally and locally, the control of the professional clubs and possibly access to the more expensive sections of stadia remained in the hands of the middle-classes.

A related theme is the one termed here the "dominance of the roughs" and the present study views this as equally important to understanding the period in question. The phrase is not intended to convey the idea that the "roughs" were dominant in a numerical sense in the disorders of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries - though they may, as will be documented, have been centrally involved in the more serious cases of mis-

12 See Chapter Three.
13 Birmingham Daily Mail, 23rd November 1888.
conduct and disorder that were encountered. Rather the phrase refers to how a violent masculine style comparable to that of present day "roughs" held sway in the behaviour of football crowds at the turn of the century relative to what we nowadays expect from the "respectable" element of the working classes. Crucially, it appears that, during this period, the distinction between the "rough" and "respectable" elements of the working class was rather more blurred than it is today. Such an analysis has to be understood in relation to the investigation undertaken in earlier chapters of the behaviour which marked popular recreations of the nineteenth century.

As noted, the overt and covert attempts to control popular culture achieved varying degrees of success. Nevertheless when the game returned to a working class milieu, the traditional mores which underpinned popular culture became infused in it, albeit with fluctuating intensity and in relatively more civilised forms.14

The significance of these themes is best understood, as argued repeatedly in this thesis up to now, in terms of the structured processes that occur in popular culture over time. Analysis has therefore to focus on the changing balance between the continuities which exist, e.g. the production and reproduction of aspects of the traditional mores which underpinned popular culture throughout most of the nineteenth century, the changing nature and the extent of the anxiety expressed by the middle classes concerning the need to control and regulate working class people and the fluctuating power potential of the former to achieve their aims in relation to the latter. With respect to the former aspect, changes in the nature and expression of violence in British society and of attitudes towards it are crucial. But it is not possible to appreciate adequately the "contentious" character of the ways of living

14 For further discussion of this, refer to Chapter Three.
specific to particular groups without tackling the ways in which such ways of living and the manner in which they are perceived by "insiders" and "outsiders" are interwoven. Hence the need to examine, for example, attitudes towards the democratisation of football and to locate the debate that occurred in that connection within the wider discussion of working class leisure and working class youth. Recognition of this relates, in fact, to an understanding of how the structurally generated balance of power creates, over time, pressures and constraints on people to modify their behaviour and co-relatively, affects the perception by the members of particular groups of other people's behaviour. With this in mind, a close inspection of the development of the forms and control of football hooligan violence in the late Victorian and Edwardian periods can be undertaken.

1. The "Hooligans" and the Forms of Spectator Misconduct and Disorder in the Late Nineteenth and Early Twentieth Centuries

One possible route to establishing the social composition of those involved in particular forms of spectator misconduct in the late Victorian and Edwardian periods is to examine the overall social composition of the crowd and then to focus on what was written about specific incidents of disorder. With regard to the overall trend in the social composition of spectators, the Pall Mall Gazette, noted in February 1895, the following transformation as having occurred since the advent of professionalism in the 1880's:

"The tone of Football and of the spectators who attend football matches has been retrograding year by year. This is what some men term the "Democratisation of Football." In other words, that the game is being transformed from the classes to the masses....." 16

Such a distinction, as noted, found expression in the writings of other commentators - most notably of Abell. It would appear that the phrase was used to distinguish between what were regarded as the "refined," "civilised"

15 See Chapter Five
16 Birmingham Daily Mail 4th February 1895 - the newspaper cites material drawn from the Pall Mall Gazette.
classes and the "uncouth", "unwashed" masses. And, as one can see from the above account, the latter were perceived as increasingly attending matches. Other evidence, however, as the review of the pertinent literature in Chapter One of this thesis highlighted, suggests that a rather different change in the composition of crowds occurred during the 1880's, and that, by and large, the terraces had, by the 1890's, become the preserve mainly of males employed in skilled manual or clerical occupations and who belonged, for the most part, to "respectable" sections of the working class. Other contemporary evidence is also supportive of this interpretation. William McGregor, the leading figure in the foundation of the Football League, wrote, for example, in 1907:

"...While the football gate shows a tendency yearly to become more respectable, you do not see the class of people present at an Association football match that you see at a county cricket game. The game has not such an attraction for the fair sex....Generally speaking the artisans who throng to our football grounds do pay some regard to appearances....

It may surprise some people whose prejudices are called into play when the word football is mentioned, to be told that the lowest class have never taken to football, and are not likely to take to it, either. My business premises are situated in a thoroughfare, which although respectable in itself, cuts through some of the worst slums of Birmingham. The inhabitants of those courts do not patronise football. The game is principally supported by the middle-classes and the working men, and the latter are more particular in regard to the wearing of clean collars, than they were twenty-five years ago...." 17

The present analysis cannot be as definitive as McGregor, whose involvement with the Football League may help to explain, in part, the "respectable" image he paints. Despite this, his description of the changing social composition of the crowd does correspond, as will be documented in general here, to that outlined in the present chapter. But what can be said, at this stage, of the social composition of those involved in disorder? Here specific reports of spectator misconduct can be utilised to provide important pointers, especially if taken in conjunction with this more general backcloth. Let us

look at some of these reports.

Following a pitch invasion and an attack on the referee of the match between Aston Villa and St. George's in 1889, the Birmingham Daily Mail recorded:

"Contests between clubs of local origin are invariably attended by rival bands of camp followers, and it is the blatant bigotry of these partisans—men dead to all sense of fairness and sportsmanlike feeling—which is responsible for the irritating policies pursued by individual players. Monday's match was characterised by roughness and foul language inside the ropes and rowdyism and blasphemous utterances of the most intolerable description in the portion of the ground frequented by spectators." 18

The reference here to rivalry between local "bands of camp followers" is not without significance since this feature of spectator misconduct is also indicated in other reports of the period. Similar reports are frequent today but in the period between 1919 and the late 1950's, as will be shown, such disorder was less frequently reported.

Another case indicative of the pattern characteristic of the period before the First World War surfaced in the press in 1889. It appeared in the context of a reference to the difficult task of the referee in the face of partisan supporters and suggested that:

"At the conclusion of the game he has not a friend in the word, for should any particular decision for which he has been responsible have given victory to either side he can count upon all the opposing team and their hordes of camp followers regarding him as their mortal foe....The evils we have complained of are usually the outcome of the unsportsmanlike and bigoted partisanship of the rabble which loves to follow the fortunes of the various teams....." 19

The term "rabble" is an example of the socially defining terminology referred to earlier but it does not give one an adequate description of the social characteristics and social position of those involved. Such labelling does, however, as will be suggested later, give some insight into the nature and extent both of the existence of class hostility and of the overall climate

18 Birmingham Daily Mail 21st November 1889.
19 Birmingham Daily Mail 16th September 1889.
of concern in particular periods.

A qualitative analysis of other newspaper accounts reveals further aspects of the terminology used to describe those reported to have been centrally involved in spectator disorderliness at football matches in the decades between the foundation of the Football League and the outbreak of the First World War. It also shows some of the forms of misconduct they are alleged to have engaged in. Following disturbances at a local derby match between Small Heath and West Bromwich Albion in 1889, for example, a writer noted in his match report:

"The lower element of the partisans of the Small Heath Football Club are a particularly objectionable lot. Not content with resorting to disgusting expletives, they not infrequently molest strangers when the chances of the Coventry Road team are vanishing. Saturday's match with the Albion was productive of this kind of feeling. Reader once or twice saved shots, upon which the rowdy portion of the spectators differed with the referee. The points were not allowed, and at the conclusion of the game, stones were thrown. One of the missiles struck Reader on the head, causing a severe wound...." 20

This account refers to a "rowdy portion" of the spectators and seems, by describing them as "the lower element," to locate them at the bottom of the social scale. It also alleges that they swore frequently, molested visiting fans and threw stones at playing members of the opposing teams.

In similar fashion, Goodall, an English International of the period, commented in 1906 on the behaviour of crowds in general:

"Crowds

Unfortunately, it is the goading and jeering and hot-headed, non-discriminating partisanship of the ignorant and lower class sections of crowds that are mostly to blame for the unpleasant scenes occasionally witnessed. The naming and barracking of players has also a very bad effect, and until the spectatorate aid in the maintenance of that comaraderie which really prevails among professional players so long will enemies of the game have a formidable tool to use against it...." 21

Here, as in other cases, problems of interpretation emerge. The comments of Goodall refer to the "enemies of the game" and as such are indicative of

---

20 Birmingham Daily Mail 6th May 1889.
21 Football Chat 18th September 1906.
conflict over it, perhaps mainly over its professionalization and con-
travention of the dominant, amateur ethos that still prevailed. As an
international player, it can be reasonably presumed that Goodall would have
been an "incorporated worker" and hence have reflected the view of the
dominant classes when referring to the "lower class sections of the crowd."
Interestingly, he refers to them as "ignorant" and "hot-headed," thus
indicating a judgement of them as incapable of exercising the socially
demanded degree of self-control. Nevertheless, the impression gained is one
which stresses the involvement of "rough" sections of the working class.
Having said this, the existence and expression of class hostility is also
evident.

Following an incident at the Wolverhampton Wanderers ground in 1895,
a writer concluded:

"I trust the Wanderers will prosecute the leaders of the mob
relentlessly; it is disgraceful that the reputation of a district
should...suffer on account of the vagaries of a handful of
ruffians." 22

Such comments are a reminder of the observations made by Harold Perkin
in this regard. Though the element of class hostility must be taken into
account, the division between "rough" and "respectable" sections of the
working class may well also be crucial. Clearly, the central concern in the
report of the incident at the Wolves ground was with the "reputation of the
district:" the writer was evidently articulating the sentiments of the more
"respectable" element who feared that they would be associated with such
"ruffians" and that, as a result of the behaviour of their "rougher" fellows,
they might lose some of their insecurely held self-esteem as members of the
"respectable" classes.

Nevertheless, despite such reservations, these examples, while replete

22 Birmingham Daily Mail 30th September 1895.
with moral condemnation and suggestive of the status-conscious position of those who felt concerned, do provide some relatively adequate evidence from which an overall view of the social characteristics and social position of those involved in disorder can emerge. Another example illustrative of this is drawn from 1900. In it, the writer of a letter to the editor of the Birmingham Daily Mail commented:

"Bad Language at the Hawthorns

Sir - I think it would be wise for the Albion Directors to see that in future a couple of Policemen are stationed in the six penny stand at the Hawthorns. On Saturday last there were half a dozen of the "Peaky" fraternity from Birmingham included in the spectators in the stand, and their disgusting language and shouting thoroughly spoiled the spectators' enjoyment. The Directors should have these fellows kept under proper control, or not admitted at all, for ladies (of whom there were a fair number) cannot be expected to come and be compelled to listen to such filthy talk." 23

Two important aspects emerge from this letter: firstly, reference is made to the "Peaky" fraternity - a collection of gangs who were involved in numerous fights both among themselves and with the police during this period. 24 Michael Blanch in his study of organised youth in the late Victorian and Edwardian decades refers to the distinctive style of clothing which the "Peakies" wore. Centered around particular streets, these gangs were, Blanch documents, said to 'terrorize' whole districts. The conduct of these gangs revolved around 'larking' in the streets to acts of vandalism and offences against the person such as assault and robbery. For Blanch, this "sub-culture represented a violent and sometimes criminal rejection of 'expected' standards of behaviour." 25 Blanch interprets the Peakies' behaviour as a reaction to attempts to organise it. 26 This is similar to the analysis offered by Humphries in this respect.

23 Birmingham Daily Mail 26th November 1900.
24 The term 'Peaky' appears to refer to a style of cap worn by the gangs.
25 Michael Blanch, "Imperialism, Nationalism and Organised Youth" in John Clarke, Chas Critcher and Richard Johnson, Working Class Culture p. 104.
26 Ibid p. 105.
While such an analysis has its usefulness, of greater potential importance is the reference to the "expected" standards of behaviour. Blanch, however, does not develop this: the present study argues, in fact, that reference to 'expected' standards of behaviour makes problematic the taken for granted acceptance of our everyday customs and codes of conduct and allows for the raising of questions such as what the nature of these standards are and who and by what criteria judges such standards as appropriate for British society to adhere to.

The second thing worthy of note to emerge from the letter quoted above is the suggestion that the position in the ground occupied by this "Peaky" fraternity was the six-penny stand. This stand would have been the cheapest available to spectators at the West Bromwich Albion ground at that time - a fact which may have attracted the poorer sections of the working classes. Further, such stands tended to carry connotations of public disorder to some commentators. But the possible involvement of the "rough" sections of the working class in particular forms of disorder, should not blind the analysis to the involvement of "respectable" elements as well. At times, in fact, observers were able, or forced by circumstance, to make favourable remarks about spectators in the cheaper sections of the ground and, by comparison, to refer more disparagingly to the behaviour of spectators in the more expensive sections. William Pickford, writing for the Sunderland Echo and Hartlepool Mail, noted for example that:

"...I am bound to say that I think the general tone of the spectators "in the pens" compares well with that in the stands, where the better example should be set. I note that in the match at Burnley one of the most reliable critics declares that the language used on the most expensive stand was disgraceful. I am sorry to hear it, and I hope that the Burnley Club will take the matter in hand, for wins are not popular when they are connected with such bad feeling...." 27

27 William Pickford, Sunderland Echo and Hartlepool Mail Press Cuttings 1907-1911 FA Library.
What the evidence discussed so far appears to suggest is that, while the "respectable" elements of the crowd sometimes used "bad language" and may have occasionally been involved in disorder, too, the "rougher" elements of the working class were more frequently involved and were probably the central protagonists in the more serious outbursts. A case typical of this surfaced in a match report of 1885:

"Brum Disgraced.

Since it has been our lot to frequent football matches we have never been witnesses of such disgraceful scenes as occurred this afternoon at the conclusion of the match at Perry Barr. It was feared by the Birmingham officials that one or two episodes which took place between the players would lead to an unpleasant finish, as a great deal of hostility was loudly expressed by a section of the spectators during the process of the game.

Still none of them for one moment supposed that the more unscrupulous of the Villa partisans would behave in such a black-guardly manner. On the North End team leaving the field, they were mercilessly attacked by a gang of - if appearances go for anything - bona fide Brummagen roughs, who mobbed them, and used sticks, stones and every available missile with which to wreak their vengeance on the visitors.

It need scarcely be said that the Villa men exerted themselves to the utmost to protect the North Enders. If the dribbling game is to be marred (as it has been of late) by such cowardly exhibitions as that of this afternoon, the sooner football is consigned to oblivion the better for all concerned. Brum, go to the bottom of the class until you can learn better manners." 28

Such comments appear indicative of the status-competition between protagonists of soccer and rugby in this period. It is also worth noting that the scenes described were not confined to the football ground itself. 29

In an incident which was witnessed and reported by a passer-by, several other elements are revealed that are relevant to establishing the social composition of those involved in spectator misconduct in this period. Following a match in Birmingham in February 1910, it was reported in a letter

28 Saturday Night 9th May 1885.
29 See Chapter Five.
to the editor of the Birmingham Daily Post that the behaviour of groups of supporters in the city centre was undisciplined. The letter, signed by a man who titled himself "Colonel Ludlow" - a fact which is presumably indicative of his status as a "gentlemen" - described "rowdy" scenes and the death of a supporter who fell under the wheels of a train. He wrote:

"Our City on Saturday night last was a disgrace to civilisation with the mob of yelling "sportsmen"(?), who are worse than Zulus or Matabele, because they have not got half their physique or pluck. They are utterly indisciplined, and the result of this lack of discipline on Saturday last was the death of one of these poor misguided enthusiasts, who lost his life under the carriage wheels of a train at New Street station...." 30

Subsequent to this letter, another correspondent wrote to the editor and commented:

"Sir, - Colonel Ludlow's well-timed words as to the conditions in Birmingham last Saturday night deserve the most serious attention. The conditions were shocking. I happened to be coming through the town at about eleven o'clock and could not help expressing to a friend that England was becoming more drunk every day.

I feel quite sure that anyone who noticed the immense crowds of drunken people (men and women) who were promenading the streets singing and shouting will not think that my statement was wrong in any way. I saw crowds of young girls about seventeen years of age, and also youths who were in such a state as to be a disgrace to a respectable citizen. Some were rolling about the pavement utterly helpless and seemed to have hardly the strength to do anything but curse, swear and endeavour to sing. I wondered what was the cause of this, and found that it was due to the fact that we had thousands of visitors from Derby to see the cup-tie at Aston.

New Street and particularly the station, was one huge pandemonium of shouting, blowing whistles and other noisy instruments. Certainly at a low estimate 30% of the men were drunk.....Gentle manners and chivalry were conspicuous by their absence. Police were helpless or powerless. Is all this necessary in the true interest of sport?" 31

Two inter-related aspects of the phenomenon as described here - the perception of the writer as expressed in his description and his condemnation of those involved - are worthy of special comment. The writer reveals, for example, that disorderliness of this type was associated with women as well

30 Birmingham Daily Post 10th February 1910.
as men and youths as well as adults. The anonymous writer's values are also partly revealed in the "temperance-style" vigour of his condemnation of drinking. Furthermore, the element of "respectability" is confirmed by his reference to the absence of such "civilised" Victorian attributes as "gentle manners" and "chivalry."

By placing such narrative accounts into the overall context of patterns of spectating, a more adequate understanding of the social composition of those involved in disorder can emerge. As early as 1883, for example, the area of the ground behind the goal was identified - in Birmingham - as being the 'favourite spot for votaries of either one body of the contestants or the other'. This would appear to indicate the relatively early formation of "ends," though they were probably, at that stage, not so conspicuous, regular or general as they were to become after 1960. Nevertheless, such an account provides a reasonably certain disconfirmation of the position adopted by the authors of Public Disorder at Sporting Events who claim that "ends" were a completely de novo creation of the 1960's.

In addition to this observation, it was noted earlier how reports occasionally surfaced in the press which were critical of certain sections of the crowd in the six-penny stands - the "unreserved portion" of grounds. Similar incidents were reported by William McGregor in 1900 as having stemmed from particular sections of the ground at Villa Park during a match between Aston Villa and Notts County. He wrote:

"It was noticeable that the crowd on the unreserved portion of the ground was in a quarrelsome mood.....When the rain came on a rush was made to get over the barriers into the reserved portion and the police had some difficulty in stemming it....." 34

Closer examination of the social "mix" of crowds in particular stands

32 Saturday Night 27th January 1883.
33 Public Disorder and Sporting Events, p. 17.
34 Birmingham Daily Mail 20th October 1910.
and parts of grounds has not proved possible. Interpretation of these elusive examples would be even more fruitful if this had been accomplished, but, given the nature of the available evidence it seems unlikely that this will ever be achieved. Despite this, the 'oblique' method or approach to the study of popular culture can be undertaken. An example drawn from 1895 can help to illustrate what insights have been gained.

During the same period in which the Pall Mall Gazette reported on the growing "democratisation of the game", The Times concluded in a general review of "The Football Fever" that:

"...The mob is now as the mob has ever been....not so very long ago it might also be said that the spectators behaved like Gentlemen, while the players behaved like brutes. If the contrary statement is something of an exaggeration, it is still nearer the truth than it ought to be....." 35

Shed of its implicit criticism, such an analysis tends to confirm the process of proletarianisation which appears to have characterised the change in the composition of the crowd during this period. Though the typical crowd appears to have centrally attracted "respectable" sections of the working class, those groups who were most frequently reported as being involved in disorder were identified as being drawn from "rough" sections of the working class. This is not to suggest that "respectable" elements were not involved - they were. Even within this broad canvas, regional variations may well have existed, too. 36

Having said this, the available evidence does suggest that it was the "rough" elements of the working class who were centrally involved in the more serious cases of disorder. The "respectables," however, were not above criticism: in 1890, London crowds, whose social composition, relative to

35 The Times, 14th October 1895.
36 See Chapter Seven.
their northern counterparts, appears to contain a greater proportion of members of the higher social classes also suffered such admonishment:

"London crowds do not, Pastime fears, set a good example to the much blamed provincial spectators. On Saturday week, at Richmond, the Prestonians, who played a good and fair game, were the recipients of much abuse from the onlookers. Such partisanship is by no means creditable to what should be the most intelligent and well-behaved crowd in the kingdom." 37

Even at this stage, however, the "dominance of the roughs" may well have been on the wane. Vamplew's work suggests that spectator misconduct "declined" around the turn of the century. That is a problematic issue and one to which attention will shortly be given. There does appear to have been, however, an "improvement" dating from around the turn of the century in the behaviour of those attending football matches. Following the scenes in the Birmingham City centre and the death of a supporter in 1910 discussed earlier - incidents, one would have thought, hardly likely to lead to praise being given to football crowds - Mr. Cresswell, the local stationmaster noted:

".....in recent years there has been a marked improvement in the behaviour of the large number of excursionists who are brought to Birmingham and the visitors to the cup-tie between Aston Villa and Derby County though exuberant, proved for the most part very manageable. There was far less drunkenness than would have been associated with such an occasion years ago. The loss of life which unfortunately took place breaks a long record of happy immunity from serious mishap in connection with the excursion traffic at New Street station." 38

Such observations may well be the precursor of a trend which was to become more apparent in the inter-war years. But before attention is given to that period and to the possible growth in "respectability" in those years, consideration must be undertaken of the problematic issue referred to earlier, the nature and the rate of spectator misconduct before the First World War.

As indicated by the evidence already cited, the idea that this early period in the development of football as a spectator sport was devoid of acts

37 Birmingham Daily Mail 17th March 1890
38 Leicester Daily Mercury 7th February 1910
of spectator misconduct, or indeed, in Taylor's terms, was "conflict free," is mistaken. A clearer idea of the nature and extent of this disorder - and its connection to the social composition of those involved - is required. Attention must therefore focus on the rate and the forms of disorder. This requires some elaboration.

A number of more general methodological issues have been discussed, at some length, both in Chapter Two and in the introduction to the present chapter. In this latter context, the process by which forms of disorderliness came to be reported and the people involved identified and socially located, was highlighted. At this point, specific features which relate to the rate and forms of disorder need clarifying.

The material drawn from Birmingham newspapers was utilised in an attempt to establish time-series for the rate of disorder. This involved the use of five-year intervals. The Leicester material, from which a case-study was constructed, similarly relates to the reported rate of disorder, at five year intervals from 1895 to 1939. In this way, a sense of continuity between the Birmingham and Leicester material can be achieved. Qualification of the term 'rate,' as used here is, however, required. The analysis is dealing with reported disorder. What in fact may be revealed, therefore, may not be the "real" rate, but the "perceptual" rate - that is, the periodicity of different groups' sensitivity to spectator disorder. This is a complex issue, one which requires, for clarification and possible resolution, the use of qualitative as well as quantitative analysis. For this reason, specific examples will be cited in the text in order to develop and highlight insights into the relationship between continuity and change in the structured processes of the phenomenon. Without such analysis, assertions concerning the dominance of the "roughs" in the majority of forms of reported disorder

---

39 See Chapter Six.
Number of spectator disorders reported in the Birmingham Press 1895-1914 at five year intervals as occurring at Football League and FA Cup matches. (1)

Key:
- Incidents in West Midlands involving Aston Villa, West Bromwich Albion, Wolverhampton Wanderers and Small Heath (Birmingham).
- Incidents elsewhere in England.
- Combined total.

Notes (1) The year 1914 is included because the League season in 1915 was curtailed as a result of the First World War.
would be that much more problematic.

An example of the importance of such an approach can be given in relation to the categorising of the forms of reported disorder which were encountered in the Birmingham and Leicester newspapers. The categories utilised, in fact, "emerged" from the data, i.e. they were inductively worked out in conjunction with the research project as a whole. That is, the forms of behaviour reported referred to particular acts, which, in turn, formed the basis for the categories constructed. Even with these measures, such evidence is treated with some circumspection in relation to attempting to make any firm conclusions regarding the "motives" of those involved.

The material gathered from local Birmingham newspapers is presented in quantified form in Graph A and Tables 1 and 2. This material, as noted above, is based on five year intervals starting in 1895. Such an approach was necessary because it would have been impossible for a single researcher to survey every issue of the relevant papers for the whole of the eighty-nine years involved. Particular features of Graph A also require elaboration.

Graph A differentiates between those home matches of West Midland clubs at which disorder was reported to have occurred, and those home matches of other League clubs at which disorder was reported. Such evidence tends, in general terms to confirm aspects of the analyses of Wray Vamplew, John Hutchinson and Tony Mason. However, this issue is a rather complex one and again requires elaboration.

In the research of Hutchinson and Mason, for example some thirteen and seventeen cases of disorder are respectively cited. The general appraisal offered, reinforced by the analysis presented by Vamplew which documents

---


41 See Chapter 1.
Graph B

Number of spectator disorders reported in the Leicester Daily Mercury 1895-1914 at five year intervals, as occurring at Football League and FA Cup matches at Leicester Fosse. (1)

Notes (1) the year 1914 is included because the League season in 1915 was curtailed as a result of the First World War.
sixty-three cases of disorder, is that spectator disorder was at its peak during the period of the onset of the development of the game as a "mass" spectator sport i.e. when large working class crowds began to be attracted to the stadia. However, these authors further suggest that the trend in disorder was on a downward path after about 1890. Vamplew, for example, cites particular years of the FA minutes to suggest that the rate was declining. Some reservations, however, need to be expressed.

Firstly, the totals offered by these authors, as little as thirteen in the case of Hutchinson and sixty-three in the case of Vamplew, do not capture the extent of the disorder reported in that period. The evidence they present is drawn from periods ranging between thirty-five and forty-five years. Yet for the five years drawn from Birmingham newspapers alone, over a twenty year period, some fifty-three cases are documented. If the average for these years is taken as 10.6, then the total would be some two hundred and twelve cases of spectator disorder. What is being suggested, therefore, is that the extent of the phenomenon has been underestimated by Vamplew, Hutchinson and Mason. Further criticism of these researchers, however, can be levelled at them in connection with the rate of disorder. While the Birmingham material on its own is not a sufficient guide, taken in conjunction with the FA records presented in Graph C and the Leicester material, presented in Graph B, the impression gained is that the rate of disorder has a cyclical pattern to it. Graph A contains a rate of disorder "peaking" at seventeen cases for the year 1900, whereas in 1905 it had "dipped" slightly to sixteen and by 1910 it had "dropped" to eight cases. The FA records, however, highlight how the number of cases of spectator disorder reported to them rose around the turn of the century, increased again during 1906 and 1907 and then fluctuated up to 1914. The Leicester material shows a similar "peak" in 1900 and the rate increasing again in 1914.
Of course, such changes may simply be an artefact of changes in the style and nature of reporting. It does appear, however, from the evidence presented that spectator disorderliness was a problem of some significance in the years before the First World War - the Scottish Football Annual in 1899, in fact, viewed it as a "hydra-headed monster" \(^{42}\) - and that the historians who have studied it can in no way be said to have adequately captured the nature and extent of the phenomenon.

A number of other points also need to be made in relation to the material presented. Two, in particular, stand out. Firstly, at this time, the West Midlands contained a number of clubs which, along with, though to a lesser extent, a group of Northern clubs, dominated the English League and Cup competitions. These clubs, particularly Aston Villa, West Bromwich Albion and Wolverhampton Wanderers, attracted large crowds and, at one and the same time, introduced crowd control measures such as turnstiles, fencing and perimeter walls. But due to the media attention given to these more successful clubs, it may be possible that the quantification of material gathered from Birmingham local newspapers serves to mask the nature and extent of incidents occurring at less successful league clubs who had not introduced the type of crowd control measures referred to. This interpretation is, in fact, borne out in two ways. Firstly, no reference in Birmingham newspapers was made to particular incidents reported in the Leicester Daily Mercury of spectator misconduct at Leicester Fosse home games, or at other grounds around the country. Secondly, and this issue will be returned to, the FA records reveal particular cases of disorder not reported in either Birmingham or Leicester newspapers. An inter-related issue, and one which has implications for the interpretation one places on the work of Tony Mason, is that these newspapers also contain reports which do not appear in the minutes of meetings.

\(^{42}\) Scottish Football Annual 1899 n.p.
Graph C

Number of Football League Clubs cited in Football Association minutes involving reports of spectator misconduct 1895-1914

Notes: * 1902-03 Minutes missing
      * 1903-04 Minutes missing
of the FA Emergency and Disciplinary Committees.

In relation to the Leicester material presented in Graph B, further observations are required. The overall total of cases relating to spectator disorder at Leicester Fosse is, in fact approximately a third of the overall total of the West Midland clubs: eight cases and twenty-five cases respectively. While this may well be an artefact of the means by which such data were collected, such a proportion of cases, relative to the number of clubs, does appear to indicate that the rates are about the same.

The evidence presented in Graph C reveals, as noted, a similar pattern to that found in relation to newspaper reports. The evidence also reveals, however, significant discrepancies, relative to such local press accounts. In none of the minutes of the FA for this period do Leicester Fosse appear as having witnessed spectator disorder at their ground. Yet newspaper accounts, as Chapter Six will document, cite several cases. Similarly, examples exist in relation to West Midland and other English League clubs where spectator misconduct occurred but which do not appear in the FA records. Equally, cases have been documented in the FA records which do not surface in the Birmingham or Leicester newspapers. Clearly, an element of under-reporting in terms of the rate of disorder exists. Thus, the estimate of two hundred and twelve cases of disorder cited in relation to the period between 1895 and 1914 may well be an under-estimation.

Such incidents were clearly uppermost in the mind of one of the FA's leading figures, N. L. Jackson, when he declared in 1899 that spectator disorder was the FA's 'most pressing problem.' Important as such documentation is in establishing the rate and extent of the disorder, clarification of the term, the "dominance of the roughs," as a characterisation of this period.

### TABLE 1. TYPES OF SPECTATOR MISCONDUCT AND DISORDER REPORTED IN BIRMINGHAM NEWSPAPERS AS HAVING OCCURRED AT ASTON VILLA, WEST BROMWICH ALBION, WOLVERHAMPTON WANDERERS AND SMALL HEATH (BIRMINGHAM) DURING FOOTBALL LEAGUE AND FA CUP MATCHES 1895-1914 AT FIVE YEAR INTERVALS (1)

#### TYPES OF MISCONDUCT AND DISORDER (2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year (1895-1914)</th>
<th>Verbal Misconduct and Disorder</th>
<th>Pitch Invasions/Gate Crashing</th>
<th>Physical Violence and Assault</th>
<th>Ambiguous or Unelaborated cases</th>
<th>Number of Incidents Counted Twice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1895</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1900</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1905</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1910</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1914</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>9</strong></td>
<td><strong>4</strong></td>
<td><strong>6</strong></td>
<td><strong>6</strong></td>
<td><strong>4</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Notes:

1. The year 1914 is included because the League Season in 1915 was curtailed as a result of the First World War.

2. Types of misconduct and disorder:
   A. Verbal misconduct and disorder, e.g. use of threatening or foul and abusive language; 'barracking'; drunk and disorderly behaviour
   B. Pitch invasions, encroachments, interference with play, demonstrations, forced entry into grounds
   C. Physical violence and assault, e.g. missile throwing, assault or attempted assault in the general match-day context on players, match officials and other fans.
   D. Ambiguous or unelaborated cases, e.g. references to "misconduct," disorderly "proceedings," mobbings, etc. without clarification of the behaviour involved.
must also be sought in probing the forms of disorder.

In attempting to clarify this characterisation, specific issues arise. Analysis, not only of particular forms of disorder but also of the relative frequency and seriousness of each of them is required. In this connection, Tables 1, 2, and 3 provide a way of documenting such issues. The evidence for the Football League as a whole gives a similar impression. The tables as presented indicate that certain cases were ambiguous and, that is, did not prove possible to locate them in the other categories. Some cases, however, contained more than one form of disorder and were therefore recorded in different categories, hence the reference to the number of

---

44 In this regard, the categories employed in these tables arose out of the project directed by Eric Dunning and Patrick Murphy investigating Working Class Social Bonding and the Sociogenesis of Football Hooliganism.
TABLE 2. TYPES OF SPECTATOR MISCONDUCT AND DISORDER REPORTED IN BIRMINGHAM NEWSPAPERS AS HAVING OCCURRED IN ENGLAND (EXCLUDING THE WEST MIDLANDS) AT FOOTBALL LEAGUE AND FA CUP MATCHES 1895-1914 AT FIVE YEAR INTERVALS (1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of Misconduct and Disorder</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Verbal Misconduct and Disorder</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pitch Invasions/Gate Crashing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Violence and Assault</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambiguous or Unelaborated cases</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Incidents Counted Twice</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>28</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Verbal Misconduct and Disorder</th>
<th>Pitch Invasions/Gate Crashing</th>
<th>Physical Violence and Assault</th>
<th>Ambiguous or Unelaborated cases</th>
<th>Number of Incidents Counted Twice</th>
<th><strong>TOTAL</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1895</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1900</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1905</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1910</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1914</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td><strong>28</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
(1) The year 1914 is included because the League season in 1915 was curtailed as a result of the First World War.

(2) For further elaboration of these categories see notes accompanying Table 1.
incidents counted twice. A more crucial qualification lies in respect of explaining the variations in the rate of particular forms of disorder. The issue of whether the analysis reveals "real" changes in the rate or reflects changes in the nature and style of reporting is a complex issue and one which cannot be resolved by reference to such tables and graphs alone - qualitative analysis of particular reports is also required.

Tables 1 and 2 indicate that the main form of disorder reported was what has been termed in the present research "verbal misconduct and disorder." Such behaviour usually took the form of threatening or foul and abusive language, "barracking" and displays of drunkenness. The verbal abuse was chiefly directed towards players, referees and club officials. Despite the prominence of such reports, as the tables show, examples of physical violence and assault occur which, in several cases were of a "serious" nature and probably involved sections of the rough working class. The impression gained is that spectator disorder was more extensive and more serious in this period than researchers such as Hutchinson, Vamplew and Mason have suggested.

The examples cited of fighting between rival groups and among individual spectators raise an interesting methodological issue. Reliance on the FA records as a guide to reports of spectator misconduct in the local newspapers - a method used by Mason - would probably tend to reinforce the bias deriving from the relatively involved position of football officials. For the FA and referees were, it appears, primarily concerned to report incidents which were deemed to have 'interfered with play.' Clearly a pitch invasion or an attack on a player would do so - but, some doubt must be cast on whether the FA were equally sensitive to fights between rival groups or individual spectators on the terraces or away from the ground. Thus, research which
TABLE 3. TYPES OF SPECTATOR MISCONDUCT AND DISORDER REPORTED IN THE LEICESTER DAILY MERCURY 1895-1914, AT FIVE YEAR INTERVALS AS OCCURRING AT FOOTBALL LEAGUE AND FA CUP MATCHES AT LEICESTER FOSSE (1)

TYPES OF MISCONDUCT AND DISORDER (2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Verbal Misconduct and Disorder</th>
<th>Pitch Invasions/Gate Crashing</th>
<th>Physical Violence and Assault</th>
<th>Ambiguous or Unelaborated Cases</th>
<th>Number of Incidents Counted Twice</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1895</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1900</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1905</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1910</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1914</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes. (1) The year 1914 is included because the League season in 1915 was curtailed as a result of the First World War.
(2) For further elaboration of these categories see notes accompanying Table 1.
relied solely upon the FA records, or used these records as a guide to consulting specific newspapers, as in the case of Mason, would be unnecessarily limited.

While the FA records tend to complement the general finding that the disorder which was reported during this period chiefly involved verbal misconduct and physical assault on players and officials, the possibly violent tenor of life on the terraces - and in the communities from which large numbers of spectators at this time were drawn - could not be determined from such a source. In order to substantiate further the idea that this period witnessed the "dominance of the roughs" - both in terms of the involvement of the roughs in the more serious cases of misconduct and in relation to how the values which underpinned their behaviour held sway during this period - what lines of investigation can the present study follow?

One possible avenue of exploration to consider in this qualitative analysis is the development of the role and authority of the referee and the concomitant formulation of the rules of the game. The introduction of whistles, for example, stemmed from the need for the referee's decisions to be heard over the barracking of the crowd.\textsuperscript{45} In addition, Gibson and Pickford, in 1906, argued that the introduction of the penalty kick was also, in part, related to aspects of crowd disorder. They wrote in relation to the latter development:

"Introduction of the Penalty Kick.

......The attempt made previously to achieve this desirable object by giving the referee the power to allow a goal that had been saved by unfair means had not proved successful. It was found that referees shrunk both from the odium and the ordeal of making presents of goals to visiting teams in the sight and sound and within touch of a hostile local following, and this Irish intervention seemed to supply a great need......" \textsuperscript{46}

\textsuperscript{45} Gibson and Pickford, Association Football and the Men who Made It 1, p. 108

\textsuperscript{46} Ibid p. 108.
Such a development partly reflected the relatively rudimentary stage at which the game stood at that time. Indeed, it may be possible, as Vamplew and Mason have done, to relate aspects of spectator misconduct to this rudimentary stage in the organisation of football as a spectator sport. Particular reports of disorder, as they show, attribute the behaviour of spectators to their frustration at teams who either arrived late or not at all for fixtures - a not infrequent occurrence at that time. Indeed, the very success of the game as a spectator sport, led, given the limited stadia available in the early stages, to overcrowding and an inability on the part of some to see - another reason given by contemporaries for particular cases of disorder.

Even when teams turned up on time and the spectators had an uninterrupted view of the match what they saw was not always to their liking: weakened teams were not acceptable to some of the supporters. Though this, in part, may help to explain particular cases, it does not shed light on why groups of spectators had such ready recourse to violence when faced with such situations. Nor, indeed, does it explain those incidents which were reported to have occurred away from the ground.

Attention to the development of the rules of the game reveals which forms of disorder were deemed most problematic. In 1902, the rules of the FA were changed. From that date on, the FA decided:

"Every Association or club is responsible to the Council for the action of its players, officials and spectators, and is required to take all precautions necessary to prevent spectators threatening or assaulting officials and players during or at the conclusion of matches. No official of an Association or club, referee, linesman or player shall bet on any football match and Associations and clubs are also required to control betting and the use of objectionable language by spectators. In the case of a breach of this rule, any player, official or spectator may be removed from any ground and such force used as may be necessary for the purpose of effecting such removal." 47

47 FA Minutes 1902 Rules of the FA.
Reference here is made to the use of "objectionable language" - something which would have been included in the category verbal misconduct and disorder in Tables 1, 2 and 3. As the tables document, in the West Midlands, at Leicester Fosse and around the Football League in general, this was the most frequently reported form of spectator misconduct. A case typical of the characteristic forms of disorder of this period was an incident given the following headline by the Birmingham press, 'Referee Baiting At Wolverhampton - A Disgraceful Scene.'

The initial stages of the incident involved, it was reported, an attack on the referee, a pitch invasion and clashes with the police. Having gained the comparative safety of the press box, the referee still had to leave the ground, but despite the efforts of the police, the crowd had not dispersed. The report continued:

"...At length it was thought safe for Mr. Armitt, the referee, to leave surrounded by policemen but no sooner had he stepped out of the box than the crowd commenced to hustle the police and generally to behave like uncivilised beings....Blows were dealt by the police and the way cleared to a cab, in which Mr. Armitt was placed, a policeman either side of him, and two in front completely sheltering him from view. Finding it impossible to get to the referee as affairs stood, a rush was made for the cabman and an attempt was made to pull him out of his box. His coat was torn from his back and had it not been for the police and a few others he would have been soon fetched from his seat. However, he drove away amid loud groans and the shower of a few missiles...."

Significantly perhaps - in terms of what it reveals about the perception of such behaviour and the values of the reporter - the writer believed that the crowd behaved like "uncivilised beings." As noted in the analysis of popular culture and popular recreations, several commentators in that period utilised similar phrases to register their disgust at particular forms of behaviour and their belief in the concomitant need for the "masses" to be

---

48 Birmingham Daily Mail 30th September 1895.
49 ibid.
saved from their "moral plight." In the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, working class leisure, as Peter Bailey has observed, still posed problems for the middle classes.50

Commenting on such a theme, an anonymous Leicester writer observed in 1894:

"...With the exception of one or two trivial fouls the game was singularly free from the "dirty" work sometimes associated with these games. I wish I could say as much for the conduct of some of the spectators. Their behaviour was scandalous, and the sooner that stringent measures are taken to put a stop to the vile language of which such grave complaints are made the better for the "morale" of the people generally." 51

Such observations raise important issues regarding an explanation of the motivation of the people involved. In this example, the actual match was seen as "singularly free from the 'dirty' work sometimes associated with these games." The games being referred to are "local derbies". One possible interpretation which arises is that, while the early stages in the development of the game as a spectator sport, particularly given the greater violence of its "play-fight" features in these stages, may have engendered such displays, there is also a case to be made out for a culture which positively valued such behaviour. This is a complex issue and will be pursued initially when reference is made to the influence of the values which underpinned the "roughs'" behaviour later in this section. It will be considered in greatest detail, however, in the context of the Millwall case study.52

The involvement of the "roughs" in the overall pattern of spectator disorder was hinted at in the earlier section. Specific examples, such as the attack on Preston players in 1889 by "bona fide Brummagen roughs" also highlight particular forms of disorder.53 Descriptions of this nature can be

---

51 Leicester Daily Mercury, 12th February 1894.
52 See Chapter Seven.
53 Saturday Night, 9th May 1885.
interpreted as carrying connotations of a "subculture of violence." Such connotations are borne out by other evidence too. Following an attack in a Leicester street on a Burton Wanderers player called Cunningham in January 1897, an incident which, the Burton press also reported on, a correspondent to the Leicester Daily Mercury observed:

"...About 10.45 p.m. on Saturday last I was walking down Churchgate, when I heard a lot of rowdy youths running behind me. Turning round I saw about 12 youths running after the man Cunningham, and when about half-way down they caught him up, and at once attacked him unmercifully by punching his head, whilst one or two were using their feet about his body. He cried out for help, and I and several others ran up, and with a policeman also appearing on the scene the youths immediately made off. That the policeman did not hold one of them was the surprise of all who witnessed the affair. The Burton report was much overdrawn, for Cunningham was certainly not unconscious, or he could not have walked away, which he did. He was, however, bleeding from a nasty cut on the temple. I have an idea that the police know the gang." 54

Of possible significance in this connection is the writer's comment that he was "puzzled" why the police did not make an arrest. So, too, is his reference to his idea "that the police know the gang." Could it be that such evidence lends weight to the interpretation that the values of the "roughs" held sway more during this period than is the case today? More concretely, was spectator disorder and physical violence inside and outside football stadia more generally tolerated, or relatively less susceptible to control, in that period? Such incidents were not confined to the Midlands, and similar cases reveal possible variations over time in the concern felt towards spectator disorder. Each can be said to reflect both changes and continuities in popular culture.

This interpretation requires elaboration. As with Cunningham, the Burton Wanderers player in 1897, a Birmingham player was attacked and badly kicked in Sheffield in 1905. Interestingly again, neither the local police nor the Sheffield Wednesday club took action against the attackers. The prosec-

54 Leicester Daily Mercury 19th January 1897.
ution of the offenders, it was argued, rested with the player concerned.
It is perhaps possible to provide some 'grounded speculation' to explain
this in relation to particular features of the period which, over the next
seventy years, were to remain, relatively constant, but which by the late,
1950's appear to have changed radically.

At this fledgling stage in the development of the game, it may be possible
to explain the reticence of the clubs to act in terms of their relationship
with their supporters and local communities. The clubs would not, possibly,
have wished to be seen to have to implement measures to clear their ground
of "roughs." Prestige - not social disgrace - was one of the motivating
influences of directors: but they would have faced a dilemma in this regard.
Allow the "roughs" to stay and "respectables" might have stayed away. Ban
them and publicity is given to grounds as "immoral places," hence still
driving "respectables" away. The fact that crowd sizes continued to grow
despite the reporting of such behaviour is perhaps indicative of the fact that
the majority of "respectables" were not unduly concerned; i.e. their threshold
of repugnance was high. The middle-classes, in any case, would have been
by and large insulated in the stands. Equally, at this stage in the develop­
ment of football as a spectator sport, such disorder, as the subsequent
chapter will examine, had not reached the status of a national problem. Nor
had the 'state' developed a particular interest in or ability to investigate
the phenomenon. It can also be suggested, tentatively, that different rates
and forms of reported disorder may, in part, be a consequence of changes in
the composition and values of the crowd overtime and there may also have been
variations between regions. It is also, it is argued, concomitantly related
to the "tolerance" and "sensitivity" exhibited by different interest groups.
Thus, in contrast to the reaction of the Sheffield Wednesday Board, a case
from 1895 can serve to highlight the variations which existed between periods and regions. More particularly, when an attack was made on a referee in the South of England, at the ground of Woolwich Arsenal to be exact, the London FA closed the stadium for six weeks. Such a decision may reflect the tenacity which the groups who dominated football in the South still clung to amateur values, with a concomitant perception of the evils of spectating.

While the distinctive forms of disorder in this period centrally involved verbal misconduct and physical assault on referees and players, on occasions such disorder was also accompanied by other forms of misconduct. Documentation of how the "lower element" were alleged to "not infrequently molest strangers" has already been attempted. The contention that the "roughs" were centrally involved in the more serious cases of disorder and that the values underpinning their behaviour held sway with other groups in the figuration is borne out by other cases. Writing on a match between Leicester Posse and Lincoln City in 1900, a reporter noted:

"...Pleasant weather prevailed and there was at the outset a 4,000 gate, included amongst which was a train from Lincoln....The match now seemed to be quite a secondary consideration with an unselect few of the spectators on the popular side, and a Lincoln v Leicester proceeded on two occasions in the shape of free fights. The sparring was wilder than judicious, and out of place in any case, but fortunately each time a constable was at hand, and promptly and firmly parted the pugilists, who showed by these actions that they were not qualified to watch a football match."

Fights between individuals have also surfaced from newspaper reports of the period. The Birmingham Daily Post noted, for example, in 1910:

"Fight at a Football Match. A Man's Jaw Broken.

.....The defendant and two friends were criticising the play of the city men saying that the play was rotten and that Chaplin was playing out of his position to put his opponents offside. Riley replied that the players could not be expected to do well every time. Perhaps you can do
do better,' he said to one of the defendant's friends. Graves then took the part of his friend and saying 'I am not a footballer, but I can do my share with my fists,' he struck Riley a blow on the lower jaw and broke it. For the defence it was stated that prosecutor had put himself into a fighting attitude. It was argued that it was a fair fight. Defendant, said: 'He dared me to strike him and I did so'....The Stipendiary magistrate said if there was provocation it was not sufficient to justify such a blow...." 58

Though such an incident is of interest in itself, in that it further documents the existence of disorder during the period in question, the report also contains a possibly more significant point. In the evidence given to the court it was argued that "it was a fair fight." Though the present study has yet to establish from what communities those involved in disorderly incidents came, it is possible to relate this to research which argues that, in particular, in mainly lower working class communities, such ready recourse to violence is indeed regarded as "fair" and non-problematic. These communities - as will be highlighted later in the analysis of Millwall FC - have been characterised as being marked by a "violent masculine style." Dunning, Maguire, Murphy and Williams, for example, have argued that the lower working class communities of the late twentieth century continue to adhere to such a style and that, around the turn of the century, the "respectable" elements of the working class were in fact, closer to this style than is presently the case.59 The implications of this for the present analysis lie in the fact that it corresponds to the idea proposed that this period witnessed the "dominance of the roughs" in terms of the influence of the values which underpinned their behaviour.

An example indicative of these sentiments concerning the expression of violence appeared in the Leicester Daily Mercury in October 1898:

---

58 Birmingham Daily Post 16th September 1910.
59 Eric Dunning, Joe Maguire, Patrick Murphy and John Williams,"The Social Roots of Football Hooligan Violence" Leisure Studies 1, 2 (May 1982).
"In Praise of Fighting: A Magistrate's Advice to Boys.

Two respectable-looking boys appeared when certain names were called during the summonses at Worship-Street police court, and Mr. Cluer, looking surprised at the juvenile prosecutor and defendant, asked their respective ages. He was told eleven and twelve years. The charge was one of assault, and Mr. Cluer asked the eleven-year-old prosecutor, "Did he hit you?" - "Yes, sir," said the boy - Mr. Cluer: "Then why didn't you hit him back?" The boy: "Please sir, I did" - Mr. Cluer "And not yet satisfied? I don't like encouraging boys to come to a police court for summonses. If I let you have back the two shillings you paid for the summons, will you be content?" The boy said he would, and Mr. Cluer remarked: "That's right. Withdraw the summons and if a boy of your own age and not too big - in that case I would protect you - hits you again, hit him back. It's much more English, and we must expect a fight sometimes." 60

It would appear possible to speculate from this, that at this stage in the development of English society, there was a greater degree of tolerance towards the expression of physical violence by males - across the social spectrum - than is characteristic of present day society. If this is so, it would seem that fighting between football supporters was not a "one-off" phenomenon or confined to the ground but a type of behaviour that was condoned and common in other areas of life as well. Moreover, ability to fight was evidently regarded as an English virtue and young males were socialised into it from an early age. This is the connection which is being made in examining the balance between the changes and continuities in popular culture - and the perception of that culture by outside observers - since the nineteenth century. For example, as far as leisure was concerned, more serious acts of violence occasionally accompanied meetings in public houses and music halls. A report to this effect - from an incident in a Birmingham public house - surfaced in the press in 1905:

"A Whiston of Fenton, believes Aston Villa will win the English Cup. He expressed that opinion on Saturday evening to a man named Booth, who had pinned his faith to Everton. Whiston's knowledge of form caused Booth to lose his temper; a scuffle ensued in which the Villa's champion was stabbed over the eye. Booth will be in gaol when the clubs meet at Stoke." 61

60 Leicester Daily Mercury 15th October 1898.
61 Birmingham Daily Mail 7th March 1905.
Throughout the report the writer gives no hint of condemnation, though this is not to argue that such behaviour did not provoke moral condemnation on the part of some. But what is being questioned is the extent to which such behaviour may have been a persistent, frequent feature of football in particular, and popular culture in general, in this period and was viewed then in a matter of fact fashion - provided, of course, that such behaviour was directed towards other members of the working classes and not towards their "social superiors" or authority figures. Conversely, such incidents may have been relatively rare, but were not deemed to be a cause for concern. It is also possible, of course, that these are not mutually exclusive alternatives.

A case similar to the one cited above is worthy of quoting at length since it combines passages which clarify issues concerning the possible existence of some subterranean aspects of spectating, more particularly the attendance at football matches of men who appear to have adhered to a "violent masculine style." Such clarification is important in considering the structured processes at work - the tendencies towards continuity and the tendencies towards change - as far as spectator misconduct since the foundation of the Football League and the emergence of football spectating as a social problem are concerned. The incident took place in Loughborough following a non-league match which those involved in the fighting had attended in 1898:

"After the Football Match: Disgraceful Row at Loughborough.

At the Loughborough Petty Sessions, on Wednesday, when the magistrates on the bench were Captain Heygate, the Mayor, T. Ritchie, S. Wells, J. S. Smith and J. G. Shields, Esqrs., James Witham, lock-keeper, and Richard Stark, labourer, both of Barrow, were summoned for assaulting William T. Cockain, licensed victualler, Loughborough, on the 19th inst. There was a cross-summons against Cockain for assaulting Witham - Mr. Deane appeared for Cockain, and Mr. Wilfred Moss for the other two. - Mr. Deane said Cockain was landlord of the Stag and Pheasant Inn, near the Athletic Ground, and on Saturday
a football match had been played between Barrow and Hemington. After the match there was a considerable rush of people to this public house, and amongst others were a number of men from Barrow, whose team had been defeated. At that time Cockain was in the cellar, and his mother was behind the counter. The men got into an altercation, and two of them started fighting. Mrs. Cockain called up her son, the complainant, and he endeavoured to separate the men. They instantly turned on him and attacked him in the most savage and brutal way. They and other men got him on the floor, kicked him and struck him while he was down, and there were five of them on top of him at once. Mrs. Cockain called for the police, and at that time Frank Cockain, prosecutor's brother, was passing, and hearing the noise, went into the house. He tried to pull Witham off, and then the Barrow men set on him, and he was seriously beaten, so much so that he had to make his escape. He went into the kitchen and got the tongs, with which he threatened the men if they did not get off his brother. A man picked up a can and threw it at Frank Cockain, just missing him, and striking a lamp. An alarm was raised that the police were coming, and all the men engaged in this most disgraceful riot, including the two defendants, ran out. When the policemen came it was found that Cockain had been badly knocked about. His forehead was cut, his jaw injured, bottom lip cut through, three teeth loosened and he was bruised about the head and body...." 62

The headline to this report indicates that those involved in the fighting had just attended a football match between Barrow and Hemington. The report claims that after the match there was a 'considerable rush of people' to the Stag and Pheasant Inn and that in this public house an 'altercation' developed into a fight. It would be hard to imagine that the people involved in the expression of violent conduct would have restrained themselves to any greater extent if a similar altercation had occurred in the more emotionally excited atmosphere of a football match. While this should not be taken to suggest that fighting was a regular occurrence at matches at that stage, it may be possible, given the haphazard pattern of such incidents, that reporters may well have been less aware or less concerned with such misconduct than with other forms such as pitch invasions and attacks on referees. As a result, under-reporting of behaviour on the terraces but particularly outside grounds may have been the norm. But what does the altercation and fight at the Stag and Pheasant Inn reveal

62 Leicester Daily Mercury 23rd March 1898.
with regard to the expression of violence and the adherence to a violent masculine style of those involved?

Significantly, the fight which took place between the two football supporters was, we are told, 'instantly' suspended and those involved turned on the "outsider," the landlord, William T. Cockain. From this point, the fight which ensued was described as 'savage and brutal.' The landlord was knocked down, punched, kicked and, when his brother Frank Cockain, intervened he too was 'seriously beaten.' The severity of the violence used would appear to suggest that those involved had little compunction in expressing themselves in this way - a fight between themselves - if interfered with - could quickly be turned on the 'outsider' who sought to break up the fight. Before consideration is given to how the Football authorities dealt with similar behaviour within stadia at this stage, however, one further observation must be made in relation to the reported forms of disorder and the "dominance of the roughs."

The possibility of the under-reporting of particular forms of disorder - and with it of those involved - cannot as the previous example indicates, be dismissed. Indeed, specific features of the pattern of disorder did emerge out of a qualitative analysis of match reports - other examples surfaced when incidents were brought to the attention of the police and the magistrates. One other source was "letters to the editor." A report in one such letter, as was documented earlier in this chapter, is suggestive of a neglect of post-match disorder by the press at that time. Following a match between Aston Villa and Derby County in 1910, "Colonel Ludlow," as we have seen, described what he termed the 'disgraceful scenes' in these terms:

"Our City on Saturday night last was a disgrace to civilisation with the mob of yelling 'sportsmen' (?), who are worse than Zulus or Matabele, because they have not got half their physique or pluck. They are utterly indisciplined, and the result of this lack of discipline on Saturday night last was the death of one of these poor
misguided enthusiasts, who lost his life under the carriage wheels of a train at New Street station...." 63

This report of a chance encounter by a 'gentleman' with what he described as a "mob of yelling 'sportsmen'" surfaced in the press by means of a letter. The impression gained from this and from the other evidence cited is that there were subterranean features to the phenomenon in this period. Such letters and cases provide support for the view that there was under reporting of the rate of the disorder at and surrounding football matches at that time. Hence the disorderly incidents cited in ordinary match reports may only be the tip of an iceberg regarding specific forms of disorder. But what conclusions has the present analysis so far reached in connection with examining the rate and nature of spectator disorder during this period?

From the evidence presented, it is clear that spectator misconduct was a relatively persistent feature of Association Football matches from the foundation of the Football League in 1888 to the outbreak of hostilities in 1914. Though relatively persistent, establishing the actual rate at any given point or indeed over time is more difficult to accomplish. By the very nature of the source material, precise judgements may well not be possible.

In contrast to Hutchinson and Vamplew, the evidence presented suggests that the rate of disorder followed a curvilinear trend. However, two points need to be made in this connection. First, as argued, care has to be taken in establishing whether such a pattern reflects changes in the perception of spectator behaviour rather than changes in the behaviour itself. Secondly, while the present analysis is critical in this regard of Hutchinson and Vamplew, it is not denied that there may have been to some degree, a drift towards respectability in these years.

63 Birmingham Daily Mail 10th February 1910.
The problems of making assertions concerning such issues are compounded by the existence of the more subterranean features of the phenomenon. That is, both in terms of its rate and its forms, aspects of spectator misconduct appear to have been relatively neglected both by newspapers and the FA during this period. In this respect, while the form of spectator misconduct most frequently reported involved the verbal abuse and physical assault of referees and players, there are grounds to suspect that the clashes which took place between individuals and groups of spectators were either considered relatively unimportant or were not encountered by reporters or the referees who submitted reports to the FA. In this respect, with spectator misconduct being a relatively persistent feature of attendance at matches and with there being more than a hint of subterranean features of the phenomenon - coupled with deaths on the field of play accompanied by pleas in such medical journals as Lancet to end "rough" play, whose evidence will be considered in more detail in Chapter Five - the period can be seen to be relatively adequately characterised in terms of the "dominance of the roughs." 64

Even when reports of disorder did emerge in the press, however, problems of interpretation still remain - the "facts" do not, in some simple sense, "speak for themselves." A case which illustrates this point is drawn from an issue of the Leicester Daily Mercury in 1896:

"Sequel to a Football Match: Attack on Police.

At the Gloucestershire Assizes, on Tuesday, three young men were charged with the wilful murder of a police-sergeant, and the attempted murder of a police-constable, during a disturbance when returning from a football match. One prisoner was found guilty of manslaughter, and the other two pleaded guilty to assault. They were given good characters, and the judge sentenced George Morgan to twelve months, James Morgan to six months, and George Hill to one month's imprisonment." 65

64 Birmingham Daily Mail 17th February 1890.
65 Leicester Daily Mercury 19th February 1890.
Clearly, the killing of a police-sergeant by football supporters was not commonplace, but, taking that into account, how is it possible to explain the societal reaction evidenced in the "matter-of-fact," non-sensationalist style of reporting in the above extract and the length of the sentences given by the judge? While it is not possible to elaborate on this at this stage, it is important to acknowledge that such facets are inter-related with questions concerning the perception of popular culture and, what has been termed the "dominance of the roughs." It is to an analysis of these issues and of the attempts that were made in this period to manage the "democratisation of the game" that attention will now be turned.

2. "Football Must be Kept Under Decent Control: The Attempts to Manage the 'Democratisation of the Game.'"

In order to understand the attempts made in this period to control the "democratisation of the game," it is important to consider the specific actions of particular groups and to locate them within the overall climate of concern. What needs to be probed, therefore, is the relationship between the forms of reported disorder, and the, possibly changing, climate of concern which existed within the period considered. In this context, it will be possible to explore the related issue that there may have existed - both within and between groups, over time and within and between regions - different thresholds with respect to the perception of this phenomenon as a "cause for concern." Such an issue, it will be argued in the subsequent chapter, is central to understanding the emergence of football spectating as a social problem.

While it has been acknowledged that it is useful to differentiate between concern that was aroused by particular incidents and, the overall climate of concern, this is not to argue that these are entirely separate
issues. Such contextualisation, for example, attempts to link the overall discussion of popular culture to specific aspects of spectating. This approach in fact, allows scope for the examination of the persistent features of and changes in popular culture and football spectating since the late Victorian and Edwardian periods.

In order to understand more adequately how the perception of the democratisation of the game both reflected and reinforced the existing climate of concern, it is first necessary to probe the general reaction to professionalisation and the incipient stages in the development of football as a spectator sport. From the evidence encountered so far, it is clear that spectator disorder and spectating *per se*, aroused criticism by groups opposed both to the professionalisation and the democratisation of the game, notably those adhering to an amateur ideology and strict temperance beliefs. Writers such as Edwardes and Ensor - as was shown in Chapter Three - are typical of this stance. In considering what they termed "The Football Madness" and "The Football Fever," they were highly critical of the corrupting influence - physically and morally - of spectating. In the terms set by the amateur ideology, spectators had no part to play in football or, indeed, in any other sport. Almond, another contemporary commentator, claimed that it was the "spectatorial element" which was ruining the game. With the onset of professionalisation and the democratisation of the game - and possibly prompted by specific incidents - a man using the pseudonym, "Creston," as was documented, also argued that crowds were "a great danger and disadvantage to football." Thus when particular cases of spectator misconduct occurred, with associated activities such as betting and drunkenness, such interest groups could point to this as

---

66 Almond, "Football as a Moral Agent" p. 910.
67 'Creston,' "Football" The Fortnightly Review 55, 1894 p. 33
"proof" for their argument. Indeed, as will be documented, it provided further confirmation to such groups as the "Rational Recreationalists" that the whole gamut of leisure activities of the working classes, particularly of their youth, required control, organisation and improvement. This backcloth helps us to understand why the editor of the Birmingham Daily Mail felt able, as has been previously noted, to claim in November 1888:

"...Professionalism, with its necessary accompaniment of playing for gate money is at the root of all these embittered and violent contests. We wish the Association would come down heavily on those players who suffer from inflammation of the vocabulary, and annoy sensitive ears with their language. Bad language and bad temper on the field influence the conduct of the crowd and evoke displays of passion which are not only discreditable to sport, but a menace to the public peace.....Football is on trial. Either by drastic measures, it must be kept under decent control, or it will soon become the recognised pastime of roughs and the regular occasion of rowdyism...." 69

Permeating this passage is an implicit criticism of spectators and a suggested need for football - and other leisure activities of the working classes - to be controlled. The attempts made to control football crowd behaviour in this period, in fact form part of the wider attempts to control public behaviour in the nineteenth century which was discussed earlier in this thesis. 70 As observed, these attempts and the issues of the professionalisation and the democratisation of the game, with their perceived concomitant, namely the debilitating effects of spectating, combined to form a backcloth within which the reaction to specific cases of disorder occurred. Indeed, some contemporary commentators recognised this in part. Writing in the Birmingham Daily Mail in February 1895, a reporter, as noted earlier, posed the following question:
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"How comes it that the introduction of Professionalism has degraded the spectator to such an extent that 'Democratisation of the game' has become synonymous with ruffianism and unjust partisanship and has banished Gentlemen from the football field?" 71

It is to the issue of who, in different periods, decided what constituted "decent control" and what measures were, co-relatively, taken - "drastic" or otherwise - that attention must now be directed.

Initially in the development of football as a spectator sport, it was the clubs who dealt with the cases of "rowdyism" which arose or which were anticipated. A case in point arose during 1888. Apprehensive of a possible recurrence of the disorder which marred the 1885 fixture between Aston Villa and Preston North End, the Aston Villa Chairman wrote a pre-match plea in the local press for spectators to behave:

"Sir - May I, on behalf of the Villa committee, ask for room to say a few words?......A staff of 50 police will be on the ground and in the road assisting and controlling the constant stream of spectators and vehicles.

During the game the greater part of the police force will be prepared to keep order in every part of the ground......

But something more than these arrangements is wanted. What is it? Why, it is the help of every man who goes to Perry Barr tomorrow.

Preston North End and Aston Villa stand hand in hand in this matter, and we both of us appeal to you to help us to show how an enormous gate can be managed, how thousands of footballers can meet in one vast crowd with perfect order and without a mishap." 72

While the present research largely confirms the analysis offered by Vamplew in relation to the control of crowds during this period, some qualifications of his conclusions are required. Vamplew has correctly pointed to the measures taken by clubs to control the actions of the spectators and to the relative "success" of these measures - but, the motivation of the directors in such matters remains unexplored. As the example cited above reveals, directors appear to have been sensitive to the possible damage
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to the reputation of the club - and thus to their own social prestige - caused by such disorder. This finding appears to be supported by other evidence. A case illustrative of this appeared in the *Birmingham Daily Mail* in 1888 when it was stated:

"We would only briefly refer to the regrettable episode that finished the match, when the spectators rushed onto the pitch after a bout of fisticuffs... and swept the players off the field. These are the sort of exhibitions that bring the game into disrepute and disgust all respectable people...." 73

While there is no direct reference to the attitude of directors in this report, the newspaper does refer to the fact that such fighting both brings the 'game into disrepute' and prompts the 'disgust of all respectable people.' As one of the main motivations for directors was social prestige it was the 'respectable people' that the directors were most sensitive to. It was they that the directors wanted to predominate in football crowds. Further confirmation of such an interpretation of the motivation of club directors is found in the remarks made by Charles Crump, the Chairman of the Birmingham and District FA in the late 1880's. During a committee meeting in 1889, he was reported to have commented that:

".....He was brought by the provocation to which Siddons was subjected, to the question of the behaviour of the spectators and the responsibility of clubs. That, they felt to be one of the most difficult matters that their Association had to deal with. They knew what a delicate matter it was for clubs to put down with a strong hand what was offensive outside the ropes....." 74

This sense of a possible loss of respectability for themselves and of respectable persons in the crowd when confronted with this "delicate matter," continually permeates accounts of the reactions of clubs to spectator disorder. As noted, this may explain, in part, some of the discrepancies between the local press and the FA minutes as sources of evidence concerning
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the rates of various forms of disorder in this period. Though it is possible to argue that the contents of the latter were a function of the bureaucratic process by which such cases were gradually being dealt with, it is also possible that such discrepancies reflected the clubs' desire to downplay disorder at their grounds, i.e. by not taking court action against or banning from the ground those involved in misconduct, they would avoid, or so they hoped, adverse publicity. Though affected by the amateur ethos and thus holding a more genteel view of the art of spectating, directors were sensitive to the possibility that rowdiness might reflect on them. By not taking court action or banning the "roughs" from the ground, the press would not have a story to pursue - their match reports would continue to be filed with the editor, and life on the terraces would remain relatively neglected - under-reporting of particular facets of terrace life would be that much more likely.

This is not to argue that the clubs did not take preventative measures. Nor is it to suggest that no actions were taken by them as a result of particular outbursts - independently of the FA. In some cases, they clearly acted according to their own wishes. Following scenes at the ground of Aston Villa in the preceding weeks, the Birmingham Daily Mail concluded in November 1889:

"We were glad to find by posters pasted up in the ground last Saturday that the committee are offering £5 reward for information that shall lead to the conviction of the offender....It is gratifying to see on Saturday that Bills were posted up and carried around the enclosure warning spectators that proceedings would be taken against any person betting, and that the club would press for the severest punishment....." 75

Interestingly, concern was expressed in this context about a form of spectator misconduct which reflected the wider debate involving working class leisure - namely betting. 76 Of more immediate relevance, however, are
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the attempts to manage particular forms of spectator disorder. Again referring to the ground of Aston Villa, though the scenes which prompted this concern occurred at another club, a writer in the Birmingham Daily Mail noted in 1896:

"The services of sixty police have been obtained; some of these will be mounted, and will be inside the ring. But the Villa ground is the best railed enclosure in the kingdom and the possibility of breaking in is almost out of the question." 77

Measures such as the use of mounted police and the railing of the enclosure around the pitch were useful, immediate steps which clubs could take to control the crowd but the prosecution of those who continued to be involved in misconduct and disorder was hampered by the prevailing legal position. Commenting on this issue in 1900, William McGregor, the founder of the Football League, observed:

"....Another phase of the question is the prosecution of those who cause the disturbances. It appears to be nobody's business. The Police can only eject the Rowdies, who, so long as they discontinue their conduct as soon as they reach the street, are safe from the intervention of the law. It does seem absurd that a disturber of the peace who has to be ejected gets off so lightly. The clubs ought to prosecute him; but here again the lawyers of the Police shake their heads sagely, and express doubts as to whether the disagreeable duty does not fall on the shoulders of the licence-holder for the grounds. It might be worthwhile getting a bit of legal advice on the question. If it were known that prosecution was likely, the fact would be worth the services of half a dozen policemen in keeping order...." 78

The scope for managing the "democratisation of the game" and for keeping it under "decent control" was thus limited by the issues outlined by McGregor. That is, the police were "unwilling or powerless" to act in a consistent manner. The onus was on the clubs; the police could not, it appears, arrest spectators for unruly behaviour inside grounds, but could only eject them. For the clubs, the only legal option was to bring individual
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prosecutions. But, by the very nature of the law relating to 'Offences against the Person,' they were faced with difficulties in establishing a case. Problems arose, for example, in relation to the identification and arrest of offenders. As well as these difficulties, as has been documented, the clubs may have been unwilling to undertake a prosecution for other reasons. Such a course of action would serve to highlight the presence of "unruly elements" at their ground. Once more, the possibility of a subterreanean phenomenon is raised: for not only is there a possible element of under-reporting of the rate of spectator misconduct, but equally crucial, where such prosecutions occurred, they reflected the prevailing sensitivity to a particular form of disorder. Thus the prosecution of the attackers of referees, players and officials was possible, though not always undertaken. However, prosecutions resulting from the reported cases of fights between rival groups of supporters do not surface in accounts of court proceedings found in the Birmingham or Leicester press.

Although the clubs were involved in managing the "democratisation of the game," the ultimate arbiter of the rules governing the organisation, playing and spectating of football was the FA. During the period in question, the FA established Emergency and Disciplinary committees to deal with infringements of its rules relating to crowd disorder. For example, it was deemed the responsibility of the clubs to deal with "insulting or improper conduct" either on the ground or "away from the field of play." In 1892, a general circular of the FA was issued to clubs, copies of which were posted around the grounds, again warning spectators concerning "demonstrations of feeling...." Another circular, issued in 1903, warned of the consequences
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of assaults on or barracking of players, referees and officials. In this regard, it was stated:

"All clubs connected with the Association must have bills printed and posted in their grounds, threatening with expulsion any person who is guilty of insulting or improper conduct towards the referee." 81

Similarly, particular cases of misconduct prompted the national FA to appeal to its various district branches to pressurize the clubs into more effectively managing their spectators. A case in point arose in 1901 following scenes at grounds in Norfolk and Suffolk:

"The Committee heard with regret statements with regard to misconduct of spectators at grounds in Norfolk and Suffolk and call attention to the urgent necessity for the local Associations to insist on better behaviour on the part of football crowds." 82

Two points require elaboration in this connection. Firstly, the circulars cited refer to "insulting or improper conduct towards the referee" - the very form misconduct most frequently reported in the press. The FA position concerning the "démocratisation of the game" appears to have reflected and reinforced the prevailing sensitivity to spectator disorder.

This connects with the second observation which needs to be made. It has been argued that the control of particular incidents of spectator misconduct is bound up with the issue of the "démocratisation of the game" - and, such concerns directly relate to the perceived "problem" of working class leisure. At the Annual General Meeting of the FA in 1884, N. L. Jackson noted this very connection:

"...Even at this early period of the introduction of the game among the "masses," the chief labours of the Association Commission was in dealing with matters arising therefrom...." 83

Unfortunately Jackson does not elaborate on this issue: but, with such
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clues in mind, an appraisal of the actions of the FA during this period can be more adequately based. No cases are cited in the FA minutes of supporters fighting among and between themselves, and thus no actions were taken by the FA against such groups. The FA's actions, therefore, can be seen to reflect the process by which spectator misconduct was reported to them. An examination of this process will assist in the analysis of how the FA managed the "matters arising from the introduction of the game among the masses."

Particular cases have been documented where the referee appears to have acted as the official initially involved in taking action against spectator misconduct. Such a trend is indicated in the following report from Birmingham in 1900:

"The only regrettable feature was the action of the crowd toward the referee....A section of the crowd objected to his decisions, and eventually the referee went towards the malcontents and administered a caution to them." 84

If such attempts failed to quell the malcontents involved in barracking and physical assaults, the referee was obliged to supply a report to the FA containing a record of events. Special commissions and enquiries were established but their terms of reference will probably never be uncovered as no record exists at the FA relating to this. From the actual reports of these commissions, however, four main forms of action taken by the FA emerge:

(a) Clubs were cautioned about future behaviour of their spectators.
(b) Clubs were ordered to post warning notices concerning the behaviour of spectators.
(c) Clubs were ordered to improve ground precautions against spectator disorder.
(d) Grounds were closed, clubs fined and ordered to pay the costs of the enquiry.
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A typical example of this process is derived from a case in February 1900:

"A commission appointed by the FA enquired into the report of Mr. Allwood, who was referee in the match between Albion reserves and Small Heath reserves. The Commission found that, although Mr. Allwood was not actually assaulted, the attitude of the crowd was very threatening and that the Albion club officials and the players on both sides did their best to protect the referee. The Albion were ordered, not only to repost their ground with the FA notices, also that a special bill be posted notifying that the club had been warned, and that another disturbance of the kind would mean the closing of the ground for a period. Notices were also to be exhibited at the entrances to the ground for a period, and more police were to be engaged for such matches." 85

Unfortunately, important as such documentation is to an understanding of how the FA managed the democratisation of the game, the criteria by which these committees decided what constituted serious misconduct remain unclear. Some insight can be gained, however, by probing the social composition of the members of such committees. Drawn largely from aristocratic and middle-class groups, it is probable that the amateur ethos and a "genteel" view of spectating may well have pervaded their discussions of cases of misconduct. 86

Other facets of the FA's position also require consideration. For example, regional variations regarding the interpretation of what constituted disorderly conduct may have existed and such variations may have been compounded by the relationship between the Football Association and the Football League. With regard to this latter dimension, while no conclusive evidence has been found in Birmingham or Leicester newspapers, some insights have been gained. An example typical of this appeared in the Birmingham Daily Mail in February 1895:

"The management committee of the Football League met yesterday
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in Manchester, Mr. Bentley in the chair. Mr. Brodie reported that
that he had been assaulted at Woolwich in a match with Burton
Wanderers but as the FA had dealt with the matter and closed the
ground for six weeks, the League took no further action. It was
decided to recommend to all clubs to have their grounds railed off
so as to keep the spectators off the playing pitch and give greater
protection to referees. 87

In this example, the introduction of railings was perceived as a
form of crowd control which would reduce the possibility of attacks on
referees. Such measures, in part, reflected the relative position of
strength which the FA held. It was, and still is, the FA's responsibility
to deal with infringements of the rules of the game. The "rules" of the
game - for playing and spectating - were, after all, those decided by the
aristocratic and middle-class members of the FA who, despite the
"democratisation of the game," had retained control over the organisation
and administration of Association Football.

The proceedings of these FA committees were also the focus of lively
debates within the sporting press of the period. An article reflecting the
issue of "rowdyism" at football matches and what actions could be taken, was
written by William Pickford, a member of the FA Committee, as part of a
series for the Athletic News which are preserved as part of a collection of
newspaper cuttings for the period 1901 to 1906 which are located in the FA
library:

"Football Problems and Hints to Referees.

.......A cure for rowdyism has not yet been discovered. The
suspension of a football ground is, after all is said and done not
altogether and always a punishment for the evil doers. I have had to
investigate many cases of misconduct by spectators and am bound to say
that in very few cases have I been able to honestly persuade myself
that those responsible for the ground were at fault. If excited and
reckless people like to make a disturbance there is no chance of
stopping them. I was at the famous match at Fallowfield in 1893,
when a few thousand spectators calmly walked over the railings and
stood on the touchlines. A hundred policemen could not have stopped
them. On the other hand, I have been at a match in the country at
which the throwing of a single stone that hit a referee was punished
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by a month's closing of the ground. At Fallowfield the crowd were not Manchester people, but visitors, and in the second case the youth who threw the stone came from a neighbouring town. I mention these two instances to show that closing a ground would not necessarily hit the actual culprits, but might injure a club and annoy its local spectators without fittingly punishing the crime...

I do not propound a cure for rowdyism. Time will bring fresh methods in its wake, but I am a believer in spiked iron railings, and the Police Court. I think, and I am borne out by facts, that the money spent in keeping the crowd off the football enclosure by means of a really formidable fence is well spent and I have an opinion that if all lovers of law and order would combine to spot offenders and give evidence against them before the magistrates we should have a happier state of things....." 88

As with other accounts, such comments calling for specific measures, appear to reflect the forms of spectator misconduct which the FA and the clubs were particularly sensitive to - namely, those forms which were deemed to "interfere with the game." Such sensitivity reflected a wider concern relating to those leisure forms of the working classes which the middle-classes "encountered." These related issues were compounded by the propensities of the newspapers and the sporting press to "treat" the phenomenon, and indeed, football spectating in general, as a form of "mania" or "madness." 89 Some contemporaries, as the analysis of the methodological dimension highlighted, were not unaware of this treatment of the phenomenon. In a telling article written for a northern newspaper, Pickford noted:

"Football Crowds: Sensational Evening Telegrams and the Cold Truth.

The brief accounts I read in the Saturday evening editions of the disturbance at Roker Park were, I am glad to think, very much exaggerated. I had looked forward with more than a lively interest, to getting my "Football Echo" on Monday morning, and it was the first newspaper that I opened. I was glad to read that matters were not so bad as they had been painted. The free use of the word "riot" in the Saturday evenings is very much to be regretted, because many people who would read the brief reports might not, as I did, get a chance to read the detailed local account. Lots are on the lookout for any stone to throw at football to whom an item of this nature is welcome. It is true we have had unfortunate scenes at football at times. I can recall several going back before the days of....."
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Professionalism which is now the text for so many ponderous and unfair sermons against the game." 91

Such comments provide a glimpse, albeit fleetingly, into the backcloth against which the fears, sensitivities and actions of those who found aspects of football spectating and working class leisure particularly problematic were located. The essential point to grasp, however, is that though these fears and sensitivities existed, no sustained and co-ordinated attempt was made by the state and its agencies of law and order, to control spectator disorder in this period. This was both a reflection of a different "climate of concern" from that which developed in the late 1950's and 1960's, and also of an inability to intervene on the same scale, again relative to the attempts to control the modern phenomenon of "football hooliganism." Though no widespread "moral panic" over spectator misconduct in the late Victorian and Edwardian periods is evident, the sense of concern was, as will be documented, greater during this period than in the decades between the wars and in the years immediately following World War Two. Indeed, as the chapter concerning the emergence of football spectating as a social problem reveals, it appears that the perception of spectator misconduct in this earlier period, if it is to be adequately understood, must be located within the debate concerning working class leisure and, especially, the emergence of working class youth as a "problem."

For contemporaries like Gibson and Pickford, therefore, spectating and implicitly also, the democratisation of the game - was conceptualised as "This Awkward Problem." As they put it:

"......Spectators have a right to criticise so long as it is done in a fair and gentlemanly manner, but they should accept a referee's decision. Criticism to a certain point is not illegal, but beyond that point it constitutes a source of annoyance to the referee,

and an incitement to others to misconduct, and should be stopped, and the persons responsible for keeping the spectators in order are the responsible officials of the home club." 92

At stake here was what constituted the right to criticise in a "fair and gentlemanly manner" and who decided: such a theme echoes the wider debate concerning what constituted publically acceptable behaviour and the struggle over competing ways of living. As has been shown, it was felt by the FA and the clubs that the chief labours of the Association were in matters arising from the introduction of the game to the "masses." Football, it was claimed, was on trial, and must be kept under decent control. The present analysis has sought to examine this both in terms of the changes and continuities in popular culture and the perception of that culture in general and football spectating in particular. As argued, reference must be made, in this context, to the emergence of football spectating as a social problem 93 and to the social roots of football hooligan violence. 94 Before attention is given to these latter features of the phenomenon, an appraisal of the problem of crowd disorderliness at football matches in the years between the two World Wars must be undertaken.

---
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The over-riding impression gained from the data to be documented in this section of the thesis, which covers the years 1919 to 1939, is of a shift towards "respectability." This trend involves a two-fold dimension. More particularly, both the status of the game and the composition of the crowd is seen to have become more "respectable" in this period. Such a trend has two main implications for the analysis of spectator disorder. Firstly, the extent of such disorder appears to have "lessened" both in terms of its seriousness and the rate at which incidents occurred. Secondly, and possibly co-relatively with this change, the "climate of concern" also shifted, with less anxiety accompanying reports of crowd behaviour. In emphasising these changes, however, a degree of continuity with the late Victorian and Edwardian decades can be detected and should not be overlooked.

Indicative of the sorts of changes which occurred between the wars are the comments made by Sir William Edge, a prominent Leicestershire politician during this period. More particularly, he was reported to have said in 1927:

"Always Play the Game: Lessons to be Learned from Football.

Sir William Edge.....said football had become part of our national life.

It was above everything else, the working-man's game, and was a splendid relief to tired men. To see scores of thousands pouring into football grounds on a Saturday afternoon was one of the sights of Britain. He said the most unreasonable spectator was usually the man who had never played football.

He urged that boys and youths be encouraged to play, as the recruitment places for the big teams were the junior clubs.

Sportsmanship of Crowds.

He had seen lads playing in open fields, with jackets as "goalposts," and had afterwards seen them playing with teams in the first division.....He was always struck by the sportsmanship of the great football crowds, and the sporting way in which the people took the result. He added that there was no finer British crowd than a football crowd, and the good humour acted as a tonic.
Concluding, Sir William added: "The great thing is to play the game. You will notice all great players do this. It is the poor player who does not play the game." 95

Such observations encompass both the status of the game itself and of its spectators. Football is seen to have become 'part of our national life' and to be contributing the 'finest British crowd.' In order further to examine such a trend - and to locate the spectator misconduct which did occur within such a development - a threefold analysis must be undertaken. Firstly, consideration must be given to the changing social composition of the crowd, or more correctly, to the "incorporation" of the "typical" crowd into "respectable" culture. Secondly, attention must still be given to the nature and extent of spectator misconduct - as documented in specific cases. Thirdly, an analysis must be undertaken of the co-relatively changing climate of concern, and the policies of control which resulted from this during this period. However, the persistence of negative perceptions of working class leisure in certain circles should not be overlooked. It is to the first of these features of the phenomenon that attention will now be turned.

1. The Trend Towards Respectability and the "Unruly Few"

The argument that this period can be characterised in terms of a shift towards "respectability" is not to rule out the persistence of spectator misconduct at football matches. In the present-day, however, more "romantic" images exist of this period. As argued, Taylor and Clarke envisage the period between the wars as a tranquil time on the terraces. Such romantic notions reflect and reinforce popular conceptions as well. For instance, reconsider the remarks made by Wilf Mannion, an England International of the 1930's when he argued in 1981 that, when he was a player, 'there were no hooligans on the terraces and there was a great relationship with
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opponents and supporters of both teams.  

Two points need to be made in this regard. First, such reminiscences should make the researcher wary of an over-reliance on the use of oral history: it is not being argued that such an approach should be completely dismissed; rather that it needs to be combined with an analysis of a wide range of source material. Second, although such romantic images were just that, images, the present analysis is not suggesting that a state of mayhem existed at football matches between the wars. On the contrary, as was suggested in relation to the preceding period, as early as 1910 there were observations being made with regard to the "marked improvement" in the behaviour of spectators. It would appear that a number of groups similarly perceived a "marked improvement" in the behaviour of spectators between the wars - relative to that which existed prior to the outbreak of war in 1914. But, to point to such observations alone would be misleading on two grounds. Firstly, as argued, spectator misconduct persisted in varying degrees and forms. Secondly, such broad characterisations must be combined with an examination of trends within the period in question. Concentration on the social composition of the crowd during the years between the wars may help to substantiate the trend towards respectability and more specific features of the phenomenon of spectator behaviour at football matches in this period.

Football crowds during the inter-war years appear to have consisted largely, as did their counterparts before the First World War, of skilled manual workers with a varying element of clerical workers. That is, terrace spectators seem to have been drawn largely from the "respectable" sections of the working class. This is not to state unequivocally - as the Leicester Daily Mercury 7th February 1910.
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study highlights - that no "rough" members of the working class attended, or that such groups were not periodically attracted, perhaps especially, to important local derby and cup matches which aroused a great deal of attention and engendered widespread excitement in a town. What the present chapter is arguing, however, is that the central and persistent feature of the social composition of the crowd was the presence of "respectable" elements of the working class and that those involved in the most frequently reported forms of spectator disorder were drawn from this group. An important inter-related point to grasp in this connection is that the influence of the "roughs" was waning - relative to the preceding period. That is, the "respectable" elements of the working class were sharing less and less in common with the "rough" working class - the former were being, as Dunning et al argue, "incorporated" into mainstream culture.

Such contentions appear to be borne out by the comments made concerning the social composition of crowds attending FA Cup Finals. Writing in 1922, a Leicester Daily Mercury reporter commented:

"Features Worthy of Note."

The cup-tie crowd is always an interesting one, and this year there were features about it which were worthy of note. To anyone who remembers the invasions of say twenty years ago it seems that the visitors from the North have changed a good deal. They are far less unsophisticated now than they were then, less provincial in their dress, and far more at home in London...."

While there is a dimension of regional prejudice to these comments, it does appear that supporters from the North in this period shared the values of their Southern counterparts to a greater extent than was previously the case. Indeed, the descriptions of cup-tie crowds during

---
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this period largely centre on praising the behaviour of the spectators. Indicative of this and of the suggested trend evident in the inter-war years, is an editorial which appeared in the Leicester Mercury following the 1928 Cup Final. It reads:

"There seems to have been more than the usual favourable comment on the good behaviour of the Wembley crowd. Students of people in mass will probably tell us that we make merry nowadays without the discreditable manifestations that were at one time thought to be inseparable from these public rejoicings. Rejoicing and sobriety go hand in hand, and great crowds distinguish themselves with a sense of discipline that is creditable all round. May we infer that we are an improving people?" 100

Also indicative of the trend outlined by this editorial is the presence of women at cup-matches. Grounds do not appear to have been perceived as "unduly dangerous" and thus the Leicester Mercury was able to note in April 1929:

50% Women.

A feature of the crowds was the number of women who were making the trip to Wembley, at least 50 per cent of the train loads being of that sex. The crowds easily constituted a record. 101

In similar fashion, The Times in 1929, noted the popularity of the sport with women. It stated:

"Manchester Corporation will make the experiment tomorrow of running special trams for women only after the Manchester City v Huddersfield football match, owing, it is stated, to the great popularity of football among women." 102

From the photographic evidence available, it would appear that those women who attended were drawn from respectable sections of the working class and, possibly, the lower middle-class. Once inside the ground, these "respectable" ladies took their seat or their position on the terraces along side their male counterparts. From this evidence, it appears reasonable
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to argue that the football ground was deemed sufficiently respectable for women to attend, safe in the knowledge that the stadia, or at least a large proportion of the terraces, were not "unduly dangerous" places.

The overall position can, however, perhaps be best captured by considering the comments made by the editor of the Birmingham Post in 1939:

"Partisanship, we venture to suggest, is becoming a nuisance because so many partisans are ignorant. Why? Surely because watching football, because it has become a respectable and fashionable entertainment, has enlisted so many ignorant spectators. . . . Soccer grounds, nowadays, have lost the old cap-filling, collar-lacking 'gate.' Your average spectator has a hat and a collar. He remains a partisan - we suggest he is even more a partisan because, being of the 'hat and collar' crowd he knows less of the game than the old 'cap and muffler' brigade...." 103

The changes the writer refers to have two important implications for the analysis being presented in relation to this period. Firstly, the "new" supporters the writer refers to may not, in fact, have been "new" but rather "old" respectable supporters who were gradually adopting new modes of behaviour and new forms of attire - co-relative to their "incorporation" into mainstream culture. This is not, however, to rule out the attendance at matches of any newcomers. As Dunning and Murphy have remarked, attendances during this period increased by a factor of 2, or possibly 3, relative to attendances before the First World War. 104 It would appear reasonable to assume that a proportion of these newcomers would have been drawn from strata higher in the social hierarchy than those that the writer refers to as the traditional 'cap and muffler' brigade. Secondly, and equally important, the game and football spectating per se were envisaged now as a "respectable and fashionable entertainment." But as the criticism implied, what was perceived as spectator disorder - in the form of "partisanship"
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which was held to be becoming a "nuisance" - still existed. At issue, therefore, is the precise nature and extent of the trend or shift towards respectability. The question arises whether such a shift was, in fact, but a thin veneer or something more lasting and deeply rooted? Of course, it is not an either/or question - at stake is the relative nature of this shift and the extent to which all football spectators who attended matches were involved in the trend towards respectability. It is within this context that the examination of the forms of spectator disorder during the inter-war years and the continuing presence of the "unruly few" which surfaces from that examination must be understood.

While the analysis presented so far has argued that this period witnessed a trend towards respectability with one by-product being the presence of greater numbers of women at matches, this should not be taken to suggest that their presence, together with "respectable" elements of the working class on its own ruled out the occurrence of particular forms of spectator misconduct. In 1920 indeed, the *Daily Express* revealed that women sometimes took part in the disorder:

"More Wild Scenes at Football Matches.

Women have now begun to take a hand in the scenes of misbehaviour by spectators that occur at football matches when the play or the control of the game is not according to their taste." 105

From the evidence which will be presented it is clear that spectator misconduct continued to be a persistent, albeit "subterranean" feature of football matches after the First World War. Closer examination of specific cases reveals that while "respectable" elements of the working class were centrally involved, reference was also made to the presence of an "unruly few" and a "hooligan element." In examining these forms of disorder, therefore, it is essential to probe the inter-related issues of the nature

---

105 *Daily Express* 22nd November 1920.
and extent of the disorder and the social composition of those involved.

One further point needs to be made. While spectator misconduct continued to be reported in the press and FA minutes, it was still not, at this stage, conceived of as a national cause for concern. Nevertheless, the problems posed by the "unruly few" were real enough for the clubs concerned.

Such problems, as the Leicester case study reveals, appear to have originated on the "popular" side of grounds. Indeed, a report in the Everton match programme in November 1926, alludes to this:

"Everton Gossip.

The demonstration at Goodison during the Bolton match is to be regretted. Stone-throwing will bring the enclosure into disrepute." 106

A more direct reference to those involved is derived from a Wolverhampton Wanderers programme from the 1922-1923 season. In this the writer deplored:

"....The hooligan behaviour of young supporters, whose chief pleasure was in throwing cinders at all and sundry, and from which exercise their elders made no attempt to dissuade them." 107

Though this report appears to suggest that young supporters were chiefly involved, it does not indicate their social class origin. But it is not difficult to imagine that such youths and the fathers of such youths, probably did belong to the "typical" respectable crowd already outlined.

The "hooligan element" referred to nevertheless appeared, intermittently, at several grounds around the country. During 1920, following disturbances on 'Spion Kop,' the "popular" side of the ground of Birmingham City FC, a police superintendent, in giving evidence in a court case, stated:

"....The 'Crown and Anchor' players did not belong to any special gang, though they were the people who were likely to create a disturbance...." 108

106 Everton and Liverpool Official Programme 11th December 1926.
The disturbance appears to have arisen out of a game involving betting. The significance of the example lies in the reference made to both the existence of gangs, possibly from "rough" working class communities, and — though this emerges from other sections of the report — the persistent nature of the disorder. The latter observation, as will be documented, runs counter to the image which emerged from the analysis of local Birmingham newspapers. The case is thus worthy of elaboration.

Witnesses called in the court case resulting from the disturbances — Birmingham F.C. were alleged not to have taken sufficient precautions to control "rowdies" — claimed that fights between spectators were a regular occurrence. One witness stated that:

"....He had only seen bottle-throwing on one occasion before. That was in the second round of the English Cup-tie in February last year. At various times he had seen fights on 'Spion Kop.' The first policeman he saw was one hundred yards away from him, and he did not see another in the vicinity of the disturbance. He had only been to two matches where he did not see disturbances. In cross-examination the witness was asked, 'Have you seen any disorderly conduct other than this? Yes.

Have you seen some fighting now and again? Yes. Plaintiff said that as far as he could see there was no attempt to stop the disturbances...." 109

Two points arise from this example. Firstly, this case provides some support for the idea that there was, again, an element of under-reporting of spectator misconduct during this period and that, possibly, this related not only to the rate but also to the forms of spectator misconduct. Further discussion of this issue will be attempted when a more detailed analysis of the nature and extent of spectator misconduct is undertaken. Secondly, comments such as these do tend to suggest that, in varying degrees over time and in different regions, "roughs" still attended matches. Further confirmation of this can be drawn from the intense clashes between rival

109 Ibid.
groups of supporters and the police in and around Scottish football
grounds which marked the years between the wars. An example, drawn from
1925, in Glasgow, is indicative of this:

"130 Football Spectators Arrested.
Rowdyism at Glasgow.

Glasgow police apprehended 130 members of four brake clubs in the South side of the city after the Rangers and Celtic semi-final football match for the Glasgow Cup yesterday. The Chief Constable had warned members of brake clubs that they would be prosecuted if they caused trouble in the streets by waving party flags and shouting provocative remarks at pedestrians. Detectives in motor cars followed the motor-coaches from the football field to Norfolk Street where a large body of uniformed officers were in readiness. A cordon was drawn across the street and policemen stepped on the running boards to prevent the brake club members from escaping.

This is the second raid which the police have made on brake club rowdyism in the streets. On several occasions in the last few months rival brake clubs have come into conflict, and pedestrians who were merely looking on have been badly injured by broken bottles and other missiles." 110

While closer analysis lies outside the scope of this research it is possible to provide some grounded speculation and argue that while, as will be documented, the phenomenon of football spectator disorderliness in Scotland and Northern Ireland has distinctive features, the essential issue still concerns the changes and continuities in popular culture in the British Isles.

Not only can the presence of "roughs" be documented, but more serious cases of disorder also occurred at football matches in England between 1918 and 1939. Writing in 1920, at a time when Whitehall was the scene of unemployment riots, which the press described vividly, the Daily Express portrayed the spectator disorder in this way:

"Mob Breaks Loose at Brighton: Policeman Stunned by a Spectator.

There was a disgraceful scene on the Brighton ground on Saturday at the close of the drawn game with Luton, the referee being chased and a policeman stunned by a blow from a corner flag." 110

110 The Times 7th October 1925.
Immediately after the last kick of the match, hundreds of the 11,000 spectators jumped the barriers and rushed across the ground. The police barred the way to the players' and officials' quarters, but it was only after an exciting melee that the hotheads calmed down and dispersed.

A policeman was stunned by a blow from a corner flag hurled by a hooligan, and was carried behind the west stand in a dazed condition.

The "sportsmen" who joined in the baiting should be utterly ashamed of themselves. People who cannot accept a decision unfavourable to their side in the proper way should stay away from football matches. Obviously the affair will be reported, and, in view of the previous FA judgements on similar scenes, the Brighton Club, though absolutely innocent, may suffer seriously."

The comments contained in this report have three main features of significance. Firstly, the Daily Express used the term "mob" to describe the spectators involved - a term, in fact, employed to describe the riots in Whitehall and other English cities by the press in general. Also important is the idea that those involved were "hotheads" who only after an exciting melee calmed down sufficiently to disperse. Such comments suggest that such people were perceived as being incapable of exercising the socially demanded degree of self-control. The presence of this group, however, should not be taken to indicate that they alone were responsible for the disorder - though they may have been for the more serious incidents that took place. In fact, another group is also identified. It is here that the third feature of significance lies. While criticising the "hotheads," the writer also refers to the "sportsmen." Such a comment, albeit somewhat ironical in tone, is suggestive of the idea that one has to be a "sportsman" to watch as well as to play football: a more "respectable" image is attached to the "sportsmen" than to the group simply labelled the "hotheads." Interestingly, it is the "sportsmen" who are reported as having participated in the "baiting," but not in the more serious disorders - the invasion of the pitch, the "exciting melee and the attack on the policeman."

Daily Express, 1st November 1920.
While this should not be taken to suggest that the "hotheads" would not have been involved in the "baiting" of the referee, the example does indicate that there possibly existed distinct groups in the crowd who took part differentially in the disorder.

So far, it has been argued that the central and most persistent characteristic of football crowds during this period was that they involved elements of the working class who were becoming more "respectable." The improvement in the behaviour of the crowd as a whole was referred to on several occasions, and the status of football as a "respectable and fashionable entertainment" was also noted. Such observations did not rule out forms of spectator disorder and, especially at important local derby and cup matches, the involvement of the "rougher" sections of the working class. Hence the analysis so far has attempted to examine the social composition of the crowd - especially in terms of the shift towards "respectability." But the presence of the "unruly few," the "hooligan element" or, as they were also referred to, the "hotheads," has been clearly established. The frequency of their visits and the forms of spectator disorder they indulged in, however, do not undermine the overall portrayal of the period - namely that it involved a trend towards "respectability" and more orderly behaviour. For the involvement of the "rough" elements of the working class, as has been hinted at already, appears to have centered mainly around important local derby and cup matches. Further clarification of this issue, however, as argued, can be gained by consideration of the nature and extent of spectator disorder. Before this is attempted, one further point needs consideration. By placing a question mark against the shift towards respectability, allowance was being made for both regional variations and, as noted, the continued, albeit intermittent, involvement of the "rough" sections of the working class. But
GRAPH D
Number of spectator disorders reported in the Birmingham press 1920-1939 at five year intervals as occurring at Football League and FA Cup matches (1).

Key:
- Incidents in West Midlands involving Aston Villa, West Bromwich Albion, Wolverhampton Wanderers and Birmingham.
- Incidents elsewhere in England.
- Combined total.

Notes (1) The year 1939 is included because there were no League games played in 1940 due to the outbreak of the Second World War.
as the case from Brighton revealed, the "respectable" element's actions could quite easily merge - for a number of reasons - into the disorder of the "roughs." How thin the veneer of respectability was - and is - remains to be established. Perhaps, as argued, a systematic discussion of the rate and specific forms of spectator disorder will assist in answering this question?

The data collected for this period from the Birmingham and Leicester newspapers and the FA records are presented in Graphs D and E and Tables 5 and 6. Like the graphs for the period 1880-1914, Graph D is based on five year intervals and when the totals for each of the five years drawn from Birmingham newspapers are analysed, a curvilinear pattern is evident. With a reported total of forty-eight cases of spectator misconduct, the average per year is 9.6. If this average had been maintained, year by year, throughout the twenty year period, then the overall total of reported cases would amount to some one hundred and ninety-two cases. If such a finding is compared to the findings for the preceding period then the years between the two World Wars witnessed some twenty fewer cases of spectator misconduct.

Graph E combines data from both the Leicester press and the FA minutes. A cyclical pattern to the rate of reported disorder is evident both in terms of the League clubs cited in the FA records and those matches reported to have witnessed spectator disorder. Considering the Leicester material, which covers each year between 1921 and 1939, a total of seventy six cases of spectator misconduct have been documented, giving an annual average of 4, less than half the average found for the Birmingham material. If a similar exercise is undertaken in relation to the FA minutes, then an average of 2.84 cases per year, with an overall total of fifty-four,
Graph E

Year

Spectator misconduct and disorder at Football League and FA Cup matches as reported in the *Leicester Daily Mercury* and the FA Minutes.

Key:

- Clubs cited in the FA Minutes as experiencing spectator misconduct on their grounds 1921-1939.

- Spectator disorder and misconduct at Football League and FA Cup matches in England 1921-1939 as reported in the *Leicester Daily Mercury* and *Leicester Mercury*. 
is produced. Such figures, on their own, are of limited value if no contextualising of these reported cases of spectator misconduct is attempted. In this respect, several points need to be made.

Firstly, discrepancies exist when the evidence from the different sources is compared. As with the previous period, the FA minutes contain examples of disorder which do not appear in the Leicester or Birmingham newspapers and there are examples in the press which do not appear in the FA minutes. In no year of the FA minutes does spectator disorder at the ground of Leicester City appear - yet, several cases are reported in the local press. An element of under-reporting is again evident in relation to the FA minutes, and the local Birmingham and Leicester newspapers do not escape this charge as examples are also cited in each paper which are not reported in the other.

Secondly, the attempt to establish whether the period between the two world wars witnessed a shift towards respectability has received tentative support from the fact that the material drawn from the Birmingham material indicates a decline in the overall total compared to the preceding period - a possible one hundred and ninety-two cases compared to some two hundred and twelve cases of spectator misconduct. But the difference becomes more apparent when the changes in the size of the League and in attendances are considered. In relation to the first of these issues, Table 4 is of direct relevance. As the table indicates, some 6448 games were played in the five late Victorian and Edwardian years when the Birmingham newspapers were examined. In the 1920's and 1930's, with the expansion of the First and Second Divisions from the twenty teams that had existed at the outset of the First World War to twenty two teams and with the formation of the Third Division North and Third Division South, some 17,556 games were played in
TABLE 4. NUMBER OF LEAGUE GAMES PLAYED IN THE PERIODS BETWEEN 1890 AND 1914 AND 1920 AND 1939, AT FIVE YEAR INTERVALS.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Number of Games Played</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1895</td>
<td>960</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1224</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1905</td>
<td>1224</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1910</td>
<td>1520</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1914</td>
<td>1520</td>
<td>6448</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1920</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1925</td>
<td>3696</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1930</td>
<td>3696</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1935</td>
<td>3696</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1939</td>
<td>3696</td>
<td>17,556</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Rothmans Football League statistics.
the years consulted between the wars. That is, in total, some 11,108 more
games were played during the latter period. With this in mind, the
reported rate of spectator disorder during the 1920's and 1930's, as a
percentage of the games played is significantly less relative to the
preceding period. Such evidence appears supportive of the argument that
this period did witness a shift towards respectability and more orderly
behaviour. But, as noted earlier, another factor is supportive of this
analysis. Attendances during the inter-war years increased, according to
Dunning and Murphy by a factor of between two and three. If the average
number of cases per year derived from the Birmingham newspapers is divided
by the factor of three - 9.6 divided 3 - then a figure is produced of 3.2
cases of spectator misconduct per year. If this figure is compared with
the average for the period prior to the First World War, 10.6, then the
rate of spectator misconduct during the inter-war years is significantly
less. With this in mind, the argument suggesting that a shift towards
respectability and more orderly behaviour occurred during the inter-war
years appears to be substantiated.

Further support for this analysis comes from examining the forms of
spectator disorder which were reported in the Birmingham press in the inter-war
years. Tables 5 and 6 attempt to document, by the use of particular categories,
the cases of spectator disorder reported in the Birmingham press during the
period in question. When the figures contained in these tables are con­
sidered several findings emerge. In the three main categories of disorder
reported in Table 6, some thirteen cases of verbal misconduct and disorder,
five cases of pitch invasions and gate-crashing and six cases of physical
violence and assault were documented as occurring at matches in England in
general - excluding the leading West Midland clubs. With reference to

112 See Table 6.
TABLE 5. TYPES OF SPECTATOR MISCONDUCT AND DISORDER REPORTED IN BIRMINGHAM NEWSPAPERS AS HAVING OCCURRED IN ENGLAND (EXCLUDING THE WEST MIDLANDS) AT FOOTBALL LEAGUE AND FA CUP MATCHES 1920-1939 AT FIVE YEAR INTERVALS (1)

TYPES OF MISCONDUCT AND DISORDER (2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Verbal Misconduct and Disorder</th>
<th>Pitch Invasions/Gate Crashing</th>
<th>Physical Violence and Assault</th>
<th>Ambiguous or Unelaborated cases</th>
<th>Number of Incidents Counted Twice</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1920</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1925</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1930</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1935</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1939</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
(1) The year 1939 is included because there were no league games played in 1940 due to the outbreak of the Second World War.
(2) For further elaboration of these categories see notes accompanying Table 1.
these West Midland clubs, Table 5 reveals that eight cases of verbal misconduct, two cases of pitch invasions and gate-crashing and five cases of physical assault were reported. When considered with those in Table 6, these figures give a total of twenty-one, seven and eleven cases for the respective categories cited. Such quantitative evidence does not give any indication of trends which may possibly have taken place. However, if the figures cited are compared to those for the period before the First World War, one significant difference emerges. More particularly, an overall decline in the rate of spectator misconduct seems to have occurred. On first inspection, comparison of the figures relating to the categories of verbal misconduct and pitch invasions would not appear to bear this out. As Tables 1 and 2 document with respect to the late Victorian and Edwardian decades and Tables 5 and 6 document with respect to the inter-war years, the number of cases of verbal misconduct and pitch invasions are exactly the same for both periods - twenty one cases of the former and seven cases of the latter. Yet, as noted, a significantly greater number of matches were played during the inter-war years, hence the impression gained is one of a decreasing rate of misconduct. This impression is reinforced when consideration is given to the incidence of physical violence that occurred in the periods in question. Tables 1 and 2 document that, with some fourteen cases of physical violence being cited in the late Victorian and Edwardian decades covered, an annual average of 2.8 is produced, giving a total of some fifty-six cases. In comparison, Tables 5 and 6 documenting spectator misconduct during the inter-war years, highlight some eleven cases of physical violence, yielding an annual average of 2.2 and giving a total of forty-four cases. A reduction of twelve cases, despite the increase in attendances and the number of games played in the inter-war years, is
TABLE 6. TYPES OF SPECTATOR MISCONDUCT AND DISORDER REPORTED IN BIRMINGHAM NEWSPAPERS AS HAVING OCCURRED AT ASTON VILLA, WEST HROMWICH ALBION, WOLVERHAMPTON WANDERERS AND BIRMINGHAM DURING FOOTBALL LEAGUE AND FA CUP MATCHES 1920-1939 AT FIVE YEAR INTERVALS (1)

TYPES OF MISCONDUCT AND DISORDER (2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Verbal Misconduct and Disorder</th>
<th>Pitch Invasions/Gate Crashing</th>
<th>Physical Violence and Assault</th>
<th>Ambiguous or Unelaborated Cases</th>
<th>Number of Incidents Counted Twice</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1920</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1925</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1930</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1935</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1939</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: (1) The year 1939 is included because there were no league games played in 1940 due to the outbreak of the Second World War.

(2) For further elaboration of these categories see notes accompanying Table 1.
evident relative to the preceding period.

While such findings may be an artefact of the manner in which spectator disorder was reported, the impression that the period between the wars witnessed a relative decline in disorder overall, and in physical violence and assault in particular, is also borne out by a qualitative analysis of the evidence. It is to this that the analysis must now be directed.

The over-riding impression of this period yielded by qualitative analysis is that the cases reported were less serious and involved a shift towards "misconduct" rather than "disorder." One example is worthy of citing at this point. In a match involving Aston Villa and Notts County in 1925, the Birmingham Post noted:

"Aston Crowd 'Barrack' Iremonger. Oranges Thrown at Notts Goalkeeper.

The most noteworthy feature of the match between Aston Villa and Notts County at Aston was the persistent and stupid barracking of Iremonger, the Notts Goalkeeper by a section of the crowd. Had it gone no further than that it would still have been a regrettable exhibition of bad taste, if not actually of bad sportsmanship. But it did not cease there. Once in each half an orange was thrown at the goalkeeper. On the first occasion the aim was bad, and Walker picked up the missile. The one thrown in the second half, however, was aimed more accurately, and Iremonger very properly complained to the referee, who, of course, administered a caution to the crowd behind the goal. The incident was extremely unfortunate, and the mere fact that Iremonger is inclined to be more demonstrative than is necessary in his general demeanour on the field is no excuse for some misguided individual to jeopardise the freedom of the ground and blemish the good reputation hitherto borne by Aston Villa supporters." 113

Cases of this kind, reported in a relatively unconcerned style and involving relatively innocuous forms of misbehaviour, do appear more evident in this period compared to the more serious disorders reported recurrently in the late Victorian and Edwardian decades. While comparisons are difficult

113 Birmingham Post 23rd March 1925.
on account of the nature of the evidence utilised - the spectator behaviour of this period does appear to have involved less serious forms of misbehaviour and less frequent outbreaks of disorder. Such an observation is relevant to the issue of the climate of concern in this period. Analysis of how the level of "concern" and "anxiety" appears to have declined between the wars, however, will be attempted later. First, a detailed qualitative appraisal of specific cases of misconduct is required.

As argued, the form of spectator misconduct which was most frequently reported in this period was verbal misconduct and disorder. Such recourse to "barracking" may reflect the "success" of the crowd control measures adopted by clubs - spectator misconduct as a result may have been increasingly confined to this form, whilst previously, direct assault of players and officials may have been more possible. Indeed, such recourse to "barracking" may reflect a shift in spectators' ability to control their emotions - which itself may be bound up with the increasing respectability of the crowd. Whatever the explanation, barracking was viewed as sufficiently problematic for Clapton Orient to issue the following warning in their club programme in December 1922:

"'Barracking' is in every way decidedly 'bad form' and very unsportsmanlike. It entirely fails to produce any good results and may lead to serious trouble, not only for officials but players, spectators and the club itself.

The referee, last Saturday, also had a few words to say after the match in support of one of his colleagues on the line as to strong language used by some of the spectators. The same remarks apply to this as to "barracking."

A referee's position is often a thankless one, and none too easy at the best of times. Healthy, well-intentioned criticism is always welcome, and is likely to do good, but we would appeal to our supporters (and we have many good friends) to assist us in preserving the good name of the club and refrain from endangering the ground, players and all connected with the club to censure and perhaps punishment by the Football Association." 114

As with commentaries on spectator disorder in the late Victorian and Edwardian periods, the remarks made with reference to this specific case are set within a context of the idea of "sportsmanship." While no clear elaboration of this emerges in the text, such remarks carry connotations of the amateur ideology referred to earlier. Interestingly, the writer of these programme notes also refers to the need for the supporters to assist the club in controlling behaviour. This, it will be argued when consideration is given to how the phenomenon was perceived, may be indicative of the supporters moving closer to the authorities' perception of what constituted acceptable and respectable behaviour.

The need to control the emotions of the crowd was not only felt by the writer in the Clapton Orient programme. During 1935, a writer in the Birmingham Post noted:

"...The match suffered from the fault that usually afflicts contests between next door neighbours. The spectators assembled in a state of high excitement and their emotions soon affected the players of both teams. Players did their work feverishly, the normal cool, calculated movements were sought in vain, and the demon of excitement was allowed to rule the roost. Such contests thrill spectators to the backbone, but they rarely satisfy those who ask for naught but good football." 115

The 'normal cool, calculated movements' appear to have been impossible to reproduce in the context of "local derbies" such as that reported above between Birmingham and Aston Villa. It would also appear that, with these highly competitive matches and when sections of the crowd supporting either team are from "segmentally ordered" communities characterised by a violent masculine style, the likelihood of physical violent confrontations is high. But as the analysis of the overall composition of crowds between the wars revealed, such groups do not appear to have been regular visitors to grounds

115 Birmingham Post 25th November 1935.
during that period.

While "local derbies" appear to have aroused feelings of "excitement," other forms of spectator misconduct reported during the 1920's and 1930's such as "barracking," suggest that more and more members of football crowds in that period were exercising greater control of their emotions. At least, it is reasonable to assume that that was the case since such verbal forms of violence in those years came to outweigh its more direct physical manifestations.

The enormous attendances at League football matches in the inter-war years appear to have brought problems. It is within this context that an explanation of another category of spectator misconduct, that of pitch invasions and gate-crashing, must be sought. During 1928, at a home match of the Arsenal, the following scenes were reported:

"Highbury Scenes: Barriers Climbed - Spectators Faint"

Six thousand visitors from the Midlands invaded London for the Arsenal v Villa match at Highbury.

Over an hour before the kick-off the ground was packed. The gates were closed and guarded by strong cordons of police. Thousands were turned away and at the Gillespie Road entrance hundreds of people, who had collected between the turnstiles and the outer gates, were dispersed by mounted police.

Among those who could not get in was a party from Birmingham. Ambulance men were kept busy inside the ground. Scores of people fainted, so dense was the crowd, and had to be carried over the heads of the spectators to receive attention at the touch line.

Many took advantage of the resulting confusion to climb over the barriers, but the police quickly cleared the playing field by accommodating the "overflow" on the path round the enclosure. 116

In this case, the police perceived a threat of "gate-crashing" and, despite the precautions they took, some supporters breached the barriers surrounding the playing area. According to Tony Mason's analysis, such

116 Leicester Mercury, 18th February 1928.
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scenes had all but died out by 1914.117 Throughout the interwar period, however, capacity crowds were attracted to many League grounds and such scenes were repeated. In 1937, for example, the Leicester Mercury recorded:

"Football 'Gate-Crashers'

Some more "gate-crashing" took place in the continuance of the holiday soccer football. The local Derby at Bristol stimulated such interest that it is estimated thousands became impatient and broke through without paying.

Very unfortunate for the clubs, for there are few in the land who can afford to provide entertainment for nothing - even at one game.

One the other hand, it would be unfair to suggest that all these "fans" deliberately defrauded. Many get in that way because they cannot help it.

Usually the stampede is started by a few, and the majority caught in the press of struggling humanity have to follow...." 118

This category of spectator misconduct was not confined to gaining entry to the ground. Having gained entrance, the spectators, at times, took recourse to pitch invasions in order to vent their feelings of "dissatisfaction." The motivation for such behaviour appears to have revolved around their anger at particular incidents on the field of play, much longer-term dissatisfaction with the team's performances and, possibly, as the Leicester case study will reveal, with what was perceived as an unsatisfactory relationship between the supporters and directors of a club.

An example of this can be drawn, from 1930. Stoke City supporters, frustrated in some such fashion, chose to voice their feelings through an "angry demonstration" at the end of their home match with Swansea Town:

"The game at Stoke, in which Swansea Town were the visitors will have unfortunate memories for the Stoke directors, officials and players, who were the subject of a hostile demonstration at the close. An angry crowd surged in front of the stand and hurled abuse at the directors and management. The Stoke players were also the victims of insulting remarks as they trooped from the field. A considerable portion of the crowd waited outside the ground with the obvious intention of continuing their demonstration, but were moved away by


Leicester Mercury 29th December 1937.
the police and there was no further incident." 119

Clearly, Stoke City supporters had no illusions about the existence of what Taylor calls a "participatory democracy" at the club. 120 The control and organisation of football clubs, despite the 'democratisation of the game' that occurred during the late Victorian and Edwardian periods, remained in the 1920's and 1930's in the hands of the middle classes. Such evidence tends to refute Taylor's conception of the relationship between spectators and the club during this period.

What the present chapter is arguing, therefore, is that some of the forms of spectator misconduct which occurred can be explained with reference to more rational goals. The spectators who were involved in these more rational forms of action cannot necessarily be linked to the violent masculine style of "rough" working class spectators. The trend towards respectability which this thesis argues occurred, is not negated by such forms of misconduct. This is not to suggest, however, that no "serious" disorder occurred at football matches in the inter-war years or that no members of the "rough" working class attended. It is to a discussion of this - and its implications for the overall analysis - that attention must now be directed.

Evidence has already been presented in connection with disorder at the ground of Birmingham City in 1920. Aspects of this case are worthy of further consideration. Arising out of the court action taken against the club by Frank Hare, an oxy-acetylene welder, comes an insight into life on the terraces which did not emerge from consultation of the relevant match reports. The case was reported in the Birmingham Daily Post in the following manner:

119 Birmingham Post 6th January 1930.
120 Taylor, "'Football Mad' A Speculative Sociology of Football Hooliganism" p. 358.
"The affair happened on 'Spion Kop' immediately after the interval, 'bottles were flying around like hailstones.' Witness tried to get away, but he was struck on the head, and received an injury which necessitated seven stitches. He had seen other disturbances on 'Spion Kop,' and on one occasion a week or so before he was injured, he saw men using bottles as clubs instead of using their fists. The bottles used were half-pint stout bottles." 121

Such insights tend to suggest that there were 'subterranean' features to spectating during this period, i.e. that disorders recurrently occurred that were not picked up in match reports. The court case as a whole questioned whether the club had taken "sufficient precautions" and considered the involvement of the police. In other cases of more serious disorder in the inter-war years, however, the police were drawn more directly into the affray.

The season following the end of the First World War witnessed crowd disturbances at several grounds. Both Middlesbrough and Grimsby were warned by the FA following scenes of disorder. An incident at Wolverhampton Wanderers which followed the previous cases was perceived to be of such seriousness that it resulted in the closure of the ground. The disorder was alleged to have originated from the award of a penalty to the away side, Bury:

"The referee was surrounded, and he considered flight the best course to pursue. He dashed off at top speed in the direction of the dressing rooms, but near the half way line he slipped and came a cropper....." 122

At this stage, police reinforcements were called for and it was recorded that the Chief Constable "superintended rescue operations." Similar scenes occurred elsewhere. They were not confined to Wolverhampton or the year 1919. At Loftus Road, the ground of Queens Park Rangers, in 1930, for example:

"What threatened to prove an ugly incident at the close of the game between Queen's Park Rangers and Northampton Town.....was quelled

121 Birmingham Daily Post 14th October 1920.
122 Birmingham Daily Mail 8th November 1919.
by the prompt action of the stewards and police. During the second half there had been considerable demonstrations against Mr. C. E. Lines, the referee, and at the close he was escorted to the dressing room by the Police. A large section of the crowd booed, and some missiles were thrown. One spectator seized a plank of wood, and with this cracked the window of the referee's dressing room. A mounted constable then helped to quell the disturbances and the crowd gradually dispersed...." 123

Some weeks after this incident - which led to the closure of the ground - Queens Park Rangers were playing away at Clapton Orient. Once more the police intervened but in this case the disorder did not directly involve match officials or players. The Daily Chronicle recorded in this connection:

"Orient Disappoint: Too Much Feeling in Game with QPR.

Clapton and Shepherd's Bush are a long way apart but some of the bad features associated with the old-time local "derby" games were seen in the meeting of Orient and QPR at Millfields Road...

Towards the end of the match the police had to stop fighting between rival spectators behind the goal which the Rangers were defending." 124

Despite a search of both local and national newspapers, however, no further details of the incident have emerged. But what is clear is a point which was made earlier. "Local derbies" - of which the above was an example in the sense that the teams came from different, if widely separated, parts of London - carried connotations of rowdiness and disorderly behaviour. Significantly, the writer, though associating the game with the "bad features" of such "derby" matches, appears to suggest that previously, such "bad features" were more prevalent than was the case in the period in which he was writing.

Given the prevalence of inter-fan group fighting as part of the "bad features" of such games, it is possible to deduce, given that local "derbies" appear to be more suitable venues for the expression of toughness

123 Birmingham Post 20th January 1930.
124 Daily Chronicle 24th February 1930.
and masculinity than matches between teams that do not come from geographically adjacent areas, that groups from "segmentally ordered" communities who adhere to a violent masculine style were more likely to attend regularly and in greater numbers.

As argued, however, the attraction of such groups to local derbies and to "important" League and FA Cup matches does not rule out the general trend referred to. But their presence does indicate an important continuity with the preceding periods - despite the changes which were also occurring. The influence of the "roughs" had not completely waned. In this respect, the features of continuity and change in popular culture are not mutually exclusive alternatives but rather involve a complex interwoven development over time.

At this stage, it is perhaps appropriate to highlight differences within the overall characterisation offered here of the period between the wars. Regional variations, for example, existed. Direct and somewhat fierce confrontations occurred between the police and football supporters who attended matches in Scotland. A case in point was the Scottish Cup Final of 1925 as the following report clearly shows:

"Following a fight with the police after the Scottish Cup Final at Hampden Park on Saturday, eighteen members of a Celtic Brake Club were arrested. Stones were thrown, many onlookers joined in. Some plate glass windows were smashed." 125

The Times 4th April 1925.

Two years later, the Leicester Mercury published the following account of a court case in Glasgow. Again a match at Hampden Park was involved:

"Arising out of the disturbances at Hampden Park football ground, Glasgow, on Saturday, two young men were fined for disorderly conduct at Queen's Park Police Court today. In the first case, David Watson was charged with creating a disturbance outside the football ground after the final tie between Celtic and Rangers.

It was stated that when the rival factions clashed, they were separated by the mounted police, many people rushing up streets and

125 The Times 4th April 1925.
into shops for safety.

Watson, who was a Rangers supporter rushed at a man who was wearing a green scarf and had a green handkerchief in his pocket.

Inflicting a fine of two guineas, the Magistrates said that rival club supporters should be able to take a beating as well as victory. He had no sympathy with young men who displayed such unsportsmanlike spirit.

Another youth, John Smith, was one of the crowd who followed Watson while he was being taken into custody and used obscene language, was fined a guinea." 126

Such examples do reveal qualitative differences from the phenomenon in England. The level of violence in Scotland appears to have been higher and the inter-fan-group fighting, involving Brake Club members, appears to have been more organised in Scotland relative to its counterparts in England. However, while Bill Murray has fruitfully examined the case of Glasgow Rangers and Celtic in this connection, the net needs widening. 127 Indeed, the situation in Northern Ireland appears, in part, to have been qualitatively different yet again. An example from 1920, it is hoped will be sufficient in this context to illustrate that this was so:

"The referee ordered a.......player off the field, whereupon an angry section of spectators rushed on to the playing pitch, but the players, forming a bodyguard around the official, escorted him to the pavilion. Some stone-throwing and revolver shooting took place, and the police had to make baton charges to clear the ground. Several persons were injured, and four, including a police-sergeant, sustained bullet wounds." 128

Further research into this area will have to probe the religious and political dimensions of the phenomenon of football hooliganism in Northern Ireland during this period.

Though football matches in England appear rarely to have been the

126 Leicester Mercury 10th October 1927.

127 Bill Murray, "Soccer Hooliganism: A Perspective. The Case of Rangers and Celtic in the Period Between the Wars" Paper presented at the History of Sporting Traditions Conference La Trobe University, Australia, August 1981.

setting for overt political demonstrations in this period, two cases do
highlight other features of the phenomenon of crowd behaviour. The
England versus Germany international match of 1935, for example, resulted
in thirty-five arrests following demonstrations by anti-Nazi groups.
Moreover, just as the rise of fascism was of concern to some groups during
the 1930's, so too, was unemployment to others. For example, the ground
of Leicester City was the setting for a demonstration against unemployment
in 1939:

"At half time in the match between Aston Villa and Leicester City,
two men, apparently displaying placards relating to unemployment, ran
on to the ground. They were quickly seized by police and ejected from
the playing area..." 129

As these cases suggest, spectator misconduct during this period was of
a multi-faceted character. Though the present chapter has observed that
there was a shift towards respectability and more orderly behaviour - as
indicated by the fact that the predominant form of misconduct was the
barracking of players and officials - more "subterranean" features of the
phenomenon, less susceptible to the expression of concern by particular
groups and to the 'argus' eye of some sports newspapers, did, however surface
in the press.

This perception by different groups of working class leisure in general
and spectator misconduct at football matches in particular both articulated
and reinforced the trend towards respectability evident in the years between
the wars. This trend or shift towards respectability cannot be fully under­
stood without understanding this climate of concern, and it is this that the
present analysis now seeks to consider.

2. Football Spectators and Crowd Control: A Sense of Security

During the 1920's and 1930's, both the overall climate of concern and
the anxiety expressed about particular incidents appear to have lessened.

129 Birmingham Post 27th February 1939.
Such changes appear to have occurred co-relatively with a factual 'decline' in the rate and seriousness of spectator misconduct and with the concomitant process of the increasing 'incorporation' of sections of the working class into "respectable" society.\textsuperscript{130} Such a process was reflected in and reinforced by the other distinguishing feature of the period between the wars - that of the definition of football crowds as relatively peaceful assemblies which posed no threat to the public order of English cities. In this way, even when more serious cases of spectator disorder did occur, they tended not to be dramatized or sensationalised.

Indicative of the trend referred to and the perceived sense of security which was evident are the comments made by the editor of the \textit{Leicester Mercury} within the context of a report of spectator misconduct at a match in Ireland in 1928. He felt able to record:

"Football and Truncheons

....In many centres in England during the next few weeks the big issues at stake in the Cup and the League will unite thousands of people in a single thought. Huddersfield's chance of a record "double," League championships, promotions and relegation - will exact their full measure of hope and anxiety from the thousands amongst whom League football is a dominating sporting interest. And, happily, all these things will be duly settled without a single policeman having to raise his truncheon to preserve the peace."\textsuperscript{131}

Despite such observations, particular forms of misconduct did arouse the indignation of some. Shortly before the outbreak of the Second World War, for example, the Bishop of Liverpool asked, following cases of swearing and barracking on the terraces, whether "The Sporting Spirit" remained intact:

"The Sporting Spirit?

We sometimes wonder if the sportsmanship on which we pride ourselves is worthy of the name. We have recently been a spectator on the popular side at various matches in the district, both Rugby and Association. Being ourselves indifferent to the result in most cases, and having no preference for any one of the three types of football we have seen, we do not think we can be accused of partisanship. What has impressed us as much as the game itself has been the behaviour of

\textsuperscript{130} See Chapter Five.
\textsuperscript{131} \textit{Leicester Mercury} 10th April 1928.
the spectators at several of the matches. Of course the home side are expected to win and failure to do so is naturally a great disappointment to the majority of the crowd, but we do not think the referee should be made the scapegoat for the failure of the home team, and surely nothing can justify the booing with which a decision against the home side is so often received. Perhaps worst of all is the sustained jeering we have heard when one of the visiting players is preparing to take a penalty or attempting to convert a try. We have seen enough of various kinds of sport to assess at its true value the irresponsible behaviour of small boys in the crowd or the occasional outburst of partisan feeling roused by a bad decision of the referee or a glaring piece of unfair play. We do not expect spectators to attempt to restrain their legitimate feelings or to refrain from urging on their own side, but it seems to us that the limit of decent partisanship is often exceeded, and that as a consequence good sportsmanship is forgotten. As to the language in which some of the spectators express their opinions, we are not squeamish and we know that many expletives, from the frequency of their use, mean nothing to those who utter them in a moment of excitement, but we should have enjoyed some recent matches more, and especially one, if our neighbours had not found it necessary to overstep the bounds of what might be termed ordinary swearing. There are words and expressions which even the hard swearer should hesitate to use yet on one occasion we heard little else." 132

Two main points arise from these comments. First, though the Bishop clearly felt indignant, his wrath was directed towards one of the main forms of misconduct reported in the inter-war years, namely barracking. As argued earlier, recourse to barracking rather than physical violence, i.e. of verbal rather than physical disorder, may well in fact be indicative of the shift towards "respectability." The Bishop's argument, however, does contain one crucial passage which is central to this analysis. At stake, the Bishop believed, was the "limit of decent partisanship." It was to the competing definitions of this and of ways of living in general that the analysis of perceptions of working class leisure in the nineteenth century was directed and which has constantly been probed in the present chapter. It will be considered further when an attempt is made to trace the development of football spectating as a social problem in the 1950's and 1960's.

Despite the Bishop's comments, there appears both to have been relatively less anxiety felt in the 1920's and 1930's concerning the possible breach

---

132 Liverpool Diocesan Review January 1939 pp 4-5.
of these "limits" and concomitantly, greater agreement between those who attended football matches and those whose business was crowd control concerning these "limits of decent partisanship." Substantiation for such a conclusion can be obtained from consideration of particular groups and their reactions to specific cases of misconduct. An appraisal of this feature must now be undertaken.

Though the FA had recourse throughout the period to actions similar to those of the late Victorian and Edwardian decades, the nature and extent of the concern felt appears to have been qualitatively different. Thus, although the Secretary of the FA, Stanley Rous, felt sufficiently concerned by the behaviour of spectators to issue a circular to clubs in January 1935, he distinguished between the majority of the spectators and a small section who directed their misconduct towards referees. The notice read:

"The Football Association: Notice to Clubs.
Misconduct by Spectators at Matches.

Clubs make arrangements for matches to be played in accordance with the Rules and Regulations of the Football Association and although the majority of spectators observe them, a small section are not prepared to do so.

Misconduct by spectators towards Referees and Linesmen has lately increased and as this interferes with the proper performance of the duties of the match officials, The Football Association gives notice that such misconduct will lead to the suspension of grounds and/or the imposition of a fine upon Clubs as the only means available to stop it." 133

S. ROUS
Secretary

The significance of these comments, as argued, lies in the division drawn between the majority of the crowd and the small section involved in misconduct. Increasingly, as will be documented, the FA were to appeal to spectators, the "respectable" sections, to control the behaviour of the unruly few. Nevertheless, more direct methods of control existed and were

133 FA Minutes January 1935.
used. During this period, for example, The Den, the ground of Millwall FC, was closed twice and the club warned or fined on five other occasions. In the same month in which the notice to clubs was issued, The Times reported on an FA resolution relating to this issue:

"Unruly Crowds

The reporting of unruly crowds by referees may in future be followed by a fine on the club instead of the closing of their ground. In extreme cases, where circumstances warrant the action, both fine and suspension of ground may be imposed. A new resolution passed by the Council of the Football Association puts the matter clearly. The resolution is as follows:-

The Council decided that in cases where the Emergency Committee or a commission considered a fine more suitable punishment than the suspension of a ground they shall have the power to impose it, or the punishment may include both...." 135

From such evidence, however, it is clear, as with the preceding period, that at this stage in the development of spectating as a social problem, the preservation of order lay with the FA and not with agencies outside the context of football. Typical of the process followed and the stance adopted by the FA is an example drawn from 1922:

"Port Vale v Barnsley: Misconduct of Spectators on the Port Vale Ground.

The Committee considered the action of the spectators would justify the closing of the ground for a considerable period. Such a course, however, would penalise the innocent as well as the guilty. The Committee ordered the Port Vale club to warn their spectators that a repetition of their misconduct would surely result in the ground being closed and see their instructions were carried out, and offending spectators removed. The referee was thanked for having made his report. Referees who officiate on the ground during the next two months are required to specially report direct to the FA on the conduct of the spectators the club to inform the referees of this requirement." 136

This case serves to highlight the process by which the FA received notice of spectator misconduct - namely, via a referee's report. The

134 See Chapter Seven.

135 The Times 25th January 1935.
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principal actions which followed involved warning notices ordered to be posted around the grounds, fines imposed upon the clubs and ground closures. These warning notices, in fact, lend support to the idea that the FA were also increasingly willing to recruit the spectators themselves in the task of keeping order. This may be an indication in itself that the spectators, or at least the majority, shared the same or a similar perception of the "limits of decent partisanship" which the FA held. Here is an example from 1930:

"Liverpool v Manchester City

Report of the referee as to misconduct by spectators. The Committee was satisfied that the Liverpool Club officials and the police took proper action. The club informed that their spectators must understand that they have a responsibility in maintaining order, and that it is their duty to aid officials and police to suppress disorder, and that failure to do so may result in the ground being closed. The club requested to post on its ground a special notice referring to the incidents in this case, and warning the spectators as to their future behaviour." 137

A possible indication of the "success" of these appeals can be drawn from decisions made by the FA in 1938. During that year, the FA withdrew several resolutions made in 1903 relating to the conduct of spectators. While no explanation was given, it is possible that the FA felt relatively secure in its handling of spectator misconduct and the potential threat posed by it. Though this may be indicative of the shift towards "respectability" outlined, regional variations still existed. Following the case of fighting on the terraces between supporters of Clapton Orient and Queens Park Rangers, for example, though the editor of the Orient Club programme expressed regret, no great sense of anxiety or condemnation is evident:

"The Editor's Gossip.

The scene at the end of the match in the spectators' enclosure was also a matter of regret. I am fully aware that it is, perhaps, easy to get ruffled when things are seen which were not expected and which make a supporter annoyed.

137 FA Emergency Committee Minutes of Meeting 7th October 1930 - 8th December 1930.
But the outcry against the QPR man in his collision with Jimmy Gay had no justification. Both went for the ball together, and the injuries sustained were mere accidents and, so far as I could see, in no sense intentional. Gay has told me so himself, and he should know."

It would appear, in this case at least, that some clubs although sharing a common perception concerning the "limits of decent partisanship" with their supporters, held a qualitatively different perception than that held by the majority of clubs in the period after the Second World War, especially since the 1960's. No great sense of anxiety over the expression of violence is apparent. Such a perception, in fact, has a close correspondence to the nature of reporting in the inter-war years. The tendency of the press to treat those incidents which did occur in an undramatic manner and, to characterise football crowds in general as orderly, is highlighted in two main ways. First, unlike the late Victorian and Edwardian periods, when football crowds in general and specific cases of misconduct in particular were reported, no reference was made to a threat or potential threat to the wider social order. Secondly, and related to this initial point, no reference is made to "blackguards," "roughs" or "hooligans" as a description of those involved in spectator misconduct. Instead, reference is increasingly made to a "small minority" or "section" of the crowd. The grave misgivings held by such writers as Almond and Ensor were lacking. Instead the crowd tended to be defined in terms of a peaceful assembly of "respectable" people. 139

Although the FA retained overall charge of such assemblies and of spectator misconduct, other agencies were involved as well. As with the preceding period, the ability of the police to intervene was limited by the fact that the stadia were not considered to be public places. An

139 There were clubs which were an exception to this general characterisation: See Chapter Seven.
example from 1919 bears this out:

"Football Ground Not a Public Place."

A legal point of public interest was raised in a case before the Nottingham magistrates yesterday, when a man who attended a recent football match on the Notts C. ground was summoned for making use of obscene language. Proceedings had been instituted in the general interest of those attending the matches. The magistrates, however, held that a football field was not a "public place" and dismissed the summons. 140

Although the case dated from 1919, throughout the period at present under consideration the same situation appears to have persisted. If the police and magistrates had not felt relatively secure in their control of spectator disorder when it periodically arose then surely some change in the relevant law or in the interpretation of it would have occurred?

Further insight into the perception of the police and magistrates is drawn from a case already cited. As was shown earlier, Frank Hare, a supporter of Birmingham FC brought a court case against the club in 1920 for failing to take adequate precautions to prevent and/or control spectator misconduct.

In the court case, one witness claimed that during the fighting which occurred, the nearest policeman was one hundred yards away. The police-superintendent, when giving evidence, claimed that the police presence on the ground was, in fact, the largest for five to six years. In concluding, the Judge was quoted as saying that:

"....He found no evidence to support any contention that scenes of this kind had ever happened on the ground before. He had no doubt there had been at times gambling, and for all he knew other small breaches of the law; but there was nothing to lead the club to suppose occurrences of that kind were likely to take place...." 141

Such conflicting evidence may, in part, be explained in terms of the interests of the particular individuals and groups involved, i.e. that

140 The Times 8th November 1919.
141 Birmingham Daily Post 14th October 1920.
Frank Hare would present a version of events which would lend support to his claim for damages, while the club, in turn, seeking both to avoid being tainted with the reputation of having rowdy supporters and also of being held responsible for the injuries sustained by Frank Hare and hence to pay compensation, would downplay the extent of the disorder. In addition, the police would wish to avoid criticism that they had either not taken adequate precautions or that they were unable to protect the public from the 'crown and anchor' gangs.

However, the case may also reveal two other issues. Firstly, neither the club, the police nor the magistrates appeared unduly concerned by such behaviour. Such a finding may be supportive of the view that anxiety regarding the phenomenon was "lower" in the inter-war years than had previously been the case. Secondly, the possible lack of policing around clashes between spectators may reveal that police policies were directed towards controlling exactly those forms of behaviour which the FA perceived as a problem and which were the most persistently reported in the press. While it is difficult to extrapolate from one case and although no explicit reference to disorder is made, the presence of policemen in front of enclosures, and not standing cheek by jowl with the spectators, may well have been connected with a desire to prevent pitch invasions and discourage barracking and verbal misconduct in general. The FA did, in fact, make a request for such policies. Take the following report from 1938:

"Liverpool v Leeds.

Misconduct by spectators. The committee decided that the Liverpool club be instructed to arrange for a policeman to patrol in front of the Boys' enclosure during all first team matches." 142

The press, in turn, both in its treatment of particular FA decisions and in relation to specific incidents encountered by reporters, does not

142 FA Disciplinary Committee 8th February 1938 - 28th February 1938.
appear to convey the same sense of anxiety that was evident in accounts of the preceding period. Such a trend is difficult to demonstrate, though as the Clapton Orient and Queens Park Rangers examples highlighted, reports of fighting between groups of spectators, a pitch invasion and an attack on a referee failed to arouse the spirit of condemnation evident in the late Victorian period. This is not to suggest that there are no reports of the preceding period which did not similarly cite somewhat briefly and in terse terms what had occurred. What is being argued is that the basic tenor of reports in that period which did contain comments was of a more alarmist nature than the majority of reports of the 1920's and 1930's.

So far, several indications of the sense of security evident in this period have been considered. Another feature indicative of this can be drawn from an analysis of the incipient involvement of the state in the affairs of football. This involvement, in fact, can be interpreted in terms of how far the game had become incorporated - as this process occurred, the state became increasingly interested in its crowds. Following the now famous "White Horse" FA Cup Final of 1923, at which a huge attendance engulfed the newly-opened Wembley stadium and stopped the progress of the game, the government of the day, under the auspices of the Home Office set up "The Management of Crowds Enquiry." However, this was designed to investigate patterns of crowd attendance and not spectator misconduct. In the following year, the Home Secretary was involved in the formation of arrangements for the Cup Final. In this connection, a report was published in The Times:

"The Final Cup-Tie

Mr. Henderson, answering an inquiry by Mr. Lumley whether he was satisfied that the arrangements being made for this year's Football Association Cup Final at Wembley would be sufficient to prevent the overcrowding which occurred last year, said: - I am advised that the arrangements made with the Exhibition authorities, which include structural improvements and improvements in the organ-
isation for dealing with the crowd, should prove adequate to the requirements so far as they can be foreseen." 143

Similarly in 1934, following a case of over-crowding at a League ground, the Home Office considered the "Safety of Spectators at Football Matches." In this report it was made clear that, though clubs had the power to employ as many police officers as was deemed appropriate, overall responsibility for law and order lay with the police. The report put it this way:

"...the police should be responsible for all matters pertaining to the preservation of law and order and that for arrangements for the convenience of the public the ground authority should be responsible." 144

Equally, the report acknowledged that the police were also the custodians of law and order outside the ground. The report concluded:

"The police are, of course, entirely responsible for the control of crowds so long as they are in public places outside the ground, and this responsibility extends to making arrangements for the marshalling of crowds into queues where necessary for the purpose of their admission into the ground." 145

The report was thus centrally concerned with public safety and ensuring adequate arrangements had been made to deal with the large number of spectators attending matches. In consequence, the FA issued the following circular:

"Safety of Spectators at Football Matches.

The Under Secretary of State has been in communication with us with regard to suitable precautions being taken on Football Grounds to ensure the safety of spectators who attend matches.

The attention of Clubs and Associations is drawn to the importance of frequent consultation and regular co-operation with the Chief Officers of the police in their districts." 146

Again, however, no reference was made to spectator misconduct or disorder. Despite this, such developments can be interpreted as one symptom of
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the growing involvement of the state and as a precursor to its more overt involvement in the preservation of law and order in the period of the "moral panic" of the 1960's and 1970's.

Examination of the inter-war years has thus revealed a trend towards "respectability." This trend is evident in the changes which occurred in the nature and extent of spectator misconduct and in the perception of football crowds in general and specific cases of misconduct. The changing social composition of the crowd overall and those involved in misconduct; the actual forms of spectator misconduct and the perception of the game and its supporters, and the methods utilised to control football crowds all intertwine to form the web in which the shift to "respectability" unfolded. The football authorities correctly held a sense of security in dealing with misconduct - for their anxiety lessened co-relatively with the gradual decline in spectator misconduct, both in its nature and extent. 147

Despite these changes and the general trend towards respectability, there was, as argued, a sense of continuity with the preceding period. The changes described did not involve a complete break or transformation. Crowd disorderliness continued, albeit in a more subterrenean fashion and the "rough" working class continued to attend matches. However, such visits appear to have been confined to the more important League and FA Cup matches and "local derbies." Indeed, within these crowds, the potential for "respectables" to involve themselves with those "roughs" who periodically attended and indeed to indulge in spectator misconduct themselves still existed. But such involvement can be explained, in part, in relation to specific problems such as the over-crowding which such "respectables" were occasionally confronted with. As far as they were concerned, it was not the

147 See Chapter Five.
manifestation of a strict adherence to a violent masculine style. The shift towards "respectability" and more orderly behaviour - in terms of the status of the game and the social composition and behaviour of the crowd was not a thin veneer. Those caught up in the process of "incorporation" were to be ingrained with a sense of "respectability." But the veneer of the respectable status of spectating was soon to be broken. The seeds for this lay in the aspects of continuity outlined - namely, the subterranean persistence of spectator disorder, the periodic attendance at football matches of the "rough" working class and the concern over the limits of decent partisanship. It is to the issues of the re-emergence of the "roughs" and the "moral panic" concerning football hooliganism in the 1960's that consideration must now be given.
c. The Re-Emergence of the "Roughs": Football Hooliganism Goes Public: 1946-1984

This section of the analysis deals with the development of football hooligan violence between 1946 and 1984. In that period, it will be argued, two main changes occurred. Firstly, this period witnessed a factual change in the social composition of the crowd which had consequences for the nature and extent of spectator disorder. Secondly, public sensitivity to the traditional forms of spectator misconduct - which had continued to lead a kind of subterranean existence on the terraces - was heightened, contributing, as an unintended consequence, to an increase in the "real" rate of disorder. This, in its turn, further heightened public sensitivity, leading correlatively via a kind of "positive feedback cycle," to an escalation both of disorderliness itself and to the generation of a "moral panic." The analysis contained in this section and in the subsequent chapter thus argues that the "limits of decent partisanship" were being re-defined just when a group, who did not adhere to the traditional "respectable limits," was being attracted to football grounds. Substantiation of such an analysis is required.

1. The Return of the "Roughs": The Changing Nature and Extent of Football Hooliganism

Several methodological problems are encountered in the course of conducting such a task. The problems outlined in preceding chapters regarding the adequacy of the evidence again hold true. Particular problems, however, arise in relation to the initial years of the post-war "austerity" era. Though the decade in question did witness spectator misconduct, insights into the nature and extent of the phenomenon are limited due to the shortage of news print - these were austere years indeed! In examining the nature and extent of the spectator misconduct reported in those years, greater use is made of FA minutes, relative to the analysis undertaken in relation to
the preceding periods. But these minutes are of little use in ascertaining the social composition of the crowd: it is in this connection that the shortage of newsprint in the late 1940's and early 1950's has its greatest impact for the present analysis. The analysis is, perforce, driven to more grounded speculation in this regard than it holds ideal: reliance on photographic evidence and extrapolation from specific insights thus becomes necessary. Given the nature and extent of the available evidence, there appears to be little alternative. The analysis of the period in which the transformation outlined occurred, however, namely the 1960's and 1970's, does not encounter such problems, for, in keeping with its newly acquired status as a social problem of national concern, social scientists were recruited to document the phenomenon. In addition, in stark contrast to the late 1940's and early 1950's, the phenomenon received, periodically at least, virtually approaching saturation coverage by the mass media, especially by the newly emerging tabloid press. It is to the earlier period, however, that attention must first be given.

In examining the return of the "rough" working class to football grounds, attention must again be focused initially on the "typical" crowd and then on specific cases of misconduct. The "grounded speculation" referred to leads the present analysis to conclude that the typical crowd, in the late 1940's and early 1950's, was similar to that preceding the outbreak of war in 1939 - namely, that the typical crowd was largely composed of "respectable" elements of the working classes. Three main features of the phenomenon lend support to such a contention. Firstly, the photographic evidence which has survived portrays the typical crowd in "respectable" terms. The attire of the supporters, while bedecked with the team's colours, often involved, it appears, a form of "Sunday best" -
many cases, suits appear the order of the day and often, the males who wore them were accompanied by women. If their presence, as in the 1930's was dependent upon a perception of the stadia as orderly places, then this, too, would lend support to the conclusion that the social composition of the crowd was "respectable."

With the huge crowds attracted to the grounds - during the 1948-1949 season, for example, some forty-one million people filed through the turnstiles\textsuperscript{148} - the club officials were faced with coping with the crowd before, during and after the match. It is in relation to the pre-match entertainment provided that the second indication of the "respectable" nature of the crowd can be illustrated. During an FA Cup tie in 1950 it was noted in the \textit{Birmingham Mail} that:

".....Enthusiasts had demonstrated their support with rattles, bells and hooters but shortly before the start of the match these were discarded, and community singing became the order......" \textsuperscript{149}

Support for such community singing would have rested on the crowd sharing a set of values which could be commonly affirmed in this form. It would appear that those on the terraces and those in the grandstand shared this "respectable" view. Indeed, E. H. D. Sewell, a writer on the game of Rugby Union, felt able to conclude in 1950 that soccer was a "fine and glorious game!\textsuperscript{150} Such sentiments appear a far cry from the expressions of disgust which the enthusiasts of Rugby Union - and the amateur ideology - were making in the late Victorian period, and such a change was no doubt aided by the community singing which both reflected and reinforced a sense of common purpose.

\textsuperscript{148} James Walvin, \textit{The People's Game} p. 147.
\textsuperscript{149} \textit{Birmingham Mail} 7th January 1950
\textsuperscript{150} Cited in \textit{Birmingham Mail} 18th January 1950 E. Sewell, \textit{Rugger - The Man's Game} Harris and Carter London 1950.
GRAPH F  Number of spectator disorders reported in the Birmingham Press 1947-1975 at five year intervals as occurring at Football League and FA Cup matches.

Key:  
- Incidents in West Midlands involving Aston Villa, West Bromwich Albion, Wolverhampton Wanderers and Birmingham City.
- Incidents elsewhere in England.
- Combined total.
Sewell's description of soccer in general, in fact relates to the third indication of the respectability of crowds following the Second World War, namely the fact that during the late 1940's and early 1950's, crowds were praised for their orderly behaviour. In one account, written in 1950 in the Birmingham Mail, British football spectators were compared to football spectators from other countries. The writer stated:

"'Well-Behaved British'

British football spectators can reasonably claim to be among the best behaved in the world. Serious crowd incidents are rare..." 151

Thus, though the evidence is somewhat sparse, it appears that the "typical" crowd was drawn from "respectable" elements of the working class and the lower middle class and that those involved in spectator misconduct during the late 1940's and early 1950's, would have been drawn, chiefly, from such "respectable" crowds. This latter contention can also be borne out by examination of the nature and extent of spectator misconduct in this period.

If an exercise similar to that followed in relation to the graphs relating to the period between the wars is undertaken, particular features of Graph F will become more evident. When the total number of cases of misconduct reporting in the Birmingham press between 1947 and 1960 are added up, the figure reached is some twenty-one cases, giving an average per year for 1947, 1950, 1955 and 1960 of 5.25. The total for the period covered by these years therefore amounts to just over sixty-eight cases of spectator misconduct. If these findings are compared to Graph D, relating to the period between the wars, then it is clear that the late 1940's and 1950's witnessed relatively less reported disorder. This is borne out in two ways. Firstly, the overall total is less, but, more

151 Birmingham Mail 26th January 1950.
GRAPH 5 Spectator misconduct and disorder at Football League and FA Cup matches as reported in the FA Minutes 1946-1974. (1)

(1) 1951-1952 minutes missing.
significantly, the average per year is only slightly more than half for the 1940's and 1950's compared to the period between the wars, 5.25 compared to 9.6.

On first analysis, Graph G, containing evidence from the FA minutes, would appear to run counter to the impression gained from the Birmingham press. Some one hundred and fifteen cases of spectator misconduct were reported in the FA minutes between 1946 and 1960, giving an average in those years of some 8.21 cases per year. Compared to the average for the FA minutes relating to the inter-war years of 3.17, such a figure is well in excess. How is it possible to explain such seemingly conflicting evidence? A possible solution lies in contextualisation of the issue.

With respect to the FA minutes, it is important to grasp the increasingly dominant and centralised role which the FA pursued. In this way, the higher average number of cases of misconduct may well have been a function of a change in the manner of reporting and dealing with behaviour to which match officials took exception. In relation to the Birmingham press, certain methodological observations can also be made. During the years 1947, 1950 and 1955, as Graph F and Table 7 highlight, only one case of spectator misconduct is cited as having occurred at the home matches of the West Midland clubs, Aston Villa, Birmingham City, West Bromwich Albion and Wolverhampton Wanderers. This itself gives a less than adequate picture, for the FA minutes reveal that in 1947, for example, both West Bromwich Albion and Wolverhampton Wanderers were reported by the referee for spectator misconduct and, in 1955, West Bromwich Albion are again cited in the FA minutes when, in fact, only the Wolverhampton Wanderers ground is referred to in the Birmingham press as having witnessed misconduct. 152

152 See Appendix A.
TABLE 7. TYPES OF SPECTATOR MISCONDUCT AND DISORDER REPORTED IN BIRMINGHAM NEWSPAPERS AS HAVING OCCURRED AT MATCHES AT ASTON VILLA, WEST BROMWICH ALBION, WOLVERHAMPTON WANDERERS AND BIRMINGHAM CITY DURING FOOTBALL LEAGUE AND FA GAMES 1947-1975 AT FIVE YEAR INTERVALS. (1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years</th>
<th>Verbal Misconduct and Disorder</th>
<th>Pitch Invasions/Gate Crashing</th>
<th>Physical Violence and Assault</th>
<th>Ambiguous or Unelaborated cases</th>
<th>Number of Incidents Counted Twice</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1947</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1955</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1965</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>11</strong></td>
<td><strong>3</strong></td>
<td><strong>18</strong></td>
<td><strong>2</strong></td>
<td><strong>4</strong></td>
<td><strong>34</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: (1) The year 1947 is included as this was the first year after the war in which a full complement of games was played.

(2) For further elaboration of these categories see notes accompanying Table 1.
It would appear that, again, a degree of under-reporting took place.

The over-riding impression, therefore, is that the rate of spectator misconduct during the late 1940's and 1950's did not differ markedly from the rate of misconduct reported for the period between the wars. If the phenomenon appeared similar in its extent, what of the nature of the behaviour which caused concern? Focusing on the Birmingham material, no cases of physical violence or disorder were reported on the grounds of the four main West Midland clubs during the period in question. Table 7, in addition, reveals that of those cases of misconduct cited and which were unambiguous, all involved verbal misconduct. In relation to the remainder of the Football League, some five cases of physical violence are reported, one less than for verbal misconduct. But as Table 8 also indicates, the rate for the more violent form of misconduct was significantly less than in the period between the wars. Expressed as an average, some 1.25 cases of physical violence occurred in each of the years 1947, 1950, 1955 and 1960, giving a total of just over sixteen for the period. In comparison, the average number of cases of physical violence per year in the period between the wars was 1.8 giving an overall total of thirty-four. The "respectable" nature of spectating and the relatively less serious nature of spectator misconduct of the inter-war years, in particular compared to the disorder of the late Victorian and Edwardian periods, appears to have persisted in the late 1940's and 1950's. This characterisation of the latter period is also borne out by consideration of specific cases of misconduct.

Analysis of both newspaper accounts and the FA minutes reveals a sensitivity to what could be termed "horseplay" rather than misconduct or disorder. During 1949, for example, it was recorded in the FA minutes
TABLE 8. TYPES OF SPECTATOR MISCONDUCT AND DISORDER REPORTED IN BIRMINGHAM NEWSPAPERS AS HAVING OCCURRED IN ENGLAND (EXCLUDING THE WEST MIDLANDS) AT FOOTBALL LEAGUE AND FA CUP MATCHES 1947-1975 AT FIVE YEAR INTERVALS

TYPES OF MISCONDUCT AND DISORDER (2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Verbal Misconduct and Disorder</th>
<th>Pitch Invasions/Gate Crashing</th>
<th>Physical Violence and Assault</th>
<th>Ambiguous or Unelaborated cases</th>
<th>Number of Incidents Counted Twice</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1947</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1955</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1965</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:  
(1) The year 1947 is included as this was the first year after the war in which a full complement of games was played.  
(2) For further elaboration of these categories see notes accompanying Table 1.
that at a home game of Hartlepool United:

"The referee reported that during the match several spectators threw orange peel at a linesman. The committee decided to accept the club's explanation and suggested that the club draws the attention of its spectators to the serious consequences which might result from such conduct towards match officials." 153

Similarly, in 1956, at a match between Swindon Town and Brentford it was noted:

"The referee reported that orange peel and ice cream cartons were thrown at him after the match.

The committee decided that Swindon Town F.C. be ordered to post warning notices in prominent positions at their ground for one month from 13th August 1956 and to print in the official club programme for the same period, a warning similar to that contained in the warning notices." 154

Likewise, an example typical of this genre surfaced in a match report in 1955:

"Halfway through the second half a section of the crowd indulged in the slow handclap as an expression of disapproval for Cardiff's efforts in a game in which neither side produced any real football. Jones, in the Villa goal, was bombarded with orange peel and paper and he complained to the referee, who ordered extra police behind the goal......." 155

Such cases form part of the number of examples cited in the FA minutes concerning spectator misconduct and are presented in Graph G and Appendix A. As noted, the rate of misconduct appears to have been similar to that which existed in the years between the wars. The "motivation" for such misconduct also appears to involve a similar combination of factors. Reference has already been made to the "horseplay" which was recurrently reported to the FA by referees. As with the period between the wars, specific examples of misconduct usually arose because spectators felt aggrieved at some aspect of the game. A case in point arose at a match

153 FA Disciplinary Committee Minutes of Meeting October 1949
154 FA Disciplinary Committee 26th May 1956
155 Birmingham Post 11th April 1955
at White Hart Lane in 1947:

"Hotspurs Draw and Crowd Abuse Directors.

A noisy section of the 30,000 crowd at Tottenham last night turned to hurl abuse at the Directors' box when Bury wiped out a two goal deficit to split the points in a game Spurs appeared to have won well.

The demonstrators urged the board to buy some new players, screamed about a boycott and generally let themselves go with expressions of disgust." 156

Such misconduct appears to have had less to do with an adherence to a violent masculine style and more to do with a sense of "injustice." On occasion, however, more serious incidents could occur. In 1950, for example, the Birmingham Post noted:

".....The highly partisan spectators gave a worse exhibition than the teams. "Get a new referee" was their monotonous chorus in the closing stages, and throughout the game they roared their disapproval of nearly every decision Mr. Ling gave - An exception was when he allowed Mortensen's goal. At the close the police deemed it wise to provide him and some of the Wolverhampton players with an escort." 157

Similarly, when faced with problems resulting from over-crowding or congestion, scenes of disorder could develop. In queuing for cup-tie tickets in 1950, supporters were reported as having rushed the gates of the Anfield and Goodison Park grounds. The Birmingham Post described the scene thus:

"More than sixty persons were hurt and seven treated in hospital yesterday, when queues waiting for the Liverpool v Everton Cup semi-final tickets - for next Saturday's match - rushed at the gates at the grounds of both clubs, half an hour after the sale of tickets began. Mounted and foot police had difficulty in restoring order among the crowds, which estimated at 25,000, queued outside both grounds." 158

Five years later, spectator misconduct again surrounded a cup-tie ticket queue, this time in Manchester:

"Cup Final Ticket Queue Scenes.
Responsibility for Damage Disclaimer.

The Directors of Manchester City FC issued a statement yesterday

157 Birmingham Post 16th February 1950.
disclaiming all responsibility for what they described as 'unforeseen and unfortunate incidents' last Saturday night, when thousands of people queued for hours before the distribution of cup final tickets.

The Directors state that they "cannot accept any responsibility for damage caused, or nuisance committed by certain reckless sections of the people in the queue. It is unfortunate that so much unseemly behaviour should have occurred."

"Some alternative system of allocation of tickets will be adopted in future to prevent a repetition of last week-end's incidents," the statement said. 159

Although it was noted earlier that the FA minutes contained references to spectator misconduct of the "horseplay" variety, more serious examples were also recorded. For example, missile throwing, involving bottles and stones - and not just orange peel - appears to have concerned the FA during this period. Indeed, the FA, as will be documented later, were forced to issue a circular concerning this form of spectator misconduct. 160 Typical of this form of misconduct is an example involving Notts County fans drawn from 1949:

"The referee reported that a bottle and other missiles were thrown on to the field of play during the game. In view of the prompt investigation of the police and Notts County club at the time of the incident the Committee decided that no further action be taken in the matter." 161

Such missile throwing, as with other forms of misconduct was, it is important to note, directed at the players and officials. A report in the Birmingham Post of 1955 can serve to illustrate this:

"Referee's report on match at Leyton.

The FA have received a report from M. E. Crawford of Doncaster, the referee of the Leyton Orient v Northampton Town 3rd Division (south) match at Leyton last Saturday. It has been forwarded to the clubs for their observations.

During the match Northampton were deprived of their left back, Patterson who was struck by a spectator as he left the pitch at half-time. He was taken to hospital.

Northampton have asked the Football League to declare the match

159 Birmingham Post 29th April 1955.
161 FA Minutes of Disciplinary Committee 11th January 1949 - 14th February 1949.
void. Leyton Orient won 2-1." 162

While such examples - and indeed the Millwall case study in general - may reveal the more subterranean aspects of football hooligan violence, the initial decade following the Second World War exhibits on the whole, as argued, less serious forms of spectator misconduct compared both to the 1890's and the present day. At the same time, the reports of such misconduct reveal in a qualitative sense, a low-key concern, especially when compared to the anxiety of the Victorian period and the "moral panic" of the 1960's. It should be noted, however, and this will be considered later in this chapter, that the kind of concern expressed nowadays was beginning to emerge in embryonic form. For example, following incidents in the cup-tie queues described above, questions concerning the Public Order Act and Police Act were asked in the House of Commons. 163 Despite this, and in keeping with the characterisation of the period in terms of respectability and relatively orderly behaviour, a writer in the Birmingham Mail in 1950, as noted, in the course of criticising the unruly nature of European and South American crowds felt able to claim that 'British crowds were among the best behaved in the world' and that 'serious crowd incidents are rare.' 164

But a transformation in the nature and extent of football hooliganism was soon to begin to unfold. The comments made by the writer in the Birmingham Mail in 1950 were to disappear from the pages of newspapers and were to be replaced by bold headlines regarding scenes of spectator disorder more akin to those previously felt to be typical of continental and South American but not of English crowds. Such headlines both reinforced and were a vivid representation of the more heightened sense

162 Birmingham Post 3rd February 1955.
163 Hansard 23rd March 1950.
164 Birmingham Mail 26th January 1950.
of anxiety relative to that which had characterised the immediate post-war period. As public sensitivity to the traditional forms of spectator misconduct increased and, as the "limits of decent partisanship" were being re-defined, an unintended consequence developed, namely an increase in the "real" rate of disorder.

The "real" increase, both in the nature and extent of football hooligan violence, led to further public sensitivity and, correlatively, to an escalation both in disorderliness itself and to the generation of a "moral panic" arising in part from the anxiety which, in the past, had often accompanied perceptions of football spectating in general and spectator misconduct in particular.

The transformation of the phenomenon of spectator misconduct after ca. 1960 involves, as argued, two interwoven dimensions. At one and the same time there was a change both in the social composition of the crowd and in the perception of what was considered to be the "limits of decent partisanship." The impact of these changes was reflected in the nature and extent of the forms of spectator misconduct that occurred and in the anxiety felt and expressed by particular groups. Closer examination of these issues is required.

The available evidence concerning football hooliganism as it emerged during the 1960's suggests that those convicted of offences were centrally drawn from the lower working class. The Harrington Report of 1968, for example, concluded that: "Soccer hooliganism is almost exclusively a male offence.....An analysis of occupation shows a preponderance of labourers and unskilled workers...." 165

Similar conclusions were reached by Trivizas writing in 1980 with regard to the 1970's: 80.1% of football-related offences and 84.2% of

165 Harrington, Soccer Hooliganism: A Preliminary Report p. 14

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Age</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Engineer</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Driver's Mate</td>
<td></td>
<td>16-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paper Worker</td>
<td></td>
<td>18-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fruit Porter</td>
<td></td>
<td>20-21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miller</td>
<td></td>
<td>22-23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Machinist</td>
<td></td>
<td>24-25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trimmer</td>
<td></td>
<td>26-28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerk</td>
<td></td>
<td>29-31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labourer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apprentice Chef</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tunnel Worker</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welder</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radio Salesman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheet Metalworker</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student, Aston University</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Recorded ages of those prosecuted for football hooligan offences by the police and reported in the local Birmingham press 1960-1979

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14-15</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-17</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-19</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-21</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22-23</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24-25</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-28</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29-31</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
the more serious offences committed in the context of football disorder were, he argues, the acts of manual workers or unemployed persons.\textsuperscript{166} Evidence gathered by Dunning and Murphy in Leicester supports these contentions. Thus, of those arrested in or near the Leicester City ground between January 1976 and April 1980, 20-32\% came from one local lower working class council estate.\textsuperscript{167} Accounts of court cases and arrests drawn from reports in Birmingham newspapers confirm such a pattern as Table 9 indicates. The impression gained from such evidence is that those arrested for football-related offences were mainly employed in unskilled or semi-skilled manual jobs - precisely those jobs in which the lower working class would seek employment. In addition, the typical age range of those arrested and prosecuted appears to have been between sixteen and nineteen years of age. Such a finding echoes the perception held by newspapers - football hooliganism had clearly become identified in the national and local press with working class youth. Take the following comments written in 1975 in the Birmingham Post: "Not football, but wrecking and violence that does not exclude stabbing are the weekend sport of a very small but intensely vicious minority among young people." \textsuperscript{168}

But such comments were not confined to the mid-1970's. As one Birmingham councillor remarked at the onset of the "moral panic" concerning the phenomenon in 1960, one would 'not tolerate thugs and hoodlums going into any part of the city and acting in this way.' \textsuperscript{169}

The Leicester study, as noted, appears to provide some answers as to what districts of towns and cities those currently involved in football-related disorder live. That is, they appear to have come centrally from

\textsuperscript{166} Trivizas, "Offenders and Offences in Football Crowd Disorders" p. 282.
\textsuperscript{167} Dunning and Murphy, "Working Class Social Bonding and the Sociogenesis of Football Hooliganism" Final Report 1983 p. 132.
\textsuperscript{168} Birmingham Post 4th September 1975.
\textsuperscript{169} Birmingham Post 6th April 1960.
lower working-class communities. Co-relatively with such changes in the social composition of the crowd, the perception of particular groups was becoming more sensitive - reminiscent, in part, of the anxiety expressed by some commentators of the 1890's when they, too, met and encountered the "roughs." Take the following account from the Birmingham Post in 1975:

"The behaviour of hooligans on what British Rail has called the worst football Saturday in memory is another inescapable indictment of the prevailing indulgent attitudes of too many magistrates, social workers, educational psychologists and determined do-gooders. Too small fines and time to pay, the establishment's habitual response to weekend barbarism has done nothing whatever to prompt the mindless young animals in our midst to mend their ways.....

It is not surprising that the advocates of sterner, sharper, corrective measures should see in the deteriorating situation a need and an opportunity to press their own remedies. They see the problem growing, not only in the number of incidents but in the scale of the violence, and they point to the overlooked claims of corporal punishment as a ready response at a time when justice needs to be a little rougher....."

If, indeed, the 1960's did witness the return of the "roughs," what consequences did it have for the nature and extent of spectator disorder? The evidence collated from Birmingham newspapers at five-year intervals has been presented in the form of Graph F and Tables 7 and 8. In examining the rate of disorder, Graph G highlights a dramatic increase in the number of reported cases during the 1960's - relative to the previous decade and to the rate of disorder reported in the period between the wars. The scale of this increase requires closer attention. When the numbers of cases of misconduct which occurred at West Midlands and other English League clubs are combined, a total of some ninety-three cases are reported for the years 1965, 1970 and 1975. Expressed as an average for the particular years cited

171 Birmingham Post 1st September 1975.
a figure of thirty-one per year is produced. If this figure was 
reproduced over the ten years between 1969 and 1975, an overall total 
of some three hundred and ten cases of misconduct would have been reported.

Clearly the average number of cases of misconduct reported annually 
between 1965 and 1975, 31, is well in excess of the 5.25 for the years 
between 1947 and 1960 and also of the 9.26 for the period between the wars. 
Such a dramatic increase in the rate of reported disorder also found 
expression in the FA minutes - with some two hundred and fifty four cases 
of misconduct being recorded between the years 1961 and 1974. Based on 
the FA figures, the average number per year would be 19.54 for the period 
in question compared to 8.21 cases of misconduct for the late 1940's and 
1950's, and 3.17 for the inter-war years. While the rate of reported dis­
order increased significantly after ca. 1960, the issue yet to be estab­
lished is what was the nature of this disorder?

An answer to this question can be obtained from an analysis of both 
the evidence presented in Tables 7 and 8 and of specific cases of mis­
conduct. From the analysis of Tables 7 and 8 it is clear that there was 
a significant increase in the number of cases involving physical violence 
and assault. In fact, over two-thirds of all cases of misconduct reported 
between 1969 and 1975, some sixty-eight cases in all, involved disorder 
of this physically violent kind. For the period between 1947 and 1960 
physical violence and assault had accounted for less than a quarter of all 
cases of misconduct reported - five cases of physical violence and assault 
out of a total of some twenty-one cases of misconduct. A similar finding 
was obtained for the period between the wars when some eleven cases of 
physical violence and assault were cited by the Birmingham press out of a 
total of forty-eight cases of misconduct. 172

172 See Tables E and F.
The dramatic increase in the 1960's in the rate of reported disorder was, therefore, accompanied by a dramatic increase in the number of cases involving physical violence and assault. This, in itself, does not tell the whole story. The category of physical violence and assault involves not just attacks on players and officials but also, and most significantly, by supporters on rival fan groups. Whereas preceding periods did witness attacks on players and officials - some quite serious, especially in the 1890's - and cases of fights between rival groups of supporters have also been documented, the feature distinctive of the 1960's and 1970's was the extent of this latter form of spectator disorder.

During the period, in other words, a marked increase in the reporting of fights between rival groups of spectators, before, during and after matches can be detected. Such a development, embracing the phenomenon in general, was viewed, by contemporaries, as a "new" and growing problem. A report from *The Times* in 1962 is a case in point. Considering the incidence of rough play and spectator disorder, the writer noted:

"Unruly Football Crowds.

Certainly the incidence of action against players has shown an increase since last season. But this does not mean the game has suddenly become more vicious in the age of the New Deal. It is merely that referees as a body - perhaps influenced by some of the events of the World Cup in Chile - have closed ranks to take a firmer control than in the past....

Far more difficult to control are crowds: this is the real problem, and a growing threat. There has been more than one occasion this season to remark upon it. The younger element is at the root of it.

The closing of stadia by the FA would certainly be a sharp reminder that they mean business, and might have a salutary effect. It is worth trying in an effort to control mob hysteria." 173

A more direct reference to fighting between rival fan groups occurred in the same year as this report which complained of unruly crowds in

---

general. In April 1962, The Times commented:

"...scores of spectators invaded the football field to escape from fighting on the terraces. As fighting broke out spectators surged towards the lower levels and overflowed onto the track surrounding the field." 174

A shift towards confrontations between rival groups of supporters, as argued, formed the major transformation in the nature of the spectator disorder reported during this period. The Birmingham Post, for example, records that in 1975, in clashes between Aston Villa and Manchester United supporters, a man was so severely wounded that he required a major operation to save his life.175 The newspaper also reported that, in conjunction with the match in question, sixty-seven arrests were made in and around the ground and thirty-three in the City centre.176

During the same year "ugly scenes of mob violence" on the terraces were witnessed at the match between Birmingham City and Glasgow Celtic.177 Such disorder was not confined to these major clubs. Following disturbances at a cup-tie between Bradford City and Lincoln City played on the Doncaster Rovers ground in 1970, Doncaster officials complained that:

"......gangs of hooligans roamed the ground, missiles were thrown and a youth was taken to hospital. We have never had violence of this nature at our ground before........" 178

Nor were such scenes confined to the English Football League. The physical violence and assault which had marked meetings of rival fan groups in Scotland in the period between the wars continued to occur. Glasgow city magistrates, recognising the consequences of such meetings, determined, in 1960, that there was a need to:
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"Keep Rival Football Supporters Apart.

Glasgow city magistrates, in an effort to avoid rowdyism after next Saturday's football match between Rangers and Celtic at Parkhead, Glasgow, are hoping to segregate supporters of the victors from the followers of the vanquished at the end of the game.

They intend to direct Rangers supporters out of one end of the stadium and Celtic supporters out of the other. One stream will then travel into the city centre via London Road, the other will go via Gallowgate.......

The Chief Constable, Mr. James Robertson, said the object of the precautions would be to prevent a clash between rival supporters at Kerrydale Street, where there was a disturbance last Saturday after a match between the same two clubs. Twenty two arrests were made.

More than 350 police would be on duty in and around the ground next Saturday." 179

Disorder also occurred away from the immediately excitement - generating context of matches during this period. In April 1960, for example, groups of Aston Villa supporters queuing for cup tickets were identified in the local press as "hooligans, hoodlums and thumbs." Respectable residents complained of fires being started with parts of fences surrounding their gardens, coal being stolen, broken glass strewn across the pavements and old car seats littering the vicinity.180

Widespread disorder also occurred in town centres before and after matches. In successive weekends of the 1969-1970 season, for example, Coventry City fans attacked Southampton supporters in and around the ground and on the second Saturday, over two hundred Coventry fans were reported as having "hunted Sheffield Wednesday supporters" in the Coventry city centre.181

Spectator disorder, however, as Tables 7 and 8 document, was not confined to confrontations between groups of rival supporters. Attacks on players and officials were not unknown - especially during the early 1960's. An example, dating from 1965, serves to illustrate this theme:

"An angry section of the crowd demonstrated yesterday after referee N. Matthews, of Oxford, had abandoned the match with only half an hour played. Feet were stamped in unison in the stand as he led
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the players off and some hundreds of spectators gathered for a time outside the Villa offices.

One man in a black cossack hat ran on to the field when the official announcement of abandonment came over the public address system and gestured to the rest of the crowd to join him.

A policeman chased him and almost fell over. Then the massed forces of the law moved in and the man in the cossack hat was gently escorted away." 182

This example is typical of its genre. Analysis of the photographs accompanying the report suggests, furthermore, that working class males aged thirty and above, in conjunction with youths, were those principally involved in this incident. Further analysis of the possible ties between these groups would possibly shed further light on the social roots of football hooliganism.

Reports of this nature after the 1960's also contained explicit conjectures regarding the motivation of those involved - that is, to feelings aroused by specific decisions of the referee or acts by particular players. Such observations have in fact been a recurring feature of accounts of spectator disorder since the 1890's.

A persistent feature of the actual forms of spectator misconduct, however, has been pitch invasions and the 1960's were no exception in this regard. Whereas in previous periods such invasions were connected with the crowd's displeasure at either specific incidents in the game or with some longer-standing grievance with the club - or, indeed, with a desire to demonstrate their pleasure at the team's success - during the 1960's both the perception of such behaviour and the actual intentions underpinning pitch invasions changed. Pitch invasions began to be perceived by the FA, the popular tabloids and the more 'respectable' press as problematic and as a source of potential disorder. Take the following account published in 1962 in The Times:

182 Birmingham Post 28th December 1965.
"For the most part 'invasions' of the pitch are confined to youthful enthusiasts who consider it fitting at the end of a match to 'mob' their heroes as they leave the field. Far be it from us to decry youthful enthusiasm, but if a situation develops whereby youngsters feel they can invade the pitch without any danger of being punished, anything can happen. They must be prevented by all means from getting onto the pitch...." 183

But, as with the phenomenon of football hooliganism in general, the changes which occurred after ca. 1960 were not confined solely to a re-definition of people's behaviour. The intent of those who "invaded" the pitch appears to have also changed. True, pitch invasions still occurred as a consequence of the reasons outlined for earlier periods, but now those involved also wished to attempt to reach groups of rival supporters situated in other stands - itself a reflection of the increase in inter-fan group confrontations which were characteristic of the 1960's and 1970's.

Yet this period also contained deviations from traditional forms of misconduct - the throwing of orange peel and apple cores most common in the 1940's and 1950's had given way to the more frequent use of more dangerous missiles. The following report of a match in Birmingham appeared in 1965:

"Just before half-time in Birmingham City's home game with Tottenham Hotspur on Saturday the referee, Mr. V. Carr walked to a constable on the touchline and gave him a blue plastic dart.

Police patrolled behind the Tottenham goal. There had been no apparent unrest there, nor was there afterwards or in any other part of the terraces." 184

Despite this case, even as recently as the 1979-1980 season, newspapers felt able to claim that dart-throwing at matches was a new phenomenon. Yet missile throwing was not uncommon in the 1960's. For example, in November 1965, a dud hand-grenade was found behind the goal of the Brentford goalkeeper in a match involving Millwall FC. With the gradual introduction of "penning" - the segregation of spectators into sections of the terraces -
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direct confrontations between groups of spectators within stadia became less possible, but the "action" did not stop there. Recourse to missile-throwing was still possible in grounds where rival supporters are "penned" in adjacent sections and there was always the meeting before and after the match. The 1980's, in fact, show no indications of the various facets of the phenomenon withering away.

Analysis of the nature and extent of the concern generated by such events is bound up with the attempt to document those forms of behaviour which caused concern. The extent of the "problem" had become sufficiently "public" during this period that, by 1975, following the Walsall Town-Manchester United FA cup-tie in which at least six people were arrested and one hundred spectators ejected from the Walsall ground, a police superintendent felt able to maintain that 'considering it is Manchester United, the crowd has been reasonably behaved.' 185

From the analysis presented so far, it appears that within this period there occurred a transformation in the nature and extent of spectator misconduct. Though there had been missile throwing, attacks on and barracking of referees and players in the initial decade following the Second World War, these traditional activities involved "respectables" and concerned the FA, that is those groups, traditionally, centrally involved in and concerned about the phenomenon. This did not rule out, however, the involvement of other groups, particularly the "rough" working class. Nor did it rule out the concern expressed by other groups who considered that working class leisure activities, particularly those of working class youth, were a source of potential disorder. Gradually, however, both the social composition of those centrally involved in particular incidents and the climate of concern aroused by the growing and apparently worsening
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nature of spectator disorder changed significantly. Increasingly, after
the late 1950's and early 1960's examples of fights between rival groups
of supporters surfaced in the press. Such cases were to become the
central concern of reporters. Moreover, cases of spectator misconduct no
longer simply surfaced in the press in the context of match reports but
appear to have been actively reported on their own account. This undoubtedly
contributed to the "amplification" of the traditional "horseplay" engaged
in by spectators but the available evidence suggests that the 1960's and
1970's were qualitatively different from the decade immediately following
the Second World War and from previous periods in the development of football
as a spectator sport. In this context, even though there are doubts about
the adequacy of the evidence utilised and acknowledging the existence of the
subterranean features alluded to, it appears that the football spectating of
the 1960's and 1970's was marked not simply by the more traditional forms of
misconduct but also by disorder which centrally involved fights between
groups of rival spectators drawn from "rough" working class communities. The
"roughs" had returned; spectator misconduct had become "public" and a "moral
panic" ensued - it is to this dimension of the phenomenon that the analysis
must now turn.

2. "Moral Panic" - The Institutionalisation of Football Hooliganism

Evidence to support the contention that the period after about 1960
witnessed the institutionalisation of football hooliganism both as a regularly
recurring social phenomenon and as a cause for national concern comes from
several aspects. Firstly, by contrasting the portrayal of English spectators
relative to their European counterparts in the 1950's and again in the late
1960's. Secondly, by the "treatment" which specific incidents of spectator
misconduct received during this period. Thirdly, by the growing involvement
of the agencies of the state. Fourthly, by the linkage made between football
hooliganism, the problem of youth and the perceived demise of cherished values. Examination of the changing climate of concern which underlay these transformations is therefore required.

Spectator misconduct in the years following the end of the Second World War, as has been shown, primarily involved missile throwing at players and officials and this prompted the FA in 1947, to issue a general circular to clubs.

"Misconduct by Spectators

The following letter was approved for circulation to clubs in membership with the Association:

'The Football Association is disturbed at the growing practice of throwing missiles at officials and players on football grounds. All clubs are asked, therefore to inform their spectators, through the medium of programmes or speaker apparatus of the serious consequences which may result from such disorderly conduct and to emphasise that such action is likely to bring both the clubs and the game generally into disrepute." 186

It is important to note that such concern arose, in part, in relation to incidents of a relatively unserious nature which contemporaries labelled "horseplay." For example, the following is recorded in the FA Disciplinary Committee's minutes for October-December, 1947:

"Tottenham Hotspur v Bradford

The Referee reported that during the match spectators threw apple cores at him. The Committee decided that no action be taken in the matter having regard to the fact that the Club had already appealed to their spectators to refrain from such action and had warned them of the serious consequences which might result from such misconduct." 187

Such concern with the throwing of apple cores - earlier examples cited referred, it will be recalled, to the throwing of orange peel - tends to suggest a sense of anxiety out of proportion to the actual form of misconduct.

As was argued earlier, the period dating from 1947 to the late 1950's, appears in this regard similar in many ways to the period between the wars. An air of "respectability" still pervaded the crowd and the sport - yet,
this anxiety of the FA appears to predate the return of the "rough" working class to the grounds. Indeed, during 1956, the FA again issued a circular to clubs, in this case warning players about "violent and unsporting behaviour." In this connection, the FA were concerned with media coverage of such incidents: the FA thus appear to have become more sensitive to breaches of the "limits of decent partisanship" and to the reputation of the game prior to the change in the social composition in the crowd documented earlier.

Efforts to control the behaviour of spectators in the context of this overall climate of concern appears, again until the mid to late 1950's, to have involved those groups traditionally involved in dealing with misconduct. More particularly, up until this time, the FA continued to be the main agency of control, aided in particular cases by police officers hired by clubs for specific matches. That is to say, spectator misconduct was still perceived primarily as a problem to be dealt with by the football authorities alone. Although the FA appear to have become more sensitive to acts of "horseplay" during the period between 1950 and 1961 no grounds were closed. To document this is not to suggest that the FA took no action, they did. The traditional response of warning notices and fines were still evident. However, in the period following the end of World War Two, several features emerged which began to undermine the predominant role of the FA in dealing with spectator misconduct. This process took place gradually at first but increased in rapidity in the mid to late 1950's and early 1960's.

The involvement of the state in football in the period between the wars centred, as documented, on the safety of spectators at matches. Similarly, following the 'Bolton Disaster' in 1946, in which a large number of spectators were killed and injured the Home Office inquired into the
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safety of grounds, but no questions were asked concerning spectator disorder. One of the initial indications of the trend towards the institutionalisation of football hooliganism, however, dates from 1950. Following "rowdy scenes" in Liverpool at the Anfield and Goodison Park grounds, involving cup-tie queues, questions were asked in the House of Commons:

"Mr. A. Lewis asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether, under the Police Acts and Public Order Act he will take action to prevent the road and pavements being blocked by the crowds that accumulate at football grounds for the purpose of collecting Football Association cup-tie tickets.

Mr. Ede: The situation on this occasion was exceptional and not likely to occur again. I will, however, communicate with the FA and ask them to consider arrangements for the sale of tickets which would avoid the accumulation of large crowds."

This appears to be the first official governmental reaction to an incident of spectator misconduct in the development of football as a spectator sport. Further evidence of this trend towards the intensification and broadening of the climate of concern can be documented in the reaction of the Railway authorities. Between 1956 and 1958, possibly co-relatively with the changes in the social composition of the crowd and the interrelated issue of changes in the nature and extent of spectator misconduct, several incidents involving "hooliganism" on the railways were reported. The Times, in 1956, following a report of a train being seriously damaged by football supporters, quoted a railway official as saying that such damage was: ".....the worst in the history of the railways." Subsequent to this, in 1957, it was reported that: "Trouble of this kind reached its peak in March 1956...........Police guards were put on many of the football specials for the rest of the season."

Such comments were not simply confined to specific examples. More
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generalised observations were also evident. In 1958, for example, in an editorial headed, "Hooliganism is Hooliganism," and which dealt primarily with the race riots in Nottingham and Notting Hill, *The Times* placed spectator misconduct in a broader perspective:

"That the so-called race riots in Nottingham and London are a complex affair is now obvious. The extent to which racial tension is the cause of them may be hotly disputed, but that there is some racial tension cannot be doubted. The extent to which they are merely the lawlessness and thuggery of a certain social layer of vicious young people venting themselves against a new target is also in question; but again the viciousness has to be admitted. There is one aspect of the matter, however, which has so far been overlooked. Depraved and disturbing as its latest manifestation may be, hooliganism itself is no newcomer to the social scene. We have been all too lenient towards it in the past, often making out that in some mysterious way it was either a manifestation of youthful high spirits or some relic of the Merrie England of more bucolic and alcoholic days......The University students who wreck theatrical performances, the football spectators who seem to feel that their afternoon's enjoyment is not complete unless they rip up the railway carriages and take them home, are - just as much as the Teddy boys who whether harmlessly or lethally, are obstreperous in public - all manifestations of a strand in our social behaviour that an adult society can do without." 193

Though the example does not particularly stress football hooliganism, its importance lies in terms of a wider debate concerning youth - a debate which was increasingly attracting intense concern. This early phase was soon to be gradually but decisively transformed: after the end of the 1950's, the nature and extent of the climate of concern was increasingly to involve an "amplification" of the phenomenon and to give rise to a "moral panic."

Crucial in this regard, as noted, was both the debate surrounding youth, particularly working class youth, and the role of the media in this process. Attention must be given to each of these issues if the "moral panic" surrounding football hooliganism is to be adequately understood.

Indicative of the broadening and deepening of concern referred to, was the subsuming of particular cases of spectator misconduct into the larger issue of the perceived problem of youth. Comments made by the Duke of

---

Edinburgh and the Duke of Norfolk in 1960 can serve to demonstrate this trend. Thus the Duke of Edinburgh observed in the context of a speech on behalf of the King George's Jubilee Trust:

"Youths' Need of Guidance

After all, it should be possible for the younger generation to have fun without being vicious to be wild without being destructive, and to be adventurous without being criminal, said the Duke....

The Duke of Norfolk had spoken of the difference between barracking and booing, and had criticised the sheer bad manners and lack of discipline shown by some of the crowd at the cup final."^194

Two main points deserve further elaboration in this connection. At issue appears to be different perceptions regarding having fun "without being vicious" and being "wild without being destructive." Such comments echo those made by the Bishop of Liverpool in 1939 concerning the "limits of decent partisanship." It was these "limits" which appear to have been at stake, and the behaviour of football spectators - both "respectable" and "rough", was in this period becoming a particular focus of concern.

Secondly, the Duke of Norfolk's comments highlight one of the probable media by which particular features of the phenomenon became amplified and by which a wider public became aware of these traditional facets of Association Football.195 Basing his comments on the television coverage of spectator misconduct at the 1960 Cup Final, the Duke of Norfolk's comments were a reflection of this process of amplification. Crucial in this regard were the roles of newspapers and television. In order to understand the nature and extent of the "moral panic" surrounding football hooliganism, the analysis must now be directed to considering such press and television coverage in more detail.

As noted in the earlier discussion of this issue the rate of reported spectator disorder at Association football matches increased significantly
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between 1960 and 1975. During 1960 there were seven cases of spectator misconduct reported in the Birmingham press; in 1965 the number of cases reported had increased by a factor of four; by 1970, thirty-two cases of spectator misconduct were reported and by 1975, thirty-three cases of spectator misconduct were cited in the Birmingham press. These figures, however, require contextualisation. Four features of the nature of reporting in this period are of direct relevance in this connection. Firstly, reporters began to be attracted to matches in search of a story relating to spectator disorder and not to solely report on the match in progress. Secondly, and in part reflecting this initial attraction, reporters, in their style of reporting, began to anticipate trouble. In 1977, for example, preceding the match between Wolverhampton Wanderers and Chelsea, the Daily Mirror chose to raise expectations of crowd disorder. Envisaging trouble as inevitable, the Mirror claimed under a headline "War on Soccer Kamikaze Kids," that: "... Big match thugs plan a secret invasion of terror....The louts are preparing to defy an official ban and earn themselves the title of the worst behaved supporters in the land."  

But the press were not content merely to raise expectations of disorder - the phenomenon of football hooliganism was placed in a wider context, that of violence in general. The Birmingham Post, in 1977, in considering what it believed to be a 'massive rise in violent crime in the Midlands,' directed attention to the following 'causes':

"If the police were not having to be employed in large numbers to try to keep the peace when extremists of the political right and left are clashing in the streets; or if a massive police presence was not necessary to control howling gangs of young hooligans....then police would have more time and energy to devote to their primary task of detecting, and so deterring, the law-breakers."  

The fourth feature of the press' portrayal of football hooliganism in
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this period which stands out is the labelling of those involved as "animals" and the concomitant denial of meaning to their actions.

Similarly the Daily Express, in 1977, by labelling football hooligans as 'mindless' de-legitimised those involved.\(^{199}\) Such sentiments, in fact, were not too dissimilar to the descriptions of those involved in spectator disorder in the 1880's and 1890's offered by contemporary newspapers.

The attention of the press and television did not go unnoticed in football circles. Somewhat ironically, given his present position as lead presenter of BBC's 'Match of the Day,' the then Coventry City manager, Jimmy Hill observed in 1965:

"......We in football have got sick of the bad publicity we have been getting lately. A single sending off becomes a headline: even the case of a kid throwing a toilet roll becomes a paragraph....." \(^{200}\)

Such comments are but one indication of how the increasing media coverage of football focused to a greater and greater extent on the crowd. The traditional and more recent additions to spectator misconduct were thus highlighted and an "amplification spiral" was set in motion.\(^{201}\) Given this widespread publicity, with grounds now being defined as times and places where fights could and did take place, the "rough" working class were attracted to this setting which carried connotations which they readily identified with - those of violent masculinity. As they did so, the attention of the press and television had something worthwhile to focus on - a "moral panic," with football grounds being defined as dangerous places, set in. In this connection, Stanley Cohen's remarks are relevant, for he noted during the early 1960's that: "....there was a steady build up
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of an image of football hooliganism as a massive new national problem, one that was increasing and becoming more intense.\textsuperscript{202}

Reinforcing this trend was the press labelling of football hooliganism as a "peculiarly English disease." The newspapers of the 1950's which had ridiculed spectator behaviour in other countries and contrasted it with the 'well-behaved British,' had changed their focus. Following a particular case of spectator misconduct, the \textit{Birmingham Post} in 1965 felt able to observe:

"This is the sort of behaviour we used to regard, with a slightly superior air, as the stamp of the excitable continentals or South Americans. Now it is becoming far too common among hooligans who regard any adverse decision, or the defeat of their favourites, as an excuse for stupid demonstrations." \textsuperscript{203}

This perception of football hooliganism as a "peculiarly English disease" was compounded in the months following this article and, crucially in the months leading up to the World Cup Finals in England in 1966, by the belief that national prestige was at stake. In the aftermath of spectator disorder at a match involving Liverpool and Celtic in April 1966, The \textit{Sun}, in an editorial, made the following remarks:

"It may be only a handful of hooligans who are involved at the throwing end, but if this sort of behaviour is repeated in July, the world will conclude that all the British are hooligans.... Either the drift to violence must be checked or soccer will be destroyed as an entertainment. What an advertisement for the British sporting spirit if we end with football pitches enclosed in protective wire cages." \textsuperscript{204}

Given this treatment by the press, the phenomenon of football hooliganism came to be defined as constituting a serious social problem requiring intervention by agencies of the state which had not traditionally been centrally involved. Comments made by Denis Follows, Secretary of the FA, in the period when football hooliganism was coming to be perceived as
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a "peculiarly British disease" and when concern began to be expressed about the reputation of the British should such conduct mar the World Cup planned to be held in England in July 1966, in fact suggest that those traditionally involved in the control of spectator misconduct wished to distance themselves from this 'national problem.' Follows was quoted as saying:

"...So much of this is a reflection of our present age. Of course we try to keep our own house in order and we cannot avoid our indirect responsibilities, but these are matters for the police. But what can one say except that I am getting tired of football being blamed for the ills of the community." 205

This sense of more widespread anxiety and the abrogation of responsibility by the FA, appears to have contributed to a more interventionist stance by the police in the 1960's and 1970's. Arrests under the Public Order Act became a frequent feature of press reports of the actions of the police. 206 Sophisticated technological aids such as close-circuit television and helicopters began to be utilised, and, as early as 1970, the "Special Commando Group" were deployed at matches. 207 Local magistrates were not slow to react, and a wide ranging sentencing policy of fines and imprisonment has now come to feature as a regular part of the Monday morning court scene!

As noted in Chapter One, this trend towards the more active control of the phenomenon also found expression in other agencies of the state: researchers such as Harrington and Lang were recruited in order to provide policy recommendations. Their recommendations centred on the "control" of the phenomenon by means of controlling the movement of the crowd inside the grounds, the erection of fences around the perimeter of the pitch, the
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banning of the sale of alcohol inside the ground, the introduction of all-seater stadia and stiffer sentences by magistrates. However, even though most of these recommendations have, in varying degrees been adopted, the phenomenon has persisted into the 1980's.

Football hooliganism also came in the years following 1960 to be seen as one symptom of the "permissive society." The Birmingham Post, for example, observed in 1975:

"The behaviour of hooligans......is another inescapable indictment of the prevailing indulgent attitudes of too many magistrates, social workers, educational psychologists and determined do-gooders....." 208

Set in these terms, there appears no escape for football hooliganism from the position of being a cause of national concern. Indeed, for the Birmingham Post, again in 1979:

"The basic problem of hooliganism is worsening. Publicans have come to dread match days because of the troubles. In other countries violence begins at football matches and leads to murders. It could be like that here if we don't do something now....." 209

Following on from one such incident, in which a football supporter was murdered, Mr. Millichip, Chairman of the FA, stated, in 1982:

"We have learned to expect these things, but not murder.....
It's not just a football problem, its a national problem and we have to convince the government of the seriousness of the situation." 210

Despite or perhaps because of such concern, the popular tabloids have eschewed any attempts at understanding the phenomenon of football hooliganism.211 The more "up-market" newspapers have been equally indulgent in portraying the phenomenon as a creation of the "decadent" and "permissive" 1960's and have contrasted the young rowdy spectators of today with the
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orderly crowds of the 1920's and 1930's. With respect to the latter point, David Lacey of The Guardian noted in January 1980 that:

"The sad fact is that for all their good intentions League clubs are paying now for the failure of those who ran their affairs in the past to modernise stadia when there was the chance to do so at a reasonable cost. The result has been that grounds which could easily assimilate the docile, disciplined crowds of 60,000 and above which were common in the pre-war and immediate post-war years have been soft targets for the relative handful of youngsters who cause the violence." 212

The really "sad fact," however, is that such misconceptions still persist. The documentation attempted in this chapter has sought to make the issue problematic. Attempts to explain the phenomenon with reference solely to the 1960's - and in simplistic terms at that - do not adequately capture the significance of football as a developing spectator sport and its emergence as a social problem. It is to that question that this and the subsequent inter-related chapter, are directed.
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CHAPTER FIVE

THE EMERGENCE OF FOOTBALL SPECTATING AS A "SOCIAL PROBLEM":
THE WIDER FIGURATIONAL CONTEXT

The central issue which dominated the documentation in Chapter Four of the forms and control of football hooligan violence since the foundation of the Football League revolved around the notion of the "limits of decent partisanship."¹ In this regard, as noted, several questions arise. What is it that is deemed permissible? By whom is this determined and how are norms regarding what is and what is not permissible produced and reproduced over time in the everyday behaviour and customs of people? In order to attempt to provide some kind of answer to these questions, consideration has already been given to competing theories of culture.² In particular, an analysis was undertaken in Chapter Three of popular culture in the context of the debate over nineteenth century leisure and 'social control.'

In order to grasp the processes involved in the emergence of football spectating as a social problem - and how the questions cited relate to this - however, the issue of the changing balance over time between continuity and change in popular culture must be located in a consideration of the area of deviance. In this way, a more adequate appraisal of the development of football hooligan violence and the emergence of football spectating as a social problem will, it is argued, be possible.

The intention of the present chapter is, therefore, twofold. Firstly, a restatement of how the present study conceives of the nature of social problems will be undertaken and then this perspective will be applied to an explanation of the emergence of football spectating as a socially problematic phenomenon. In this way, approaches to deviance - and the interconnections between these and approaches to the analysis of popular culture - can be

¹ See Chapter Four.
² See Introduction and Chapter Two.
probed further and the implications for the present study be thus outlined. Having accomplished this, the second intention of the present chapter can be tackled. More particularly, a substantive examination of the network of relations within which the emergence of football spectating as a social problem developed - running complementary to the documentation attempted in the previous chapter - will be undertaken.

A. The Wider Context

In language somewhat akin to that used by commentators of the 1960's, Canon Horsley argued in 1894 that "Juvenile Crime" was the "Great Social Question of the day." Gillis, in citing this example, claimed:

"Not all contemporaries would have agreed of course, with an analysis that placed the problems of poverty and war second to those of rowdism and masturbation, but in the eyes of the middle classes the threat of all forms of deviance took precedence. Juvenile mis­conduct was no longer explicable in terms of grinding poverty, but was instead the function of rising affluence and "abundant leisure." 3

Such an analysis brings one to the crux of the present study: the examination of - as but one aspect of the ongoing debate concerning popular culture - the emergence of football spectating as a "social problem." But how is this development to be conceptualised? In this respect, a restatement of the analysis of social problems undertaken in the Introduction is necessary.

Drawing inspiration from figurational sociology, the analysis presented in the Introduction argued that in order to grasp the nature of social problems it is first necessary to realise that people have to cope with the problems of interdependence. The tensions and conflicts which are inherent in social development are seen as inevitable and structured. In order to understand social development, it was argued that the sociologist has to grasp the structured nature of interdependence. Similarly, in order to understand social problems, the sociologist must grasp the complex inter­dependence between behaviour and reaction. Social problems arise out of the

---

3 Gillis, Youth and History p. 172.
figurations in which they are located. The emergence of football spectating as a socially problematic phenomenon is no exception to this.

Ian Taylor, as noted, has also seen the value of examining how football hooliganism has achieved its current status as a subjectively defined social problem. In fact, Taylor's analysis, underpinned by the work of Becker and Fuller and Myers, sought to examine what he calls "the natural history of a social problem." In this conception, a series of stages is viewed as integral to the process. Thus, starting from the premise, espoused by Becker, that the objective condition is necessary but not in itself sufficient to constitute a social problem and that social problems thus involve an element of subjective definition, a fourfold scheme of stages of development is conceived. The initial stage involves the perception by an individual or group of an objective condition as problematic; secondly, comes the sharing of this definition by others; thirdly, there arises the embodiment of the definition in the activities of an organisation, and finally comes the dependence of this organisation on the existence of the problem. Applying this to the development of football hooliganism, Ian Taylor claimed:

"......Something of this type of analysis could be applied here as a help in attempting to identify the stages in the development of football hooliganism from a troublesome matter dealt with by the police alone (up until ca. 1960) through a series of stages involving individual clubs, the Football League and Football Association - in that order - in which the press came to play a crucial role culminating finally in acceptance by the Government of their responsibility in 1967 when a research team of psychologists were appointed by the Minister of Sport to investigate the "problem." By this stage a definition of the problem as more serious and implicitly pathological was current." 7

The weakness of Taylor's analysis, however, lies at two levels. Firstly,

4 Taylor, "'Football Mad' A Speculative Sociology of Football Hooliganism" pp 372-373.
6 Fuller and Myers, "The Natural History of a Social Problem".
7 Taylor, "'Football Mad.' A Speculative Sociology of Football Hooliganism" p. 373.
as noted in the Introduction, there is no sense in which the reciprocal and integrated nature of what is termed the 'objective condition' and the 'subjective definition' is evident in Taylor's analysis. In his formulation the focus is on the actions of the 'authorities' - the police, the FA, the government. That is, the emphasis is on the 'subjective definitions' of members of these powerful groups and not on the interplay between them and the groups whose behaviour they perceive as problematic. Secondly, this weakness is compounded by gross errors in his empirical findings. Reference to these will be made in the substantive section of the present chapter. It is necessary, at this point, to extend the analysis of the nature of social problems. This will be done in the context of a critical review of the literature on the overall issue of deviance. Connections with analyses of popular culture will then be drawn and the idea of the changing balance between continuity and change as an aid to explaining transformations in culture in general will be explicated. By adopting this course, a basis for contextualising the substantive analysis of the emergence of football spectating as a social problem will have been provided.

1. Central Issues

In arguing that *The Long Revolution* was centrally concerned with questions in the theory of culture, the historical analysis of certain cultural institutions and forms, and problems of meaning and action in the contemporary cultural situation, Raymond Williams has posited an approach which is broadly similar to that which finds expression in the present study. According to this view, the areas of popular culture, leisure and deviance appear to revolve around three main issues. Firstly, the perceived characteristics and meaning of particular cultures. Secondly, the ability of the people involved to contribute to the "making" of that culture. Thirdly, the process

---

8 Williams, *The Long Revolution* p. 9
of how cultural change occurs. In considering these issues with reference to the areas cited, three main "ideal types," which can be termed the "dismissive," the "optimistic" and the "pessimistic," can be identified. What follows is an attempt to consider these areas and issues within the "ideal types" identified. But first, some clarification of these "ideal types" is required.

The "dismissive" ideal type, quite simply, denies the importance of the need to examine popular culture in its own right. From this perspective, traditional culture was smashed with the onset of industrialisation and urbanisation, a "mass society" culture replaced it, from which little of value was or is produced. For the exponents of this perspective, such a "mass society" leaves the people as "cultural dopes" and deviance is the consequence of under or faulty socialisation.

In contrast, the "optimistic" ideal type runs counter to such a perspective in a number of key respects. Crucially, exponents of this perspective are "optimistic" regarding the ability of people to make their own history and to resist attempts by more powerful groups to control or label their culture and behaviour. In this way, the active, creative nature of popular culture is emphasised: though the impact of industrialisation and urbanisation, for example, is, in part, recognised, the resistance to aspects of these processes is emphasised. The central concern of this "ideal type" is with what is termed "authentic popular culture" and, indeed, the resistance to pressures attempting to change that "authenticity" finds expression it is argued, in the actions of working class youth. For the exponents of this perspective, therefore, deviance is conferred onto the behaviour of the carriers of this "authentic popular culture."

While such "optimism" stands in contrast to the "dismissive" approach outlined earlier, the third ideal type identified, what Stuart Hall has termed
the "pessimism of the intellect."9 shares some of the assumptions which underpins the "dismissive" ideal type. By seeking to explain popular culture and leisure in terms of "unconscious structures," i.e. that the characteristics and meaning of people's behaviour are a reflection of mental structures below the level of consciousness, this "pessimism" has a deterministic view of the processes of history. The development of culture and, within it, of leisure, is viewed, for example, in terms of "cultural imperialism" - people's customs, beliefs and behaviour, and changes in these regards are held to reflect processes of which they are, at best, only dimly aware. The "cultural dope" thus reappears. In relation to deviance, such an ideal type seeks to explore the functions of defining particular behaviour as deviant rather than the process of becoming deviant - a sense of "pessimism" regarding people's ability to resist the definitions of powerful labelers pervades analyses working within this tradition. As with the "dismissive" ideal type, people's actions are envisaged as the product of forces beyond their control or consciousness. At this point, further elaboration of these themes appears to be appropriate.

2. The "Dismissive" Theme in Studies of Popular Culture, Leisure and Deviance

"Dismissivism" of this type, which Stedman Jones has perceived as being pervasive in analyses of leisure and popular culture, has centred on the presumed "decline" or "disappearance" of traditional forms and focused on how the people involved reacted to changes wrought on them by "leisure entrepreneurs."10 Within this ideal type, as Harold Perkin has argued with reference to most histories of the working class, the people are seen as "dopes."11 In consequence, these "cultural dopes" are seen, in the twentieth

9 Hall, "Cultural Studies: Two Paradigms" p. 36.
10 Stedman Jones, "Class Expression Versus Social Control?" p. 163
century, to consume and enjoy the cultural products of the modern cultural industry. Therefore, as Stuart Hall argues:

"...If the forms and relationships, on which participation in this sort of commercially provided 'culture' depend, are purely manipulative and debased, then the people who consume and enjoy them must either be themselves debased, by these activities or else living in a permanent state of 'false consciousness.' They must be 'cultural dopes' who can't tell what they are being fed in an updated form of the opium of the people." 12

Reservations regarding such a conception of the characteristics and meaning of popular culture and leisure patterns can be made, but at this stage, it is appropriate to probe its implications further. For Stedman Jones, this research focus is in the ascendancy and the consequences are clear-cut. It is worth quoting again what he writes:

"As a result......the cumulative picture conveyed by research into popular recreation and leisure is out of perspective. The sharply delineated foreground is occupied by puritan, methodist and evangelical moral reformers, gentry deciding where to place their patronage, prescient magistrates, calculating employers, prudent municipal elites, entre­preneurial publicans and rationalising merchants of leisure. Behind this obtrusive phalanx, we can just make out the blurred and rather undiffer­ential features of the rural and urban masses. Once or twice, their generally dim profiles are illuminated by a 'flashpoint of class conflict.' Forms of resistance may momentarily be discerned. But since, at this distance of time, evidence of their resistance can only be found generally in non-verbal activity - a burnt hayrick for example, or a pitched street battle - it is then difficult to situate these 'flashpoints' in their surrounding terrain." 13

Having been "dismissed" as unimportant to how change occurs and having been perceived as 'cultural dopes,' the working class are correspondingly neglected in the research endeavour. According to Stedman Jones, Donajgrodzki, in his analysis of social control in nineteenth century Britain, implicitly adopts such assumptions. Donajgrodzki envisages the transition to a more orderly society as having centrally involved the actions of those in power - those who "needed to be controlled" offered little resistance. Donajgrodzki thus feels able to conclude that 'it remains an enigma as to why the transition was so easily accomplished.' 14 Conceptualised in this way, the issues

12 Hall, "Notes on Deconstructing the 'Popular' p. 232.
13 Stedman Jones, "Class Expression Versus Social Control?" p. 163.
of popular culture and leisure, as Eileen and Stephen Yeo put it, centrally involve problems of "control."\(^{15}\) Within this perspective, popular culture has been totally "encapsulated" into mainstream culture. The only problem which remains is to control those who deviate. But Stuart Hall argues that such a position is "unacceptable" in terms of how popular culture is actually produced and reproduced over time.\(^ {16}\) In similar fashion, Stedman Jones takes exception to the portrayal of leisure and popular culture outlined. In this connection it is worth quoting again what he has argued:

"It is as if class conflict in England has been a largely one-sided affair conducted by capitalism and its representatives; as if the rural and urban masses, like the newborn child in Locke's psychology, were simply a blank page upon which each successive stage of capitalism has successfully imposed its imprint."\(^ {17}\)

Applying such criticisms to the development of football, Hugh Cunningham, as noted, holds several reservations. His two main reservations, however, reflect both the ideas of such writers as Stedman Jones and Stuart Hall, and how they conceive of the issues which the areas of popular culture, leisure and deviance revolve around. Thus Cunningham is critical of how "conventional" histories of football have failed to probe the part played by the working classes and secondly, of how the working classes have been portrayed as embracing the bourgeois ideology which those in control of the game fostered.

An example which perhaps best illustrates the type of "dismissive" perspective outlined and of which Cunningham is critical is the work of Lincoln Allison. Tending to conceive of such behaviour in terms of a behaviourist framework, Allison comments:

"Social science has had a lot to say about hooliganism. It is, after all, a minor, but still classic, example of a 'problem' for the intelligentsia. Like racialism, fascism, the poverty trap, urban decay and a handful of other matters about which there are generally more people prepared to write articles than to read them, it is both puzzling and yet promising. We cannot understand it yet it promises to reveal something fundamental about our society......The mainstream of intellectual slush sees hooliganism as an expression of deprivation......Then there is

\(^ {15}\) Yeo and Yeo, "Ways of Seeing: Control and Leisure Versus Class and Struggle" p. 30.
\(^ {16}\) Hall, "Notes on Deconstructing the 'Popular'" p. 232.
\(^ {17}\) Stedman Jones, "Class Expression Versus Social Control?" p. 163
the frustration/aggression effect which stresses the relationship between expectations and achievements. To conservatives of a certain sort hooliganism is precisely the sort of thing one would expect to happen in a society which has abandoned important principles about authority, the family and personal restraint. There seems to be a germ of truth in all of them. But a germ is not much use.

This is not, as it may appear to some, a trivialization of a serious problem. It is serious, for the ritual creates circumstances of disorder in which genuine nastiness, which is always available in human society, may prosper and in which, also, quite ordinary people, through ignorance or hyperexcitement, may flout or forget the rules. 18

Only in the final sentence does Allison give himself away. Hooliganism, for Allison, has always and will always exist, and besides, the issue is too complex to capture anyway. By adopting a behavioural perspective, Allison downplays the need to understand social conduct as a meaningful activity - the hooliganism of popular culture is no exception to this. Acceptance of the phenomenon as "given" also finds expression, as noted, in official reports. The "official" position perceives the "problem" in terms of its "control."

The "problem", for sections of the press, involves "mindless" youths and blame is attached to the permissiveness of the 1960's. Considered in this way, meaning is denied those involved and they are again characterised as "cultural dopes." 19 Such sentiments, in fact, both reflect and find expression in the wider analysis of deviance. Attention must therefore now be paid to the connections which can be documented in this conceptualisation of popular culture, leisure and deviance.

In the positivist tradition, deviance is seen as "objectively given" - deviant acts are unproblematic, they occur and the sociologist's task is to explain them. Implicit within this idea is that deviance is inferred in behaviour. Three main problems therefore confront the sociologist. Firstly, he must find out who the deviants are; secondly, he must explain how they came to be what they are by examining the socio-cultural conditions within

19 See Chapter Two.
which they live; thirdly, he must provide some solutions as to how such deviants can be controlled. The aim is causal analysis, aided by statistics, which will assist in a "correctional" approach to the problem. While greater discussion lies outside the scope of the present analysis, several observations can still be made.

In common with criticisms made of the "dismissive" approaches to popular culture and leisure, this perspective on deviance treats social reality as given, the social actor is passive. Consideration of the meaning of the problematic behaviour is denied. In this way, this positivist perspective explains what is rather than making problematic the phenomenon under discussion. By so doing, as with the reports documented in Chapter One, the "official ideology" is maintained. The focus is on the violator of the law not on the social status of the "problem." Deviance is viewed in pathological terms - in relation to some biogenetic, personality or social structural condition. Football hooliganism is, as argued, viewed in similar terms. The official reports on the phenomenon and work such as that by Marsh, Grayson and Allison can be located within this tradition. When welded together, such conceptions of popular culture, leisure and deviance would conceive of the development of football spectating as a socially problematic phenomenon in a distinct way. Before further criticism of this is attempted, however, consideration must be given to what has been termed the more "optimistic" ideal type.

3. The "Optimistic" Theme in Studies of Popular Culture, Leisure and Deviance

Aspects of the approach adhered to by Eileen and Stephen Yeo typifies the "optimism" of this perspective. In their far-ranging analysis of popular culture, they argue that more is at stake than the subjects specifically addressed. For their concern is with "creative social history." The process of change in popular culture and leisure was and is not a one-sided affair:
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20 For further discussion see Taylor, Walton and Young, The New Criminology.
For them, change can best be conceptualised in terms of 'struggle.' Implicit in their approach, and in the "optimistic" ideal type in general, is a processual view of change - as will be shown, such a perspective links quite closely to an "interpretative" or "interactionist" analysis of deviance.

For Eileen and Stephen Yeo, these "struggles" find expression in the leisure and popular culture debate today. For them: 'This mixture of the past in the present is our guarantee not that a different, better future is inevitable but that it is at least available through present struggle.' While reservations have been and will be made elsewhere in this thesis, in connection with the idea of finding "messages of hope in the past," it is clear that such a stance is in stark contrast to the pessimistic and dismissive tone adopted by Allison for example. Indeed, this approach makes the issues of popular culture and leisure more problematic. For, as Peter Bailey argued, leisure time 'was one of the major frontiers of social change in the nineteenth century and like most frontiers, it was disputed territory.' At issue, therefore, is the nature and meaning of this dispute and the ability of those involved to shape the outcome. From this perspective, a distinctive interpretation can be traced.

By stressing the idea of "struggle," the Yeos are explicitly defining the issues which, in their view, studies of popular culture and leisure ought to revolve around. Instead of a one-sided view of the historical process, with the focus on the "leisure entrepreneurs", the notion of struggle allows meaning to be given to the behaviour of those involved as "underdogs" and the opportunity to examine the part played by the participants in popular culture.

21 Yeo and Yeo "Ways of Seeing: Control and Leisure Versus Class and Struggle" p. 137.
22 Ibid p. 130.
in its making. Such an analysis of leisure also finds expression, as noted in Chapter Two, in broader appraisals of culture and the historical process. At this point it is pertinent to consider why it is that such a position can be viewed as "optimistic."

Identifying the work of Raymond Williams and E. P. Thompson as the leading exponents of what he terms 'culturalism,' Stuart Hall outlines the major premises on which this approach rests:

".....it conceptualises culture as interwoven with all social practices; and those practices, in turn, as a common form of human activity: sensuous human praxis, the activity through which men and women make history. It is opposed to the base - superstructure way of formulating the relationship between ideal and material forces, especially where the 'base' is defined as the determination by 'the economic' in any simple sense. It prefers the wider formulation - the dialectic between social being and social consciousness: neither separable into its distinct poles.....It defines 'culture' as both the meanings and values which arise amongst distinctive social groups and classes, on the basis of their given historical conditions and relationships, through which they 'handle' and respond to the conditions of existence; and as the lived traditions and practices through which those understandings are expressed and in which they are embodied." 24

Such an approach stresses the active, purposeful and lived experience of those involved in the historical process and it is clear that both Stedman Jones and the Yeos draw from this tradition. Taken to its extreme, however, and posited as the polar alternative to the "dismissive" approach, the optimism of this perspective seeks to examine what its practitioners regard as the "true" and "authentic" popular culture and leisure. Hall, in probing the alternatives to the cultural dope idea, puts it this way:

"One is to counterpose to it another, whole 'authentic' culture - the authentic 'popular culture'; and to suggest that the 'real' working class (whatever that is) isn't taken in by the commercial substitutes. This is a heroic alternative; but not a very convincing one......" 25

---

The reservations which the present study has with this "optimistic" ideal type centres on three issues. Firstly, by stressing the active, purposeful nature of popular culture, there is a tendency to write into the actions of working class people the meanings of the observer. Secondly, by stressing the part played the working class in the making of their culture, there is a tendency to ignore the power realities of the figurations in which they are located. Thirdly, by stressing the notion of a "real" and "authentic" culture and holding it up for all to see and admire, there is a tendency towards romanticism - a non-relational view of the making of culture creeps in. At this stage, it is perhaps appropriate to examine how such optimism has found expression in the analysis of the development of football and the area of deviance.

As has been suggested earlier, Hugh Cunningham takes exception with what he views as an elitist interpretation of the development of football. In this context, it is useful to remind oneself of the basis for his argument. In rejecting what he terms "conventional histories" of the game, Cunningham wishes to emphasise the role of the working classes in its development. For Cunningham, such a role has been downplayed - hence, he emphasises the importance of, for example, street football rather than the public schools. But, as was argued, such a position can be found wanting. The present study does not deny the importance of folk football, street football or the ready acceptance of football in its modern forms in working class communities, at least from the 1870's onwards. But Cunningham appears to overreach his analysis in relation to the ability of working class people to have determined the overall outcome of the development of football in the nineteenth century. As such, his analysis can be said to be somewhat "optimistic."

26 See Chapter Three.
Such sentiments also find expression in the analysis of deviance in general. Stephen Humphries, in examining working class childhood and youth between 1889 and 1939, posits an explanation in terms of "hooligans" or "rebels". While, in fact, the present chapter will be found to have sympathy with the conclusions reached by this perspective concerning "moral panics" and the emergence of "social problems," reservations remain. Humphries appears to write into people's actions a stark alternative - the analysis must either accept the "stock images" of working class people as "hooligans" or interpret their actions as involving "heroic" resistance - neither alternative is satisfactory in explaining the emergence of football spectating as a socially problematic phenomenon. This is not to deny that Humphries is correct to point to the "stock images" which have been presented of working class life. He writes:

"My main concern is to penetrate the stock images of brutality that were associated with gang members and to look beyond the epithets ('savage hooligan,' 'slum monkey' and 'street blackguard') that were commonly used to condemn them......In this chapter I will explore the internal structure, the focal concerns and the illegal activities characteristic of the street gang and will seek to outline the ways in which it provided an inarticulate and immediate solution to the problems of disadvantage that confronted working-class youth in all spheres of life." 28

By seeking to explain the significance of such behaviour, Humphries is, of course, some distance from the positivist perspective on deviance outlined earlier. In fact, his analysis draws from what may be termed the "interpretative" perspective. It is to an assessment of this perspective and its place in the "optimistic" theme that attention must now be directed.

The "optimism" which finds expression in analyses of popular culture and leisure tends to be viewed in a processual manner - it is the ongoing interaction which is important. One of the debates in the "interpretative" perspective concerns the precise form that a processual model of deviance

27 Humphries, Hooligans or Rebels? pp 175-176.
28 Ibid.
should take. Of course historians such as Humphries do not explicitly debate the nature of a processual model of deviance, but Humphries does call into question conventional wisdom in criminology and implicitly reflects the debate referred to.

The "optimistic" approach to the study of popular culture and leisure tends to be paralleled in what Stan Cohen has termed the "sceptical" view of deviance and in what David Matza has called the "appreciative stance." That is, the "optimism" which emphasises the ability of people to contribute to the making of their culture and to give meaning to their actions finds expression in a "sceptical" view of suggestions that deviance is a "given," a form of behaviour to be corrected and not to be understood in its own terms. It is to the latter that the "appreciative stance" is directed. But on what premises do this "scepticism" and "appreciation" rest?

In contrast to the positivist tradition, the sub-cultural theorists, labelling theorists and ethnomethodologists who contribute to this perspective treat deviance as 'subjectively problematic.' Such a position rests on the assumption that, even though constrained by situations, men make choices. Therefore, deviants are not seen as 'sick,' 'pathological' or 'mindless,' but as normal participants in the social process who are apprehended and processed as deviant. The major concern is with the social definition of the act described as deviant - this perspective problematises the circumstances by which a person became a deviant. The 'problems' for this perspective concern how a person is cast in that social role, what actions others take on the basis of this re-definition and how a person adjudged to be deviant reacts?

30 Humphries, Hooligans or Rebels? See Introduction.
32 Matza, Delinquency and Drift.
Accordingly, attention focuses on the person labelled deviant and on those responsible for the labelling: by so doing, the aim is to understand, to "appreciate" and, at the same time, remain "sceptical" of such definitions in the process of becoming deviant. Deviance, in this sense, is "conferred" onto behaviour.

Criticism of the characterisation of the deviant found in this perspective has, however, arisen. In particular, even those who acknowledge the contribution made by proponents of the "appreciative" view, argue that, within it, the deviant tends to be seen as the product of society, a cultural dope or "man on his back," rather than, as Gouldner argues, a rebel against it, "man fighting back." As with Humphries, such a conceptualisation forces the analysis into an either/or debate which, it will be argued, proves misleading. Such a conception of deviance, and indeed of popular culture, stemming from an adherence to positivist or interpretative perspectives is, as Stedman Jones argues, inappropriate. To see working class people as "cultural dopes" or as proletarian "revolutionaries" is equally mistaken. Writing with reference to the analysis of recreations, Stedman Jones argues that it is a 'false step' to write into recreations a symbolic form of class conflict - or its reverse a channelling or diversion of class consciousness.'

Such formulations of deviance, as with the view of popular culture as being "smashed" or "autonomous," are, as Hall argues, the "unacceptable poles" within which analyses have, so far, been rooted. The links, however, between these perspectives on deviance, popular culture and leisure centre around a view of man as active, purposeful and creative in the social process. As Thompson and Williams wish to probe the lived experiences of historical

---

35 Stedman Jones, "Class Expression Versus Social Control?" p. 170.
36 Hall, "Notes on Deconstructing the 'Popular!" p. 232.
actors, so Becker and Hatza wish to appreciate the process of becoming deviant, and so Humphries seeks to explore, as with Cunningham in terms of street football in particular and leisure in general, the "focal concerns" of working class youth, from their perspective. While some reservations have been expressed, further criticism of this "optimistic" theme will be reserved for the overall critique and alternative perspective which will be proposed. First, however, identification and clarification of a more "pessimistic" ideal type must be accomplished.

4. The "Pessimistic" Theme in Studies of Popular Culture, Leisure and Deviance

In sharp contrast to the more optimistic perspective, the research found in this ideal type is underpinned by assumptions which tend to stress a "structural" explanation for change. In considering approaches to the study of culture, Hall commented as follows on what he termed the "structuralist paradigm":

"Whereas, in 'culturalism', experience was the ground - the terrain of 'the lived' - where consciousness and conditions intersected, structuralism insisted that 'experience' could not, by definition, be the ground of anything, since one could only 'live' and experience one's conditions in and through the categories, classifications and frameworks of the culture." 36

Within this deterministic conception of culture, the characteristics of peoples' behaviour are a reflection of what Hall terms "unconscious structures." Peoples' ability to contribute to the "making" of their culture is negated by the idea that they are 'bearers of the structures that speak and place them, rather than as active agents.' 37 This deterministic theme, therefore, as Hall notes:

"....has at its centre the changing and uneven relations of force which define the field of culture - that is, the question of cultural struggle and its many forms. Its main focus of attention is the relation between culture and questions of hegemony." 38

Such "pessimism" can also take other forms and, not surprisingly, it finds

36 Hall, "Cultural Studies: Two Paradigms" p. 29.
37 Ibid.
38 Hall, "Notes on Deconstructing the 'Popular'" p. 235.
expression in analyses of leisure. The emphasis of the Yeo's, for example, can serve to illustrate this. Although stressing that the term they employ, "struggle," can describe the creative culture forming processes in leisure over time, this struggle, they argue, was unequal. Changes in leisure can best be described in terms of "cultural imperialism" with a particular view of culture prevailing. In this way, the work of the Yeo's can be located both in the "optimistic" ideal type and the "pessimistic" ideal type.

With these ideas underpinning their work, other researchers have sought to examine the relationship between sport, leisure and hegemony. John Hargreaves, for example, has probed the "political economy of mass sport," while researchers such as Coalter and Henderson and Cohen have written into their examination of people's leisure a reflection of the "categories, classifications and frameworks" of the culture. Their central concern is with the 'determining conditions,' not with the notion of experience. Both the analysis offered by the Yeo's and these latter analyses hold in common a perception that people are more determined than determining in relation to the making of their culture.

This "pessimism of the intellect" - as Hall terms it - has also found expression in analyses of deviance. Such a "critical" approach to the study of deviance arose out of a sense of unease about the "optimism" of labelling perspectives and an adherence to the assumptions outlined above. The interpretative paradigm was seen as having neglected the issue of power - that the acts termed deviant by the definers were serving some wider purpose. Equally, writers such as Taylor, Walton and Young argued that a causal analysis of

39 Yeo and Yeo "Ways of Seeing: Control and Leisure Versus Class and Struggle" p. 137.
43 Hall, "Cultural Studies: Two Paradigms" p. 30.
deviance was required. In addition, from this perspective it was felt that there was an unacceptable characterisation of the deviant. Instead of being a helpless victim, he was a rebel against society. Yet, while stressing this, it was also argued that it is necessary to revise or reject some actors' definition of the situation - for otherwise, as Quinney remarks, the view of reality of the ruling class may be accepted.

While it is important to recognise the "appreciative" stance, from the perspective of critical criminology, it had excessively concentrated on the deviant's point of view, at the expense of an analysis of the agents of social control. The central problem, therefore, is to pin down the labellers and definers, to probe how control is exercised. For Quinney, the analysis must examine both the nature and construction of laws and the violators and how different groups attempt to control the agents of control. With this in mind, the aim of such authors is to develop a fully social theory of deviance.

Illustration of this change in perspective - and its application to football hooliganism - can be made with reference to the work of Ian Taylor. The "idealism," which Taylor admits informed his earlier, "liberal" analysis, has been replaced in his most recent work with a call to examine soccer violence in relation to the issue of class and the state. In considering the "pessimism" evident in Taylor's more recent work it is useful to remind oneself of the comments made by Stedman Jones. He rightly observed that it is a "false step" to write into recreations a symbolic form of class conflict - he also added, that it is equally false to see leisure solely as a channelling or diversion of class consciousness. With the emphasis on "unconsciousness structures" which men are the bearers of, the analysis has almost come full

---
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circle - the cultural dopes of the "dismissive" theme re-emerge.

With respect to the work of Taylor, this is evident in the following passage in which he is stressing the importance of uncovering the ideological connections upon which hegemonic domination depends:

"It is through our examination of the activities of the state authorities and the organisations (like the free enterprise media or privately owned sports club) which are allowed existence within the formal, public arena of the state that we can begin to understand how a dominant class attempts, through the state, to take the side of the people, and, thus, to produce popular consent to its rule." 49

For Taylor, the "moral panic" concerning football hooliganism must be viewed in this way. It is the result of the manipulation by the "new right" of the popular perception to produce support for their law and order campaign in general and the calls for a clampdown on football hooliganism in particular. Although "pessimistic" with respect to people's ability to resist such manipulation, this perspective is useful in terms of sensitising the researcher to the task of pinning down those who label and define what is appropriate and how particular groups attempt to legitimise their own interests through the various agencies of state control.

While particular reservations have been and will still be made with respect to each of these themes, fruitful insights from each have also emerged. At this point it is appropriate to draw together some overall criticisms and to outline, as a prelude to the next stage in the substantive analysis, the outlines, of an alternative framework.

5. Thoughts on Popular Culture, Leisure and Deviance

The central problem which the three themes identified above all share is that they are trapped into a way of thinking which dichotomises the phenomena in question. Current accounts of popular culture and leisure flounder on their conception of the historical process: too often, the working classes are seen as either totally encapsulated into mainstream culture or as

49 Ibid pp 35-36.
totally independent from it. In one version, the working classes are totally determined; in another they are seen to be voluntarily able to decide their own destiny. Similarly, in analyses of deviance, men are viewed as either "cultural dopes" or as enjoying an authentic, autonomous existence, as either "man on his back" or "man fighting back," as either "villains" or "heroes." According to the standpoint of the present thesis, none of these alternatives is satisfactory in relation to the analysis of popular culture, leisure, deviance or the emergence of football spectating as a social problem.

Some observers, however, are willing to take stock. Stedman Jones, as noted, has traced the false steps which, in his view, researchers have made and continue to make. Hall has written of the "unacceptable poles" in the analysis of popular culture, while Burke has warned of the dangers of "mystification." Having examined the development of the forms and control of football hooligan violence and the concomitant emergence of football spectating as a social problem, the present study is in agreement with Stedman Jones when he argues that such "polarities are difficult to maintain."50 But what is the alternative?

The central issue which emerged in connection with the analysis of the emergence of football spectating as a social problem undertaken here concerned the "limits of decent partisanship." Several questions, as argued, arise in this regard. What are the forms and ranges of behaviour that are deemed permissible, by whom is this determined and how are such determinations produced and reproduced over time in the everyday experiences of people? The conceptual framework within which the analysis of these questions will be located in this thesis has already been outlined. More particularly, it is argued that a figurational approach avoids a "mystifying polarisation" of the analysis of the historical process, i.e. it avoids both an entirely

50 Stedman Jones "Class Expression Versus Social Control?" p. 170.
deterministic and an entirely voluntaristic conception of the making of popular culture. It is also argued that there is a need to provide a relatively detached perspective and that a highly involved study revolving around "heroes" and "villains," "hooligans" or "rebels" should be eschewed.

How, therefore, can the making of popular culture be characterised?

In this connection, the Yeos, for example, have commented:

"We want to suggest that.....in Britain the transition - whatever that means - has been and is being made with much effort, much struggle (notable from above) and with noticeable incompleteness.

The struggle was often, perhaps usually, initiated from above..... Remaking customs, re-forming people or removing alternative practices actively produced and practised in common among large numbers of people.

Such imposition was often violent in the simplest sense of that word. Even where it was not, there was so much 'heat and thundering noise' about 'the reformation of one class by another' that phrases like 'cultural revolution' or 'cultural imperialism' capture the process much better than sociological ones like 'incorporation' or 'social control.'"

It is clear, as the analysis so far attempted has done and as that which will be outlined in the present chapter of the perception by powerful observers of football spectating over time will reveal, that the hegemonic dimension does form a significant part in the overall network of relations. Nevertheless, to allow the central issue identified to be examined solely in these terms would be to fall into the traps already outlined. There is, as argued, an element of continuity in aspects of popular culture which must be accounted for. The Yeos have, in fact, implicitly recognised this by referring to the "noticeable incompleteness" of the transition. It is here, in terms of the structured, changing balance between continuity and change in popular culture, that resolution of the analysis of the emergence of football spectating as a social problem lies. Further explanation is required.

Several writers have acknowledged the retention of old customs in everyday behaviour. The Yeos, for example, have argued:
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"That the problem of 'contemporary manners' seen as a problem remains, and not for want of trying on the part of those who have tried to 'solve' it through three and more centuries, is a tribute to those who have maintained their manners and found forms for their expression, albeit temporary and partial.....

It is transparent now, from whatever angle of vision, that there has been and still is formidable recalcitrance in Britain. There has been and still is resistance, sometimes private and passive sometimes public and active, to the dominant drives and needs of late - twentieth century competitive world capitalism.....Old practices like commitment to a place, or a skill, or a custom, or to a real freeing of time live on. Old demands live on, demands for real, mutual nexuses of social life, for forms within which as much of life as possible can happen in accessible ways; such demands for material unities continue to find expression, however deformed....." 52

While the present analysis does not rule out the retention of these "old demands," it is more concerned with the retention of both the "old practices" regarding the expression of violence and the ongoing debate concerning competing ways of living and the limits of publically acceptable behaviour, dating back at least to the early nineteenth century. In this context, it would be useful for the Yeos to heed the words of Burke; namely that all that is retained is not necessarily "bad or stupid, good or intelligent." Further evidence of the retention of old customs comes from Bailey. In considering the development of modern leisure, he noted:

"......modern leisure made its debut in Victorian England, the first mature industrial society. Of course, it was not all so cut and dried: the creature of custom that was the homo ludens of traditional culture was not transformed overnight into the free agent of an atomistic modern world. Traditional modes and mentalities persisted, community norms in one way or another were maintained....." 53

Bailey is quite correct - the issue is not cut and dried. Community norms were maintained and form an important element in explaining the persistence of violence in particular communities, one manifestation of which takes the form of football hooliganism. 54 John Clarke, in fact, also implicitly recognised this in his analysis of football and the working classes when he wrote:
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"Though changes did take place in patterns of work and leisure, these changes were not so thorough as to kill off class and class differences, though they did involve changes in the ways in which those class differences were patterned and experienced. More specifically, the culture of football support of the pre-war period did not simply wither and die, it remained and was passed on to new generations - through word of mouth and example......" 55

What each of these authors has failed to grasp, however, is the significance of this retention for an explanation of football hooligan violence in terms of it being one manifestation of the existence in English society of differentiated standards of violence control. Stuart Hall has recognised the existence of such different standards, but argues that normally:

"We imply that the standards of conduct which guide middle-class society are universal for all classes, whereas we know that a certain measure of social violence has been for long a marked characteristic of traditional working class communities - a phenomenon which has a perfectly rational source in the conditions of life and work in which working class men, women and young people are obliged to live......" 56

In this connection, it is also wise to heed a point which Fuller and Myers make about the development of social problems that 'in the last analysis social problems arise and are sustained because people do not share the same common values and objectives.' 57

John Stevenson, in fact, goes one step nearer to the recognition of the point made by Fuller and Myers. In arguing that Thompson was correct to point to the "extraordinary deep-rooted pattern" of the activities of English crowds in the eighteenth century, he noted that the "transition to order" in the nineteenth century was a "gradual shift" and not absolute. 58 Reference has already been made to the appropriateness of utilising the idea of the civilising process to explain this - as one part of the changing balance between continuity and change in popular culture. A brief re-appraisal of this appropriateness is perhaps pertinent at this stage. It was noted in

57 Fuller and Myers,"The Natural History of a Social Problem" p. 321.
Chapter Two that Norbert Elias argued that, with the development of the civilising process, the twin processes of self-control and external restraint were permeated by the tendencies which he termed "attraction" and "repulsion." In a period of "attraction," a phase of colonization occurs; that is, the culture of the "lower classes" is assimilated into the "upper classes" culture. In contrast, in a period of "repulsion," the upper classes seek to redefine their own behaviour, making it more distinctive. In addition, they focus on the more public extremes of the lower classes' behaviour. As argued in Chapter Two, the changing balance between continuity and change in popular culture in the nineteenth century can be explained, in part, with reference to these processes. The emergence of football spectating as a social problem is no exception to this - at issue was, as argued, the "limits of decent partisanship" and, more fundamentally, particular ways of living.

The changing nature and purpose of football hooligan violence and the changing perception by outsiders of such behaviour and of spectators in general, reflect, as will be documented, such processes. In this respect, the analysis offered by Robert Storch provides a complementary perspective. In addressing some of the issues raised in the present chapter, he wrote:

"Hugh Cunningham recently reaffirmed that people are not passive or totally powerless before external agencies of change and are active in the making of their own history....The persistence and adaptation of many older cultural forms into the nineteenth century is, I suppose, one proof of it. So long as they continue to have a point and function and serve concrete uses - the affirmation of local or class solidarities, the profession of loyalty or patriotism, the criticism or intimidation of bosses, local politicians or rulers, and so forth - people could (and did) defend them. But customs and practices themselves changed and mutated in the process of being defended, or when alternative and appropriate sources of amusement and entertainment, new ways of expressing criticism, loyalty or solidarity, were presented or devised. In these ways the lower classes certainly did make their own history and exercised initiative, choice and creativity in doing so.

It is a point which can be overstressed, however. History can rarely be made to any person's or group's measure. If it can be so made, it is usually more to the measure of ruling classes or elites than to anyone else's. Neither continuity nor change in popular culture can be
understood without keeping in mind the sheer inequalities of power in nineteenth century society, the existence of a ruling class which, on both national and local levels, was less indifferent to both popular culture and popular politics, the appearance of new conceptions of public order and social discipline, and the creation of new agencies of repression, regulation and constraint. 59

This structured continuity in popular culture is important to grasp in approaching an explanation of how particular communities continue to adhere to standards of violence control which are different from those of "respectable" society. The production and reproduction of these standards has meaning for the communities concerned. This is a point which Storch has made with reference to popular culture in general:

"...Survivals from the past...continue into the present, not because of inertia or of conservatism, but because they play important roles within......contemporary social settings. Indeed some are revived from the past to serve in the same way. Others are of recent origin and yet others are being continuously created for new, or for old purposes." 60

On this basis, the analysis must centre on the meaning which such behaviour has for the participants. It is never enough to adopt some explanation in terms of pathology derived from the "dismissive" theme discussed above. The question remains, however, how best to explain how and why the structured balance between continuity and change altered over time in the way it did and why it is that "contemporary manners" continue to remain a source of contention. In this connection, the analysis offered by Dunning et al concerning "ordered segmentation" as an explanation of the social roots of football hooligan violence is appropriate.

An alternative to the approaches so far outlined would focus centrally on the sociogenesis of what may be termed "censure." Such "censures" have two main sources. Firstly, they consist of definitions of what is publically acceptable behaviour, imposed upon people, in this case working class people, by socially more powerful groups adhering to a different way of living.

60 Ibid p. 3.
Secondly, such "censures" arise from within. That is, the individual members of particular groups, as a consequence of the ongoing impact of the civilising process, gradually develop patterns of self-control and restraint. Within any social system, as Dunning and Sheard have argued, there are pressures and constraints. These pressures and constraints are inherent in and arise from the interdependency pattern, and, in some situations, lead groups reciprocally to modify their behaviour. In this regard, Dunning and Sheard argue, an analysis of the interdependency patterns of the groups involved and the structurally created balance of power between groups existing at any given time must be undertaken. To do this an examination of how and why certain definitions persist over time and how and why competing ways of living reflect, sustain and create anew such censures must be accomplished.

In this connection, Humphries has made a pertinent observation:

"....the key factor in the formation of law and order campaigns to control working class youth during our period was not so much a rapid increase in delinquency per se as the increased public sensitivity to law breaking that followed from internal and external threats to the power and stability of the state....However, although the moral panics of press and public were generally disproportionate to the actual delinquency, and despite the undoubted class prejudice that infused these hostile reactions....I do not wish to underestimate the crucial importance within working class culture of the street gang and its aggressive stance against society....." 62

The present study seeks to avoid underestimating both the changing public sensitivity to deviance and the aggressiveness of working class street gangs. In fact, the probing of these features as interwoven dimensions of the phenomenon in question is deemed essential. While Humphries seeks not to underestimate the latter dimension, he does not work through its importance in explaining how, as Elias argues, later social formations arise out of earlier ones. By considering the changing balance between continuity and change in popular culture, the present analysis is able to eschew "optimistic"
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or "pessimistic" perspectives. By this way of conceiving of the transformations which have occurred in popular culture the analysis is able to keep three crucial points uppermost. Firstly, it allows for the possibility of what is termed "creative social history" but also allows for the ongoing attempts to control the making of popular culture. Secondly, in allowing for this potential of less powerful groups to contribute to the making of their culture, the analysis does not overlook what Burke wrote in this connection; namely that all that is retained is not necessarily "good or intelligent, bad or stupid." More particularly, independently of such positive and negative evaluations, the legacy of violence has still not waned. Thirdly, it does not write into its analysis of popular culture, leisure or deviance an heroic sense of resistance, a cultural dope thesis or some overarching conspiracy prevalent in more "pessimistic" accounts. This is not to suggest that those who were relatively more powerful did not and do not attempt to control or "civilise" popular culture - as the analysis of the "rational recreationalists" contained in Chapter Three and the analysis of the emergence of football spectating as a social problem contained in the present chapter will show - they have done and continue to do so. But, as Norbert Elias has remarked in the context of the sociological enterprise in general, more long-term, blind, unplanned social processes are also at work.63

Up to the present, therefore, Robert Storch best captured the processes which were at work in relation to nineteenth century popular culture when he wrote:

"...It is clear that there was a palpable narrowing of the limits of what would be tolerated in public and an increasing tendency to suspect the unforeseen, the unplanned, the unregulated and the unlicensed on the part of both local and national authorities (the 'state'). Newspapers, writers on social questions, magistrates and new police authorities developed and implemented a new conception of what I term 'baseline' public order in the nineteenth century: the delineation of new thresholds of tolerated public behaviour, individual and collective, and the closer definition of what would be tolerated (and under what conditions) and what would not. This project had as its object the creation

of a more orderly, disciplined, regulated and supervised society. What was permitted or tolerated certainly contracted over the long term, and what remained tolerated was likely, by the late nineteenth century to be more closely supervised, regulated and licensed by the state, counties, boroughs and their agents. 64

Such an analysis found expression in the present study's attempt to examine the forms and control of football hooligan violence since the foundation of the Football League and is extended in this chapter to consider how football spectating emerged as a social problem. It does so mindful of the alternative formulation of popular culture, leisure and deviance proposed. In this, the analysis is returning to the principles relating to the civilising process and its application to football hooliganism cited at the outset of the present study and applied to the developmental examination of the violent milieu of nineteenth century football, leisure and popular culture. 65

Illustration of the appropriateness of the framework outlined can be provided by a brief re-appraisal of these links between the violent milieu of nineteenth century football, leisure and popular culture and the emergence of football spectating as a social problem. The issues which come to the fore concern the "narrowing of the limits of what would be tolerated" and pertain not only to this early period but throughout the development of football as a spectator sport.

B. Football, Leisure and Popular Culture - A Violent Milieu Re-Assessed

Folk football in the nineteenth century was embedded in mores which reflected and contributed to traditional working class culture. One dominant characteristic of this culture was the element of violence which pervaded social relations. This is not to deny, as the analysis contained in the present chapter and in Chapter Three was at pains to stress, that such behaviour was informed by particular goals and intentions. In this regard, the analysis presented here is in sympathy with Geoffrey Pearson when he writes:

65 See Chapter Three.
The theme of this essay has been historical, and I have argued that the hooligan behaviour of the machine-breakers is intelligible and rational if one listens to their experience in their own terms - that is "from below." However, the direction of the essay hopefully carries some implications for the criminological and sociological study of contemporary hooliganism - for example, vandalism, fights between rival gangs of youths, attacks on migrant workers, street crime and mugging, and the powerful ritual violence of football hooliganism. In our historical time we have become all too familiar with the ways in which this trouble, particularly amongst young working class men and boys is shrugged off as utterly irrational and is portrayed in the mass media as a series of senseless and mindless spectacles....In attempting such an enquiry into the motives of contemporary hooliganisms, the criminologist must confront deeply embedded cultural bans which deny any intelligibility to hooligan conduct, a profound line of historical continuity between our own historical time and the apparently remote historical conjuncture of the machine-smashers." 66

Such "cultural bans," as Pearson terms them, were outlined at the outset of the present study. 67 The intention of this chapter has been to undermine such blockages further and to posit an alternative which recognises the importance of the concept of creative social history while at the same time probing the sociogenesis of the phenomenon.

Gradually, as was observed, through a process of overt control and covert manipulation, sections of the working class increasingly came to exercise a greater degree of restraint over the expression of the violent mores which had underpinned, for example, the gregarious folk forms of football. In this connection the notion of the "narrowing of the limits of what would be tolerated" and the struggle which therein ensued, is again relevant. Further explanation is required.

An indication of the processes involved can be gained from examining the development of mass schooling. Here, as in other aspects of popular culture, the anxieties felt by the upper classes manifested themselves. Richard Johnson, in analysing the schooling of the English working class between 1780 and 1850, located its development within the context of the transformation of popular culture in general. He wrote:

67 See Introduction.
.....When bourgeois social investigators noted resistance to work disciplines, the defence of customary sports and pastimes, the equally traditional use of alcohol in sociability or need, the spending of hard-won wages on petty luxuries, the theft of property or the street life of children and adolescents, they were actually mapping a range of cultural responses that were resistant to capitalist imperatives and their corresponding values. They did not express these observations in the language of cultural analysis: they wrote instead of 'idleness,' 'drunkenness,' 'pauperism,' 'vice,' 'improvidence' and 'crime.' When they insisted, however, that such forms of behaviour were obstructive to progress or even to self-advancement within a capitalist social order, they were quite correct. It was necessary to cut the reproduction of the older popular culture if capitalist development in town and countryside was to be speeded up and secured. Modern industry did need new elements in human nature, did require the learning of new relations. Early Victorian moralism, then, was not some gratuitous bourgeois aberration. Cultural aggression of this kind was organic to this phase of capitalist development. That is why 'class-cultural control' is a better, more explicit, expression to use than the looser term 'social control,' which carries quite different meanings within different sociological traditions.....Even this term does not quite catch the aspect of movement: not control merely, but transformations were required. All the distinctive liberal social policies of this phrase should be seen in this light: the creation of a new labourer by the deterrent mechanisms of the New Poor Law; the moralization of factory children through compulsory school attendance; the continued attack on 'football' and all 'brutal sports'; the encouragement of temperance and rational recreation, etc. Education was part of this overall drive, a drive which became a partly conscious strategy in the minds of men, such as Edwin Chadwick, Dr. Kay and Nassau Senior, with the percipience to see the long-term interests of capital as a whole. 68

Such a "partly-conscious strategy" was not confined to the early nineteenth century. The development of education throughout the nineteenth and twentieth centuries has continued to reflect and reinforce the processes outlined by Johnson. Indeed, as Raymond Williams has remarked, since schools were concerned with the training of the members of a group into the "social character" or "pattern of culture" which is dominant, it is hardly surprising that such processes continued to find expression in the development of education. 69 In the 1870's, for example, as Stuart Maclure has pointed out, the expansion of elementary education for all could be interpreted in this way. He wrote:

"Religion and philanthropy were joined by utilitarian motives. The violence and poverty of the time, the sharpness of social distinctions,
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the prevalence of pauperism and the links between poverty, ignorance and crime made it inevitable that the better-off classes should look for practical advantages from their benevolence. They expected much from religious instruction and Bible reading, including social peace, industrial skill and the arts of self-government." 70

The provision of education during the nineteenth century was thus closely related to the perceived problem of securing social order — by the training of working class youth into the "social character" desired by the dominant group: a process of incorporation was unfolding. As will be documented, the provision of state education continued to play a significant part in that context in the twentieth century and both reflected and reinforced the attempts to supervise and regulate popular culture.

The attempts to abolish folk football, played in the streets of the rapidly emerging towns and cities, corresponded, in fact, to the more general campaign to control and 'civilise' the various facets of working class leisure. These attacks, however, met varying degrees of resistance. Some leisure forms, notably some less gregarious, more privatised forms and those more public forms which could be so modified as to permit participation in more private settings, for example, cock-fighting and various forms of "street-betting" continued to attract the "lower" working class and probably, although to a decreasing extent, "respectable" members of the working classes. Such communities, notably the "rough" working class, were more able to prevent, to an extent, the penetration of their culture in the period of "colonisation" to which Elias refers and thus were more able to "resist" such attempts to provide "rational recreation" and "moral improvement." This ability to "resist" was, in fact, a relational affair. That is, it depended both on the relative inability of the developing state and of those sections of the ascendant classes who wished to promote "moral reform" to penetrate all aspects of the everyday behaviour of people including those least powerful economically,

and, on the structure of "rough" working class communities and the links their members sought to retain with their traditional customs. In this way, Tholfsen 71 and Rude 72 are correct to observe that the working class in general did not simply and slavishly adopt "respectability." As was acknowledged with regard to Pearson's analysis, the working class were active in the development of their own culture, and although it was, to an extent, an unequal struggle, even those features of respectability which were grafted onto working class culture e.g. the modern sporting and leisure forms promoted by the rational recreationalists, could still, as with football spectating, continue to affirm certain more traditional mores. Summarising these trends in general, Stedman Jones has noted:

"By the end of the century, this reforming effort was evident in an impressive array of legislative changes, reformed charities and a proliferation of missionary activity.

The results of this effort were assessed around 1900 in Booth's survey of "religious influences". It marked the point of recognition not only that the working class had resisted middle-class attempts at proselytization but further, that the working class had constructed a 'culture' of its own. This working-class culture had proved itself impermeable to evangelical or utilitarian attempts to dictate its character. But at the same time, it was neither revolutionary nor subversive. Aside from trade unionism, its focal points were not politics and education, but entertainment, sport and leisure time activity." 73

Where the analysis of Stedman Jones appears to be flawed, however, is in the assumption which is implicit within his analysis that sports do not change, that the structure of a game such as football is a timeless, changeless essence. To assume this, would be to ignore the earlier civilising influences on sports to which reference has already been made and the ways in which they are currently continuing to develop.

But the present study is not completely rejecting the perspective offered by Stedman Jones - it is necessary, rather, to strike the correct balance.

72 Rude, Ideology and Popular Protest p. 52.
balance between stressing the ability of particular groups to "resist" the penetration of their culture, whilst acknowledging the changes brought by groups who seek to colonise and control the culture of what they perceive as their social inferiors. In fact, it is precisely this ability to "resist," to an extent, the creation of a more "orderly, disciplined, regulated and supervised society" and the trends towards incorporation that enabled, for example, the "hangovers from the days of cock-fighting and bear-baiting," as the Daily Worker in 1947, described the behaviour of Millwall supporters, to have still 'survived' into the inter-war years and, indeed, as will be argued, to the present day.74 This ability to contribute to the making and retention of one's culture can allow on the one hand, for "the defence of the liberties of the free born Englishmen,"75 but it also enables the retention of mores which can be traced back to and appear more in keeping with popular culture of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. Thus, commenting on 'Everyday in Blackest Birmingham,' T.J. Bass, though an outsider, felt able to record in 1898:

"A Saturday night passed in this neighbourhood sometimes supplies depressing pictures. Shortly after eleven o'clock the streets present many tragic and deplorable scenes. Lewdness, drunkenness, and rivalry are rampant. Men and women engage in combat, so fierce that the contending parties might be veritable savages. The police, unless sufficiently strong in force, reluctantly allow the miserable disturbance to spend itself, for interference with so violent and drunken a crowd would not only be useless, but fraught with great danger. Here is the home of the "Peaky Blinder," and awful is the vengeance of this blackguard king to those who refuse obeisance. These thoroughfares constitute his little kingdom, and the terror of his anger is manifest on all hands......

A really enlightened Birmingham will speak of the present state of things round the church of Saint Laurence as a condition of barbarous wretchedness impossible for people of their own days to conceive. As to the savagery, the brutality, the hideous sin that makes the moral atmosphere of the district blacker than the physical atmosphere, I have no heart to speak of them, even if they were mentionable in the pages of a newspaper. And that such a state of inconceivable degradation is
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inseparable from material conditions such as I have described, is well-known to every student of sociology." 76

While "stock images" of this kind do, as Humphries argues, require to be penetrated, the evidence gathered, as outlined in Chapter Three, does suggest that football, working class leisure and popular culture in the nineteenth century formed, on the whole, a violent milieu. What the present study is stressing as part of an explanation of the social roots of football hooliganism, therefore, is both the retention of traditional mores and the active resistance by sections of the working class to the ever-increasing regulation and supervision of society. The observations of Bass both inform this analysis, by capturing, to an extent, the then existing forms of behaviour, and reflect the public sensitivity and 'moral panic' referred to by Humphries. 77 An analysis of this, within the context of the appraisal of the incipient stages in the emergence of football spectating as a social problem, is required.

C. The "Football Fever" and the Narrowing in the Limits of Public Order: 1880-1914

An analysis of this nature must consider, as noted, not only the "actual" behaviour which occurred but also an interwoven dimension of the phenomenon, the perception by socially superior outsiders of such behaviour and of football spectating per se. Interestingly, Geoffrey Green, in documenting the incipient growth of football as a spectator sport provides an illuminating observation in this regard:

"Yet for all the talk of betting, unruly behaviour of crowds, and the supposed sins of professionalism, most of it fired by certain semi-religious organs of the press, there had clearly come a marked improvement in the state of affairs by the end of the '90's, due partly, no doubt, to the firm action of the FA and its affiliated bodies. Perhaps it had all been largely exaggerated from the start by those enemies of the game who looked upon football, and particularly professional football, as a sport for the evil-minded. At all events, it was probably more a state of mind with a certain section of the community than an..."
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actual condition of fact...." 78

Green's comments, though insightful, are similar to the themes identified earlier, in that he fails to conceive of the interwoven nature of these issues. Such an observation, in fact, informed the previous chapter. In documenting the forms and control of football hooligan violence in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, note was taken, as Green does, of the actions taken by the FA regarding such disorder. In these cases of misconduct which reached the attention of the FA, and to which they were sensitive, various recommendations were made. In one such case in 1908, the FA commission advocated greater police presence in and around football grounds:

"......The Police force engaged was not sufficient for such a match, particularly seeing that feeling ran high when the Walsall team visited Kidderminster about a week previously. More strength must be engaged for such matches, and the police must be instructed to prevent tumult or hostile action in the public roads as well as inside the ground." 79

Though it was documented that one of the main reported forms of disorder in this period involved verbal abuse, it was also acknowledged that subterranean aspects of football spectating existed. The FA's recommendations in the case cited above add credence to this and are of significance in probing the status of football spectating as a social problem during this period. Suggesting that the police should be instructed "to prevent tumult or hostile action in the public roads" appears to indicate that forms of disorder were occurring away from grounds. The Birmingham and Leicester material, with the episodes recorded of fighting between supporters of rival teams, further supports such a contention. It is argued here, that these pleas for greater policing, coupled with demands by observers such as McGregor for magistrates to act, find expression in other areas closely connected to the issue of the perception of football spectating and working.
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class leisure and reflect the wider concern of the need to control, regulate and supervise public order. 80

In this way, as Bailey records, for Bishop Fraser, the control of leisure was "the great question of the day." 81 Connected to this were the sentiments expressed by Canon Horsley. For as he remarked, the "great social question of the day" was "juvenile crime," and no place better illustrates the attempts made to control, regulate and supervise working class youth than the anxiety expressed concerning playing football in the streets and other non-indictable offences such as trespassing and loitering. It has already been noted how the FA felt it necessary in 1906 to suggest that the police should be instructed to 'prevent tumult or hostile action in the public roads.' Writers to the Birmingham and Leicester newspapers in this period were no less vociferous in their demands. Take the following letter, written to the Leicester Daily Mercury in 1900.

"Football in the Streets.

Sir, - Your correspondent who writes re football in the streets might well complain, and I can assure him he has the sympathy of a great many other residents in the borough. It is not only in his district, but in every street of the town nearly, that we find these brainless youths annoying peaceable citizens by indulging in this horse-play. I have repeatedly seen people rushed against and nearly thrown down by this latest form of street nuisance. Remonstrance is out of the question. From what one sees and reads the streets seem to be handed over for anything in the evening, and in some parts of the town it is a perfect pandemonium. I also notice that should there be a case brought against any of these offenders they are let off with a caution. This is useless, and an injury to all well-conducted citizens. Nothing but severity makes any impression in these cases. There is something radically wrong that this disorder should go on every night, and street government seems to be in a very primitive form yet." 82

Yours, ORDERLY.

At issue, it appears, as the writer who signed himself "Orderly," observed, was the question of who controlled the streets? In a period of acute social unrest, a major economic depression and rioting in the streets of
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London, the middle classes clearly felt uneasy. This sense of "respectable" anxiety is borne out by newspaper reports of the period. Take the following report published in the Leicester Daily Mercury in November 1900:

"London Hooliganism.

The hooliganism prevalent in South London again came under the consideration of the St. Saviour's Board of Works, Southwark, on Wednesday. Nearly two months ago the Board wrote to the Home Secretary, pointing out that several members of the Board, together with many other residents of the district, had been subject to outrage at the hands of the hooligans. Astonishment was expressed that no reply had been received by the Home Secretary." 83

But the reaction to working class leisure forms, though heightened by this class tension, has also, as noted, a longer pedigree. The exponents of rational recreation still sought to "civilise" the masses - to rescue them from the "sloth" of the street corner and to attract them to the "moral improvement" provided by such organisations as the Temperance movement: in other words, to control, regulate and supervise the public and private customs of the working classes. Commenting on this trend towards increasing attempts to control street life, Gillis notes:

"Sliding on bridges, throwing rocks and playing street football were typical activities which led to the arrest of large groups. This would seem to suggest that there was a tendency on the part of the public and the police to attribute anti-social intents to boys collectively, thus raising the rate of recorded offences until about 1910, when gambling became the most frequent non-indictable charge.

It is of course possible that youths were becoming more violent and aggressive in the 1890's, but the evidence seems to suggest rather that a new willingness to prosecute accounts for the increased recorded rate of crime." 84

While the present analysis is not in disagreement with Gillis's overall appraisal, it has to be restated that, though the perception by members of the higher classes of working class leisure did exhibit a heightened sense of anxiety, relative to the period between the two world wars and though
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the 1890's did witness a narrowing of what were regarded as the limits of public order, youths of the late Victorian and Edwardian decades were often involved in violent confrontations in fact. Reminiscing about his working class childhood in Birmingham around the turn of the century, for example, V. W. Garrett argued in 1939 that:

"Practically every street had its public-house, in which men sat the whole of the evening drinking, arguing, smoking and swearing, finding the atmosphere more congenial than the dismal surroundings of their homes....On Saturday nights the rowdiness was more intense on account of more drunkenness and street fighting and domestic rows often put the neighbourhood in a state of uproar.....

The public-house was also the breeding ground for rival gangs of roughs. They were composed of 'Peaky-Blinders,' who wore long-peaked caps and wide, bell-bottomed trousers which tapered towards the knee.... The relations between these gangs and the police were never very cordial, and it required little provocation for a pitched battle to flare up after a Saturday night's drinking bout.....But if these clashes injured the reputation of the district, they certainly helped the newspaper proprietors, for a special Sunday edition was shouted around the streets which excited as much interest as the bells of the fire brigade." 85

In fact, Garrett's reminiscence mentions rowdism and violence on a scale involving more than simply youths. In addition, this commentary, with its reference to the "Peaky Blinders," again reinforces the connection between violence in the streets and some forms of spectator misconduct at football. More particularly, as has been shown, "Peaky Blinders" were not infrequently mentioned as centrally involved in football rowdism.86 To what extent, however, were such connections made by contemporaries and to what degree was football spectating envisaged as a "problem," more particularly as part and parcel of the overall problem of working class leisure?

In this regard, the stages in the development of football as a social problem identified by Taylor are of relevance. For at this point, though the FA were the prime agency involved in the control of football as a spectator sport, wider debates did enter into and reflect the discussion of "spectatorial
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hooliganism." The important point to grasp, however, is that football spectating in this period, unlike the 1960's, did not gain the same degree of prominence as a major social problem; nor was it viewed as the touchstone by which the decline of public order was measured. At this stage, it was but one of several areas of working class social life which were viewed with a measure of anxiety and a sense of the need to regulate. In fact, Charles Mastersman, in 1909, in expressing his worry and that of his fellow intellectuals, of the 'unified face of the working class crowd,' connected these areas together. For Mastersman, the football crowd was a symptom of the new society of "mass culture." He wrote:

"You may see it in the Saturday football crowds in all the manufacturing cities, see it in concentrated form when a selection of all the Saturday football crowds has poured into London for the final contest for the cup, which is the goal of all earthly ambition. All the long night over-crowded trains have been hurrying southward along the great trunk lines and discharging unlimited cargos of Lancashire and Yorkshire artisans in the grey hours of early morning. They sweep through the streets of the metropolis, boisterous, triumphant. They all wear grey cloth caps, they're all small men with good natured undistinguished faces. To an oriental visitor, they would all appear exactly alike, an endless reproduction of the same essential type." 88

The development of this "mass culture" was perceived as a threat to traditional society and the old social order. By dovetailing Gillis's work and the documentation of the forms and control of football hooligan violence attempted earlier, the analysis can thus both account for how football spectating formed part of this general source of anxiety and show how it had its own particular status as a social problem.

Gillis, in further probing the evolution of juvenile delinquency notes that, by 1910, gambling, at least in Oxford, had become the most frequent non-indictable charge. 89 During the same period, the minutes of the FA and the columns of local newspapers contain repeated condemnation of the perceived
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The evils of betting at football matches. An example indicative of this trend is drawn from the FA minutes for 1907:

"The Secretary reported as to his communications with the Home Office, the Chief Commissioner of Police, London, and the Chief Constables of provincial towns. It was resolved that it should be an instruction to the clubs, members of the Association, that notices prohibiting betting be conspicuously published on their grounds, such notices to be published by the Association." 90

By 1913, a Bill was introduced into the House of Commons seeking to prevent the organisation of football betting on any formal basis. The minutes of the FA Council for April of that year record that:

"The Council approved of a Bill introduced into the House of Commons by the Rt. Hon. W. Henry-Fisker M.P. entitled 'An Act to prevent the writing, printing, publishing or circulating in the U.K. of Advertisements, circulars, or coupons of any ready money Football Betting business." 91

Such condemnation of betting stemmed in part, as will be argued later, from the clash over amateurism and professionalism which occurred in the incipient stages in the democratisation of the game. The most significant phases in this process of democratisation, in fact, followed in the wake of the legalising of professionalism in 1885 and the formation of the Football League in 1888. As the documentation of this phase in the development of football as a spectator sport revealed, there was a clear connection drawn in the perception of newspaper editors and reporters and certain members of the FA between this democratisation of the game, betting and the onset of rowdism. G.O. Smith, for example, the old 'Corinthian,' wrote in 1897 of the issue of betting:

"It is unnecessary for me to dwell on the evils of this vice: they are apparent to every one, and have spoilt so many sports that it is impossible to find one free of them; and it is of the utmost importance that all, in so far as they can, should make it their object to stamp them out. Signs are not wanting to prove that the ever-growing popularity of football has also been attended by the spread of this evil, which kills all the wholesome enjoyment of the game and turns its good into bad. The many speeches made against it by prominent members of
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the football world, the dastardly attacks on referees, the retirement from the game of, at any rate one well-known player, all point to the fact that it is yearly on the increase." 92

For many middle class observers, the spread of the game to the "masses" inevitably involved a decline in the "morals" of the game - those working class spectators were seen to drink and swear to excess and to gamble away money which could and should be better spent. Such criticism of the "evils of spectating", however, was interwoven with the anxiety felt towards working class crowds in general. For during this period, as Geoff Pearson has remarked, the imagery attached to the working classes focused upon them in terms of the danger they posed to the moral condition of the nation. 93

Middle-class moral entrepreneurs, therefore, chose to sanitise the "masses" in a number of ways. As Lawson and Silver have observed, for example, the schools provided for the masses under the Balfour Education Act of 1902 involved a "training in followership rather than leadership training, as suited to the working classes." 94 The curriculum in these elementary schools, despite some modifications, was to centre on what had been the main focus of attention in the nineteenth century, namely, "habits of regularity," "self-discipline," "obedience" and "trained efforts." 95

Another means chosen to supervise and regulate popular culture was Sunday Schools. In this context, however, the "spectatorial element" of the "football fever" was seen as an obstacle to success.


A Sunday school-teacher in the Black Country has given a Mail Representative a deplorable account of the absorbing influence of football on the minds of the Sunday School rising generation. He says that the craze for the game is one of the great anxieties that teachers have to encounter. Teachers who have been engaged in the work for a quarter of a century assert that they never experienced so much difficulty as at the present time. The children of all ages are so
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interested in the previous day's football that even in the Sunday School they manifest a strong disinclination to listen to any other subject." 96

Indeed, the very growth in Sunday schools is indicative of the overall trend towards the regulation and supervision of the morals of the "masses." The prevailing distrust of the gathering together of large sections of the working class community at football matches had parallels in other spheres of social life. Spectator misconduct, however, did not become, as it was to in the 1960's, the litmus paper by which commentators felt able to determine the deteriorating tenor and fabric of social life in general. Nevertheless, though it did not gain the same degree of national notoriety, itself a reflection of the stage which the state and the media had then reached, the comments made by Masterman in relation to football crowds and "mass culture" in general and by Ensor and Edwards in relation to spectator misconduct in particular, do reveal, in part, the stage which football spectating as a socially problematic phenomenon had reached by that time. Reaction to such spectator misconduct was not confined to outside agencies or observers. The clubs and the FA were still faced, as Pickford, a prominent figure in the football world noted, with:

"The Spectator Problem.

The main difficulty is that of the spectators, without whom the game would soon deteriorate, and who are at the same moment its main prop and its chief worry. It is, I think, a wonderful thing that such vast concourses can gather week by week, to a large extent partisan and excited, and complaints to be comparatively few.

It is a tribute to those sporting traditions that in the main keep a British crowd in check.

For all that there are not infrequent complaints by referees and linesmen of hostile demonstrations and of bad language and abuse. At times a section of a crowd gets out of hand, and then there is more trouble: it is not a peculiarity of the big League games. I am at this investigating two local cases where the spectators at junior matches were not really even numerous.
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Stout Iron Rails.

......I am a believer in substantial fencing at football grounds, on the principle that prevention is better than cure. An enclosure where at any excited moment the crowd can climb the barriers is always a nervous strain on some occasions.....

I am afraid that excepting the provision of police to keep order, most clubs trust to luck, and that on the junior grounds the responsible committee make little effort to watch for the rising temper of a crowd and fail to nip it before it gets too high." 97

One other crucial difference between the late Victorian and Edwardian periods and the 1960's can be observed. Because of the lack of national notoriety, football grounds were not perceived in those years, as grounds in the 1960's came to be, as ideal settings for the regular expression of violent masculine norms. This is not to argue that there was no criticism of the behaviour of football spectators or to deny that some members of the "rough" working class did perceive the local football ground as a place to display such norms. The criticism voiced in the rapidly expanding sporting press and journals of the period was such as to force exponents of the game, like McGregor, into:

"A Defence of Association Football.

Mr. W. McGregor, late President of the League, writes to the Daily Chronicle: a great deal of controversy has arisen of late with regard to Association Football. Many writers and speakers aver that the introduction of professionalism has tended to brutalise the play and degrade the game. Betting and rowdyism are also put forward as resultant evils. These complaints can only be made by men who are entirely ignorant of how the game is governed and organised. Many people infer that the occasional mobbing of referees, and the bias shown by spectators towards their particular local teams, are the results of betting; probably among the many thousands of people who follow the game keenly, there may be some betting, but I feel convinced that this evil habit is indulged into a very limited extent, and then only when local rival teams are engaged, or in the final stages of the English Cup.....

If football cannot claim to be the national game, it can at least lay claim to be the people's game. Considering that those attending football matches include the lower, the middle, and to a limited extent the upper classes, it can hardly be wondered at that an occasional ebullition of temper and partisanship is shown." 98
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According to Dunning and Sheard, the interrelated processes of professionalisation and democratisation in the game of football occurred in conjunction with the democratisation of British society at large, a process that was expressed in the 1890's in an intensification of overt class conflict. One of the areas where this was expressed was in the controversy over amateurism and professionalism in sport. Little wonder, in such a context, that exponents of professionalism in Soccer like McGregor were forced into a defence of the game. While a split such as that which had occurred in rugby had been avoided, the denunciation of the usurpation of soccer by the "masses" was vociferous. As Abell argued in 1903:

".....Only a quarter of a century ago if anyone had dared to hint that a hearty, wholesome national pastime might be an indirect source of national danger, he would have been ridiculed.....But it should be borne in mind that at that time the two most salient characteristics of what have been called the Football Fever were unknown, - the infection of the working classes with it, and the part played in it by money...." 99

This "infection" of the working classes with the "Football Fever" was not only perceived as a contaminating influence on the "civilised" middle-classes, but also as having a debilitating effect on the people involved themselves. Spectating was held to be evil per se. In a sermon delivered in April 1900, the Reverend H. T. Gedge felt able to claim, according to a report in the Leicester Daily Mercury, that:

".....Two great dangers, however, menace Athletics and Sports in this country and the responsibility for the danger which it could not be denied had followed in the wake of most sports, was to be accredited, not to the Sports, but to those who went to the sports as spectators. Who was responsible for the betting, the drinking and the bad language which was too prevalent at athletic meetings? Not the players but the spectators in most cases. Therefore there was a too distinctly marked tendency for people to let others play the game, and the people attending simply to look on. Mr. Gedge drew attention to this tendency and the sports of Rome in her declining years, the gladiatorial displays and the like, observing that people seemed to enjoy the same sort of thing in so far as they employed others to play a game they ought to play themselves.....Sports existed for those who took part in them; the spectator was an element foreign......" 100
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The amateur ideology which underpinned the clash over professionalism reinforced the negative connotations attached to the emergent working class spectator. It was the participant who enjoyed the 'wholesome benefits' of sport: spectating inevitably led to the physical and moral deterioration of the population. In fact, in the context of the perceived physical deterioration of the populace, the themes concerning hooliganism, football spectating and working class youth are more vividly displayed. In the minutes of evidence to the Report of the Inter-Departmental Committee on Physical Deterioration, in 1904, reference was made to working class youths in general. In this connection, the following was recorded:

"Colonel Onslow: 'Those boys are not exactly the very lowest hooligan class?'
Mrs Bagot: 'Some of them.....are pure hooligans.'
Colonel Onslow: 'I should have thought from that list you have handed in that they are hardly the pure hooligans?'
Mrs Bagot: 'We have some good specimens of hooligans.'" 101

The sense of anxiety which is evident in this report also found expression in the football context. According to Abell once again:

"There never was a period of our history when there was so much necessity for solving this problem of the improvement of the physique of the class upon which we shall have to rely so largely in the hour of need.....

Yet so long as the Football Fever continues to grow as it has grown during the past few years - and there is no present sign of a check in its growth - a startlingly large mass of the very sort of material required will not merely get useless and unworkable itself, but will be sowing the seeds of such a crop of weeds as the most elaborate treatment in the future will be unable to eradicate....." 102

Such expressions of concern, must be located within the context outlined, i.e. the attack on professionalism and the perceived threat posed by the democratisation of the game. This position is displayed no better than in the sentiments expressed by Ensor in 1898:

"Professional football is doing more harm every year.....The system is bad for the players, worse for the spectators. The former learn improvident habits, become vastly conceited, whilst failing to see that they are treated like chattels and cannot help but be brutalised. The latter are injured physically and morally.....The physique of the manufacturing population is bad enough already it is rapidly growing worse under the pleasures no less than the pains of civilisation. As regards morality, the old English feeling for "sport" or "fair play" has receded to thinly-populated or remote districts where Athletics cannot be exploited for money....The line of demarcation between the upper and lower classes, which everybody professes to wish to see removed is growing more distinct. The terms "gentleman" and "amateur" have now very different connotations. Gentlemen can now only play Association Football with each other, for they cannot risk plunging into the moral slough." 103

While it is easy to categorise such sentiments, solely in terms of middle class anxiety concerning working class leisure, there may well have been in fact a significant increase in the sale and consumption of alcohol in and around football grounds during this period. This may well have been connected to the fact that several brewers became club directors. Take the following sentiments expressed by N. L. Jackson in 1899:

".....There is a more potent factor in the encouragement to drink than those mentioned, and that is the large number of prominent professional footballers who become publicans. Local brewers, aware of the attractiveness of such men, are only too glad to give them a start in a tied house and the large increase in business which follows such an appointment only too truly shows how many of the spectators adjourn to the 'football pubs' to discuss the result of the latest match or the prospects of the next one." 104

Denunciation of the moral "quagmire" indicated for middle class contemporaries by the consumption of alcohol and the resort to betting, echoed the wider debate concerning the perceived physical and moral deterioration of the populace: in Elias's terms, a period of "repulsion," in which the upper classes sought to redefine their own behaviour and focus on the more public extremes of lower class behaviour, was evident. These sentiments led, for example, to demands for the establishment of physical training in schools and extra-curricular sports activities in boys' clubs.105 Such
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institutions were exactly those which were involved, as Gillis observed, in the debate concerning juvenile delinquency. Lord Baden-Powell, the founder of the Boy Scout movement, for example, claimed in 1908 that:

"Football in itself is a grand game for developing a lad physically and also morally, for he learns to play with good temper and unselfishness, to play in his place and 'play the game' and these are the best of training for any game of life, but it is a vicious game when it draws crowds of lads away from playing the game themselves to be merely onlookers at a few paid performers......Thousands of boys and young men, pale, narrow chested, hunched up, miserable specimens, smoking endless cigarettes, numbers of them betting, all of them learning to be hysterical as they groan and cheer in panic in unison with their neighbours......" 106

Though the connections between such perceptions of football hooligan violence, football spectating and the whole nexus of working class culture are ambiguous and, at times, given the nature of the source material, somewhat tenuous, they do highlight the network of social relations within which the changing balance between continuity and change in popular culture developed. A crucial element in this changing balance in relation to popular culture in general and the perception by powerful outsiders of football spectating in particular concerns the existence of differing standards of violence control and the anxiety felt by particular groups towards others who expressed themselves in different modes of behaviour and ways of living. Adoption of a sociogenetic explanation can assist in analysing this crucial element.

During the period in which the initial professionalisation and incipient democratisation of football were occurring, subtle redefinitions relating to the control and expression of violence - especially that of working class youth - were emerging. Note has already been taken of the influence which the "civilising process" had on the modernization of folk forms of football; soccer, indeed, was but one of two main, more civilised versions that
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developed out of the folk matrix, the other being rugby. 107 Crucially, however, there was a continuing stress on masculinity in both forms. By the 1890's, soccer had been widely adopted by the working classes. That is, it had been adopted in a milieu where the traditional mores, perhaps in a more civilised form, still persisted in varying degrees. A warm reception was thus assured. One symptom of the change which was occurring in what was perceived to be acceptable expressions of violence, was the controversy surrounding "hacking" - kicking an opposing player off his feet in order to relieve him of the ball. A leading exponent of this form of play in soccer was Lord Kinnaird, a famous player during the 1870's. An observation made by the President of the FA from 1874 to 1890, Major Francis Marindin, captures the nature of the style of play which then existed. In an anecdote retold in a collection of contemporary articles compiled by Terence Delaney, it was recorded:

"Let Us Have Hacking.

One of the famous players of the early days, the old Etonian Lord Kinnaird, was well known for hacking. The President of the FA, Sir Francis Marindin, called on Kinnaird's mother one day and found her worried about her son. "I'm afraid," she said, "that one of these days Arthur will come home with a broken leg." "Never fear, madam," said Marindin, "it will not be his own." 108

The controversy surrounding hacking, in fact, dated back at least to 1863 and the foundation of the Football Association. It occurred moreover in both soccer and rugby. But despite the sentiments expressed by Marindin hacking was on the wane. There were calls for the adoption of what was termed, "scientific soccer" - a style of play which emphasized the mastery of technique and tactics rather than brutal and rough play. Such a shift was commented on by Gibson and Pickford in 1906. In a passage entitled "public opinion and rough play," they wrote:
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"Public opinion is opposed to reckless and heavy play. Though we sometimes hear the cry, 'Knock him over, Bill,' or 'Get yer own back, Sammy,' it does not voice the great mass of popular sentiment which recoils from brutality and revenge in football. Unfortunately one hears more the raucous yell of the spectator urging the players to acts of violence, while the well-dispositioned onlooker is silent......" 109

This passage is of significance for two reasons. Firstly, it indicates a shift in the limits of what should be tolerated in terms of rough play. But there is also another feature which is of greater importance. In distinguishing between the "raucous spectator" and the "well-dispositioned onlooker" - in the context of a discussion of a shift in the limits of what was deemed to be an acceptable expression of violence - these authors' comments were emphasising both the existence of different perceptions over violence control and the shift or re-definition which occurred in the behaviour of the upper and middle classes. This, in itself, is indicative of the fact that this period was characterised by a phase of "repulsion." Dunning and Sheard argue in this connection regarding the shift that occurred in the game itself:

"What happened......was that the standards of violence control applied in the game advanced in the sense of demanding from players the exercise of a stricter and more comprehensive measure of self-control." 110

This shift in standards regarding the expression and control of violence also shaped the formulation of what was perceived by the middle classes as "decent partisanship." As argued, this shift in standards, occurring, as it did, in a period of mounting class tension, resulted in the middle classes refining their own behaviour and focusing on redefining the limits of what they regarded as decent partisanship. In consequence, there were demands for both players and spectators to 'act like Gentlemen,' Expressions of 'excessive' feeling were frowned upon. Partisanship was allowed, provided that it did not blind the supporters to the virtues of the game
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or of the opposition. 'Courage' and 'manliness' were still emphasised as an integral part of football but 'foul and disgusting language,' for example, as one commentator noted in 1888, was seen to have 'imperilled its (soccer's) reputation with respectable people.' In commenting on crowds in 1906, J. Goodall, an England International, provided further insight into what were perceived at the time to be the limits of decent partisan­ship. What he said has been cited before but it is worth quoting again. He wrote:

"Unfortunately, it is the goading and jeering and hot-headed, non-discriminating partisanship of the ignorant and lower class sections of crowds that are mostly to blame for the unpleasant scenes occasionally witnessed. The name and barracking of players has also a very bad effect, and until the spectator aid in the maintenance of that camaraderie which really prevails among professional players so long will enemies of the game have a formidable tool to use against it." 112

Significantly, Goodall refers to the 'non-discriminating partisanship of the ignorant and lower class sections of crowds' which appears to suggest that this group of spectators were perceived to be unable to exercise the necessary degree of socially demanded restraint. In addition, the call by Goodall for the 'spectatorate /to/ aid in the maintenance of that camaraderie which really prevails among professional players' highlights the increasing emphasis which the middle-classes placed on the self-regulation of spectators as a means of maintaining order.

This shift in the standards of violence control, coupled with the anxiety felt by the middle classes in this period of mounting class tension, also found expression in the continued alarm registered in the local, national and sporting press concerning the "brutality" of the professional game and in the perception of spectating per se as evil and spectator mis­conduct as involving "uncivilised beings." Such a perception is, in fact, indicative of the second feature of a phase of "repulsion" - for in such
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a phase, as argued, not only do the higher classes seek to redefine their own behaviour but they also focus on the more public extremes of lower class behaviour. The shift of members of the higher classes out of soccer and into rugby reflected this repulsion. At the same time, their condemnation of professional soccer and the crowds who flocked to watch it expressed the values of the amateur ideology to which they adhered. In fact these developments were all bound up together. Criticism of those who adhered to different standards of violence control was related to the seeking of status exclusively and a more secure grasp on power by groups whose dominance was threatened, above all, by the slowly dawning realisation by members of the working class of their latent power and by the growing intensity and overtness of the class conflict which resulted. It will be useful at this point to spell out in greater detail how these developments relate to the narrowing of what was considered "decent" within the context of football as a spectator sport.

The controversy surrounding professionalism and its concomitant, the negative perception by the middle classes of spectators have already been noted. A feature woven into the debate that took place in this connection was the equally forceful condemnation of particular standards of violence control. Take, for example, the following extract from an article published in 1888:

"Fracas in the Football Field.

The tendency of football, especially since the introduction of professionalism, to develop unnecessary roughness, and to excite bad blood between players, has evoked so much remonstrance of late, that no one will be surprised at the Council of the National Football Association deeming it necessary to institute a stern and exacting enquiry into some of the more flagrant cases. To some extent, it is an indispensable accompaniment of football....In a struggle in which swiftness, dexterity and strength play so great a part, it would be absurd to expect the polite consideration of the drawing room and the exhibition of a superfine self-restraint. No one who cares for the cultivation of courage and manliness wants to see the verve and dash of football suppressed by the imposition of conditions which would
reduce it to the level of a boudoir pastime. But the most ardent lovers of the game have noticed with regret and alarm that the free introduction of the professional game has not only greatly lowered its tone, but has led to frequent discreditable scenes of violence. Fracas on the football field are a matter of far too common occurrence. The fierce and unruly partisanship of the spectators has on several occasions been stimulated to a dangerous extent by the example of the contending players on the field itself. Foul and disgusting language in the case of one or two notable offenders has still further disgraced the game and imperilled its reputation with respectable people. Bad language and bad temper on the field influence the conduct of the crowd and evoke displays of passion which are not only discreditable to sport but a menace to the public peace. Football is on trial. Either by drastic measures, it must be kept under decent control, or it will soon become the recognised pastime of roughs and the regular occasion of rowdism. 113

This notion of "decent control" as argued previously, lies at the crux of the argument. Namely, who was it who wished to see the limits of public order narrowed - who was it who wished to supervise, regulate and control what was, in the main, working class behaviour? The evidence points to attempts by middle class leisure and moral entrepreneurs to control and regulate the public and private customs and mores of the "masses," the working classes.

Further expression of the perceived need to redefine the limits of acceptable public order is found in the pages of the British Medical Journal. In a summary of one of its articles, published in the Leicester Daily Mercury in April 1894, it was noted that between November 1893 and March 1894 in the games of soccer and rugby:

"Eighteen deaths among players are recorded, besides several which took place among spectators, apparently from excitement. We should be the last to dissuade young men from indulging in games and athletic exercises, but surely some sort of moderation might be displayed. It certainly is the fact that in some instances the game was played, or rather fought, with great brutality, and no one can fail to see that in this respect the presence of an immense crowd of hooting and cheering spectators, whose only aim is gambling and excitement, is a deteriorating influence, leading to undue violence and roughness. The game is right enough; the mischief is playing to the gallery - and such a gallery." 114

113 Birmingham Daily Mail 23rd November 1888.
114 Leicester Daily Mercury 2nd April 1894.
As with the commentary offered by the writer in the Birmingham Daily Mail, implicit in this report is the shift that was occurring in the standards regarding the expression of violence. It is important to note, however, that the debate took place on two levels that were sometimes seen as interconnected. More particularly, it took place in relation to the expression of violence on the one hand by the players and, on the other, by working class spectators. The pleas for a more 'scientific soccer' and the pleas that football needed to be kept under "decent control" were underpinned by this shift in the standards regarding the expression and control of violence.

Little wonder, then, that a game returning, in its modernised form, to a milieu where the traditional mores of the working class still persisted - albeit in varying degrees and in more civilised forms - attracted widespread condemnation of its working class spectators. The anxiety implicit within such criticism was, as suggested earlier, heightened by the growth of class tension. It is within this context that "interpretative" and "critical" theories of deviance can be applied. Thus Humphries is correct, in one sense, to refer to the "key factor" in the attempts to control and regulate working class youth in terms of an increased public sensitivity. But such short term panics may also be interpreted in terms of a phrase of "repulsion," that is, as part of a longer process, the "civilising process" to which Elias refers. Utilising Elias's theoretical framework, the analysis can interpret the criticism of spectators and working class youth in general in relation to the effects, intended as well as unintended, of changes in standards of self-control. In this connection a general observation made by Mennell is fruitful.

"In early modern Europe, transitionally, forms of behaviour were often considered distasteful or disrespectful in social inferiors which the superiors were not ashamed of in themselves....
Yet by the twentieth century, symmetry was established, and largely similar patterns of shame and restraint expected equally of all classes. Elias's explanation - to simplify it greatly - is in terms of the advancing division of labour creating much closer and less unequal interdependence between social strata or process of 'functional democratisation' leading to more equal power-balances. 115

Though, increasingly, similar patterns of shame and restraint were expected equally of all classes by the late nineteenth century, the fact was that different groups continued - and continue to this day - to adhere to different social standards. As Fuller and Myers noted, such a situation is bound to lead to the emergence of "social problems." 116 Some sections of the working class had been more "incorporated," more "civilised" than others, but even the "respectable" elements in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries would still have lived under social conditions and adhered to standards of behaviour that approximate to those of the present day "rough" working class. 117 Criticism of spectators in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, however, was coupled with attempts to incorporate such groups into adherence to the more universal patterns of shame and restraint to which Mennell refers. As the Editor of the 'Hammers Gazette,' the official programme of West Ham United, noted in 1907:

"In my notes in the first number of the 'Gazette,' I used the phrase "Manners maketh the man." I would like our supporters to ponder over them. "Barracking" a referee or player, to say the least, is not good form and does not bring credit to the club...." 118

Such comments were not reserved solely for football spectators. The communities from which the spectators of West Ham United were drawn attracted more general attention. Thus S. A. Barnett, in examining 'Distress in East London' observed in 1886 that:

"...The greatest evils of absenteeism are first that it withdraws from the community the upper class, who are the natural channels of civilising influences to the classes below them....The result in Ireland was heartbreakingly poverty, which relief funds do not relieve

---

118 The Hammers Gazette - The Official Programme of West Ham United F.C., No. 5, November 2nd 1907.
and there is no reason why, in East London, absenteeism should have other results...." 119

Barnett appears to be referring to the consequences of class segregation as far as residence was concerned. In order to promote what they regarded as civilising influences, and thus overcome the effects of such segregation, the "rational recreationalists" offered "moral improvement" schemes to the working classes. The situation in terms of spectating at football was alluded to by Pickford when he referred to the action of a referee when a spectator invaded the pitch:

"Clubs and Obnoxious Spectators.

......I congratulate the referee on his action and the club on removing the spectator. People who will not act like gentlemen at football ought to be refused admission." 120

Notions of what constituted "gentlemanly conduct" echoed the debate over "civilisation" already discussed. A more forthright comment was made by the Birmingham Daily Post in October 1910:

"It has now to be plainly said that if the popularity of spectacular football is to be maintained the baser passions of the players, and those of certain sections of the spectators too, will have to be kept under firmer control......" 121

Such comments epitomise the perception of football spectating in this period, and reflect not only the mounting class tension but also the longer term "civilising process." At this point, it is perhaps best to recap on the characterisation reached so far of this stage in the development of football spectating as a socially problematic phenomenon.

In documenting the forms and control of football hooligan violence, the findings indicated that, though the "respectable" working class were involved, possibly centrally, the period can best be captured by referring to the dominance of the "roughs." Such "dominance" refers to how the

119 S. A. Barnett, "Distress in East London" Nineteenth Century XX 1886 np
120 Pickford, Athletic News 1906-1907 Press Cuttings FA Library.
121 Birmingham Daily Post 31st October 1910.
violent masculine style of the "roughs" held sway, relative to the "rough" working class of the present day, over the "respectable" elements of the working classes. This pattern is not surprising. Though undergoing a period of intense "colonisation" of their culture in the early and middle nineteenth century, such incorporation, while it continued in the late nineteenth and twentieth centuries, was not complete and did not, in any case involve a total transformation in values. The "respectable" working class in the late Victorian and Edwardian periods still adhered to social standards which in some ways approximated more closely to those of the "rough" rather than the "respectable" working class of today.122

Given this, coupled with the fact that these early stages in the democratisation of football took place within a period of mounting class tension and "repulsion," and that a more long-term "civilising process" was at work, it is not surprising that the anxiety and concern to control and regulate working class behaviour manifested itself in football. The shift in the standards regarding the expression and control of violence - a central feature of the civilising process - coupled with the mounting class tension and the phase of "repulsion" outlined, thus led to both a concomitant narrowing of what was deemed to be publicly permissible in general and to focusing onto and the re-definition of the limits of decent partisanship. Such sentiments dovetailed neatly into the aims of the "rational recreationalists" and the need for the status conscious upper classes to re-define their own behaviour and to focus on the more extreme public gestures of the lower classes. Subsequently, as Gillis has observed, working class youth in general became the subject of overt and covert regulation, supervision and control.

While, as argued, football spectating did not become a cause of concern

to the state before the First World War, it was nevertheless incorporated into a wider debate concerning juveniles and working class leisure. The present study thus argues that the phenomenon, in this period, cannot be adequately understood if reference is not made to this. Thus, at this stage in its emergence as a social problem, it formed part of the "great social question of the age." It was not, however, to become the litmus paper by which the "permissiveness" and "moral decline" of English society was to be judged - as the moral panic of the 1960's ensured "football hooliganism" would be. Having said this, the structured balance between continuity and change in popular culture which characterised this period was to alter significantly in the next phase in the emergence of football spectating as a social problem. While the late Victorian and Edwardian decades can be seen to be marked by a period of "repulsion," a further period of "colonisation" or "incorporation" occurred in the years between the two world wars. It is to this phase that the present chapter must now turn.
D. Football Spectating: 1919-1939. A Further Phase of Colonisation and Incorporation

In an attempt to characterise the period 1919-1939 in the development of football as a spectator sport, it was argued earlier that, similarly to the late Victorian and Edwardian decades, the phenomenon of spectator misconduct was partly formed and shaped by issues peculiar to the game itself but also partly by features of the wider social context. Substantively, it was noted that those involved in spectator misconduct in these years were largely drawn from the "respectable" working class. The years between the wars, it was argued, witnessed, in fact, a trend towards "respectability." The "colonisation" of respectable working class culture, and indeed of society in general, with bourgeois values, that is, a process which involved the increasing "incorporation" of the "respectables" into mainstream culture, was part of and assisted such a trend. Significantly, the respectable members of the working class appear to have had less in common with the "rough" working class of this period than was previously the case. The influence of the "roughs" was, temporarily, waning.

While there appears to have been a factual decline in the rate and nature of reported disorder as a consequence of this shift towards "respectability," the perception of misconduct, when it did take place, also appears to have been less fraught with anxiety than in the earlier period. Such changes appear to be bound up with changes in the wider social context. Crucially in this regard, as Gillis observes, the trend outlined also appears in the perception of and policies adopted towards working class youth in general.

This is not to deny that more subterranean features of spectator life existed. Fights between groups of rival spectators did occur and, periodically, sections of the "rough" working class were attracted to matches and were, possibly, those centrally involved in the more serious
cases of misconduct. What does appear to be qualitatively different is the nature and extent of the anxiety expressed about spectator misconduct in particular and about youth in general. The process referred to earlier, that of the narrowing in the range of what was deemed to be publically acceptable behaviour, was still occurring, but the sensitivity towards and measures adopted to control such behaviour appear to have been less anxiety-ridden and interventionist in character. A broader agreement - between sections of different classes - may well have been established in relation to the expression and control of violence.

Interwoven with this trend was the decline in the connections made and parallels drawn between football spectating and the "problem" of youth and working class leisure. Overall, based on a content analysis of various newspapers and the FA minutes, it is apparent that suggestions concerning the "contamination" of soccer by the "rowdy" elements and the perceived "inherent evil" of spectating were noticeably absent. Gone were the pervasive commentaries condemning the adverse moral and physical influence of soccer-spectating on youths and the resulting threat to public order. Such changes, as argued, relate both to specific features of the development of the game and, interwoven at particular points with this, to specific features of the social position of working class youth in this period. Consideration of these two sets of features must now be undertaken. By so doing, the ongoing process of the emergence of football spectating as a social problem will also become more apparent.

By the 1920's, the sporting press, more particularly the specialist journals and special editions of newspapers that had proliferated before the First World War, was in relative decline. Such a trend had a not unimportant effect on the processes outlined as it both reflected and reinforced the change which was occurring in the medium for the expression
of anxiety. In part, this decline of the sporting press may be connected to other processes - namely the possible withdrawal from active participation and spectating in soccer by sections of the literate middle classes. Furthermore, the type of articles written by such vociferous critics of the incipient professionalisation of the game as Ensor and Edwardes had disappeared.

One other source for the expression of anxiety was the FA. Here, too, however, the medium was changing. A more formal structure had been established - what precise influence this had on the number and forms of disorder reported remains unclear. Within the FA, however, the controversy surrounding professionalism had subsided. The growing 'respectability' of the sport - nationally and internationally - may have resulted in the FA being relatively immune from any adverse criticism which may have been felt but was not publically expressed by those groups who had been so vociferous in the 1890's. The exponents of amateurism - at least in soccer - had lost the day. Such trends must also be coupled with one other trend if the emergence of football spectating as a social problem in this period is to be adequately understood. The very establishment of football, reflecting and reinforcing the growing 'respectability' of the sport, within the enclave of "respectable" working class culture, may also have resulted in less public awareness of and thus anxiety regarding those forms of spectator misconduct which continued to occur.

Co-relatively, as with the late Victorian and Edwardian decades, such a development not only reflects the stage which the emergence of football spectating as a social problem had reached but also has implications for an explanation of the forms of football hooligan violence which existed. Due to the relatively low-key public anxiety, football grounds had not yet reached the point of being - as they were later to become - the vogue venue
for the expression of a violent masculine style. Such a style, Dunning et al believe to be an integral feature of rough working class culture. As the Leicester case study reveals, other sporting venues, such as boxing, may have proved a more attractive setting in this period to display one's masculine prowess - both as a boxer and spectator.¹²³

Certainly the language of concern expressed by the FA towards disorder was in unison with the tenor of contemporary newspapers. The perceived threat had waned. The connections drawn between football spectating and the 'great social question of the age' lay, for now, relatively dormant.

However, further probing of this broader context is still required. The analysis of Gillis concerning juvenile delinquency was utilised to highlight the possible link between upper and middle class perceptions of working class boys and spectator misconduct during the period around the turn of the century. His study also has implications for the analysis of the perception of such groups of spectator misconduct and its status as a social problem in the inter-war years. Gillis notes that, by the outbreak of World War One, the use of the term "maladjusted adolescent" had been legitimised and institutionalised. Part of this institutionalisation involved reliance upon youth clubs. Gillis comments that the initial reaction by working class youth to such clubs and their middle class youth workers was hostile and that the latter, in consequence, and despite their paternalistic values, advocated stronger laws and stricter enforcement. But the situation was changing:

"Apparently, after two decades of attempting to control youthful behaviour the police had learned that tolerance was a better preventative than repression, at least as far as the excesses of misrule were concerned.

In any case anxiety about delinquency had reached a peak by 1912 and the number of prosecutions for non-indictable offences was

¹²³ See Chapter Six.
declining. Among the reasons for this was the adoption by the police of a preventative approach to delinquency.

...Of course, the "maladjusted adolescent" was still on the minds of contemporaries, but was no longer an object of fear and resentment. Large numbers of working youths remained beyond the reach of youth organisations, which, even in the 1920's could lay claim to less than half of Oxford's teenage population. The social stereotypes of the organised adolescent and his anti-social counterpart, the maladjusted adolescent persist to the present day. However, the intense anxiety that accompanied their origins diminished somewhat once this new way of interpreting youthful behaviour became firmly established...

Indeed, Gillis' analysis in common with that of Wilkinson, may be indicative of a "pacification" or what was earlier termed a "colonisation" process. Such "pacification" and "colonisation" seem to have occurred under the aegis of the developing state and to have involved more and more sections of society as a whole.

By Elias, "pacification" of more and more sectors of society, is envisaged as an integral feature of the progressively stricter control of impulses and emotions which leads and has led individuals to exercise relatively automatic self-restraint. In addition, the level of overt class conflict declined as the inter-war years wore on, as a result, e.g. of unemployment. That is, it is reasonable to suppose that the mass of those who remained in work would have been reluctant to take industrial action in case they, too, were to join the ranks of the unemployed. Such a trend seems to have led the organised, more "respectable" members of the working class into a more moderate, conciliatory stance towards established groups and their representatives and, while this helped to ensure their continued employment, the socially dominant groups as a result also felt more secure.

In writing of successful youth movements in England in the inter-war years Wilkinson concludes:

---

126 See Introduction.
"The successful English youth movements were not simply movements of protest by the young. Rather they were carefully designed attempts to respond to their needs and demands, to harness their energies for great causes approved by their adult leaders. As educational movements they had no need to challenge the political status quo. They brought about improvements in training and recreational facilities, physical fitness (and incidentally increased opportunities for social advancement) on behalf of the less privileged. Tactically they were restricted to the pace permitted by their patrons among the political, ecclesiastic and military elites. They should therefore be regarded as movements not of protest, but of peaceful reconstruction and reform. Through their agency many demands of the young were contained, absorbed and redirected, with astonishing success." 127

With such social processes at work, it is less surprising that spectator misconduct at football proportionally to the number of League matches played in this period in contrast to the preceding one, declined and that the tone of public responses to it was, relatively, less alarmist. 128 Neither the FA, the police, magistrates nor the press exhibited the same sort and level of concern which permeated commentary in the late Victorian and Edwardian decades. The attempt to control, regulate and supervise working class youth was, as Gillis notes, viewed in terms of a "preventative" not a "repressive" approach. The process of "incorporation," at least with large sections of the working class, was proving 'successful.' Indicative and reflective of this was both the increasingly respectable nature of the football crowd and the recruitment of the working class into the youth movement.

Particular cases derived from the minutes of the FA lend support to the idea that there was a "respectable agreement" over what constituted misconduct and how all "respectables" should join in attempting to control and regulate crowd behaviour. A case involving a match between West Ham and Rotherham County in 1922 was cited in the minutes of the Emergency Committee, whose members concluded: 'Well-wishers of the club should assist the club in seeing that offenders are dealt with.' 129

128 See Chapter Four.
129 Minutes of the FA Emergency Committee 21st March 1922 - 22nd April 1922.
Several cases have already been documented, in fact, which highlight how the FA appealed to spectators to assist in the control of the rowdy element. This appears to have been a persistent theme. Two further cases support such a contention. The following is recorded in the minutes of the FA Emergency Committee for 1924 after a match at the Stoke City ground: 'The club be informed that the general spectator should be invited to assist the club in putting down misconduct because failure to do so must result in the ground being closed.'

And in 1930, the FA Emergency Committee concluded:

"The Committee was satisfied that the Liverpool club officials and the police took proper action. The club informed that their spectators must understand that they have a responsibility in maintaining order, and that it is their duty to aid officials and police to suppress disorder, and that failure to do so may result in the ground being closed. The club requested to post on its ground a special notice referring to the incidents in this case and warning the spectators as to their future conduct." 132

Appeals by the FA to sections of the crowd, firstly, to control themselves and secondly, to assist in the control of others, appear to rest on an agreement over what was considered to be permissible. This, it seems reasonable to suppose, was probably a reflection of the growing "respectability" of crowds and of the perceptual responses on the part of ruling groups that resulted from the growing incorporation of sections of the working class. A more generalised indication of the growing respectability of football spectating stems from the perception of its perceived role in times of social strife. Take the following report from 1920:

"The Position of Football.

Interviewed by a press representative, yesterday, on the question of the position of football in relation to the coal strike, Mr. F. J. Wall, Secretary of the Football Association, said that the Association

130 See Chapter Four.
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132 Minutes of the FA Emergency Committee 7th October 1930 - 8th December 1930.
would carry on so far as it might be desirable to do so in the best interests of the country. Sport of any kind helped to distract the attention from what might be troubling one and both in times of peace and in times of war it was well to provide recreation for the minds and bodies of the people." 133

Similarly in 1926, at the time of the General Strike, the FA Committee argued that:

"...the playing of football would prove helpful in the present unsettled condition of industrial affairs of the country, and that acting under powers given by rule 27 of the rules of the Association, decided on 10th May 1926, that the following decision be promulgated:

"The Football Association authorises football to be voluntarily played by its members until further order. Competition matches must not be played, nor may any payment be made or prizes given to players." 134

This theme appears to be complemented by the apparent sensitivity of the FA to the particular consequences of ground closures. Following incidents at Port Vale, a meeting was convened at the FA headquarters in January 1922 and it was recorded in the minutes that:

"The Committee considered the action of the spectators would justify the closing of the ground for a considerable period. Such a course, however, would penalise the innocent as well as the guilty. The Committee ordered the Port Vale club to warn their spectators that a repetition of their misconduct would surely result in the ground being closed and see their instructions were carried out, and offending spectators removed." 135

Such a policy appears to have been directed towards the older, more respectable spectators in the hope that they would control the younger fans. But appeals by the FA for the control of the "rowdy element" were not confined to the "general spectator" but also made to the police. Thus in 1938, the FA Disciplinary Committee decided: "...That the Liverpool club be instructed to arrange for a policeman to patrol in front of the Boys' enclosure during all first team matches." 136

But while the police were present at matches and while the FA were forced, as noted, to issue circulars to clubs concerning the behaviour of...
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spectators, thus indicating the continued occurrence of disorder, such disorder does not seem to have attracted attention from the wider public. That is, the more low-key sense of anxiety felt by the FA appears to have been shared by other sections of the community, newspapers, local and central government.

It is important, as argued, to locate such developments within a broader context. One other feature in the internal pacification of society which Elias sees as crucial is the gradual monopolisation by the state of the use of violence. Examination of the position of the police in relation to spectator disorder at football in particular and "juvenile delinquency" in general, may cast light on this broader context.

Gillis' work, as noted, has revealed that, following World War One, the police in Oxford, in attempting to control youth behaviour, adopted "preventative" rather than "oppressive" measures. Similarly, Gillis has observed, that local youth clubs adopted a less oppressive policy towards working class boys. More particularly, he contends:

"By the 1920's, youth clubs were used by the Oxford courts as agents for the probation of offenders. Organisations which earlier had expelled anyone tainted with wrong-doing, were now willing to work with youngsters designated as needing care and protection. It would seem that once the youth organisations were firmly established, they tended to become less sensitive to behaviour that might be interpreted as a challenge to their authority. This was the experience of the Balliol Boys' Club which, after an initial period of conflict during which the police were called and rowdy lads expelled as troublemakers, came to tolerate a certain degree of misrule, as long as this did not disturb its St. Ebbe's neighbours. Organisers found that excluding the "occasionals" tended to strengthen the esprit de corps of the regular members; and that relaxation of the rules to allow for a certain amount of ragging worked to the benefit of law and order. In effect, the rituals of misrule that had been directed against the Balliol club during its first two years of existence were made to serve the club's internal cohesion." 138

While such less oppressive measures succeeded in attracting larger numbers of boys to the clubs, the exclusion of the "occasionals" may well


138 Ibid p. 125.
have reinforced the growing separation in values between "rough" and "respectable" sections of the working class. By adopting a more subtle policy of regulation and control, i.e. in allowing for a certain amount of "ragging," such organisations were colonising the culture of large sections of respectable working class youth.

The adoption of a less repressive policy appears to have occurred in relation to spectators at football matches too, and to have led to the gradual adherence to a notion of regulation by the spectators themselves. Now that there was greater agreement over the limits of decent partisanship, the spectators could regulate their own behaviour and that of their fellow spectators. At this point, it is appropriate to examine these themes in more detail.

Although the exact nature of the relationship between the FA and the police in the inter-war years is difficult to establish - as are the policies followed by the latter in controlling spectator misconduct - the FA were, towards the end of the period, gradually recognising the overall authority of the police as far as the control of spectators was concerned. Thus S. F. Rous, Secretary of the FA, wrote to the Under-Secretary of State in 1934 that:

"...The clubs under our jurisdiction take all necessary and suitable precautions on their grounds to ensure the safety of the spectators who attend their matches. They act under the advice and guidance of the Police Authorities, and the police have complete control." 139

Examination of the involvement of the police in specific cases of misconduct was undertaken in the previous chapter. In this connection, several questions arise which straddle both the analysis of the police perception of spectator misconduct in particular and of youth in general. Did the police perceive "rowdiness" as a cause for concern? If so, did they have, at this

139 Minutes of FA Correspondence 446, 941/23 S. F. Rous - To the Under-Secretary of State 1934.
stage in the development of their authority, sufficient power to intervene?
Thirdly, if the police did perceive such behaviour as a cause for concern, and, had sufficient power to intervene, did they, as Gillis notes in relation to youth in general, adopt a more preventative rather than oppressive approach to the control of spectator misconduct?

Clearly, if the police had wanted to adopt a more oppressive approach, then some liaison with magistrates would have followed. Yet, in England in 1919, a case against a man for swearing at a football match was dismissed. The magistrates declared that a football ground was not a "public place." In consequence, the powers of police intervention were curtailed. In Scotland, however, a different position appears to have prevailed. With the recurring clashes between Brake Club members and the police before and after matches, the Glasgow magistrates, for example, adopted measures concerning admission to grounds and the use of plain-clothes police. It is not clear, however, whether the concern felt by the authorities there was due to the phenomenon taking a different form and extending to a wider social milieu than its English equivalent. A deeper explanation than is possible here would consider the balance of power between groups - the pressures and constraints prevailing in Scotland - particularly in the large industrial conurbations during the 1920's and 1930's. In other words, it is crucial not to assume a uniform development between England and Scotland and not to ignore the fact that, within the former, regional variations may also have been evident.

The important features to grasp, in understanding the nature of the emergence of football spectating as a social problem in this period are fourfold. Firstly, and most importantly, a process of incorporation and pacification of sections of the working class and of society as a whole was gaining momentum. The colonisation of working class culture, or at least of
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sections of it, was evident in the "success" of, for example, the Boy's clubs which Gillis has drawn attention to. Such a process was also reflected in and reinforced by the appeals by the FA to spectators to regulate their own and others behaviour.\textsuperscript{142}

Secondly, and connected to this regulation, the FA, while they remained the main arbiters regarding the control of spectator behaviour, reacted in a relatively low-key manner to specific cases of misconduct. Thirdly, though the central government did begin to make incursions into this leisure sphere, its main concern was directed towards crowd safety and not the control, regulation and disciplining of behaviour. Fourthly, while the role and authority of the police in relation to the control of football crowds appears to have increased during this period and to have been welcomed by the FA, the methods by which they dealt with the "problem" were, in Gillis' terms, largely "preventative" not - as was to be the case in the stages of the development of football spectating as a socially problematic phenomenon that unfolded after 1960 - chiefly "repressive" and interventionist.

This is not to argue that there was no criticism of football crowds, or that despite the trends outlined, there were no elements of the "rough" working class involved in spectator misconduct in the inter-war years or that the "respectables" did not themselves sometimes engage in what were perceived as forms of misconduct or, indeed, that class conflict did not emerge in specific areas of the leisure sphere.\textsuperscript{143} An important aspect of the emergent overall social figuration in that period seems to have consisted of the fact that, despite the processes of incorporation and colonisation and the resultant "pacification" of sections of the working class, "rough" working class communities continued actively to resist such trends and, in

\textsuperscript{142} See Chapter Four.

\textsuperscript{143} This is best illustrated in the "Kinder trespass" of 1932 in the Peak District, in which working class ramblers sought to establish the right to walk across open countryside. See Guardian 24th April 1982.
part, were jettisoned by the more pragmatic policy adopted by such moral entrepreneurs as the exponents of boy's clubs. As a consequence, "rough" working class communities still engaged in, although in a relatively more civilised fashion than their early nineteenth century counterparts, public expressions of a violent masculine style.

The adherence to and retention of this lifestyle by specific groups within the lower working class is of significance in understanding the later stages in the emergence of football spectating as a social problem and will be spelt out in more detail in the context of a discussion of those stages. 144

Some of the communities of the lower working class, however, were being destroyed during the inter-war years. In commenting on his youth in one such community, Jack Douglas noted:

"George missed Summer Lane at first. There was a comradeship among the people that couldn't be found anywhere else. Perhaps they were birds of a feather, all in the same boat, kindred souls thrown together in a friendship born of poverty and want and going without. Whatever it was, despite the Saturday night fights along the lane, they stood united. They criticised themselves, laughed away their poverty and hammered the world outside if it dared do the same." 145

For Douglas, Summer Lane was "the toughest street in Brum." But the bulldozer could not simply wipe away the mores which underpinned these communities. Despite the attendance of members of the "rough" working class at football matches between the wars it has to be restated that at this stage, this presence appears to have been largely periodic and to have centred on important league, cup and local derby matches. More particularly, it can be argued by a measure of grounded speculation that, as those occasions were the setting for the more serious cases of disorder reported in the 1920's and 1930's, it may be possible that such disorder centrally involved youths and young men from the "rough" working class.

To sum up, several features have surfaced in explaining this phase in

144 Further probing of the involvement of the "rough" working class is attempted within the context of the case study of Millwall FC.

145 Jack Douglas, From Summer Lane Second City Birmingham 1979, p. 9.
the emergence of football spectating as a social problem. The more over­
riding processes have already been outlined, but specific developments
also impinged on what was going on. The decline of the sporting press,
for example, had resulted in the demise of the medium in which the
vociferous criticism of the spectator misconduct of the 1890's was expressed.
From the basis of a content analysis, it appears that a similar development -
in terms of the nature of reporting incidents - occurred at the level of
local and national newspapers. Within the FA itself, the controversy
surrounding professionalism had waned. Although it continued to be con­
trolled and regulated by the middle and upper classes football had now been
absorbed into the domain of the respectable working class. Co-relative to
such changes, the period was marked by an apparent lack of public criticism
of the "degeneracy" of the sports spectator. With the growth in the con­
sensus over what constituted the "limits of decent partisanship" this is
hardly surprising. A "respectable agreement" appears to have prevailed.

If the spectators themselves adhered to this agreement, and, were
perceived by powerful groups to adhere to it, what of the respectable
working class youth once they left the football ground? As Gillis notes,
the means chosen to pacify the population - underpinned by the sense of
security documented in Chapter Four - involving preventative rather than
oppressive measures, had largely worked. This should not be interpreted as
undermining the case for the involvement of the respectable working class
in particular forms of spectator misconduct at football matches, however.
The processes of colonisation and incorporation were far from complete.
That is, the effects of these processes were felt to differing degrees even
by the respectable working class. Furthermore, the transformation which was
occurring involved only a relative shift in the norms and values of working
class communities. Hence, even at this stage, the "respectables" may well
have still adhered to standards of behaviour in some ways closer to those of the present "rough" working class than is now the case.

Such a theme is supported by the comments of the editor of the Everton official club programme of April 1937. In this, echoing the appeals of the FA, the editor acknowledged the crowds' own attempts to control those involved in spectator misconduct:

"Evertonia.

....You will all be glad to know, that the spectators at the rear of the Gwladys street goal, took violent exception to the bottle throwing incident, and gave the offender a "hot" time. He was sorry for himself long before the end of the game. Every little helps and your "good citizenship" in checking such incidents as this, are very much appreciated. Only by your help, can the nuisance be completely stopped. But stern measures will be taken against anyone who is proved to be an offender." 146

Permeating this passage is the impression that forceful measures were adopted by the respectable majority in order to control the equally forceful propensities of a minority of spectators. The use of such measures, stemming from the "violent exception" taken, is indicative of a possibly greater recourse to the expression of violence than respectables in the 1960's and 1970's would exercise if confronted by such incidents. Nevertheless, the reference to "good citizenship" does imply that a "respectable" agreement appears to have been consolidated with regard to the expression and control of one's own and others' violent behaviour.

How is the analysis to explain this consensus over the "limits of decent partisanship" - itself a reflection of the wider processes of colonisation and incorporation? As noted, the success of the recruitment of sections of the working class into youth movements espousing the virtues of self-control and respect for authority is a key element in this. Secondly, the less oppressive policy adopted by, not only these Boy's Clubs, but also by the FA and the police - as indicated by their appeals for spectators to

146 Evertonia - The Official Programme of Everton FC 3rd April 1937.
regulate their own behaviour - also reinforced and reflected the growing consensus over the limits of decent partisanship. But deeper processes were at work as well, and crucial in regard to the process of colonisation which was occurring were the further developments in state education which emerged in the period between the wars. Further analysis of this is required.

During the nineteenth century, as Richard Johnson has noted, the developments in mass schooling which occurred can be interpreted in terms of what he describes as "class-cultural control." This was crucial to many of the transformations which were wrought in that century. Reference has already been made, to how the provisions of the Elementary Code for schools and the Balfour Education Act of 1902 can also be interpreted in this way. The developments in mass schooling in the period between the wars can arguably be explained in similar terms.

While writers like R. H. Tawney sought to establish 'Secondary Education for All' in order to achieve socialist objectives, other writers in the interwar years who did not share such sympathies, also wished to influence a greater proportion of the working classes through the medium of state education. Crucial in this regard is a report called The Education of the Adolescent, more commonly known as the "Hadow Report." Published in 1926, the report, as its title suggests, was concerned with adolescents. This is significant for present purposes in itself as it connects to the growth in concern for the "maladjusted adolescent" which Gillis has documented in relation to youth in the late Victorian and Edwardian decades. Such a connection is confirmed by examination of the text of the report. In considering the education of "the adolescent," the Hadow report concluded:

"There is a tide which begins to rise in the veins of youth at
the age of eleven or twelve. It is called by the name of adolescence.
If that tide can be taken at the flood, and a new voyage begun in the
strength, and along the flow of its current, we think it will 'move on
to fortune.'" 148

Having stated the problem, the report felt able to express what it saw
as the facts of the situation. It went on to observe:

"The rising interest in the problem presented by children between
eleven and fifteen or sixteen can be traced in the literature, official
and unofficial, on educational subjects for many years before 1918. It
was due in the main to two different, but closely connected, considera-
tions. The first, directed to the individual demoralization and social
wastage too often followed on the completion of the elementary school
life, was emphasised in the Report by this Commission on Attendance
Compulsory or Otherwise at Continuation Schools which appeared in 1909....
But the problems which they described had also, as was emphasised in the
Reports, an educational reference. For school and industry are different
facets of a single society, and the habit of mind which isolates
them from each other is a habit to be overcome. Education fails in
part of its aim, if it does not prepare children for a life of active
labour and of social co-operation....It is to a clearer realization of
the dangers to which many boys and girls are exposed at a critical
period of their lives that the increased public interest in the education
of children between eleven and fifteen years of age is in great measure
due." 149

For Hadow, therefore, education was about the preparation of children
for a "life of active labour" and of "social co-operation": working class
youth was being prepared for its station in life, hard manual toil and being
inculcated with the manners of obedience to and deference towards the existing
status quo.

Such developments in state education, reinforced as they were by the
various forms of youth movement discussed earlier, were a reflection of a
deeper process involving the spread of bourgeois values in society as a
whole. Given that, is it surprising that a period of relative consensus
between social classes existed between the wars? In such a climate of
lessening anxiety, the FA were able to appeal to spectators to regulate their

148 The Hadow Report, - Report of the Consultative Committee of Education on
149 The Hadow Report. Cited in Harola Silver, Equal Opportunity in Education
own and others' behaviour. Safe within the knowledge of the growing respectability of the game and its spectators, it is also not surprising that the FA were thus not unduly alarmed by those cases of spectator misconduct which periodically were deemed to have interfered with the game during the period between the wars.

Given these trends - reinforced by the relatively non-interventionist stance adopted by the police towards working class youth in general and their non-interventionist stance in the control and regulation of working class football spectators in particular - their involvement being confined to a supervisory role as directed by the clubs - football spectating did not emerge as a cause of national concern. But particular features of the game and of the wider society in this stage in the emergence of football spectating as a socially problematic phenomenon were to prove important in relation to the post-war period, especially in relation to the 1960's and 1970's. Crucially, though the inter-war years were a period of relative consensus over the limits of decent partisanship - reflecting the wider process of incorporation as evidenced in the trends in state education and voluntary youth movements - the "rough" working class had, by and large, remained immune from such influences. After about 1960, they returned to the grounds leading to a further re-defining of the "limits of decent partisanship." This occurring as it did in a period of mounting public concern over working class youth culture in general, was to shatter the air of respectability and to catapult football spectating into its current status as a social problem. It is to these developments in the post-war period that the present study must now turn.
As was argued earlier, findings regarding the forms and control of football hooligan violence must always be located in the social formations from which such behaviour emerges. Attention must also be paid to the perception of it by powerful outsiders and to the changing balance between continuity and change in popular culture that is revealed for particular periods. At this point, it is perhaps best to re-consider some of the more salient findings reported regarding the period following the end of the Second World War in Chapter Four.

Similar to the preceding period, it appears that up to the late 1950's, spectator misconduct at soccer matches principally involved attacks on and barracking of players and officials. Those involved in these disturbances were drawn, centrally, from the respectable working class. In those years, though circulars continued to be issued warning clubs concerning the behaviour of their spectators, neither the FA, nor the press, were unduly alarmed by such misconduct. Gradually, however, a transformation began to occur initially in relation to the perception of these by now traditional forms of mistreatment. Later on, this dimension meshed closely with changes in the social composition of the crowd and, at this point, more violent forms of football hooligan behaviour began to become more widespread. Increasingly, during the late 1950's, and throughout the 1960's and 1970's, press reports and the FA minutes characterised the misconduct of football fans - which increasingly involved fights between groups of rival spectators - in stark and dramatic terms. That is to say the current press penchant for dramatising a phenomenon which, by now, was quite clearly occurring before, during and after matches, had surfaced. An "amplification" of the phenomenon occurred and it had the effect both of increasing alarm and of intensifying and spreading the behaviour involved. Stanley Cohen has described such a "deviancy amplification spiral" in the following terms:
When society defines a group of people as deviant it tends to react against them so as to isolate and alienate them from the company of 'normal people.' In this situation of isolation and alienation, the group tends to develop its own norms and values, which society perceives as even more deviant than before. As a consequence of this increase in deviancy, social reaction increases even further, the group is even more isolated and alienated, it acts even more deviantly, society acts increasingly strongly against it, and a spiral of deviancy amplification occurs.

In the context of the deviancy amplification spiral regarding football spectators that occurred from the late 1950's onwards both the more traditional aspects of and the more recent additions to patterns of spectating became focused upon. A national panic ensued. The context of concern had widened and had become permeated by a heightened sense of anxiety. As this process gained momentum, football grounds came, inadvertently, to be defined and perceived as ideal settings in which to display a violent masculine style. Defined as such by such groups as the press and television and perceived as such by members of the "rough" working class, the latter flocked in growing numbers to the grounds. Match days increasingly became an important public stage in which forms of behaviour which had long characterised lower working class life could find expression. For the first time since the 1890's, the number of "rough" working class spectators, as a proportion of the overall crowd, began to increase and those centrally involved in the more serious forms of spectator disorder were principally from this very group.

In order to contextualise such developments, the analysis must focus on at least four main areas. Firstly, the changing balance between continuity and change in working class culture. In particular, reference must be made in this connection to the adoption by sections of the class of a more 'privatised' and 'individualistic' way of living. Secondly, the changes in the social composition of the crowd. Thirdly, the concomitant changes in the perception of football crowds by such groups as the police and

magistrates - itself a reflection of the growing involvement of the state in the everyday behaviour of people in the leisure sphere. Fourthly, the shift in the perception of what constituted "decent" spectating - a shift which reflected the spread of bourgeois values throughout society and also the anxiety felt by the dominant classes towards youth culture in general and working class youth culture in particular.

It is important to grasp the interrelationship of these aspects of the phenomenon, Taylor makes a similar observation:

"As in other working class activities (e.g. street games, youth clubs, local bars), the possibility of a brawl, or 'fisticuffs' (or inter-personal conflict generally,) was a general life-expectation. It was in this sense no less dangerous and no more dangerous, to send one's child to the football than it was to send him to the corner shop. It is not meant that football was not a violent focal concern: it only implies that it was not significantly "tougher" than others.....

Since football was a central working class concern, not so widely patronised by other social groups in the inter-war years, violence around it was not a central "problem" for the dominant culture. It could, as it were, be "hived off" from that culture, and agencies of social control allow that violence to be expressed within the sub-culture without any threat to dominant or influential interests. Our argument involves the observation that football violence only comes to be defined as "socially problematic" working-class action with the participation of other social groups in the football culture - that is, when activation of problem-definition is possible by influential social groups. When these definitions are activated (in the mass media, by agencies of social control, etc.) they are accepted by the working class as arising from legitimate (dominant) authority. The working class parent as much as the middle class parent comes to believe that it is no longer "safe and sensible" to send his offspring to football matches." 151

While Taylor, in this instance, acknowledges the possibility of the existence of disorder prior to the contemporary period, his analysis, by concentrating on the 1960's, is deficient in at least four respects. Firstly, he cannot, by concentrating solely on that recent period, understand the changing nature and extent of football hooligan violence in the longer term. Secondly, his analysis utilises a gross and undifferentiated concept of the working class. As a result, whilst explicitly arguing for changes in crowd

composition, he sees it as principally an increase in middle-class attendance. Thirdly, the changing perception by the media and dominant groups of football hooligan violence in particular and working class youth in general is neglected. Fourthly, the importance of the structured, changing balance between continuity and change in popular culture is not grasped. Thus, Taylor appears to have a sense of uniform development in terms of the behaviour and composition of the crowd - up to the 1960's. More particularly, he sees watching the professional game as uniformly the preserve of a homogeneous working class. He thereby attributes the rise of football hooliganism to an influx of middle-class spectators and the resistance of particular working class groups to co-relative changes in the game. While the present analysis does not deny either occurrence or the importance of such changes, Taylor's analysis is gross and incomplete. Other aspects of the phenomenon and its development over time require to be examined.

Taylor, in fact, fails to probe the antagonism that began to be manifested on the terraces in this period between the traditionally "respectable" football crowd and the "rough" working class who were attending matches in increasing numbers. The sense of anxiety felt by the members of such "respectable" groups was not simply a function of media amplification, but a response to forms of behaviour that they could readily observe and fear. Why should this be so?

As documented, several researchers, including Taylor, Clarke and Critcher, have sought to explain the phenomenon of football hooliganism in terms of changes in post-war Britain. Clarke, in particular, has focused on changes in post-war working class culture. Further consideration of the changing balance between continuity and change in this culture is required if the answer to the question why the "respectables", reacted in the way they did to the return of the "roughs" is to be understood.
One means to explain such a reaction would be to utilise the conventional embourgeoisement thesis, namely that which argues that specifically wage-earning manual workers were becoming, in the 1950's and 1960's, increasingly "affluent" and therefore, 'bourgeois': that is, that they were gradually losing their working class identity's life-styles and values and were adopting middle class values and behaviour patterns.\(^{152}\) While it is not appropriate to consider all of the ramifications of the research conducted by Goldthorpe and Lockwood et al into this issue, it is generally agreed that their research cast doubt on such an analysis.\(^{153}\) In a number of key respects, in terms of attitudes to work, interaction patterns in the community, aspirations, social perspectives and political views, these authors found no firm evidence to confirm the embourgeoisement thesis. But, of course, the perspective on popular culture utilised in the present research has testified to the fact that, in English history over the past two centuries, there has never been a complete absorption of one culture by another. In fact, while the present research has referred to the "colonisation" of respectable working class culture and of society in general with bourgeois values, it differs in three main respects from the conventional embourgeoisement thesis.

Firstly, as noted earlier, the theory of embourgeoisement utilised in the present study, is drawn from the research of Dunning and Sheard.\(^{154}\) These authors argue that it is more fruitful to consider embourgeoisement in terms of the gradual emergence of the bourgeoisie as the ruling class, to their growing control of major institutions and to the consequent spread of their values through society. Crucially, they argue that embourgeoisement is a long-term process than can neither be confirmed nor rejected by studies res-

---


\(^{154}\) Dunning and Sheard, *Barbarians, Gentlemen and Players* p. 306.
stricted to a particular point in time, i.e. that time-series data are required in order to test it, and that it is not simply the working class which experiences *embourgeoisement* but society as a whole. With respect to the present analysis, therefore, changes in the limits of decent partisanship and the narrowing of the limits of public order relate to the nature and extent of changes in society as a whole.

The second main difference to the more conventional approach lies in the fact that the present research does not adopt an undifferentiated or static conceptualisation of the working class. Consequently, as in the work of Perkin, the importance of the subtle and shifting separation between "rough" and "respectable" elements of the working class is stressed.

Thirdly, while it was argued that total absorption of the more susceptible elements of the working class into mainstream society has not taken place in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries equally the "rough" working class has not so far "withered on the vine." That is, the lower working class have retained their relative position in the British class structure. In fact, such influences as state schooling have, as noted, by and large, tended to reinforce not only their position but the overall contours of the British class system as a whole. Post-war state schooling has proved no exception in this regard. As Raymond Williams has pointed out:

"One has only to compare the simple class thinking of the Taunton Commission's recommended grades with the Hadow, Spens and Norwood reports, and the practical effects of the 1944 Education Act, to see the essential continuity, despite changes in the economy, of a pattern of thinking drawn from a rigid class society, with its grading by birth leading to occupation, and then assimilated to a changing society, with a new system of grading." 155

But, while reservations such as those outlined above can be made with regard to the conventional embourgeoisement thesis, the research of Goldthorpe and Lockwood *et al* is significant for the present analysis in two respects.

---

Firstly, these researchers point out there has been a "privatisation" of the worker and his family, with "home-centredness" consequently amplified. The affluent worker's social relationships are centred on and largely restricted to the home. His time is spent watching television, gardening, doing jobs around the home and socializing with his immediate family. Secondly, while utilising the trade unions for instrumental ends, there is no "solidaristic collectivism" evident - a more individualistic outlook pervades the workers' way of living. How do such findings assist in explaining the reaction of the "respectables" to the return of the "roughs" to the football terraces in greater numbers in the 1960's?

The tendency for the lifestyles of these affluent workers to become 'privatised' - involving the watching of television - may well explain, in part, the decline in football crowds during the 1960's and 1970's. In addition, as has already been documented, the media were able to construct vivid accounts of football hooliganism during this period, sufficient, no doubt, to induce anxiety in these "armchair fans." This anxiety, combined with the relative decrease of their attendance and a relative increase in attendance at matches of the "rough" working class, contributed to the manner in which the phenomenon developed. But even those affluent workers who still attended may well have increasingly dropped the traditional forms of spectating - involving the collective expression of support for their team - as a consequence of their shift from "solidaristic collectivism" to a more individualistic and restrained outlook. In fact, the latter may have corresponded to the re-definitions which were occurring in the desired role of the spectator, i.e. the adoption of a more passive, consumer-orientated outlook, itself a reflection of the spread of bourgeois values in society in general. As argued, just as such developments were occurring, the "roughs"
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who adhered to a violent masculine style were being attracted increasingly to grounds. It is possible to speculate that, as a result of the differences in ways of living and codes of conduct between them, antagonism and anxiety would have marked the meeting of the "roughs" and "respectables" as they met on the terraces of football stadia in the 1960's.

In fact, as documented, one of the distinguishing features of the transformation which began to be wrought in football in that period was the changing composition of the crowd. Such a trend was implicitly acknowledged by the FA in 1964:

"It must be clearly stated that the home Club is responsible for the good conduct of the spectators attending a match. It is appreciated that misconduct may emanate from visiting supporters or from groups who have no allegiance to either team but who use a football match as a medium for performing acts of violence which they might perform elsewhere....

Whereas in the past the instruction to post warning notices has been effective this would not now appear to be so." 157

The reference to the misconduct emanating from "groups who have no allegiance to either team" is crucial in this regard. Traditionally it was the partisanship of committed supporters which was perceived as the problem, but not in the 1960's. In fact, the growing involvement of the lower working class whose interests lay more in the possibility of violent confrontations and had less to do with the demonstration of partisanship for their team, is confirmed in a number of studies.

During the early 1950's, however, football spectating was still marked by forms of behaviour similar to those which had existed prior to the outbreak of World War Two. Outside observers continued to perceive it similarly too. Though the FA in 1947 did issue a circular warning clubs of the consequences of 'disorderly conduct,' it is apparent that, relative to the perceptions which were soon to emerge and similar to those which had been

157 Minutes of the FA Disciplinary Proceedings 7th December 1964.
expressed in the 1890's, the late 1940's and early 1950's were periods marked by a lower sense of concern. Typical of this is an example drawn from the minutes of the FA for 1948:

"The linesman, V. A. Lottey, reported that during the match he was struck in the chest by a pellet fired from an airgun or air pistol. In view of the evidence submitted by the Chief Constable of Preston and the club doctor, the Committee decided that no further action be taken in the matter." 159

This case is in keeping with the lack of anxiety expressed by the FA during this period. No great sense of alarm is registered. It is important to note, however, that as early as 1956, the FA were becoming sensitive to the treatment of the game by television. They were concerned about potential damage to the image of the game in a period when the public was increasingly using this medium as a source of information and entertainment. This sensitivity is highlighted in a circular issued by the FA Council to clubs and referees in 1956. It was stated:

"The members of The Football Association Council have been distressed to hear first-hand accounts from their colleagues of incidents at recent football matches which tend to bring the game into disrepute.

We are writing to remind referees of their duty towards players who commit breaches of the laws and to say further that the Football Association will support them in any steps which they may take to stamp out violent and unsporting behaviour.

.....As many of the Cup games are filmed for television and cinemas and are consequently seen by millions of people, it is important that these matches should be a credit to our game....." 160

This growth in sensitivity to media coverage was coupled with the changing relationship between the FA and the state. Ten years prior to the circular cited, the Bolton disaster, in which thirty-three people died and over four hundred were injured, led to a Government enquiry into crowd safety which presented its finding to Parliament. Its importance in the
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present context lies, not in its actual findings, but in the explicit recognition - rejected by the FA in 1923 and 1934 following similar crowd disasters - of the increasing power and authority of the state to implement controls relating to individual behaviour in varying social milieux. This recognition is but one indication of the widening of the context of concern about Association Football crowds and links to the FA's attempts in the 1960's to disown responsibility for crowd behaviour. In 1965, for example, Denis Follows, then Secretary of the FA, argued that crowd disorder was a "reflection of our present age," and that "football was being blamed for the ills of the community." Such comments were designed both to change the explanation from one in terms of the ailments of the game to one which stressed the ills of the community, and to shift the onus of responsibility from the FA to the government of the day.

Further illustration of this widening of the context of concern can be gleaned from other sources. Cup-tie ticket queue disturbances in 1950 and 1955 were focused on by M.P's. Questions were raised in the House of Commons concerning the possible use of the Public Order Act and Police Acts to control "unruly" crowds. During the mid-1950's, as noted previously, the railway authorities became publically concerned about the growing problem of damage to trains carrying football supporters. Though acknowledging the growing involvement and authority of the state and the police, the FA nevertheless continued, at this stage, to make appeals to the ordinary spectator to control himself and others in the crowd. That is, the idea of the self-regulation of the limits of decent partisanship had not yet waned in favour of the centralised supervision and control by the state of the

---
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narrowing limits of what was held to constitute public order. But this position was not to hold sway for much longer.

One of the features also indicative of the transformation in the nature and extent of football hooliganism which occurred in the late 1950's and 1960's, was the re-conceptualisation of the "problem" of spectator misconduct which then took place. In effect, it was both a reflection of the changing climate of concern and of the attempt by the FA to avoid being held culpable. This requires elaboration.

While examples of spectator misconduct continued to arouse condemnation specifically of the football match context in this period, the behaviour of football supporters was grouped together with what were perceived to be other forms of hooliganism in a report in *The Times* in 1958. In this report, as noted, hooliganism in several forms was criticised as possibly belonging to the 'lawlessness and thuggery of a certain social layer of vicious young people.' \(^{169}\) Two years later, the Duke of Edinburgh and the Duke of Norfolk were complaining of the behaviour of spectators and linked this to the 'youth problem.' \(^{170}\)

As argued, however, the FA were also seeking to avoid being held responsible. But what responsibility were they seeking to avoid? Given the changing climate of concern outlined, even traditional forms of spectator misconduct were frowned upon and the FA were becoming uneasy of being held solely responsible. But this process was accelerated by the impact of the return of the "roughs" to football grounds in greater numbers and more frequently. An FA memorandum in 1964, as noted earlier, argued that misconduct was now emanating 'from groups who had no allegiance to either team but who used a football match as a medium for performing acts of violence which

\(^{169}\) *The Times*

\(^{170}\) *The Times* 10th May 1960.
they might otherwise perform elsewhere. The youths who were congregating on the "ends," behind the goals, were now seen as using football matches as a setting to display their adherence to a violent masculine style. Both the problems of coping with such disorder and the condemnation which the behaviour aroused, combined with the preceding anxiety concerning traditional forms of spectating, forced the FA Secretary, Denis Follows, as noted, to argue that "football was being blamed for the ills of the community" and to abrogate responsibility for football hooliganism.

The increasing media attention was accompanied by a "moral panic" and the recruitment of the forces of law and order to control, supervise and regulate the re-definition which was occurring over the limits of decent partisanship at football matches. In March 1963, for example, British Railways were organising what they termed a "Halt the Hooligans" plan to combat the anticipated arrival in London of 40,000 Liverpool and Everton fans - if their clubs qualified for the next round of the FA Cup - who, the Daily Express claimed, "have the worst reputation in football." But the supporters from Merseyside were not to "enjoy" this status for long. The reputation for being the toughest fans had to be earned on the terraces and streets but was confirmed by the media. Soon Manchester United, Chelsea and, to an extent, Millwall, were highlighted by the media as taking the leading roles in the status league of most violent fans. In November 1967, for example, the Daily Sketch claimed that Millwall supporters had the "blackest name in English soccer." Now they had earned that reputation had been highlighted by the Lewisham Borough News some ten months earlier. Following disorder at a match at the Den in January 1967, in which Millwall lost their fifty-nine match unbeaten home record, the Lewisham Borough News noted that

171 Minutes of the FA Disciplinary Procedures 7th December 1964.
172 Birmingham Post 8th November 1965.
'Hooligans brought the name of Millwall club before the public on Saturday in a way that the club's previous 59 league matches at the Den had failed to do.' But the actions of the 'hooligans' brought the name of Millwall not only before the anxious public at large but also to other "rough" working class communities. Reputations were being earned and then enhanced by the media. The net result of this general amplification spiral was that, throughout the 1960's at clubs all round the country, more and more members of the rough working class were being attracted to stadia, and reputations of local and national standing were being won or lost. In perceptual and in "real" terms, football hooliganism was escalating.

Symptomatic of this increasing media attention and of the heightening of anxiety was the concern expressed about the possibility of spectator disorder during the World Cup of 1966. Take the following account published in the *Birmingham Post* in August 1965:

"Police Dog Patrols at Football.

Police dogs will patrol pitches for the first time in English football history when the World Cup matches are played in Britain next July.

Policemen facing the stands and terraces will maintain a continuous "beat" around the perimeters of pitches during play.

These measures have been decided on by the FA in its anxiety to prevent spectator rowdyism tarnishing the thirty-two match series....

An official said last night: 'The World Cup organising committee is paying special attention to the problems of crowd discipline and control and will be keeping close contact with the police.'

A special three point memorandum is being sent to the clubs and organisations. This recommends that police should maintain a continuous patrol round the perimeter; policemen should face or partly face the crowd; and police dogs should walk the ground before each match and during the interval.'

Such references to the FA's 'anxiety to prevent spectator rowdyism tarnishing the thirty-two match series' and that the World Cup Organising
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Committee was 'paying special attention to the problems of crowd discipline and control' and would be 'keeping in close contact with the police,' give the impression that, for some, the staging of the World Cup was potentially threatening and damaging to national prestige and would have to be controlled, regulated and supervised effectively.

This 'special attention to the problems of crowd discipline' was, in fact, leading to the institutionalisation of football spectating as a social problem. What had traditionally been seen as rowdism linked to specific incidents in the game - at least in the period between 1919 and the late 1950's - was coming under increasing scrutiny by the football authorities, being labelled as "mindless" by the press, 'criminalised' by the actions of the police and becoming the preserve of psychologists and psychiatrists to investigate. The Daily Mirror, in April 1977, for example declared:

"Another idea might be to put these people in 'hooligan compounds' every Saturday afternoon....They should be herded together preferably in a public place. That way they could be held to ridicule and exposed for what they are - mindless morons with no respect for other people's property or wellbeing. We should make sure we treat them like animals - for their behaviour proves that's what they are." 177

In addition, as already noted, the police had increasing recourse to the Public Order Act and psychiatrists such as Harrington and Lang were recruited by the government to investigate the 'problem' of spectator disorder. In fact, similarly to the late Victorian and Edwardian periods, the contemporary scene is also marked by references to the threat to public order posed by behaviour which is and was seen to stem from a general malaise in society and the 'permissiveness' of youth.

The growing involvement of the state in the control of individual behaviour in this period is indicated by the establishment of official investigations and by the activities of the police and magistrates. Indeed,

where previously the FA had spurned such involvement, it now actively
courted it. Take the following report of the FA Council published in
1965:

"The meeting had been called at the request of the Chairman of
the Council to consider the general question of spectator misconduct
at football matches......

After a lengthy discussion it was agreed that an interview be
sought with the Home Office in an attempt to secure an increase in
the penalties imposed by the Magistrates' Courts for proved cases of
unruly behaviour by spectators......

The Committee felt that Clubs should be asked to seek the
closest possible co-operation of their Chief Constables and the local
police forces." 178

Throughout the 1960's and 1970's, the FA sought to widen the sphere of
responsibility and to enlist the support of other groups in controlling
crowd behaviour. Indeed, the "football world" in general has responded
similarly. For example, the Football Trust's support for the research being
conducted at Leicester by Dunning, Murphy and Williams which seeks to
examine the social roots of the phenomenon, is evidence of this trend. In
addition, the FA appears, at times, to have attempted to deamplify the
nature and extent of the problem of football hooliganism. Take the following
report of a meeting between representatives of the FA and the Football League
in 1975:

"Sir Andrew Stephen opened the Meeting by commenting on the con­
fusion which seemed to have arisen over what action was being taken by
the Football Authorities to combat violence at football matches.....

Mr. Hardaker considered that Denis Howell's working party had
achieved a great deal and he did not see that there was much else that
could be done by the Football authorities to eradicate what was, after
all, a problem suffered by society as a whole.....

Lord Westwood suggested that a carefully worded statement should
be issued jointly by The Football Association and The Football League
outlining the actions which had been taken.

Sir Andrew Stephen agreed but was concerned that the contents of
the statement should be very carefully considered.

Mr. Groker pointed out that it had been the policy of the Working
Party to play down the problem of violence in the media. Any statement
should bear this firmly in mind." 179

178 Minutes of the FA Disciplinary Committee 26th October 1965.
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Though open to interpretation, such comments are suggestive of the FA's desire to downplay the more serious aspects of the violent clashes that were occurring between rival groups of supporters. This may have stemmed from a belief that such an approach might play a part in reducing hooliganism. Alternatively, it might have been an attempt to avoid, as far as possible, being tainted with a violent image.

A theme related to the FA's desire to widen the context of concern, to absolve themselves of sole responsibility for football hooliganism, and to avoid being tainted with a violent, unruly image, can also be seen in their efforts to re-define the role and composition of football crowds. The Secretary of the FA, Ted Croker, stated in the Evening Standard in 1979 that:

"Football has possibly for too long aimed at the wrong strata of society and would be better served by reducing capacities, including more seating and amenities thereby eliminating violent elements and once more attracting the middle class, law-abiding citizens." \(^{180}\)

Croker further observed in 1980:

"What I am suggesting is that the people who run professional football should think the unthinkable and abandon their traditional audience. Twenty or thirty years ago this meant the working man either with or without his son. Today, more often than not, it means gangs of unaccompanied - and therefore largely uncontrolled - youths and children... In giving him what he wants - a seat, comfortable accommodation and facilities, entertaining football - the clubs will, in time, change the nature of the game to the extent that it will no longer be so appealing to the hooligan." \(^{181}\)

More recently, the Chairman of Fulham FC similarly stated:

"We have always expected the customers to come to us but at last we have moved into the 20th century.

We are going to educate all strata of society that football is no longer a cloth cap industry." \(^{182}\)

While the FA have sought to jettison their involvement with the working class, other organisations, with intentions similar to those of the "rational recreationalists" of the Victorian period, have sought to use sport to

---

\(^{180}\) Evening Standard 22nd February 1979.

\(^{181}\) Ted Croker, Sport and Leisure October-November 1980 p. 4.

\(^{182}\) Guardian 23rd February 1982.
regulate the behaviour of working class youth. In a report in the Leicester Mercury in April 1982, for example, it was noted:

"A scheme to encourage school-leavers to keep up their sporting activities has been given a warm welcome by county councillors...... Mr. Williamson, an executive committee member of the City of Leicester Sport and Recreation Advisory Council said: 'This may be a back-door way of combating vandalism.....!'"

The FA, however, appear to have abandoned such sentiments. They appear to want to provide, as Croker argues 'entertaining football' and to 'change the nature of the game to the extent that it will no longer be so appealing to the hooligan.' This wish to 'abandon their traditional audience' can be explained in two ways. Firstly, such observations tend to support those aspects of the analysis provided by Goldthorpe and Lockwood in their critique of the conventional embourgeoisement thesis which, it was argued earlier, may have played a part in this process, e.g. the "privatisation" and drift away from "solidaristic collectivism" in the life style of the "affluent worker." The desire to 'abandon the traditional audience' was a recognition of these changes. Secondly, the analysis offered by Clarke is of relevance in this context. In order to understand his relevance, it is necessary to remind oneself that Clarke sought to examine how 'football hooliganism emerges out of the changing relationship between football and its audience.' The desire to shift from the 'traditional audience' and to provide 'entertaining football' may correspond, in Clarke's terms, to a shift from a game in which the 'fan' was actively involved in the excitement and partisanship, to a spectacle in which the 'consumer' watches in a relatively detached manner. It is possible that the conceptions of the "new spectator" may be underpinned by changes in what is perceived to be "civilised" conduct and hence "decent partisanship." Take the following report of comments made by the Hull City Chairman in 1982:

183 Leicester Mercury 21st April 1982.
"The Chairman.....says the aim is to 'bring back some civilisation into football.' Don Robinson's scheme is aimed at encouraging a broader outlook between rivals and at the same time widening each others appreciation of the game." 184

The gregarious displays of spectator partisanship, similarly to the public displays of folk football in the nineteenth century and earlier, are thus no longer considered appropriate by powerful groups. A redefinition of decent partisanship, a narrowing of the limits of public order has occurred on a significant and far-reaching scale. Clarke was thus partly correct when he concluded:

".....Hooliganism appears as a problem because it contravenes the view of how football spectators should behave. For the football consumer the game is what takes place on the field; for the fan, the game is "going to the match," a social event involving both the foot­ball and the crowd. The crowd make something of the game on the field, they add excitement, drama, comradeship and involvement. The consumer watches, while the fan - or more precisely, the fans, since being a fan implies a collective or group relation to the game - take part in a social event. In this sense, it has always been the crowd which has made the game what it is. What we are pointing to here is a gap between the official definition of what football is and how it is to be watched, and a set of unofficial and informal definitions about the game and how to watch it....." 185

The present analysis cannot help but have sympathy with this analysis - provided it is combined with a developmental analysis of the changing balance between continuity and change in popular culture, especially with reference to the expression and control of violence in this regard. Clarke is limited however, by his failure to probe historically the social roots of the behaviour of football spectators and the perceptions of powerful outsiders of football spectating.

In summing up, it can be argued that the post-war period witnessed a transformation. Increasing media attention, the widening of the context of concern, the heightening of the sense of anxiety, the narrowing of the limits of public order, 186 the drawing to grounds of "rough" working class males.

---

185 Clarke, "Football and Working Class Fans: Tradition and Change" p. 57.
adhering to a violent masculine style, the continued "colonisation" of large sections of society with values which led a process of pacification to occur and a re-definition over the role and composition of the crowd fused together in a figuration which led to the emergence of football spectating as a social problem of national - increasingly indeed, international - proportions.

The implications of such an analysis for the critique of the approaches to popular culture and working class youth require spelling out. Such a task, however, will be reserved for the concluding remarks of the present study. Consideration, at this stage, must be given to the case studies which complement the two preceding chapters.
CHAPTER SIX
FROM FOSSE TO CITY - THE WIDER CONTEXT IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF LEICESTER CITY FC

This examination of the emergence of Leicester Fosse FC and its transition to the Leicester City club is structured around three main areas. Both in relation to the Victorian and Edwardian decades and the period between the wars, consideration will be given to patterns of spectator behaviour, the relationship of the club to its supporters, and the connections between football, leisure and the working classes. In this way, specific and more general observations can be made which will help to substantiate the arguments presented in the previous chapters. In this context, moreover, an attempt will be made to examine the phenomenon of "football hooliganism" in its totality, and not solely with reference to the fighting propensities of some spectators.

The crucial methodological issue, the 'adequacy' of the evidence which has limited the scope of the present study in general, also hampers achievement of the objectives outlined above. In relation to primary sources, no club documents of Leicester Fosse have survived, and records regarding the early stages of Leicester City are scanty. Moreover, the minutes of the FA Emergency and Disciplinary committees contain no references to spectator misconduct at Filbert Street prior to 1947. Secondary sources provide an equally sparse record of the development of the club. Those club histories which exist are only of limited use - the most noteworthy being written by a former editor of the Leicester Daily Mercury, N. Tarbbottom in 1948. Histories of Association Football - such as those by Green, Marples, 
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1 This is of interest in itself and will be returned to in the main text. FA Disciplinary Committee 1947.
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Walvin, Young and Mason - contain little mention of Leicester Fosse or City and are of no direct use in this context. Those sociologists who have considered the development of football also provide no direct evidence to assist this particular case study. Furthermore, such historical accounts as those of the development of Leicester as a city refer infrequently to sport and not at all to the formal development of the club.

So what is there left to consult?

As with other chapters in this substantive section of the thesis, extensive use has been made here of local newspapers. The problems involved in utilising this source material have been discussed elsewhere. It is important to reiterate, however, that the evidence gleaned is largely anecdotal: at present that is all the analysis has to go on. This evidence was drawn from the local newspaper, the Leicester Mercury, and examined for each year between 1895-1914 and 1919-1939. Further consultation of the years between 1946 and 1984 - proved to be outside the scope of one researcher, given the limitations of time, access and technological assistance. Despite such difficulties, however, an attempt has been made to explore the three main aspects cited by qualitatively analysing and contextualising the reports drawn from this local newspaper during the periods in question.

A. The Emergence of Leicester Fosse

The formation of Leicester Fosse in 1884 appears to have followed a pattern similar to that of other clubs founded in this period. In his history of the club, Tarbottom claimed that its formation, in the spring of 1884, was due to the efforts of Old Wyggestonians and members of the Old
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Emmanuel Church Bible class. If this is correct, then Leicester Fosse provides another example of the development of a club which runs contrary to the analysis offered by Taylor and which is closer to the research of Mason. That is, those involved in these incipient stages appear not to have been from the working classes but from sections of the middle class, although one cannot rule out altogether the possibility that a sprinkling of members from the respectable working class may also have been involved.

Tarbottom commented as follows on the reaction of the Leicester populace in general in the 1880's to this birth of a club playing one of the modern forms of football in their city:

"So complete was the apathy into which the new club intruded that when the old Midland Railway Co. organised a trip from Leicester to Derby for the FA Cup semi-final between Queen's Park and Blackburn Olympic there were hardly sufficient supporters to fill a single compartment."

Further consideration of the formation of the club is hampered by a lack of contemporary evidence relating to relevant developments. Leicester City Football Club, as noted, have no minutes relating to the birth of the Fosse, and the local press, in this instance, is equally unfruitful. It is possible to sketch a tentative outline regarding the development of the club but answers to questions concerning, e.g. its control and organisation and the social composition of those involved in running it, playing for it, and watching at its matches remain based on anecdotal evidence. Such as it is, this evidence makes it clear that, during the 1880's and 1890's, several grounds in the city were utilised by Leicester Fosse, something which suggests that the organisation of the club was, at this stage, informal and not yet
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placed on a regular footing. The fact that matches often started late, that, sometimes, opposing teams did not arrive and that players not infrequently did not turn out to play, all point in the same direction.\footnote{15}

At the outset, Leicester Fosse were entered in the local Leicestershire and Midland leagues. Such matches, as has already been noted, could be the setting for spectator misconduct. Regarding a match played for the Leicestershire Challenge Cup in the 1888-1889 season, Tarbottom records that:

"No quarter was given or asked, but when the Fosse snatched a merited victory in the closing minutes and the whistle blew for time, the Shepshed section of the crowd went completely haywire. The Fosse players were pelted with clods of turf and any other missiles that were handy, and the visitors brought off the fastest move of their career, dashing for the safety of a nearby hotel with the howling mob behind them." \footnote{16}

The progress of Leicester Fosse, in common with other clubs, depended on several issues. Firstly, the acquisition of a permanent ground, which was achieved in 1891 when the Filbert Street site was secured. Secondly, the organisation of finances - revenue from spectators began to be collected in November 1887. Thirdly, expenditure on improving ground facilities and the engaging of professional players. As far as the latter issue was concerned, the first professional was signed in 1888, and by the 1892-1893 season, the club had a squad of twelve. \footnote{17} As argued, however, in order for this case study to provide specific and more general observations relating to evidence presented in previous chapters, attention must be given to the three particular issues which are central to contextualising the emergence of Leicester Fosse and the transition to Leicester City.

1. Patterns of Spectator Behaviour

From the evidence drawn from Tarbottom, it is evident that the progress of the club in attracting spectators was slow but that gradually, the

\footnote{15} Ibid
\footnote{16} Ibid
\footnote{17} Ibid. See also Folliard, A History of Leicester City FC.
administrators were able to introduce differential admission prices. That is, attendance gradually moved from a form of membership of the club to access to all, provided money was paid at the 'gate': those more able and willing to pay the higher admission charges were granted access to the mainstand: those who could only afford, or were only willing to pay 6d, were able to stand on the rough, rock-strewn ground which surrounded the pitch. Leicester Fosse were also not free, as shown by the case cited by Tarbottom, from the outbursts of spectator misconduct which marked the development of other clubs during this period. It was recorded in the Leicester Daily Mercury in 1890, for example, that:

"Referee baiting has developed into a fine art in some parts of England, and is practised here and there without any vigorous effort being made to stop it, but grieved indeed am I to find that a crowd of Leicester spectators have so far forgotten themselves, and what has frequently been written of them, as to descend to this ignoble conduct. I care not how mistaken Mr. McGawley might have been on Saturday, the spectators ought not to have kicked up the row they did. To err is human; to forgive divine. If Mr. McGawley's errors of judgement were frequent the free forgiveness of so critical a crowd must have caused far more poignant pain, by virtue of its irony, than the storm of groaning with which he was, on all sides assailed. Wishing, of all employments, is the worst, but I do trust that in future we may be spared all such acrimonious outbursts as that of Saturday last - no matter how deeply they may be provoked." 19

Such developments were occurring within the context of the Midland League, but by 1894-1895, despite financial problems in the early 1890's, Leicester Fosse had applied for and gained election to Division Two of the recently formed Football League.

Prior to this admission to the Football League, the city of Leicester had witnessed several reported cases of misconduct at other sporting venues and meeting places. While no clear link between such misconduct at different sporting venues has yet been established, by probing other facets of social life, it is possible to place the spectator misconduct at Association Football matches in its wider context. 20

---

18 Ibid p. 4
19 Leicester Daily Mercury 15th February 1890.
20 See Chapter Five.
Leicester Fosse's formation in the 1880's was located in an area marked, according to Tarbottom, by a relatively strong Rugby Union tradition. Interestingly, Leicester Tigers - the premier Rugby club of the area - were not free from the spectator misconduct which was reported to have attended the matches of Leicester Fosse. For example, in February 1890, in the same month as the referee-baiting which occurred during a home game of the Fosse, the ground of Leicester Tigers was the scene of a pitch invasion and an attack on the referee and players.

The documentary legacy relating to these incidents is contained in both Leicester and Birmingham newspapers. It is, however, marked by a conflicting interpretation of the events. In the Leicester Daily Mercury, the events in question were described as follows:

"Unfortunately, some of the decisions of the Referee were received with great disfavour, and at the conclusion of the game that official became the medium for a very hostile demonstration. However, nothing worse than hooting and groaning was resorted to, and it is only fair to say that this conduct on the part of the crowd appeared to our reporter to be simply "righteous indignation," inasmuch as more than one appeal for palpably unfair play by Moseley was passed unnoticed by the referee."  

The reporter in this instance appears to want to emphasise that the reaction of the crowd involved "righteous indignation." Following a meeting of the Midland Counties Rugby Union - which ordered the closure of the Tiger's ground - the Birmingham Daily Mail chose to emphasise different aspects of what went on and to do so in a more alarmist tone:

"The Midland Counties Rugby Union has issued a decree which cannot fail to increase the respect in which that organisation is held. On February 8th the referee officiating in the contest between Moseley and Leicester was mobbed, the provocation being that through sheer superiority, the Birmingham team worsted their rivals of the hosiery town. The insult was not to be brooked, and the hot blood of a few of the Leicester partisans coursed rapidly through their veins as they beheld the victorious visitors quitting the field. 'When in doubt assault the referee' would seem to be the motto of the scrum and dregs of football spectators, and so upon a mild and innocent official the ruffians vented their spleen.
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The result is that the Leicester club has been prohibited from allowing spectators to enter their ground until the end of the present season. Members are at liberty to avail themselves of the privileges which are their due, but to outsiders the gates must be barred. Although it bears hard upon the Leicester club itself, the decision must commend itself to true lovers of the game. The worst feature of it is that the innocent suffer with the guilty, but what sentence could be substituted? Clubs, Associations and Unions cannot afford to wink at the evil any longer. Let us hope that Leicester's bane will prove the country's blessing."

While problems remain with the interpretation of such evidence, limited as it is, it does reveal something of the nature and extent of the reported disorder in this particular locality. That is, that spectator disorder was not confined to soccer grounds and, in specific cases, the disorder could take what was perceived by reporters and sports administrators to be a serious form.

During the same year in which this incident of spectator misconduct occurred, letters were received by the Leicester Daily Mercury complaining of the behaviour of young people around the streets of Leicester. While no direct connection has been established, such aspects of social life provide a basis from which further investigation can proceed. As the analysis stated, there is still a need to uncover more extensive evidence concerning the social composition of the crowd with specific reference to those involved in misconduct and, those involved in disorder in other areas of social life. At this stage, the following set of questions remains unanswered: were those involved in misconduct at Association Football and Rugby Union matches and on the streets of Leicester drawn from a particular social stratum or group? Can the analysis identify which group or groups were involved and having established this how can the analysis explain it? One general clue in this connection can be drawn from the Birmingham press. In the columns of the local newspapers of that area reference was made as has been documented, to the presence of "Peakies," a term used to describe a number of gangs of

24 Birmingham Daily Mail 6th March 1890.
working class youths who attended a number of leisure venues, including football, and were also noted for their fighting propensities. Could it be that those involved in spectator disorder at Association Football and Rugby Union matches in Leicester during this period were drawn from the same or similar working class communities?

With the entry of Leicester Fosse into Division Two of the Football League, ground improvements continued to be made. The main grandstand became more exclusive, the terraces were 'banked' and the flow of spectators into, around and out of the ground became more regulated with the introduction of turnstiles and fencing. While no evidence remains concerning the motives of the club directors in carrying out these improvements, a speculative analysis can be attempted. Clearly, with the increase in the number of spectators watching matches at Filbert Street, there would have been a need to manage and control the flow of the crowd and to provide some basic facilities. In common with other clubs, differentially priced admission allowed the Fosse to cater for the perceived comforts of those attending. For example, the "popular" side, on which the "Bob-siders" of the 1920's stood, was a long, uncovered terrace along one side of the pitch - as yet, no roof was provided for the ordinary working man! The provision of terracing and the main grandstand are indicative of the mixed social class composition of the crowd. But this in itself may not explain all the ground improvements undertaken - there was more to these improvements than simply catering for different social groups.

As Vamplew has noted, some of the measures taken at other grounds were deliberate measures to safeguard the investment made by directors from the actions of rowdy spectators. Vamplew further argues that these measures were relatively successful and believes, as noted, that spectator misconduct

declined during the period following the death of Queen Victoria and the outbreak of the First World War. Criticism of his argument on this general issue has been attempted elsewhere in the present study. At this point, the concern is to highlight how the Leicester Fosse case study raises examples of aspects which Vamplew overlooks and which cast further light on the complexity of the figuration.

Tarbottom, in his history of the club, cites two cases, where the control of the crowd was inadequate and which serve to highlight how the issue of the club's ability to control large numbers of spectators is not as clear cut as Vamplew suggests. Citing an example from 1900, Tarbottom notes:

"In those days, of course, the accommodation at Filbert Street was not nearly so adequate as it is today, nor were the entrances so well equipped to deal with big crowds. The Fosse fans came from far and near to see this Leicester-Sheffield battle, over 25,000 swarmed round the ground with the result the gates at the Filbert Street end gave way, thousands rushed through without paying and many were left outside...." 27

Some six years later, Tarbottom noted, the crowd precautions taken inside the ground, again proved inadequate:

"There was one rather alarming experience during that season. It happened on February 1st 1906, when West Bromwich visited Filbert Street and lost 3-0. The crash barriers on the popular side smashed like matchwood under the pressure of the crowd. The injured were handed down over the heads of the sandwiched thousands and only the coolness of the typical soccer fans eased a situation that might easily have ended in panic." 28

With respect to the first example, the picture given of the crowd rushing through the gates in their thousands without paying may well be exaggerated, but, despite this, the ability of some to enter the ground in this fashion does tend to contradict the analysis presented by Vamplew regarding the scale and the effectiveness of the crowd control measures which
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clubs introduced. Equally, though crush barriers appear to have been introduced on the popular side by 1906, such measures proved equally inadequate. Rather, as the second example highlights, it was deemed to be the "coolness of the typical soccer fans" which "eased the situation." As noted earlier, the trend towards respectability, with the corresponding control of one's emotions, did show signs of developing in the Edwardian period. It may well be, therefore, that the relative decline in the extent of football hooligan violence may have less to do with the measures adopted by the clubs and more to do with the changing social composition of the crowd.

Indeed, while such examples do not totally refute the analysis offered by Vamplew, a second interpretation may be placed on such evidence. With the entrances to the ground and the crush barriers erected inside the ground proving inadequate, it may well be that the Fosse were somewhat out of step with the possibly more organised measures adopted by the more successful clubs - in this sense, an element of regional variation may well have existed. Furthermore, as the analysis of the inter-war years will reveal, the pace of these developments in the control of the crowd was not uniform in its nature and extent across the country. Too bland an assertion concerning the measures taken and the success achieved by club directors to control the crowd during this period can be misleading. Several elements require greater consideration. The financial and League status of the club, the number of spectators attending both home and away, and the threat perceived by the directors as emanating from the crowd, or at least from sections of it, must all be woven into future analyses concerned with testing the adequacy of Vamplew's assertions.

The reported apathy in which Leicester Fosse had been founded, was, only ten years later, replaced by regular five figure home gates and frequent travel to away games by some supporters of the club.29 But who were the...

29 See Leicester Daily Mercury 4th April 1895; 14th September 1895; 27th March 1900; 16th March 1910.
people who travelled to these away matches? Unfortunately, in this, as in evidence concerning the social composition of the home crowd, little information is forthcoming from local newspapers. What is known is that "special" and "excursion" trains were laid on for Fosse supporters who travelled in "a fair number" during the 1890's. Specific numbers were sometimes cited - with 1,500 for a match in 1900 being the highest recorded. In common with other clubs, reference is made to the hiring of saloons which may well indicate that those who travelled were groups drawn from the middle or upper classes as it would have been these groups who could afford both the money and time involved. Alternatively, such saloons were ordered by working people for special occasions. But such insights are as elusive as they are intriguing.

In order to gain evidence concerning the patterns of spectating at Filbert Street, consultation of match reports in the Leicester Daily Mercury was undertaken. In keeping with the findings cited in Chapter Four, reported misconduct by Leicester fans largely involved verbal abuse of and assault on officials and players, assaults between groups of rival spectators and some post-match disturbances. As argued, investigation of particular cases must be located within the context of developments in the club and city and be coupled with an elaboration of themes cited in other research.

Towards the end of Leicester Fosse's first season in Division Two, a letter to the editor of the Leicester Daily Mercury was received complaining about the behaviour of the spectators:

"How Those Men Do Swear?

....It is understood how a man may say something short and expressive when he misses hitting a nail and lands on his thumb, but how to explain the torrent of the vilest of expletives used over witnessing a game! It is inexplicable! No sportman would behave in this manner, and to the sportsman I appeal for an expression of their feelings on this matter and I make the appeal for their wives and daughters. It is no use speaking on the ground: it is but courting insult. Such was my experience to point to the notices the Committee

30 Leicester Daily Mercury 4th April 1895.
31 Leicester Daily Mercury 27th March 1900.
have posted about the matter is to hear the notices and yourself made the subject of further blackguardism, regardless of womanhood or youth."

Driveller. 32

While it is impossible to identify the writer of this letter, or indeed what the significance of the term "Driveller" would have had for contemporaries, certain important features emerge from what he says. Firstly, the writer indicates that the Committee of Leicester Fosse FC had posted notices concerning bad language. This, together with the general description he provides, suggests that the use of "bad language" was a regular feature of spectator behaviour at the club. Secondly, the writer tells us that he was the victim of "blackguardism" when he attempted to bring the warning notices to the attention of fans who were swearing. What forms this "blackguardism" took are uncertain, as is the part of the ground in which such behaviour took place. Clearly, however, there was some form of intermingling occurring between those involved in misconduct and the more "respectable" men and women of the crowd.

As was suggested earlier, spectator disorder at Filbert Street in this period was not confined to swearing. Hostile crowds also appear to have been a feature, though not necessarily a dominant one, of matches at the Leicester Fosse ground around the turn of the century. Here is an example from October 26th 1895:

".....When the finish came the referee was the subject of some attentions from the crowd, but although he was escorted off the field by policemen no violence so far as we could see was attempted though the spectators were anything but pleased with his decisions in the match." 33

Two days later, the Leicester Daily Mercury commented further on the incident:

".....Excited partisans of any club are very sensitive of wrong done to their pets on the field, whether by their opponents in a match or by the officials of the game."

32 Leicester Daily Mercury 6th April 1895.
33 Leicester Daily Mercury 26th October 1895.
There is no doubt the Leicester crowd, on Saturday was worked up to a pitch of unnatural excitement, for when Darwen were not engaged in taking free kicks against the Fosse some of their players were all too fond of a style of play almost bound to provoke retaliation in a manner not provided for in the rules. 34

As was shown in Chapter Four, similar references to "excited partisans" figured in other reports of crowd disorder in this period. One possible interpretation of this - as has been argued - is in terms of Elias' concept of the civilising process and Elias and Dunning's notion of the 'quest for excitement in unexciting societies.' 35 If Elias and Dunning's perspective is outlined at this point, its relevance can be made more apparent. These authors argue that sports - such as football - fall within what they call the "mimetic sphere"; this concept refers to the fact that a whole range of leisure activities, from football to the cinema, share a feature in common, namely, that they arouse affects which bear in a playful and pleasurable fashion, a specific resemblance to the affects generated in seriously critical situations. This generation of "tension-excitement," as the authors observe, can, under specific circumstances in which the play-fight element moves towards real combat, shift towards disorderliness. 36 It is argued, that the particular case cited and those which will be documented for the period between the wars, may, in part, be explicable in these terms.

Other references to the "temper" of the crowd can be cited. Take the following example of a missile attack on the referee and some of the players of Leicester Fosse in 1905:

"The spectators were most unsportsmanlike, and at the close they snowballed the referee and some of the Fosse players, Durrant coming in for special attention. Altogether they gave a most unwarrantable exhibition of temper." 37

Some cases of fights between spectators of opposing teams and of post-match disorder in Leicester were documented earlier but they are not the only examples to surface in the present study. In 1900, for example, in a game

34 Leicester Daily Mercury 28th October 1895.
35 See Introduction.
36 Norbert Elias and Eric Dunning, "Dynamics of Sport Groups with Special Reference to Football" in Dunning, The Sociology of Sport pp 75-80.
37 Leicester Daily Mercury 21st January 1905.
involving Leicester Fosse and Lincoln City, with a reported 4,000 crowd
and a large contingent of Lincoln supporters present, fighting was, as noted,
reported to have broken out on the terraces. The writer observed:

"...The match now seemed to be quite a secondary consideration
with an unselect few of the spectators on the popular side, and a
Lincoln v Leicester proceeded on two occasions in the shape of free
fights. The sparring was wilder than judicious, and out of place in
any case, but fortunately each time a constable was at hand and
promptly and firmly parted the pugilists, who showed by these actions
that they were not qualified to watch a football match." 38

Three features of this incident require further analysis. From what
social group were those involved drawn; what was the policy of and reaction
to the police in these situations; and what do the writer's comments reveal
concerning the position of this disorder in the wider context of the issue
of the working class in general in this period and of working class youth
in particular? 39

Analysis of the social composition of those involved in this and similar
incidents can only be speculative and based on the anecdotal evidence to
hand. The writer in the example cited above indicates that those involved
were an "unselect few of the spectators on the popular side." The term,
"popular side," normally referred to the cheapest and most densely populated
of the terraces in the ground. The evidence from Mason appears to suggest
that crowds in this period were mainly artisans and clerks but also workers
in heavy industries: the popular side, as the cheapest and most populous,
would probably have drawn mainly from these groups. Unfortunately, the
analysis of Leicester newspapers reveals no descriptions of the crowd on
the popular side during this period. A photograph, taken in 1912, of the
'popular' side at Leicester Fosse has, however, survived. From this it can
be observed that only men and some boys - the former mainly wearing straw-
busters or flat caps - were present. Furthermore, all appear to be dressed

38 Leicester Daily Mercury 7th April 1900.
39 See Chapter Five.
with collar and tie. As a result a respectable image of spectators is gained - that, at present, is the only evidence available.

One other interesting feature revealed by the photograph is that the press boxes were on the "popular side" of the ground. It was not until after the First World War that the press resided in the main grandstand. During the period under discussion, in other words, it is evident that the press may well have been 'nearer the action.' Such positional movement of the press may influence, along with other technological and ideological aspects, the number and form of disorderly incidents reported - the reporter in 1900 may have been better placed to report specific disorder in his immediate vicinity on the "popular side" while in contrast, a report in the main stand in the inter-war years would have been able to get a more panoramic view of events in the ground but particular details may have escaped him. In both cases, however, the reporters were at the match principally to report the game in progress and not necessarily to report incidents of disorder, especially if those did not interfere with the game; in contrast, as argued, reporters during the 1960's came increasingly to focus on the "action" off of the field of play.

Evidence concerning the policy regarding and public reaction to police intervention is an equally blurred area. The writer who described the "Leicester versus Lincoln" incident referred to the reaction of a constable who is said to have "promptly and firmly parted the pugilists" but this, in isolation, cannot be relied upon as a basis from which to generalise in any meaningful way.

The author of the report cited also notes that the behaviour of the spectators involved was "out of place in any case:" such an observation reflects the more general perception that such fighting should not form part of patterns of spectating. From the writer's perspective, such fighting
disqualified these spectators from watching a football match. This is indicative, not only of the writer's own standards regarding what constituted a football supporter, but also of a much wider belief system. Those involved, however, may have perceived such fighting as an essential part of the "partisanship" of supporting one's team. Unfortunately, these supporters have left no written record of their own experiences on the terraces.

Large crowds at Leicester Fosse's home matches in this period were not only drawn to local derby games. During the same year in which the reported fighting occurred at the Leicester Fosse - Lincoln City match, a large crowd of home and away fans gathered to watch the visit of Woolwich Arsenal to Filbert Street. In the week preceding the game, the Leicester Daily Mercury predicted a large gathering of enthusiastic supporters:

"Already over 30 saloons have been ordered and it is anticipated that about 1,500 will pay a visit to Leicester, for three trains have been commissioned.....Those who have seen a Woolwich crowd know what we have got to expect from the supporters of the "red and whites". Covered with favours, and armed with any number of musical (?) instruments, they generally make their presence felt wherever they go. However, they are a good-natured lot, and as the majority of them patronise the stand, I don't suppose the Fosse executive will grumble at their presence, but on the contrary, will be pleased to gather in their shillings." 40

As with other examples involving away supporters, the analysis can but speculate from this anecdotal evidence on the people who travelled. Reference is again made to the hiring of "saloons" and that the majority of the Woolwich Arsenal crowd would patronise the 1s stand. It can be argued that it may have been the respectable working class and lower middle class who would have been able to afford, not only the travel costs, but also the hiring of saloons and the entrance fee to the more expensive stands at Filbert Street. The writer does remark, however, that the latter involved

40 Leicester Daily Mercury 15th December 1900.
the majority of fans, which may imply that a minority might well have spectated on the 'popular side.' The issue, therefore, is not clear-cut.

On the match day, armed with musical instruments and singing choruses of music-hall songs, the *Leicester Daily Mercury* records that:

"About 1,500 of the Arsenal supporters travelled to Leicester to see them play, and, taking possession of nearly the whole of the grandstand, they made things very lively during the afternoon." 41

Despite these scenes, the match reports contain no reference to misconduct involving rival spectators. It is only on the Tuesday following the match, as noted in Chapter Four, that any mention of disorder is cited. This was contained in the following letter to the editor of the local paper:

"The Woolwich Visitors
To the Editor

Sir, - It was hoped that the Fosse would have a good gate last Saturday, as a large crowd was expected from Woolwich. Well, sir, we have seen the crowd. We noticed early in the day a lot of these sportsmen, already dead to the football world. But at night the conduct of these people was most reprehensible, and our local hooligans must have learned a further lesson in the art. But there is enough drunkenness, filthy language and disorderly conduct without strangers swelling the number. The races do not bring together, all the year, such disgraceful scenes as accompanied Saturday's event, and in the interests of public order the public have a right to be protected.

Yours truly,

Social Order." 42

Two points arise from this which require consideration. The writer who signed himself, "social order," interestingly notes that the Woolwich Arsenal crowd had not behaved in a sportsmanlike manner prior to the match at Filbert Street and stresses that a number of the away fans were drunk. As the analysis contained in Chapter Five revealed, the issues of the "football fever," working class youth and "social order" are complex, yet connections can be documented. It would appear possible to locate the writers' comments within such a context. In this regard, "Social Order's" observations concerning the behaviour of the Woolwich Arsenal supporters in the streets on

41 Ibid.
42 *Leicester Daily Mercury* 18th December 1900.
that Saturday night are significant for two main reasons. Firstly, the
sense of anxiety which was felt, particularly by specific middle-class
groups towards working class youth in this period, is vividly illustrated.
Secondly, the writer makes a connection between the "drunkenness, filthy
language and disorderly conduct" of these football supporters with what
he terms "our local hooligans." It is to such connections that attention
must now be turned.

2. Football, Leisure and Working Class Youth

In the month preceding the case of post-match disorder cited, the
Leicester Daily Mercury contained references to "hooliganism" in Leicester,
Birmingham and London.\(^{43}\) A sense of "respectable" fear and anxiety is
evident in these reports. Fearing that such a phenomenon would spread to
Leicester, one correspondent to the editor of the Leicester Daily Mercury
wrote in November 1900:

"Hooliganism in Leicester.

.....If this hooliganism is allowed to take root in our town it
will hardly be safe for our wives and daughters to be out after dark
by themselves.....I am sure our Chief Constable only requires his
attention to be drawn to it and he will immediately take steps to
remedy it."

William Bell. \(^{44}\)

This sense of unease and anxiety towards "hooliganism" appeared to
embrace the whole gamut of unsupervised working class leisure. A letter to
the editor in 1895 highlighted this:

"Our Recreation Grounds.

Sir, - I think the best means of clearing our streets of boys
during the winter nights would be to light up our recreation grounds
by means of the electric light....

Regarding the extra cost.....I think the inhabitants would not
mind that, if it was the means of relieving us of the nuisance caused
by too many boys being about our streets at night.

'Let There Be Light'

P.S. Of course police supervision would be necessary." \(^{45}\)

\(^{43}\) See Leicester Daily Mercury 15th November 1890; 7th March 1905; 13th
November 1900; 5th November 1900. Leicester Daily Post 16th August 1915.

\(^{44}\) Leicester Daily Mercury 5th November 1900.

\(^{45}\) Leicester Daily Mercury 28th November 1895.
The issue of playing football in the streets and the concomitantly perceived potential threat to public order can possibly be interpreted as a legacy both of the antipathy towards folk football which characterised the first half of the nineteenth century and as providing testimony to the particular social tensions of the 1890's. In the view of some writers to the Leicester Daily Mercury, the link between youths, playing football in the streets and public disorder was clearly established. Take the following letter written in April, 1900:

"Street Annoyance.

Sir, - when the police have a few minutes to spare I would suggest that they devote their attention to the overcrowding of buses and the game of football in the streets. I hold one or two football tokens now which I have become possessed of by their entrance through the window. The finding of a gentleman in blue is as difficult as the solving of the '15' puzzle. If a little more money could be utilised for the protection of property, and a little less for what is termed improvements, there would be no occasion for letters of this kind."

J. N. O. Gould.

Organised football did not escape such criticism. The "degenerative" effect of 'The Football Craze' - echoing the articles of Ensor, Edwardes and Abell of this period - was remarked upon in several letters to the editor.

Typical of this genre is a letter, signed by "Beware," in 1905:

"The Football Craze and After.

Sir, - ..... What is the Englishman of today doing? He is provided with technical education, reference libraries, art, science, and knowledge placed in very easy and convenient form. Yet what do we find? The "Football Craze," pure and simple and nothing else. Work, duty, knowledge of one's business, the idea of rising to a better position in life, are all thrown to the winds. From Saturday afternoon to about Wednesday night we hear nothing talked of but the results of the "last match," and from Thursday morning to Saturday afternoon there is nothing heard but the "coming match on Saturday." How much longer is this mad craze to last?

46 See Chapter Three.
47 See Chapter Five.
48 Leicester Daily Mercury 6th April 1900.
49 See Chapter Four.
50 Leicester Daily Mercury 30th October 1905.
Men who are in subordinate positions are often told by their masters that they may expect to have a rise in position, either in the shop, the works or other business, and a suggestion may be made that technical instruction can easily be had. "What!" replies the man, "go to the technical school on a Saturday afternoon! Not me; why it's the football match and every night in the week is occupied with the committee, or the arrangements, or obtaining the latest results." Every boy we see in the street must be kicking something, either a marble, or a stone, or a ball of paper. This shows a remarkably low-down form of intellect, if the whole of the people of the country devote their time to nothing else......but to this absurd and everlasting "kicking." No country can ever hope to progress under such circumstances. 51

Beware.

This anti-football and anti-working class youth feeling - echoing, as noted the sentiments of people like Ensor and Edwardes - was not confined to criticism through the medium of letters to the editor. Nor did the appeals by these writers for the Leicester police to act go unheeded. Here is a report from the Leicester Daily Mercury in November 1905 documenting proceedings from the local court:

"The Football Fever: Borough Police Court.

George Ellis (17), Milton Street and John Heward (14), Durham Street, shoe hands, appeared in answer to summonses for unlawfully playing football in Brixton Street on the 24th ult. - A fine of 2s 6d was imposed upon each defendant." 52

The debate concerning playing football in the streets - and Sunday football as well - continued until the outbreak of war. A typical case which reveals the positions of the various groups involved in the controversy surrounding the playing of football in public places arose in 1910:

"The youths admitted that they were kicking a ball about, but said they had not seen any notices prohibiting that.

The Chairman (Mr. J. B. Everard): Aren't they allowed to play football on Spinney Hill Park?

P.C. Simpson: No, sir; there are notices all round the park.... they were on the cricket ground, which is fenced off and no one is allowed to walk across it.

The Chairman: Is there any place in the neighbourhood where boys can play football?

51 Leicester Daily Mercury 24th October 1905.
52 Leicester Daily Mercury 1st November 1905.
P.C. Simpson: No, sir; only private fields.

The Chairman: Where is the nearest place where they can play football?

P.C. Simpson: Victoria Park, I should say, sir.

The Magistrates Clerk: That is as bad; they are not allowed to play there.

Ald. Lakin: Spinney Hill Park covers 16 acres; they ought to find a little ground where the boys can play?

The Chairman: We don't allow them to play in the streets, and the Corporation won't allow them to play in the parks. Where are they to play?.....

Mr. Vary: Let them join a club, and play at the proper time.

The Chairman: Well, my lads, you must find somewhere else to play. You are not allowed to play in the streets, or in the public park. We shall fine you if you play in the streets, and we are obliged to take notice of the offence, if you play in the park. We are not going to deal with you harshly to-day! You will each have to pay Is towards the costs." 53

While in this case the magistrate was not unsympathetic to the activities described, working class youth - whether playing football or involved in other activities - continued to be seen, at least by Leicester newspaper writers, as a source of disorder. A Saturday night scene in 1915, possibly reminiscent of the activities of the Woolwich Arsenal supporters in 1900, prompted the Leicester Daily Post to use its editorial space to indict young people in general:

"Gadby's Fair Fame.

At last the secret of the attraction of Gadby's public houses has been named in the police court. It has been a matter of common observation that many young people make the trip to Gadby on Saturday evenings and come back to Leicester, if not intoxicated, at least showing signs of having drunk too much and at times they are a source of considerable annoyance to other passengers on the late trams. Apropos of a sad case heard at the Castle, on Saturday, in which a youth of seventeen and a girl of fifteen pleaded guilty to being drunk and disorderly on Saturday August 7th, Superintendent Bowley told the court that music was provided in the Gadby public houses and that was the attraction to young people. He added that "if there was no music there would be less drunkenness and the public houses would be less frequented by young people." It rests on the urban council of Gadby to clear the fair name of their district. They have only to adopt the Public Health Amendment Act of 1890, and at once singing and dancing would come under the control of the Justices and require a special licence." 54

53 Leicester Daily Mercury 8th February 1910.
54 Leicester Daily Post 16th August 1915.
The reference to the 'annoyance to other passengers on the late tramcars' by 'young people' was not unique. In considering the career of Ernest 'Tuf' Ward, a conductor on Leicester tramcars in the Edwardian period, M. S. Pearson noted:

"In the winter of 1913-1914, Leicester Fosse were at home to Norwich in the FA Cup and "Tuf" was conducting on a football special, when several gentlemen sporting canaries in their button holes started a roughhouse. "Tuf" unceremoniously despatched five of them from his tram while an inspector who had been watching events smiled quietly and walked away." 55

There are two features of these disturbances on tramcars which are of significance. Firstly, such examples tend both to highlight the more subterranean features of the phenomenon of disorderly behaviour by football fans and to illustrate the connections between spectator misconduct and 'hooliganism' in general. Secondly, the incident involving the five Norwich supporters being 'unceremoniously despatched' by "Tuf" Ward is of significance not simply because it indicates the existence of disorder away from the ground but also because of the fact that the inspector who witnessed this confrontation was deemed to have 'smiled quietly and walked away.' Such a reaction tends possibly to suggest that those in authority in that period may have tolerated the expression of violent conduct in order to resolve disturbances to a greater extent than later became the case. While it is unwise to generalise too greatly from such evidence, it is to these issues that any further analysis of placing misconduct by spectators at football matches in its wider context must be directed.

3. The Relationship Between Leicester Fosse and its Supporters

During the late Victorian and Edwardian decades, Leicester Fosse spent most of the time in Division Two of the Football League, only one season, 1908-1909, being played in Division One. From its entry into Division Two, however, the relationship between the club directors and some groups of

supporters had been marked by antagonism. As early as 1895, there were moves to replace the existing committee and to form a new club. Take the following report which appeared in the Leicester Daily Mercury in September of that year:

"....What I would like to place before your readers, and Association patrons generally is how much longer are we going to quietly submit to the dictations of the committee? Would not it be as well to face the question boldly, and see if some steps cannot be taken to form a new club? I think there are a great number of people who would be only too pleased to take up one or two pound shares; besides there is already a very fine ground lying idle and I'm afraid if we don't take some definitive action in the direction I suggest before the commencement of another season, someone else will, probably an "out of town" syndicate. Gates of 8,000 to 10,000 and upwards are not going to be trifled with."

Forewarned, Forearmed. 56

Although no local evidence exists which would shed light on the social composition of the committee, the writer does provide some anecdotal evidence concerning the social composition of a potential take-over group. Firstly, reference is made to the fact that a number of people would be only too pleased to take up one or two pound shares. It does not appear likely that this group would have included the poorer working class sections of the supporters. Secondly, the writer posits the belief that an "out of town" syndicate might take over the club - this would imply some grouping of middle class entrepreneurs. Such developments hardly indicate the type of workers' control which Taylor and Cunningham believe existed in the organisation of football clubs at this stage. 57

Further evidence which tends to refute these writers analyses is drawn from an article by, "Forward," in the Leicester Daily Mercury in 1895:

"....I regard this as a fitting opportunity to bring home a few truths to the committee.....Some of the members may be excellent men of business and may do a lot of hard work for the club, but their actions on occasions are not always entirely satisfactory. For instance, players have been signed on almost regardless of cost and they have come to the club with a great reputation, but despite the

56 Leicester Daily Mercury 19th September 1895.
57 See Chapter One.
continual changes, the team is as far off finality as ever." 58

Significantly, reference is again made here to the committee being composed of "men of business." While this is one feature of the relationship between the club and its supporters, other features also require consideration.

While particular groups wished to found a new club, some articulate individuals were content to voice their criticism of the club's fortunes in the local press. Though supporters who go to such lengths as to write to the local newspaper cannot necessarily be seen as part of the majority of fans, there is evidence which suggests that the relationship between the Leicester Fosse and some of its supporters was not as close in this period as Taylor, through his concept of "participatory democracy" or an illusion thereof, has suggested was in general the case. Indeed, such was the criticism voiced by supporters during the latter part of the 1904-1905 season that it prompted one of the directors to reply to the critics:

"Sir, - As you have been good enough to publish letters of complaint in your papers from various correspondents, complaining of the position of the club in the League Chart and apparent apathy on the part of the directors in not obtaining new blood, you will perhaps be good enough to insert this letter bearing on the merits of the club from a director's standpoint. In the first place, I would like to say that the club at the present time is indebted to the directors to a sum well over four figures hard cash advanced by them to keep it going. In addition to that, several of them are bound at the bank for a further sum of £700, a legacy, by the way, left us by the old committee, of whom we have heard and read so much. Then again, the gate money received up to date has barely paid the players' wages, to say nothing of the many sundry expenses, such as rent of ground, office, travelling, and numerous others. Your correspondents seem to overlook the fact that summer wages, around £500, had to be found by the directors, the receipts during that period being nil. Some may say the season tickets would pay for that. The income from that source, however, only just paid for the transfer of those League-tied players secured by us. They have also forgotten that three rounds of the English Cup competition resulted in a very heavy financial loss. Who found the deficiency in expenses for those weeks? Not the grumblers...

In some towns I could mention a Finance Committee of supporters, outside the directorate, practically keep the clubs in those towns going,

58 Leicester Daily Mercury 16th December 1895.
but with the exception of a very limited number of gentlemen locally, to whom we are very grateful, not a helping hand has been offered. We find other clubs, who are in as bad a position as we are from a playing standpoint, but well off financially, and able to get the men they want. Why? We have seen as good football on our ground this season as some of the first League games I have seen and the support given has been about one quarter. On whom, then, rests the disgrace - the directors or supporters? Opinions may vary, but I have mine."

W. H. Squires
Director L.F.F.C

The letter, in fact, reveals the extent to which the club was being run by businessmen and thus, perhaps, in terms of business rather than community interests. Local entrepreneurs were in control. Following the letters of criticism cited above, a "Supporters' Fund" was founded in 1905. Although details of its formation have not emerged, it is clear that the Fund, by emphasising the need to raise extra revenue for the purchasing of new players, was a criticism of the handling of the club by its directors and thereby exemplified the gulf which existed between the club and its supporters. However, the movement to found the "supporters' fund" was not working class, but appears to have been dominated by successful businessmen and people of standing in the community - their involvement being indicated by the size of the contribution which was necessary, £1.60. Those centrally involved appear to have been a local MP, John Rollerton and a local councillor, Mr. Hudson. Thus, though Association Football is seen by later writers to have become, by this period, "The People's Game," in reality, control still lay in the hands of the middle classes. This situation, as the analysis will now document - as with the issues of spectator behaviour and working class leisure in general - did not change dramatically in the period between the wars.

59 Leicester Daily Mercury 14th January 1905.
60 Leicester Daily Mercury 4th February 1905; 20th February 1905.
61 Walvin, The People's Game.
1. Patterns of Spectator Behaviour

As with the analysis of the development of football as a spectator sport in general, a portrayal of life on the Filbert Street terraces in the 1920's and 1930's must be based on an adequate grasp of the social composition of the crowd and the perception by powerful outsiders of spectators as a whole. The following example, published in the Leicester Mercury in 1927, provides some general clues to these two issues in Leicester at the time:

"...The tremendous growth of soccer in Leicester in recent years raises many interesting points. The crowds at Filbert Street are two or three times the size of pre-war 'gates.'"

This is partly a case of success begetting success, but there must be something in the game itself as well as the success of a team that commands a regular following of 30,000 enthusiasts.

An old-time Leicester sportsman, who has watched the growth of both clubs and has always been in touch with the two games in Leicester attributes the remarkable popularity of the City to a change in public opinion.

'There have been times,' he said, 'when the Tigers had bigger gates than the Fosse. There was a lot of prejudice against soccer. Rugby was thought to be a game for the classes, the other for the masses.

Perhaps this prejudice still exists in some quarters. I could never quite understand it. In some respects, no doubt, it was a case of amateurism and professionalism.

There was even something snobbish about the affectation of superiority of the one over the other.

I do not think there is much of that feeling about now, because all sportsmen are pleased with the progress of the City, who have so splendidly won their way to the Front.

The improvements to the ground, and the vastly better and more comfortable accommodation compared with the old days have helped draw the people, and a successful team has done as much as anything." 63

Probing of this quotation reveals an implicit suggestion that the crowds attending matches were becoming more "respectable:" the "classes"...
and not just simply the "masses" were now, to an extent, being attracted to the game. Such evidence is in keeping with the material gathered in relation to the composition of crowds generally in this period. It is, however, largely of an anecdotal nature. Even combined with photographic material it has to be noted that such evidence provides only a limited insight into the overall social composition of the crowd and the nuances of particular groups within it.

Those tendencies which can be identified, relative to the previous period and within these decades, are best briefly summarised before particular cases are cited to substantiate the analysis. Anecdotal evidence drawn from the columns written by the sports writers of the Leicester Mercury indicates a possibly growing number of women attending matches. Photographic evidence, while again limited in scope, also bears out the presence of women. Secondly, the crowd during this period appears to be marked by a greater degree of social mixture. In this regard, the analysis relates to both the overall composition of the crowd and, those congregated in particular areas of the ground. Thirdly, several references are made in the Leicester Mercury to the need for provision to be made for juveniles - most notably, that they should be provided with their own enclosure - this may perhaps be indicative of growing age-differentiation in the crowd. Fourthly, while the analysis of patterns of spectating during this period reveals expressions of intense loyalty, partisanship and "excitement" by the Leicester crowd, the perception of spectators was, relatively, not as clouded by feelings of anxiety as was the case with commentaries of the 1890's and as was to become the case in the 1960's.

Within the context of reports of misconduct by spectators, however, evidence concerning the social composition of the groups involved is even more sparse than for the preceding period. What does not appear, at least
in this case study, and what did appear in the study of Birmingham and Leicester newspaper reports of the 1890's, are references to "rougs" and "blackguards." As noted earlier, Pearson observes how the Victorians employed the metaphor of the "sewer" to describe what they termed the "dangerous classes" during the period when the "blackguards" have been shown here to have caught the "football fever," but no such metaphors have emerged in the study of Leicester newspaper reports between the wars. While the absence of such labels and metaphors may reflect nothing more than changes in language fashions and/or in the style of reporting, the overall tenor of reports in the inter-war years does appear to be less fraught with the anxiety which permeated accounts in the late Victorian and Edwardian decades.

With reference to Leicester City FC, there are a number of interwoven developments which may account for this. Firstly, it may be possible that the "rouger" sections of the working class did not attend matches as frequently and/or in such numbers as they did in the 1890's and early 1900's. Such a possibility has to be coupled with an understanding that, during this period, the "respectable" sections of the working class may have become more "respectable", more "civilised" and that, though the "rough" working class may have undergone a similar process, it was not, relative to the "respectables," of the same nature and extent.

Photographs of the period, as noted, reveal the presence of women at matches: these illustrate that women travelled in groups to matches, significantly, not accompanied by males. A problem of interpretation remains, however, in tracing the social class of such women - certainly the clothes they wore presented a respectable appearance, but dress can be as misleading as it can be revealing! General comments on women spectators, however, may assist in establishing an overall impression. Here is an account from 1923:
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"...So now at elections, at football matches, at race meetings, once women start to take an interest they are completely carried away by excitement.

It indicates a great enthusiasm when people will stand for half an hour to witness a match, but when a woman will stand (as they do) for unlimited time with the rain pelting down upon her pretty clothes, ruining her hat and her comfort, it shows an interest amounting almost to heroism...." 65

A more direct reference to the number of women - and, just as significantly, of juveniles - attending is found in a report of a match in 1922:

"A number of enthusiastic juveniles had actually taken up their stand outside the ground by ten o'clock this morning, and their anxiety to obtain the best points of vantage was not quelled by the subsequent show. At twelve o'clock the great onslaught began.

From that time until well after the kick-off there was a never-ending stream of people, including a good sprinkling of ladies. Quite a number of women in fact, faced the Cup-tie crush without even a male escort. If Leicester is any criterion, then the lure of the English Cup is rapidly infecting the female mind." 66

Interestingly, the writer refers to women attending without "a male escort" and suggests that this phenomenon may have been a general tendency. This should not be surprising as far as Leicester is concerned, the town largely because of the hosiery industry, is reported to have had a considerable surplus of women for a long time. Certainly, as argued, the presence of woman in the crowd throughout this period is borne out by photographic evidence, but, as with other aspects of spectating, precious little direct evidence remains in written form regarding the number, social origins and perceptions of the game of women during this period.

The social mix of any football crowd involves, as argued earlier, a two-fold dimension. There is, firstly, the overall composition of the crowd and secondly, the composition of spectators occupying particular parts of a ground. Differentially priced admission to areas is partly indicative of the latter, but such an analysis is reinforced by a review of photographs.

65 Leicester Mercury 5th November 1923.
66 Leicester Daily Mercury 7th January 1922.
67 Leicester Mercury 26th December 1936; 17th April 1937; 7th January 1939.
of this period. The males highlighted in such photographs appear to include a broad social mix. Nevertheless, the overriding impression is of the "respectability" of those photographed. This is borne out by the fact that, of the "Bob-siders" who were photographed, the majority, though wearing cloth caps were also dressed in collars and ties. In addition, there were groups of males who, by their "up-market" attire, clearly enjoyed a greater income and exuded an air of respectability.

Regarding travel to away matches, comment is again limited by the sparseness of direct evidence. Certainly cup and local derby matches attracted large numbers of supporters - one game in January 1923 prompted up to 10,000 to travel. Numerous references exist to "extraordinary scenes" being witnessed by the influx of visiting supporters into Leicester and by Leicester fans travelling to away games. Travel was by road and rail, with the London and North Eastern Railway and the Midland Railway laying on train excursions. On none of these occasions, however, are there any reported cases of misconduct between supporters of rival teams.

The crowd, as argued, also included numbers of boys, though, as yet, no reference or photographic evidence has been encountered regarding the attendance of young girls at matches. With the growth in attendances at Leicester City's matches, letters to the editor of the Leicester Mercury began to appeal for provision to be made with regard to juveniles. Two cases, one from 1924, the other from 1925, will suffice as evidence in this regard:

"Juveniles at Filbert Street.

I should like to call the City directors attention to the fact that nothing has yet been done in the direction of a special enclosure or space for boys. A four-foot rail from the front of the popular side would meet the case. I should like to see three or four St. John's men in attendance at every Second Division match and two at the reserve matches. There have been several juvenile supporters injured recently.

Playing The Game." 71

68 Leicester Mercury 8th September 1924; 29th September 1924; 12th January 1929; 2nd February 1929; 23rd February 1929; 18th January 1926; 26th December 1936; 17th April 1937; 7th January 1939.

69 Leicester Daily Mercury 27th January 1923.

70 Leicester Mercury 14th January 1928; 17th April 1937; 9th January 1926.

71 Leicester Mercury 16th September 1924.
"...Half an hour before the kick-off 25,000 people were inside the ground, and the turnstiles were still clicking. Some of the crowd were allowed over the rails, preference being given to boys. There was no encroachment on the touch-line...." 72

In these cases, both formal pleas for special provision for boys and some of the informal measures taken in this regard are evident. Again, however, one cannot be sure of the exact relationship between adults and young supporters but, from such anecdotal and photographic evidence, it is apparent that, to some degree, young supporters did group together on the terraces. In other words, some form of autonomy from direct adult supervision may have existed. In addition, it seems reasonable to deduce that, pace Clarke, many young boys in this period went to matches on their own, for as was documented earlier, it was noted in a match report in 1922, that 'a number of enthusiastic juveniles had taken up their stand outside the ground by ten o'clock in the morning.' Such observations thus call into question the analysis presented by Clarke in regard to the relationship of fathers and sons attending matches in the period between the wars. 73 The complex nature of the phenomenon, in short, does not lend itself to the bland speculative assessments prevalent in much of the literature.

In relation to the social composition of the crowd, an impression of growing "respectability" has been established. But is such an impression borne out by the overall perception by observers of and commentators on spectators in Leicester? One indication of this, and which links to patterns of spectator behaviour, is drawn from 1929. Noting the influence of supporters' clubs, the Leicester Mercury cited a tribute to Leicester spectators sent by the Chairman and Secretary of the Hull City supporters' club:

"Tribute to Le-ster Football 'Fans.'
Amenable and Sportsmen.

We desire to pay a tribute to the splendid sporting spirit of the supporters of the Leicester City team who journeyed to Hull on Saturday last.

72 Leicester Mercury 21st February 1929
The members of our club who acted as stewards and assisted in packing the crowd, speak in terms of the highest praise of the manner in which their task was made lighter and more congenial by the uncomplaining co-operation of the visitors from your city.

Apart from the experience of our members, one hears on all sides highly complimentary expressions regarding them, and, perhaps, the general opinion is best expressed by saying that in their partisanship they did not forget their sportsmanship.

In conclusion we would assure the supporters of Leicester City a hearty welcome whenever they may find it convenient to visit us again.

Hull City Supporters’ Club 74
V. C. Adkins, Chairman, A. E. Benson (Hon. Secretary)

Such comments may be indicative of the 'respectable' nature of Leicester City supporters. They are also, probably, indicative of the fact that the supporters of other clubs were not so "nice" - otherwise, why write such a letter? The Millwall case study\(^7\) and the example of fighting between supporters of Clapton Orient and Queens Park Rangers in 1930,\(^6\) reveal the possible existence of regional variations in this regard. Nevertheless, a report of the behaviour of Brentford supporters in 1936 echoed the sentiments expressed regarding Leicester fans eleven years previously:

"Strictly Between The Fans.

The good fellowship too, was also evident among the fans. Brentford people proved themselves to be capable of hiding their feelings, and took defeat in the most sporting fashion. Many little groups, wearing the rival colours, were seen walking away together towards the city...." \(^7\)

In fact, this ability to, as the writer claims, "hide their feelings" may be indicative of a shift in the direction of greater self-control.

Further exemplification of the "respectable" character of crowds can be drawn from reports of two aspects of spectating - one a specific case, and the second, a more generalisable trend. Following the death of King George V

\(^7\) Leicester Mercury 25th February 1929.
\(^7\) Chapter Seven.
\(^7\) Chapter Four.
\(^7\) Leicester Mercury 13th January 1936.
in 1936, the Filbert Street crowd is reported as having reacted in sombre vein. The Leicester Mercury noted supporters weeping and the great sincerity of the crowd as a whole. Such emotions are indicative of a shared value system - the working class and middle-class spectators present appear to have respected George V as a person and as King. His importance and position were not questioned. In his death, there appears to have existed a common perception of the appropriate emotions to express: a consensus of respectability existed.

The second exemplification of this growing shift to respectability relates to the crowd's sense of safety consciousness. During this period, references are made to the difficulties involved in entering and leaving the ground when large attendances were witnessed. Indeed, during such matches, crowd spillage over the railings not infrequently occurred, and reports exist of members of the public climbing onto the roofs of the stands to gain a better vantage point. A report in 1923 highlighted such a trend:

"Spectators in the Ring.
All parts of the ground were packed. There were a number of reserve seats within the ring, and a large number of boys were also permitted over the rails. Some adventurous mortals clambered on to the roof of the "Spion Kop," and thus had an exceptionally good view." 80

But such occasions - particularly given the added fervour of the excitement created by cup and local derby matches - did not pass without attracting some criticism. The tendency for supporters to travel around the ground in order to watch the home forwards, for example, drew adverse comment which incorporated criticism of Leicester crowds in general:

"Sir, - I should like a few words in reply to "season." Seeing that he has brought up the question of a move of supporters of the City F.C., like lost sheep to a fresh rendezvous for the second half of play, possibly the matter is quite worth commenting upon. I have had the opportunity of seeing first and second division soccer on various grounds during the past two seasons, and take this opportunity

78 Leicester Mercury 25th January 1936.
79 Leicester Daily Mercury 3rd January 1922; 31st January 1922
80 Leicester Daily Mercury 3rd February 1923.
to ventilate my opinion as to the behaviour of the crowds on our local plot, Filbert Street. Of course, in a football crowd, like every other, there are exceptions, but from my experience, the crowds at Filbert Street are partial and inglorious, speaking generally. I was on the Fulham ground (Craven Cottage) on the occasion of the City's visit last week, and during the play you could hear a pin drop. When Leicester excelled they were encouraged to go one better by good honest applause, and the like I have seen on other grounds. Why not here?"

Yours Respectfully, 81

GRANDSTAND

In sum, it appears reasonable to conclude that in the inter-war years the tone of the criticism and the behaviour it was condemning were both qualitatively different from the criticism and behaviour reported in the decades prior to the First World War.

But what was it like to be one of the crowd? True, several more articulate members of the crowd wrote letters to the editor of the Leicester Mercury, but, in general, the majority have left no written legacy. A report from 1925, does, however, give some insight, albeit from a reporter's perspective:

"Spion Kop's Part in the Fight:
Crowd Electrified with Excitement.

"....We were perched on a vantage point on Spion Kop while below us and around us the vast crowd swayed and broke down in those devastating rushes that everyone forgets the moment the play begins. Beside me was a black and white ribboned supporter of Newcastle, but all around him were the blue and white of the City.

They whiled away the time by rough jokes about the City going to Hull, and ribaldry at the expense of the solitary defender of Newcastle faith near us. He - wise fellow - took it all in good part. But we had not much longer to indulge in joking. Suddenly there was a stir around the dressing-room entrance, the Press photographers ran to their cameras, somebody ran out with excitement in his actions. There was a shrill cheer from a boy peering over the railings into the dressing rooms, and then the ground was a cheering, hatless chaos of enthusiasm...

The preliminaries were soon over, just three figures in the centre and the toss of a coin. The teams separated, and there was silence as the first whistle went and the ball was sent away from the centre mark. The fight was on. Men forgot the train journeys and the sacrifices they had made, the discomfort, and the long hours they had put in to attend the match.

81 Leicester Daily Mercury 9th September 1921.
Women forgot that they had worked late the night before to ensure that their housework was finished in order for them to be early at the match. They lived for the moment only. Every movement was watched as if it was the most important incident in the game. Every attack was a possible goal-getter every save was an escape from what must have been a certain score.  

Interestingly, reference is made here to the "wise fellow" who supported Newcastle and who had refrained from reacting to the "ribaldry" of the Leicester supporters surrounding him. It is possible that, at other grounds at different times, the reactions of the spectators would have been different. The report also suggests, however, that a degree of informal segregation of opposing supporter groups may have been the norm. Such insights, however, are as tantalising as they are revealing. The writer does, nevertheless, draw attention to a facet of the crowd's behaviour which could be incorporated into the analyses offered by Elias and Dunning, and Dunning and Murphy - namely, that the crowd 'lived for the moment' - a sense of the crowd's behaviour being dominated by affect appears implicit in the writer's descriptions of the crowd's reactions to the ebb and flow of the hard-fought and exciting game.

More general expressions of favour were often directed towards the Leicester crowd. In a report to a local Referees' Association in 1923, the Secretary/Manager of Leicester City, Mr. Hodge noted: '.....the Leicester crowd was as good as any he had come across anywhere in its readiness to see the good things in the play of both sides and its general appreciation of the finer points of the game.'

While, of course, from this source the comments may have been a public relations exercise, what of the perception of football spectators in general? In an article by "Albion" in 1923 - "Albion" was a pseudonym used by a writer on the staff of the Leicester Mercury - the psychology and partisan-

82 Leicester Mercury 5th February 1929.
83 Leicester Daily Mercury 5th October 1923.
ship of the football crowd was characterised in the following way:

"Psychology of the Crowd: Football Partisanship.

Roughly, I suppose, the people of Leicester, as of any big industrial centre, may be divided into two classes. There are those who interest themselves in football and those who don't. Each class pities the other.

It is urged against the football crowds - those grim congregations of men and women who have the Saturday afternoon habit of moving in certain well-defined directions - that their outlook on the game is purely partisan, and that they have little use for a beaten side.

But it is not the whole truth. And only a cynic would seek to make much of circumstances so fundamentally human.

Football, of course, is essentially an affair of partisanship. Crowds are transparently honest about it. You know where you stand. Actually they are less formidable than they look. In the bulk - perhaps a rather fearsome, awe-inspiring lot, hasty, and sometimes embittered in judgement, and thoroughly uncompromising. But individually - a most delightful and sport-loving people.

Question any one of them and you will find that he subscribes heartily to all the best standards of sportsmanship. He may even overdo the thing, and express the pious hope that the better team, not necessarily his own, may win - surely one of the prettiest little hypocrisies of the time.

Every crowd, I ought to mention, is, on its own authority, the most sporting crowd in the world. No harm is done by conceding this wherever you go, for I find them all very much alike, and, with scarcely a reservation, I like them all. Away from home they are not very keen to see Leicester win, but one can always reflect that corresponding emotions have been known to sway the multitude at Filbert Street and Welford Road......

This weekly exercise of varied emotions has surely something to commend it. Again, what of the keen critical faculty inspired and developed by football! A 30,000 "gate" represents 30,000 critics, all of whom know what they are talking about. Perhaps that fact presents club directors and committees with their most perplexing problem." 84

Significantly, the writer maintains he has "scarcely no reservations" concerning football crowds. The criticism of "partisanship" so prevalent in articles and newspaper columns of the 1890's is not evident in this passage. 85 Indeed, "Albion" believes such partisanship is essential to the game. It is possible to speculate that football and its associated values, had, by the 1920's, become institutionalised to a greater extent than it was in its emergent form decades earlier and that this accounts for the trans-

84 Leicester Daily Mercury 1st November 1923.
85 See Chapter Five.
formation which was occurring both in behaviour and reporting.

The benefits attributed to football spectating also appear to be cited in preference to the damaging connotations attached to spectating in the 1890's and early 1900's. A sense of community, "Albion" appears to be arguing, could be established in football crowds. Take the following article written by "Albion" in 1925:

"....Only a soccer crowd can cheer like that. At first it was a polite soccer crowd, a little self-conscious at hearing its voice bounded by walls and a roof. Then it forgot everything but the man on the platform. It forgot everything except that now was the chance to combine all the cheers of the season into one....

Sporting Democracy.

In the crowd the shoehand sat next to the solicitor, and the miner next to the magnate...." 86

Despite this appraisal of a football crowd during the period between the wars - one in which the notion of "respectability" gains greater credence - the game could engender moments of "fervid excitement" and be the setting for misconduct in different forms. No analysis of the patterns of spectator behaviour in those years would be complete if attention was not given to these aspects.

Local derby games and cup-tie matches, as noted, attracted large numbers of spectators in support of the opposing teams. Reports of these matches, while containing no reference to fighting between rival spectators - at least in Leicester - do refer to the "fervid excitement" surrounding this type of game. 87 This is, as argued, worthy of further investigation. A report typical of this genre dealt with a local derby between Nottingham Forest and Leicester City in 1921:

"The official excursion trains from Leicester were all crowded to excess, and many supporters travelled by road. It must be the biggest football exodus from Leicester for many years. The greatest excitement prevailed amongst the rival sections before the players took the field, cheers and counter-cheers often drowning the effect of the band...." 88

86 Leicester Mercury 9th May 1925
87 Leicester Daily Mercury 17th October 1921.
88 Leicester Daily Mercury 15th October 1921.
Though no reference is made to disorder, the impression gained runs
counter to the docile, passive caricature painted by Grayson \(^{89}\) and Lacey \(^{90}\)
of soccer crowds during the 1920's and 1930's. Indeed, it appears that
such excitement and enthusiasm were actively encouraged. Take the
following letter. It was written to the *Mercury* in May 1925:

"Hats off to the 'Blues.' I hope the City 'Fans' will make
Saturday a red letter day and show their gratitude to the players
and club on gaining promotion.

Remember the reception the Fosse had 17 years ago, and don't
forget to make yourselves known and heard. We are told we were too
modest. Remember the trips we have had to Nottingham and the
receptions we have given the City. Here's hoping for a big noise
and the championship.

J. Johnson. \(^{91}\)

Travel to FA Cup games away from Filbert Street was also the occasion
for the expression of excitement. \(^{92}\) Home ties witnessed pitch invasions
following victory by the Leicester team, but, again, no reference is made
to misconduct such as fighting between spectators of opposing teams.
Unlike the 1960's and 1970's, it appears that such demonstrations of
"loyalty" to and enthusiasm for the club were greeted with expressions of
favour, not anxiety for their control. Typical of this phenomenon is a
case drawn from 1921, which again emphasises the feelings engendered by
'local derby' matches:

"Leicester and Nottingham had therefore something very much like
a "Cup-Final" on their own. Fervid demonstrations of club loyalty
from the massed enthusiasts created a thoroughly dramatic setting,
and the game itself, contested with an impressively grim earnestness
was well qualified to intensify the excitement." \(^{93}\)

Such exhibitions of loyalty also brought accompanying problems - due,
in part, to the very size of the crowds attending. Injuries to spectators
arose, largely as a result of crushing and crowd falls. It was mainly the

---

89 Grayson, "We Must Beat the Hooligan" p. 28.
91 Leicester Mercury 1st May 1925.
92 Leicester Mercury 7th March 1925.
93 Leicester Daily Mercury 17th October 1921.
dangers that arose from this source that led to the perceived need to provide separate accommodation for juveniles in the crowd. Some supporters, in fact, went to great lengths to counter the swaying multitude on the 'Popular' side at Filbert Street. Here is an account from 1936:

"Making Sure of a View.

'Mr. Bob-Sider' at Filbert Street - as I think almost everybody knows - takes his football very seriously. His devices too, for getting a good view of the game - and security on big crowd days while doing so - give great scope to an inventive mind.

I am told it would, in fact, be most enlightening to many people who are accustomed to one regular point of view to take a holiday some Saturday afternoon on the bob side.

A leather belt and the railings is an excellent means for making a point of vantage secure. This reminder of the early days of the suffragette movement does not make the subject attached to the railings look so helpless as then....."  

Despite the need for such precautions, the overriding impression gained is that the football crowd was more respectable relative to previous periods and also less marked by serious outbursts of disorder. This is not to suggest that no misconduct occurred - as argued, 'incidents' did take place at Filbert Street. In concluding this section on patterns of spectator behaviour in the inter-war years, it is appropriate to consider such misconduct in some detail.

In keeping with the overall impression of spectator misconduct in England during the 1920's and 1930's presented earlier, the ground of Leicester City in that period witnessed disorder of a "less serious" nature - relative to the Victorian and Edwardian decades and to the disorder of the 1960's and 1970's. One important point has, however, to be made in this connection. Repeatedly, it has been stressed that regional variations may have existed regarding the nature and extent of spectator misconduct. In other words, the Leicester crowd may not, in all respects, have been typical. Indeed, Millwall

94 See Leicester Mercury 29th March 1937; 18th April 1938.
95 Leicester Mercury 25th March 1936.
provides a case study which will lend weight to this suggestion. 96

During this period, numerous calls were made by individual supporters, club officials, and reporters of the *Leicester Mercury* for the spectators at Filbert Street to refrain from "barracking." This was the most prominent reported form of spectator misconduct during this period. A few examples will suffice to give an impression of this form of spectator misconduct and of how it was perceived by particular writers and supporters. According to "Albion," writing in 1922:

"...I am told that there is still reason to complain of the behaviour of a few people in the crowd, who were periodically shouting gibes at one of the home players. If there is a repetition of this conduct, the club officials will, I am assured take practical steps to prove to the offenders that their room is preferred to their company." 97

The existence of a more general form of barracking is indicated in the following letter written to the editor of the *Leicester Mercury* in February 1927:

"Barracking at Filbert Street.

Sir, It is quite time the Leicester City directors took drastic steps over the question of the barracking of players. I happen to know that Waterston's life was made absolutely miserable while in Leicester, owing to this senseless action by a section of the crowd, yet in Scotland he is doing excellent service.

Lowe was the chosen one on Saturday, and whether his play satisfied the crowd or not, this barracking of a player who is unable to retaliate is both unsportsmanlike and despicable.

The guilty ones are undoubtedly those who have never taken an active part in sport, and therefore do not know how difficult it is sometimes to satisfy even themselves. It is to be hoped this will catch the eye of those concerned, and that, if in the future they feel they cannot restrain themselves, they will keep away from a football ground altogether.

True Sport." 98

Two aspects of these writers' observations deserve attention. It is possible, as will be argued, that sections of the working class and lower middle class both restrained themselves to a greater extent than they had previously done and that the "rough" sections of the working class largely

96 See Chapter Seven.
97 *Leicester Daily Mercury*, 30th October 1922.
98 *Leicester Mercury*, 28th February 1927.
stayed away from football grounds during this period. This may possibly, in part, explain the relative lack of "serious" misconduct at Filbert Street during the 1920's and 1930's. Secondly, the criticism of the "unsportsmanlike" attitude of spectators found in most accounts of barracking, was coupled with proposals to alleviate the situation. An example drawn from 1937 illustrates this tendency:

"In the Barrackers' Camp.

......I am unable to suggest any remedy other than removal, but this I do not suppose is practicable. Therefore, I would suggest to any such individuals, until they can watch without losing all control, to stay away so that the sportsmanship of Leicester may not be placed in doubt." 99

How can the present analysis interpret such comments? It is possible to suggest that they are underpinned by a shift in the ability of sections of the community to control their emotions - a "civilising" shift, in which these people grew increasingly sensitive to the behaviour of other groups. What appears to have happened in this period was the emergence of a stricter separation between player and spectator roles, with the latter being increasingly defined as passive observers who ought not, by their behaviour, to interfere in any way with the spectacle going on before them. The exhibition of "excited" behaviour or the barracking of particular players appear to have been the aspects of spectator behaviour which created the most anxiety. With the switch towards passive spectating, such behaviour was deemed more inappropriate. Unfortunately, little evidence remains concerning the formal and informal policies adopted by the club and the FA towards upholding particular standards of "sportsmanship" and thus insights into this complex issue remain somewhat limited.

Indeed, as with the account of the overall composition of the crowd, problems emerge in attempting to establish who was involved in barracking in these years. Anecdotal evidence, however, provides some insights. In

99 Leicester Mercury 10th March 1937.
one particular case, schoolboys were held to be responsible. Generally, however, it was deemed to be the "Bob-Siders." This was suggested in a report written in 1937:

"Barrackers Do No Good.

....I often wonder if those demonstrative spectators stop to realise the harm they might do to a player by their persistent attentions. A man who "pays his bob" is, of course, entitled to call some tune. But this can hardly be helping his own enjoyment by upsetting a player and thereby preventing him from giving of his best.

Many well-known names could be mentioned of players who simply could not do the right thing with one club and touched the high spots with another. The difference can often be traced to the barracker." 101

"Barracking," however, was not the only form of spectator misconduct reported in this period. One overall comment can be made in relation to the reported gate-crashing and pitch encroachments that occurred, namely that the club officials and the police simply had not evolved sufficiently the techniques which were necessary to manage large crowds, and sections of the Leicester supporters realised this. A report in the Leicester Mercury in 1925 highlights aspects of what went on in this regard:

"Barrier Broken Down.

Before the kick-off it was necessary to close the gates. So great was the pressure made that a portion of the palisading in the bend between the enclosure and Spion Kop was broken down, and despite the efforts of the police, one of whom was mounted, several hundreds of people rushed through to take up positions around the touch line.

A few brave spirits climbed to the roof of Spion Kop and outside the ground several men viewed the arena from roof-tops...." 102

A more dramatic account which incorporates 'gate-crashing,' pitch encroachments and the general inability of the police and club to control the spectators is drawn from the report of a cup-tie in 1928 which engendered the kind of intense excitement elaborated on before:

"Amazing Scenes at Leicester's Cup-Tie.

Crowd Rushes Gate to Directors' Stand: Many People Faint: Mounted Police Called.

....Over an hour before the kick-off the ground was packed to its

100 Leicester Mercury 24th March 1928; 27th April 1928.
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utmost capacity, and there were still thousands of people waiting outside. Many people in the cheapest parts of the ground fainted and were attended by ambulance men. Mounted police had to be called to keep the crowd back from the touch-lines.

At 2.15 the entrance to the directors' stand was rushed. The police were powerless to deal with the crowd, and hundreds gained free admittance. Some men and boys climbed up telegraph poles near the stand, and actually jumped across on to the roof, where they had a good view of the match. 103

If this inability to control large attendances indicates the stage of sophistication in crowd management which had been reached, such a phenomenon has implications for Vamplew's analysis. His conclusions regarding the effectiveness of the crowd control measures which, he suggests were undertaken during the 1880's and 1890's must, as suggested earlier, be treated with a degree of caution. At Filbert Street, even during the inter-war years, measures to prevent pitch encroachments - railings and wooden barriers, for example - appear either not to have been introduced or to have been inadequately constructed.

But the analysis must also consider the motives of those involved in crowd disorders in this period. Consideration of the reported forms of disorder may reveal some aspects of this. No reports of direct clashes between rival supporters at Filbert Street or on other grounds appear in the Leicester Mercury, and even in cases where sections of the crowd engaged in "gate-crashing" or encroaching onto the pitch, no reference is made to fights between rival supporters or between spectators and the police. The latter, too, are seen as 'powerless to intervene' - especially at local derby and cup matches in which intense excitement, as noted, is exhibited by large crowds of partisan supporters.

Before analysis is given to the general trend evident within this period, it is necessary to refer to the more serious cases of disorder which did occur. In 1937, for example, a fight between two Leicester spectators took

103 Leicester Mercury 18th February 1928.
place at a match at Filbert Street. The fight was reported in the following way:

"Spectator's Nose Broken at City Match. Two Supporters in a Scene.

Discord at a Leicester City football match, when a spectator's nose was broken by a fellow supporter of the City, was described at Leicester Police Court today.

Leonard Mawby (18), labourer, 18 Denmark Road, Leicester, pleaded guilty to assaulting Harold Day, of 67 Havencrest Drive, and was fined £2.

Day said that he was attending the Leicester City v Burnley football match on Saturday, March 13th and Mawby was standing behind him.

Mawby, he said, had rather a lot to say, and witness turned to him and told him not to say such silly things. Mawby then said "What's the matter? Do you want a fight?"

Criticising the Match.

Mawby then gave him a push in the middle of the back and knocked him forward.

"I turned round and asked him what the game was, and he hit me and broke my nose," said witness.

Day, who appeared with his nose in plaster, said that he had to go to the Royal Infirmary.

Mawby and himself were both supporters of the City.

Mawby: I got criticising the match.

The Clerk: Still there was no justification for assaulting this man.

Mawby: He turned round and told me to shut my mouth. He had been a nuisance all the afternoon and used obscene language.

Day denied this.

Mr. A. Lorrimer (Chairman) Mawby: If you can't keep your temper you had better keep away from football. It is a contemptible thing on your part to go and break a fellow's nose when you are both on the same side." 104

While it might be stretching a point to say so, the Chairman's concluding remark literally implies that it would not have been regarded as contemptible to break an opposing fan's nose! This, in its turn, might indicate a tendency to under report inter-fan group disorder, i.e. that the degree of localism/provincialism or "in-group" identification of Leicester people was then so great that it was regarded as legitimate to break out of the play-
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fight mode into the real-fight mode as far as rival supporters were concerned.

Serious disorder, however, was not confined to the ground. In 1930, for example, Leicester supporters were involved in a scene on a train travelling to Birmingham - a window was smashed and one supporter clashed with other passengers.105 This sort of clash was highly probable where a group, travelling in festive mood, especially when alcohol is consumed, meets people who are not travelling as part of a group and who are not in festive mood. Under such circumstances, at the very least, the behaviour of the former is likely to be perceived as intrusive by the latter. Fight's seem likely when, e.g. one or more of the non-festive individuals attempts to intervene, perhaps especially if he makes derogatory remarks about the team supported by the travelling fans.

A more serious incident was reported on a train in 1934. The Leicester Mercury described it in the following way:

"Everything had gone smoothly from the time of the departure at New Street and it was feared that something extraordinary had happened to cause the train to pull up in such a manner only 300 or 400 yards from its destination. After a thorough search of all the coaches, it was found that the communication cord had been pulled. It is understood that the railway representatives questioned a number of people regarding the matter.

From other sources, it was ascertained that the hooligan element sometimes found on the trips had caused not a little damage to the rolling stock, some of it almost new. Windows were smashed, seats cut and torn and the leather window straps slashed with knives." 106

In this account, it is important to observe that the writer stresses that it was ascertained that "the hooligan element sometimes found on the trips had caused not a little damage," which suggests that "roughs" may sometimes have attended matches, i.e. it was, for them, an occasional affair. Thus, while the analysis is here dealing with a specific example, a more generalised
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phenomenon appears to have existed. Crucially, however, such a phenomenon was not evident in the general coverage provided by the Leicester Mercury in the years between the wars.

While these examples point to more subterranean features of football crowd disorder at Leicester in this period, consideration of the more general pattern of spectator behaviour which was evident between the wars requires attention. While the analysis so far presented has suggested that a trend towards "respectability" is evident, relative to the late Victorian and Edwardian decades, the process of "colonisation" which occurred in the 1920's and 1930's also requires documentation. Take the following example of a letter to the editor which appeared in the Leicester Daily Mercury in 1922:

"Sportsmanship.

Sir, - As a visitor to your town for a short period, I am taking the liberty of addressing you on the above, in my humble opinion, all-important matter. During my visit I have been to the football matches and the various well-arranged boxing tournaments, but was greatly disappointed on each occasion to see the lack of sportsmanship shown by the Leicester crowd...." 107

Significantly, spectator misconduct at football and boxing were linked in the writer's mind - indeed, boxing matches appear to have been, as will be documented in examining working class leisure in general, relative to football games, the venues of more serious outbursts of spectator misconduct in Leicester during this period. Thus, as the period following the end of the First World War begins, criticism of spectators and the "Leicester crowd" is made in quite general terms. A further clue to the perception of the crowd during the early 1920's may be found in a letter written to the editor of the Leicester Mercury in 1925 in which the writer believed it necessary to note that:

107 Leicester Daily Mercury 1st March 1922.
"...The police had little to complain of in the way of rowdyism, and their only job was to prevent would-be spectators from scaling the wall. The disappointed ones took it all in good humour, but were reluctant to leave the locality...." 108

The reference here to rowdyism is, of course, indicative of its occurrence earlier and perhaps elsewhere. In this particular example, a gate of 36,000 was reported for the match in question - between Leicester City and Tottenham Hotspur - and, although the report describes a crowd that was orderly in most respects, it is evident that there was, at that time, an expectation that spectator "rowdyism" could accompany such events. A letter written to the editor in 1926, suggests that such an expectation still persisted at that time:

"Tribute to Leicester Fans.

Why all this grumbling about yelling crowds at football matches? I attended the match at Filbert Street on Monday and was very much struck by the splendid behaviour of the crowd.

We were packed like sardines in the 1s enclosure, the heat was terrific, and many could hardly see; but in all that vast crowd I never saw a single instance of loss of temper or rowdy behaviour." 109

Anti-Grouser.

Some weeks later, one of the few pieces of photographic evidence relating to spectator misconduct emerges with the referee, accompanied by a police officer, warning the crowd concerning their barracking.110 Even at this stage, however, tributes to Leicester supporters concerning their sportsmanship were made without reference to any misconduct. Such sentiments were, as noted, expressed in a period which straddled the late 1920's and early 1930's.111

The dominant perception, at least that held by the Leicester Mercury during this period, is best exemplified in an editorial commenting on crowd behaviour in general:
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"When the Crowd Demonstrates.

The attack on the behaviour of large football crowds which has appeared in the Liverpool Diocesan Review will no doubt displease many people who assist at these great weekly gatherings in order to share in the excitement that they offer. The criticism of the Review writer, whose views, we are told, are shared by the Bishop of Liverpool, is directed against spectators whose language oversteps the mark and against those who jeer and boo the referee or the players of the other side.

It is agreed that the noise that is made at a football ground is often very noisy indeed and that the dislike of some of the crowd in respect of the referee and certain of the players is indicated with no sense of refinement. There is quite frankly a great parade of partisanship, and feelings run so high that there is little restraint.

All football authorities desire to keep these demonstrations within proper bounds, and with very few exceptions the individuals who make up these huge crowds are just as jealous of their reputations. But partisanship is an essential part of the game. And partisanship will out. Let it be conceded that the bark of the football fan is a great deal worse than his bite and we may regard his excessive enthusiasm with tolerance as a not unhealthy manifestation of a deep interest. Football crowds, like a great many other people, are probably no so bad when you know them." 112

Two aspects of this editorial are crucial with regard to understanding the trends in patterns of spectating evident in this period. Firstly, reference is made to the fact that spectators showed "little restraint" and their "feelings run high" - a "great parade of partisanship" is witnessed. The writer thus tends to reinforce the analysis already presented. Crucially, however, he also notes that this "partisanship is an essential part of the game." Thus it can be argued that, while the crowd exhibited varying ability to control their emotions at this stage in the development of football as a spectator sport, such partisanship was not perceived as constituting a social problem. It was, as the editorial concluded, "a not unhealthy manifestation of a deep interest."

In concluding this section, the analysis must seek to explain the twin interwoven themes evident in this period: namely, the occurrence of an overall shift towards "respectability" and the episodes of misconduct which
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continued to surface from time to time. In fact, the shift to respectability contains four main elements. Firstly, the changing social composition of the crowd indicates that it was people from the respectable working class, who, by and large, composed the majority of those who attended matches. In this connection, however, as argued, it is important to note the periodic presence of members of the "rough" working class - such a presence, in fact, helped to explain, in part, the continuing episodes of misconduct. Secondly, while the misconduct cited continued throughout the period - as was documented for the country as a whole in Chapter Four - there was, in fact, a decline in the rate of reported disorder, relative to the preceding period. As has been repeatedly stated, this is not to suggest that no disorder occurred between the wars, nor that, at times such disorder was serious; it was. Even here, however, aspects of such misconduct can usually be explained with reference to the situations the spectators found themselves in. Exhibiting the partisanship welcomed by the club, such spectators, when faced by abnormally large crowds, must have been greatly tempted to "gate-crash," and pitch encroachments may well be explicable simply in terms of the weight of numbers. Despite the shift to respectability, however, the process was not "complete." Disorderly behaviour was still indulged in by some respectables - but even here the resort to barracking was a step away from the direct physical intervention which characterised the Victorian and Edwardian decades. Thus, even the forms of spectator misconduct can illustrate a shift to respectability and yet explain the most frequently reported types of disorder. Finally, as noted, there appears to have developed a greater sense of the need for safety measures - a safety consciousness was being developed, a trend which was reflected above all in the increased governmental attention paid to this area which has already been documented.
As argued, such patterns of spectator behaviour must also be considered in conjunction with an analysis of the relationship between the club and its supporters and of the connections between football, leisure and the working classes. Consideration of the relationship between the Leicester City club and its supporters will now be attempted.

2. The Relationship Between the Club and its Supporters

"......The club is, properly speaking, an institution of the town, and not a kind of private trading company, conducted at the whim of the few men who are at the moment immediately interested." 113

Such sentiments - they were expressed in 1923 - which express the view of a more articulate section of the supporters, appear as a persistent theme in reports of the activities of the Leicester City club during this period. More particularly, they suggest that a gulf - despite their growing "respectability" - between the supporters and those who controlled the club, the directors, existed. How sensitive this relationship was can be illustrated by the reaction of the club to a visit by Winston Churchill to Filbert Street in 1923. The directors denied that the visit was a subtle political move, evidently not wishing to exacerbate any strains in the relationship between themselves and the supporters.114

The letter from which an extract is cited above also alluded to the manner in which a small group of local businessmen controlled the club. During 1924, more forceful condemnation of the autocratic nature of the club was aired in the columns of the Leicester Mercury. The following letter appeared in the January of that year:

"City F.C's Future.

Perhaps when you get this letter some of the officials of the City FC will have written to the "Mercury." If so, I can only say they have been a long while about it. If not, are we to take it that they are to reply in deeds, not words? Still, sir, it does seem with what there has been of delay in some sort of answer or explanation or
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assurance, that at Filbert Street there is autocratic rule in the relationship of directorate and the spectators. Surely we supporters are entitled to some say in the government of the game that we support, and surely it is not asking too much that those in authority should answer the critics?

A Filbert. 115

What the comments of "A Filbert" show is that Leicester City directors were perceived, at least in some quarters, as being autocratic. Such a perception is hardly consistent with the notion of "participatory democracy," real or illusory, to which Ian Taylor refers and which he regards as central in explaining the alleged absence of football hooliganism in this period. 116

Further exemplification of the relationship between supporters and directors that existed between the wars can be found in another letter to the editor published in the same edition. A relevant extract from it reads:

"Of course, we are all coming to Filbert Street as usual on Saturday. That's why we write letters about our favourites' prospects. We are terribly interested in the game and its welfare in Leicester, though the City directors don't seem alive to the fact. They are a mystery. Like the old-fashioned alchemists, they veil themselves in mystery; it saves them the trouble of answering those who pay the piper for their stewardship. The players have to be in the limelight and we have some sort of human relationship with them. But apart from them, the President and the manager, we grope in the darkness of Sphinxlike mystery.

Roll Up Boys." 117

This description of the supporters as isolated from the club refers to Leicester City, but as will be shown later, similar feelings were expressed by Millwall supporters during this period. 118 At this stage, however, this particular supporter still felt that the "boys" still had "some sort of human relationship with [the players]" - by the 1960's and 1970's, with the formalisation of the passive spectator, this situation was to be less and less the case.

The perception of "autocratic" rule appears to have been heightened in periods of poor team performance. Numerous letters in the columns of
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the Leicester Mercury testify to this. Although this indirect channel of protest existed, more direct access to the controllers of the club was limited and, consequently, a number of supporters felt aggrieved. Here is an extract from a letter to the editor of the Leicester Mercury published on 17th January 1924:

"The Chairman of the Leicester City FC seems to have lost sight of the fact that the main support of a football team like ours is the "gate." I know they only pay their shillings but I think that in doing so they are entitled to air their views just as much as the directors...." 120

The position of the local newspaper in this connection appears somewhat ambiguous. Certainly by the mid-1930's, the Leicester Mercury was a tacit advocate of the need for the foundation of a supporters' club with closer links to the directors. But, in the early 1920's, its position was more ambivalent. Take the following example from the Leicester Mercury published in 1924:

"Know-All Grousers.

Happily the very violent criticism that flaunts itself in public places is not representative of the majority of a club's followers and directors safely ignore the feelings of people whose interest in a club is governed entirely by results and who have no use for a team that isn't winning most of the time.

It is good for a club that it be subjected to a reasonable criticism. Every one of the thousands in the crowd is a potential critic, and his views must count. The critic thoroughly disliked by reasonable men is he who "knows it all," disregards the difficulties that players and directors alike have to face, and who, above all, conveniently ignores the opposition team when things do not go according to plan - his plan...." 121

Reactions by the directors to such arguments are difficult to establish. No minutes of club meetings have survived. All that remains are the replies reported in the local press. For example, in an attack on critics of the directors' policies, the Chairman of Leicester City, Mr. Burrage, is reported
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in 1935 as having referred to:

"...the unfairness of the Press in its weekly criticism - an unfairness not so much from their own friends and followers as from outside writers, who, in his opinion, were unfair because they didn't know what they were writing about. That was quite evident to him and his colleagues on the Board, and he hoped it would be discontinued during next season." 122

Such remarks gained a hostile reception, and letters printed in the Leicester Mercury again emphasised the apparently unaccountable position the club directors enjoyed.123 However, it was not just the articulate and respectable supporters who were critical of this situation. In the report headed, "know-all-Grousers," cited earlier, reference was made to the "barrackers" on match days. The majority of them seem to have been "bob-siders," men and women who watched matches from the 'popular side.' In 1936, the Leicester Mercury described them thus: "The 'popular side,' by which is meant the great army of regular followers who pay their shilling to see the fun and are in consequence entitled to hold decided views...."124

The popular side, while possibly principally containing members of the working class who were not as articulate as the people who sat in the grandstand, may well have resented the autocratic rule exercised by the directors as much as those in the more expensive and comfortable sections of the ground. For them, the most obvious way of demonstrating their displeasure was either through "voting with their feet" or through the medium of barracking. An unresolved problem, therefore, is that of determining the extent to which cases of barracking were examples of spectators responding to particular incidents on the field, decisions of the club or to a general feeling that the relationship between the directors and the supporters was too autocratic. Whereas examples do exist, for example at the Stoke City ground in January 1930, of invasions of the pitch by a large section of the crowd to demon-
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strate to the directors their feelings concerning the team's poor performances, more usually, those who reported such incidents chose to cite either a particular incident in the game or the partisanship of the crowd in general as the cause of such outbursts. The possible existence of deeper motivations of the crowd was relatively neglected.

Such criticism by supporters had prompted calls for a Supporters' Fund and organisation as early as 1905. During the 1920's and 1930's, such ideas were resurrected. The call for a supporters' club arose, it appears, out of an antipathy perceived by sections of the supporters to be emanating from the directors. Two examples drawn from 1924 exemplify this:

"I have read with great interest the correspondence re. the City F.C., and I don't think we as supporters have had fair play. After supporting the team through good times and bad times we are told to mind our own affairs. I would remind Mr. Rice that a faithful following of supporters is quite as essential as a board of "competent" directors to a club...."

Supporter. 125

Whilst this letter referred to the general relationship between the directors and supporters, specific decisions could also prompt reaction:

".....Another grumble I consider might be looked into. At Nottingham for 52s 6d a reserve seat may be booked to see First Division football. At Leicester it requires three guineas to see Second Division football in a reserve seat. I would suggest a strong supporters' club, with a demand for two seats on the Board.

Disgusted Season Ticket Holder." 126

Throughout the 1920's and 1930's, there were repeated calls for the foundation of a supporters' club. The directors, it appears, remained, up until late in 1939, hostile to the idea. While the cause for such hostility remains unclear, it may well be that the directors perceived this supporters' club as a threat to their own rule of the club. In contrast, the press, as noted, increasingly gave tacit support to the idea. For example, it was argued in the Leicester Mercury in June 1939 that:

---

125 Leicester Mercury 18th January 1924.
126 Leicester Mercury 19th January 1924.
"Value of Supporters' Clubs.

To many football club directors supporters' clubs are anathema, but one cannot understand exactly why they should fear them - for fear appears to be at the bottom of their remarks when such organisations are mentioned in their hearing." 127

By the outbreak of the Second World War, an organisation had been established, but it was not until after hostilities had ceased that the Leicester City Supporters Club, despite the directors renewed antagonism, began to attract members in large numbers. 128

The perception of "autocratic rule" on the part of sections of Leicester supporters not only casts doubt on the empirical thesis presented by Taylor. It may also help to explain, in part, some forms of barracking in this period. Examination of this relationship has fruitfully exposed the relatively inadequate and idealised notions of Taylor and others regarding clubs and their supporters between the wars. As important, is the fact that such an analysis has assisted in gaining a more adequate understanding of the pattern of spectating evident in this period.

Despite the growing "respectability" of the crowd, the club directors still felt able to take decisions as sole arbiters of the club's finances and organisation. As noted, aspects of spectator behaviour may have been influenced by this. However, other themes also impinged upon the overall pattern of spectating, and an analysis of the relationship between these patterns and the perception of working class leisure must be made before an overall assessment of the phenomenon in Leicester between the wars can be adequately attempted.

3. Football and Working Class Leisure

Analysis of the columns of the Leicester Mercury during this period reveals three discernible themes which assist in locating the development of football as a spectator sport in this East-Midland city in its wider
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Figurational context. Attention will be drawn, firstly, to the strong remnant of the Temperance Movement found in Leicester during this period; secondly, to the relationship between sports - particularly football and horseracing - and betting; and thirdly, to the connotations attached to "workers" attending matches during this period. The analysis will conclude with a brief comparative appraisal of spectator sports in Leicester and an assessment of working class leisure in general.

During the nineteenth century, as noted in Chapter Three, the Temperance movement, coupled with other groups such as the "Rational Recreationalists," had formed the vanguard of an attack on the traditional forms of working class leisure. The influence of the Temperance and Sunday Observance Movements still remained relatively strong and pervasive in Leicester between the wars. A long drawn out controversy surrounded playing football on Sundays, but it is in relation to alcohol and spectators that the tensions within the community became most readily apparent. In Leicester, the issue of the provision of alcohol for the football supporters was considered within the context of the value of the club to the city as a whole. The *Leicester Mercury* observed in 1928 that:

"What Football Success Means to a City.

......Even if one does grant that football is allowed to take precedence over practically everything else these days, it is of great benefit in the town in which it thrives. There must have been a huge sum spent in Leicester on Saturday night, the town being invaded not only from neighbouring towns and villages, but by people from far afield....." 129

This comment was drawn from the match report of the quarter-final FA Cup-tie between Leicester City and Tottenham Hotspur. As noted earlier, 130 some of the crowd had "gate-crashed" their entry into the ground and mounted police had been called. The tie was won by Tottenham Hotspur and the FA decided to play a semi-final tie at Filbert Street. In the preparations  
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leading to this tie, perhaps with memories of the misconduct which occurred at the earlier match, the controversy surrounding drink and football emerged. Licensees applying for extensions to their opening hours were refused. The position of the Temperance Society was summed up by its Secretary, Mr. A. Lockwood in March 1928:

"If the licensees desire to supply refreshment in the way of tea, sandwiches, cakes, etc., there is nothing in the law to prevent them.

It seems a pity that with our advancing knowledge licensees should still be insisting on the right to supply alcoholic drinks if they are to cater for food supplies on this special occasion.

Football supporters follow football for the game, not for the drink, and any suggestion that when a great match is again staged in Leicester that supporters will not attend if extra drinking facilities are not granted, is pure bunkum." 132

Several letters were published in the Leicester Mercury in which criticism was voiced of the Magistrates’ decision. The newspaper’s own position appears to have been ambiguous. Recognising the need to regulate the provision of alcohol, it still felt it was necessary to provide some facilities. Other letters published in the newspaper, however, drew connections between football crowds, drink and rowdyism. Here is an example from 1928:

"Licensees and the Cup-Tie Visitors.

Sir, - Some of the women of Leicester feel grateful to the magistrates for their decision re. the "extra hour" applied for on Saturday next.

The scenes witnessed on London Road at 10 o’clock on the occasion of the Bank Contest were degrading to our city.

By all means popularise Leicester, but not as a drinking centre. Some are glad that "grandmotherly" edicts endeavour to keep our city sober and respectable always. Some of those who write in praise of drink forget that "when drink is in, wit is out."

It is a well-known fact that matches are not won on beer. So surely spectators can do without and have the cup that cheers.

If licensees are so anxious to supply the public let them provide
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good tea and eatables which many would consider "reasonable refreshment." The only thing they seem to think about is intoxicating drink.

A Mere Woman." 134

Following the semi-final tie, such fears, it appears were reinforced:

"Cup-Tie Visitors.

Sir, - It is true that when the Magistrates declined to grant an extension of licenses for the semi-final I was rather indignant. I thought it was the height of inhospitality, but after being about the city a good deal on Saturday evening I am thankful that the Justices stood firm and refused to be hectored into a change of policy.

I am not a teetotaller but I believe in moderation. Whether some of our Cup-tie visitors were flushed with victory, or despondent because of defeat I cannot say, but I know from what I saw on Saturday evening that the Magistrates' decision was a wise one.

Not a Bigot." 135

No elaboration of what happened on that Saturday evening can be found in the columns of the Leicester Mercury. Clearly, however, some "scenes" involving working class males, possibly its youth, must have been witnessed and were deemed inappropriate by the writer. For the Temperance Movement - still sufficiently powerful to sway the decisions of the Leicester magistrates - working class football supporters remained in need of saving by their missionary zeal.

If, indeed, drink resurrected old shibboleths from nineteenth century attacks on working class leisure, the idea of betting on sport provoked equal condemnation in some quarters. Take the following example written in the Leicester Mercury in 1924:

"Football Betting Craze.
Leicester Police Find No Extension.

'Is betting on football increasing?' In some parts of the country there is no doubt that more money changes hands in this way than ever before, but in Leicester, according to police testimony, there has not been an appreciable extension of the practice.

At Huddersfield the Chief Constable reports that lately it had come to the knowledge of the police that there was growing in the town a system of distributing, by bookmaker's touts, football coupons at
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public houses, and he suggested a serious warning be given to licence-holders by the magistrates.

Not Easy to Trace.

No such warning has been found necessary in Leicester, but it is not denied that such ready money betting on football results takes place in the factories and other places. The police are not blind to the practice either, but it is not easy to trace offenders.

Betting on football, notwithstanding even the combined efforts of the police and Football Association, has now become something approaching a national institution.

Those who make a practice of betting on horse racing only rarely have anything to do with football betting, maintaining that the odds offered are absolutely ridiculous. Further, the average racing man says he has a natural objection to supporting "talking horses."

If it were left merely to the hard headed racing punters who have reduced betting to a fine art there would be very little betting on football as it exists nowadays." 136

It was perhaps fortunate for the FA and the police that those attracted to betting on horses - prominent among them were the "rouglier" sections of the working class - did not find football betting equally appealing.

Throughout the 1920's and 1930's, newspapers carried reports of Racecourse gang feuds in which fights, stabblings and shootings, sometimes resulting in murder, were reported to have taken place. 137 An example, taken from the columns of the Leicester Mercury in May 1925, can serve to illustrate this phenomenon:

"Five Men on Murder Charge After Wild Night. Terrible Street Fight by Rival Gangs."

In a street battle between rival gangs in Sheffield last night a man was killed and several wounded. A gang set out last night to avenge an attack upon one of their lot in a public house the previous night and waylaid a man who was not concerned in the quarrel.

They attacked him with weapons of all sorts and he put up a splendid fight against great odds but he was knocked down and fatally stabbed with a bayonet near his own doorstep. A free fight ensued.

Earlier in the evening a man was attacked by hooligans in another part of the city. Later the police made a round-up and arrested seven men." 138
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While there is no reference in the above example to the connection with racecourses, the link was more clearly established when the Leicester Mercury reported on the existence of a similar phenomenon in Leicester. Ten days after the previous report the newspaper reported on:

"Gang Feuds in Leicester. Police Out to Break Warring Factions."

The "Mercury" understands that the Leicester police are taking every possible step to break up the rival racing gangs in Leicester, whose feuds threaten to rival those of the rowdies in Sheffield.

The men who compose these two gangs are of the racing fraternity and besides engaging at bookmaking on courses within easy reach of Leicester, are leading the police a merry dance when they engage at "pencilling" in the streets.

The gangs operating in the heart of the city are the most dangerous type and many are believed to carry firearms, knuckle-dusters, and other weapons of attack.

'There is no doubt whatever,' declared a prominent police official today, 'that things are very bad at present, as an extraordinarily bitter feeling exists between the gangs.'

But what was the motivation for such "extraordinary bitter feeling?"

In this respect, Smithies, in his analysis of the period between the wars, writes:

"...During the 1920's and 1930's, a number of gangs vied for control of the race-tracks. They offered 'protection' to bookmakers and attempted to secure a proportion of the profits of the betting industry. Epsom and Ascot were the courses most affected, and gangs of some size were based in Leeds and Birmingham as well as London. There ought to have been sufficient 'loot' for all, but the gangs squandered a great deal of energy on internecine 'warfare': they seemed as anxious to demonstrate 'toughness' and 'daring' and thereby establish a claim to be 'boss of the turf' as to make money."

This demonstration of "toughness" and "daring" prompted alarm in some quarters. The Leicester Mercury wanted to "Exterminate these Gangs." Only the day before this announcement appeared in the Leicester Mercury, the newspaper, in its edition of 20th May 1925, reported the Deputy Chief Constable of Leicester as having stated that one of his policemen: "...was attacked by members of a certain gang in Wharf Street and I might add that...
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A sense of anxiety and fear is evident in this statement. In comparison, the criticism of football spectators appears quite mild. This may, in part, explain the perception of the relative "respectability" of the football crowds and the relatively "less serious" misconduct associated with it, compared to the gang feuds of the 'racing fraternity.' Different elements of the working class may possibly have attended particular sports during this period at greater or lesser rates. The analysis cannot be certain, however, given the sparseness of the evidence remaining, of how close a correspondence the clubs and the police saw between the potential threat of disorder resulting from betting on football and the actual disorder resulting from betting at racecourses. Specific cases do exist of disorder and betting being associated on football grounds during this period and extensive reference was made to one particular case in Chapters Four and Five. The analysis is forced to conclude, with this, as in other areas, that further research on particular facets treated in the present study would prove fruitful in shedding light on the character of popular culture during this period.

Analysis of the perception by the middle classes of football spectators as a whole was undertaken in examining patterns of spectator behaviour, but consideration of the position of football in the lives of those who attended matches and the concomitant connotations attributed to it must also be attempted. During the 1920's, for example, references are made to "Workers" willing to take half days off work or to do overtime in order to attend mid-week games. But such devotion to the game drew criticism. Writers such as Edwards and Ensor had drawn attention to the debilitating effects of spectating during the 1890's. During the 1920's, employers reacted

---
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in similar vein. But the reaction of the workers to such attempts at restricting their attendance was clear cut. In criticising a letter published in the Leicester Mercury, Ben Pertin argued in 1925:

"... 'Worker,' and others like him, must be taught that the people are not to be dragooned from one of their chief joys in life. They still have sufficient good sense left to recognise that in this football cup atmosphere there is the finest tonic the nation can have. At a football match there is among the crowd far more of the goodwill and kindliness and forbearance which people tell us about on Sunday than in church circles.

Indeed this criticism of football and those who like it has come to be snobbishness with certain invertebrates, whose honesty and sincerity is as sounding brass and who care no more for the real good of mankind than a cannibal who is only satisfied when he is 'fed up.'"  

Clearly those who did take time off work to watch football in this period were strongly criticised by some sections of the community in Leicester. Another letter to the editor of the Leicester Mercury again in 1925, confirms this:

"...Why should we be called hooligans for attending football matches? Perhaps this little gentleman is afraid that if he had the pluck to attend one of these 'hooligan shows' someone quite near might shout too loud, or perhaps even trample on his toes....."

City Supporter. 146

Similar letters echoed this writer's defence of football spectators. Take the following example written in March 1925:

"It is quite time 'Worker' woke up and realised that so far there have been two mid-week cup matches this year.

Where does the wholesale disorganisation come in? Let him also remember that football is the finest exhibition of skill and prowess in the world. As to being a hooligan show, I challenge him to prove it."

Another Worker. 147

The reference here to "hooligan shows" may well connect to the expectation of rowdism cited earlier. Despite the general shift to "respectability," particular episodes of misconduct appear to have justified some groups' perceptions of football crowds as in need of control and

145 Leicester Mercury 28th February 1925.
146 Leicester Mercury 28th February 1925.
147 Leicester Mercury 2nd March 1925.
148 Leicester Mercury 5th February 1925.
regulation. Despite further probing, however, it is not clear how widespread such a perception of football matches as "hooligan shows" was. At this point it is probably pertinent to consider the position of football in relation to other working class spectator sports in Leicester during this period.

In the context of boxing, as noted earlier, relatively more serious outbreaks of disorder were reported. A case drawn from 1934 will suffice to demonstrate this:

"Uproar at Leicester Big Fight: Orgy of Window Breaking."

Disorder at the cheaper side at the Granby Halls last night on the occasion of the Mee-Peterson contest was almost continuous. Packed like sardines in a tin the crowd were clamouring for air from the start. Mr. Jacobs the M.C. came over to remonstrate but was informed by a spokesman that if the doors and windows were not opened the windows would be smashed. Almost immediately there was a tinkle of broken glass and this was the signal for an orgy of window breaking. Mr. Jacobs several times came out of the ring to protest and said that a portion of the roof had been slid back and that every possible window and door was open. Conditions were certainly getting better but in the interval before the big fight a further number of panes were bashed in....At the beginning of the second round an extraordinary scene was witnessed in Mee's corner. A spectator in one of the ringside seats dashed out to where Alf Hall, Mee's trainer was standing, and proceeded to attack him. What looked like developing into a free fight ensued and one man sitting quite away from the scene was struck a nasty blow which inflicted a cut over the left eye. At one time as many as twenty people were engaged in the struggle. The reason for the man's attack was not clear cut, but it is understood that he accused Mr. Hall of blocking his view of the fight." 150

Although it has yet to be fully established empirically, it is possible to speculate that boxing matches in this period attracted the "rougher" sections of the working class to a greater extent than did football. Despite this, the perception held by others of boxing and football spectators was fused together. The missionary zeal to reform the manners of the people of Leicester had not deserted some groups. 151

---
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In attempting to assess the perception of football spectators relative to spectators of other sports, it is also necessary to consider the perception of popular behaviour in general in Leicester during this period. In March 1922, for example, a writer to the editor of the *Leicester Daily Mercury* complained of the "Lack of sportsmanship shown by the Leicester crowd" at a match at Filbert Street. This theme was followed up more explicitly in May 1928 when another writer asked "Is Leicester a Sporting City?" The writer, one W. J. Craven, argued that:

"...I have this season been on every First Division ground, and the impression that I have is, although I am Leicester born and bred, that the City crowd are the most unsportsmanlike crowd of any First Division side. They act more like spoilt children than adults. I may be mistaken, but there seems a distinct trend throughout the whole town to fail to live up to the reputation of Leicester as a 'sporting city.' Its citizens are lacking in breadth of mind and general development, and, as one always notices on the City ground, it is always the opponent, whether business or pleasure, who is wrong."

W. J. Craven. 153

In this, albeit tenuously, a connection is drawn between the behaviour of spectators at matches and the behaviour of the citizens of Leicester in general. But, despite this, and also the reference in the earlier letter to football matches being "hooligan shows," the sense of anxiety and fear felt by the "respectables" appears to have declined. Certainly, neither the forms of behaviour nor the sense of alarm expressed towards the race-course gangs and, to a limited extent, boxing matches, was evident in relation to football spectators in this period. Having said this, the seeds of the moral panic of the 1960's and 1970's can be seen as being present at least in germ. At this point, it is perhaps best to summarise the findings of the present chapter.

**Concluding Remarks**

An attempt has already been made to explain the patterns of spectator

---

152 *Leicester Daily Mercury* 1st March 1922.
153 *Leicester Mercury* 1st May 1928.
behaviour evident at Association Football matches in this period. The
trend towards respectability and the sporadic episodes of misconduct
which occurred are not, as argued, incompatible. Particular aspects of the
barracking by spectators, for example, can be traced to a dissatisfaction
on the part of the spectators with their relationship to the club's
directors. Reported cases of more serious disorder were, moreover, usually
associated with local derby and cup-tie matches. In these, large, "excited"
crowds gathered to watch "heated," intensely competitive games. Problems of
crowd control arose and some reports exist which highlight the relative
inability of the police and club officials to control the activities of the
more vociferous members of the unusually large crowds. Indeed, despite the
generally growing "respectability" of football spectators - and of the
game as such - during this period, it may be possible to speculate that the
larger crowds at these local derby and cup-tie games attracted those
"rougheimer" elements of the working class who did not normally attend but
whose presence at boxing matches, where disorder of a more serious nature
existed, as has already been noted, was a more regular occurrence.

Such an observation - that the feelings and expressions of excitement
engendered by and expressed in local derbies by some of the crowd - possibly
including those rougher sections drawn to particular matches - has to be
coupled with the perception held by particular groups in Leicester of
football spectating in general and working class spectators in particular.
Thus, despite their growing "respectability" - still not in any sense
"complete" - football spectators, as had their counterparts in folk
football, continued to arouse feelings of anxiety and condemnation in groups
like the Temperance and Sunday Observance movements. It is probable that
these very local derby games cited heightened this perception that football
spectators were a cause for concern.

What the analysis is centrally addressing, therefore, is the changing
nature and extent of the forms and control of football hooligan violence as part of a long-term social process. In this period, while there appears to have been a lessening in the extent of misconduct overall and a change in the forms that did occur, at particular points, actual forms of misconduct did take place.

This, it appears was due to a combination of factors, already outlined, which merged in and around important local derby and cup-tie matches. Attracting members of the "rough" working class, such games were marked by a more intense form of "play-fight" by the participants and the excitement engendered, coupled with the presence of these groups who, according to Dunning and Murphy, tend to exhibit relatively less emotional restraint than those above them in the social hierarchy, explains, in part the existence of sporadic misconduct in a period marked by an overall trend towards respectability.

Although misconduct did occur and requires explanation, so, too, does the perception of football as a "hooligan show" attended by working class men who merely gambled and got drunk. The Temperance Movement, as in the nineteenth century, wished for a close supervision and control of working class leisure. While this period has its distinctive features, it is equally crucial to grasp the sense of continuity in the phenomenon. The persistent features of the patterns and perceptions of spectating cannot be neglected. It is to such an understanding - informed by the notion that later social formations arise out of earlier ones - that this case study has been directed. The period can, however, also be distinguished from the preceding period in the trend towards respectability which was evident. Such an observation is borne out in an editorial, cited earlier which appeared in the *Leicester Mercury* in 1928:
"Orderly Crowds."

There seems to have been more than usual favourable comment on the good behaviour of the great crowds assembled in London to take part in the Cup Final and its associated activities. The comment arises, no doubt, from a legendary feeling that big sporting crowds are in some peculiar way predisposed to riotous and unseemly behaviour. All crowds, whatever may be the occasion of their assembling, need something of external control, but it is a matter of happy significance that with practice in these matters we are a great deal better than we were at one time.

Students of people in the mass will probably tell us that we are better behaved, and that we make merry nowadays without the discreditable manifestations that were at one time thought to be inseparable from these public rejoicings. Rejoicing and sobriety go hand in hand, and great crowds distinguish themselves with a sense of discipline that is creditable all round. May we infer that we are an improving people." 154

By the mid-1960's however, such sentiments, as noted in Chapters Four and Five, were increasingly deemed inappropriate as descriptions of football supporters - in part, such a transformation had its antecedents in the phenomena of this period. That is, that the sense of anxiety which filled the minds of late Victorians and Edwardians had not completely waned during the period between the wars. In fact, neither had spectator misconduct. In order further to examine these earlier phases and the more recent transformation to which reference has been made, analysis of the behaviour of Millwall supporters and the perception of them by powerful outsiders since the turn of the nineteenth century is necessary. It is to this that attention will now be directed.

154 Leicester Mercury 23rd April 1928.
CHAPTER SEVEN

Millwall Supporters 1885-1984: An Examination of Their Violent Reputation and the Social Roots of Their Behaviour

1. The analysis in this chapter of the development of football as a spectator sport at Millwall F.C. has two central aims. Firstly, in the context of documenting such developments, a number of methodological issues will be examined which have not been touched on so far. This will enable a more adequate understanding of the nature of the source material to emerge. Secondly, and more importantly, a tentative examination and explication of the sociogenesis of football hooliganism will be attempted within the context of this necessarily limited case study. In particular, the work of Dunning will be considered with reference to various substantive aspects of spectating at Millwall since the turn of the century.

The motivation for focusing on Millwall stems from both the media presentation of spectator behaviour at The Den, and the reputation of Millwall fans among fellow supporters. The dominant image of them is one of "toughness" and violent conduct. Such notoriety, it was felt, was worthy of further investigation.

It was not possible, given the limited time available, to undertake a systematic study of local newspapers dating from the foundation of Millwall FC as a works team through to their present position in the Third Division of the Football League. Instead, treatment of the club in the local press was focused on, using only known examples derived from other sources. These were then contrasted with the reportage of such incidents in the national press. Analysis can thus focus on the attitudes of the local community - as articulated and formulated in the local press - and on the possible discrepancies between local and national reporting and official perceptions of the phenomenon. At stake is the nature and extent of the localism which affected the phenomenon and how this stood in contrast to the official perception of the behaviour of Millwall supporters.
But, as argued, this study has not been concerned solely with the perception of football hooliganism. The notoriety enjoyed by Millwall supporters is probed in addition in terms of the social roots of their behaviour *per se*. This has been undertaken in order to explore, firstly, the degree to which their reputation is deserved and secondly, by the indirect source of newspapers, the generating conditions of the behaviour they engage in.

A. Millwall Supporters: The Emergence of a Violent Reputation

In 1885, according to Percy Young: 'Workers at Morton's factory in Millwall formed a team.....later to become the present day professional club.' 1

Little is known of these early beginnings. Local libraries contain no records of the club, and the club itself has no minutes of meetings held in this period. Uncertainty, therefore exists concerning the motivation for the foundation of the club and the social origins of those who were involved in the control and organisation of it. By 1893, however, it had turned professional. In the following year, its development was such that the club was formed into a limited company. At this stage, Millwall FC were members of the Southern League, and it was not until 1920 that they became members of Division Three of the Football League.

During the late Victorian and Edwardian periods, the club occupied, consecutively, a number of grounds - five in all - most notably at East Ferry Road, North Greenwich, and 'The Den.' The common factor was that all five grounds were situated in South-East London. With regard to the final move - to 'the Den,' still the ground of Millwall F.C. - the motivation appears to have been financial. Thus, according to a near-contemporary report:

1 Young, A History of Football p. 60.
"It is perfectly true that the Directors have been looking around for a suitable ground in the midst of a populous district. Several likely spots have been carefully considered, and eventually a ground situated in the neighbourhood of the Old Kent Road was thought to be about the best." 2

While it is not possible to be precise concerning the social characteristics of the 'neighbourhood,' what is clear is that although there existed a fair sprinkling of artisans, predominantly those people who lived in this area would have been drawn from the less respectable elements of the working class and, if employed, would have been connected with semi-skilled or unskilled occupations.

With respect to the early organisation and control of the club little else is currently known. By the turn of the century, however, with the club now competing in the Southern League, the first "encountered" case of disorder involving Millwall supporters had emerged. 3 More particularly, a report in the Daily Chronicle claimed that during a match with Portsmouth in September, 1901, W. Smith, a Portsmouth player:

"...was a victim of a cowardly assault, being struck by a stone. It behoves the Millwall directors to take greater precautions to prevent miscreants causing the closing of the ground." 4

Reports in the national press contained similar accounts. The local newspapers, however, contain no record of the incident. Despite this, the incident was reported by the referee to the FA, who ordered the club to:

"...Publish notices in the district of the offence which had been committed, and warning spectators that any recurrence of misconduct on the ground might seriously prejudice the club......." 5

In conjunction with this, the club was obliged to give "full publicity" 6 to the warning via the local press. Analysis of several local newspapers

---

2 The Hammers Gazette No. 61 11th September 1909 - The Editor of which was quoting the Millwall club's official handbook.
3 This is not to suggest that there are not cases of disorder involving Millwall fans, prior to 1901, but that this is the first reported case to be 'encountered' in the analysis of sources.
4 Daily Chronicle September 23rd 1901.
5 Minutes of FA Emergency Committee August 1st 1901 - December 31st 1901.
6 Ibid.
reveals, however, that no such publicity was forthcoming. Several possible interpretations arise. Either the newspapers consulted were not the newspapers read by Millwall supporters - or were not those in which the club placed the warning and which were read by those suspected of being involved. Equally, the club may have failed - for whatever reason - to have followed the instructions of the FA.

As yet, it has not been possible for the writer to explore any possible connections between disorder by youths on the streets during the week and spectator misconduct at football matches at Millwall on Saturdays: the style and mechanics of football reporting were such that the primary aim appeared to be to provide details of particular matches. Indeed, referees themselves only reported to the FA those incidents deemed to have interfered with play. Who spectated and what forms of conduct were common at the ground on East Ferry Road in this period, remain unreported. This should not be taken as ruling out rowdyism on the streets in and around the ground - indeed, such issues are considered in section B. Occasionally, however, reports of such disturbances inside the grounds of local clubs did surface in match reports. Take the following report of the West Ham v Millwall match in September 1906:

"The 'Rivals' at Upton Park. Unseemly Scenes.

......From the very first kick of the ball it was seen that there was likely to be some trouble, but the storm burst when Dean and Jarvis came into collision, the former pressing the latter, so that seizing Dean by the waist, Jarvis threw him with great force against the railings. This aroused considerable excitement among the spectators.....The crowd on the banks having caught the fever, free fights were plentiful. There is one other matter that I cannot pass without comment, and that is the biased opinion of some of the spectators who frequent the grandstand. To many of them I would give a word of advice, and that is study the rules of the game before they commence criticising in public." 8

7 A problem which emerged in conducting this case study was that by the very geographical location of the club, no one district newspaper existed with sole reference to Millwall FC. Thus, the newspapers utilised covered a cross-section of South East London districts.

8 East Ham Echo 21st September 1906.
The importance of this is two-fold. Firstly, it documents various forms of disorder. Secondly, the more serious form - the "free fights" - took place on the 'banks' or terracing, while the barracking stemmed from the grandstand. While there is no direct evidence regarding the social composition of the crowd in this period, it may be that the rough - respectable division referred to elsewhere in the present study, is evident in this connection. In addition, it should be noted that such fighting between rival supporters took place at a local derby match - the importance of this will be further explored in section B.

Following the First World War, by which time Millwall F.C. were, as noted, in the Third Division of the Football League and achieving attendances in excess of 20,000, the Lewisham Borough News reported on an incident in the Millwall v Newport County match in October 1920:

"...In the second half Cooper, the Newport goalkeeper had an argument with the crowd, and actually climbed the railings to enforce his point of view, and a spectator at the other end, incensed at the manner in which the game was being mishandled, entered the field to give the referee the benefit of his wisdom. Just as the 20,000 spectators had been worked up to fever heat, Keen, the Millwall centre-forward scored a goal, and this acted as a safety-valve...." 9

At this stage in its emergence as a social problem, spectator misconduct was still perceived as involving "over-excitement" due to partisanship and hence as something which could be dissipated if the team was ultimately successful. The national newspapers confirmed the element of disorder, with a Daily Sketch headline being indicative: "New Cross - Millwall Crows and Groans." 10 A point worthy of note, however, especially if considered in the light of the Hall thesis relating the media treatment of violence to political issues, was that these same national newspapers also contained lengthy articles relating to the "Riots" by the unemployed in Whitehall and in cities throughout the country which involved stone throwing and baton

9 Lewisham Borough News 20th October 1920.
10 Daily Sketch 18th October 1920.
charges by the police. This riot imagery was evident in several reports of the incident of spectator misconduct in question. For example, as the Daily Herald concluded:

".....How the game ended without a riot is a mystery. It seemed as though the crowd would invade the pitch when the referee ordered the arrest of a man for dashing on the field and threatening a player. But the crowd were put in a little better humour by Keen's goal, and the peace was not broken....." 11

Such reportage by the national press does not, however, find expression in the style of reporting found in the local press, which, as argued, characterised the disorder in terms of an excess of excitement.

By the following month, the Emergency Committee of the FA had met and concluded: '...that missiles were thrown by a section of the spectators, and that there was a considerable amount of disorderly conduct, bad language and intimidation of the visiting players.' 12

In consequence, the Millwall ground was ordered to be closed. Commenting on this verdict, the Brockley News and New Cross and Hatcham Review stated:

"The tendency towards hooliganism among football crowds is becoming so marked that it is not to be wondered at that the F.A. took a very serious view of it. Since the Newport match there has been another angry demonstration at the Den, accompanied by stone throwing, and it is time something was done to eliminate it. It seems hard that the club has to accept punishment, and over 24,000 supporters be deprived of their afternoon's sport, because of the unruly conduct of a section of hooligans. Surely the great bulk of the orderly supporters can do something to assist the officials in stamping out this creeping paralysis. A supporters' club, pledged to help the officials in detecting and punishing the offenders is worth considering," 13

The latter report, significantly, appears to indicate not only a general trend of spectator misconduct at Millwall, but also the persistent presence of a "small section of hooligans". 14 Although it has not been possible to establish the exact social composition of these "hooligan" groups, a more detailed and systematic study of one or more local newspapers

11 Daily Herald 18th October 1920.
12 Cited in the Birmingham Post 20th November 1920.
14 Ibid.
might reveal evidence relating to this and other areas of social life where such groups are reported as coming into contact with more "respectable" members of the community.

A seven-year period elapses before another incident of disorder is known to have been reported at the Den.\textsuperscript{15} During a match between Millwall and Swindon, ending in a 3-3 draw, the referee was struck by a missile. This evidence was initially encountered in the F.A. Disciplinary Committee minutes. The Committee, meeting in December 1927, concluded that:

"Millwall F.C. be ordered to post notices on their ground warning spectators, and also required to offer a reward for information leading to the conviction of the offender, who, when ascertained they were to prosecute." \textsuperscript{16}

A subsequent analysis of the match reports in the local press revealed little apparent concern or knowledge of the incident. The Brockley News and New Cross and Hatcham Review merely reported that the "crowd grew very noisy"\textsuperscript{17} and the Kentish Mercury failed to comment at all on the behaviour of the crowd.\textsuperscript{18} Indeed, in the editions of these local newspapers, preceding and following the meeting of the FA Disciplinary Committee, no reference can be found to the case in question or to the decisions subsequently reached.

There is no immediate explanation for this. It is possible to speculate that the lack of reference to the case may be indicative either of the relatively minor nature of the incident which was regarded by the press as trivial or of the haphazard nature of the reporting in this period - i.e., the reporters may simply not have known of the FA decision. Alternatively, it may have been a conscious policy on behalf of the local editors to avoid damaging reports concerning the club and its neighbourhood. It is doubtful, however, even with further research, whether such issues can be resolved.

\textsuperscript{15} It should be noted that the analysis of Millwall spectators involved in disorder was dependent, initially, on sources distinct from the immediate locality. Thus references are made to local Birmingham newspapers, the national press and the Minutes of the FA. From these, the particular cases of disorder were traced back to the local press. It was not possible to extend the analysis to examine the periodic nature of the disorder.

\textsuperscript{16} Minutes of the FA Emergency Committee October 14th 1927-December 5th 1927.

\textsuperscript{17} Brockley News and New Cross and Hatcham Review 28th October 1927.

\textsuperscript{18} Kentish Mercury, 28th October 1927.
adequately.

Whatever the explanation, by December of the same year, the writer of the Millwall programme felt it necessary to admonish the crowd for the barracking of players. Clearly, the official if not the local media perception of the spectators at Millwall, emphasised that there was a 'cause for concern.'

A similar interpretation can be drawn from an analysis of the reports of misconduct at a match between Millwall and Swansea in February 1933. Thus, while the minutes of the FA Emergency Committee meeting note the misconduct of spectators at the match, several local and national newspapers reports contain no reference to disorder. In the view of the FA, the incident was serious enough to warrant a caution and an order for a warning to be displayed on notices around the ground - stating that further offences would result in the ground being closed. Although it is tempting to speculate on the existence of a degree of differential sensitivity to such disorder as far as the football authorities and the media - or sections of them - were concerned, the analysis cannot be too definitive without further empirical support. Nevertheless, it is possible to deduce from this that such a situation reflects the stage in the emergence of a social problem that football spectating had reached. During this period, it was, as a phenomenon, primarily the concern of the football authorities, it had not yet - nor had the Millwall supporters involved - been elevated to a cause of national or wider political concern.

Analysis of the incidents of spectator misconduct reported in the following season does, however, reveal the existence of variations in the

---

19 Cited in the Leicester Mercury 21st December 1927.
20 See Lewisham Borough News; Kentish Mercury; Daily Herald
21 Minutes of the FA Emergency Committee March 21st 1933 - April 21st 1933.
"style" of reporting and of the images attached to individual clubs - particularly Millwall. For example, misconduct at the match between Millwall and Bradford in March 1934 prompted the Kentish Mercury to state: 'Scenes at the Den. Millwall Supporters! Not so Bad as they are Painted.'

In more detail, the sports writer continued:

"Bradford did Millwall a bad turn in more senses than one on Saturday: from a football point of view they took away two valuable points that the Lions could ill-afford, and "scare" headlines on Sunday morning suggested scenes that reflected adversely on the crowd's behaviour.

Feeling did run high, it is true, and one enthusiast paid the penalty by appearing at the Police Court on Monday morning, but nothing really serious occurred." [23]

While claiming that "nothing really serious occurred," the writer commented on the "scare headlines" of the Sunday press. Two such headlines appeared in The People and The News of the World. On the front page of the former, the report began: 'We want the Ref. Crowd had paid, but fights were free.' [25]

The report continued:

"When some of the crowd at the Second Division league match between Millwall and Bradford at New Cross yesterday didn't like the decisions of the referee they threw things at him.

Then some of the players got out of control, and when free fights began to break out between various members of the teams a police officer dashed on to the field.

He was followed a little later by a force of police but at the end of the game the crowd refused to leave the ground. Some of them began to demonstrate against the directors in the stand. They hung around the dressing rooms, shouting: 'We want the ref. We want the players.' The directors instead of making their way across the pitch, walked around the back of the stand." [26]

Echoing the headline of The People, the News of the World stated:

'Scenes after match. Players at loggerheads and referee pelted.' [27]

---

22 Kentish Mercury 29th March 1934.
23 Ibid.
24 Ibid.
25 The People 25th March 1934.
26 Ibid.
In a similar vein, the anonymous writer described the events:

"Some of the players also got out of control; there were several free fights between various members of the two teams and a police officer rushed on to the field of play.

Then a force of police appeared on the scene to restore order, but at the end of the game the crowd refused to leave the ground, some demonstrating against the Directors in the stand.

They remained near the players' dressing rooms shouting 'We want the ref.' We want the players.'

It was not until nearly half an hour after the match had ended that the police were able to clear the crowd from the ground.

Meanwhile, there was a demonstration outside the directors' rooms, and mud was flung at the windows." 28

Clearly there was some discrepancy between the reporting of this incident at the local and national levels. Not only was the disorder given less attention in the Kentish Mercury than in the Sunday newspapers, but the Lewisham Borough News merely noted that the crowd had "violently disagreed" - no elaboration or condemnation was undertaken. 29 It may well be that the local newspaper was biased in favour of the club - again reflecting the sense of localism referred to earlier - while the national press were possibly able to adopt a more detached stance or were reflecting a wider consensus regarding Millwall supporters. While it is difficult to be conclusive, these national examples may also herald the early stages of the emergence of a sensationalising popular press.

In consequence of the referee reporting the matter to the FA, the Emergency Committee convened and decided:

"In view of the fact that there had been enquiries on two previous occasions with regard to misconduct of spectators at the club's matches, and the club having been informed that any further offences would result in the ground being closed, the Commission decided that the ground of the club be closed for fourteen days commencing on Saturday the 25th August 1934." 30

28 Ibid.
29 Lewisham Borough News 27th March 1934.
30 Minutes of FA Emergency Committee 20th April 1934 - 28th May 1934.
Despite this, the Chairman of the club denied that anything had happened, "save a little mild barracking." In this connection he further noted:

"There was some cat-calling outside the director's room, nothing else.

It is untrue to say there was any interference by the police at any time.

No missiles were thrown at the referee or the police and the crowd dispersed without intervention by the police.

No complaint against players or crowd was made by any official of the match to the Millwall club." 32

Problems of interpretation emerge from such discrepancies in the data. While it is not clear what actually happened, a marked divergence in the perception of the behaviour involved is apparent. Local and national differences arise, the real significance of which requires further investigation.

Some nine months later, 'the Den' was again the scene of misconduct by spectators which was sufficient, in the opinion of the referee, to be reported to the FA, who, in turn, fined Millwall £50.33 Examination of the local and national newspaper coverage again reveals variations in the "style" and content of reportage. Thus while the Daily Sketch, Daily Herald and the Kentish Mercury contained no reference to crowd behaviour or misconduct, the Lewisham Borough News cited the fact that: 'The referee came in for a good deal of vociferous criticism from the crowd in the second half. Millwall made one or two very strong appeals for a penalty..." 34

The headline in the Daily Mail made explicit what its report would focus on: "Booing Crowd at Millwall." 35 The report continued:

31 Daily Mail 27th April 1934.
32 Ibid.
33 Minutes of FA Emergency Committee 8th January 1935 - 21st January 1935.
34 Lewisham Borough News 18th December 1934.
35 Daily Mail 17th December 1934.
"Mud and rain - thrills and frayed tempers - An amazing victory for Luton, and an angry crowd who showed disapproval of the referee by throwing newspapers on to the field.

All these things made the match at New Cross on Saturday a game to remember.

Mud-plastered players lost their heads and the crowd booted lustily. They booted everything - the referee, the Luton backs and the game in general." 36

One consequence of the disorder was that the club began structurally to alter the entry and exit point to the field of play. This development was recorded in the Kentish Mercury:

"Calling at the Den this week, a 'Mercury' reporter noticed that workmen were busy, and was informed, on enquiry, that a tunnel is to be erected to give the players, linesmen and referee shelter when they leave their dressing rooms and go out on to the field." 37

In the next edition of the Kentish Mercury, the same writer noted:

"The 'tunnel' which is being built at the Den for the officials and players caused quite a lot of comment on Saturday, and it is now nearly completed." 38

Such developments are of significance. Clearly Millwall's directors felt they were faced with a spectator containment problem. As with Leicester City, the club had not been previously as successful in their attempts to control the crowd as, by that time, they should have been if Vamplew is correct. A more detailed analysis, however, has not proved possible - there was simply no further elaboration concerning this particular case in the newspapers of the time. Similarly, when the FA announcement concerning the fine imposed upon Millwall was made, the Kentish Mercury merely reported the official press release of the FA.

In contrast, in November 1938, the national press, in reviewing Millwall's home match against Southampton, commented in a critical fashion on the behaviour of the crowd. 39 One of the Sunday newspapers, The People

36 Daily Mail 17th December 1934.
37 Kentish Mercury 4th January 1935.
38 Kentish Mercury 11th January 1935.
39 As well as the analysis of the possible differential sensitivity to disorder, consideration must also be given to the possible negative connotations of Millwall FC and of South-East London - particularly, Lewisham, Deptford and New Cross which may have been held by the Football Association and sections of the press.
reported the misconduct with the following headline - 'Fireworks at
the Den. Millwall Crowd can't take it."  

A more detailed account was to be found in the Daily Herald:

"...The behaviour of many of the spectators was most unsports-
manlike. Fireworks were thrown on the pitch to unsettle the players,
and once in the second half, when a Southampton player was brought
down unfairly and injured, hundreds clapped and cheered.

The referee, Mr. W. E. Pleyer, of Dorset, had to seek the aid of
two policemen following an incident near the corner flag, and when
the players were leaving the field fireworks were thrown amongst
them...."  

In contrast, the Kentish Mercury and the Lewisham Borough News noted
that "Most of the fireworks came from the crowd" and that: '...The crowd
took exception to Southampton's tackling and catcalls and exploding fire-
works were all too frequent indications of their dissent.'  

Although the element of spectator misconduct was stressed in this
report, in the edition of the Kentish Mercury preceding it it had been noted
that for a cup-tie at Norwich some five to six thousand had travelled and no
misconduct was reported. The newspaper commented: 'What a loyal band of
supporters Millwall have! There must have been five or six thousand who
made the excursion.'  

Despite this view of Millwall supporters held in the
local community, the FA Disciplinary Committee decided:

1. That in view of the previous record of unsatisfactory
behaviour of spectators at their matches the Millwall club be fined
£100.

2. That any further report of disturbances or unsatisfactory
conduct by spectators will result in the closing of the ground for a
considerable period.

3. That warning notices be posted in prominent positions at
the ground and approaches thereto.

4. That the decision of the Commission be printed in the
official programmes for the next four home matches."  

It is possible to speculate that, for those closest to the club,
"partisanship" and "loyalty" were part and parcel of the same way of

---

40 The People 6th November 1938.
41 Daily Herald 7th November 1938
42 Kentish Mercury 11th November 1938.
43 Lewisham Borough News 8th November 1938.
44 Kentish Mercury 4th November 1938.
45 Minutes of FA Disciplinary Committee 6th December 1938 - 2nd January 1939.
spectating and supporting your team; for others, however, such demonstrations were perceived as problematic - such supporters needed to be controlled and regulated.

True to their word, following another episode of misconduct at the Den, this time in 1947, the FA closed the ground for seven days and fined the club £100. These sanctions arose out of the misconduct of the crowd in the match between Millwall and Barnsley. With regard to this particular incident, the Lewisham Borough News noted:

"...when Baxter scored from the spot to give Barnsley a point they hardly deserved, the crowd at the Den showed their disapproval in traditional fashion, and after the final whistle police had to drive back those protesting spectators who encroached on the playing pitch. They took away one man who tried to molest the referee...." 46

Two features worthy of note emerge from this report. In common with other cases of misconduct, the "spark" or immediate cause for disorderly scenes is, according to the newspaper accounts, attributable to particular incidents in the game. Secondly, reference is made to the fact that the spectators showed their disapproval in "traditional fashion." 47 Such comments are suggestive of the existence of a persistent phenomenon which even at this stage in the emergence of football spectating as a social problem, appears to have been broadly similar to that which had existed prior to the First World War. Whether the social composition of the Millwall crowd had remained constant since that time remains, however, unresolved.

Once the FA decision to close the ground had been made public the reactions of some club officials and directors provide insights into their sensitivity and into the groups deemed responsible for the misconduct. In the Lewisham Borough News in December 1947, the club secretary was quoted:

47 Ibid.
as stating:

"Mr. Linney, condemned the action of the 'hot-heads' among the supporters and added:—

'The club and spectators have to suffer for the action of one or two stupid people who can't keep their tempers.' 48"

Again, explanation is in terms of partisan supporters being unable to "control their tempers." The significance of this is two-fold. Firstly, at this stage in its emergence as a social problem the misconduct was still perceived to be connected to football spectating per se. Secondly, the notion that particular groups are unable to "control their tempers" links to Dunning's explanation of football hooliganism: that is, that particular social groups which have relatively evaded state control and who live in communities whose internal structures approximate to 'ordered segmentation' generate norms which, relative to other social groups, tolerate a high level of violence in social relations. The members of such communities, moreover, are, again relative to socially more powerful and prestigious groups, unable to exercise great self-control over their violent tendencies.49

Adopting a similar theme to the club secretary, Mr. F. Thorne, a Millwall director argued in the Kentish Mercury that:

"'Although the section of the crowd who misbehaved only got just what they deserved' said Mr. Thorne, 'I do think that the powers that be who inflicted this hardship on the club might have thought a second time and not given the Directors such a financial bump."

'Many years ago - I think it was in 1921 - the Den was closed,' said Mr. Thorne, 'but it must of necessity be an entirely new set of players, almost a new board of directors and an entirely new set of spectators. No, it is quite a coincidence that it should be Millwall again.' 50

On a factual basis, Mr. Thorne was incorrect for, as has already been noted, the ground had also been closed in 1934. More pertinently,

48 Lewisham Borough News 9th December 1947.
49 Dunning et al "The Social Roots of Football Hooligan Violence" pp 141-144.
50 Kentish Mercury 12th December 1947.
he believed that a "new set of spectators" now followed the club.
Although a new generation of supporters would have been attending the Den, it is possible to speculate, and here the work of Dunning in relation to "ordered segmentation" is of importance once more, that this new generation of spectators were located in the same type of social networks as their fathers and families. It can thus be argued, that it was in fact no "coincidence that it is Millwall again." That is to say, the recurrence of spectator disorderliness at the Millwall ground may have been related to specific features of the social composition of the crowd and the structure of the community from which they were drawn.

Although the comments relate specifically to Millwall, the FA, it is important to note, believed the problem was not confined to this club alone. In this connection, in December 1947, the FA Consultative Committee were reported as having concluded: 'Nobody wants London to become a soccer blackspot - least of all the clubs. The recent general warning to spectators issued by the F.A. must be hammered home - repeatedly.'

Despite such general warnings, the Millwall club felt it necessary to issue its own list of "Don't Do it Chums" advice in its programme. The notes, issued in December 1947, were addressed to the Fathers in the crowd and read:

"Don't throw soil, cinders, clinkers, stones, bricks, bottles, cups, fireworks, or other kinds of explosives, apples, oranges etc. on the playing pitch during or after the match. If you do you are liable to eviction, prosecution and permanently denied admission to the Den.

Don't forget there are ladies and children in your midst.

Don't barrack, utter filthy abuse or cause physical violence to the referee or his linesmen inside or outside the Den.

Don't assemble in small or large numbers in the streets adjacent to the Den.

51 Kentish Mercury 13th December 1947.
52 Daily Herald 6th December 1947. See also Minute 25(11) (B) FA Consultative Committee 14th October 1947 - 15th December 1947.
Don't barrack, utter filthy abuse or molest in any manner the visiting or Millwall players." 53

Though ambiguous, the reference to spectators gathering in large numbers outside the ground is suggestive of a form of behaviour which the club were aware of - and which they found problematic - but which did not surface in the match reports of the local or national newspapers. This speculation is given further credence by examination of incidents surrounding the match between Millwall and Exeter City in November 1949. In this connection, the minutes of the FA Disciplinary Committee meeting in January 1950 note:

"The referee and linesmen reported that when fifty yards from the Millwall ground after the match, they were subjected to abuse and hostility by a crowd, numbering 150-200 people. The referee received a blow in the back and tea-cups were thrown at the three officials." 54

Yet, while the Lewisham Borough News highlighted that the referee required a police escort off the field, no details are given of the incidents which occurred after the match. 55 The Kentish Mercury, indeed, in its match report - and in subsequent editions - made no reference to crowd behaviour or misconduct at the match in question. 56 The FA's decision, however, was similar to that reached in 1947. Meeting in January 1950, the Committee concluded:

"(1) That the Millwall F.C. ground be closed for seven days from 30th January 1950 and the club be fined £100.
(2) That the Millwall F.C. be instructed to co-operate more closely with the police in order to prevent any repetition of misconduct by spectators inside or outside the ground.
(3) That the Directors and permanent officials of the Millwall F.C. (including writers of programmes or magazines) should do their utmost to uphold the authority of the FA." 57

---

54 Minutes of FA Disciplinary Committee January 1950 Ref. Min. 46(B).
55 Lewisham Borough News 29th November 1949.
56 Kentish Mercury 2nd December 1949.
57 Minutes of FA Disciplinary Committee January 1950 Ref. Min. 46(B).
These two decisions of the FA raise questions concerning the attitude of club officials to misconduct by Millwall supporters. Following these decisions, Charles Hewitt, the Manager, made his position apparent in the club's programme in January 1950:

"The findings and punishment meted out to the club has come as a great shock to the many thousands of loyal supporters who have always behaved in the manner expected of sportsmen and gentlemen, but it must be conceded that there are in our midst a few undesirables. I have my suspicions, in regard to what happened after the match on November 26th, and would welcome information from any person who was in the vicinity when the attacks were made. The directors will not hesitate to prosecute offenders and permanently deny them admission to the Den."

Mr. Hewitt also expressed the opinion that if the misconduct did not cease the best way to preserve the club would be to move - lock, stock and barrel - to another part of the Metropolis." 58

The comments made by the manager again emphasise the presence at matches of a "few undesirables." More importantly, he suggests that the real solution would be to move the club out of the district in which it was located. 59 Hewitt appears to have believed that the district as a whole had a "bad" or "tough" reputation and that some of the people who lived there were the "undesirables" referred to. Clearly there was an attempt to disassociate the club from some of the people who lived in the districts of New Cross, Lewisham and Deptford. From such an example, further grounded speculation is possible. Firstly, the processes documented in Chapters Four and Five - the changing relationship between clubs and their supporters - appear to have surfaced earlier at Millwall than at other clubs. Secondly, it may have been that the schism between the "respectable" and "rough" sections of the crowd was more pronounced and occurred at an earlier stage there than in other areas of the country.

Further illustration of the problems involved in documenting these

59 Hutchinson, in fact, has documented the adoption of a similar practice in nineteenth-century Scotland. Hutchinson, "Some Aspects of Football Crowds Before 1914."
themes arises out of a case of misconduct reported by the referee to the 
FA involving a match between Millwall and Bristol City in September 1952.
No account of the incident has so far emerged in the analysis undertaken 
of local or national newspapers, and the FA minutes of October 1952 merely 
b Briefly recall that 'the referee reported misconduct by a spectator. No 
action was taken.'\(^6^0\) From this it is impossible to determine the nature 
or extent of the misconduct by this spectator. Nor can the reasons why 
the FA took no action be discerned. The case, in fact, serves to highlight 
the need to juxtapose several different sources and not to allow the analysis 
to be filtered through one source only. Such a trap, in part, is one into 
which some historians - notably Mason - have fallen. That is to say, mere 
consultation of the FA records and then following up the particular 
incidents in newspapers, can give an unnecessarily limited perspective.\(^6^1\)

In October 1952, again an article appeared in the Kentish Mercury which 
highlighted the existence of a gulf between the club and some of its 
supporters. The article noted:

"......A feeling of concern has been growing for some time amongst 
the Millwall supporters, concerning the attitude of officials at the 
Den.

Mr. J. J. Archer, the supporters' club chairman was rather 
indignant. He was indignant because an article in the Millwall 
programme referred to them as an unofficial body. 'There are alot 
of people who would like to see us fail,' he said 'but we must 
fight on and see that we are not beaten. You are the pioneers of 
this club and it is up to you.'\(^6^2\)

Taken in conjunction with the Millwall Director's comments of 1947, 
such views are of relevance, especially if considered in the light of 
Taylor's analysis concerning the relationship between spectators and clubs 
in this period. That is, such comments are more suggestive of a divide 
between the club and its supporters rather than a close and harmonious

\(^6^0\) Minutes of FA Disciplinary Committee October 1952.
\(^6^1\) See Chapter Two.
\(^6^2\) Kentish Mercury 3rd October 1952.
relationship.

In a manner similar to the development of the forms of football hooligan violence in general and the ways in which it was controlled up until the late 1950's, Millwall appears to have enjoyed a relatively low-key phase - both in terms of the forms of behaviour and the perception by outside observers of spectators at the Den during the 1950's. A ten year interval exists between the last incident discussed and the disorder reported at the match between Millwall and Hull City in September 1962.

The following report of the 1962 incident appeared in the Daily Mirror:

"Bottle Thrown at Millwall. Police Step In.

A bottle-throwing incident ten minutes before half-time threatened to spoil this all action, all excitement game.

With the score at 1-1, Millwall centre-forward, Terry, and Hull goalkeeper, Jim Fraser, collided in a chase for the ball.

Some of the 16,919 crowd started to boo and as the Hull defence lined up for the resultant corner, one wild fan threw a bottle.

It missed the Hull players and left back Brian Roberts picked it up and gave it to referee Bill Clements.

Police were called to stand behind the goal and there were no further incidents." 63

In similar fashion, the Kentish Mercury also noted that a bottle had been thrown and that the police had intervened. 64 While the club did not impose sanctions of any kind, the Disciplinary Committee of the FA decided:

"That Millwall FC be ordered to post warning notices in prominent places at their ground for one month from 1st October 1962 and to print in the official club programme for the same period a warning to their spectators similar to that contained in the warning notices." 65

Local reaction to this verdict cannot, at present, be documented, as no comment was made in the local press. During the season 1962-1963, however, several cases of misconduct occurred at the Den and attracted the

63 Daily Mirror 4th September 1962.
64 Kentish Mercury 7th September 1962.
65 Minutes of FA Disciplinary Committee 26th September 1962.
attention of the local and national press. In February, 1963, Millwall, at home to Wrexham, lost 2-4. The Lewisham Borough News reported the game in the following way:

"There was a 'bag full of goals' in this game at the Den, but only two of Millwall's five counted - A fact that irritated one fan at least beyond the point of endurance.

As referee E. Crawford, of Doncaster blew his whistle, to wipe out the third of these 'scores,' a spectator tried to get on the pitch.

One policeman who moved to stop him disappeared apparently into the crowd, but four other policemen took his place, and a man was taken from the ground.

And there were shots of a different kind as the crowd left the ground - snowballs were thrown by them at the referee, who later left the ground under a police escort as a large crowd waited." 66

Several other newspapers referred to the behaviour of the individual spectator involved and to the conduct of the crowd at the end of the match. However, a variety of different interpretations were given to these actions. The Times for example, argued that the fan had "Run Berserk,"67 while the Lewisham Borough News believed that the fan had been "irritated beyond the point of endurance...."68 While the local newspaper still interpreted the actions of the spectator in traditional terms, i.e. his actions were connected to events on the field of play, the national press were beginning to portray such behaviour in a more vivid and dramatic way and to interpret it in relation to the psychological make-up of youths. As such, it reflected the stage which football spectating had reached as a social problem by the early 1960's.69

The club eventually decided not to ban the individual in question, and although the referee did not report the matter to the FA, the police

66 Lewisham Borough News 26th February 1963.
67 The Times 26th February 1963.
68 Lewisham Borough News 26th February 1963.
69 See Chapter Five.
arrested him and he was subsequently prosecuted. In the court case the Millwall fan referred to the fact that he had got 'too excited.' The Kentish Mercury, in March 1963, reported his explanation in the following way:

"'I got too excited over the game. The referee was terrible. I was just getting wild.'

Mr. Hooper: 'You must have gone completely mad. You need a way of keeping control over yourself.'" 70

Significantly, the magistrate emphasised the need for the Millwall fan to exercise greater control over himself - the implication being that compared to more mainstream values regarding the control of emotions, this fan was relatively less able to do so. This particular case was, in fact, not an isolated one and crucially, the explanation for such behaviour was not conceived in terms of traditional ideas about partisanship. In keeping with this phase in the emergence of football spectating as a social problem, spectator disorder at the Den was assuming the status of a cause for concern.

The "disorderly" scenes outlined prompted the Millwall manager R. Gray, to warn the spectators in March 1963 via the club programme concerning their future behaviour. 71 Despite this, the Lewisham Borough News during the same month, still felt it necessary to record that:

"A fear that the irresponsible acts of a small group of Millwall supporters might eventually lead to action by the Football Association was voiced as the crowd left the Den on Saturday.

......For the third successive home game the action of a few of the fans led to the police being called. A linesman had to complain about things being thrown at him." 72

By April, the Kentish Mercury was appealing to the fans to "Keep Calm." 73 Significantly, their concern surrounded a local derby match between

70 Kentish Mercury 1st March 1963.
71 Kentish Mercury 1st March 1963.
73 Kentish Mercury 5th April 1963.
Millwall and Crystal Palace. The *Kentish Mercury*'s match report noted:

"Trouble flared again at the Den on Monday when Millwall fought out a full-blooded battle with Crystal Palace. And this time poor Millwall will suffer because of the behaviour of the fans....

...Moments of anger are becoming too common these days. Admittedly, they are caused by only a few fans who are unable to discipline themselves and enjoy a match without causing a disturbance...." 74

In each of these cases, the FA was notified. In keeping with the general trend documented in Chapter Four, the FA were content to spread the responsibility for the control of misconduct and thus noted, "with satisfaction," the action taken by Millwall and the police. 75

Although reports of disorder on other grounds when Millwall were the away team do exist, such examples do not refer to any involvement by Millwall supporters who may have been present. In fact, it is not until November 1963, the month in which Millwall played away at Hereford United, that the involvement of Millwall's away supporters was highlighted since the "free fights" reported at West Ham in 1906. 76 More particularly, whilst travelling home, some fans threw fire extinguishers out of an excursion train. During the same month, at Brentford, again a local derby, fighting and missile throwing were reported to have occurred. During the last few minutes of the game, the *Lewisham Borough News* claimed:

".....the fun started, Brodie was the target for nails, cans, wood and a Grenade, which fortunately was dud, as Millwall lined up for the kick-off and extra police were called in to protect his goal for the final sixty seconds of play." 77

During the same match, Alex Stepney, the Millwall goalkeeper, was attacked by Brentford supporters. The *Kentish Mercury* commented in this connection on the presence of a large number of Millwall supporters: 'Lucky

74 *Kentish Mercury* 5th April 1963.
75 Minutes of FA Disciplinary Committee 18th April 1963.
for Alex Stepney that they did turn up as one of them came to his rescue when he was attacked. They're a loyal band. 78

Considering that it was again a "local derby" at which such incidents occurred, it is less surprising that, in fact, such supporters did "turn up." Equally noteworthy, while the Kentish Mercury praised the intervention of these "loyal" fans - and implicitly the fighting qualities utilised; a Docker, in fact, lost two teeth in the fight - Dennis Follows, the FA Secretary, was prompted by the disorder at the Den and at other grounds to castigate supporters in general. Take the following extract found in the Daily Mail in November 1963:

"....Crowd control within football grounds is primarily our problem. But most of the trouble is caused outside. That is a police responsibility.

However, no one can argue that it is not part of the same problem, and no one can deny that it is not part of a much wider question of juvenile delinquency." 79

Such observations tend to support the contention that, during this period, there occurred a shift in the nature of the perception by powerful outsiders of spectator misconduct. Gone were the explanations in terms of partisanship; the issue was now perceived - as in the 1890's - as part of a wider question, of delinquency by working class youth.

Following a disturbance at the match between Millwall and Walsall Town in December 1965 in which fights took place between supporters, missiles were thrown and the Walsall players and officials were attacked, it was claimed in the Daily Mail that:

"....Millwall fans have never believed soccer is a cissie's game, they thrive on full-blooded but fair matches.

Yet this brutal display earned only the disgust of the broad-minded docklanders.

Even so, there is little point in meeting like with like. The group who waited after the game to abuse the Walsall team did not show

78 Kentish Mercury 13th November 1963.
79 Daily Mail 8th November 1963.
Such qualities, in fact, appear to have been a characteristic of spectating at the Den for a considerable period. But with the changing perception of football spectating and spectator misconduct, such displays were increasingly seen as problematic. With regard to this particular case, the Birmingham press - more sensitive to the views emanating from Fellows Park, the home of Walsall Town - believed that such incidents proved that Millwall had 'one of the country's most dangerous crowds.' In similar vein, the Walsall supporters' club made moves to boycott any future away matches at Millwall and demanded an enquiry into the fights on the terraces and the missile throwing at the coaches carrying Walsall supporters.

In direct contrast to such a perception, the South East London Mercury offered the following comment on the Millwall crowd:

"At grounds that boast well-behaved spectators, we know that quite a few rocks and stones would have been thrown at Walsall. The Lions have never lost the reputation of being ill-behaved for incidents that took place many years ago. We would go so far as to say that the New Cross crowd are as well-behaved as any in the country."

The Chairman and Manager of the club also apologised to its supporters for the display. The Chairman, using the columns of the local newspaper commented: "We must congratulate the New Cross crowd on the way they behaved. Only one person jumped over the 'top' to have a crack at the villain of the peace, G. Kirby, the Walsall centre-forward."

Despite the discrepancies in newspaper coverage of the Millwall crowd, there seems to have been a general consensus regarding the existence of an "unruly few." Take the following item from the Millwall club programme

---

80 Daily Mail 13th December 1965.
81 See Section B.
82 Birmingham Post 13th December 1965.
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published in December 1965:

"I suppose no club in the country can have appealed as much as we have for their supporters to behave themselves. It would appear, however, that in common with many other clubs we have this unruly element in our midst, who, for some reason best known to themselves, simply don't know what it means to behave in a civilised manner." 86

It is possible that what was felt to constitute behaving in a "civilised" manner differed somewhat in the perceptions of the local South-East London and local Birmingham press reports and the accounts of the clubs concerned. Whether this is supportive of the suggested existence of differential standards of violence control, however, remains to be more fully explored. 87

The season in which these incidents occurred, 1965-1966, closed with another case of misconduct being reported. Reinforcing the points made previously concerning the control of the excitement generated by the game, the Daily Mirror headline relating to the match played between Millwall and Bournemouth in April 1966 stated: 'Stop the Brickbats - Or I Stop the Match. Ref Warns 'Lions' Fans as Promotion Fever Mounts." 88

The South East London Mercury commenting on this incident, and on football hooliganism in general stated:

"Millwall are backing the FA's plea to stamp out hooliganism. They will not hesitate to prosecute any fans guilty of throwing things on to the pitch, or any incident likely to bring the game into disrepute.....

Billy Gray, the Millwall Manager, is determined that this club's reputation will not suffer because of the senseless acts like those that happened at the Den, on Tuesday night, when David Best was struck by something thrown by a 'nut-case', as Billy called the spectator.

Spectators in this part of London have a reputation for fair play. Millwall's image of cloth cap, mufflers and bricks in one hand to threaten the referee has changed with the years. Even in those days reports of their unruly behaviour were grossly exaggerated." 89

87 See Section B.
89 South East London Mercury 15th April 1966.
The image of Millwall spectators held by the media and other football supporters was clearly uppermost in the mind of this writer. As early as 1934, when the local newspaper complained of the national press coverage, Millwall supporters had gained a certain notoriety. By the 1960's, such a reputation was enhanced by both the nascent "moral panic" concerning spectator misconduct in general and the demonstration by Millwall supporters of their "traditional" patterns of spectating both at the Den and at other grounds. The "excitement" of being involved in a promotion race also appears to have been perceived as contributing to the generating conditions in which the disorder at the match between Millwall and Bournemouth in April 1966 occurred.

Having gained promotion to the Second Division of the Football League, the club may well have looked towards the new season, 1966-1967, with anticipation and perhaps a degree of trepidation. By the first month of the new season, however, "persistent pitch invasions" prompted the Millwall board of directors to announce:

"During the past few weeks we have repeatedly warned boys about running on to the pitch and told them of the consequences if this continued. It would appear that our warnings and appeals have fallen on deaf ears, so we have reluctantly decided that in future the boys will have to pay 3s for admittance to these grounds." 90

Such a measure should, in fact, be interpreted within the wider context of football spectating. At this stage, in fact, punitive measures were being introduced in a number of grounds around the country. Millwall was no exception. 91

During the season in which Millwall gained promotion to the Second Division, they had remained unbeaten at home. This record stood until

90 Daily Mail 28th September 1966.
91 See Chapter Four.
January 1967. The immediate effect on some Millwall supporters of losing it appears to have been too great. The particular match involved Millwall and Plymouth Argyle, and was reported on in the following way in the Daily Mail:

"...Plymouth yesterday were still angry at the price they paid for stopping Millwall's record run of unbeaten home league games at 59.

Chairman S. Williams said: 'We shall be writing a letter of complaint to the Football League and to Millwall. It was disgraceful. We were told when we arrived that we would not get out of the Den alive if we won.

We were constantly abused by the crowd in front of the director's box and someone jumped over it and struck at my fellow director, Harry Deans.

Several players were attacked by hooligans. Up to £150 worth of damage was done to the coach. It was frightening, unlike anything I have seen in all my years at football," 92

Such newspaper coverage by the national press did much to enhance the reputation of the Millwall crowd. With reference to the coverage surrounding the particular misconduct at the Millwall - Plymouth Argyle match, the South East London Mercury commented:

"Suddenly, my colleagues on the National Press, who should know better, are stating that the Den should be closed for soccer, following incidents that took place away from Millwall's ground after Plymouth A. had shocked the Lions on Saturday.

Because a few irresponsible hooligans had smashed up the Argyle coach, which was parked away from the Den, all the Millwall crowd are condemned....." 93

Despite such observations concerning the propensities of the press, a more adequate account must also consider the more stable, only relatively slowly changing aspects of working class culture in general and football spectating in particular. In this respect, the fact that violent behaviour continued to mark patterns of spectating in this period is seen as crucial.

Two months later, the match between Millwall and Huddersfield Town was

92 Daily Mail 16th January 1967.
marred by fighting between groups of rival supporters. Subsequently, suggestions were made in the press concerning the closure of parts of the Den, increasing admission prices for juveniles and for the erection of barriers around the pitch. The club officials and the local press feared that the FA—who had warned the club following the Plymouth Argyle match—would order the ground to be closed.

Although the ground was not closed and no action was taken by the FA over an attack on Derek Dougan, the Wolverhampton Wanderers' player, in a match at the Den the following month, the local press still maintained that the Millwall spectators and the club were being maligned in the media. In April 1967, for example, the South East London Mercury argued:

"Once again the action of one spectator has brought Millwall into disrepute. It doesn't matter that heads were smashed at other grounds, the Lions have a bad name....They are 'carrying the can' for soccer rowdies at most grounds." 95

Another local newspaper, however, the Lewisham Borough News in October 1967, had no hesitation in describing the "Violence at the Den" at the match between Millwall and Blackburn Rovers when fighting occurred before, during and after the match. The newspaper put it this way: 'A new season opened at the Den on Saturday, but with the old, old story of violence, punch-ups and hooliganism among a section of the crowd...." 97

Similar misconduct marked the game against Aston Villa at the Den during the same month. Fights between fans, coupled with an attack on the referee, N. Burtenshaw, resulted in an official FA enquiry. In fact, the Referee's Association threatened a national strike because of what they believed to be the lack of safety measures at the Den. The Lewisham Borough

---
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97 Ibid.
News, in November 1967, reported the Referee’s Association as being concerned with the inadequate protection at Millwall and other grounds. 98

The FA enquiry found Millwall in breach of rule 38a relating to spectator misconduct and were fined £1,000. The national press had, however, demanded more severe measures. Ken Jones, writing in the Daily Mirror, in October 1967, stated:

"I have every sympathy with Millwall. They do not encourage bad behaviour. They have made many attempts in the past to ensure that trouble does not happen.

But it has happened again and again. Within the last twenty years the Den has twice been shut for a week, and on the last occasion the F.A. took into account five previous reports of misconduct by spectators.

The record of their crowd is a bad one and Millwall must recognise the extent of it." 99

Despite such negative commentaries by the national press, the local newspapers questioned the exact nature of the "alleged" assault. The South East London Mercury, for example, began making an appeal for witnesses to the "alleged" assault on the referee, stating that the readers replies would be forwarded to the F.A. The consistent theme to the questions raised by the newspaper concentrated on "Was he punched or did he fall?" 100 One article, written in October 1967, continued:

"...The image of a typical Millwall crowd as a horde of flat-capped beefy men hysterically waving their dockers' hooks does not exist.

Again and again it is proved that when there is trouble it comes from teenagers. And they are not all home supporters either." 101

This newspaper's ambiguous position concerning the "alleged" assault was thus combined with an attempt to undermine the "image" of Millwall supporters presented in the national press. As such, it indicates that

100 South East London Mercury 19th October 1967.
101 Ibid.
the sense of localism referred to earlier in this chapter had not yet waned. In contrast, the Daily Mail was able to establish, from a "police source" at Lewisham police station, that 'hooliganism is a great problem for us at Millwall. It has been for years.'\(^{102}\)

The national press were thus united in the view that action was essential. As The People simply but forcefully stated: 'Close the Den.'\(^{103}\)

One month after the disorder at the match with Aston Villa, a Millwall fan attacked J. Scouler, the Cardiff City manager, at an away game in Cardiff. Fortunately for Millwall, media coverage was minimal. Such disorder was not, however, confined to trips to Wales. As noted, Millwall supporters began to demonstrate their "traditional" patterns of spectating around the country. During train journeys to Norwich\(^{104}\) and Crystal Palace, damage was reported to have occurred to railway carriages. In the latter case, in December 1967, some two hundred Millwall fans were put off a train and were then reported as having attacked people in Upper Norwood town centre.\(^{105}\)

In December 1968, the Daily Telegraph reported that the Birmingham goalkeeper had been struck by a missile thrown by a member of the crowd at the Den. The Chairman of the club, implicitly echoing the reference made earlier in this chapter, was reported by the Daily Telegraph as having commented: 'Our fans feel so strongly about things that some of them lose their sense of proportion.'\(^{106}\) Such comments correspond to the idea that the group identified by Dunning as being centrally involved in the more violent forms of spectator misconduct, has, as one of its characteristics, intense feelings of attachment to a club. Simply put, such groups also

---
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have a comparatively low ability to exercise emotional control. The strength of feeling felt by Millwall supporters was also, on occasions, directed at the Chairman himself. Following a home defeat by Cardiff in December 1969, the Chairman's car showroom windows were smashed by the club's supporters travelling home along the Old Kent Road. The Chairman, The Times reported, recalled that this had happened four times in the previous five years.107

A "lull" in the reporting of disorder involving Millwall fans, whether at home or away, appears between this latter incident and 1973. During September of that year, disorder at the match between Millwall and Aston Villa was, in contrast to the relative neglect of Millwall in the previous four seasons, given prominent attention in local and national newspapers. The Birmingham Post, for example, labelled the misconduct, "The Battle at the Den."108 The South-East London press gave more details. Here is an account of the disorder drawn from the columns of the Lewisham Borough News in September 1973:

"......Again, there was an element of rowdyism off-field. One section of Villa supporters preferred to sit the afternoon out at New Cross station than venture to the ground. And before kick-off sporadic packs of Millwall fans clashed with Villa supporters. There was one police eviction and a fan treated by an ambulance man." 109

During the same match, Rimmer, the Aston Villa goalkeeper, was struck by a missile. The ensuring FA enquiry resolved in October 1973 that:

"Having given careful consideration to the matter the Members of the Committee were satisfied that Millwall F.C. had met the requirements of Rule 38(a) and had taken all reasonable precautions to prevent misconduct by spectators. It was decided to take no further action other than to instruct the club to post warning

107 The Times 17th December 1969.
notices in prominent positions at its ground for a period of four weeks and to include a similar notice in the club's official programme for the same period." 110

In similar fashion, the FA maintained that all "reasonable precautions" had been taken by the club to prevent disorder at the local derby game against Orient in February 1975. 111 In this match, an Orient player was struck by a knife. The FA noted that steps had been taken by the club to improve crowd control since the previous incident. 112 During 1976, however, incidents involving West Ham and Millwall supporters occurred away from the ground and they resulted in the death by stabbing of a Millwall fan. Two years later, again with regard to West Ham and Millwall supporters, the police were utilising helicopters in their crowd containment policy for this 'local derby.' With such a legacy possibly in mind, a change in the FA's position was evident following the match between Millwall and Ipswich Town in 1978, in which a linesman was struck by a missile. As a result of this incident, the ground was closed yet again, this time for two weeks. 113

The reputation of Millwall supporters had thus attracted nationwide attention. During this period, their notoriety was such that they became the special focus of a "Panorama" programme on BBC TV. 114 The activities of 'F Team' or 'F Troop,' formed from amongst the ranks of the Millwall supporters aged up to their late twenties, and whose intention was to get involved in fighting and "rucking" at away games at other London grounds, became known not only to their rival supporters but also to journalists and academics alike. 115

Further illustration of how reference was made to Millwall supporters
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when criticism of football hooliganism in general was made, can be
demonstrated in an article that appeared in *The Guardian* in 1979:

"Salisbury's F.A. Cup-tie against Millwall.....has been
switched to Southampton at the request of the local police. The
F.A. yesterday emphasised, however, that the change had nothing
to do with Millwall supporters, widely regarded as some of the
worst in the country....." 116

In fact, this "anticipation" of disorder - stemming from the Millwall
supporter's reputation - accompanied the club's progress in the Second
Round F.A. Cup - away tie at Croydon F.C. The *Daily Mirror* headline, in
November 1979, typified this, it read: 'Petchey fears fan trouble.' 117

*The Guardian*, adopted a similar theme to that found in the tabloids:

"After more than a decade of frequent, at times pathological
violence among young supporters, it is not surprising to find clubs,
police and local authorities alert to the dangers attached to
certain football fixtures.....

The switching of Croydon's Second Round F.A. Cup-tie against
Millwall from their own ground to nearby Crystal Palace is one
example." 118

The reference to "pathological violence" in a description of such
behaviour is again indicative of the changing status of football spectating
as a social problem. 119

Despite no disorder being reported at the match against Croydon, the
"lull" could not continue. During Millwall's 5-1 defeat of Shrewsbury
in the next round of the FA Cup, a piece of concrete was reported to have
been thrown at and to have struck a linesman. Faced with an FA enquiry
the Manager, G. Petchey, commented in the *Daily Mirror*:

"This incident has sickened everyone at the club and we are
convinced that the lunatic who did it has no connection with Millwall.
The people who have caused trouble here in the past are well
known to us. We watch every move they make and I can assure you none
of them were responsible." 120

119 See Chapter Five.
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Such incidents, as Section B documents, have not ended with this particular case. Feared by fellow supporters and the authorities alike, and becoming the focus of media and academic attention, Millwall supporters have become central among the folk-devils of the football world. As documented, however, such a phenomenon has a longer pedigree - explanation of its social roots is required and, it is to this, that the analysis must now turn.

B. The Social Roots of Football Hooliganism: The Case of Millwall

What follows is an attempt to formalise the observations which have been made throughout the present study concerning the persistence of particular features in working class culture: these features have, in fact, found expression in patterns of spectating since the foundation of the Football League. Theoretical guidelines are drawn to assist in an explanation of the latter and analysis of the development of the forms and control of football hooligan violence at Millwall is then attempted within this perspective. Finally, some preliminary observations are offered in connection with grasping the complex relationship between the two interwoven dimensions of the phenomenon, i.e. the perception by outside observers of working class football spectators per se and the social roots of football hooligan violence.

Fundamental to this analysis, as noted, is the realisation that the present study is dealing with long-term aspects in the development of British society - thus, the fruitfulness of a developmental perspective, stemming from a re-conceptualisation of the disciplines of history and sociology, has been advocated. Eric Dunning, with specific reference to football hooliganism, has addressed this issue. He writes:

"...Football hooliganism... has to be in large measure explained, not by reference to recent changes, but by reference to more stable, only relatively slowly changing aspects of British society and the British working class." 122

But what are these 'more stable, only relatively slowly changing aspects,' and how do they help to explain football hooliganism? Focusing on the more phenomenal dimension, that is, the persistence of particular norms and values and their expression in football hooligan confrontations, Dunning elaborates his analysis:

"I should like to hypothesize that such confrontations - they do not, of course, occur solely in conjunction with football - are centrally connected with norms of masculinity that stress "toughness" and physical fighting, and that such norms are generated and sustained within a figurational context that approximates closely to what Wolfgang and Ferracuti have called 'the subculture of violence'...

...It seems... plausible to suppose that the total figurational context of such groups is the generating agent, in particular the fact that segments of the working class appear to be segmentally organised and bonded in a manner that approximates closely to what Durkheim called "mechanical solidarity," that is, united by strong kinship and local ties, i.e. by "bonds of similitude." 123

More recently, the Leicester University group have coined the term "segmental integration" to describe the basic relationships of such communities: nevertheless, the outcome is the same. According to this perspective, members of communities based on "segmental integration" tend to develop narrow bonds of allegiance to community and kin, and to form strong territorial identifications and a sense of proprietorship regarding their local "turf" and other areas which they appropriate - such as the football "end." 124 But what is it about the structure of such communities which tends to produce and reproduce violent masculinity as a central cultural characteristic?

Ideal typically, such communities can, crucially, according to Eric

Dunning, be said to be 'marked by the continual formation of street-corner "gangs" within and between which fighting is frequent.' In addition, Dunning lists the following as characteristic of such communities: 'inter-generational clashes, often of a violent nature; frequent resort to physical violence in the socialization of children; comparatively low ability of members to exercise emotional control and defer gratification; intense feelings of group attachment and correspondingly intense feelings of hostility towards "out-groups."' \(^{125}\)

Utilising the work of Suttles, \(^{126}\) Dunning uses the term "ordered segmentation" to characterise structures of this type - to develop such a perspective further, the Leicester group conclude:

"To the extent that (1) they are not subject to effective state control and (2) their internal structures approximate to 'ordered segmentation,' lower working class communities tend to generate norms or standards which, relative to those of other social groups, tolerate a high level of violence in social relations. Correlatively, such communities exert comparatively little pressure on their individual members to exercise self-control over their violent tendencies." \(^{127}\)

Such a perspective complements aspects of the present study. In considering the development of working class leisure in the early nineteenth century note was taken both of the violent milieu within which it was set, and of the degree to which particular leisure activities and, possibly sections of the community - underpinned by these relatively violent mores - were able, to an extent, to evade, in this phase of "colonisation," state control and the "civilising" influences of groups such as the rational recreationalists. In addition, the links between this milieu and the emergence of patterns of spectating at football matches in the late Victorian and Edwardian periods, which involved the expression of relatively violent

\(^{125}\) Dunning, "Notes on the Sociogenesis of 'Football Hooliganism'" pp 8-9.
\(^{127}\) Dunning, Et al "The Social Roots of Football Hooligan Violence" p. 143.
behaviour by the "roughs," was stressed. Furthermore, while the period
between the wars witnessed, as argued, a shift towards respectability,
misconduct at football matches, sometimes quite violent, was not unknown:
indeed, if other sports in this period are examined, for instance, boxing
and horseracing, the existence of relatively serious disorder can be
documented. The communities from which the "gangs" involved in such mis-
conduct were probably predominantly drawn were marked, as the research
by Jerry White highlights, by a violent way of living. More recently,
during the contemporary period, it was documented that those arrested for
football hooligan offences were centrally drawn from the lower working class.
It was also observed that this group did periodically attend and were
sporadically involved in acts of spectator misconduct often of a serious
nature at football matches between the wars. But while such a way of living
has persisted in some sections of the working class, other sections, during
the course of the twentieth century, have gradually moved away from such
social standards regarding the expression and control of violence, especially
by men and in more public contexts.

How do these violent propensities relate, however, to the contemporary
phenomenon and why is football seen as a setting for the expression of such
a 'violent masculine style?' In this regard, Dunning argues that those
involved in some forms of football related disorder are, in fact, as or more
interested in fighting one another than they are in watching the game.
Secondly, such conflict involves groups from the same level of the social
stratification hierarchy, more particularly from the "rough" or "lower
working class." Thirdly, such fighting can take a vendetta form - memories
of past "encounters" figure high in the motivation for such fighting.

128 Jerry White, "Campbell Bunk: A Lumpen Community in London Between the
Wars" History Workshop 8, Autumn 1979 pp 1-49.
Fourthly, the songs and chants - so characteristic of the contemporary period - serve to reinforce the masculine image of the 'in-group' and to denigrate the 'out-group.' But why should football prove such an ideal setting? Dunning has addressed this issue in the following terms:

"... Football is a natural medium for the expression of such norms because norms of 'manliness' are intrinsic to it i.e. it, too, is a play-fight in which masculine reputations are won and lost.... Football, moreover, is inherently oppositional and that, together with the fact that its teams are symbolic representatives of wider communities such as towns and cities, means that it lends itself readily to group identification and to the enhancement of in-group solidarity in opposition to a series of easily identifiable out-groups, the opposing teams and their supporters." 130

Confirmation of such features can, in fact, be drawn again from the analysis of nineteenth-century leisure. Folk football demonstrated the qualities of the play-fight - and the concomitant scenes of violence - which were outlined. However, while the more gregarious forms of folk football were effectively destroyed in the course of the nineteenth century and while, when football 'returned' to a working class context there was a stricter separation of the roles of the player and spectator, at least in terms of the official rules of the game, the patterns of spectating which came into existence were still, relatively speaking, underpinned by a sense of 'manliness.'

In sum, the Leicester group felt able to conclude:

"... We have argued that adolescent "gangs" and a violent masculine style are generated by specific structural characteristics of lower working class communities and by the manner in which such communities are integrated into the wider structure of social interdependencies. The areas of social life outside lower working class communities where these violent propensities have found expression have tended to shift under the influence of changing fashions. However, it seems that one relatively permanent context for such behaviour has been provided by Association Football. That is, virtually since its emergence in its modern form, the game has been accompanied by fan disorder, much of it involving physical violence. The incidence of

129 Dunning, "Social Bonding and Violence in Sport" pp 34-35.
such disorder seems to have varied over time, depending for example on: (1) the changing attraction of the game to the lower working class; and (2) the changing proportion of communities in society at large whose structures approximate to 'ordered segmentation.' 131

While the focus of this study has not solely been on such features of the development of the forms and control of football hooligan violence - in fact, in order to examine the total figurational context, the analysis has had also to consider the interwoven perceptual dimension, i.e. the emergence of football spectating as a social problem within the context of the analysis of deviance and working class youth in general - the present study's findings are in broad agreement. Elaboration of this can be attempted with specific reference to Millwall F.C.

The violent masculine style which characterises lower working class communities and the concomitant clashes between neighbourhood "gangs" have long been a feature of English society. The streets within the vicinity of the "Den" have not been immune to such clashes. During the same month in 1901 in which the first "encountered" case of spectator misconduct at the ground of Millwall F.C. was noted, the Kentish Mercury commented on the widespread disorder in the district in which the ground was located:

"Rowdyism in New Cross Road is no new thing. Our columns have for years borne witness to its existence. Correspondents have been loud in their complaints, and our Police Court reports have shown that mainly in consequence thereof, the police have been praise-worthily vigilant. But to judge from 'information received,' as the constable puts it, the condition of affairs in that important thoroughfare is as bad as ever, more particularly on Sunday nights, when noisy gangs of youths of both sexes perambulate the road. The majority of them are respectably dressed, in many cases the lads are apparently office boys or shop assistants, each with the cheap and poisonous cigarette in mouth, but there is a considerable proportion too, of the Coster Sans - collar class, with neckerchief tightly knotted round the throat. These young hooligans are specially offensive just about the time that more respectable folk are making their way home from church." 132

132 Kentish Mercury 27th September 1901.
This example is of significance as it highlights a clash between the "roughs" and "respectables" who lived in and around the district. Unfortunately, it has not proved possible to probe the occupational structure and residential patterns of this particular working class community extensively over time. Despite this limitation, some 'grounded speculation' can be attempted on the basis of such reports. It is clear that the writer identified two main elements to the disorder - a more 'respectable' section and what he called the 'coster-sans collar class.' The latter seemingly were perceived as the more offensive of the two. It is difficult to imagine that, if such groups were involved in disorder on the streets in this area and if they were attracted to local football matches, similar behaviour would not also have occurred in and around the ground at East Ferry Road.

Indeed, from early on, those involved in spectator misconduct were not averse to travelling to 'support' Millwall. Such trips were also marked by confrontations with groups of supporters - probably drawn from similar communities - of the rival team. As the example of the West Ham - Millwall match of 1906 illustrated, "free fights" in the context of such matches were not unknown. Interestingly, in this case, the clash occurred at a local 'derby;' such venues provide a stark demonstration of the loyalty and identification expressed about one's own district on the one hand, and great antagonism towards the rival supporters who are equally defending the 'honour' of their district, on the other. Of those cases of spectator misconduct encountered several have in fact involved these local 'derby' matches and a number have involved clashes between West Ham and Millwall supporters.

Such incidents at matches were by no means unusual. Throughout the period between the wars, spectator misconduct continued to be a feature of
spectating at the Den. Such was the reputation of the Millwall supporters, even at this stage in the emergence of football spectating as a social problem, that one writer in the local newspaper was forced, as noted, to complain of the "scare" headlines in the national Sunday newspapers. What he argued in fact was that Millwall supporters were "Not so Bad as They are Painted." Folk devils, it appears, are not confined to the present day!

With such a legacy - during the period between the wars, the Den was ordered to be closed twice and the club warned by the FA on three other occasions - it is hardly surprising that another writer, in commenting on disorder at the Den immediately following the end of the Second World War, argued that the Millwall supporters were acting "in traditional fashion." But what did this tradition entail and which social groups were involved in this period? A clue to the latter - and indeed to the generating conditions of such a tradition - can be found in the work of Jerry White.

Closer attention to his work is appropriate at this point.

In his analysis of Campbell Bunk, a North London working class community, White is concerned to examine what he sees as its 'lumpen' character during the period between the wars. In the course of his analysis, White makes a passing reference to the fact that a member of this community would "On Saturday afternoons......often travel to the Lion's Den at Millwall and pick up a pile of coppers by singing to the football crowd." Although we are not told that he was interested in football, his presence at such venues would suggest, at the very least, that he did not
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feel out of place. Being a North London community, however, it would have been more likely that people from Campbell Bunk, if followers of football at all, would have been supporters of Arsenal FC or Tottenham Hotspur FC. But what type of community was it? In this connection, White refers to the conflicts and tensions which permeated all relationships. He wrote:

"Time and time again, tensions erupted in violence. Violence was Campbell Bunk's dominant characteristic. It was never far beneath the surface. There was violence within families, between neighbours, even between streets; for good reasons and for no reason; leaving grudges and cementing friendships.... The fist, boot, pudding basin, chair leg, flat iron, were often the first resort in arguments between neighbours, and even within families. Little of this violence was confined discreetly behind closed doors. Generally it took place in the street." 139

Such street-corner clashes seem to substantiate the analysis outlined. Violence - a dominant characteristic - permeated all social relations. Rivalries emerged and grudges were maintained - the vendettas to which Dunning refers. But such communities were not confined to North London. The neighbourhood within which the Den was located contained similar social formations. The 'Terror of Brick Lane,' Arthur Harding, has recently reminisced about his life in the East End of London. Once more a picture of violence being part of the everyday social relations emerges. 140

Unfortunately, similarly to White's account of Campbell Bunk, no elaboration of his sporting experiences is given, but the violence encounters are vividly described. For example: 'I got my first gun about 1904. I remember I fired it in a crowd against a man named Sawyer. He was a good fighting man from the Hackney Road, but we were at loggerheads....' 141

While it is not being claimed here that spectator misconduct at the Den involved the use of guns - though, as noted, at racecourses in the

139 Ibid pp 24-25.
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period between the wars scenes involving guns were witnessed - what is being suggested is that those involved in the more serious forms of spectator misconduct may well have been drawn predominantly from such communities.

Echoing the idea that the Millwall supporters were behaving in "traditional fashion," A.A. Thomas, writing for the Daily Worker, noted in 1947:

"The first of the Football Association's moves to clean up the game will be greeted by players, spectators and officials. There are several little outposts of bad sportsmanship still holding out in English football and the fining of Millwall and the closing of their ground for a week will act as a warning not only to the "Tough" fans at the Den, but also to those at other grounds.

Millwall manager, Jack Cocks will make a "play the game" appeal to the crowd at the club's next home game against Sheffield Wednesday on December 20th.

Action by supporters club's officials at several grounds might help considerably in checking these elements for whom either the players or the officials can do no right. The spectators themselves could stamp out these missile-throwing roughs in their own way.

It is unfortunate that the clubs themselves must bear the brunt of their unwelcome supporters actions.

Although they are nominally innocent, it is still their responsibility to see that their ground is kept free from these few roughs, who are hangovers from the days of cock-fighting and bear-baiting, and would be more at home attending bull fights than a game whose sportsmanship has made for Britain a reputation second to none." 142

These comments are of especial significance to the present study in two respects. Firstly, they stress the relative persistence, within specific communities, of the mores of the folk culture of the nineteenth century - something which the present study itself has been at pains to highlight. Secondly, such comments reflect the ongoing attempts by the authorities and more established groups to control, regulate and supervise working class leisure and colonise working class culture. Interestingly, these comments appeared in the left-wing newspaper, the Daily Worker, and not in the main-
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stream newspapers which, one would have thought, would have been more likely, by and large, to reflect the "hegemonic" values of British society.

Such "hangovers from the days of cock-fighting and bear-baiting" are the possible link between those communities which both resisted colonisation and were less susceptible to the actions of the state and groups such as the rational recreationalists, and, the communities now termed "rough" working class. The community from which Millwall drew such "hangovers" may, in fact, be only one such example, for A.A. Thomas also refers to the existence of what he terms "several little outposts of bad sportsmanship."

During the period since the end of the Second World War, both specific and more general features of some of the cases of spectator misconduct that have occurred at the Den lend support to the analysis proposed in this thesis. Following disorder in 1947, the club secretary, as noted earlier, blamed those people who "cannot control their tempers." Dunning has argued that the members of communities characterised by "ordered segmentation" tend to be less able than members of more "respectable" or "incorporated" groups to exercise self-control in critical situations and that they tend, in consequence, to resort more readily to violence. In fact, matches at the Den may have attracted members of the "rough" working class more regularly and in greater numbers than was the case at other clubs both in the period between the wars and in the 1950's and 1960's. Such an analysis is supported by the Millwall manager's observation in 1950 that the club would leave the district if the "undesirables" continued to create disorder. But what of the social composition of the district the manager referred to? While the present analysis cannot be too definitive, the crucial distinguishing feature was that this district was dominated by dockland: a district
where, predominantly, semi-skilled and unskilled members of the working class would have worked and lived. The occupational structure of docking tends to confirm the types of relationships which traditionally used to exist in working class communities. New workers were usually recruited from the sons of dockers. Having gained entry into this hard manual job, sons would be taught their trade by their fathers and the dockers were either organised in family "gangs" or belonged to different "gangs" but helped their relatives when they could. Perhaps as a result of the close-knit nature of such patterns of employment, when disputes did arise between groups of dockers, the resort to violence was the usual outcome. Despite their dependency upon them in specific ways, the "respectable" directors of Millwall FC may well have wished to distance themselves from people from such humble and above all, "rough" and violent roots.

Other features of such communities are, however, evident in the values perceived by the media as being those of the groups involved in spectator misconduct. In 1963, in rescuing the Millwall goal-keeper from an attack by rival supporters, the Millwall fans are seen as a 'loyal band' what interpretation can be placed on such "loyalty?" While Brake refers to the "symbolic importance of territory" and Dunning et al refer to the "intense identification with the local turf" which the lower working class exhibit, the former appears to rule out and the latter do not sufficiently stress the possibility that such identification could be transferred to a sense of loyalty to representatives of their territory, i.e. their football team. True, Brake refers to such symbolism as manifestating itself in "aggressive support for local football" - in fact, the example he uses is Millwall FC - but the analysis is left there. Is it not reasonable to suggest that such "aggressive support" could be extended to effect the
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rescue of the Millwall goalkeeper and that such behaviour would be perceived by sympathetic "outsiders" as an act of loyalty?

Several reports of spectator misconduct also stress the "masculine" nature of the support offered by Millwall supporters - one writer, argued, for example that the fans have "never believed soccer is a cissie's game." As noted, however, while tacit support was evident in this example, differences in the perception by the press and the club of what was permissible behaviour in public did exist, so much so, in fact, that the writer of the Millwall club programme in 1965 was forced to concede that those Millwall supporters involved in spectator disorder "simply don't know what it means to behave in a civilised manner." What, in fact, the writer appears to fail to recognise is that there exist, in English society, communities who share values which are significantly different from those which he assumes to be "civilised." If the writer had remarked that these supporters appear to display a love of fighting and that this is a central source of meaning and gratification in their lives, he would not have been mistaken. But such values are not entirely absent in the "respectable" society in which the writer is located. Whereas the aggressive masculinity of the "rough" working class finds expression in public situations where a more regulated and controlled behaviour is expected, the aggressive masculinity of the "respectables" manifests itself, by and large, in socially legitimate channels such as contact sports, e.g. rugby union. In addition, as Dunning and Murphy observe:

"The central difference in this regard between lower working-class communities and those of their "respectable" counterparts in the upper, middle and working-classes appears to be that, in the latter, violence in face-to-face relations tends to be normatively condemned whilst, in the former, it tends normatively to be
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positively sanctioned, that is, encouraged and rewarded. A further difference is that there is a tendency in the "respectable" classes for violence to be "pushed behind the scenes" and, when it does occur, for it to take on balance, an "instrumental" form and to lead to the arousal of feelings of guilt. By contrast, in the communities of the "rough" working class violence tends to occur to a greater extent in public and to take, or balance, an "expressive" or "affectual" form. As such, it tends to be associated to a greater extent with the arousal of pleasurable feelings.147

In consequence, in part, of the regular expression of such violence in the public context of football matches, by the mid-1960's, football spectating had come to be defined as a social problem of national proportions. Millwall supporters had become defined as the enfant terribles in this regard, so much so, that the first governmental report into the phenomenon focused on Millwall supporters. During the same period, a Reverend Owen Beament offered three points which he considered "....to be vital for a proper understanding of the situation in South-East London." One of his points reinforces the analysis already suggested: 'This area of London abounds in acts of hate and destruction, and the behaviour at "The Den" is certainly no worse than the behaviour in the area in which it is situated.'149

Whether "hate" was the motivating force for such behaviour is questionable, but the Reverend Beament is quite correct to attempt to locate such behaviour in the context of the community.

But it was the first government-commissioned report, The Harrington Report which elaborated on this. Its analysis substantiates the connections this study has sought to probe and highlight. Harrington noted:

"These Millwall youngsters are a strange mixture. They are tough but warmhearted and likeable individually but they can turn into a hostile and threatening mob on the terraces.....I believe much of this violence on the terraces is a reflection of the violent district in London's dockland in which they live.

The general code of conduct seems to be if in doubt hit out."150

Quoting one Millwall supporter, Harrington captured the essential nature
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of the relationship being examined: "fighting is a way of life - we are born into it." In the official report, Harrington concluded:

"In one dockland area notorious for serious outbreaks of hooliganism we found that fighting was regarded as a way of life the inhabitants were born to and the only proper way of settling disputes. Here to avoid a challenge was unmansly; to remain passive was looked on as wrong. There was a suggestion that youths accepted without question a code about fighting handed down to them by their Fathers." 152

The hypothesis concerning the existence of such a legacy, handed down from one generation to the next, is consistent with the explanation outlined earlier concerning the persistent accounts of spectator misconduct involving Millwall supporters since the turn of the century. It is why Millwall supporters were seen to have been acting in "traditional fashion" and why they were perceived to be "hangovers from the days of cock-fighting and bear-baiting." But the anxiety expressed about this dockland area in general and Millwall F.C. in particular, has also resulted in an amplification over time of the threat posed by Millwall supporters. In the 1930's they were the subject of "scare headlines" in the national Sunday newspapers; in the 1960's and 1970's, they were branded the "worst crowd in the country." Here the analysis is faced with the twin themes which permeate the phenomenon of football hooligan violence in general, i.e. the social roots of such behaviour and the perception by powerful outsiders of football spectators per se since the foundation of the Football League.

With such an analysis in mind, the comments made by the present Millwall Chairman must be treated with some degree of scepticism. Following an FA Cup-tie at Slough in which crowd violence occurred, the Chairman, Allan Thorne, threatened to close the club if there was a repeat of such disorder. Writing in the club programme in November 1982, Thorne stated:
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"The good name of Millwall FC has been dragged through the mud for the last time.....I shall not wait for the FA to close down the Den - I shall do it myself. This is a promise not a threat." 153

It is doubtful whether Thorne will act on this threat or, if he does, whether it will prove to be effective.154 Such expressions of violent masculinity, while they can be, in part, regulated and controlled by the "respectables" through the various agencies of the state, do not lend themselves to complete control. Now, therefore, can the phenomenon be summed up? In this regard, Dunning and Murphy have provided some guidelines which go some way towards adequately grasping the twin interwoven themes referred to earlier. What they write is, in fact, worthy of quoting at length:

"The point about the aggressive masculine behaviour of the "rough" working class as displayed whether in football hooligan fighting or in comparable activities in other social locations is that, by contrast with the aggressive masculinity of their respectable counterparts, its expression takes place in public situations where more peaceful and restrained forms of behaviour are demanded by the dominant social values. It also tends to be more seriously violent. As a result, the expression of such masculine behaviour tends to be perceived as illegitimate by those who adhere to the dominant values. However, whilst it grows out of specific structural conditions of lower working class life and is more or less constantly reproduced in that social context, such behaviour is also, in part, a protest against the dominant values. That is because its expression, along with many other aspects of lower working class culture, brings those who engage in it regularly and publically into conflict with more "respectable" groups and with the police and other agencies whose task it is to uphold established values. It is, however, a complex phenomenon. In particular, because it involves, simultaneously, intra- as well as inter-class conflict, it cannot be adequately grasped in terms of conventional class and stratification theories. Thus the fighting of males from the "rough" working class, whether in a football context or elsewhere, is, in the first instance, an expression of conflict with and hostility towards others like themselves, but by regularly engaging in it, especially in public situations where more restrained behaviour is normatively expected, they come into conflict with groups above them in the status order and with agencies such as the police whose ostensible social role is the protection of dominant values. This level of the conflict has, as it were, a "life of its own," that is, its own relatively autonomous dynamics. The two levels also interact but both of them, and their interplay, have to be grasped
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While the present study shares much in common with the analysis proposed by Dunning and Murphy, where it does differ is in the degree to which the nature and extent of the conflict at an inter-class level - since the foundation of the Football League - is adequately spelled out. In this respect, the present study has sought to examine the emergence of football spectating as a social problem within the analysis of deviance and working class youth in general. An attempt must therefore be made, as Dunning and Murphy rightly point out, to grasp simultaneously the subtle interplay between the social roots of football hooligan violence, the perception of it by outside observers, and the actions taken in an attempt to control it, i.e. the total figurational context. It is to this, together with an overall appraisal of the present study, that remarks in the conclusion will be directed.

CONCLUSION
PRELIMINARY FINDINGS AND OBSERVATIONS ON THE WIDER SIGNIFICANCE OF THE PRESENT STUDY

The concluding remarks to the present study are divided into four sections. In the first section, an examination is undertaken of the intentions which the study originally set out with. In this context, a re-appraisal of the dominant mythology, which analyses of football hooliganism are seen to reflect and reinforce, will be undertaken. Reference will also be made both to those research orientations identified in Chapter One and to the themes and issues which are seen to dominate accounts of popular culture and leisure; in particular, the prevailing conceptions of the relative power potential of people to make their own culture and the significance and interpretation of popular culture are seen as crucial in this regard. The analysis is undertaken in the light of the substantive findings of the present study.

The methodology of doing historical sociology forms the focus of section two. In considering the manner in which the present study has sought to analyse and explain how particular ways of living come into being, are preserved and changed, reference will again be made to the nature of the socio-historical process. By probing this issue in this fashion, the analysis is better placed to provide an overall appraisal of the substantive findings of the present study.

Section three, accordingly, attempts to provide a summation of the evidence and analyses presented in the four preceding chapters. It does so in the light of the broad issues, particular themes and focal concerns outlined in the Introduction. In short, a "tying together" of the strands which permeate the present study is attempted.

Finally, section four deals with the significance which the findings of the present study have for analyses of popular culture, leisure, working
class youth, and the sociology of sport. On this basis several recommendations for further research will be proposed.

A. The Dominant Mythology: A Reappraisal

The present study originally set out with the intention of performing a debunking function in relation to the ways in which the phenomenon of football hooliganism has been both popularly conceived and analysed in existing research. While certain criticisms were made in the Introduction and in Chapter One, a further critique in the light of the substantive findings is also necessary. For the purpose of analysis, attention will first be given to the dominant mythology in which popular conceptions of football hooliganism are located and then, a critique of particular research orientations will be undertaken.

The dominant mythology centres around three main contentions. Firstly, that the phenomenon of football hooliganism is peculiar to the 1960's and 1970's. Secondly, that the phenomenon is "getting worse." Thirdly, that the phenomenon is attributable to the onset of the "permissive" society.

Are such contentions borne out by the substantive findings of the present study?

The contention that spectator disorder at Association Football matches - and elsewhere - is novel and that it dates from the 1960's is clearly unfounded. The evidence provided by the present study has documented the existence of disorder and misconduct at matches dating from the foundation of the Football League. Indeed, such disorder and misconduct appear to have been a persistent feature of spectating throughout the period in question. This is not to deny the periodic dimension to the phenomenon - that is, that the nature and extent of the form, control and perception of football hooligan violence have varied over time. Nor is it to deny that particular periods contain features and styles which are specific to these
times. In this respect, as noted, the 1960's and 1970's, in particular ways, do indeed demonstrate a distinctive style. But, having acknowledged this, the present study would be flawed if it did not re-emphasise that the more general point made by Elias concerning the processes by which later social formations arise out of earlier ones, is applicable in relation to explaining the phenomenon in question. That is, while particular decades may well have features specific to them, the characteristics of the phenomenon existing in any given period must be understood in terms of how they have been produced and reproduced over time. At issue, is the complex, ever-changing balance between continuity and change. The phenomenon of football hooliganism is not novel; to believe that it is is to go against the argument outlined and is thus more a reflection of the today-centred thinking to which Goudsblom has referred.

The second contention which the dominant mythology expresses is that "things are getting worse." The problem which arises in this connection is to determine what kind of benchmark has been used to justify such an assertion. Clearly, if it is also believed that football hooliganism is at least novel in some respects then it would appear that things are "getting worse." Here again, however, clarification is required. For even if the phenomenon is seen as novel, i.e. as dating from the 1960's, it still allows an analysis to be undertaken of the trends which have occurred within the period in question. For example, despite the development of elaborate control measures and their adoption by the FA, the clubs and the police, the "moral panic" which surrounded the early weeks of the 1983-1984 season would, if taken at face-value, convince the observer that things were indeed getting worse. Indicative of this trend is a report published in the Sunday Mirror in September 1983 with the following headline:
"Save Our Soccer Maggie."

Football, worried by crowd violence, may seek help from The Prime Minister. And unless Margaret Thatcher can be persuaded to intervene, the professional game in this country may be abandoned to the escalating threat of mob rule." 1

For the present study, a more adequate benchmark for considering the proposition that the game is faced by the "escalating threat of mob rule" lies in examining the trends in the nature and extent of football hooligan violence since the 1880's and the establishment of the game in its present form.

Before consideration is given to this, two points need to be made. First, reference will be made to both the nature and the extent of football hooligan violence in order to highlight the possible changes in its forms and rates over time. A number of permutations are thus possible in relation to the assertion that things are getting worse. It is conceivable that both the nature and extent of football hooligan violence could change, i.e., that the rate could increase and the more serious forms become more prevalent, or conversely, any combination of each could exist, i.e., the rate could remain constant but more serious disorder could occur, or the forms could remain constant but the rate at which they occur could increase. In each case, the phenomenon could be interpreted as "getting worse."

However, an assessment of whether a phenomenon is "getting worse" is also bound up with a second dimension of social problems which is integrally integrated with its actual forms and the rate at which it occurs. That is, the perception of it by powerful outsiders. It is here that the second point needs to be made. A different interpretation of the perception that things are getting worse can be made: the nature and extent of the phenomenon can remain constant, but the perception of, in this case, football hooligan violence, can, for reasons not directly connected to the game and the behaviour of its supporters, become more or less fraught with anxiety and

1 Sunday Mirror 11th September 1983.
fear. A possible resolution to this problem can be sought in the substantive findings of the present analysis.

In harking back to the period between the wars, a number of ex-players, writers and academics have stressed that the period exhibited both an absence of disorder and a close relationship between the supporters and the clubs. From the evidence presented here, it is clear that this account is far from adequate. Yet, this mythology may have a basis of truth in it, i.e. that even though conflict was present and while supporters such as those at Leicester did resent what they termed the "autocratic" rule of the directors, the period can also be characterised in terms of what the present study has termed the trend towards "respectability." The inter-war years, more than the period which preceded it and more than the 1960's and 1970's, was marked by a relatively greater consensus over the "limits of decent partisanship" as far as football spectating was concerned. For those middle-aged and older contemporaries of the 1960's and 1970's attending matches in the context of what the present study has termed the "return of the roughs," things may well indeed have seemed to be getting worse. Yet such recollections appear somewhat selective - the football hooligan violence of the period between the wars and of the late Victorian and Edwardian decades is "forgotten." Indeed, in relation to this latter period, the present study has documented forms of disorder which are strongly reminiscent - in terms of the expression of a violent masculine style - of the football hooliganism of the 1960's and 1970's. In the way it is present formulated and utilised, the assertion that things are getting worse, simply, undirectionally and in all dimensions, will not do.

Stemming from such an assertion, exponents of the dominant mythology have sought to explain the trend they perceive towards decline in terms of
contemporary changes in cultural values and morals. It is here that reference is made to the onset of the "permissive society." Yet, if the phenomenon of football hooliganism is seen, in fact, to predate the onset of the "permissive society," what is one to make of such an analysis? While it may be conceded that the phenomenon has a longer pedigree than some would have us believe, exponents of this perspective could claim that their explanation is a historically specific idea, i.e. that it explains the phenomenon of the 1960's and 1970's and that any disorder predating this can be explained with reference to factors which pertained in earlier periods. But such an argument overlooks, as argued, how these later social figurations arise out of earlier ones. For example, the forms of spectator misconduct of the contemporary period are strongly reminiscent to those of the Victorian and Edwardian periods, and which persisted, in varying degrees, in the 1920's and 1930's. Moreover, the "moral panic" of the 1960's and the 1970's had its antecedents in the anxiety evident in the period between the wars which was but a less intense version of that which existed in the 1890's and early 1900's.

The suggestion that football hooliganism could be explicable in terms of the changes brought about by the "permissive society" found expression in the official reports conducted by Harrington and Lang. The latter suggested that present-day society is marked by a "relaxed discipline" and that the existence of the social malaise of hooligan behaviour is therefore not surprising. But both Harrington and Lang unwittingly undermine their own case by also making reference to the existence of disorder prior to the emergence of this perceived trend towards the relaxation of discipline. In fact, Harrington went as far as to claim that there had been a "recent regression" to older and long-forgotten patterns of behaviour. Harrington was nearer to a relatively adequate appraisal of the phenomenon
than his formulation would suggest. The football hooligan violence of the 1960's and 1970's was not, however, a "recent regression" but rather a continuation of well-established, deeply rooted ways of living and patterns of spectating evident in sections of English society. Having criticised Harrington in this way, however, it would be mistaken to overlook his reference to the connection between the values which underpinned both folk football and working class culture, i.e. the stress on masculinity and excitement. Though Harrington treated this issue somewhat tentatively and inadequately, this connection has, in fact, been borne out by the substantive findings of the present study.

Harrington is not alone, in drawing attention to this issue. Both Critcher and Clarke stress that the core values of male working class culture and football revolve around masculinity, aggression and regional identification. By such an observation, these researchers were providing, however inadvertently, the framework for the examination of the social roots of football hooligan violence. But Critcher and Clarke chose to highlight these values in connection with the changing relationship between the working class supporter and his club which they perceived to have occurred during the 1960's. Thus emphasis, was given, as Clarke termed it, to the growth of the football match as "a spectacle for passive consumption." The substantive findings of the present study in fact go some way to supporting the idea that there has been a trend towards a demand for a more passive, genteel and "civilised" form of spectating. However, this trend occurred throughout the period studied, and, perhaps, was particularly evident in the inter-war years. In addition, for the present study, a second difference can be noted in comparison with Clarke. An explanation for this trend must refer both to the attempts by more powerful groups to impose a more restrained version of the limits of decent partisanship, and,
as the concomitant outcome of the changes which were occurring in sections of working class culture, reference must be made to the drift towards an individualised lifestyle and a less gregarious display of emotions.

Not all working class groups, however, were equally affected by these changes in culture or by the attempts to impose particular codes of conduct on their behaviour. Such changes assist in providing an explanation of the most recent stages in the emergence of football spectating as a social problem, but the reference to the value placed on aggression and masculinity in male working class culture and its correspondence with forms of spectating requires an additional explanation to that provided by Clarke, Critcher and Taylor. In particular, no support can be given to the idea that those involved in football hooliganism have been "protesting" about the changes which were and are occurring in the game. As argued, the issue is centrally connected with both the competing perceptions over ways of living and codes of conduct in English society and with the disension interwoven with this, namely the social circumstances within which football hooligan violence is produced and reproduced.

In this regard, Clarke's interpretation of football hooliganism as a "new extension" of traditional forms of spectating is equally misleading. While there were, as Chapter Four documented, distinctive aspects to the football hooliganism of the 1960's and 1970's, there are also a number of features which have permeated football hooligan violence since the foundation of the Football League. The implicit suggestion by Clarke is that the traditional forms of spectating were mere partisanship and troubled no-one, but that the modern forms of spectating take a violent form as a conscious revolt against the changes which are occurring. But considered in the light of the findings of the present study, this simply does not hold up. This
can be illustrated in two ways. Firstly, for late Victorians and Edwardians, spectator misconduct was a source of considerable anxiety and such behaviour was marked by quite seriously violent forms. Secondly, processes of commercialisation, professionalisation and, at the level of control, bourgeoisification, was occurring in the game in the 1880's and 1890's which, at the very least, would mean that the Clarke-Taylor-Critcher hypothesis would have to be backdated by seventy or eighty years. However, few of the forms of spectator disorderliness reported in those years can be interpreted as acts of protest against the pattern of ownership and control of the game. Most of them took the form of attacks on players and match officials, and would thus have to be seen in terms of "displacement" if the "real" targets were those who owned and controlled the clubs. However, there is little evidence for such displacement. The Clarke-Taylor-Critcher hypothesis evidently results, in large measure, from ideological sources, in particular from their common belief that they know what the "interests" of the working classes "really are."

In addition, the analyses by Clarke and Taylor of the relationship between clubs and supporters in the inter-war years are not supported by the evidence presented in the preceding four chapters. Nor is much of what they say about the origins and ownership of clubs, or about the emergence of football spectating as a social problem. For example, as the evidence documented in relation to Leicester during the inter-war years revealed, a number of particular episodes of misconduct appear to have been connected to a sense of injustice felt by the supporters with regard to the organisation and administration of the club by its directors. From this it is clear that there has been no golden age when clubs and supporters enjoyed a close and harmonious relationship or when violence was absent either from the field
of play or from the terraces.

Similarly, the failure to provide a developmental account of the media treatment of the phenomenon has also led to a relatively inadequate appraisal being offered by Whannel and Hall. As Chapter Five revealed, it is undoubtedly true that the 1960's and 1970's did contain many of the features which these writers claim were distinctive of the media presentation of football hooliganism in that period. Indeed, television and newspapers, especially the tabloids, played a crucial role in both the emergence of a moral panic and in the creation of particular images of football hooliganism. But to point to this media presentation alone is not sufficient. By viewing the treatment of football hooligan violence in the press since the foundation of the Football League a clearer understanding of the climate of concern in which such press coverage took place can emerge. While it is not appropriate to go into great detail at this stage, it is apparent that, although there were features of press coverage which were peculiar to the 1960's and 1970's, a number of other aspects which Hall and Whannel document also found expression throughout the development of football as a spectator sport. For example, the use of dismissive labels to portray the phenomenon found a vivid representation in the use of the term "football fever" in the 1890's and 1900's. The term "fever", when contextualised in relation to respectable fears regarding "the masses" in general, can be seen as part of the socially defining terminology employed to refer to the "evil" and "poison" perceived as emanating from the working classes. In addition, the existence of "scare headlines" and the portrayal of particular groups of supporters as more violent and dangerous than others is also not confined to how the popular tabloids presently treat such groups as Millwall and Chelsea fans. In the 1930's, as was documented, Millwall supporters were the subject of what one South-East London newspaper described as "scare headlines" and the paper complained that these
"supporters were not as bad" as the Sunday national newspapers - such as The People and the News of the World - painted them.

In order, therefore, to tease out the relationship between the social roots of football hooligan violence and its treatment by the media at any given point in time, a developmental approach must be adopted. In the process of providing an overall account of the substantive findings of the present study, it will be seen as crucial to explicate this relationship - as part of the changing nature of the perception, above all by socially dominant and therefore influential groups, of particular ways of living in English society.

Although the documentation of forms of disorder predating the 1960's serves the purpose of undermining the idea that spectator disorder was somehow novel, if left at that, such "facts" could provide support for the analysis offered by Marsh and Morris. As argued, however, empirical access to any such phenomenon must be coupled with a concomitant analytical distance and be informed by theory. While Marsh and Morris envisage that aggressiveness of the kind which manifests itself in football hooliganism is at least in part innate and therefore an inevitable feature of human relations, the present study, drawing on the work of Elias, has sought to explain the structured continuity and change involved in the struggles over codes of conduct evident in English society in terms of the civilising process. Such an analysis not only makes problematic the idea that the mores and consciousness which underpin behaviour are fixed but also provides a more adequate grasp of the relationship between the emergence of patterns of spectating in the late Victorian period - and which have been to some extent evident throughout the development of football as a spectator sport - and the mores which underpinned the folk football and popular culture of the early nineteenth century. Commenting on the comparison between the violence of the Blue and Green factions
at chariot races in Rome and football hooliganism, Geoff Pearson has provided a pertinent observation in this connection:

"The more modest punch-ups of our time hardly bear comparison with such a spectacular disregard for human life. Even so, faced with formidably ageless continuities such as these we must be tempted to conclude that these problems are indeed of the 'timeless,' if more regrettable aspects of the human condition. But whether we care to phrase such an appeal in terms of eternal human folly, or evil, or the ageless chemistry of the demon drink, or in terms of a built-in aggressive impulse and an upsurge of youthful instinctual energy, we must take care not to write off history at the stroke of a pen. It is one thing to wriggle free of the ageless mythologies of historical decline. It is quite another to leap into the sins of the equally pernicious social doctrine that nothing ever changes." 2

While the adoption of a developmental analysis allows one to overcome both the "ageless mythologies" and the "pernicious social doctrine" to which Pearson refers, it is also of assistance in examining the norms and rules which underpin codes of conduct over time. While Marsh is correct to point to the ritual nature of the terrace behaviour of the 1960's and 1970's, such rituals are, in fact, more longstanding and are not confined to the contemporary scene. Although such rules tend to be tacitly held and therefore difficult to document, in no period in the development of football as a spectator sport are they absent. While Marsh, in the overall context of human behaviour, has recognised this, what he cannot come to terms with, given his sociobiological base, is that the mores which underpin such codes of conduct, are themselves not immutable, nor fixed for all time.

While Marsh and Morris point to the meaningful, rule-governed nature of football hooliganism, and thereby serve to undermine the labelling of such behaviour as 'mindless,' their analyses can also serve to reinforce the dominant mythology referred to. By arguing that the problem will not wane, but rather that the aggression which underpins football hooliganism is inevitable, Marsh and Morris argue that the phenomenon needs to be carefully controlled and channelled. While the intelligibility of terrace

behaviour - within certain limits - is stressed, these researchers, view the phenomenon in terms of its control. Again, there are direct parallels with the dominant mythology.

The dominant mythology which exists in relation to football hooliganism also finds expression in analyses of popular culture and leisure. While writers such as Stedman Jones, Cunningham and Eileen and Stephen Yeo have correctly pointed to the conventional and well-trodden routes which analyses of leisure and popular culture have followed, a number of reservations were expressed regarding their respective contributions. The significance of the findings of the present study for the analysis of popular culture and leisure will be considered in more detail in the final section of this Conclusion. For the moment, attention will be given to a further appraisal of the work of Hugh Cunningham, for it is he who has conducted research which focused on particular features which the present study has also considered. In this way, a critique of Cunningham can serve as a rejoinder to this grouping of writers in general.

In his analysis of leisure in the industrial revolution, Cunningham, as was noted earlier, took exception with three main aspects of what he takes to be the conventional histories of leisure. First, that popular culture was "smashed," that there was a "vacuum" in popular culture in the early nineteenth century. Secondly, that with the onset of industrialisation, the connections with the past were severed completely. Thirdly, that cultural forms diffused down the social scale to fill the vacuum resulting from the smashing of popular culture and the severing of the links with the past. The present study is in agreement with Cunningham that popular culture was not completely smashed and that it is more correct to consider the issue in terms of the nature and extent of the continued production and reproduction of particular ways of living and codes of conduct. At stake, in fact, is
the more general question of how ways of living come into being, are preserved and changed. With respect to this question, Cunningham's analysis, along with those proposed by Stedman Jones and the Yeo's, has been found wanting.

In relation to the notion that popular culture was "smashed", the present study, as already noted, is, to an extent, in sympathy with Cunningham. In fact, the connections between the codes of spectating and ways of living in general in the late nineteenth and early twentieth century and the popular culture of the early nineteenth century have been repeatedly stressed. But such ways of living did not just "survive," as Cunningham argues, because of the ability of the working classes to make their own culture. Rather, the relative power potential of particular groups to contribute to the production and reproduction of ways of living in those periods was a reflection and reinforcement of the overall structure of English society - a point which Cunningham does not come to terms with in his analysis of the "survival" of popular culture. This is not to deny that, throughout the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, communities less susceptible to the overt control of the police and the covert influence of the state - in the form of its educational provision, for example - and less subject to the exhortations and pressures of groups such as the rational recreationalists, were able to continue to adhere to ways of living and codes of conduct which were permeated by values which remained in many ways strongly reminiscent of early nineteenth century popular culture. This relative autonomy was, however, a relational affair. That is, it did and has, depended both on the relative inability of the state to penetrate all aspects of the everyday mores of people, including those least powerful economically, and, was and is also a reflection of the structure of "rough" working class communities and the links which they, in consequence, sought
and continue to seek to retain with their traditional customs.

Even though such links were retained, the overall transformation which occurred in English society was not without influence on the communities of the "rough" working class. The excesses of violent conduct and brutal recreations of the beginning of the nineteenth century and earlier were on the wane. But this relative persistence of particular ways of living in the context of the transformation of English society in general, was not something which such communities rationally chose. Rather, as Elias has argued, the analysis is faced with grasping the nature and extent of processes, compulsions and regularities of a relatively autonomous kind.

From this perspective, two further criticisms can be levelled at Cunningham. First, the manner in which he conceives of cultural change is inadequate. That is, he over-empphasises the ability of particular groups to "make" culture and in consequence he fails to grasp the complex relationship between how culture comes into being, is preserved and changed. For the present study, this needs to be understood in terms of the sociogenesis of culture. In this respect, it is important to grasp three fundamental points. Firstly, the goals, plans and intentions of individual people constantly interweave in a friendly or hostile manner. Secondly, this interweaving of the many single plans and actions of people gives rise to changes and patterns that no individual has planned or created. Thirdly, these changes and patterns create an order which is more compelling and stronger than the will and reason of the individual people who make it up. But, as noted, Cunningham's analysis is also deficient in a second respect. More particularly, he misconceives the prevailing balance of power within and between groups in nineteenth century English society. This is quite ironical given his, albeit brief reference, to the hegemonic character of leisure provision during this period. In fact, the ability of all sections of the
working class to make and retain their own culture or to resist changes is bound up with and was and is circumscribed by the actions and perceptions of more powerful groups. The analysis of the emergence of football spectating as a social problem undertaken in Chapter Five amply demonstrated that this is so.

Such criticisms have also to be coupled with Cunningham's failure to conceive of the working class in a differentiated manner. In his analysis, Cunningham points to the "resistance" of particular communities and rejects the idea that the bourgeois ideology was taken on board by those participating in and spectating at football. But by neglecting the division between the "roughs" and "respectables" within the working class, he overlooks the degree to which the process of "incorporation" penetrated working class culture.

But all these weaknesses stem from a more fundamental failure - Cunningham's inability to conceive of the nature of historical sociology in a relatively adequate fashion. Both in terms of how such historical sociology is to be conceptualised and how the research stance subsequently adopted follows this through in relation to particular substantive issues, Cunningham can be seen to be found wanting. It is with this failure in mind that the present study now seeks to reconsider both the way of conceptualising the task and, equally importantly, the process of doing historical or more correctly "developmental" sociology.

B. The Methodology of Doing Historical Sociology

In criticising the research of Cunningham, it was argued that his analysis of the nature of the socio-historical process is inadequate. In particular, his work was found wanting with respect to the neglect of how the nature and extent of cultural change stems not solely from the intentions of any one individual or group but rather from the figurations they form.
together. Fundamentally, Cunningham's analysis does not come to terms with the dichotomy between what is conventionally termed "agency" and "structure." This coming to terms, on theoretical and methodological grounds, with conventional wisdom, is necessary for two main reasons. Firstly, if this is attempted, the relative adequacy of the present study can be more readily assessed. Secondly, certain problems of a more general kind and of wider significance can be identified. In this way, research which seeks to adopt a similar theoretical framework and research stance can be forewarned, to an extent, of obstacles which may possibly be encountered.

This criticism of Cunningham stems, in fact, from the present study's conception of the sociological enterprise, i.e. from its attempt to come to terms on more theoretical grounds with the nature of the socio-historical process. At the beginning of the thesis, it was argued that a theoretical framework would be utilised which stresses that social processes are structured and that their structure is the unplanned consequence of the interweaving of the intended acts of innumerable interdependent individuals. It was also stressed that, critical in this regard, are the ways in which the structurally generated balance of power between groups creates pressures and constraints on people to modify their behaviour. By studying how people cope with the problems of interdependency, the essential problem was seen to involve the discovery and explanation of how later social formations arise out of earlier ones.

Of course, such a theoretical framework has had implications for how the phenomenon of football hooliganism was conceived, how the present study went about determining its characteristics and how it reached conclusions based on such evidence. Cunningham's analysis, too, like any other, is
rooted in initial assumptions. Different modes of thinking have implications for establishing what can be accepted as "real" and "true," and how research operationalises such a task. While the weaknesses which were highlighted in Cunningham's analysis lie at the level of the assumptions on which his research rests, such weaknesses also found expression at the level of his substantive work. Similarly, the theoretical framework on which the present study is based also found expression in the process of conducting the substantive work.

In fact, the assumption which underpins the present study, that the phenomenon of football hooliganism can be more adequately understood if it is conceptualised in relation to the competing definitions over ways of living and codes of conduct evident, over time, in English society, is itself a reflection of both the theoretical framework utilised and the substantive work undertaken. In this connection, therefore, reference must be made to how the theoretical principles of developmental and figurational sociology which guide such an analysis were actually followed through and operationalised in the course of the ongoing research. Having shifted the terms of reference, the methodology employed had also, as argued, to come to terms with the nature of the socio-historical process. While the writings of Norbert Elias were, as noted, of considerable influence in this respect, the present study has found that the work of Philip Abrams - in many ways complementary to that of Elias - is of more use in terms of following through or operationalising the theoretical perspective employed as a guide to research. As a result, more extensive reference will be made in this section, to the work of Abrams.

If the analysis returns to the original premise, that a dominant mythology has served to blinker existing analyses of football hooliganism

3 Abrams, Historical Sociology.
and that a more adequate approach lies in conceiving of the phenomenon in terms of the ongoing struggle over ways of living in English society, what assumptions were being made and how did the analysis develop from this point? From the outset, in fact, the present study has been embroiled in a dialectic between what has been varyingly called observation and theory formation, experience and abstraction, and empirical access and theoretical distance. In the process of formulating an approach to the phenomenon it was, at an early stage, established that prevailing research orientations are to varying degrees, inadequate, e.g. in terms of their stress on the novel nature of football hooliganism, that it was a phenomenon confined to the 1960's and 1970's. The evidence uncovered by historians such as Hutchinson, Vamplew and Mason which documented that football hooligan violence had occurred prior to the 1960's sensitised the present study to the shortcomings of the prevailing consensus. But the shift in the frame of reference outlined - which itself has undergone changes in emphasis - was influenced by both the approach of Dunning and Murphy to the phenomenon and is also an outgrowth of doing the research. The present study has thus sought to adhere to the guidelines which Elias set himself. That is to say, a general theory was not constructed and then tested to see whether it fitted the evidence. Rather there has been a constant interplay between the observational and the theoretical, an interplay in which neither the empirical nor the theoretical mode took precedence over the other. At this point it is perhaps best to address the specific issues which arose in the course of doing such research.

On reflection, one question immediately arises. Having discovered, as Vamplew, Hutchinson and Mason document, that particular cases of spectator misconduct occurred at football matches in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, how is it possible to explain such "events?"
While such historians may have uncovered what they would presumably would argue were "facts," the task of developmental sociology is not only to generate substantive research but also to explain the status, selection and interpretation of such "facts" as part of the more general endeavour of examining how later social formations have arisen out of earlier ones. As noted in Chapter Two, at issue are questions concerning the nature of the research stance - of observation and theory formation, involvement and detachment, narrative and analysis. Fundamentally, as Abrams remarks, such questions are a reflection of:

"....the problem of finding a way of accounting for human experience which recognizes simultaneously and in equal measure that history and society are made by constant, more or less purposeful, individual action and that individual action, however purposeful, is made by history and society....it is easily and endlessly formulated but, it seems, stupifyingly difficult to resolve...." 4

Both in terms of the theoretical perspective adopted and the research methodology employed, the present study attempts to go some way towards resolving this issue in the context of a substantive piece of work. How, therefore, does one account for these more general issues and also provide a relatively adequate account of the specific events of spectator misconduct discovered within the context of the broader issues and themes identified?

By way of considering the events which were characteristic of English justice in the eighteenth century, Abrams has provided some observations which are relevant in this respect. In this connection, he noted that the researcher has to conduct a dialogue between what he terms the interwoven elements of narrative and theoretical matter. He writes:

"The appalling chronicle of the brutalities of English justice in the eighteenth century is the essential matter for a complex argument about the structuring of a certain kind of class domination."

4 Ibid p.xiii
The process resided in the chronicle, the structuring was in the action as it were, but the chronicle itself does not reveal or demonstrate the process. To reveal it to us the author has to organize his argument in terms of a continuous confrontation and interweaving of narrative and theoretical matter. The power of the essay springs from the systematic skill with which that dialectic is accomplished.

What is involved is a breaking of the bounds of conventional distinctions between types of explanation. It seems that the attempt to move beyond action and structure to process impels neglect of such restrictions.  

While the present study shares Abrams' emphasis that the power of any essay ultimately springs from the systematic skill with which the dialectic of narrative and theoretical matter is accomplished, this is to advance the analysis too far. The actual method employed to make public the research findings is dependent on the manner in which the research has been conducted.

Abrams, in fact, touches on this issue when he acknowledges that the dialectic of narrative and theoretical matter revolves around not simply asking 'how it happened questions' but also, at the same time, 'why it happened questions.' Therefore, to provide a chronicle of the "events" in the development of football as a spectator sport would not, as Abrams noted with reference to eighteenth century English justice, enable the research to trace and analyse more significant issues, i.e. the emergence of football spectating a social problem. In fact, as argued, the ability to integrate this type of questions into ongoing research is an indication of its relative adequacy. Abrams thus remarks:

"... 'How it happened' questions demand answers in terms of manifold, sequential and cumulative structuring. Narrative is far and away the best type of talk available to us for representing the action involved in such processes. But the rules of narrative do not permit adequate analytical treatment of what is being presented (the elucidation of structuring). Indeed, the persuasiveness of what is being presented is directly threatened by such treatment. Yet, because what is being represented is not just 'the facts,' however well-researched, but an interpretative arrangement of the

facts, historians must be free to discuss the arranging they have done. They must if challenged be able to abstract both the arrangement and its explanatory cogency from the story they have had us follow. They have, despite the rules of narrative, to be able to be rather explicit about both interconnection and structuring."

The analysis so far presented of the emergence of football as a social problem would not, in fact, be possible, unless such an "interpretative arranging of the facts" was adhered to. To argue this is not to impose some over-arching theory on the evidence. Rather, it is an attempt to come to terms with the fact of the mutual interdependence and contamination of evidence and theory. The "arranging of the facts," as Abrams phrases it, involves a subtle interplay between access to empirical evidence and, at one and the same time, the adoption of some theoretical distance from the apparent chaos of particular events. Such a research stance is but a recognition of two issues. Firstly, what developmental and figurational sociology perceives as its focus of attention. Secondly, how such a sociological perspective operationalises the intertwined tasks of observation and theory formation. Abrams himself addressed these issues when he wrote:

"Social realities are there for the discovering but discovering them involves analytical distance as well as empirical access; they are not to be known by direct representation. Social reality stands behind social appearances not in the relation of face to veil but in the relation of process to moment. Its apprehension is more a matter of analytical structuring than of empirical seeing-through."

In fact, the present study does not, as argued, view this apprehension of social realities as an "either/or." A constant yet ever changing interplay occurs at all levels of the analysis. It is not a question of gathering facts and yet more facts; the task is to trace and analyse the significance which specific events have in time and in relation to the patterns reinforced by and reflected in their conjunction with other events. In order to
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6 Abrams, Historical Sociology p. 310.
7 Ibid p. 317.
accomplish such a task, it is important to recognise that it is not simply the recognition that there should be an interweaving of observation and theory formation. The sociologist must also, as argued in Chapter Two, at one and the same time, be both relatively involved and relatively detached - these, of course, are equivalent ways of saying the same thing - in the process of doing research. It is perhaps useful to restate why this is necessary. Firstly, such a stance is necessary if the adequacy of the evidence is to be ascertained. Both "verstehen" analysis based on the relative positions and perceptions of groups and a more detached knowledge of the balance of power and of tensions within the prevailing figuration are required to work out the adequacy of any given evidence. But the sociologist must also be both relatively involved and detached in order to grasp the basic experience of social life. He should not be cut off from participation and involvement in the phenomenon under investigation, nor is it desirable that he should be: for it is by this means that the sociologist comprehends, from the inside, the perspective of particular groups. But the sociologist as participant must also be able to stand back and become the sociologist as observer and interpreter.

But while a relatively high degree of detachment is required in the process of doing research, the form in which this research stance is articulated also requires attention. The sociologist must, as argued, blend, in an interwoven manner, a style of writing which encompasses what has traditionally been termed narrative and analysis. But before this is accomplished, the sociologist must also come to terms with both the particular "events" which he documents and interpret the place which such events have in the phenomenon under investigation. As a result, it is necessary for the present study to consider this issue in more detail before a final summation of the substantive findings can be presented.
Cases, or more correctly "events," of spectator misconduct have formed the substantive basis for the present study. Located within the research stance outlined, two questions arise. Firstly, what significance do particular "events" of spectator misconduct have and secondly, how is such significance determined by the researcher? With reference to the first of these questions, Abrams summed up the significance of an "event" when he wrote:

"The issue is not just to explain how the event happened but to make clear what sort of event it was and thence its meaning as a moment in a larger process of historical change... The event reveals the conjunction of action and structure within the larger historical process. That is the reality it contains that makes it worth explaining. And the explanation turns in equal measure on identification of the relationships and dispositions of categories of participants, narration of the enactment of those relationships and dispositions by particular persons, and a coherent theorisation of the process of structural change within which action had meaning." 8

But how does developmental and figurational sociology both coherently theorise the processes of structured continuity and change, and explain what significance a particular event has in this socio-historical process?

As argued earlier, the present study is guided by a sociogenetic methodology which recognises that social processes are structured and that their structure is an unplanned consequence of the interweaving of the intended acts of innumerable interdependent individuals. Of crucial importance in explaining what Abrams terms this conjunction of action and structure, is the analysis of the ways in which the structurally generated balance of power between groups creates pressures and constraints on people to modify their behaviour. But while such a methodology provides the guidelines for the present study, how is it possible for a sociological observer to come to terms with determining what meaning a particular event of spectator misconduct has in the process of historical change?

In order to grasp this conjunction from a figurational perspective, the

8 Ibid p. 213.
analysis must deal with the phenomenon at three levels. At each of these levels, the prevailing balance of power between and within groups and the pressures and constraints felt and exercised by these groups must be probed. But these levels, the short-term day-to-day phenomena, i.e. "events," the patterning of action within the flow of such events and the points at which such patterning reinforces and reflects the ongoing structural features of the historical process, must be viewed as interwoven.

By conceptualising and explaining "events" in this way, a particular problem arises. In considering, for instance, the issue of the relative persistence of specific ways of living in English society - as manifested, for example, in nineteenth century working class patterns of leisure behaviour and in those patterns of spectating which have persisted since the foundation of the Football League - it was argued that this was not the result of what particular communities rationally chose to do. Rather, to explain the ongoing, ever-changing balance between continuity and change in ways of living and codes of conduct, reference was made to the need to grasp the sociogenesis of people's behaviour. In explaining the transformation which occurred throughout the nineteenth and twentieth centuries in terms of ways of living and codes of conduct, reference in fact was made to the decisive influence of a process of a relatively autonomous kind, the civilising process. But by explaining the historical process in this way, such an approach shares a fundamental dilemma with Marxist historical sociology. This fundamental dilemma was raised by Abrams when he observed with regard to the religious dogma of the 1850's:

"How then does one work back from what people believe they are doing to the 'real' meaning of what they are doing? In the absence of statements from Calvinist employers to the effect that they are engaging in disciplining the lower orders how is one to get behind the statement they do offer to the effect that they are engaging in promoting Christianity to show that despite their own beliefs the
real historical significance of their religiosity is as a form of class discipline?

To my mind this is the fundamental dilemma of Marxist historical sociology.......

While Abrams is correct to point to this fundamental dilemma, it is not so much a question of 'real meanings,' but rather of the observable, objective consequences of behavior. In order to overcome the dilemma raised in accounting for this issue, the transformation which occurred in nineteenth century popular culture and the continuing competition between ways of living, as evident in the emergence of football spectatoring as a social problem, must be interpreted as the result of the unintended consequence of the actions of such groups as the 'Rational Recreationalists' and the Temperance movement who, however inadequately, sought to shape the outcome of this struggle. How is it possible to explain that it was the interweaving of the deliberate actions of these interdependent groups that produced the processes that were at work in the transformation referred to? In this connection, Anthony Giddens, commenting on the reproduction of social systems, has written:

"Explanation of human social conduct in terms of reasons can certainly not be ignored by sociologists: the rationalisation of action is the fundamental component of social activity that orthodox sociology discounted. On the other hand, it should be emphasised just as strongly that the rationalisation of action is always bounded, in every sort of historical context; and it is in exploring the nature and persistence of these bounds that the tasks of social science are to be found." 10

In fact, Elias, while stressing that the sociogenetic methodology is ostensibly concerned with the structure which, though it has arisen out of the interweaving of the actions of individuals, has a more compelling and stronger influence than the people composing it, has also, in two distinct ways, allowed for what Giddens has termed the 'rationalisation of
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10 Giddens, Central Problems in Social Theory p. 250.
First, the recognition that the structure of social processes is an unplanned consequence of the interweaving of the intended acts of innumerable interdependent individuals explicitly acknowledges the point made by Giddens. Secondly, in considering the "colonization" phase in the civilising process, Elias makes reference to the possibility of how, in this phase, the established upper group can intentionally permeate the lower, outsider class with its own patterns of behaviour. Nor is it denied that 'competent members of society know a great deal about its workings,' but this knowledge, as evident in the emergence of football spectating as a socially problematic phenomenon, is more at the level of what Giddens refers to as 'practical consciousness' rather than 'discursive consciousness.'

The stress on analysing the sociogenesis of people's behaviour is not at odds with human agency or 'discursive consciousness.' Nor should the processes at work be seen solely in relation to their constraining influence - in Giddens terms, they have, potentially, an "enabling character" as well.

But the stress on analysing the sociogenesis of people's behaviour does challenge the basic assumptions which individuals have of themselves and of the society they form. In commenting on this issue, Elias argued:

"...it is quite understandable that people should feel repugnance at the idea that the society of which they themselves are members is a functional nexus relatively autonomous of the objectives and intentions of its members. Similar resistance was encountered during the period when people were struggling towards the idea that natural events are a blind, purposeless functional nexus... The paradox was that people were unable to take steps against the constant menace of natural events, unable to see meaning and purpose in such precautions, until they were able to perceive the meaningless, the purposelessness and the blind mechanical regularity of physical events. In attempting to put over the insight that social processes also are relatively autonomous of human intentions and purposes, the same difficulties and the same paradox constantly recur. Many people find the idea repugnant. It is frightening to realise that people form functional interconnections within which much of what they do is blind, purposeless and involuntary... In the long run again, people can only hope to master and make sense out of these purposeless, meaningless..."
The recognition and investigation of these relatively autonomous, distinctive functional interconnections lies not only at the level of theoretical sophistication but also in terms of doing research. In fact, faced with the 'dilemma' to which Abrams refers, the analysis returns full circle to the process of doing historical or developmental sociology, i.e. it is necessary to make explicit the interwoven processes of observation and theory formation, involvement and detachment, narrative and analysis. With this way of coping with the dilemma, coupled, or more correctly armoured with the methodological and conceptual approach proposed uppermost in one's mind, the analysis can now return to reconsider the substantive issues of the present study.

C. The Substantive Findings Re-Visited

This reconsideration of the emergence of football spectating as a social problem is based on four main premises. First, emphasis is placed on the existence in English society of different ways of living and, as part of them, of different codes of conduct regarding the expression and control of violence. Secondly, such ways of living and codes of conduct are seen as deeply-rooted and the long-term development of them is seen as having been shaped by both the civilising process and the 'partly conscious' cultural struggle which is an integral feature of that process. In considering the behaviour patterns of Western European societies, Elias has, in fact provided a pertinent observation in this regard. He writes:

"The behaviour patterns of our society, imprinted on the individual from early childhood as a kind of second nature and kept alert in him by a powerful and increasingly strictly organised social control, are to be explained, it has been shown, not in terms of general, ahistorical human purposes, but as something which has
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evolved from the totality of western history, from the specific forms of behaviour that develop in its course and the forces of integration which transform and propagate them. These patterns, like the whole control of our behaviour, like the structure of our psychological functions in general, are many-layered: in their formation and reproduction emotional impulses play their part no less than rational ones, drives and affects no less than ego functions. It has long been customary to explain the control to which individual behaviour is subject in our society as something essentially rational, founded solely on logical considerations. Here it has been seen differently. 12

While the present study has borne out such a perspective, the element of deliberate action in shaping the cultural struggle referred to has not been discounted. Recognition of this element is made in connection with the third premise on which this reconsideration is based. Different groups, it is argued, have, over time, in the context of this cultural struggle, sought to legitimate their own ways of living and to make problematic the ways of living of other, outsider groups. More particularly, the higher, more established classes have sought, with varying degrees of success, to regulate, supervise and control the everyday behaviour of the lower, outsider class. In fact, since the early nineteenth century, a narrowing of both the limits of what constituted publicly acceptable behaviour in general and the limits of decent partisanship in particular has occurred. What has been witnessed has been the development of a more orderly, disciplined and regulated society. The fourth premise thus argues that the social roots of football hooligan violence and the interwoven perception by powerful outsiders of working class football spectators - and the subsequent emergence of football spectating as a socially problematic phenomenon - are bound up with and explicable in these terms. What follows is an attempt to elaborate on the premises outlined with reference to the phenomenon mentioned and to explicate the stages in its emergence as a social problem in terms of how ways of living and codes of conduct arise, persist for a while in relatively

unchanging forms, and then undergo processes of more or less fundamental
change.

In examining, in Chapter Three, the ways of living expressed in folk
football and in the leisure forms and popular culture of the early nineteenth
century, it was argued that they were, relative to later forms, dominated by
affect, with a stress on masculinity and violent conduct. To trace how such
social formations arose out of earlier ones lies outside the scope of the
present analysis, but the research of Wrightson with reference to the late
sixteenth and seventeenth centuries and Dunning and Dunning and Sheard with
respect to folk football, does indicate that such a tradition was not of
recent origin but rather than such mores were deeply embedded in popular
culture and, indeed, though in varying degrees, in English society in general.

Illustration of the transformation which occurred in English society in
the nineteenth century - the significance of which will be discussed in the
context of the narrowing of the limits of public order which has occurred
over the last century and a half - and of the connection between the competing
ways of living which existed in the early 1800's and the patterns of football
spectating which existed in the late Victorian period can be made with
reference to the incipient modernisation and modernisation of football. By
probing the issue in this way, the analysis of the emergence of football
spectating as a social problem and its emergence within the context of the
more general narrowing of the limits of public order referred to, is more
adequately based.

The incipient modernisation of football involved two main aspects.
Firstly, the transformation of folk games. Secondly, the bifurcation of
football into its modern forms. In respect of the first aspect, the more
gregarious forms were effectively controlled by the authorities - so much so
that large numbers of games were destroyed. But these folk games were not completely "smashed". The tradition survived in particular places like Hallaton, and the mores which underpinned such folk games continued to be produced and reproduced, to varying degrees, in specific social milieux. Crucially, however, such folk games were also adopted by public schools. While it is not appropriate to return to this issue in great detail in this context, it is important to note that it was in this relatively privatised setting that the distinctive forms of 'soccer' and 'rugby' developed.

The bifurcation of the game took place in connection with the changes which occurred in the nineteenth century public schools in connection with embourgeoisement and the changes in codes of conduct involved in the civilising process. Although the bifurcation of football was only finally accomplished when the rugby clubs walked out of the meetings held to form the Football Association, subsequently forming their own Rugby Football Union, this process of bifurcation was reinforced and sustained by the "games cult" which created social conditions in which modern football could more easily develop.

In soccer, however, in contrast to rugby, there occurred a demand for the stricter control of aggression. But the shift in what was considered acceptable was relative in nature - no complete break between the values of the folk and modern forms of football was evident. Yet, particular perceptions of what constituted appropriate codes of conduct did hold sway in middle class circles during the late Victorian period, and although the mores which underpinned the prevailing patterns of spectating corresponded to the values underpinning the playing of the game, these perceptions, held in the context of growing class cultural conflict, were to prove crucial. The onset of the professionalisation and democratisation of the game were to arouse a sense of alarm and outrage in some quarters: in fact, both this sense of anxiety and the patterns of spectating which existed at the time were
illustrative of the wider conflict over competing ways of living in English society. With this in mind, it is to this period that attention must now be directed.

The game of soccer which diffused to a working class setting in the 1880's and 1890's, though relatively more civilised than the folk processors which the working classes had played before, was still based on the expression of masculinity and physical prowess. Indeed, although elements of the middle classes had demanded and, by all accounts, gained a measure of stricter control of violence in playing the game, this should not lead the analysis to conclude that violence was absent - it was not. During the 1880's, as the professionalisation of the game led to the attraction of an increasing number of working class spectators to the gradually developing stadia, processes were at work in society in general which were to prove significant in relation to how this democratisation of the game was to be received.

This phase in the development of the game - attracting large numbers of people who adhered to a different way of living than those who controlled and administered the game, the middle, upper middle and upper classes - occurred within a period of mounting class tension and "repulsion," an element in the longer term civilising process. As was documented, anxiety and concern filled the minds of the middle classes; the need to control and regulate was uppermost in their thinking. But the narrowing of the limits of public order which was demanded, and, to an extent, obtained, was not solely the outcome of the conscious strategy of these Victorians - relatively more autonomous processes were also at work. The shift in a civilising direction, however, with the concomitant narrowing of what was deemed to be publically permissible in society in general and spectating at football in particular, dovetailed neatly into the aims of the rational recreationalists.
and the fears of the middle classes concerning the growing power of the masses. The need for the status conscious middle classes to re-define their own behaviour and to focus onto the more extreme codes of conduct of the working classes was bound up with processes working in a civilising direction. How did such trends work themselves out in the context of football?

The manner in which the phenomenon of football spectating in general and spectator disorder in particular was described by the middle classes is indicative of the processes at work. The term, the "Football Fever," captures the sense of alarm felt by the middle classes towards all aspects of the growing working class passion for the game but also corresponds to the manner in which working class culture, especially the culture of its youth, was perceived. The term "fever" was a socially defining phrase which indicated the sense of anxiety which respectable society, the "classes," felt towards the "masses."

The term was, in fact, used with reference to spectatorship in general, spectator disorder, playing football in the streets, hooliganism and those working class leisure activities which were seen to overstep the bounds of decency. In this context, the overall climate of concern in which the perception of spectator disorder was located, is discernible. For contemporaries, the control of leisure and juvenile crime were the 'great social questions of the age.' A common thread has been documented which runs through the perception of the middle classes of such activities as playing football in the streets, drinking, betting, hooliganism and a whole array of working class recreational activities. The thread incorporates the fear and anxiety aroused in the minds of the 'classes' concerning the onset of "mass culture," the relative decline of their power and the concomitant narrowing of the limits of public order. But to argue this is not
to overlook that there were factual differences between classes in ways of living and codes of conduct—whether those differences were as great as the sense of anxiety and fear aroused in the middle classes would indicate is something which will be dealt with in the final section of this thesis. Nevertheless, with such anxiety uppermost in their minds, it is hardly surprising that episodes of misconduct did arouse the wrath of such writers as Ensor and Edwardes. In fact, the processes outlined in this thesis helped shape their perception of spectator misconduct in particular and working class spectating in general.

The "spectator problem," as Pickford chose to describe the democratisation of the game, both reinforced and reflected the processes outlined. Crucially, both particular episodes of spectator disorder and spectating per se were seen as indicative of the moral and physical deterioration of the population. This requires elaboration. The onset of professionalisation had not been welcomed by all. Those who criticised this development espoused an amateur ideology: the same grouping pointed to the codes of conduct evident in the patterns of spectating which developed as confirming their worst fears. Those who adhered to this amateur ideology coupled with the rational recreationalists and supporters of the Temperance movement, vociferously condemned what they perceived as the evils of spectating, laziness, drunkenness and gambling. For these groups, the populace were not only in jeopardy of moral but also of physical deterioration. Spectating was a diversion away from direct involvement in sport; for the pristine amateurs spectating per se was evil.

But such sentiments were not simply the conscious working out of class interests. As was documented, the bifurcation of football into its modern forms was bound up, not only with embourgeoisement but also with the changes wrought by the civilising process. This process, with one of its features
being the demand for a stricter control of violence, continued to find expression in the late Victorian period. In this way, both the pleas for the playing of a more scientific soccer with less emphasis on physical strength, and the sense of anxiety expressed about episodes of spectator disorder in particular and spectatorial hooliganism in general is more adequately understood. Indicative of this are the pleas by Gibson and Pickford in 1906 that spectating should have less to do with the "raucous yell of the spectator" and more to do with the "well-dispositioned onlooker."

In fact, both "respectable" and "rough" elements of the working class were involved in football hooligan violence during the late Victorian and Edwardian decades. As argued, the "rough" working class adhered to a way of life which stressed, to a greater extent than other social groups, a violent masculine style. In consequence, it was this group that appears to have been most centrally involved in cases of serious spectator disorder. This, however, does not rule out the involvement of the "respectables." The involvement of such groups may well be connected to the fact that the "respectable" working class in the late Victorian and Edwardian periods adhered to social standards which in some ways approximated more closely to those of their "rough" contemporaries than is the case with the "respectable" working class of today, i.e. that the "rough/respectable" divide has widened in the present century. In fact, not only were the "respectables" involved occasionally in more serious incidents of spectator "disorder" such as assaults on referees and players. They also appear to have been the main participants in the less serious forms of misconduct such as barracking and verbal abuse. However, a central feature of this period is captured by the phrase the "dominance of the roughs." This is borne out not only by the fact that the "respectables" at that time were closer to the ways of living.
of the "roughs" but also that English society in general appears to have accepted, to a greater degree than is presently the case, the open expression of violence by men. These features of English society in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries may well help to explain why, in terms of the nature and extent of the phenomenon at the time, football hooligan violence was more prevalent and more serious than in the period between the wars. To argue this is not to rule out the overall trend which occurred in the late Victorian and Edwardian periods - a narrowing of the limits of public order was occurring then and continued to develop in the inter-war years.

What characterisation can therefore be offered with respect to the late Victorian and Edwardian periods? In general terms, a shift in the standards regarding the expression and control of violence occurred in those years. This development led to both a concomitant narrowing of what forms of behaviour were deemed to be publicly permissible in society in general and to the focusing onto and the redefinition of the limits of decent partisanship at football matches in particular. Such trends were the result of the complex, interwoven working out of the changes wrought by the civilising process and the class interests of particular groups such as the rational recreationalists. The whole gamut of working class leisure activities merged together in the minds of such groups to form the great social question of the day. While working class football spectators in general and those involved in football hooligan violence in particular were subsumed into this general debate, such spectator disorder was not in that period, as argued, the litmus paper by which the physical and moral deterioration of the masses was determined. In the Eliasian sense a phase of "repulsion" was occurring; but its features were not simply the result of a conspiracy of the ruling classes; factual differences in ways of living and codes of conduct, perceptions
of other classes which grew out of these differences, and conflict and competition in those regards were involved. While this struggle favoured the ruling classes, who perceived the ways of living of the working classes as a threat to their interests and values, their victory was not complete. The "respectables" were not totally absorbed into middle class ways of living nor did the "roughs" wither on the vine. Nevertheless, a narrowing of the limits of public order and decent partisanship occurred and, in the period between the wars, such limits were, as the analysis will now argue, strengthened.

The phase in the emergence of football spectating as a social problem between the wars is explicable partly in terms of issues peculiar to the game itself, and partly in terms of features of the wider social context in those years. The ongoing struggle over ways of living and codes of conduct was, relative to the preceding period, less fraught with anxiety and more marked by consensus. Such trends, in fact, are evident both in the football context and in working class cultural activities in general. But why was the struggle in that period less ridden by fear and more marked by a sense of common agreement over the limits of what was publically permissible?

During the period between the wars, as argued in Chapter Five, a process of colonisation of working class culture occurred. The relative success of this process of colonisation may well be connected to the increasing ability of the state in that period to penetrate the affairs of working class people to a greater and deeper extent. Support for such a contention can be drawn from an analysis of the educational and social provision which the state provided during this period. While this colonisation by mainstream values was more pronounced in some groups than in others, no groups remained unaffected. In addition, despite the heady days of unrest in 1919, the middle classes were to feel that they were in relative ascendency in this
The processes of colonisation, or incorporation, and the pacification of sections of the working classes were gaining momentum. Such themes find expression in the manner in which working class youth were regulated and supervised by youth clubs, and by the state provision of education. In relation to the policies of youth clubs, it is clear, as Gillis documented, that two significant changes occurred between the wars. Firstly, the nature of the control and supervision measures utilised was altered - less oppressive and more preventative policies were adopted. This less oppressive approach stemmed from a perception by those who ran the clubs that, in order to attract and subsequently influence a large number of youths, a degree of "ragging" and "horseplay" had to be permitted. Secondly, and perhaps as a consequence of this shift, the clubs chose to seek to attract the "respectables" alone; the "occasional" - those elements of working class youth who more frequently and in more serious ways breached the limits of acceptable behaviour - were expelled and were possibly written off as a "lost cause." But the state, now confronted with the task of providing secondary education for all, could not so easily dismiss this grouping. Indeed, adolescents in general were seen, as noted, as a potential source of disorder and in such reports as the Hadow Report, emphasis was placed on the need to inculcate a spirit of "social co-operation." Obedience to and deference towards agreed standards of behaviour were deemed essential.

But, despite the growing momentum of such incorporation and pacification of large sections of the working class, the "roughs" continued to adhere to a way of living with a different emphasis. In the wider social context, this violent masculine style continued to find expression - and to arouse anxiety and fear - at such venues as racecourse meetings and boxing matches. And while the police could intervene in the more extreme cases, such codes of conduct continued to persist, despite the trends outlined, because the
generating conditions for this violent masculine style had not radically changed. It is still necessary, in providing this characterisation of the period in question, to probe how such processes were reflected in and reinforced by the situation which existed in the football context.

Concomitant with the growing colonisation of working class culture in general, the "respectable" elements of the football crowd gradually adhered, to a greater and greater extent, to mainstream values regarding the expression and control of violence. There developed, in the football context, greater consensus regarding the limits of decent partisanship. In fact, as part and parcel of this process, the game itself was becoming more respectable. As argued, however, there were features peculiar to the game which also assist in explaining this phase in the emergence of football spectating as a social problem. Crucial in this regard was the changing social composition of the football crowd. Two features of this stand out: firstly, as noted the "respectable" working class were adhering, to a greater extent, to mainstream values regarding the limits of decent partisanship. Secondly, less and less of the "rough" working class appear to have been regular visitors to matches. In consequence, both the rate and seriousness of football hooligan violence declined. But the "rough" working class were still occasional visitors and "respectables" may have also, on occasions, overstepped the limits of decent partisanship in a serious manner. Spectator misconduct continued, albeit less seriously and less frequently, but more subterranean codes of conduct occasionally surfaced in the pages of the press.

In fact, the antecedents of the phenomenon of football hooliganism as we know it in the present day were still evident. While the "rough" working class were, in general terms, only occasional visitors to matches, they did have, as the Daily Worker was to report in 1947, "outposts" such as at Millwall
where they still attended in large numbers and on a regular basis. Equally, as indicated by the codes of conduct which found expression at racecourses during this period, their violent masculine style, which one can speculate had not been untouched by the process of pacification which was occurring in society in general, continued to persist. In addition, while the general climate of concern in relation to working class youth and spectating at football had grown less anxious and fear-ridden, relative to the preceding period, this did not rule out, as the Leicester case study illustrated, the re-emergence, from time to time, of the old shibboleths regarding working class culture - drinking, betting and violence. The class cultural interests of established groups had not waned; the struggle over the predominance of particular ways of living and codes of conduct went on. During the 1960's, these trends were, as will now be argued, to crystallise into the present day phenomenon of football hooliganism.

As argued in the Introduction, if football hooliganism is to be adequately understood, it has to be explained both in terms of how it has emerged out of earlier social relations and in relation to the changing balance between continuity and change evident in the period in question. The characteristics of these earlier social formations have just been discussed and, in fact, in the late 1940's and up to the mid 1950's, a similar network of relations existed. In such a context, there was a relative consensus with regard to the limits of decent partisanship. While particular events on the terraces prompted adverse comment in the late 1940's and early 1950's, the tone of the reports was less anxiety-ridden and the incidents themselves were less serious in terms of the violence and aggression displayed than had been the case before the First World War and as was shortly to become the case once more. But during the late 1950's, a transformation began to develop, the momentum of which was to increase dramatically in the 1960's. This more
recent phase in the emergence of football spectating as a social problem - similar to the phases which preceded it - involved a changing balance between continuity and change at the level of the wider social context and at the interwoven level of the more immediate football milieu. In attempting to analyse the transformation which occurred, and thereby its significance in terms of explaining the emergence of football spectating as a social problem, attention will now be given to probing how these levels, while reflecting the changing balance between continuity and change, meshed together overtime.

In Chapter Five it was noted that, during the 1950's and 1960's, a more 'privatised' and 'individualistic' way of living was adopted by the "respectable" working class. With the gradual emergence of this way of living, there was a tendency for the "respectables'" behaviour to become less gregarious and more restrained. These more restrained codes of conduct appear to have also found expression in the changing perception of the role of the spectator. During the 1960's and 1970's, a more passive, consumer-orientated view of the spectator was advocated. More recently, in October 1983, paralleling the move to more privatised way of living - and hence the advent of "arm-chair fans" - Norman Macrae, writing in the Sunday Times, argued:

"In the future, the civilised way of watching football will be home supporters in the stadium; the visitors' supporters in front of their televisions, watching the game on their local cable channels." 13

The privatisation and individualisation of the "respectable" working class were to have two main important consequences as far as football was concerned. Firstly, the FA sought to disassociate the game from traditional ways of spectating; secondly, in terms of how the "respectables" perceived

13 *Sunday Times* 9th October 1983.
the return of the "rough" working class to the terraces.

With respect to the first of these issues, it was documented in Chapters Four and Five that the FA sought both to absolve themselves from responsibility for spectator misconduct and to explain these forms of spectating in terms of the "decline in morals" in society in general. Gone were the explanations of such conduct in terms of partisanship; the idea of the "mindless thug" was ushered in. Such codes of conduct did not fit with the new role of the spectator which was being advocated.

These attempts to disassociate the game from the traditional patterns of spectating were, in fact, to run concomitant with a change in policy by the police. During the 1950's, it appears, a less interventionist policy began to be adhered to, but throughout the 1960's, a more interventionist approach gained momentum. But the forms of spectating which had existed during the 1950's were also becoming the source of increasing media attention. As a consequence of this newspaper and television coverage, the climate of concern worsened and came to be marked by a greater degree of anxiety.

As argued, however, these initial changes in the way the phenomenon was perceived by those in authority in football and in the wider social context also contributed to a significant shift in the social composition of the crowd - the "rough" working class were attracted to the grounds where, by all reports, masculine reputations could be earned. In this context, the "respectables" directly encountered the "roughs". Adhering in certain key respects to different ways of living and codes of conduct, it is little wonder then that such direct encounters led anxiety and fear to fill the minds of the "respectables." As they were gradually adopting - along with society in general - a less gregarious and more restrained code of conduct, they were confronted with a group whose members emphasised the vivid and
public display of a violent masculine style. Such anxiety was to be compounded in two ways. Firstly, by the increasingly violent encounters, both in terms of their nature and extent, between the rough working class supporters of rival teams; and secondly, by the penchant of the tabloids to paint a picture of "mindless mayhem." While many "respectables" may have witnessed such encounters even larger numbers received their impressions through the media - a moral panic was soon to be forthcoming. In that context, the interventionist policy of the police was further accelerated; the FA pleaded for successive governments to act; the law and order lobby pointed to such behaviour as symptomatic of the decline in morals, and academics were recruited to explain football hooliganism. The phenomenon had emerged into its present-day status as a social problem of national proportions.

D. The Wider Context: Final Remarks

How is it possible to make sense of the development of the ways of living and codes of conduct evident in the emergence of football spectating as a social problem? In these concluding remarks it is perhaps best to compare how researchers such as Bailey, Humphries and Pearson have conceived of these issues in general. Having accomplished this, the analysis can conclude with a summary of its own alternative. On this basis, its significance for the analysis of popular culture can be proved and the present study can be brought to a close with reference to detailing several research recommendations which it sees as appropriate.

Pearson, by his historical analysis of hooliganism, has proven himself to be sensitive to the need to make problematic the conventional vision which lays stress on changes which have occurred in post-war Britain as an explanation for the continued presence of codes of conduct which emphasise the expression of violent behaviour. Although he is critical of the con-
ventional wisdom, he does not argue that violence is an overestimated problem. In order to explain violent conduct, however, he seeks, as he terms it, to 're-allocate the facts.' Instead of emphasizing the ever-decreasing standard of behaviour resulting from particular historical charges, Pearson is more concerned with continuity or 'stable traditions' of lawlessness.' In this way, he argues:

"The twin mythologies of 'law and order' and 'permissive'rot thus arise out of the way in which the facts of disorder are paraded within a historical idiom of decline and discontinuity. Whereas, if we reinstate the facts of the past it becomes clear that the pre-occupation with lawlessness belongs more properly to a remarkably stable tradition. Rather than being cast in the historical idiom of change, that is, the facts of crime and disorder must be re-allocated within the idiom of continuity." 14

The present study has not a little sympathy with the analysis of Pearson. By stressing the notion of continuity, the idea that lawlessness is novel is undermined. In addition, the idea that the persistence of the ways of living from which hooliganism springs can be traced to the continued existence of the material conditions in which the poor and dispossessed live, is not without foundation. In this respect, Pearson writes:

"When the cobwebs of historical reality are cleared away then we can begin to see that the real and enduring problem that faces us is not moral decay or declining parental responsibility, or unworthy working motives or the unparalleled denigration of popular amusements - or any other symptom of spiritual degeneration among the British people. Rather, it is a material problem. The inescapable reality of the social reproduction of an underclass of the most poor and dispossessed is the material foundation of these hooligan communities." 15

At first glance, the fact that the present study has documented a sense of continuity in terms of the persistence of football hooligan violence since the foundation of the Football League would appear to lend support to Pearson. In this way, football hooligan violence could presumably be interpreted as but one more consequence of such material conditions. Yet, several

14 Pearson, Hooligans A History of Respectable Fears p. 212.
15 Ibid p. 236.
reservations can be made with respect to the analysis offered by Pearson. Firstly, Pearson, in his attempt to stress the continuity of crime and disorder, fails to acknowledge the structured changes that have occurred with respect to the nature and extent of disorder in English society over the last century and a half. Secondly, by focusing on the 'stable tradition' of disorder, Pearson ignores the element which the present study has envisaged as an interwoven feature, i.e. the structured changes that have occurred with respect to the perception by powerful outsiders of football spectating in particular and working class youth in general. Thirdly, Pearson fails to consider the transformations which have occurred in English society in general since the early nineteenth century. In consequence he is unable to grasp the processes involved in the conflicted development of popular culture over time.

Humphries, while not as emphatic as Pearson in his acknowledgement of the continuity of crime and disorder in English society, also seeks to 'reallocate the facts.' In this respect, he attempts, as he himself argues, 'to situate violence within its detailed historical context of class-cultural conflict' and thereby to probe the social meaning of such violence. For Humphries, therefore, the social meaning of the violence of working class youth is explicable in terms of 'rebellion' - the alternative explanation rooted in what he believes to be a 'deprivation thesis' is rejected. Working class youth are "rebels" not "hooligans." "Hooligan" behaviour, for Humphries, needs to be envisaged in the context of class inequality and oppression, as a defence against, or an attempt to compensate for, harsh living and working conditions. On the face of it, such an interpretation lends support to the analyses of Taylor and Clarke that football hooliganism is a form of rebellion against the changes that have occurred in the game and the wider social context. Four criticisms can be

16 Humphries, Hooligans or Rebels p. 24.
levelled at this position. Firstly, the 'stable tradition' - in the way Pearson uses the term - is ignored. In his attempt to undermine the cultural deprivation thesis, there is a tendency for Humphries to fail to conceive of popular culture as it is. In this respect, Pearson was quite correct to argue that 'historical realism insists that we must find some way of holding on to the realities and specificities of street violence, and the anxieties that surround it.' Secondly, Humphries' analysis contains an undifferentiated view of the working class and he fails to grasp how the conduct which he envisages as "rebellion" is an integral feature of social relations within and between working class communities. Thirdly, the genesis of the values which give rise to the conduct to which Humphries refers is neglected. That is, the question why such rebellious behaviour takes a violent form remains unanswered. Fourthly, while correctly pointing to the class-cultural nature of aspects of hooliganism, Humphries tends to overstate the importance and ability of different classes to articulate their interests in the making of the historical process. More correctly, Humphries neglects the extent to which blind, unplanned social processes have shaped the ways of living evident in English society.

In some respects, a more subtle account of popular culture has been provided by Bailey. In considering the trend towards respectability and its significance for the relative cohesion and stability of mid-Victorian England, Bailey questioned whether this trend represented a stable and consistent pattern of behaviour and belief denoting real attachment to bourgeois values. In response, Bailey argued that working men 'reformulated conventional values and preserved a distinctive working class identity.' In addition, he argued that it is necessary to guard ourselves against the tendency to

---

18 Bailey, Leisure and Class in Victorian England
represent working class respectability as a cultural absolute in the lives of its practitioners." For Bailey, respectability was not a manifestation of a generalised code but rather a performance of a particular role. Despite this emphasis on the ability of historical actors to choose to adhere to respectability in certain situations, Bailey also conceded that 'obviously not all respectable behaviour was superficial and calculative.' Nevertheless, by stressing what he termed the 'impermeability of working class culture,' Bailey felt able to claim that it was only in the twentieth century, with the emergence of mass leisure industries, that 'the contest for the hearts, minds and pockets of the new leisure class truly began.'

The present study has four main reservations regarding this analysis of popular culture. First, by stressing the idea of the performance of respectability, it is argued that Bailey both over-emphasises the ability of the working class to opt in and out of respectability and neglects the extent to which their conduct is shaped by the figurations within which they are located. Secondly, while Bailey correctly refers to the external constraints applied to the working classes, he overlooks the internal restraints which, if Elias is correct, were also developing in this period with respect to their behaviour. Thirdly, by stressing the notion of the 'impermeability of working class culture,' Bailey appears to have fallen into the trap to which Hall has referred, i.e. by stressing the notion of the 'pure autonomy' of popular culture, a non-relational view of cultural change is produced. Fourthly, while rightly pointing to the impact of the mass leisure industries of the twentieth century, Bailey neglects the role of the modern state and underestimates the impact of the nineteenth century transformation of English society to which Chapter Three paid attention. If the research of

---

19 Ibid p. 179.
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Pearson, Humphries and Bailey does not fully explain the conflictual development of the ways of living and codes of conduct evident in the emergence of football spectating as a socially problematic phenomenon, then what is the alternative?

At the outset of the present study it was argued that the debate surrounding the "limits of decent partisanship" was caught up in the competing definitions over codes of conduct and ways of living found in English society. In addition, it was observed that of crucial importance in this regard was the more or less progressive narrowing of the limits of the forms of behaviour that would be tolerated in public, the net result being a proliferation and tightening of constraints on people's behaviour, particularly with reference to the nature and expression of violence. Illustration of the issues involved in this transformation of English society over the last century and a half can be made by re-considering the comments made by the Bishop of Liverpool in 1939. In questioning whether the 'Sporting Spirit' still existed, he observed:

"We do not expect spectators to attempt to restrain their legitimate feelings or to refrain from urging on their own side, but it seems to us that the limit of decent partisanship is often exceeded and that as a consequence good sportsmanship is forgotten." 21

It is the contention of the present study that such limits are not as fixed or unchanging as the Bishop believed. In fact, the processes by which such limits have developed, persisted and changed over the last century and a half have been a central focus of the present study. Let us review what has been established in this connection.

Although it is not appropriate to go into any great detail at this point, the available evidence appears to suggest that, between 1780 and 1850, there was a decisive and far-reaching remaking of the character of English

21 Liverpool Diocesan Review January 1939 p. 5.
society. There grew a concern, among the middle classes in particular, for moral improvement, refined manners and the establishment of more orderly conduct. In consequence, popular culture came increasingly to be regarded from above as primitive, disorderly and at odds with certain elementary standards of decency and order. During this period, and indeed throughout the nineteenth century, there was, at one and the same time, an extensive reworking of the character structure of the ordinary working man and of popular culture as a whole.

In fact, in Eliasian terms, a process of "colonisation," in which the upper classes, intentionally or otherwise, permeated the working classes with their own pattern of conduct and in which the working classes themselves copied their 'masters' was occurring. In consequence of this gradual development of restraint and self-control, there emerged a narrowing of the limits of what would be tolerated in public. Furthermore, there was an increasing tendency for the upper classes to suspect the unregulated, the unlicensed and the unsupervised. There occurred the delineation of new thresholds of publicly tolerable behaviour, both at the level of an individual's personality and in English society as a whole.

Two points need to be made about this development of restraint and control. Firstly, the phase of "colonisation" referred to is but one of a twin tendency in this regard. The other phase is one, as noted in Chapter Three, of "repulsion," where the upper classes seek to emphasise the differences in codes of conduct and thereby maintain their distinctiveness, prestige and power. Although the period referred to can be adequately described in terms of "colonisation," this should not be taken to suggest that the element of "repulsion" was completely absent. Rather, it was the case that the process of "colonisation" was in relative ascendancy. The second point which needs to be made is that the process referred to was not
'complete' - i.e. the limits of public order, the nature of popular culture and the character of the working man were still at the time of the initial democratisation of Association Football in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, contentious issues. It is to this that attention will now be directed.

It is clear, that the late Victorian and Edwardian periods witnessed, in a context of mounting class tension, a period of "repulsion." In consequence, the limits of decent partisanship with reference to soccer came to be focused on, as part of this wider process, with increasing intensity and concern. Football spectators in general needed to be supervised, i.e. barriers needed to be both erected around the ground and pitch, and between the grandstand, where the genteel middle classes sat, and the terraces, where the 'great unwashed' stood. Connections were also made between the gathering of large numbers of the "masses" together to watch an increasingly professional game passively while consuming the perceived social evils of tobacco and alcohol, and the deterioration of the physical and moral health of the nation. Such sensitivity was both confirmed and compounded by incidents of spectator disorder. The 'hotheads' who could not 'control their feelings' were seen as a threat to public order. In the minds of the middle classes, the "rowdy," "blackguard" football spectator and the "hooligans" in the street merged in a whirlpool of anxiety and fear. But if this period can be said to be marked by a phase of "repulsion," between the early 1920's and the mid-1950's, a further phase of "colonisation" can be said to have occurred.

Although lacking the same degree of anxiety and fear, this phase of "colonisation" may well have had a more longer lasting and more profound impact on the limits of decent partisanship than its nineteenth century
counterparts. That is, there grew, gradually, greater consensus about and greater adherence to the limits of what was "acceptable," "proper" and "decent." Although the comments made by the Bishop of Liverpool would, at first sight, appear to contradict this, the fact that he felt able to refer to these "limits" in such a generalised way and the fact that he was chiefly referring to "excessive swearing," not to the type of physical violence which punctuated spectator disorder in the late Victorian and Edwardian period, confirms the overall trend.

But this "colonisation" phase was soon to be superseded by a further phase of "repulsion." Football spectating became caught up in this and, as the limits were redefined in the manner outlined in Chapter Five, the "roughs" who adhered least to such limits returned to the grounds in greater numbers. As in the 1890's, football spectating, hooliganism and working class youth merged in the minds of the "respectables" as a source of anxiety and fear. Something needed to be done - the recruitment of the agencies of the state, its police, magistrates and social services, for the containment, control and supervision of football hooligans was soon evident. The limits of decent partisanship and of public order in general were now to be the subject of vigilant and zealous policing.

But why has this developmental process evident in nineteenth and twentieth century English society, and considered in the present study with special reference to the interrelated problems of the conflictual emergence of popular culture and spectator disorderliness in the context of the emerging game of Association Football, occurred in the way it has? An answer can, in part, be found in the writings of Norbert Elias.

In order to grasp the significance of the insights which Elias offers in this regard, several points need to be made. First, it is necessary to remind ourselves of a fundamental tenet of this approach, namely that the
structure of psychological functions and the particular standard of behavioural controls at a given period is connected to the structure of social functions and the change in relationships between people. In fact, the direction in which the behaviour and the affective make-up of people has moved over the last century and a half, i.e. towards a narrowing of the limits of public order, is directly related to the transformation of the structure of human relations.

Secondly, the controls and constraints which bind people together are seen as an inevitable feature of human relations. There is no escaping this. In this regard, Elias writes:

"No society can survive without a channelling of individual drives and affects, without a very specific control of individual behaviour. No such control is possible unless people exert constraints on one another, and all constraint is converted in the person on whom it is imposed into fear of one kind or another. We should not deceive ourselves: the constant production and reproduction of human fears by people is inevitable and indispensable where people live together, wherever the desires or actions of people interact....." 22

But while no society can survive without the establishment and maintenance of specific ways of controlling behaviour, such control is not 'natural;' it does not spring from outside the realm of human control. In fact, this relates to a third point which needs to be made. There is a tendency to accept the ways of living which guide our everyday affairs in an unquestioning manner. In contrast, for Elias, it is crucial that they are made problematic. He notes:

"Often enough it seems to people as if the codes regulating their conduct towards one another, and thus also the fears moving them, are something from outside the human sphere. The more deeply we immerse ourselves in the historical processes in the course of which prohibitions, like fears and anxieties, are formed and transformed, the stronger grows an insight which is not without importance for our actions as well as for our understanding of ourselves: we realise to what degree the fears and anxieties that move people are man-made. To be sure, the possibility of feeling fear, just like that of feeling joy, is an unalterable part of human nature. But the strength,

kind and structure of the fears and anxieties that smoulder or flare in the individual never depend solely on his own "nature" nor, at least in more complex societies, on the "nature" in the midst of which he lives. They are always determined, finally, by the history and the actual structure of his relations to other people, by the structure of society; and they change with it." 23

Crucially, the codes of conduct regulating people's behaviour are seen by Elias, to be 'men-made.' The use of the term 'men-made' is significant. While an individual's acts and intentions play a part, these codes of conduct are seen to be determined by the history and the actual structure of his relations with other people, by the structure of society. In this way, Elias is emphasising that the codes of conduct which regulate people's behaviour are the result, not of rational choice founded on logical considerations, but rather are the consequence of a social order which stems from the interdependence of people.

In recognising this, it is also necessary to grasp a further point. The decisive influence, at what one might call a "deep-structural" level, of the blind, unplanned social processes of state formation, lengthening of interdependency chains and functional democratisation, needs to be highlighted. While it is not appropriate to consider these process in all their details in a thesis such as this, it is important to highlight the role of the lengthening of interdependency chains and functional democratisation in leading the power chances of groups in British society to become less unevenly distributed. As a consequence of the increase in the relative power of lower groups, the higher strata, in order to maintain their distinctiveness and hence their privileges and power, were forced to elaborate still further their already differentiated standards of social conduct. This necessitated the exercise of greater self-control over their behaviour. In addition, as the process of functional democratisation gathered momentum, there arose both a greater expectation for people to adhere to a commonly held array of

23 Ibid p. 327.
values and for the state, as we know it today, to emerge. But this emergence of more differentiated standards of social conduct on the one hand, and the increasing demand for adherence to a commonly held array of values on the other, did not correspond, in any simple sense, to a set of "needs" inherent in the changing structure of social functions. As Elias has observed:

"One should not believe or attempt to be persuaded that the commands and fears which today set their stamp on human conduct have as their "purpose" simply and fundamentally [the] basic necessities of human co-existence, or that they are restricted in our world to those constraints and fears necessary to a stable equilibrium between the drives of many and for the maintenance of social collaboration. Our codes of conduct are as riddled with contradictions and as full of disproportions as are the forms of our social life, as is the structure of our society. The constraints to which the individual is subjected today, and the fears corresponding to them, are in their character, their strength and structure decisively determined by the particular forces engendered by the structure of our society....by its power and other differentials and the immense tensions created by them." 24

For Elias, therefore, our codes of conduct are "as riddled with contradictions and as full of disproportions as are the forms of our social life, as is the structure of our society." The analysis undertaken by the present study substantiates such a perspective. What have come to be regarded as the limits of decent partisanship in a football context today are as riddled with contradictions and as full of disproportions as the rest of our society and has been the case with football ever since Association Football first began to develop as a mass spectator sport in the 1880's and 1890's. The sense of anxiety and alarm periodically expressed by the "respectables" regarding spectator disorder since that time is a reflection of such contradictions and was and continues to be disproportionate to the actual violence witnessed. In addition, the differences between the ways of living of the "roughs" and "respectables" are nowhere near as great or as

complete as the latter would have us believe. The "respectables," too, can express themselves through violent masculine means. The codes of conduct which guide football hooliganism and rugby football, for example, are not too dissimilar, yet one is envisaged as a social problem, the other as an appropriate educational and leisure activity for the future leaders of the country! In this respect Dennis Marsden was quite right to observe that "in politer days we pretend the roughs have gone array, only to fly into moral panics at their shadows. In more honest times we admit to the roughness in ourselves." But why should our codes of conduct and our ideas concerning the limits of decent partisanship in a football context be so riddled with contradictions and full of disproportions? In this respect, Elias provides a further clue:

"To understand the control of conduct which a society imposes on its members, it is not enough to know the rational goals that can be adduced to explain its commands and prohibitions; we must trace to their source the fears which induce the members of this society and above all the custodians of its precepts, to control conduct in this way." 26

What therefore are these fears and anxieties which induce the "custodians" of the precepts of English society to approach the control of conduct in the way they do? While Elias points in this connection to both the tensions of inter-state rivalry and to the tensions within particular state societies, the latter is probably of more importance for the subject at present under discussion. He writes:

"The uncontrollable, monopoly-free competition between people of the same class on the one hand, and the tensions between different classes and groups on the other.....give rise, for the individual, to continuous anxiety and particular prohibitions or restrictions. They too engender their own specific fears: the fear of dismissal, of unpredictable exposure to those in power, of falling below the subsistence level, which prevail in the lower classes; and the fears of social degradation, of the reduction of possessions or independence, of loss of prestige and status, which play so great a part in the life

of the middle and upper classes.\textsuperscript{27}

In tracing to their source the anxieties and fears of the custodians of the precepts of decent partisanship as far as British Association football since the foundation of the Football League is concerned, several features have been highlighted. The fear of the gathering of the masses together in large numbers; the fear of the loss of prestige by the directors of clubs whose grounds were deemed to be a bastion of rowdyism; the anxiety surrounding the perceived decline of the physical and moral health of the country, be it in terms of the ills of drinking, betting, and indeed spectating \textit{per se} as was the case in the 1890's, or in terms of the dangers supposedly posed by the onset of the "permissive" society and football hooliganism of the 1960's; and, perhaps most decisively, the anxiety surrounding the extent to which an unsupervised, unregulated and uncontrolled popular culture could pose a threat to the prestige, privileges and power of the middle and upper classes, which, as Elias noted, play so great a part in their lives.

What significance does the analysis outlined in the present study have for research into popular culture, leisure and working class youth? Its significance in the most general sense lies in sensitising the researcher to the need to make the codes of conduct which guide our everyday lives problematic and to trace to their source the fears and anxieties which induce the more powerful members of English society to control their own behaviour in particular ways and which lead them to approach the control of less powerful groups in the ways that they do. Its significance also lies in the perspective adopted and substantively employed. Of crucial importance in this regard is the idea of the structured processes of continuity and change in popular culture. The transformations in popular culture need to be grasped.\textsuperscript{27} Ibid p. 327.
in the way historical processes in general have been understood here. The making of culture is shaped by two interwoven features. Firstly, by blind, unplanned social processes. Secondly, by what Johnson has termed the 'partly conscious strategies' adopted by individuals and groups located in these emergent figurations. The impulse to establish hegemonic control with respect to the limits of decent partisanship and the narrowing of the precepts relating to public order, and indeed the subsequent emergence of such limits and precepts as a consequence of the intertwining of the plans and intentions of all interested parties, is, in fact, bound up in the blind, unplanned social processes which the present study has sought to examine. In fact, the ability, or more correctly, the relative power potential of individuals and groups to shape the outcome of cultural encounters is dependent on these processes in particular, on the structurally generated and, in the long term, changing balance of power between groups in society at large.

With this in mind, analyses of popular culture must become more relational in their orientation. The alternatives, i.e. of a working class that experiences total encapsulation or that enjoys pure autonomy, are equally unacceptable. Cultural struggle - as has been shown substantively by the present study - takes many forms and goes through different phases - incorporation, resistance, negotiation and repulsion. The important thing to do in approaching the analysis of these forms is to examine them developmentally and from a figural perspective: only then is it possible to discern such forms and phases as actual historical processes.

In addition, what Burke has argued in relation to the analysis of history in general is relevant here for the study of popular culture. The

28 Johnson, "Notes on the Schooling of the English Working Class 1780-1880".
29 Burke, Popular Culture and Early Modern Europe.
tendency to adopt a non-relational perspective and to approach analysis
in terms which approximate closely either to the pole of pure autonomy or
that of total encapsulation also finds expression in characterisations of
popular culture. There is a need to avoid writing into popular culture
something which is not there. Heroic rebels and "cultural dopes" are both
reflections of an inadequate conceptualisation of historical processes. In
the present study, the exploration of the changing nature and expression of
violence in English society - especially in the context of popular culture -
does not result in a denial of meaning to those involved. Equally, to
probe the social meaning to the actors involved of the violence of football
hooligan encounters is not a task mutually exclusive to that of examining
the social roots of their behaviour. There is a need, as Elias argues in
relation to sociological analyses in general, to be relatively detached in
the study of popular culture, leisure and working class youth.

British society, in fact, has failed to come to terms with the social
roots of football hooligan violence. While the "rough" working class may
find, as they evidently did in the period between the wars, a less con­
tentious social milieu in which to demonstrate their codes of conduct, and
although the present phase of "repulsion" in inter-class relations may wane
or lessen in its intensity, until the generating social conditions of the
ways of living characteristic of the poorest members of our society are
removed, the violent masculine style which underpins the present day
phenomenon of football hooliganism will not go away.

Equally, British society has failed to make problematic the basis for
the progressive narrowing of the limits of public order in general and the
limits of decent partisanship in particular that has been occurring for at
least the past century and a half. Until the contradictions which mark the
structure of our society become less marked, the moral panics which recurrently
surface will remain an integral feature of social development. In fact it is here, while accepting the overall contribution made by Elias, that the concept of hegemony is of relevance. The custodians of the precepts regarding the limits of decent partisanship at Association football matches have been, as documented, the upper and, more generally, the middle classes. It is they who have both attempted to permeate the working classes with their own standards of conduct and, at times, emphasised the differences in codes of conduct between classes in order to maintain their power and prestige. While such behaviour may have been, to use Johnson's term 'a partly conscious strategy' in an attempt to establish class-cultural control, it has also been necessary to observe that such behaviour is itself bound up in the blind, unplanned social processes which were and are at work. It is also possible to acknowledge the accuracy of the conclusion which Elias reached in this regard, a conclusion which is apposite regarding the limits of decent partisanship that our ruling groups wish to see applied at soccer matches:

"At present many of the rules of conduct and sentiment implanted in us as an integral part of one's conscience, of the individual superego, are remnants of the power and status aspirations of established groups, and have no other function than that of reinforcing their power chances and their status superiority. They help members of these groups to such distinction not simply through their own achievement... but through the monopolistic appropriation of power chances the access to which is blocked for other interdependent groups. Only when the tensions between and within states have been mastered is there a chance that the regulation of men's affects and conduct in their relations with each other can be confined to those instructions and prohibitions which are necessary in order to keep up the high level of functional differentiation and interdependence without which even the present levels of civilised conduct in men's co-existence with each other could not be maintained, let alone surpassed." 30

In the light of the overall analysis attempted by the present study, what more specific research recommendations can be made? Several suggest themselves. Firstly, a more comprehensive analysis across the social

---

spectrum of the transformations wrought by the phases of colonisation and repulsion would prove fruitful and contribute to a greater understanding of English society. Secondly, further investigation of the links between the control and supervision of working class leisure, the perception by powerful outsiders of working class youth, and the nature and extent of class anxiety would yield valuable insights. Thirdly, a developmental analysis of the "rough" working class across the social and leisure spectrum, and not solely with reference to a single leisure activity, would provide an in-depth study of the character of such communities. Fourthly, investigation of the patterns of policing and the processes of control adopted by the emerging agencies of the state towards, for example, activities such as boxing matches, racecourse meetings, political rallies and elections and industrial unrest, would cast further light on the supervision and regulation of the narrowing limits of public order. More specifically in relation to soccer, further research could focus onto particular aspects of the development of football as a spectator sport which it was impossible to embrace within the scope of the present study. In this respect, three recommendations can be made. Firstly, an analysis of the ownership and control of clubs from the foundation of the Football League to the present day could be attempted and in such a context, the relationship between clubs and their supporters could be further examined. Secondly, as noted in the main text, the emergence of football spectating as a social problem in Northern Ireland and in Scotland may well have features distinctive to these areas and which, as such, are worthy of more investigation. Thirdly, an appraisal of what the present study terms Britain's most enduring export, namely the spread of the game of soccer first to Europe and then to most other parts of the world, would not only provide insights into the development of specific societies but would also provide a valuable cross-cultural
increment to sociological knowledge, an increment of potentially wider significance than to some narrowly conceived "sociology of sport."

In these final remarks, it is perhaps best to return to a brief discussion of what Goudsblom has termed the "sensitising concepts" which should guide sociological research.\textsuperscript{31} The acquisition of \textit{precise} information formed the basic intent of the documentation of the development of Association Football as a spectator sport in Chapter Four. Such evidence, however, requires \textit{systematic} presentation. The analysis in this thesis of popular culture, leisure and working class youth and of the emergence of football spectating as a social problem attempted both to classify and explain the evidence. With respect to these features, the study attempted to grasp their wider significance with reference to the ongoing struggle between ways of living in English society. These concluding remarks have sought to explicate this \textit{significance} more clearly, though \textit{perforce} more abstractly, than was possible in the main text. But there is also a need to ensure that the knowledge produced should be of some "\textit{avail in arranging the lives of real people.}" It may be that Peter Jenkins had such a sentiment in mind when he wrote of the speech given by Leon Brittan, the Home Secretary, to the Conservative Party Conference in October 1983:

"An honest man, and a man of courage, might... have begun by educating the Conservative Party, the Prime Minister and the public in the complexities of crime statistics. Mr. Brittan is well aware of the conclusion reached by many of his experts and a good few chief constables that there is no general crime wave, that crimes of violence are historically in decline, and that the fear of crime whipped up by politicians and the press, is probably the cause of greater suffering than crime itself.

A man of principle and courage might have explained these matters, not in order to minimise the actual incidence of crime, or the localised concentration of certain types of crime, or the horror of crime itself for its victims, nor as a preface to a policy of weakness or complacency, but to perform the politician's duty of putting reason before unreason, knowledge before ignorance, facts before myth and humanity before inhumanity." \textsuperscript{32}

\textsuperscript{31} Goudsblom, \textit{Sociology in the Balance} pp 100-101.

\textsuperscript{32} \textit{The Guardian} 13th October 1983.
Such a task is not confined to politicians; and, in its own way, by seeking to provide a relatively adequate analysis of the limits of decent partisanship with special reference to the interrelated problems of the conflictual emergence of popular culture and football spectating in the context of the emerging game of soccer, the present study has sought both to remain faithful to the notion of sensitising concepts outlined by Goudsblom and to produce an analysis that may be of practical value.
APPENDIX A: Clubs Cited in FA Records at Whose Grounds Spectator Misconduct is Reported to have Occurred 1895-1974

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Clubs</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1895</td>
<td>Derby County</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sheffield Wednesday</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1896</td>
<td>Crewe Alexander</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Loughborough</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1897</td>
<td>Burnley</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lincoln</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1898</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1899</td>
<td>Luton</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sheffield Wednesday</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gainsborough Town</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1900</td>
<td>West Bromwich Albion</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stoke City</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Loughborough</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1901</td>
<td>Gainsborough</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Newcastle</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* 1902</td>
<td>Stoke City</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* 1903</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* 1904</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1905</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1906</td>
<td>Bradford City</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bristol City</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Leeds United</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Middlesbrough</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sheffield Wednesday</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1907</td>
<td>Notts County</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sunderland</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1908</td>
<td>Oldham Athletic</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1909</td>
<td>Glossop</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bristol City</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1910</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1911</td>
<td>Stockport County x 2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lincoln</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* 1902-03 Minutes missing.
1903-04
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Team 1</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1912</td>
<td>Glossop</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1913</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1914</td>
<td>Fulham</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lincoln</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1921</td>
<td>Bradford City</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Merthyr Tydfil</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Port Vale</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1922</td>
<td>Coventry City</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>West Ham United</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Derby County</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aston Villa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Clapton Orient</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Crewe Alexander</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1923</td>
<td>Crystal Palace</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wolverhampton Wanderers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Blackburn</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hartlepool</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Walsall</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1924</td>
<td>Hartlepool United</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stoke City</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1925</td>
<td>Bradford</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Newport County</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1926</td>
<td>Notts County</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Queens Park Rangers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Luton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Everton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Blackburn</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Clapham Orient</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Preston North End</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1927</td>
<td>Chesterfield</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reading</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Millwall</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bradford City</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1928</td>
<td>Northampton Town x 2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reading</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1929</td>
<td>Chelsea</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Carlisle</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1930</td>
<td>Cardiff</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Queens Park Rangers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Luton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Liverpool</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nottingham Forest</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Blackpool</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Team 1</td>
<td>Team 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1931</td>
<td>Northampton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1932</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1933</td>
<td>Millwall</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1934</td>
<td>Aston Villa</td>
<td>Millwall x 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chester</td>
<td>Hull City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coventry</td>
<td>Carlisle United</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rochdale</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1935</td>
<td>Cardiff City</td>
<td>Crewe Alexander</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Carlisle United</td>
<td>Blackpool</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1936</td>
<td>Wolverhampton Wanderers</td>
<td>Middlesbrough</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Brighton</td>
<td>Newport County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Newport County</td>
<td>Queens Park Rangers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1937</td>
<td>Chester</td>
<td>Barrow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Everton x 2</td>
<td>Crewe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1938</td>
<td>Liverpool</td>
<td>Rotherham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aston Villa</td>
<td>Accrington Stanley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Portsmouth</td>
<td>Brighton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Newcastle</td>
<td>Millwall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1939</td>
<td>Liverpool</td>
<td>West Ham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bury</td>
<td>Blackpool</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1946</td>
<td>Rochdale</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1947</td>
<td>West Bromwich Albion</td>
<td>Wolverhampton Wanderers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sheffield Wednesday</td>
<td>Fulham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tottenham Hotspur</td>
<td>Leicester City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Walsall</td>
<td>Arsenal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Southampton</td>
<td>Millwall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Preston</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Matches</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1948</td>
<td>West Bromwich Albion, Port Vale, Leyton Orient, Bristol City, Norwich City, Exeter City, Notts County</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1949</td>
<td>Brentford, Port Vale, Watford, Manchester City, Lincoln City, Walsall, Hartlepool United, Plymouth Argyle, Millwall</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950</td>
<td>Blackpool, Liverpool x 2, Manchester City, Tranmere Rovers, Crewe Alexander, Bradford Park Avenue, Blackburn Rovers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* 1951</td>
<td>Northampton Town, Port Vale</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* 1952</td>
<td>Gateshead, Millwall, Sunderland, Mansfield Town</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1953</td>
<td>Chesterfield, Reading, York City, Newcastle, Sunderland</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1954</td>
<td>Cardiff City, Everton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1955</td>
<td>Everton, Leyton Orient, Exeter City, Rochdale, Brentford, West Bromwich Albion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1956</td>
<td>Aldershot, Manchester City, Walsall Town, Bristol Rovers, Doncaster, Swindon, Derby County, Crystal Palace, Southend</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* 1951-52 Minutes Missing.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Teams</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1957</td>
<td>Ipswich, Sunderland, Halifax Town x2, Queens Park Rangers x2, Workington, Wolverhampton, Preston North End, Bournemouth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1958</td>
<td>Swindon, Newcastle, Everton, Southend, Bournemouth x2, Bristol City, Chesterfield, Oldham Athletic, Plymouth Argyle, Wolverhampton Wanderers, Crewe Alexander x2, Barrow, Liverpool, Luton, Southampton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1959</td>
<td>Queens Park Rangers x2, Middlesbrough, Fulham, Burnley, Plymouth Argyle, Port Vale, Reading, Rotherham United, Chelsea, Coventry City, Birmingham City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td>Fulham, Portsmouth, Crystal Palace, Doncaster Rovers, Gillingham, Leicester City, Birmingham City, Burnley, Workington, Bradford City, Queens Park Rangers, Southport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total 12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1961

Gillingham
Newcastle
Fylmooth
Tranmere Rovers x 2
York City
Wolverhampton Wanderers
Huddersfield
Manchester City
West Ham United
Port Vale
Northampton
Peterborough
Notts County

1962

Stoke City
Oldham Athletic
Liverpool
Bradford Park Avenue
Queens Park Rangers
Derby County
Grimsby
Millwall
Preston
Southend
Crewe Alexandra
Tranmere
Charlton Athletic
Brentford
Bradford City
Coventry City
Port Vale
Bolton

1963

Millwall x 2
West Ham
Queens Park Rangers x 2
West Bromwich Albion
Bury
Bristol City
Northampton Town
Southend
Chester
Halifax
Wolverhampton Wanderers
Reading
Port Vale
Everton x 2
Leyton Orient
Bournemouth

1964

Arsenal
Aston Villa
Birmingham City
Nottingham Forest
Doncaster Rovers
Bournemouth
Carlisle United
1964
Bristol Rovers
Burnley
Manchester City
Portsmouth
Everton
Bolton

1965
Gillingham
Colchester
Crewe Alexander
Luton
Oldham Athletic
Manchester United x 2
Rotherham United
Burnley
Leeds United
Reading x 2
Queens Park Rangers
West Bromwich Albion
Oxford United
Huddersfield Town
Liverpool

1966
Blackburn
Swindon
Bristol City
Shrewsbury Town
West Bromwich Albion
Brentford City
Southampton
Millwall
Rochdale
Grimsby
Bradford City
Port Vale
Derby County
West Ham United
Bradford Park Avenue x 2
Bristol City
Middlesbrough
Oldham x 2
Gillingham
Queens Park Rangers
Manchester City
Coventry City

1967
Millwall x 2
Brighton
Lincoln
Leicester City
Newcastle
Barnsley
Grimsby Town
West Bromwich Albion
1967
Oxford United
Nottingham Forest
Leeds United
Bury
Orient
Luton Town
Blackburn
Fulham
Plymouth
Shrewsbury Town
Burnley x 2

1968
Blackpool
Newport County
Leeds United
Torquay United
Orient x 2
Grimby Town x 2
Everton
Tranmere
Nottingham Forest
Newcastle
Birmingham City
Rochdale
Walsall
Sheffield Wednesday
Bournemouth
Plymouth
Tottenham Hotspur
Carlisle United

1969
Bristol Rovers x 2
Rotherham United
Bradford City
Rotherham United x 2
Brighton
Swindon
Chester
West Ham United
Darlington x 2
Crystal Palace
Manchester City
Norwich City
Blackburn
Blackpool
Bradford Park Avenue x 2
West Bromwich Albion
York City
Carlisle United
Middlesbrough
Bournemouth
Halifax
Manchester United
Scunthorpe x 2

Total 20
Total 28
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Teams</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>Bradford City, Burnley, Port Vale, Walsall, Plymouth, Brighton, Grimsby Town x 2, Manchester United</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972</td>
<td>Orient, Chesterfield, Torquay United, Portsmouth, Doncaster Rovers x 2, Reading, Derby County, Leicester City, Burnley x 2, Bradford City, Birmingham City, Halifax Town, Chester x 2, Bury, Hartlepool, Bradford Park Avenue, Oxford United, Leeds United, Newcastle, Manchester United, Rotherham United</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973</td>
<td>Orient, Bournemouth x 2, Bury, Grimsby x 2, Peterborough, Blackburn, Hartlepool, Port Vale, Norwich City, Sunderland, Colchester United</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Teams</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973</td>
<td>Millwall, Newcastle, Oxford United, Northampton, Gillingham, Notts County</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1974</td>
<td>Derby County, West Ham, Fulham, Newcastle United, Swindon Town, Orient, Oldham, Torquay, Northampton Town, Luton, Manchester United, Southampton, Plymouth Argyle, Millwall, Darlington, Sheffield Wednesday, Crewe Alexander</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX B: Chronological Account of Spectator Misconduct Involving Millwall Supporters

1. September 1901 Millwall v Portsmouth
   Player struck by Missile, Club Warned by FA and Ordered to Post Warning Notices.

2. September 1906 West Ham v Millwall
   "Free Fights" Between Supporters Reported.

3. October 1920 Millwall v Newport County
   Barracking of Officials, Missiles thrown and Spectator on Pitch.
   Goalkeeper Involved in Fight in Crowd.
   Ground Closed by FA.

4. November 1920 Millwall v Swindon
   Stone Throwing and an 'Angry Demonstration' Reported.

5. April 1925 Charlton v Millwall
   Crowd Burst Through Entrance Gates.

6. October 1927 Millwall v Swindon
   Referee Struck by Missile, FA Orders Notices to be Posted Warning Spectators.

7. December 1927
   Millwall Club Programme Complains of Barracking of Players by Crowd.

8. February 1933 Millwall v Swansea
   Misconduct by Spectators Reported - FA Warn Club, Further Offences Ground Would be Closed.

9. March 1934 Millwall v Bradford
   Referee Barracked - Ground Closed by FA.

10. December 1934 Millwall v Luton Town
    Referee Barracked, Missiles Thrown.
    Millwall Fined £50 by FA.
    Tunnel Built to Protect Players and Officials.

11. November 1938 Millwall v Southampton
    Barracking, Fireworks Thrown
    Police Protect Referee, Club Fined £100.

12. October 1947 Millwall v Barnsley
    Missiles Thrown, Pitch Invasion Attempted.
    Assault, Man Arrested.
    Ground Closed for 7 days, Club Fined £100.

13. November 1949 Millwall v Exeter City
    Referee Barracked, Referee and Linesmen
    Attacked Outside the Ground
    Millwall Ground Closed for 7 days, Club Fined £100.
    Club Ordered to Co-operate with the Police more closely.

14. September 1952 Millwall v Bristol Rovers
    Misconduct Reported, No Action by FA.
15. September 1962 Millwall v Hull City
   Bottle Thrown, Club Ordered to Post Warning Notices.

16. February 1963 Millwall v Wrexham
   Players Pelted with Snowballs, Fan Invades Pitch/Arrested
   Club Ordered to Post Warning Notices.

17. March 1963 Millwall v Bristol Rovers
   Missiles Thrown - Player Struck
   No Action by FA.

18. April 1963 Millwall v Crystal Palace
   Bottle Thrown - No Action by FA.

19. November 1965 Brentford v Millwall
   Fans Fight, Missiles Thrown.

20. December 1965 Hereford United v Millwall
    Damage to Train Reported.

21. December 1965 Millwall v Walsall Town
    Fans Fight, Attacks on Players, Fans Invade Pitch.

22. April 1966 Millwall v Bournemouth
    Missile Thrown - Club Ordered to Post Warning Notices.

23. Season 1965-1966 Millwall v Birmingham City
    Attacks on
    Millwall v Bristol City
    Fans

24. September 1966 Millwall Programme Complains of Persistent Pitch
    Invasions.

25. January 1967 Millwall v Plymouth Argyle
    Players and Directors Attacked - FA Warn Club as to Conduct of Fans.

26. March 1967 Millwall v Huddersfield Town
    Fights Among Spectators - Club Warned by FA.

27. April 1967 Millwall v Wolverhampton Wanderers
    Attack on Wolves Player - No Action by FA.

28. August 1967 Millwall v Blackburn Rovers
    Fights Before, During and After the Match
    No Action by FA.

29. October 1967 Millwall v Aston Villa
    Fights Between Fans, Referee Struck by Fan
    Millwall Fined £1,000.

30. December 1967 Cardiff City v Millwall
    Cardiff Manager attacked by Millwall Fan.

31. December 1967 Norwich v Millwall
    Train Damaged by Travelling Fans.
32. December 1967 Crystal Palace v Millwall
Train Damaged and Local People Attacked after Two Hundred Fans Ejected from Train.

33. December 1968 Millwall v Birmingham City
Goalkeeper Struck by Missile.

34. December 1969 Millwall v Cardiff City
Chairman of Millwall had his Property Attacked.

35. September 1973 Millwall v Aston Villa
Fights Before, During and After the Match
FA Warn Spectators.

36. December 1974 Millwall v Orient
Player Struck by Knife - No Action by FA.

37. 1976 West Ham v Millwall Fan Found Dead - Stabbing.

38. March 1978 Millwall v Ipswich Town
Missiles Thrown, Fight Between Fans Reported
Ground Closed for Two Weeks.

39. October 1978 West Ham v Millwall
Helicopter Used by Police to Control Fans.

40. January 1980 Millwall v Shrewsbury Town
Linesman Hit by Missile.
FA Enquiry Ordered.

41. November 1982 Slough Town v Millwall
Crowd Violence Reported, Chairman Threatens to Close Club if
Conduct Repeated.

42. August 1983 Four pre-season 'friendlies' cancelled on police advice as a result of crowd disorder at Tonbridge.

43. October 1983 Millwall v West Bromwich - Clashes Between Supporters, Coach Stoned, Millwall Fans Seen as 'Animals' By Cyrille Regis, a West Bromwich Player.

44. January 1984 Missile Throwing and a Pitch Invasion at the Den, the FA Decide Not to Take any Further Action - The Club was Deemed to have 'Taken All Reasonable Steps to Control the Crowd.'

45. October 1984 Millwall v Chelsea Milk Cup 'Disturbances Reported at Stanford Bridge and the Den.'
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C. DISSERTATIONS


ABSTRACT OF J. MAGUIRE.

THE 'LIMITS OF DECENT PARTISANSHIP': A SOCIOGENETIC INVESTIGATION OF THE EMERGENCE OF FOOTBALL SPECTATING AS A SOCIAL PROBLEM.

THESIS PRESENTED TO THE UNIVERSITY OF LEICESTER FOR THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY 1985.

This thesis attempts to document the forms of spectator disorder that have been associated with Association football since the emergence of the professional game in the 1880's. It also traces the concomitant emergence of football spectating as a recognised "social problem," analyses changes in the ways in which this "problem" has been perceived, and looks at the various measures that have been adopted for controlling it. These tasks are located within an examination of the major social changes that have occurred in England in the last 100 years, and special attention is paid in this connection to the struggle between classes over competing ways of living.

The study is a developmental one and uses as its principal sources of data the records of the Football Association and accounts of spectator disorders in newspapers and journals. While chiefly qualitative, quantitative documentation of the changing rates of different forms of disorder is also attempted.

Although spectator disorder has been a persistent feature of Association football since the emergence of the professional game, its nature, extent and the ways in which it is perceived by powerful outsiders inside and outside the game have varied over time. The emergence of football spectating as a social problem, along with changing perceptions in this regard, is bound up, it is argued, both with the continuing "cultural struggle" that has taken place in English society since at least the onset of industrialisation and with the longer term "civiliising process" to which Norbert Elias has referred.

Prevailing conceptions of the nature of continuity and change in historical processes generally and in popular culture and working class leisure in particular are seen as inadequate. The dominant mythology currently surrounding football hooliganism is also rejected, and the nature of "social problems" is reconceptualised. Changes in the specific forms of spectator disorder, in perceptions of it and in attempts to control it, it is argued, are more adequately understood in terms of class cultural conflict over ways of living in English society and by attempting to trace the social roots of such conflict. Crucial in this regard over the last century and a half has been a marked narrowing of the forms of behaviour that are seen as consistent with "public order:" the defining and re-defining of "the limits of decent partisanship" reflect this process. A case is thus made out for the adoption of a developmental and figuralational sociology in examining sport, leisure and popular culture.